



## 11<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Wetlands (Ramsar, Iran, 1971)

*“Wetlands: home and destination”*

Bucharest, Romania, 6-13 July 2012

### Conference Report

#### Opening Ceremony, First & Second Plenary Sessions

Friday 6 July 2012, 17.00–19.00 (Agenda Items I & II)

Saturday 7 July 10.00–13.00 (Agenda Items III–IX)

Saturday 7 July 15.00–17.30 (Agenda Items X & XI)

#### Agenda Item I: Opening of the Meeting

#### Agenda Item II: General Statements

##### a) Opening ceremony

1. The Opening Ceremony commenced with a musical performance featuring Romania's world-renowned pan flute player **Mr Gheorghe Zamfir**.
2. The **Master of Ceremonies** (Mr Magor Csibi, WWF Romania Country Office Manager) welcomed participants to Bucharest and to COP11.
3. The Ramsar Flag was symbolically transferred from the representative of the **Republic of Korea** (Mr Yeon-Chul Yoo, Director General, International Cooperation Office, Ministry of Environment), host country of Ramsar COP10, to the representative of the **Republic of Romania** (Mr Corneliu Mugurel Cozmanciuc, Secretary of State, Ministry of Environment and Forests), host country of COP11.
4. **Mr Yoo** expressed his gratitude to the government and people of Romania as hosts of COP11 and thanked all those who had assisted the Republic of Korea in its role as host of COP10 and as Chair of the Standing Committee during the last triennium.
5. **Mr Cozmanciuc** welcomed participants to Romania on behalf of the Ministry of Environment and Forests. He felt certain that COP11 would offer the opportunity to deal with the challenges of protecting wetland ecosystems around the world and to set the Ramsar Convention's strategy for the next 40 years. Recalling the slogan of the conference, *“Wetlands: home and destination”*, he wished all participants success in their work and a pleasant discovery of Romania and its wetlands in particular. (Note: The texts of Mr Cozmanciuc's and other Opening Statements are available as part of the COP11 Proceedings at <http://www.ramsar.org/cop11-statements>.)

6. The **Minister of Transport and Infrastructure of the Republic of Romania** (Mr Ovidiu Salaghi) observed that in a global world it was counterproductive to overlook the interdependence of development, tourism and biodiversity. Efforts were required to reduce the effects of climate change and to secure the livelihoods of local communities. An important aim of the Ministry's strategy was environmental protection, including the prevention of pollution by shipping on the Danube River and other waterways. There was a need to balance the growth of strong economies with the protection of the natural environment that not only supplies food, water and economic opportunities, but also engenders pride and wonder.
7. The **Secretary of State, Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Romania** (Mr Bogdan Aureescu), noted that COP11 was the largest environmental event ever hosted in Romania. He hoped that the conference would prove to be a milestone in the protection and sustainable use of wetlands, especially at a time when economic considerations seemed to be taking precedence. In that regard, the theme of the conference had been very well chosen.
8. The representative of the **Cabinet of the Prime Minister** (Mr Remus Cernea, State Counsellor) reflected on his recent attendance at Rio+20 and his pleasure at seeing the participation of many Rio+20 delegates at COP11 in Bucharest. It was encouraging to see that such a diversity of people and countries shared a common will to work for environmental protection. The debates during the coming days and subsequent political decisions could help shape a better future for the environment, for wetlands and for people everywhere.
9. The **Ramsar Secretary General** (Mr Anada Tiéga) also referred to the conclusions of Rio+20, which recognized that well-designed and well-managed tourism could make a significant contribution to sustainable development. Other key issues addressed by both Rio+20 and COP11 included energy, sustainable cities, health and population, poverty eradication, climate change, sustainable agriculture, biodiversity, water and sanitation, and the oceans and seas. On behalf of all participants, the **Secretary General** warmly thanked the government and people of the Republic of Romania for the efforts made in hosting COP11. Noting that this would be his last COP as Secretary General, **Mr Tiéga** expressed his deep gratitude to all those who had supported the work of the Convention during his period of office and reflected on future challenges, not least the need to continue building and strengthening a broad range of partnerships. He concluded by naming and thanking all Contracting Parties, partners and institutions that had provided financial or in-kind support to the Convention during the last triennium.
10. Following a further musical performance, welcome messages were delivered by the representatives of **IUCN** (Ms Julia Marton-Lefèvre, Director General) and **UNEP** (Mr Masa Nagai, Acting Deputy Director, Division of Environmental Law and Conventions), as well as by the representative of Ramsar's five **International Organization Partners – IOPs** (Mr Jim Leape, Director General of WWF International).
11. **Ms Marton-Lefèvre** considered that Rio+20 had been a reaffirmation that governments should not be expected to make development sustainable by themselves, but rather through partnerships. Ramsar had grown from the germ of an idea in the minds of wetland experts some 50 years ago into a global Convention ratified by 162 countries; success had come from working together. Now the biggest challenge was how to

implement the Convention on the ground to achieve ‘wise use’ of wetlands. The challenge at Rio+20 had been similar: how to move from aspiration to implementation. Ramsar’s partnership model should show the way and IUCN was pleased to present concrete examples of its own partnerships for wetland conservation in many regions and countries. Commenting on the future institutional hosting of the Ramsar Secretariat, Ms Marton-Lefèvre renewed her pledge of IUCN’s continued commitment and support, irrespective of the decision taken by the COP.

12. **Mr Nagai** addressed the meeting on behalf of UNEP’s Executive Director, Mr Achim Steiner, who conveyed his apologies for being unable to attend and his best wishes for a successful meeting. The linkages between sustainable tourism, ecosystem management and sustainable development were highlighted in the outcomes of Rio+20, and sustainable wetland tourism could clearly be a major contributor to a ‘green economy’. In the past, wetlands had commonly been perceived as having little value, whereas they were now considered among the most productive and valuable of all ecosystems. Referring to the institutional framework for global environmental governance, examples of enhanced cooperation included collaboration between the Ramsar Convention, the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) and the Convention on Migratory Species (CMS), as well as in the framework of the emerging Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES). UNEP/WCMC continued to work with Multilateral Environmental Agreements on a range of data and reporting tools. Confirming its readiness to host the Ramsar Secretariat, should the Parties so decide, UNEP remained fully committed to supporting the development and implementation of the Convention, whatever the outcome of the COP on this issue.
13. **Mr Leape** reflected on increasing recognition that wetlands form a vital component of the ‘green infrastructure’ on which the whole of society depends. At the same time wetlands continued to face many pressures, setting the Ramsar Convention and its partners a tough challenge. In this regard, the IOPs were calling for the long-running debate on institutional hosting of the Ramsar Secretariat to reach a swift resolution, thereby avoiding ongoing distraction from the Convention’s core business. Key substantive issues for the COP to address included the linkages between water, food and energy; compensation and mitigation for wetland losses; and responding to threats to wetland ecosystems. Sites of particular concern to the IOPs included the Bay of Panama, Virunga National Park (Democratic Republic of Congo), and around the Yellow Sea. In this regard, the frequency and resourcing of Ramsar Advisory Missions, and the resourcing of the Ramsar Small Grants Fund, required significant upscaling.

**b) An example of cooperation and synergy**

14. The **Ramsar Secretary General** briefly introduced the second part of the Opening Ceremony, designed to showcase an example of partnership and synergies between the Ramsar Secretariat, an IOP (IUCN), and the private sector (Danone Group).
15. **The Danone Group’s Vice-Chairman of the Board of Directors and Deputy General Manager** (Mr Emmanuel Faber) stressed that responsible management of water catchments and responsible dairy farming were essential components of his company’s business. This had led to the establishment in 1998 of a unique partnership between Danone, Ramsar, and IUCN. Ten years later, a new phase of the partnership had been motivated by Danone’s commitment to a 30% reduction in its carbon emissions by the

end of 2012 and to making its Evian water operations carbon neutral. To this end, and with the ongoing support of Ramsar and IUCN, the ‘Danone Fund for Nature’ had been established to support large-scale ecosystem restoration projects, including the replanting of thousands of hectares of mangroves. The most recent innovation had been the creation at the end of 2011 of the ‘Livelihoods Fund’, through which five (soon to be six) other corporations, including Schneider Electric, Crédit Agricole, and Hermès, had joined Danone to invest 25 million Euros. This would finance further large-scale mangrove restoration, agroforestry, and access to energy as means of supporting sustainable livelihoods for rural communities whilst at the same time sequestering 6 to 8 million tons of carbon over the next 20 years. None of this would have been possible without the cooperation with Ramsar and IUCN initiated in 1998 and thanks were due to both institutions.

16. The **Director General of IUCN** commented that she had rarely seen partnerships work so effectively and so quickly, vividly demonstrating the value of scaling-up successful experiences on the ground in pursuit of a clear vision. IUCN was very pleased to be part of the partnership and looked forward to its continuation.
17. **The Danone Group’s Vice President for Sustainability and Shared Value Creation** (Mr Bernard Giraud) reflected on the successes achieved to date and the encouraging participation of new corporate partners. Danone hoped to be able to report to COP12 on the involvement of even more companies and the achievement of even greater results.
18. A short video presentation further highlighted the main elements of the cooperation between Danone, Ramsar, and IUCN.

**c) Ramsar Wetland Conservation Awards 2012**

19. The **Ramsar Secretary General** briefly recalled the history of the Ramsar Wetland Conservation Awards, established by COP6 in 1996 in order to recognize and honour the contributions of individuals, organizations, and governments around the world towards promoting the conservation and wise use of wetlands. The Ramsar Awards 2012 were being presented – together with the Evian Special Prize, a cheque for USD 10,000 awarded to each laureate and generously contributed by the Danone Group – to:
  - **Wetland Education Category:** The Wisconsin Wetlands Association (USA), represented by Ms Katie Beilfuss
  - **Wetland Management Category:** Ms Augusta Henriques, Secretary General of Tiniguena (Guinea-Bissau)
  - **Wetland Science Category:** Professor Tatsuichi Tsujii (Japan)
20. The **Secretary General** announced that the Ramsar Standing Committee had also decided to recognize and honour two individuals whose lifelong contributions to wetland conservation remained unmatched, and to confer Special Awards as follows:
  - **Recognition of Achievement:** Thymio Papayannis (Greece)
  - **40th Anniversary Honorary Ramsar Award:** Dr Luc Hoffmann (Switzerland)

21. Short video clips highlighted the work and achievements of all five laureates. The **Chair of the Standing Committee** (Mr Yeon-Chul Yoo, Republic of Korea) and the **Secretary General** presented the Ramsar Wetland Conservation Awards 2012 and the Special Awards. The Evian Special Prize was presented to the three Ramsar Award laureates by the **Danone Group's Vice President for Sustainability and Shared Value Creation** (Mr Bernard Giraud).
22. Each laureate made brief acceptance remarks, a common thread being the need to continue to inspire and engage people to take action for wetland conservation on the ground. All recipients received warm applause from participants, but the unique contribution of Dr Luc Hoffmann was recognized by a standing ovation.
23. This concluded the Opening Ceremony, which was followed by a reception for all delegates, hosted by **Romania**.

### **Agenda item III: Adoption of the Agenda**

24. As **President**, representing the **Republic of Korea, Host Government of COP10** and current **Chair of the Standing Committee**, Mr Yeon-Chul Yoo thanked the government and people of Romania for hosting COP11 and offered his congratulations to the Ramsar Award laureates honoured during the Opening Ceremony.
25. At the invitation of the **President**, the **Deputy Secretary General** noted that the 44<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the Standing Committee (SC44, held on 4 July 2012) had reviewed a number of documents and requested revised versions of COP11 DOC. 1 *Provisional Agenda* and COP11 DOC. 2 *Rules of Procedure*. The revised versions (Rev. 1 in each case) had now been distributed to all Contracting Parties and posted on the Ramsar website. A new document, DOC. 38 *List of registered observers* had also been made available in preparation for Agenda item VII. The Report of SC44 would be made available shortly, following the Conference Committee's review of a draft.
26. The **Secretariat** drew participants' attention to the following documents, which contained useful information and guidance concerning conference procedures and documentation: COP11 DOC. 3 *Procedures for the preparation and approval of decisions by Ramsar Contracting Parties at COP11*, COP11 DOC. 3 Add. 1 *Guidance to Contracting Parties for providing their input on COP information documents and COP11 DR4 during COP11 plenary sessions* and COP11 DOC. 4 *Guide to Draft Resolutions and related Information Papers*.
27. The **President** referred participants to document COP11 DOC. 1, Rev. 1 *Provisional Agenda*, which contained some minor adjustments approved by SC44.
28. The **Deputy Secretary General** summarized the adjustments that had been made.
29. At the invitation of the **President**, COP11 DOC. 1, Rev. 1 *Provisional Agenda* was adopted by consensus.

### **Agenda item IV: Adoption of the Rules of Procedure**

30. The **President** recalled that COP11 DOC. 2 *Rules of Procedure for Meetings of the Conference of the Contracting Parties to the Convention on Wetlands of International Importance especially as*

*Waterfowl Habitat (Ramsar, Iran, 1971)*, which had been distributed well in advance of the COP, included a number of recommendations for amendments endorsed by the 43<sup>rd</sup> meeting of the Standing Committee (SC43, October/November 2011), largely in response to advice from the COP10 Credentials Committee. SC44 had made a number of proposals for further adjustments and these were now reflected in document COP11 DOC. 2 Rev. 1 *Rules of Procedure for Meetings of the Conference of the Contracting Parties to the Convention on Wetlands of International Importance especially as Waterfowl Habitat (Ramsar, Iran, 1971)* distributed on 6 July.

31. The **Deputy Secretary General** introduced the proposed amendments to Rules 18, 19 and 26 of the Rules of Procedure.
32. The **President** opened the floor to comments.
33. **Jamaica** observed that a proposed amendment to Rule 5 had been submitted to the Secretariat on behalf of the Caribbean subregion, but that this proposed amendment did not appear in the revised document.
34. **Denmark** was sympathetic to Jamaica's position, but wished to see the proposed amendment in writing before taking a decision.
35. Following further discussion, during which interventions were made by **Brazil, Central African Republic, Chile, Colombia, Comoros, Mauritania** (on behalf of the Africa region), **Paraguay, Peru** and **Senegal**, the **President** invited the COP to approve DOC. 2 Rev.1 *Rules of Procedure*, with the exception of Rule 5 and Rule 26, which remained open and would be revisited in a subsequent plenary session.
36. The **Deputy Secretary General** clarified that submission of credentials to COP11 was governed by the Rules of Procedure adopted at COP10. However, in the case of Rule 18.1, where an extension of the deadline for submission of credentials (from 24 hours to 48 hours after the opening of the COP) was proposed, it would be entirely appropriate to apply that amendment – if adopted – with immediate effect.
37. At the invitation of the **President**, the COP adopted DOC 2 Rev.1 *Rules of Procedure*, with the exception of Rules 5 and 26, which remained to be finalized, and subject to clarification of a language correction in the French text, as requested by **Comoros**.

#### **Agenda item V: Election of the President and Vice-Presidents; Remarks by the President**

38. The **President** reported that, in conformity with Rule 21 of the Rules of Procedure, the Conference Committee had decided to nominate:
  - As **President: Mrs Rovana Plumb**, Minister of Environment and Forests, Republic of Romania.
  - As **Alternate President: Mr Mihail Fâcă**, State Secretary and President of the National Agency for Environmental Protection, Republic of Romania.
39. The COP endorsed by acclaim the Conference Committee's nominations.

40. **Mr Făcă** was invited to the podium to assume his responsibilities as **Alternate President**.
41. The **Alternate President** recalled that when nominating Vice-Presidents it was customary to take account of geographical distribution and to recognize that some Parties had already been elected to the Vice-Presidency of previous COPs. The Standing Committee had duly nominated **Mr Mohamed Saif Abdulrahman Alafkham Hammoudi**, United Arab Emirates, from the Asia region and **Ms Nancy Cespedes**, Chile, from the Neotropics region.
42. The two nominees were elected by acclaim and invited to the podium to take up their duties.

#### **Agenda item VI: Appointment of the Credentials Committee and any other committees**

43. At the invitation of the **Alternate President**, the **Secretariat** recalled the composition and means of establishment of the Credentials Committee.
44. In conformity with Rule 19 of the Rules of Procedure (COP11 DOC. 2, Rev. 1 *Rules of Procedure*), the following Contracting Parties, and their individual representatives, were nominated to serve on the Credentials Committee for COP11:
  - Africa – **Islamic Republic of Mauritania**, represented by Mr Sidi Mohamed
  - Asia – **Japan**, represented by Mr Yusuke Honda
  - Europe – **Denmark**, represented by Ms Helle Liemann
  - Neotropics – **Guatemala**, represented by Dr Erick Cabrera Castellanos
  - North America – **United States of America**, represented by Ms Krishna Roy
  - Oceania – **Australia**, represented by Ms Georgina Usher
45. The Credentials Committee was duly elected by consensus.
46. The **Deputy Secretary General** confirmed that the Secretariat would be represented in meetings of the Credentials Committee by Ms Claudia Fenerol, supported by Mr Dave Pritchard. The first meeting of the Committee would take place from 15.00 to 16.00 on Saturday 7 July. Further meeting times would be at the discretion of the members of the Credentials Committee.
47. The **Alternate President** noted that, in line with past practice, the Standing Committee had recommended establishing a COP11 Committee on Finance and Budget to consider DR2 *Financial and budgetary matters* and related issues.
48. The **Deputy Secretary General** reported the Standing Committee's further recommendations that membership of the COP11 Committee on Finance and Budget should be composed of the members of the Standing Committee Subgroup on Finance, plus one additional Contracting Party from each Ramsar region, and that the COP11 Committee should be chaired by Finland, Chair of the Standing Committee Subgroup on Finance. Given that Finland would have to remain entirely impartial, it was further recommended that the European region should be able to nominate one additional member of the COP11 Committee on Finance and Budget. Meetings of the Committee would be open to all Parties.

49. The following additional Contracting Parties were elected by consensus to serve on the COP11 Committee on Finance and Budget alongside the existing members of the Standing Committee Subgroup on Finance:

Africa: **South Africa**

Asia: **Japan**

Europe: **Denmark, Switzerland**

Neotropics: **Antigua & Barbuda**

North America: **Canada**

Oceania: **Fiji**

50. The **Deputy Secretary General** confirmed that the Committee's first meeting was scheduled for 13.15 to 14.45 on Sunday 8 July.
51. The **United States of America** regretted that a great deal of time had been spent on procedural matters under Agenda items IV and VI and considered that efficiencies could be made at future COPs. The US was therefore proposing that the Management Working Group of the Standing Committee be tasked with taking up this matter.

#### **Agenda item VII: Admission of Observers**

52. At the invitation of the **Alternate President**, the **Deputy Secretary General** introduced document COP11 DOC. 38 *Admission of registered observers*, which had been compiled in conformity with Rules 6 and 7 of the Rules of Procedure. The document listed all those observers who had registered up to and including 6 July. Those observers who had registered subsequently would be listed in an addendum to DOC. 38, to be distributed for consideration during a subsequent plenary session.
53. The COP duly approved by consensus the admission of all those observers listed in COP11 DOC. 38 *Admission of registered observers*.

#### **Agenda item VIII: Report of the Chairperson of the Standing Committee**

54. **Mr Yeon-Chul Yoo, Republic of Korea, Chair of the Standing Committee**, presented his report contained in document COP11 DOC. 5 *Report of the Chairperson of the Standing Committee*.
55. The **Alternate President** and **Secretary General** expressed deep gratitude on behalf of the Ramsar family and all Ramsar partners to Mr Yoo and to the Republic of Korea for their tireless efforts for the Convention during the past triennium.

#### **Statement by World Wetland Network NGO conference**

56. The **Deputy Secretary General** recalled that prior to both COP10 and COP11, the World Wetland Network had brought together representatives of wetland NGOs from around the world and that the Conference Committee had agreed to provide an opportunity in plenary for participants in that NGO conference to convey their views and recommendations to the COP.



57. A statement was delivered on behalf of the World Wetland Network by Prof. Petruta Moisi, Eco Counselling Centre, Galati, Romania. The statement is attached as Annex 3 to this Report.
58. The **Alternate President** acknowledged the fantastic work undertaken by NGOs and considered that it was very important for the COP to take these remarks into account.

**Agenda item IX: Report of the Chairperson of the Scientific & Technical Review Panel (STRP)**

59. The **Chair of the STRP**, Dr Heather MacKay, presented her report contained in document COP11 DOC. 6 *Report of the Chair of the Scientific & Technical Review Panel (STRP)*. (Note: Dr MacKay's and other PowerPoint presentations are available as part of the COP11 Proceedings at <http://www.ramsar.org/cop11-ppt>.)
60. The **Alternate President** opened the floor to comments and questions.
61. **Denmark** thanked the Chair and members of the STRP for their important and successful work over the past three years. Denmark looked forward to discussing the proposals put forward by the STRP, namely DRs 16, 17 & 18, with the aim of strengthening the scientific support available to the Convention.
62. **South Africa** also recorded its thanks to the STRP and appealed for measures and mechanisms to be put in place to overcome the constraints identified in the STRP Chair's report so that the Panel was able to provide effective advice to the Convention in future.
63. The **Chair of the STRP** invited South Africa to contribute its ideas during discussion of DR16. She noted that some countries had very strong connections between wetland scientists on one hand and wetland managers and decision makers on the other. In other countries the connections were very weak, or even absent. She would like to see a range of models developed for improving the input of science to implementation on the ground, and she highlighted the relevance of this in relation to the emerging Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES). Dr MacKay also drew attention to a paper prepared by the STRP and Secretariat which showcased examples of how some National Ramsar Committees were already providing a science-policy interface mechanism.
64. The **STRP Chair** continued that strengthening the funding for STRP's was not necessarily a question of allocating more resources in the core budget, and new means of securing voluntary and in-kind contributions should be sought. Similarly there was a need for creative ideas on improving communication between Contracting Parties and the STRP and achieving an extended scientific support network on the ground. In terms of STRP National Focal Points, and the challenges faced by some Parties in identifying suitable experts, it might be helpful to look to networks of young scientists and to view their possible participation in the STRP's work as an important opportunity for building experience and capacity.
65. **Switzerland** thanked the Chair and members of the STRP and called upon Parties to assist the Panel in working on selected implementation priorities during the coming triennium. Switzerland looked forward to continued collaboration with the STRP.

66. **The Islamic Republic of Iran** recommended that the STRP should consider working more closely with the UN Forum on Forests and emphasized the desirability of strengthening relations between the STRP and other scientific bodies.
67. The **Alternate President** and **Secretary General** recorded their appreciation of the work of the STRP.

**Agenda item X: Report on implementation of the CEPA (Communication, Education, Participation and Awareness) Programme 2009-2015**

68. The **Secretariat's CEPA Programme Officer**, Dr Sandra Hails, made a PowerPoint presentation highlighting key elements of document COP11 DOC. 14 *Overview of the implementation of the Convention's CEPA Programme*.
69. Observing that the Convention could achieve nothing without CEPA, the **Alternate President** opened the floor to comments and questions.
70. **The Islamic Republic of Iran** drew attention to a lack of skilled people in some countries. In this regard the Regional Ramsar Centres could be much more active in delivering CEPA-related training, a challenge that NGOs could also assist with.
71. The **CEPA Programme Officer** confirmed that the Secretariat had been in contact with some of the Regional Ramsar Centres on this issue to see what could be done, but also recognized that some of the Centres themselves needed capacity building on CEPA.
72. **South Africa** observed that the COP11 reports on the implementation of the Convention at global and regional levels drew attention to challenges related to CEPA. Key among these was a need to think more carefully about how target audiences are characterized, and to recognize that different approaches are needed for different audiences. Awareness raising and capacity building were often presented as something to be done mainly at local or community level, but there was also a need to engage politicians and other high-level decision makers.
73. The **CEPA Programme Officer** concurred and stressed the need for properly structured CEPA planning to identify and engage key target audiences, including decision makers.
74. **Peru** recommended targeting specific CEPA efforts towards older women in indigenous communities; it was often such women who played a key role.
75. **Uganda** stressed the need to consider not only the target audience, but also the message. It was perhaps time to shift from a focus on wetland values towards emphasizing the risks of failing to look after wetlands properly.
76. **India** drew attention to its participatory approach to wetland management planning, as highlighted in the National Report to COP11, which unfortunately had been submitted too late to be included in the analysis just presented. Concurring with South Africa's comments about the need to engage more strongly with decision makers, India felt consideration could be given to holding a high-level segment at future Ramsar COPs, building on the experience at COP9.

77. The **CEPA Programme Officer** agreed that there were many Ramsar Site and other wetland management plans that did integrate CEPA, but others were put together purely by scientists and technical experts, without the benefit of CEPA experience and without adopting a participatory approach.
78. The **United Arab Emirates** stressed the challenge of finding the right person with the right qualifications to coordinate CEPA planning and actions.
79. Reporting on lessons learned from a Ramsar Small Grants Fund project, **Kenya** stressed the interlinkages of CEPA with other key aspects of Ramsar implementation including National Wetland Committees, National Wetland Policies, and wetland management planning.
80. **Nepal** saw strong potential in working on CEPA together with other conventions; many Parties faced difficulties working in other languages and responding to multiple reporting requirements. Nepal also supported the calls made by other Parties to increase CEPA efforts at the political level as a means of enhancing implementation.

**Agenda item XI: Report of the Secretary General and overview of the implementation of the Convention at the global level**

81. The **Secretary General** presented his report contained in document COP11 DOC. 7 *Report of the Secretary General on the implementation of the Convention at the global level* and other relevant documents, including, among others:
  - COP11 DOC. 8 *Report of the Secretary General pursuant to Article 8.2 concerning the List of Wetlands of International Importance*
  - COP11 DOC. 9 *Regional overview of the implementation of the Convention and its Strategic Plan in Africa*
  - COP11 DOC. 10a *Regional overview of the implementation of the Convention and its Strategic Plan in Asia*
  - COP11 DOC. 10b *Regional overview of the implementation of the Convention and its Strategic Plan in Oceania*
  - COP11 DOC. 11 *Regional overview of the implementation of the Convention and its Strategic Plan in Europe*
  - COP11 DOC. 12 *Regional overview of the implementation of the Convention and its Strategic Plan in the Americas (Neotropics & North American regions)*
  - COP11 DOC. 13 *Progress and issues concerning Regional Initiatives operating within the framework of the Convention*
  - COP11 DOC. 18 *Strategic Framework for Ramsar partnerships: partnerships and fundraising*
  - COP11 DOC. 35 *Uptake of the "Changwon Declaration" (Resolution X.3) since COP10*
82. **Costa Rica** endorsed the Convention's approach to water issues, but felt that even greater recognition of the need to protect wetlands could be achieved through additional strategic alliances, especially with UN Water. Costa Rica had recently established a multi-institutional National Wetlands Committee, including involvement of civil society, but required additional technical support; the Ramsar Advisory Mission mechanism was particularly valuable in this regard.

83. The **Central African Republic** appreciated the vision and dynamism embodied in the Secretary General's report and the re-thinking of relations between the Secretariat and Contracting Parties that had been evident in recent years. The thoroughness of the analysis and the detail of the report would enable Parties to launch activities to correct current weaknesses and to share and learn from the strategies used by others.
84. **The Islamic Republic of Iran** underlined the need within the Asian region for more technical advice and capacity building. The lack of such support was currently damaging the region's wetlands. Iran had recently hosted an international conference on Engineering and Managing Wetlands, which had discussed some of the main areas mentioned by the Secretary General in his report, notably the role of wetlands in water management. Since the United Nations General Assembly had designated 2013 as the International Year of Cooperation on Water, did the Secretariat have plans to use this opportunity?
85. The **Secretariat** confirmed that a proposal had been submitted to the Ramsar Standing Committee with a view to establishing 'Wetlands and Water Management Cooperation' as the theme of World Wetlands Day 2013.
86. Referring to the section of the Secretary General's Report summarising the status of the Montreux Record, **Uruguay** informed the COP that it had requested the removal of two of its Ramsar Sites from the Montreux Record.
87. Noting that it would be submitting detailed points to the Secretariat, **South Africa** highlighted a number of key challenges, including the importance of reviewing the criteria and selection process for appointing National Focal Points; including the costs of holding the COP and sponsoring delegates within the Convention's core budget; and the need for a strategy to recover Parties' outstanding financial contributions. It would be helpful if these and other challenges could be presented in a tabular form, together with solutions and proposed timeframes.
88. **Peru** congratulated the Secretary General for including in his report not only the many successes achieved, but also a clear picture of how much remained to be done. Peru considered that the Memorandum of Understanding between Ramsar and the Convention on Biological Diversity was the oldest and best of its kind. There ought to be more explicit reference to the results obtained from such synergies. Peru was pleased to report the establishment of its National Wetlands Committee, which was already engaged in developing a national wetlands action plan.
89. **Wetlands International** referred to the urgent need to update the Ramsar Sites Information Service (RSIS), as highlighted in the Secretary General's Report. Maintaining the RSIS in its current form was not an option; an upgrade was essential and would bring more functionality and opportunities that would benefit Contracting Parties. Wetlands International wished to underline that improvements to the RSIS would be dependent on securing resources outside the core budget.
90. **Argentina** informed the COP that it had presented a note to the Secretariat in relation to the contents of the National Report of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland. The Republic of Argentina requested that this note be circulated to Contracting Parties and annexed to the Final Report of COP11 (see Annex 4).

91. **India** called for greatly improved systems to monitor the status of existing Ramsar Sites and suggested that there could be a role for Contracting Parties to assist one another in this respect at regional level. There was a need to devise performance indicators based on the criteria for which sites were designated. India felt that the STRP needed to improve consultation on its draft guidance documents to make them meaningful and results oriented.
92. In response to a question from the **Marshall Islands**, the **Secretary General** confirmed that while Asia and Oceania had been grouped together in some of the analyses presented in his global report, the relevant regional data were shown separately in the regional overviews (COP11 DOC. 10a and COP11 DOC. 10b)
93. **Cuba** confirmed that it had updated the Ramsar Information Sheets on its six existing Ramsar Sites and was currently in the process of designating three new sites. Cuba felt that great progress had been made under the Ramsar Convention, especially in terms of synergies with other MEAs. Rio+20 had provided new opportunities to work even more intensively on these synergies.
94. The **United Kingdom** noted Argentina's intention to place on record its differences with the UK. The UK wished to reserve its position and would respond in due course (see Annex 5).

#### **Special Presentation on wetland conservation and sustainable use in Romania**

95. This presentation was made by the **Executive Director of the Danube Delta Biosphere Reserve Authority Romania**, Dr Grigore Baboianu.
96. **Dr Baboianu** summarized the types, distribution, extent and principal values of wetlands found in Romania, highlighting the national, regional and global importance of the Danube Delta. Significant threats and pressures included the separation of the Danube River from its natural floodplain, including damage within the Danube Delta itself, during the 20<sup>th</sup> century; development of navigation; pollution; over-exploitation of natural resources; and climate change. Particularly since the political changes of 1990, Romania had been engaged in a wide range of national and international efforts, including those at EU level, to improve the protection of wetlands. These efforts included many different governmental and non-governmental organizations. Transboundary, regional-level activities included the Carpathian Wetlands Initiative, involving the participation of seven countries, all of them Ramsar Contracting Parties, the Ramsar Regional Initiative on Black Sea Coastal Wetlands ('Black Sea Wet'), and the Network of Protected Nature Areas 'Danube Parks'. Until very recently, Romania had eight Ramsar Sites, each of which was briefly introduced. On the occasion of COP11, four new Ramsar Sites were being designated:
  - Junction of Olt-Danube Rivers, total area: 466.23 km<sup>2</sup>
  - Bistreţ Lake, total area: 274.82 km<sup>2</sup>
  - Iezerul Călăraşi Lake, total area: 50.0 km<sup>2</sup>
  - Suhaia Lake, total area: 195.9 km<sup>2</sup>

97. Noting that WWF had been instrumental in the provision of technical assistance to the government of Romania, thereby supporting designation of these sites, the **Secretary General** invited the Director General of WWF International, Mr Jim Leape, to present Ramsar Site certificates to the **Alternate President** in his capacity as representative of the Ministry of Environment and Forests, the Ramsar Administrative Authority in Romania.
98. **Dr Baboianu** announced that a further eight potential Ramsar Sites were under consideration, with the continued support of WWF Romania.
99. The presentation concluded with a video, copies of which would be presented to all participants.

### **Third and Fourth Plenary Sessions**

Sunday 8 July 10.00–13.00 (Agenda Items IV (continued), XI (continued), XII, XIII & XV)

Sunday 8 July 15.00–18.00 (Agenda Items XIV & XV)

100. A **Special Presentation on *Outcomes of the Rio+20 Summit and their implications for the Ramsar Convention*** was made by **Mr Brice Lalonde, Executive Coordinator of Rio+20**, United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs (UN-DESA).
101. Following his presentation, Mr Lalonde responded to questions and comments from **Congo, Islamic Republic of Iran, Nicaragua, and Switzerland** concerning the response of the Ramsar Convention to the decisions taken at Rio+20.
102. The **Deputy Secretary General** thanked Mr Lalonde on behalf of all the participants for his very valuable presentation on the complex Rio+20 outcomes and for making the considerable effort to come to Bucharest so soon after the event to brief the Ramsar Parties.
103. The **Deputy Secretary General** informed the COP that the Conference Committee had given its approval for the Secretariat to translate and distribute a Rev. 1 of COP11 DR6 *Partnerships and synergies with Multilateral Environmental Agreements and other institutions*.
104. Parties who still wished to provide updates to COP11 DR4 Rev.1 *The Status of sites on the List of Wetlands of International Importance* were asked to submit them in writing to the Secretariat before the end of the morning plenary session.

### **Agenda item XI: Report of the Secretary General and overview of the implementation of the Convention at the global level (continued)**

105. The **Alternate President** invited the **Secretariat's Partnership Officer**, Ms Claudia Fenerol, to present an update on Ramsar's Partnerships Programme. (Note: Ms Fenerol's presentation is available at <http://www.cpe.ch/ar2/demo2/index.php>.)
106. The **Islamic Republic of Iran** called for cooperation between TEEB and the Ramsar regional groupings.

107. **Cameroon** would like to have heard an inventory of where things stood at present with regard to partnerships established for the benefit of Contracting Parties.
108. The **League of Arab States** stressed the need for capacity building and establishment of partnerships with the private sector across the Arab regions.
109. Underlining the importance to the Convention of the position of Partnership Officer within the Secretariat, **Switzerland** had nevertheless been expecting to see concrete achievements and wondered what the barriers to this had been. The Secretary General was requested to take appropriate measures for ensuring concrete outcomes from the Partnership Programme.
110. **Cuba** stressed the important role that the Secretariat could play in helping to mobilize resources as a neutral player without political strings attached.
111. **Senegal** suggested that a key task might be to ensure that there was a Focal Area on wetlands in the next replenishment of the Global Environment Facility; such a Focal Area was currently missing under GEF-5.
112. **Congo** noted that GEF had supported a number of wetland-related projects, even though there was no GEF Focal Area on wetlands *per se*. Congo also enquired about the Secretariat's involvement in the Blue Carbon Project.
113. **Japan** shared the view of Switzerland that the Partnership position within the Secretariat was very important, which is why clearer and more concrete results were needed. The Secretariat was asked to provide such results.
114. **Benin** emphasized the importance of partnerships with the private sector and also the need for continued engagement and follow-up once formal implementation of a project had been completed.
115. The **Secretary General** undertook provide the additional information requested by Parties. He was convinced of the need for a programme-based approach to partnerships; the Secretariat and Convention as a whole had to ensure that all partnership-related activities were aligned with the priorities of potential partners and especially with the priorities of the Contracting Parties themselves. No matter how interesting an idea might appear to be on paper, it was a non-starter without such strategic alignment.
116. Referring to comments made by the Secretary General when presenting his report on 7 July, **South Africa** noted that it would be tabling a proposed additional operational paragraph in COP11 DR2 *Financial and budgetary matters*. This would address the unfortunate situation whereby the costs of holding the COP, including support for delegate travel, were not included in the core budget, a situation that disadvantaged developing countries. South Africa also considered that the capacity of the Secretariat might be increased by streamlining existing capacity, rather than by increasing the head count and adding to the financial burden on Contracting Parties.

**Agenda item XII: Issues arising from Resolutions and Recommendations of previous meetings of the Conference of the Contracting Parties**

117. The **Deputy Secretary General** reported that as far as the Secretariat had been able to assess, there were no matters arising from COP10 Resolutions which were not covered by either COP11 information documents or COP11 Draft Resolutions.

118. There being no comments from the floor the **Alternate President** closed this item.

#### **Agenda item IV Adoption of the Rules of Procedure** (continued from 7 July)

119. The **Alternate President** recalled that this item remained open pending adoption of Rules 5 and 26.

120. The **Deputy Secretary General** introduced document COP11 DOC. 2 Rev. 1 Add. 1 *Rules of Procedure*, which had been amended to reflect the earlier discussion. Further examination by the Secretariat had suggested that Jamaica's proposed amendment concerning the production and circulation of an Annotated Agenda could most helpfully be included in Rule 10, rather than in Rule 5. Rule 10 referred to the deadline for the circulation of COP documentation, and it might be better to link the production of the Annotated Agenda with this timeframe, rather than with the timeframe of Standing Committee meetings as proposed for Rule 5.

121. The Secretariat had endeavoured to produce a clean text of Rule 26 showing clearly the net effect of all proposed amendments. Unfortunately a key clause ("*...à moins qu'un membre du Comité permanent ne s'y oppose*") had been missed from the 5<sup>th</sup> line of Rule 26.1 in the French text, but this would be rectified in the final version of DOC. 2. In summary, the proposal endorsed by the Conference Committee was to amend Rule 10 and Rule 26 (the latter including the correction to the French text mentioned above).

122. In response to the editorial amendment, affecting the French text only, proposed by **Comoros** on 7 July, the **Deputy Secretary General** reported that the Convention had a long-standing and consistent use of the term "*lettre de créance*" and it was therefore suggested that this terminology be retained.

123. The **United Kingdom** was on the whole content with the proposed changes and the proposal to amend Rule 10 rather than Rule 5, but considered it preferable to refer to "recommendations" of the Standing Committee, rather than "decisions" of the Standing Committee.

124. There being no other requests for the floor, the amendments and corrections outlined by the Secretariat, as well as the suggestion of the **United Kingdom**, were approved by consensus.

125. A clean version of the Rules of Procedure, as amended by COP11, was distributed to Contracting Parties during the afternoon of 8 July as document COP11 DOC. 2 final, *Rules of Procedure for Meetings of the Conference of the Contracting Parties to the Convention on Wetlands of International Importance especially as Waterfowl Habitat (Ramsar, Iran, 1971)*.

#### **Agenda item XIII: Financial report for 2009-2012 by the Chairperson of the Standing Committee Subgroup on Finance and proposed budget for the triennium 2013-2015**



126. **Finland, Chair of the Standing Committee Subgroup on Finance**, represented by Ms Tiina Niikonen presented documents COP11 DOC. 15 *Financial and budgetary matters – Outstanding contributions*, COP11 DOC. 16 *Background information on financial and budgetary matters*, and DR2 *Financial and budgetary matters*.
127. The **Secretary General** thanked the Chair and members of the Subgroup on Finance, as well as the Standing Committee itself, for the guidance provided to the Secretariat over the past three years. He asked Contracting Parties, when making decisions at COP11 to consider if possible the links between the tasks assigned to the Secretariat and the resources required to undertake those tasks. Other pressing issues included the need to try to reverse the decline in voluntary contributions; making sure that the next Strategic Plan was fully owned and resourced by the Parties; resourcing key activities such as the Ramsar Advisory Missions, which did not have any core budget provision; making the best use of available technology to serve the Parties better; and at least maintaining the Secretariat's current capacity.
128. The **Alternate President** recalled that a COP Committee on Finance and Budget had been established and that the Committee would consider in detail the documents presented by the Chair of the Subgroup. The floor was nevertheless open for comments or questions.
129. No such remarks were forthcoming.

#### **Agenda item XIV: Election of Contracting Parties for the Standing Committee 2013-2015**

130. The **Secretariat** outlined the composition of the Standing Committee as determined by Resolution VII.1, recalling the proportional system of regional representation and noting that the COP11 host country, Romania, and the COP12 host country, yet to be determined, would also serve on the Standing Committee during the coming triennium.
131. The **Alternate President** invited each Ramsar region to nominate Standing Committee representatives for the forthcoming intersessional period.
132. The following nominations were made:
  - Africa:** Burundi, Guinea, South Africa, Tunisia
  - Asia:** Cambodia, Republic of Korea, UAE
  - Europe:** Croatia, Denmark, Finland, France
  - Neotropics:** Chile, Cuba, Guatemala
  - North America:** Canada
  - Oceania:** Fiji
133. At the invitation of the **Alternate President**, the COP approved those nominations by consensus.
134. The **Secretariat** confirmed that the first meeting of the new Standing Committee would be convened at 18.30 on 10 July 2012. A Provisional Agenda for that meeting, proposed by the 44<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the Standing Committee, would be made available to the newly elected members.

**Agenda item XV: Consideration of the draft Resolutions and Recommendations submitted by Contracting Parties and the Standing Committee**

135. At the invitation of the **Alternate President**, the **Secretariat** confirmed that it was the intention of the Conference Committee that Draft Resolutions be considered in numerical sequence, beginning with DR1. The only exception would be in the case of DR2, which was being considered by the COP11 Committee on Finance and Budget.

**COP11 DR1** *Institutional hosting of the Ramsar Secretariat*

136. The supporting information document for this DR was COP11 DOC. 17 *Synthesis report of information and conclusions concerning hosting arrangements for the Ramsar Convention*.
137. The **Alternate President** observed that the issue addressed through DR1 had a history of seven years of debate. He therefore did not propose to go back to the beginning, but instead invited Contracting Parties to make short statements indicating whether they preferred DR1 Alternative 1 (hosting of the Secretariat to remain with IUCN) or DR1 Alternative 2 (hosting of the Secretariat to move to UNEP).
138. Interventions were made by the following Contracting Parties, many of whom explained the reasons for their position on DR1:

**Algeria** (speaking also on behalf of **Libya**)  
**Argentina**  
**Australia**  
**Austria**  
**Belgium**  
**Benin**  
**Brazil**  
**Cambodia**  
**Canada**  
**Colombia**  
**Congo**  
**Costa Rica**  
**Cuba**  
**Czech Republic**  
**Democratic Republic of Congo**  
**Denmark**  
**Finland**  
**France**  
**Indonesia**

**Islamic Republic of Iran**  
**Japan**  
**Malaysia**  
**Mexico**  
**New Zealand**  
**Norway**  
**Panama**  
**Peru**  
**Republic of Korea**  
**Russian Federation**  
**South Africa**  
**Switzerland**  
**Thailand**  
**Tunisia**  
**Turkey**  
**Uganda**  
**United States of America**  
**Uruguay**  
**Venezuela**

139. Of these 39 Parties, 22 indicated that they were in favour of Alternative 1 (IUCN), and 14 in favour of Alternative 2 (UNEP), while 3 Parties did not express a preference for either option. **Costa Rica** noted for the record its view that the situation had changed since initial drafting of DR1, especially after Rio+20, which made clear the advantages of being within the UN system. While Costa Rica also recognized the benefits offered by IUCN

and currently supported the status quo, much remained to be clarified and Parties should consider the issues carefully in preparing for COP12.

140. Following a short recess, the **Alternate President** called for an indication of preference from all Parties, a 'straw poll', to help guide him in deciding how to make further progress. He stressed that no decision was being taken and that the purpose of the straw poll was simply to help him understand whether there was a realistic likelihood of Alternative 2 commanding the two-thirds majority of all Contracting Parties required under Convention Article 8.1.
141. The **Deputy Secretary General** outlined the mechanics of the straw poll procedure. Only Contracting Parties were eligible to participate and then only those for whom the Convention had already entered into force, which was the case for 160 Contracting Parties. When the poll was called, the proposal being voted on would be displayed on the screen in the Plenary Hall and read out by the Secretariat. Eligible delegations should indicate whether they were in favour of the proposal, not in favour of the proposal, or abstaining, by raising their country name card (one card per delegation) when invited to do so and keeping it raised until the podium had received confirmation from the tellers that all votes had been counted. The tellers would count only the number of Parties voting in each case, not the names of the Parties.
142. **A number of Contracting Parties** expressed the view that the process called for by the Alternate President and explained by the Secretariat was not in conformity with the Rules of Procedure and that an informal mechanism should not be used in relation to such a sensitive issue. **Costa Rica** noted for the record its disagreement with the indicative voting procedure which, in its view, was not within the Rules of Procedure, would only polarise the debate and make consensus more difficult to achieve. The Alternate President should consult directly with delegations in order to assess properly their positions.
143. **Other Contracting Parties** took the view that such a straw poll could be a very helpful means of helping to reach an eventual consensus and to avoid an unwanted formal vote on DR1 that would not be in the long tradition of Ramsar consensus-building.
144. In light of those differing views, the **Alternate President** ruled that his call to hold a straw poll on DR1 should itself be put to a vote.
145. Applying the mechanism already explained by the **Secretariat**, eligible **Contracting Parties** were asked to indicate their positions as follows:
  - 1) Those delegations in favour of having an indicative vote on DR1
  - 2) Those delegations NOT in favour of having an indicative vote on DR1
  - 3) Those delegations abstaining
146. The results showed that 61 Contracting Parties were in favour of an indicative vote on DR1, 44 Parties were not in favour of such an indicative vote, and 10 abstained.
147. The **Alternate President** ruled that since there was a majority in favour, an indicative vote on DR1 would proceed. He explained again his reasons for calling for such an informal straw poll and confirmed his preference that an eventual formal solution should be reached on the basis of consensus, if at all possible, involving Ramsar's established approaches of

negotiation between Contracting Parties and consultation within regions. The straw poll would help him to facilitate eventual consensus on DR1 by showing the extent of support for each of the two options currently on the table.

148. At the request of the **Alternate President**, the **Deputy Secretary General** invited eligible Contracting Parties to indicate their positions as follows:
- 1) Those favouring DR1 Alternative 1 (IUCN)
  - 2) Those favouring DR1 Alternative 2 (UNEP)
  - 3) Those abstaining
149. The result showed 66 Contracting Parties favouring Alternative 1 (IUCN), 26 Parties favouring Alternative 2 (UNEP), and 18 Parties abstaining.
150. Suspending further consideration of DR1, the **Alternate President** expressed his intention of making a proposal to the COP in due course for taking this issue forward, based on the indications derived from the straw poll.

**COP11 DR3** *Adjustments to the Strategic Plan 2009-2015 for the 2013-2015 triennium*

151. This Draft Resolution was introduced by the **Deputy Secretary General**.
152. The **Alternate President** opened the floor to comments.
153. Interventions were made by **Australia, Burundi, Cameroon, Chile, Colombia, Denmark** (representing the Presidency of the EU and on behalf of the EU Member States present at COP11 and Croatia), **India, Japan, Libya, Peru, South Africa, Switzerland**, and **Uruguay**.
154. The **Deputy Secretary General** requested all those Parties that had proposed amendments to provide written texts of their proposals to the Secretariat (ideally electronically, using the email system set up to receive interventions), so that a revised version of DR3 could be prepared taking these proposals into account.

**COP11 DR4 Rev. 1** *The status of sites in the Ramsar List of Wetlands of International Importance*

155. The supporting information documents for this DR were COP11 DOC. 8 *Report of the Secretary General pursuant to Article 8.2 concerning the list of Wetlands of International Importance* and COP11 DOC. 30 *Current status and future development needs of the Ramsar Sites Information Service (RSIS)*
156. This Draft Resolution was introduced by the **Deputy Secretary General**, who recalled that an outline DR4 had been issued three months before the COP, in conformity with the Rules of Procedure, followed by a Rev.1 that had been circulated on 27 June taking account of the inputs received from Contracting Parties as of that date. The Secretariat had since received additional inputs from Argentina, New Zealand, and Ukraine, and had also identified an error in the first preambular paragraph, which incorrectly referred to Resolution VIII.11 (2002) instead of Resolution VII.11 (1999).

157. The **Alternate President** opened the floor to comments.
158. Interventions were made by the following Contracting Parties: **Argentina, Armenia, Australia, China, Colombia, Croatia, Denmark** (on behalf of the **EU Member States** present at COP11 and **Croatia**) **Mexico, New Zealand, Poland, Russian Federation, Senegal, Turkey, and Uruguay**, as well as by the Observers from the **League of Arab States** and **BirdLife International**. **Australia** made a statement for the record in which it provided an update on the status of the Murray-Darling Basin (see Annex 6).
159. The **Deputy Secretary General** requested all those Parties that had proposed amendments to provide written texts of their proposals to the Secretariat promptly so that a further revision of DR4 could be prepared, taking those proposals into account. Parties requesting specific amendments to Annex 2 to DR4 Rev. 1 were asked to discuss those amendments with the relevant Senior Regional Advisors from the Secretariat.

**Fifth and Sixth Plenary Sessions**

Monday 9 July 10.30–13.00 (Agenda item XV)

Monday 9 July 15.00–18.00 (Agenda item XV)

160. A **Special Presentation** on *Sustainable tourism and the value of wetlands* was made by **Mr Taleb Rifai, Secretary General, World Tourism Organization (UNWTO)**.
161. The **Alternate President** opened the floor to comments.
162. Interventions were made by **India, Islamic Republic of Iran, and Mauritania**.
163. The **Alternate President** thanked Mr Rifai for his presentation and for responding to the points raised by Parties.

**Agenda item XV: Consideration of the draft Resolutions and Recommendations submitted by Contracting Parties and the Standing Committee** (continued)

**COP11 DR1** *Institutional hosting of the Ramsar Secretariat* (continued)

164. The **Alternate President** reported that a meeting of the Conference Committee had been held on the morning of 9 July. He clarified that his intention during the Fourth Plenary Session, held during the afternoon of 8 July, had been to assess the preferences of Contracting Parties on this very important subject. It had not been a final decision, as decisions must be taken either by consensus or through a final vote, neither of which had been applicable. The Alternate President excused himself and the Secretariat, since in spite of this good intention, there had been a difficulty in communicating it clearly to the Contracting Parties and consequently some delegates had some concerns. With the support of the Conference Committee he proposed to continue to give the floor for one minute to each Party that did not have the opportunity to intervene on this issue on 8 July, so that a more complete picture could be established and a way forward decided.
165. **Venezuela**, speaking also on behalf of **Cuba, Ecuador and Nicaragua** made the following statement for the record:

“The Republic of Cuba, the Republic of Ecuador, the Republic of Nicaragua and the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela, members of the Alianza Bolivariana para los Pueblos de Nuestra América (ALBA), strongly object to the procedure for debating Draft Resolution XI.1 *Institutional hosting of the Ramsar Secretariat*, in violation of the Rules of Procedure adopted for the COP11.

According to Article 6 of the Convention, the Conference of the Contracting Parties shall adopt rules of procedure for each of its meetings. These Rules of Procedure must be strictly applied in respect of that sovereign decision of the Contracting Parties. The procedure used by the Chair of the COP11 and the Secretariat of the Convention, the so-called “indicative voting” intended to “check” the preferences of the Contracting Parties regarding both options proposed for the highly sensitive subject addressed in this Draft Resolution, is not foreseen in the Rules of Procedure and therefore it is not acceptable.

Hereby, we firmly express our deep disagreement with the procedure implemented, in spite of the motions of order submitted by several Contracting Parties according to Rule 48 of the Rules of Procedures of COP11, underlining the irregular process being followed.

Accordingly, we request that this declaration be included in the final report of the COP11 of Ramsar Convention.”

(*Note:* The COP11 Legal Advisor provided his legal opinion to the Conference Committee on the morning of 9 July. Having provided his advice to the Conference Committee, the Legal Advisor did not intervene on this matter during the present plenary session.)

166. Interventions were made by the following 61 Contracting Parties:

<b>Antigua and Barbuda</b>	<b>Guinea-Bissau</b>
<b>Azerbaijan</b>	<b>Honduras</b>
<b>Bahamas</b>	<b>Hungary</b>
<b>Cameroon</b>	<b>Iceland</b>
<b>Cape Verde</b>	<b>Iraq</b>
<b>Central African Republic</b>	<b>Jamaica</b>
<b>Chile</b>	<b>Jordan</b>
<b>China</b>	<b>Kenya</b>
<b>Comoros</b>	<b>Lao People’s Democratic Republic</b>
<b>Congo</b>	<b>Latvia</b>
<b>Croatia</b>	<b>Lebanon</b>
<b>Cyprus</b>	<b>Lesotho</b>
<b>Djibouti</b>	<b>Malawi</b>
<b>Ecuador</b>	<b>Mali</b>
<b>El Salvador</b>	<b>Marshall Islands</b>
<b>Fiji</b>	<b>Mauritania</b>
<b>Georgia</b>	<b>Mauritius</b>
<b>Germany</b>	<b>Namibia</b>
<b>Greece</b>	<b>Nepal</b>
<b>Grenada</b>	<b>Netherlands</b>
<b>Guatemala</b>	<b>Nicaragua</b>

**Nigeria**  
**Philippines**  
**Poland**  
**Portugal**  
**Republic of Moldova**  
**Saint Lucia**  
**Samoa**  
**Senegal**  
**Seychelles**  
**Slovakia**

**Spain**  
**Sri Lanka**  
**Sudan**  
**Sweden**  
**United Arab Emirates**  
**United Kingdom**  
**United Republic of Tanzania**  
**Yemen**  
**Zambia**

167. An intervention was also made by the Observer from the **League of Arab States**.
168. Once all those Contracting Parties that wished to speak had done so, the **Alternate President** indicated that he would assess the information provided and bring forward a proposal concerning the next steps for the consideration of the Conference Committee on the morning of 10 July.
169. The **Deputy Secretary General** presented a brief update on the work of the Credentials Committee. As of the morning of 9 July, there had been 101 Contracting Parties whose credentials were in order. The credentials of a further 10 Contracting Parties were still being considered, pending the resolution of outstanding issues.

**COP11 DR5** *Regional Initiatives 2013-2015 in the framework of the Ramsar Convention*

170. The **Deputy Secretary General** and the **Senior Regional Advisor for Europe** introduced COP11 DR5 and the supporting information paper DOC. 13 *Progress and issues concerning Regional Initiatives operating within the framework of the Convention*.
171. Interventions were made by **Argentina, Australia, Brazil, Cameroon, Chile, China, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, France** (on behalf of the **EU Member States** present at COP11 and **Croatia**), **Greece, Guatemala, Jamaica, Malaysia, Norway, Panama, Russian Federation, Senegal, South Africa, Spain, and Switzerland**.
172. An intervention was also made by the Observer from the **Ramsar Regional Centre for Central and West Asia**.
173. The **Deputy Secretary General** suggested that **Jamaica** might be asked to facilitate informal consultations on paragraph 11 of DR5, on which clearly opposing views had been expressed. This proposal was accepted by consensus.
174. The **Deputy Secretary General** confirmed that the Secretariat would produce a revised version of DR5, taking into account the interventions made. Those delegations that had proposed specific amendments were asked to provide those in writing to the Secretariat as soon as possible.

**COP11 DR6 Rev. 1** *Partnerships and synergies with Multilateral Environmental Agreements and other institutions*

175. The **Deputy Secretary General** briefly introduced DR6 Rev. 1, which had been circulated with the authorization of the Conference Committee, based on the work of the drafting group established by the 44<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the Standing Committee. He also introduced the relevant background documents:

COP11 DOC. 7 *Report of the Secretary General on the implementation of the Convention at the global level*

COP11 DOC. 18 *Strategic Framework for Ramsar partnerships: partnerships and fundraising* and COP11 DOC. 18 add. 1 *Strategic Framework for Ramsar partnerships: Annex 4: Status of Ramsar partnership agreements and memoranda*

COP11 DOC. 19 *Cooperation between the Ramsar Convention and the Convention on Migratory Species: Ramsar-CMS Joint Work Plan 2012-2014*

COP11 DOC. 20 *5<sup>th</sup> Joint Work Plan between the Convention on Biological Diversity and the Ramsar Convention on Wetlands*

COP11 DOC. 36 *Update on the establishment of the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES)*

176. The **Deputy Secretary General** outlined a small number of additional amendments that had been identified by the Secretariat as being desirable.
177. The **Alternate President** opened the floor to comments.
178. Interventions were made by **Argentina, Azerbaijan, Brazil, Canada, China, Colombia, Denmark** (on behalf of the **EU Member States** present at COP11 and **Croatia**), **Marshall Islands, Mongolia, Namibia, Russian Federation, South Africa, Switzerland, and USA**.
179. Interventions were also made by the Observers from **BirdLife International** and **UNEP**.
180. The **Deputy Secretary General** confirmed that the Secretariat would produce a second revised version of DR6, taking into account the interventions made. Those delegations that had proposed specific amendments were asked to provide these in writing to the Secretariat as soon as possible. He recalled that proposals made by Observers needed to be supported by Contracting Parties. To this end, he invited the Observer from **BirdLife International** to consult with **China**.

<b>COP11 DR7</b> <i>Tourism and wetlands</i>
--

181. DR7 was introduced by the **Secretary General**.
182. Interventions were made by **Argentina, Australia, Austria** (on behalf of the **EU Member States** present at COP11 and **Croatia**), **Brazil, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Denmark, India, Islamic Republic of Iran, Malaysia, Mauritania, Mexico, Norway, Panama, Russian Federation, Senegal, South Africa, Thailand, and USA**.
183. An intervention was made by the Observer from **WWF**, speaking also on behalf of **Wetlands International**.



184. The **Deputy Secretary General** confirmed that the Secretariat would produce a second revised version of DR7, taking into account the interventions made. Those delegations that had proposed specific amendments were asked to provide these in writing to the Secretariat as soon as possible.

**COP11 DR14** *Climate change and wetlands: implications for the Ramsar Convention on Wetlands*

185. The **Deputy Secretary General** explained that as a result of indications received from a number of Parties, consideration of DR14 was being moved forward in the agenda. The relevant background paper was COP11 DOC. 32 *Climate change and wetlands: implications for the Ramsar Convention on Wetlands*.
186. DR14 was briefly introduced by the **STRP focal point** for this issue, **Dr Max Finlayson**.
187. The **Alternate President** opened the floor to comment.
188. Interventions were made by **Argentina, Australia, Austria** (on behalf of the **EU Member States** present at COP11 and **Croatia**), **Brazil, Canada, Colombia, India, Jamaica, Japan, Libya, Mexico, Norway, Philippines, South Africa, Switzerland, Thailand**, and **USA**.
189. Noting the diverse and sometimes conflicting views expressed, the **Deputy Secretary General** suggested that an informal working group should be established for further consideration of the text of DR14.
190. This proposal was accepted by consensus. The **Deputy Secretary General** confirmed that the informal group would be able to meet from 08.00 – 10.00 on 10 July, continuing for longer if necessary. He confirmed that the order in which further DRs would be considered was at the discretion of the Conference Committee at its meeting on the morning of 10 July. He also noted that four Parties had requested the floor during consideration of DR14 but had not yet been given the opportunity to speak.
191. Referring to the intervention made by **Argentina** under Agenda item IX (para. 90 above), the **United Kingdom** noted that it would provide a response that should also be appended to the Final Report of the COP (see Annex 5).

**Seventh and Eighth Plenary Sessions**

Tuesday 10 July 10.30–13.00 (Agenda Item XV)

Tuesday 10 July 15.00–18.00 (Agenda Item XV)

192. A **Special Presentation** on *The value and economics of water and wetlands – TEEB synthesis report* was made by **Mr Andrew Farmer, Director of Research, Institute for European Environmental Policy (IEEP)**.
193. The **Alternate President** regretted that time did not allow for questions or comments from the floor, but he encouraged all participants to attend the COP11 Side Event on TEEB.
194. The **Deputy Secretary General** thanked Mr Farmer for his presentation.

**Agenda item XV: Consideration of the draft Resolutions and Recommendations submitted by Contracting Parties and the Standing Committee (continued)**

195. The **Deputy Secretary General** proposed a procedure for trying to deal efficiently with the remaining significant number of DRs in the limited time available. Unfortunately, this would mean that only Parties would be able to intervene; Observers would have to submit any points they wished to make via a Contracting Party.
196. **Switzerland** expressed its unhappiness with the way in which the COP was being conducted. The purpose of such a conference every three years was to meet and exchange views. This was not possible if the time for Parties to intervene was restricted and partners were unable to intervene at all. Switzerland called for measures to be taken to avoid such a situation at the next COP.
197. The **Deputy Secretary General** concurred with Switzerland's sentiments, noting that DR1 had taken up a considerable amount of the time originally envisaged for discussion of other DRs. He confirmed that the Conference Committee had decided at its meeting on 10 July that the current plenary session should commence its further consideration of DRs in numerical sequence, beginning with DR8, and that DR1 would be reopened at the end of the session.

**COP11 DR8** *Streamlining procedures for describing Ramsar Sites at the time of designation and subsequently, DR8 Annex 1 Ramsar Site Information Sheet (RIS) – 2012 revision, DR8 Annex 2 Strategic Framework and guidelines for the future development of the List of Wetlands of International Importance of the Convention on Wetlands (Ramsar, Iran, 1971) – 2012 revision*

198. The **Deputy Secretary General** and the **STRP lead** for this issue, **Mr David Stroud**, introduced DR8, its two Annexes and the supporting document COP11 DOC. 22 *Background, rationale and issues for the 2012 revisions proposed for the Strategic Framework and guidelines for the future development of the List of Wetlands of International Importance and Ramsar Site Information Sheet (RIS)*. A number of minor suggestions for amendments to the Annexes had already been received from Parties and these would be incorporated.
199. The **Alternate President** opened the floor to comment.
200. Interventions were made by **Brazil, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Cyprus** (on behalf of the **EU Member States** present at COP11 and **Croatia**), **El Salvador, Japan, Kenya, Mauritania, New Zealand, Panama, Russian Federation, Turkey, and Uganda**.
201. **Turkey** placed on record its reservation with regard to DR8, unless the references to Resolution VII.19 *Guidelines for international cooperation under the Ramsar Convention* (COP7, San José, 1999), contained in Annex 2, were deleted.
202. The **Deputy Secretary General** confirmed that, working with the **STRP lead**, the Secretariat would produce a revised version of DR8, taking into account the interventions made. Those delegations that had proposed specific amendments were asked to provide these in writing to the Secretariat as soon as possible.

**COP11 DR9** *An Integrated Framework and guidelines for avoiding, mitigating and compensating for wetland losses*

203. The **Deputy Secretary General** and the **STRP lead** for this issue, **Prof Royal Gardner**, briefly introduced DR9 and the two relevant supporting documents COP11 DOC. 27 *Avoiding, mitigating, and compensating for loss and degradation of wetlands in national laws and policies* and DOC. 24 *Limits of Acceptable Change: The definition and operation of concepts and approaches for "limits of acceptable change" which may be applicable to the Ramsar context of defining and detecting change in the ecological character of wetlands.*
204. The **Alternate President** opened the floor to comment.
205. **South Africa**: considered that plenary session time should be used only for intensive discussions on the most significant issues. At future COPs there should be technical working groups to discuss the scientific and technical details of DRs.
206. The **Deputy Secretary General** suggested that South Africa might address a proposal to this effect for the new Standing Committee to look into.
207. With regard to the substance of DR9, interventions were made by **Argentina, Australia, Canada, China, Colombia, France** (on behalf of the **EU Member States** present at COP11 and **Croatia**), **Malaysia, Mexico, New Zealand, Republic of Korea, Senegal, Switzerland** (including an intervention submitted on behalf of the Observer from **WWF**), **Thailand**, and **USA**.
208. The **Deputy Secretary General** confirmed that, working with the **STRP lead**, the Secretariat would produce a revised version of DR9, taking into account the interventions made. Those delegations that had proposed specific amendments were asked to provide these in writing to the Secretariat as soon as possible.

**COP11 DR10** *Wetlands and energy issues*

209. The **Deputy Secretary General** and the **STRP Chair, Dr Heather MacKay**, briefly introduced DR10 and the relevant background document COP11 DOC. 28 *Supporting information on wetlands and energy issues (COP11 DR10)*. **Dr MacKay** also tabled a small number of minor amendments.
210. The **Alternate President** opened the floor to comment.
211. Interventions were made by **Argentina, Brazil, Colombia, Congo, Denmark** (on behalf of the **EU Member States** present at COP11 and **Croatia**), **Guatemala, India, Japan, Libya, Panama, South Africa, Switzerland, Thailand**, and the **USA**.
212. The **Deputy Secretary General** confirmed that, working with the **STRP lead**, the Secretariat would produce a revised version of DR10, taking into account the interventions made. Those delegations that had proposed specific amendments were asked to provide these in writing to the Secretariat as soon as possible.

213. The **Chair of the STRP** indicated that she would confer with the delegations of **Denmark** (on behalf of the EU) and **USA**.

**COP11 DR11** *Principles for the planning and management of urban and peri-urban wetlands*

214. The **Deputy Secretary General** and the **STRP lead** on this issue, **Dr Rob McInnes**, briefly introduced DR11 and the relevant background document COP11 DOC. 23 *Background and context to the development of principles and guidance for the planning and management of urban and peri-urban wetlands (COP11 DR11)*. A number of proposed minor amendments were outlined.
215. The **Alternate President** opened the floor to comment.
216. Interventions were made by **Benin, Burundi, Chile, Colombia, France** (on behalf of the **EU Member States** present at COP11 and **Croatia**), **New Zealand, Philippines, Senegal, South Africa, Tunisia**, and **Uganda**.
217. The **Deputy Secretary General** confirmed that, working with the **STRP lead**, the Secretariat would produce a revised version of DR11, taking into account the interventions made. Those delegations that had proposed specific amendments were asked to provide these in writing to the Secretariat as soon as possible. He invited the STRP lead to confer with Chile, in particular.

**COP11 DR1** *Institutional hosting of the Ramsar Secretariat (continued)*

218. The **Alternate President** recalled that during the plenary sessions held on 9 & 10 July, a clear majority of those Parties expressing a preference had been in favour of continued institutional hosting of the Secretariat by IUCN (DR1 Alternative 1). However, while it was clear that Alternative 2 could not achieve the two-thirds majority of all Parties required under Article 8 of the Convention text, the only desirable outcome was consensus. Furthermore, those Parties that had favoured Alternative 2 had done so for substantive reasons. It therefore seemed reasonable to conclude that Alternative 1 should serve as a starting point for building consensus, but that the means should be found of addressing the substantive issues raised by Parties that were in favour of Alternative 2. These issues included the official working languages of the Convention, raising the Convention's visibility, strengthening relations with other MEAs, and the status of Secretariat staff. He therefore proposed establishing a 'Friends of the Chair' group, co-chaired by Jamaica and Senegal, to examine these matters further and to seek consensus on a revised text of DR1 that could be brought forward for consideration in plenary session.
219. **Costa Rica** supported this general approach, but reiterated its discontent with the procedure followed at previous plenary sessions in relation to this DR. Costa Rica felt it would be most appropriate for the Convention to defer a decision on the issue until COP12, to allow time for seeing how the relationship with IUCN evolved. A clear roadmap from COP11 to COP12 should be established.
220. **Venezuela**, speaking also on behalf of **Cuba, Ecuador** and **Nicaragua**, concurred with Costa Rica. There were still many Contracting Parties that had not indicated their preference

in relation to the two Alternatives in DR1. The intersessional period would allow for more information to be gathered and for the outcomes of Rio+20 to be addressed.

221. The **Alternate President** requested all those Parties that wished to contribute further to discussion of DR1 to do so by joining the 'Friends of the Chair' group, which would meet at 13.30 on 10 July.

### Special Presentation

222. A **Special Presentation** on *Water security and the importance of wetlands as natural infrastructure in water resource management* was made by **Prof Michael Scoullos, Chair of Global Water Partnership (GWP) Mediterranean**.
223. The **Alternate President** thanked Prof Scoullos on behalf of all participants.
224. The **Vice-President from the UAE** presented gifts to the **Alternate President** and to the **Secretary General** in recognition of their efforts on behalf of the Convention.

### COP11 DR12 *Wetlands and health: taking an ecosystem approach*

225. DR12 was briefly introduced by the **Deputy Secretary General** and the **STRP lead** for this issue, **Dr Pierre Horwitz**.
226. The **President** opened the floor to comment.
227. Interventions were made by **Australia, Canada, China, Islamic Republic of Iran, Japan, UK** (on behalf of the **EU Member States** present at COP11 and **Croatia**), and **USA**.
228. The **Deputy Secretary General** confirmed that, working with the **STRP lead**, the Secretariat would produce a revised version of DR12, taking into account the interventions made. Those delegations that had proposed specific amendments were asked to provide these in writing to the Secretariat as soon as possible.

### COP11 DR13 *An Integrated Framework for linking wetland conservation and wise use with poverty eradication*

229. DR13 was briefly introduced by the **Deputy Secretary General** and the **STRP lead** for this issue, **Mr Ritesh Kumar**.
230. The **Alternate President** opened the floor to comment.
231. Interventions were made by **Australia, Colombia, Costa Rica, France** (on behalf of the **EU Member States** present at COP11 and **Croatia**), **Islamic Republic of Iran, New Zealand, Norway, South Africa, and Thailand**.
232. The **Deputy Secretary General** confirmed that, working with the **STRP lead**, the Secretariat would produce a revised version of DR13, taking into account the interventions made. Those delegations that had proposed specific amendments were asked to provide these in writing to the Secretariat as soon as possible.

**COP11 DR15** *Agriculture-wetland interactions: rice paddy and pesticide usage*

233. DR15 and the relevant background documents COP11 DOC. 31 *Agriculture-wetland interactions: background information concerning rice paddy and pesticide usage* (COP11 DR15) and DOC. 33 *Agriculture and wetland interactions: recent progress and STRP-related activities 2009-2012* were briefly introduced by the **Deputy Secretary General** and the **STRP lead at COP11** for this issue, **Ms Rebecca D’Cruz**.
234. The **President** opened the floor to comment.
235. Interventions were made by **Argentina, Brazil, Canada, China, Costa Rica, Denmark** (on behalf of the **EU Member States** present at COP11 and **Croatia**), **India, Japan, Paraguay, Sri Lanka, Switzerland, Thailand**, and **USA**. In addition to commenting on the text of DR15, some delegations noted their view that the background documentation contained a number of factual errors.
236. Referring to information document COP11 DOC. 31, **Japan** noted for the record that this document contained incorrect scientific information. For example, a reference to one article made it seem as if that article supported the view that waterbird populations had decreased due to pesticide use. In reality, the article suggested that land consolidation was the reason for such decreases, together with habitat loss and degradation in other areas.
237. The **Deputy Secretary General** clarified that that COP11 DOC. 31 was a background paper only and not a formal product of the COP. He confirmed that, working with the **STRP lead**, the Secretariat would produce a revised version of DR15, taking into account the interventions made. He invited those delegations with concerns about the background documentation to confer with the STRP lead. Those delegations that had proposed specific amendments were asked to provide these in writing to the Secretariat as soon as possible.

**COP11 DR16** *Ensuring efficient delivery of scientific and technical advice and support to the Convention*

238. DR16 and the relevant background paper COP11 DOC. 26 *Ensuring efficient delivery of scientific and technical advice and support to the Convention* were briefly introduced by the **Deputy Secretary General** and the **Chair of the STRP, Dr Heather MacKay**. The **Deputy Secretary General** drew attention to the fact that this was the first of a package of three related DRs, namely DR16, DR17 and DR18.
239. The **Alternate President** opened the floor to comment.
240. Interventions were made by **Australia, Chile, Denmark** (on behalf of the **EU Member States** present at COP11 and **Croatia**), **Japan, Libya, Mexico** (also in relation to DR17), **Panama** and **South Africa**.
241. The **Deputy Secretary General** confirmed that, working with the **STRP Chair**, the Secretariat would produce a revised version of DR16, taking into account the interventions made. Those delegations that had proposed specific amendments were asked to provide these in writing to the Secretariat as soon as possible.

**COP11 DR17** *Future implementation of scientific and technical aspects of the Convention for 2013-2015*

242. DR17 and the relevant background paper COP11 DOC. 21 *Scientific and technical priorities for the implementation of the Convention 2013-2015: task pro-formas* were briefly introduced by the **Deputy Secretary General** and the **Chair of the STRP, Dr Heather MacKay**.
243. The **Alternate President** opened the floor to comment.
244. Interventions were made by **Argentina, Australia, Chile, Denmark** (on behalf of the **EU Member States** present at COP11 and **Croatia**), **India, New Zealand, Norway**, and **South Africa**.
245. **India** placed on record its thanks for the efforts made by the STRP Chair in relation to this issue.
246. The **Deputy Secretary General** confirmed that, working with the **STRP Chair**, the Secretariat would produce a revised version of DR17, taking into account the interventions made. Those delegations that had proposed specific amendments were asked to provide these in writing to the Secretariat as soon as possible.

**COP11 DR18** *Adjustments to the modus operandi of the Scientific & Technical Review Panel (STRP) for the 2013-2015 triennium*

247. DR18 was briefly introduced by the **Deputy Secretary General** and the **Chair of the STRP, Dr Heather MacKay**.
248. The **Alternate President** opened the floor to comment.
249. Interventions were made by **Australia, Canada, Colombia, Denmark** (on behalf of the **EU Member States** present at COP11 and **Croatia**), **Panama**, and **South Africa**.
250. The **Deputy Secretary General** confirmed that, working with the **STRP lead**, the Secretariat would produce a revised version of DR18, taking into account the interventions made. Those delegations that had proposed specific amendments were asked to provide these in writing to the Secretariat as soon as possible.

**COP11 DR19** *Adjustments to the terms of Resolution VII.1 on the composition, roles, and responsibilities of the Standing Committee and regional categorization of countries under the Convention*

251. DR19 was introduced by the **Deputy Secretary General**.
252. The **Alternate President** opened the floor to comment.
253. Interventions were made by **Argentina, Armenia, Azerbaijan, Canada, Costa Rica** (on behalf of the Neotropical region), **Denmark** (on behalf of the **EU Member States** present at COP11 and **Croatia**), **Islamic Republic of Iran, Republic of Korea, Senegal, South Africa** and **USA**.
254. The **Islamic Republic of Iran** placed on record its reservation concerning the regional categorization contained in Annex 2 to DR19.

255. In relation to the interventions made by **Costa Rica** and **Argentina**, the **Alternate President** confirmed that he would bring to the attention of the Conference Committee the issue of possible appointment of Alternate Members to the Standing Committee.

**COP11 DR20** *Promoting responsible investment by government and the private sector to ensure the maintenance of the benefits people and nature gain from wetlands*

256. DR20 was introduced by **Switzerland**.
257. The **Alternate President** opened the floor to comment.
258. Interventions were made by **Argentina, Australia, Benin, Brazil, Canada, Cameroon, Denmark** (on behalf of the **EU Member States** present at COP11 and **Croatia**), **Islamic Republic of Iran, Japan, Mauritania, New Zealand, and Philippines**.
259. The **Deputy Secretary General** confirmed that the Secretariat would produce a revised version of DR20, taking into account the interventions made. Those delegations that had proposed specific amendments were asked to provide these in writing to the Secretariat as soon as possible.

**COP11 DR21** *Wetlands and sustainable development*

260. DR21 was introduced by the **Islamic Republic of Iran**.
261. The **Alternate President** opened the floor to comment.
262. Interventions were made by **Benin, Cameroon, Congo, Japan, Republic of Korea, South Africa** and **USA**.
263. The **Deputy Secretary General** confirmed that the Secretariat would produce a revised version of DR21, taking into account the interventions made. Those delegations that had proposed specific amendments were asked to provide these in writing to the Secretariat as soon as possible.

**COP11 DR1** *Institutional hosting of the Ramsar Secretariat* (continued)

264. The **Alternate President** invited **Jamaica**, as Co-Chair (with **Senegal**) of the 'Friends of the Chair' group established at the end of the Seventh Plenary Session (10 July), to update the COP on the work of that group.

265. **Jamaica** made the following statement:

"The Co-Chairs, **Senegal** and **Jamaica**, wish to extend our thanks for the confidence entrusted to us by the COP President and our gratitude to all of the Parties that attended the Friends of the Chair meeting on DR1. These Parties included but were not restricted to **Bahamas, South Africa, USA, UK, Denmark, Zambia, Argentina, Japan, Thailand, Switzerland, Cameroon, Cuba, Canada, and Republic of Korea**.



As you may well imagine the discussions were quite spirited and lively, but in the spirit of consensus and cognisant of the charge by the President we have sought to the best of our recollection and with the assistance of a smaller group to draft the text that has now been submitted to the President.

I should mention that **South Africa** has made a very clear request to have on record their position that the Secretariat should be relocated to UNEP but in the spirit of consensus are agreeing to this interim position. Other members indicated that the decision should not be delayed as it was a matter that had gone on for long enough and were firm that the matter be finalized at this COP. Some members also expressed sympathy for the proposed improvements and hence were willing to work on compromise language that could then be adopted by consensus. The delegation from **UAE** stressed the importance of moving towards the inclusion of Arabic as one of the official languages and indicated that they would be willing to support the implementation of this measure. **Cuba** also insisted that the decision on hosting should only be decided at COP12 as there were not enough members here so to do.

The Parties agreed that based on suggestions by the **USA** and **Cameroon** the language would be drafted by a smaller group and presented to the **President** and the **Plenary** for their consideration.”

266. **Cuba** noted that, during the group’s deliberations, it had underlined its view that institutional hosting arrangements should be decided upon at COP12 because of the number of countries asking for more information, but also agreed it was important to work towards a consensus.
267. The **Deputy Secretary General** confirmed that the Secretariat would work with the Co-Chairs of the ‘Friends of the Chair’ group, and with the **Alternate President**, to bring forward a revised version of DR1 for consideration in plenary. He also confirmed that a further addendum to COP11 DOC. 38 *Admission of registered observers* would be issued for consideration and final approval in plenary.

<p><b>Ninth and Tenth Plenary Sessions</b></p>
--

<p>Thursday 12 July 10.00–13.00 (Agenda Items XVI, XVII &amp; XVIII)</p>
--

<p>Thursday 12 July 15.00–18.00 (Agenda Item XVIII)</p>
---

**Agenda item XV: Consideration of the draft Resolutions and Recommendations submitted by Contracting Parties and the Standing Committee (continued)**

268. The **Alternate President** opened the plenary session.
269. The **Secretary General** announced that there would be an opportunity during the COP11 Closing Ceremony on 13 July for the IOPs to make a joint statement and for the NGOs to do the same. He invited both groups to prepare their statements.
270. The **Deputy Secretary General** reported that the Conference Committee had met to discuss the proposal made by the Neotropical region that Alternate Members of the Standing Committee should be appointed. Such a mechanism would be considered when

DR19 Rev.1 came up for discussion under Agenda item XV. If the proposal were to be adopted in the final version of DR19, names of countries who would serve as Alternate Members would need to be agreed before the close of the COP. The Conference Committee had therefore requested regional groupings to prepare themselves for such an eventuality and be ready to nominate candidates as Alternates on 13 July.

271. **Norway**, speaking also on behalf of **Switzerland**, raised a Point of Order, stating: “At plenaries of the Ramsar Conferences of the Parties, the Chair or the Secretariat cannot request the International Organization Partners to refrain from taking the floor if the reasons are due to lack of time or to delays accumulated in the discussion of the Draft Resolutions. This can be introduced in rule 22 as a paragraph 2 bis.”
272. This statement was supported by **Denmark** (on behalf of the **EU Member States** present at COP11 and **Croatia**) and **China**.

#### **Agenda item XVI: Report of the Credentials Committee**

273. The **Chair of the Credentials Committee, Mr Erick Cabrera (Guatemala)**, presented his report, which is attached as Annex 1. He confirmed that the credentials of 113 Contracting Parties had been confirmed by the Committee.
274. The **Alternate President** opened the floor for comments or observations. There being no such remarks, the **Alternate President** invited the COP to adopt the report.
275. The Report of the COP11 Credentials Committee was adopted by consensus.

#### **Agenda item XVII: Report on the discussions, conclusions and recommendations in the preceding sessions**

276. At the invitation of the **Alternate President**, the **Deputy Secretary General** recalled that the COP had established a Committee on Finance and Budget, which had now completed its work. DR2 Rev.1 would be issued in due course for presentation to plenary by the Chair of the Committee.
277. The Friends of the Chair group established for DR1 (institutional hosting of the Secretariat) had met on 10 July and had prepared text now distributed as DR1 Rev.1.
278. A working group for DR14 (climate change) had met regularly and was still working to resolve a number of remaining difficulties. DR14 Rev.1 had been prepared as an interim version to take account of text changes up until the end of the evening of 10 July only. Plenary consideration of this DR might therefore best be deferred until the group had completed its work.
279. The **Alternate President** invited comments.
280. **New Zealand** supported the proposal for postponing consideration of DR14 in plenary to allow the working group to finish its deliberations.

#### **Agenda item XVIII: Adoption of Resolutions and Recommendations**

281. The **Deputy Secretary General** updated participants on progress with amending, translating and distributing revised DRs. He also invited participants to review the Draft Conference Report that was being distributed in daily sections, and to convey any comments or proposed amendments to the rapporteur. He confirmed that **Australia's** statement to plenary on 8 July, concerning the Murray-Darling Basin, would be appended to the Final Report.
282. Speaking generally about the DRs, the **Alternate President** urged Parties to strive for consensus and to focus their deliberations on square bracketed text. He reminded them of their prerogative to enter reservations against text they were unable to accept.

<p><b>COP11 DR1</b> <i>Institutional hosting of the Ramsar Secretariat</i></p>
--

283. The **Alternate President** thanked the members of the Friends of the Chair group for their efforts to develop a proposal that was before the plenary as DR1 Rev.1. He drew Parties' attention to square bracketed text towards the start of paragraph 11 and suggested replacing the bracketed text with "an appropriate working group". He also suggested removing the square brackets in sub-paragraph 11 d), but with the addition of "e.g." before "through Regional Initiatives". These two changes would leave remaining square brackets in sub-paragraph 11 c) only.
284. The **Deputy Secretary General** observed that Conference Committee had identified 11 c) as being of particular interest to Parties. It was therefore suggested that the **Alternate President** might seek adoption of the remainder of the text, including the suggestions made concerning paragraphs 11 and 11 d), but then come back to consideration of 11 c).
285. The **Alternate President** opened the floor for comment.
286. **Peru** stated for the record its concern over the way in which DR1 Rev.1 had been drafted. It did not reflect discussions during the COP. Peru requested that any decision to remain with IUCN should be a temporary one and that a process be initiated of study and information provision to Parties through the appropriate channels, especially at high level, concerning the options for UNEP and IUCN. In particular, this should define clearly the procedure to be followed for a decision to be taken at COP12, as requested by other delegations. If DR1 was not amended in this way, Peru would request a reservation to be entered in the Report of the Meeting.
287. **Denmark** (on behalf of the **EU Member States** present at COP11 and **Croatia**) was content to follow the advice of the **Alternate President**, to listen to the views of other Parties, and to seek a consensus, but reserved its right to intervene further.
288. **South Africa** reiterated its commitment to the spirit of compromise and reaching a consensus on this matter. However, South Africa's inputs to the deliberations of the Friends of the Chair group were not reflected in DR1 Rev.1. A Minister from another Party would be speaking on behalf of the African region shortly and South Africa suggested that the COP should not be limited to discussion of DR1 Rev.1. Key issues identified by the Conference Committee, in a spirit of consensus and compromise, such as the strengthening of UNEP, establishment of a high-level segment for Ramsar, and synergies with other MEAs, had been left unresolved. So far, 104 Parties had not clearly given their opinion and

only 56 Parties had supported the IUCN option. The basis for DR1 Rev.1 was therefore questionable. South Africa considered this as an interim arrangement until COP12, following the provision of further information and high-level consultations. The latter might involve the Depositary, UNESCO, communicating with Ministries of Foreign Affairs. South Africa wished its concern to be clearly entered in the Conference Report.

289. **Canada** welcomed the work of the Friends of the Chair group and noted that DR1 Rev.1, if adopted, would serve to build and strengthen relations with IUCN. Canada suggested deleting paragraph 5 *ter* and including “as appropriate” at the end of paragraph 5 *bis*.
290. **Costa Rica** was against adoption of DR1 Rev.1, which was not acceptable in its present form. The will of the Contracting Parties had not been expressed. Many Parties had expressed opinions half-heartedly and questioned compliance of the process followed with the Rules of Procedure. None of what Costa Rica and others had proposed was reflected. The Convention should prepare for taking a decision at COP12.
291. **Senegal** (Co-Chair of the Friends of the Chair group) recalled that the group had been charged with reaching consensus, which implied a compromise. Clearly some items still need discussion, but there were some fundamental differences of substance. During the discussions of the Africa group it was clearly agreed that there was a strong wish for a ministerial segment. Senegal proposed reverting to the text agreed by the Friends of the Chair, which had not contained any square-bracketed language.
292. **Benin** observed that consensus was necessary and congratulated the Friends of the Chair group for its efforts. As the Minister of Environment of Cameroon was attending the plenary session, he would be able to take the floor as a high-level representative of the African viewpoint. He called on other European Parties to move towards the view of Switzerland so that the Convention could be better implemented.
293. The **Minister of Environment of Cameroon** expressed the gratitude of the government of Cameroon and all African governments to the government and people of Romania. He noted that when compared with their initial positions the Parties had shown great capacity to listen to one other and to reach consensus. The quality of the COP’s proceedings and the success of the Convention clearly pointed to the fact that the scientific community had made great efforts over the last 40 years. However, it was high time for the Ramsar Convention to have a broader resonance. This required those who exercised political power to take their proper position through a future high-level segment. Other key issues included better relations with other MEAs and the improvement by IUCN in conjunction with the Swiss Confederation of the working conditions of the Ramsar Secretariat staff. Africa believed the COP should set up a truly representative group, without undue financial cost, not only to work with the Standing Committee, but also on COP12 preparations to address these issues in a dynamic way for COP12. Cameroon would submit specific text proposals to the Secretariat.
294. **Venezuela** had the honour to speak also on behalf of Nicaragua, Ecuador and Cuba, members of the ALBA group of countries, who expressed their deep concern for the way in which DR1 Rev.1 was being presented. This did not reflect the position the ALBA countries had expressed in their statement to plenary of 10 July and wished to reiterate, supporting the interventions made already by Peru and South Africa. The basis for this so-called consensus

was very questionable. Venezuela and ALBA reserved the right to intervene again and requested that this statement be reflected in the Report of the Meeting.

295. **Cuba** supported and reiterated its statement to plenary of 10 July and considered that DR1 Rev.1, even in its non-bracketed form, reflected a supposed consensus that did not exist. There had been an attempt to use a doubtful mechanism. At the Friends of the Chair group a significant number of Parties had required more information to take educated decisions. Such a sensitive decision should be taken by a high-level segment. Cuba supported South Africa and expressed surprise that reference to a high-level ministerial segment had been square-bracketed even though this was opposed by the Co-Chairs of the Friends of the Chair group. Cuba underscored that this issue should be placed on the agenda of COP12, where a ministerial segment should be organized.
296. **Brazil** noted that it had been very clear when this issue had first been discussed that its preference was for UNEP. This didn't mean any dissatisfaction with IUCN's services; on the contrary. Such a move would be in line with Rio+20 decisions and having Ramsar within the scope of the UN would help the Convention to share more of the limelight. To help consensus, Brazil urged Parties to look at the possibility of having the decision taken at COP12.
297. **Panama** supported Costa Rica, but wished to ensure that this COP did not end on an unpleasant note. Other Parties had stated that the text emerging from the Friends of the Chair group did not reflect the spirit of what had been agreed at the meeting; therefore, consensus had not been reached. Rule 40 of the Rules of Procedure indicated that a consensus must be sought. Therefore Rule 57 applies and the decision should be deferred to COP12. If that happened, the Convention would be heading along the proper road and in the right spirit.
298. **Central African Republic** endorsed the comments of Cameroon.
299. **New Zealand** reserved the right to take the floor again on this issue. For the moment it was New Zealand's view that this was an issue that the Convention had been engaged on for some years and a large volume of information had been amassed. All those Parties whose credentials had been confirmed by the Credentials Committee were granted their governments' authority to reach a decision. This was a decision that should be taken at COP11 to enable the Convention to refocus its efforts on the conservation and wise use of wetlands.
300. On the basis of the Alternate President's suggestions and to avoid extreme positions, **Chile** suggested consensus be sought for a decision to be taken at COP12.
301. **Colombia** considered consensus as indispensable, but noted some crucial items remained to be discussed. Colombia was content to go along with DR1 Rev.1 as an interim arrangement, but supported the proposal of Brazil and others that the final decision should be taken by COP12.
302. **Nicaragua** stated that it was clear that consensus had not been reached and urged that a high-level segment at COP12 be established to take this decision.

303. **India** felt that it was important to examine carefully what was the best outcome for the future of the Convention, rather than to see this matter as simply one of which institution should host the Secretariat.
304. **Guatemala** expressed unconditional support for all those countries from the Neotropical region that had spoken on DR1 and concurred that a decision had to be deferred.
305. **Denmark** (on behalf of the **EU Member States** present at COP11 and **Croatia**) reminded delegates that in the original DR1 text received from the Standing Committee it had been stated in paragraph 5 that the decision should be taken *at the latest* by COP11. Many delegations had expressed a firm view that the discussion had to be stopped and a decision taken at this COP. Denmark (on behalf of the **EU Member States** present at COP11 and **Croatia**) reserved the right to take the floor again on this matter.
306. **USA** felt that there were a number of issues on the table. The last comment of Denmark had been fundamental. This had been a seven-year process. The intent had been to take a decision at COP11 and the US supported this. The fact that some Parties had chosen not to recognize that there was a clear majority in favour of the IUCN option did not change the outcome, which was for the Secretariat to remain with IUCN. This didn't mean that all the issues on the table had been resolved. But neither did having ministers at the COP mean they would be solved at COP12. Every Party with approved credentials had ministerial authority. By COP12 it would have become a 10-year discussion. It was regrettable that no interpretation services had been available for the Friends of the Chair group, which had resulted in some difficulties of communication. There had been no intent to prevent any text from being included. No situation in the history of Ramsar had been more analysed with fewer results. This was an administrative issue not directly connected with wetland conservation on the ground.
307. **Australia** supported the US and Denmark (on behalf of the EU). Australia had approached this issue with an open mind, but believed that a full body of information had already been developed and made available. It would be unfortunate for the decision to be delayed rather than allowing the Convention to refocus on core issues.
308. The Observer from the **League of Arab States** regretted that Arab delegates didn't have a chance to comment on the DRs and called for particular attention to the situation of wetlands in the Palestinian territories.
309. **Jamaica** apologised as Co-Chair of the Friends of the Chair group if anything had been omitted. The square brackets in paragraph 11 c) had been included only for Parties to decide if this point was needed here or already adequately reflected in 11 b). Jamaica supported the view of Denmark (for the EU), USA and New Zealand; a decision had to be taken here and the matter brought to a close.
310. The **Deputy Secretary General** and **Alternate President** recalled that during previous plenaries Parties had been able to indicate their preference for a move to UNEP or remaining with IUCN, or to take no position, while 37 Parties present at COP11 had not made any intervention. The reason that DR1 Rev.1 had been tabled was that the number of Parties in favour of Alternative 1 (IUCN) already exceeded one-third of Contracting Parties. Under Rule 57 of the Rules of Procedure, Article 8.1 took precedence and thus any proposal for a move to UNEP would have to be approved by at least 2/3 of Parties. Since more than

1/3 preferred the IUCN option, it was a mathematical impossibility for a 2/3 majority for a move to be reached at this COP. The focus was therefore on a modified version of the IUCN option and on taking advantage this opportunity to strengthen key areas for the future operation of the Convention. If the COP failed to reach consensus, there appeared to be several options for the Alternate President to consider. The primary objective was to reach consensus, with or without reservations being expressed by some Parties. There was also the formal voting option, or the outcome of no Resolution being adopted. In the case of the latter the Secretariat would continue to be hosted by IUCN, but the opportunity to initiate key reforms would be lost.

311. The **Alternate President** suspended consideration of DR1 Rev.1 to enable further consultations.
312. At the beginning of the afternoon plenary session on 12 July, the **Alternate President** confirmed that discussion of DR1 would be re-opened during the afternoon of 13 July. He made a final appeal for consensus to be based around DR1 Rev.1 with the square brackets removed from paragraph 11 c) and urged Parties to consult with one another in this regard. If that were not possible, the original version of DR1 Alternative 1 might have to be reconsidered.

<p><b>COP11 DR3 Rev.1</b> <i>Adjustments to the Strategic Plan 2009-2015 for the 2013-2015 triennium</i></p>
--

313. At the request of the **Alternate President**, the **Deputy Secretary General** briefly introduced DR3 Rev.1.
314. Further amendments were tabled by **Chile, Colombia, Denmark** (on behalf of the **EU Member States** present at COP11 and **Croatia**), **Jamaica, New Zealand**, and **Switzerland**.
315. The amendment tabled by **Jamaica** was withdrawn in the interests of consensus. The other amendments tabled by Parties were accepted, following the **Deputy Secretary General's** summing up and response to questions raised.
316. An amendment proposed by the Observer from **the League of Arab States** was opposed by a Contracting Party (USA) and was therefore not accepted.
317. The **Alternate President** invited the COP to adopt DR3 Rev.1, subject to incorporation of the amendments accepted during the current session.
318. Resolution DR3 Rev.1, as amended, was adopted by acclaim.

### Special presentation

319. A special postage stamp issue dedicated to COP11 was introduced by **Mrs Catalina Ionescu, Marketing Director of Romfilatelia** ([www.romfilatelia.ro](http://www.romfilatelia.ro)). She invited Mr Corneliu Mugurel Cozmanciuc, Secretary of State, Ministry of Environment and Forests of Romania, and the Secretary General, Mr Anada Tiéga to sign the official stamp banner. All Heads of Delegation would receive a presentation pack, which would also be for sale at the Romfilatelia booth.

## Announcements

320. The **Deputy Secretary General** noted that the text of Rio+20 decisions referred to indigenous peoples and local communities. This was relevant to several DRs, where minor final edits would be needed to ensure consistency throughout using the Rio+20 terminology.
321. The **Deputy Secretary General** also noted that owing to the late receipt of previously tabled and admissible amendments to DR7 Rev.1 (tourism), Rev.1 was being withdrawn and a Rev. 2 was being produced.

### **COP11 DR6 Rev. 2** *Partnerships and synergies with Multilateral Environmental Agreements and other institutions*

322. At the request of the **Alternate President**, the **Deputy Secretary General** briefly introduced DR6 Rev. 2.
323. Further amendments were tabled by **Canada** (supported by **Japan**), **Congo**, **Denmark** (on behalf of the **EU Member States** present at COP11 and **Croatia**), **Islamic Republic of Iran**, **Jamaica**, **Mexico**, **Namibia**, **Senegal**, **Switzerland**, and **USA**.
324. **Turkey** made the following statement for the record: “Turkey is happy to join the consensus on this DR, however, this is not to be construed as change of the Turkish position with regard to the UNECE Convention on the Protection and Use of Transboundary Water Courses and International Lakes. Turkey is not a Party to the said Convention and has no intention of becoming so in the near future.”
325. The **Secretary General** thanked all Parties for considering this important Draft Resolution but highlighted the limited capacity of the Secretariat to develop and engage in all such Partnerships as fully as would be desirable.
326. The amendments tabled by Parties were accepted, following the **Deputy Secretary General’s** summing up and response to questions raised.
327. The **Alternate President** invited the COP to adopt DR6 Rev. 2, subject to incorporation of the amendments accepted during the current session.
328. Resolution DR6 Rev. 2, as amended, was adopted by acclaim.

### **COP11 DR4 Rev. 2** *The status of sites in the Ramsar List of Wetlands of International Importance*

329. At the request of the **Alternate President**, the **Deputy Secretary General** briefly introduced DR4 Rev. 2.
330. Further amendments were tabled by **Argentina**, **Australia**, **Canada**, **Colombia**, **El Salvador**, **Senegal** and **Switzerland**.
331. The **Secretary General** appealed for resources to be made available to enable the Secretariat to do more in relation to the conservation of specific Ramsar Sites, notably in



the framework of Ramsar Advisory Missions, which depended on securing non-core funding.

332. The **Deputy Secretary General** confirmed that the details of individual site names and numbers, etc., would be double-checked with the support of the Secretariat's Regional Teams.
333. The amendments tabled by Parties were accepted, following the **Deputy Secretary General's** summing up and response to questions raised.
334. The **Alternate President** invited the COP to adopt DR4 Rev. 2, subject to incorporation of the amendments accepted during the current session.
335. Resolution DR4 Rev. 2, as amended, was adopted by acclaim.

**COP11 DR12 Rev.1** *Wetlands and health: taking an ecosystem approach*

336. At the request of the **Alternate President**, the **Deputy Secretary General** briefly introduced DR12 Rev.1.
337. **Denmark** (on behalf of the **EU Member States** present at COP11 and **Croatia**) supported DR12 Rev.1.
338. Further amendments were tabled by **Canada, Islamic Republic of Iran, Japan, New Zealand** and **UAE**.
339. It was agreed that in finalizing the text the **Secretariat** would incorporate a form of words responding to the concerns of both **Islamic Republic of Iran** and **UAE** in an additional paragraph.
340. In response to a point raised by **Senegal**, the **Deputy Secretary General** confirmed that he had received advice from the **Chair of the STRP** that the references within this DR to the "ecosystem approach" were consistent with established usage under the Ramsar Convention.
341. The **Alternate President** invited the COP to adopt DR12 Rev.1, subject to incorporation of the amendments accepted during the current session.
342. Resolution DR12 Rev.1, as amended, was adopted by acclaim.

**COP11 DR13 Rev.1** *An Integrated Framework for linking wetland conservation and wise use with poverty eradication*

343. At the request of the **Alternate President**, the **Deputy Secretary General** briefly introduced DR13 Rev.1.
344. Further amendments were tabled by **Canada, France** (on behalf of the **EU Member States** present at COP11 and **Croatia**), **Norway, Peru** and **South Africa**.

345. The amendments tabled by Parties were accepted, following the **Deputy Secretary General's** summing up.
346. In response to a question raised by **Senegal**, the **Deputy Secretary General** confirmed that the terminology of “poverty eradication” versus “poverty alleviation” had been strongly debated at COP10. It had been decided to use “poverty eradication” in Resolution X.28, so it would be quite tricky to retrofit other language at this point. It might be helpful if **Senegal** were to speak with the **STRP Chair** to discuss how the concerns raised could be addressed in a way that ensured consistency. The Secretariat would undertake the final editing of this element of the text based on further advice from the **Chair of the STRP**.
347. Replying to an observation by **India**, the **Deputy Secretary General** cautioned against using the terminology “people below poverty line”, since the definition of poverty line was so variable, but concurred that an alternative needed to be found to “poor people” where the latter phrase was used in the DR. He suggested that the STRP might look into the terminology issues raised by both Senegal and India during the next triennium.
348. The **Alternate President** invited the COP to adopt DR13 Rev.1, subject to incorporation of the amendments accepted during the current session.
349. Resolution DR13 Rev.1, as amended, was adopted by acclaim.

**COP11 DR16 Rev.1** *Ensuring efficient delivery of scientific and technical advice and support to the Convention*

350. At the request of the **Alternate President**, the **Deputy Secretary General** briefly introduced DR16 Rev.1.
351. Further amendments were tabled by **Canada, Japan, Panama, Peru** and **USA**.
352. The amendments tabled by Parties were accepted, following the **Deputy Secretary General's** summing up and response to questions raised.
353. The **Alternate President** invited the COP to adopt DR16 Rev.1, subject to incorporation of the amendments accepted during the current session.
354. Resolution DR16 Rev.1, as amended, was adopted by acclaim.

**COP11 DR2 Rev.1** *Financial and budgetary matters*

355. At the request of the **Alternate President**, DR2 Rev.1 was introduced by **Ms Tiina Niikonen, Finland, Chair of Standing Committee on Finance and Budget** (and Chair of the Standing Committee Subgroup on Finance). Ms Niikonen's statement is attached as Annex 2.
356. The **Alternate President** opened the floor to comments.
357. **Cameroon** welcomed with satisfaction, but also a degree of circumspection, the outcome of the Committee's deliberations on DR2. It was important to stress that the measures being taken in relation to unpaid dues needed to be provisional and that there was a need to find

both new approaches to assessed contributions and a new way of drawing up the budget so as to further the work of our Convention.

358. **Denmark** (on behalf of the **EU Member States** present at COP11 and **Croatia**) tabled two minor amendments, one of which (a correction to paragraph 24) was confirmed by **Antigua and Barbuda**.
359. **Norway** acknowledged and supported the work of the Committee and also of the Finance Subgroup of Standing Committee. Norway was deeply worried by the financial situation of the Convention and asked those who were able to do so to make additional voluntary contributions.
360. **Guatemala** reiterated the need to start considering innovative ways of financially strengthening the Convention, which could not rely forever on the assessed contributions of Parties. This could be achieved through mechanisms that allow support for wetland conservation and restoration projects at a different level. That was why Guatemala proposed establishment of a Ramsar Fund to boost the Convention in the medium and long term.
361. The **Alternate President** invited the COP to adopt DR2 Rev.1, subject to incorporation of the amendments accepted during the current session.
362. Resolution DR2 Rev.1, as amended, was adopted by acclaim.
363. **Denmark** (on behalf of the **EU Member States** present at COP11 and **Croatia**) made the following statement for the record:

“The EU Member States present and Croatia recognize this draft resolution and thank the chair of the Finance and Budget Committee and the Parties for the elaboration of this vital document that effects the core implementation of the Ramsar Convention in the coming triennium.

We regret that we are in a situation where we have to adopt a budget with 0% increase. But considering the current worldwide economic crisis this seems inevitable. In real terms this makes it more difficult to at least maintain the present level of the Convention’s activities but we hope that, with smart use of means, it will be possible. It is of great importance for us that the budget is agreed by consensus.

Since we recognize that the general economic situation worldwide is challenging, we consider that the decision we are about to take on this budget is an exception and hopefully the situation will improve over the coming years, thus making it possible to remedy at the next COP getting the Ramsar Convention back on track to the benefit for the wetlands we are to protect and conserve.

We anticipate that this decision does not set a precedent for the budgets in the subsequent years of the Ramsar Convention and other international environmental agreements and conventions.

The flat budget is not however the only challenge to the leadership of the Ramsar Convention. France, Finland, Croatia and Denmark will as members of the Standing Committee on behalf of the European region collaborate with the current and the

new Secretary General, who will assume office within less than a year, and do our best to handle this difficult situation.

We appreciate that it has been a guiding principle in the budget negotiations to avoid staff reductions at the Secretariat. In our view this will contribute to maintaining the high level of wetland knowledge at the Secretariat and its capacity to support the Parties in implementation of the Convention.

It is our expectation that in the near future fundraising by the Secretariat and voluntary contributions will ensure a higher level of funding to the non-core budget and by these means contribute to the promotion of wise use and conservation of wetlands.”

364. In response to a question from **Canada**, the Deputy Secretary General clarified that the square brackets in paragraph 21 c) had been removed and a ceiling of 15% had been set for the Reserve Fund, as set out in the Chair of the Finance & Budget Committee’s Report.

**COP11 DR18 Rev.1** *Adjustments to the modus operandi of the Scientific & Technical Review Panel (STRP) for the 2013-2015 triennium*

365. At the request of the **Alternate President**, the **Deputy Secretary General** briefly introduced DR18 Rev.1.
366. Further minor amendments were tabled by **Canada**.
367. The **Alternate President** invited the COP to adopt DR18 Rev.1, subject to incorporation of the amendments tabled during the current session.
368. Resolution DR18 Rev.1, as amended, was adopted by acclaim.

**COP11 DR21 Rev.1** *Wetlands and sustainable development*

369. At the request of the **Alternate President**, the **Deputy Secretary General** briefly introduced DR21 Rev.1.
370. Interventions by **Denmark** (on behalf of the **EU Member States** present at COP11 and **Croatia**), **Japan**, and **USA** noted that paragraph 6 discussed allocation of resources for a high-level segment and proposed deletion of this text.
371. The **USA** was not opposed to high-level meetings, but observed that they had a cost that was generally absorbed by the host country. So it was not just a matter of elevating the issues, but also one of costs. The US believed insertion of language referring to high-level segments in DRs other than DR1 was counterproductive and should be stricken from this and any other DR apart from DR1.
372. **South Africa** reported that it would be bringing forward a new version of paragraph 6 and requested that it be square bracketed pending the outcome of negotiations on DR1.

373. **Congo** wished to share the concerns of **South Africa**. It was important to further improve paragraph 6 by recognizing how the participation of politicians could improve implementation of MEAs, not simply make decisions about resourcing. The idea was to establish not only a high-level segment at COPs, but also a Council of Ministers or something similar.
374. **Cameroon**, on behalf of the **Africa Group**, reiterated the desirability of a high-level segment in Ramsar's proceedings. Cameroon supported its inclusion in the present DR but leaving open the mechanisms and workings. If necessary, Cameroon would express its reservations.
375. **Uruguay** affirmed that it was proposing to host COP12 in 2015. Beyond the cost of a ministerial segment, it would also represent a series of political costs that would have to be taken into account. Uruguay believed there were other political fora where the positions of Parties could be made at a high level. There was a need to bear in mind what this might ultimately represent. Uruguay therefore supported the US in asking for the language concerning the high-level segment to be withdrawn.
376. In response to a question from the **USA** concerning the footnote contained in DR21 Rev.1, the **Deputy Secretary General** confirmed that more specific language would be welcomed.
377. The **Alternate President** confirmed that he had other speakers on his list, but the session had to close to enable the 45th meeting of the Standing Committee to take place. He invited Parties to consult informally during the evening and to seek a way forward on paragraph 6.

**Eleventh and Twelfth Plenary Sessions**

Friday 13 July 10.00–13.00 (Agenda Item XVIII (continued))

Friday 13 July 15.00–20.40 (Agenda Items XVIII (continued) –XXII)

**Agenda item XVIII: Adoption of Resolutions and Recommendations** (continued)

378. Opening the final day of COP11, the **Alternate President** cautioned that it would be a busy and difficult day since there were still 14 DRs to be discussed and approved.
379. With regard to DR1 (institutional hosting of the Secretariat), the **Conference Committee** had agreed that morning to the **Alternate President's** proposal that ALL interested Parties with specific inputs on DR1 should meet from 12.00 to 15.00 in a room set aside for that purpose. The first two hours would be without interpretation, but thanks to an exceptional effort by the interpreters, interpretation would be available from 14.00 to 15.00 to assist the informal group with resolving any language problems. The subject matter of DR1 had been thoroughly debated, so when DR1 came back into plenary later that afternoon, general discussion would not be reopened. Those interested were therefore urged to participate in the informal group meeting at 12.00. Hopefully consensus would be achieved within the group; if not, the only alternative would be to reintroduce DR1 in its original form, setting aside Rev. 1.

380. The **Deputy Secretary General** confirmed that the COP had so far adopted eight DRs, most subject to the inclusion by the Secretariat of further minor amendments agreed by Parties. From now on it would be logistically impossible for the Secretariat to issue further revised versions of DRs within the time remaining, so he encouraged the COP to work quickly and efficiently.
381. The **Deputy Secretary General** noted that an informal group working with the STRP had revised Figure 1 of DR9 Rev.1 (avoiding, mitigating and compensating for wetland losses), which in English had been issued as document DR9 Rev. 1 add. 1. The revised version of Figure 1 had already been included in the French and Spanish texts of DR9 Rev. 1. He further announced that, in view of their length, the revised technical Annexes to DR8 (describing Ramsar Sites) would be web-posted only and not distributed as hard copies. The Contact Group on DR14 (climate change) had completed its work and DR14 Rev. 2 was currently in translation. Finally, documents DR22 (Thanks to the host) and DOC. 38 add. 1 supplement (Admission of observers) had now been distributed.

**COP11 DR21 Rev.1** *Wetlands and sustainable development* (continued)

382. Recalling that all except one paragraph of this DR had been approved on 12 July, the **Alternate President** accepted a proposal by **Denmark** (speaking on behalf of the **EU Member States** present at COP11 and **Croatia**) that paragraph 6 of DR21 Rev.1, which dealt with the issue of establishing a future high-level segment under Ramsar, should only be finalized once the outcome of DR1 had been decided.

**COP11 DR5 Rev. 1** *Regional Initiatives 2013-2015 in the framework of the Ramsar Convention*

383. DR5 Rev. 1 was introduced by the **Deputy Secretary General**.
384. The **Alternate President** opened the floor for comment.
385. Interventions were made by **Argentina, Australia, Canada, Chile** (speaking also on behalf of **Argentina, Brazil, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cuba, Ecuador, Jamaica, and Uruguay**), **China, Colombia, Costa Rica, France** (speaking on behalf of the **EU Member States** present at COP11 and **Croatia**), **Islamic Republic of Iran, Panama, and Senegal**.
386. Finalization of certain paragraphs was deferred pending the outcomes of informal discussions between some of the above-mentioned Parties (see paragraphs 446-449 for final amendments and adoption).

**COP11 DR15 Rev. 1** *Agriculture-wetland interactions: rice paddy and pest control*

387. DR15 Rev. 1 was introduced by the **Deputy Secretary General**, who drew attention to the proposed change in title to refer to “pest control” (rather than “pesticides”) and to the remaining square-bracketed text.
388. The **Alternate President** opened the floor for comment.

389. Interventions were made by **Argentina, Brazil, Canada, China, Costa Rica, Denmark** (on behalf of the **EU Member States** present at COP11 and **Croatia**), **Japan, New Zealand, Switzerland, and USA**.
390. The amendments tabled by Parties were accepted, following the **Deputy Secretary General's** summing up and response to questions raised.
391. The **Alternate President** invited the COP to adopt DR15 Rev. 1, subject to incorporation of the amendments accepted during the current session.
392. Resolution DR15 Rev. 1, as amended, was adopted by acclaim.

**COP11 DR7 Rev. 2** *Tourism, recreation and wetlands*

393. DR7 Rev. 2 was introduced by the **Deputy Secretary General**, who drew attention to the proposed change in title to insert "recreation". He also highlighted remaining square-bracketed text.
394. The **Alternate President** opened the floor for comment.
395. Interventions were made by **Canada, New Zealand, Saint Lucia, South Africa, Sweden** (on behalf of the **EU Member States** present at COP11 and **Croatia**), and **USA**.
396. The amendments tabled by Parties were accepted, following the **Deputy Secretary General's** summing up and response to questions raised.
397. The **Alternate President** invited the COP to adopt DR7 Rev. 2, subject to incorporation of the amendments accepted during the current session.
398. Resolution DR7 Rev. 2, as amended, was adopted by acclaim.

**COP11 DR10 Rev. 1** *Wetlands and energy issues*

399. DR10 Rev. 1 was introduced by the **Deputy Secretary General**.
400. The **Alternate President** opened the floor for comment.
401. Interventions were made by **Argentina, Canada and Denmark** (on behalf of the **EU Member States** present at COP11 and **Croatia**).
402. The amendments tabled by Parties were accepted, following the **Deputy Secretary General's** summing up and response to questions raised.
403. The **Alternate President** invited the COP to adopt DR10 Rev. 1, subject to incorporation of the amendments accepted during the current session.
404. Resolution DR10 Rev. 1, as amended, was adopted by acclaim.

**COP11 DR11 Rev.1** *Principles for the planning and management of urban and peri-urban wetlands*

405. DR11 Rev. 1 was introduced by the **Deputy Secretary General**, who summarised the outcome of informal discussions between the STRP and Chile, with regard to section 3.2, Practical Principle 1, of the Annex.
406. The **Alternate President** opened the floor for comment.
407. Interventions were made by **Canada, Colombia, France** (on behalf of the **EU Member States** present at COP11 and **Croatia**), **Japan, New Zealand**, and **South Africa**.
408. The amendments tabled by Parties were accepted, following the **Deputy Secretary General's** summing up and his response, and that of the **STRP Lead** on this DR, to questions raised.
409. The **Alternate President** invited the COP to adopt DR11 Rev. 1, subject to incorporation of the amendments accepted during the current session.
410. Resolution DR11 Rev. 1, as amended, was adopted by acclaim.
411. The Observer from the **League of Arab States** intervened with a proposed amendment, but the **Alternate President** ruled this inadmissible, since amendments tabled by Observers had to be supported by one or more Parties and in any case the Resolution had already been adopted.

**COP11 DR17 Rev.1** *Future implementation of scientific and technical aspects of the Convention for 2013-2015*

412. DR17 Rev. 1 was introduced by the **Deputy Secretary General**, who apologised for the inadvertent omission from Rev. 1 of language submitted by **Mexico** in relation to environmental water allocations and environmental flows in Annex 1. This would be incorporated into the final version.
413. The **Alternate President** opened the floor for comment.
414. Interventions were made by **Argentina, Canada, Chile, Denmark** (speaking on behalf of the **EU Member States** present at COP11 and **Croatia**), **India, Iraq, Japan, Mexico** and the **Chair of the STRP**.
415. The amendments tabled by Parties were accepted, following the **Deputy Secretary General's** summing up and response to questions raised.
416. The **Alternate President** invited the COP to adopt DR17 Rev. 1, subject to incorporation of the amendments accepted during the current session.
417. Resolution DR17 Rev. 1, as amended, was adopted by acclaim.

**Agenda item VII: Admission of Observers** (continued)



418. The **Alternate President** invited the COP to approve DOC. 38 Add. 1 *Admission of registered observers*, which included all Observers registered since the listing contained in DOC. 38, which had been approved during the second plenary session on the afternoon of 8 July.
419. There being no observations to the contrary, the **Alternate President** ruled that DOC. 38 Add. 1 *Admission of registered observers*, was approved by consensus.

**Agenda item XVIII: Adoption of Resolutions and Recommendations** (continued)

**COP11 DR5 Rev. 1** *Regional Initiatives 2013-2015 in the framework of the Ramsar Convention*  
(continued)

420. The **Alternate President** invited a report back from one of the Parties involved in the informal consultations resulting from consideration of DR5 Rev. 1 earlier in the day.
421. **Colombia** reported on the outcome of informal discussions involving a number of Parties and tabled a number of consequent amendments.
422. Following discussion with further contributions from **Colombia** and from **France** (on behalf of the **EU Member States** present at COP11 and **Croatia**), consensus was reached on amendments to a number of paragraphs, though questions remained on others.
423. The **Alternate President** invited Parties to confer further and to report back with final proposed amendments later in the session.

**COP11 DR14 Rev. 2** *Climate change and wetlands: implications for the Ramsar Convention on Wetlands*  
(update)

424. The **Deputy Secretary General** reported that DR14 Rev. 2 had been web-posted and issued as a hard-copy document in English, had been web-posted in French, and would soon be web-posted in Spanish. Furthermore, Brazil had prepared its own alternative text of this DR, some copies of which had been distributed earlier by Brazil, but this unofficial document was not to be considered as formally tabled.

**COP11 DR19 Rev. 1** *Adjustments to the terms of Resolution VII.1 on the composition, roles, and responsibilities of the Standing Committee and regional categorization of countries under the Convention*

425. DR19 Rev. 1 was introduced by the **Deputy Secretary General**.
426. The **Alternate President** opened the floor for comment.
427. Interventions were made by **Argentina** (referring to the outcomes of the COP11 preparatory meeting for the Americas), **Colombia**, **Denmark** (on behalf of the **EU Member States** present at COP11 and **Croatia**), and **Jamaica**.
428. It was agreed that for the 2013-2015 triennium, each Ramsar region would have the right to designate *one* Alternate Contracting Party Representative *pro rata* for *each* of its Regional Representative Members of the Standing Committee. However, the exact number of

Alternates to be appointed (within its *pro rata* allocation) would be for each region to determine.

429. The **Alternate President** invited the COP to adopt DR19 Rev. 1, subject to incorporation of the amendments accepted during the current session.
430. DR19 Rev. 1 was adopted by acclaim.
431. In conformity with the provisions of the amended text of DR19 Rev. 1 and at the invitation of the **Alternate President**, each Ramsar region nominated Alternate Regional Representatives to serve on the Standing Committee during the 2013-2015 triennium as follows:
- **Africa:** Democratic Republic of Congo, Mali, Kenya, Namibia
  - **Asia:** Islamic Republic of Iran, Japan, Nepal
  - **Europe:** Czech Republic
  - **Neotropics:** Costa Rica, Jamaica, Argentina
  - **North America:** Mexico
  - **Oceania:** Palau
432. At the invitation of the **Alternate President**, these nominees were appointed by consensus.

**COP11 DR20 Rev. 1** *Promoting sustainable investment by the public and private sectors to ensure the maintenance of the benefits people and nature gain from wetlands*

433. DR20 Rev. 1 was introduced by the **Deputy Secretary General**.
434. The **Alternate President** opened the floor for comment.
435. Interventions were made by **Australia, Brazil, Canada, India, Switzerland** and **Turkey**.
436. Turkey made the following statement for the record:
- “Turkey reiterates its position regarding the management, development, protection and use of transboundary watercourses and in this context the Turkish Delegation would like to point out that all the issues related with transboundary watercourses can only be tackled and resolved among the concerned riparian countries without any third party involvement. Therefore, the Turkish Delegation put its reservation on para. 12 of Resolution XI.20 of COP11.”
437. The **Alternate President** invited the COP to adopt DR20 Rev. 1, subject to incorporation of the amendments accepted during the current session and noting the reservation announced by **Turkey**.
438. Resolution DR20 Rev. 1, as amended, was adopted by acclaim.

**COP11 DR9 Rev. 1** *An Integrated Framework and guidelines for avoiding, mitigating and compensating for wetland losses*

439. DR9 Rev. 1 was introduced by the **Deputy Secretary General**, who recalled that, as previously announced, a revised version of Figure 1 from this DR had been distributed in English as **DR9 Rev. 1 Add. 1**. The revised Figure 1 was already included in the French and Spanish texts of DR9 Rev. 1, so there was no Add. 1 in those languages.
440. The **Deputy Secretary General** summarised the issues that remained unresolved.
441. The **Alternate President** opened the floor for comment.
442. Interventions were made by **France** (on behalf of the **EU Member States** present at COP11 and **Croatia**), **India**, **Mexico**, **New Zealand**, **Senegal**, **South Africa**, **Switzerland**, and **USA**.
443. The amendments tabled by Parties were accepted, following the **Deputy Secretary General's** summing up and response to questions raised.
444. The **Alternate President** invited the COP to adopt DR9 Rev. 1, subject to incorporation of the amendments accepted during the current session.
445. Resolution DR9 Rev. 1, as amended, was adopted by acclaim.

**COP11 DR5 Rev. 1** *Regional Initiatives 2013-2015 in the framework of the Ramsar Convention*  
(continued)

446. At the invitation of the **Alternate President**, final interventions, reporting back on further informal consultations among Parties, were made by **France** (on behalf of the **EU Member States** present at COP11 and **Croatia**) and **Senegal**.
447. The amendments tabled by Parties were accepted, following the **Deputy Secretary General's** summing up and response to questions raised.
448. The **Alternate President** invited the COP to adopt DR5 Rev. 1, subject to incorporation of the amendments accepted during the current session.
449. Resolution DR5 Rev. 1, as amended, was adopted by acclaim.

**COP11 DR8 Rev. 1** *Streamlining procedures for describing Ramsar Sites at the time of designation and subsequent updates, DR8 Annex 1 Ramsar Site Information Sheet (RIS) – 2012 revision, DR8 Annex 2 Strategic Framework and guidelines for the future development of the List of Wetlands of International Importance of the Convention on Wetlands (Ramsar, Iran, 1971) – 2012 revision*

450. DR8 Rev. 1 was introduced by the **Deputy Secretary General** and by the **STRP Lead** for this issue, **Dr David Stroud**.
451. The **Alternate President** opened the floor to comment.

452. Interventions were made by **Australia, Canada, Colombia, Denmark** (speaking on behalf of the **EU Member States** present at COP11 and **Croatia**), **El Salvador, India, Japan, Senegal** and **Turkey**.
453. Turkey made the following statement for the record:
- “The Turkish Delegation would be happy to join the consensus on this draft resolution. However, when we join the consensus, it should not be taken as a change in the Turkish position regarding the Resolution VII.19 of COP7 which is placed as reference in para. 21 and para. 43 of Annex 2 of DR8. We still maintain our reservation on the above-mentioned Resolution and furthermore we put a reservation on para. 21 and para. 43 of Annex 2 of DR8 Rev. 1 also thereby.”
454. The **Alternate President** invited the COP to adopt text DR8 Rev. 1, subject to incorporation of the amendments accepted during the current session and noting the reservation announced by **Turkey**.
455. Resolution DR8 Rev. 1, as amended, was adopted by acclaim.

<p><b>COP11 DR14 Rev. 2</b> <i>Climate change and wetlands: implications for the Ramsar Convention on Wetlands</i></p>
--

456. The **Deputy Secretary General** presented a report on behalf of the Chair of the Contact Group established for DR14 (see full text appended as Annex 7). He noted that the Contact Group had tabled a near-consensus text as DR14 Rev. 2. However, the Brazilian delegation had subsequently distributed its own version of DR14.
457. The **Alternate President** confirmed his intention to open discussion on DR14 Rev. 2, as tabled by the Contact Group. Given that this text had been agreed by a large group of Parties, which had met and discussed it at length, it was hard to imagine that the COP would accept a completely new proposal from one Party. He recommended that Brazil should enter a reservation to DR14 Rev. 2 if it was unable to join the consensus on that document.
458. **Brazil** confirmed that it had circulated its own version of DR14 and apologised for this unusual procedure, which had been in the best interests of sharing the view of the Brazilian delegation. Brazil would decide on how to proceed depending on the outcome of discussions during the present session. If Brazil were to enter a reservation this would be done at a later point, after having heard the views of other delegations. Brazil outlined its view of the Contact Group’s deliberations and introduced the key elements from its own version of DR14 that it would wish to see incorporated into DR14 Rev. 2, in particular a recognition that climate-related issues should be dealt with only by UNFCCC.
459. The **Alternate President** invited comments on DR14 Rev. 2 from other Parties.
460. **China** supported the views of **Brazil** with regard to UNFCCC and proposed a number of further amendments.
461. The **Alternate President** reminded Parties that they had been given the opportunity to participate in the Contact Group’s lengthy debates. He did not wish to reopen negotiations

- at the end of the COP and urged Parties to refer only to the fundamentally important problems.
462. The **UK** (on behalf of the **EU Member States** present at COP11 and **Croatia**) stressed that reaching a conclusion in the Contact Group had not been easy and required compromise on all sides. Thanks were due to the Chair of the Contact Group and to the STRP for its support. The **UK** (on behalf of the **EU Member States** present at COP11 and **Croatia**) considered DR14 Rev. 2 the best result that could be achieved and deeply regretted that **Brazil** felt unable to join consensus on this matter. Reopening negotiations in plenary was not acceptable and all Parties, including **Brazil**, were urged to accept the consensus.
  463. **Chile, India** and **Venezuela** supported the views of Brazil with regard to the supremacy of the UNFCCC.
  464. **Norway, the Republic of Korea, and Switzerland** fully supported the intervention made by the **UK** (on behalf of the **EU Member States** and **Croatia**), while **Iceland** also endorsed the Contact Group's text, i.e., DR14 Rev. 2.
  465. **Brazil** requested an opportunity to seek improved language in three or four paragraphs it had found especially alarming and also indicated its intention of making a political declaration prior to closing discussions on this DR.
  466. The **Alternate President** renewed his plea for negotiations not to be reopened.
  467. **Colombia**, supported by **Chile**, was uncomfortable with the output of the Contact Group being considered final. A limited number of Parties had participated in the Contact Group and developing countries should have an opportunity to comment. Some further changes could be incorporated.
  468. Following a proposal from the **UK** (on behalf of the **EU Member States** present at COP11 and **Croatia**), the **Alternate President** suspended the session for 15 minutes and invited **Brazil**, the **UK** (for the EU and Croatia), and other interested Parties to confer informally and determine whether a consensus could be reached
  469. Reconvening the session, the **Alternate President** invited the **UK** (on behalf of the **EU Member States** present at COP11 and **Croatia**) to report back on the outcome of the informal consultations. The **UK** reported that a possible consensus text had been reached and tabled amendments to three paragraphs of DR14 Rev. 2.
  470. Brazil made the following statement for the record:
 

“The negotiations on Draft Resolution XI.14 ‘*Climate change and Wetlands: implications for the Ramsar Convention on Wetlands*’ were unfortunately not able to produce a text that all Parties are fully comfortable with. Brazil participated actively in the negotiations and, although we do not believe that our views are adequately expressed in the text, we will not obstruct its approval by the COP. Our decision is based on an understanding of the importance of the Ramsar Convention and its work. Our views regarding climate change and wetlands remain intact. Brazil would like to clearly state its position that Resolution XI.14 does not, in any way, impinge on the work of the

UNFCCC, which is the sole multilateral forum mandated to address issues regarding climate change.”

471. The **Alternate President** invited the COP to adopt DR14 Rev. 2, subject to incorporation of the amendments accepted during the current session and noting the statement made by **Brazil**.

472. Resolution DR14 Rev. 2, as amended, was adopted by acclaim.

<p><b>COP11 DR1 Rev. 2</b> <i>Institutional hosting of the Ramsar Secretariat</i></p>
---

473. The **Deputy Secretary General** confirmed that DR1 Rev. 2 had emerged from the mid-day meeting of the Friends of the Chair group and due to the time constraints had been posted in English only on the COP11 webpages, though accessible via all three language portals.

474. The **Alternate President** invited **Dr Nana Aboubakar Djalloh, Delegate Minister for Environment, Nature Protection, and Sustainable Development, Cameroon**, to make a statement on DR1 on behalf of the African Group.

475. **Minister Djalloh** thanked the COP for the confidence placed in African Parties to work through the Friends of the Chair in order to develop a consensus text, now distributed as DR1 Rev. 2. This decisive development had occurred thanks to the willingness of States to go beyond their initial positions. The new draft included: restating the Convention’s faith in IUCN as the host of the Secretariat; inviting IUCN to work with the Ramsar Secretariat and the Host Country for the Secretariat to improve the working conditions for the Secretariat and its staff; increasing the political reach of the Convention’s work, through *inter alia* introduction of a ministerial segment; making the Convention’s working languages more representative by incorporating official languages of the UN, notably Arabic; and raising the international profile of the Convention. The Standing Committee would set up a working group charged with submitting to COP12 a comprehensive report and recommendations addressing the measures that might be taken and the implications involved – especially financial implications. Nevertheless this was not a definitive solution; no resolution could deliver such a thing. The solutions to the questions raised would call for step-by-step, intelligent and coherent solutions that would rely on patience, good faith and a sense of compromise. Romania had provided a warm welcome that could appropriately be repaid through adopting DR1 Rev. 2 by consensus; no organization, however large, could withstand division for long without being harmed by it. The Minister thanked all those regional groupings and individual Parties that had contributed to the debate, closing with the words, “Long live international cooperation; long live Ramsar!”.

476. The **Alternate President** thanked the Minister for this statement.

477. The text of DR1 Rev. 2 was projected onto a screen in the plenary hall and was also available, as previously mentioned by the **Deputy Secretary General**, on the Convention’s website.

478. At the request of **Jamaica**, the **Deputy Secretary General** guided Parties through the text of DR1 Rev. 2, reading aloud the amendments (indicated by yellow highlighting) since DR1 Rev. 1 had been circulated.

479. The **Alternate President** invited further questions or comments. There being no such remarks, he invited the COP to adopt DR1 Rev. 2.
480. DR1 Rev. 2 was adopted by acclaim, without further amendment.
481. The **Alternate President** expressed his satisfaction that a conclusion had been reached after seven years of work.
482. **Costa Rica** made the following political declaration for the record, speaking also on behalf of **Cuba, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Guatemala, Nicaragua, Panama, Paraguay** and **Venezuela**:

“Our countries, in conformity with their fundamental principles and values, take seriously the responsibility that they hold on behalf of present and future generations, to continue working on and for the fulfilment of the objectives of the Ramsar Convention, and in this regard show their support for the proposal presented by the African Group, and for the amendments made by the working group, as a means of taking this issue forward on the basis of currently available information.

However, we consider that this issue should be revisited in the light of new circumstances, taking into account the implementation of planned actions with IUCN, as well as the process for strengthening UNEP agreed by the United Nations Summit on Sustainable Development, ‘Rio+20’.”

**COP11 DR21** *Wetlands and sustainable development* (continued)

483. The **Deputy Secretary General** suggested that paragraph 6 be removed from DR21 Rev. 1, observing that now that this issue had been addressed through the adoption of DR1 Rev. 2, it was unnecessary and potentially confusing to include similar language in DR21 Rev. 1, which addressed a somewhat different issue.
484. To a question raised by **Colombia**, the **Deputy Secretary General** confirmed that the whole of the Annex was a direct quotation and so could not be amended. The **Secretariat** would include a footnote in the final version of DR21 Rev. 1 to clarify this point.
485. **Brazil** accepted this point but reiterated its position against inclusion of wetlands in the REDD+ system unless so decided under UNFCCC.
486. The **Alternate President** invited the COP to adopt DR21 Rev. 1.
487. Subject to inclusion of a footnote clarifying the status of the Annex, DR21 Rev. 1 was adopted by acclaim.

**COP11 DR22** *Thanks to the host country, Romania*

488. DR22 was introduced by the **Deputy Secretary General**.

489. The **Alternate President** said that he would not be opening the floor for comment, but that he felt honoured that the COP had appreciated Romania's efforts to do things as well as possible.
490. DR22 was adopted by prolonged applause from participants.

**Agenda item XIX: Date and venue of the next Ordinary Meeting of the Conference of the Contracting Parties**

491. The **Secretary General** recalled that an offer to host COP12 had been received from Uruguay, that this offer had been in order and submitted to the new Standing Committee for its consideration. He now took pleasure in commending the offer to all Contracting Parties and invited the **Ambassador of Uruguay to Romania, Mr Pedro Mo Amaro**, to present Uruguay's formal candidacy.
492. The **Ambassador** reiterated Uruguay's commitment to Ramsar and called upon Contracting Parties to work with his country before and during COP12 to ensure continued success for the Convention. Uruguay wished to be associated with those who had expressed their thanks to the government and people of Romania for the efforts made in hosting COP11. He also thanked the Contracting Parties and Secretariat. The Ambassador made a short presentation about Uruguay and the candidate venue for COP12 Punta del Este, some 130 km from the capital city Montevideo.
493. The **Secretary General** invited the response of COP11 to the invitation from Uruguay.
494. **Uruguay's** offer to host COP12 was warmly and enthusiastically accepted by acclaim.

**Agenda item XX: Any other business**

495. A statement on behalf of the **NGOs present at COP11** was presented by Mr Chris Rostron, representing the **World Wetland Network** (see the full text in Annex 8).
496. A statement on behalf of Ramsar's five **International Organization Partners (IOPs)** was presented by Dr Matthew McCartney, **International Water Management Institute** (see the full text in Annex 9).
497. Speaking on behalf of **UNEP, Mr Masa Nagai, Acting Deputy Director, Division of Environmental Law and Conventions**, recalled that during the COP11 Opening Ceremony, he had confirmed on behalf of UNEP's Executive Director that UNEP remained fully committed to Ramsar. Now that the Contracting Parties had decided the institutional arrangements for hosting the Secretariat, UNEP wished to reaffirm that commitment. UNEP would endeavour to increase its support for sustainable development and looked forward to working more closely with Ramsar in the future.
498. The **Secretary General** presented **Mr Herb Raffaele** (United States) with a certificate confirming him as a **Wetland Person of International Importance** in recognition of the outstanding contribution he had made to implementation of the Ramsar Convention and to wetland conservation in general over many years (see Annex 10).



### **Agenda item XXI: Adoption of the report of the 11th Meeting of the Conference of the Contracting Parties**

499. At the invitation of the **Alternate President**, the **Rapporteur** recalled that the Draft Report of COP11, up to and including the plenary sessions held on 12 July, had been distributed in the three official languages in five parts for review. He assured participants that all 'statements for the record', and particularly political declarations, that had been submitted to the Secretariat would be carefully checked using the original language of submission as the authentic text. He also confirmed that observations of an editorial nature could continue to be submitted to the Secretariat via the interventions email address ([intervention@ramsar.org](mailto:intervention@ramsar.org)), which would remain open. He thanked the Secretariat colleagues who had supported the work of all COP participants by managing the interventions inbox with quiet efficiency.
500. The **Deputy Secretary General** noted that it was usual practice for the Draft Report of the last day of Ramsar COPs to be prepared by the Rapporteur for review by the Secretary General and Deputy Secretary General, then transmitted to the President of the COP and Chair of the Standing Committee for final sign-off.
501. The **Alternate President** invited the participants to consider each of the five parts of the Draft Report of COP11 in turn and to raise any comments, questions or concerns that they might have.
502. There being no such remarks, the Draft Report of COP11 was adopted by consensus.

### **Agenda item XXII: Close of the meeting**

503. The **Alternate President** invited **Mr Corneliu Mugurel Cozmanciuc, Secretary of State, Ministry of Environment and Forests of the Republic of Romania**, to make closing remarks on behalf of the host country.
504. **Mr Cozmanciuc** expressed his conviction that the Ramsar Convention was an extremely important tool for the protection of wetlands and biodiversity. The solutions promoted under the Convention could create sustainable jobs for people and contribute to healthy, green economic growth. Romania has demonstrated its own commitment to wetland conservation by designating eight Ramsar Sites by the end of 2011 and announcing at COP12 the designation of four new sites. A further eight potential Ramsar Sites had already been identified. The transboundary nature of many of the existing and potential sites meant that they could play a significant role in regional economic development. It was vital to allow people to enjoy and value nature and so preserve it for future generations. Romania was delighted that COP12 would be hosted by Uruguay and was pleased to offer its full support. In closing, thanks were due to all Parties and Observers, the Secretary General, the Romanian Parliament and all stakeholders involved in making COP11 'Home & Destination' a success.
505. The **Alternate President** confirmed that Romania was inviting Heads of Delegations and the Secretariat to a cocktail immediately after the close of the session.
506. The **Secretary General** renewed his thanks to all COP11 participants and to the Romanian hosts and especially to the volunteers who had assisted the COP quietly but

with great effectiveness. He also thanked Uruguay for inviting COP12 and wished the Uruguayan organizers every success. Thanks were also due to the Standing Committee, especially the outgoing Chair of the Standing Committee, Mr Yoo from the Republic of Korea, and to the outgoing Chair of the Finance Subgroup, Tiina Niikkonen from Finland, as well as to the new Standing Committee and the COP11 interpreters, translators, Earth Negotiations Bulletin team, MKA, and the Romanian events management company that had organized technical equipment and logistics. Finally he expressed his thanks to the staff of the Ramsar Secretariat, on whose behalf he renewed the commitment to implementing the decisions taken by the COP.

507. **France** (speaking for the **EU Member States** present at COP11 and **Croatia**) thanked Romania on behalf of the European region and placed on record its appreciation of the work of the COP11 translators and interpreters.
508. Following a short video presenting images of COP11, the **Alternate President** delivered his closing remarks. He observed that although his colleagues had prepared a written speech for him, he would not be delivering it, since over the course of the COP he had been made to feel more like one of the Ramsar family and not ‘just’ a Chairman. We should and would all work together in the future in pursuit of the Convention’s objectives. In closing, he thanked all participants who had worked so hard towards a successful conclusion, as well as the Secretary General, Deputy Secretary General, Rapporteur, Secretariat, interpreters, translators, and everyone else involved, including last but definitely not least the COP11 volunteers.
509. The **Alternate President** declared COP11 closed with the words “see you again in Montevideo”.

## Annex 1

### Report of the Credentials Committee

Presented to the plenary of the 11th Conference of the Contracting Parties on 12 July 2012

1. Rule 19 of the Rules of Procedure provides for a Credentials Committee composed of one Party from each of the Ramsar regions, elected at the first session of each ordinary meeting on the basis of a proposal from the Conference Committee, which shall examine the credentials and submit its report to the Conference of the Parties for approval.
2. On the basis of Rule 19 and a proposal from the 44<sup>th</sup> meeting of the Standing Committee meeting immediately prior to the COP, the Conference elected the following members to the Credentials Committee:

For Africa: Mauritania (Mr Sidi Mohamed Ould LEHLOU); for Asia: Japan (Mr Eiji HATANO); for Europe: Denmark (Ms Helle LIEMANN); for the Neotropics: Guatemala (Mr Erick CABRERA); for North America: United States of America (Ms Rowena WATSON); for Oceania: Australia (Ms Georgina USHER). Mr Erick CABRERA was named Chair. Ms Claudia FENEROL of the Convention Secretariat was appointed as the Secretary to the Committee.

3. The Committee referred to all relevant Rules of Procedure and in particular Rule 18.
4. The Committee met on four occasions. In accordance with the requirements above, the Committee confirms the credentials submitted by delegates of 113 Contracting Parties, as follows:

Algeria, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chile, China, Columbia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, El Salvador, Estonia, Fiji, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Islamic Republic of Iran, Iraq, Jamaica, Japan, Kenya, Kyrgyz Republic, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Latvia, Lesotho, Lithuania, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Mali, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Mongolia, Montenegro, Mozambique, Myanmar, Namibia, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Norway, Palau, Panama, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Lucia, Samoa, Senegal, Seychelles, Slovakia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia.

5. The Committee encountered a variety of challenges in the course of its work, and appreciated the efforts that were made by many of the Contracting Parties concerned in resolving them.

6. A small number of credentials submitted did not meet all the requirements of Rule 18, notably 18.1 and 18.3, and were therefore not approved by the Committee.
7. Additionally, the issues of scanned credentials and use of electronic signatures in lieu of original signatures on the statement of credentials were raised. As explained in Rules 18.1 and 18.4 original signatures are required and electronic signatures are not acceptable. Rule 18.4 in particular states that the credentials must bear the name and position of the person who signs the credentials as well as the full signature of the appropriate authority or else be sealed and initialed by that authority. Parties are requested to note this.
8. Based on its experiences, the Committee recommends to Parties that they pay close attention to the requirements for credentials as set out in the relevant sections of the Rules of Procedure well in advance of the Conferences of the Parties. Parties are encouraged to request any necessary clarification from the Secretariat in advance of the Conference to ensure their credentials are in compliance.
9. Parties are requested to note that whilst credentials shall be submitted at the venue of the meeting of the Conference of the Parties not later than forty-eight hours of the opening of the meeting, Parties are also able to submit credentials directly to the Secretariat in advance of the Meeting of the Conference of the Contracting Parties.

## Annex 2

### Report of the Chair of COP11 Finance & Budget Committee

Colleagues, ladies and gentlemen,

The Committee on Finance and Budget has been working hard to bring to you good recommendations in relation to DR2 and a sound budget for the next triennium. I would like to thank all members of the Committee for their commitment to these important matters. We have had six meetings over the course of this week, and have given these matters our full attention, both during the meetings and beyond. Thank you.

It is clear that all Parties are keen to see investment in wetlands and to do what is necessary to halt and reverse the loss of wetlands. Many Parties have expressed their wish to support a developmental Convention budget. However, an even stronger message has been that Parties are not able to return to their capitals with a Core budget exceeding 2012 levels. Even a compromise of a 1% increase was deemed impossible.

This means that in order to achieve the desired development we will depend heavily upon voluntary contributions and all of us – Parties, the Secretariat, the private sector – will need to continue to work hard, together, to reach our goals.

The Committee was asked to consider two budget alternatives and has concluded that Budget Alternative A should be recommended for adoption. This is a combined budget with a Core and a non-Core part, and the recommendation put forward by the Committee fixes the total budget for the Core element to the level of 2012.

We have heard clearly that Parties highly value efforts to communicate the Ramsar message and to that end the budget includes only modest investment over the coming triennium in the website and other communication technology. Information management is also important and provision is made for some investment here too.

In these challenging financial times that leave almost no Party unaffected, it is hard to argue for an increase in salaries and staff-related costs. The Committee is therefore suggesting to freeze the budget line for salaries to the level of 2012. At the same time, however, the Parties do not want to see the Secretariat's capacity reduced. It is also considered important that contractual obligations are met. Actions such as deferring the replacement of departing staff are not generally supported. These aspects have been taken into consideration and are noted in Annex I – it may be that inflation adjustments to salaries will require Reserve Funds to be utilised.

Members have discussed different ways to use resources more effectively. I hope these will be of some value for the Secretariat as they embark on the new triennium. Formal reallocation between budget lines, however, was not considered possible or helpful.

A flat Core budget will present some challenges for the new Secretary General – and possibly for the new Standing Committee, too, which will be managing the budget and any use of the Reserve Fund.

The members of the Committee recognize the efforts that have been made, and that will need to continue to be made by Parties to pay their Core contributions.

The current situation is that we have too many Parties with outstanding contributions. To address this, in para. 17, the Committee suggests that the Secretariat and the new Standing Committee seek and implement actions, giving special attention to Parties who have had contributions outstanding for more than three years. Tough times call for tougher action!!

As mentioned earlier this week, and with a bit of luck, the Reserve Fund should be in reasonable shape by the end of 2012, but the plan to add to it a little over the triennium is supported by the Group. The Committee recognizes the importance of Reserves to cope with unforeseen and unavoidable expenditures or income shortfalls. We welcome the opportunity to present you with refreshed text governing the Reserve Fund and its use. As you may have noticed, we did have one matter left unresolved as of Tuesday in DR2 Rev.1 regarding a decision about the maximum reserve. Having consulted widely this morning, the recommendation is that the COP adopt 15% for now, and ask the Standing Committee and Secretariat to work together to propose any further update to the maximum ceiling at COP12.

### **Non-core/voluntary**

The non Core budget lists recommended activities amounting to more than CHF13 million over the next three years. By approving this budget our job is far from done. Voluntary contributions, monetary and in kind, are required to fund important Secretariat, regional and on-the-ground actions such as the three grant programmes and Ramsar Advisory Missions, the scientific work of the STRP, and of course the next COP. It must not be forgotten how significant the financing of regional meetings and a COP is! There are very few governments and economies that can easily support such large scale meetings.

The new Standing Committee and Subgroup on Finance must be charged with overseeing the healthy realization of these ambitious non-Core activities. This has to be a high priority also for the new Secretary General.

### **Other**

There is one late addition to paragraph 14 line 4, namely the insertion: “,which for those only paying voluntary contributions is applied on an indicative basis”.

Finally, I would like to mention that the Committee has received requests from a number of Parties to consider including budgets for language services beyond the current rules of procedure. It may be appropriate for the SC to ask the Secretariat to investigate some of these costs, but at this point the Committee believes that to give these matters a formal budget decision at COP would not be helpful. Whilst sympathetic to the motive behind the requests, the Committee felt strongly that the right place to advance these matters is not via this finance Resolution and notes that the already strained core budget cannot fit any additional activities.

### **Closing remarks**

I would like to end by thanking the Secretariat, in particular Finance Officer Anna Goodwin, for her valuable support and excellent work during the past triennium and this COP. I very much appreciate the efforts the Secretariat has made to facilitate the work of the Subgroup on Finance

during my time as its chair as well as the strong commitment shown by the Secretariat staff to make this Convention successful. Thank you.

### Annex 3

#### **Statement on behalf of the World Wetland Network, delivered by Prof. Petruta Moisi, Eco Counselling Centre, Galati, Romania**

The NGO sector greatly appreciates this opportunity to present our views to the Conference of the Parties, and we have worked together through the World Wetland Network over the past months to develop this statement. We hope that this Ramsar COP11 meeting can help us move forward as civil society, private sector and governmental partners to make a positive difference to the delivery of wetland conservation in our respective countries.

We fully support the wise use principle of the Ramsar Convention, but we continue to see examples of Contracting Parties favouring unsustainable development and lifestyles. These lead to the irreversible loss and degradation of both designated and non-designated wetlands. Without a change of emphasis from over-consumption and economic development to genuine sustainability, we do not see how the ongoing degradation of wetlands or the wider environment can be halted, let alone reversed. We strongly urge Contracting Parties to adopt the Wise Use of Wetlands approach, in practice not just in principle.

Although the Danube Delta is one of the best preserved wetlands in the world for wildlife and people, civil society groups are still highly concerned about the continuing degradation and loss of wetlands both in Romania and globally. With the world's population now over 7 billion – we need to find a more sustainable way of living to protect nature and wetlands, not just protect isolated sites.

Our specific recommendations to the COP are as follows:

1. Even in times of economic crisis, do not make short-term unsustainable economic development more important than longer term investment in wetland protection.
2. Regarding unavoidable damage or loss of wetlands, ensure that strategic environment impact assessment and any compensation work are implemented BEFORE any development or loss of wetland, and that impacts on ecological function, biodiversity value and ecosystem services are taken into consideration.
3. Protection of wetlands has to go beyond designated sites to engage social, environmental and economic stakeholders that have an impact in the wider catchment.
4. Civil society and NGOs deliver the majority of practical wetland conservation on the ground, and work to support Contracting Parties' commitment to Ramsar. We offer our support wholeheartedly, but in return, we need support financially and access to decision-makers to do this well.
5. Despite targets for Ramsar Site designation, NGOs find that Contracting Parties are very slow at designating sites that NGOs and local people put forward. NGOs are keen to support the process and help Contracting Parties identify and put forward potential sites.
6. Regarding DR7, tourism offers an important opportunity for education for people visiting wetlands, but the same wetlands are important to local communities and nature so



strategic choices need to be made to balance these demands. Sustainable tourism should bring economic benefits to local people through their direct involvement.

7. NGOs are concerned about the change of hosting arrangement due to short-term disruption and use of resources, and longer term-increase in bureaucracy. We would only support a change if clear benefits are available to the delivery of the Ramsar goals and better involvement of civil society.
8. Taking into account the impacts of climate change and energy production on wetlands, we encourage Contracting Parties to take measures to increase energy efficiency and reduce consumption.
9. With regard to DR10 on wetlands and energy, we have concerns regarding environmental, social and economic impacts of renewable energy production affecting wetlands and local livelihoods, such as small hydropower production. Special attention should be given to cumulative impacts of these activities and assessments at a whole catchment level.
10. DR15, which talks about pesticide use in rice paddies, looks positive on the surface but we have identified various concerns with it. No reference is made to traditional farming practices, and we recommend STRP to produce guidelines on how these methods can help reduce pest damage through organic means. Currently suggested Integrated Pest Management implies a continued use of pesticides, potentially including use of genetically modified organisms, which we do not support.
11. There is an implementation gap between STRP guidelines/reports and what can practically be used to deliver wetland conservation on the ground. For example, in the Draft Resolutions on Health and Energy, relevant technical information needs to be shared in an accessible format to those delivering them.
12. We stress the importance of National Ramsar Committees for inclusion of stakeholder and continuity of support. We urge the Ramsar Convention to strongly request that countries adopt National Ramsar Committees, with the active participation of NGOs/CSOs.
13. WWN has held an open international survey to identify good and bad wetland practice internationally, the Wetland Globe Awards. We will announce the results of this competition at the side event held today at 18.15 in Room 3, to which you are all welcome.

Finally, the NGO sector is a vital component for delivering changes on the ground, working with the Contracting Parties and private sector, and we look forward to working together positively to deliver the outcomes of COP11.

Those present at the meeting included:

Katie Beilfuss, USA, Wisconsin Wetlands Association  
Karen Denyer, New Zealand, National Wetland Trust  
Louise Duff, Australia, Australian Wetlands Alliance  
Lee Han-In, South Korea, Rice Field Ecosystem Network Korea  
Miyagaki Hitoshi, Japan, White Storks Committee  
DungHuynh-Tien, Vietnam, WWF  
Lee In-Sik, South Korea, Korea Wetlands NGOs Network

Park Jin-Sub, South Korea, Eco-Horizon Institute  
Jang Ji-Young, South Korea, Eco-Horizon Institute  
Lim Jum-Hyang, South Korea, Rice Field Ecosystem Network Korea  
Oshima Katsuyuki, Japan, OWS  
Shimasaki Kunio, Japan White Storks Committee  
Kim Kyung-Cheol, South Korea, Wetlands and Birds Korea  
Roxana Mazilu, Romania, National Centre for Sustainable Development  
Baboucarr Mbye, The Gambia, Stay Green Foundation  
Mandics Miklos Attila, Romania, Asociatia Valea Verde  
Melissa Marin, Costa Rica,  
Gwon Mi-Ock, South Korea, Rice Field Ecosystem Network Korea  
Enomoto Hisakazu, Japan, OWS  
Petruta Moisi, Eco Counselling centre Galati (ECCG), Romania  
Lengyel Peter, Romania, Unesco Pro-Natura  
Grigore Povidron, Agua Terra Ecological Society, Romania  
Christine Prietto, Australia  
Rafaela Nicola, Brazil, Wetland System Alliance/ South America and PNP (Peace Nature and Pantanal)  
Chris Rostron, WWF, UK  
Choi Sang-Chul, South Korea, YMCA  
Lee Seung-Hwa, South Korea, Eco-Horizon Institute  
Salinas Sergio, WWF, Mexico  
Yasumura Shigeki, Japan, WWF Japan  
Adriana Suarez, Chile, Fundacion Kennedy  
Merita Susuma, Japan, OWS  
Sugenami Tamotsu, Japan, Ramsar Network Japan  
Felipe Velasco, Colombia, Fundacion Montecito  
Kashiwagi Minoru, Japan, Ramsar Network Japan  
Yamashita Hiromi, Japan, Nagoya University  
Martin Frid, Sweden, Consumers' Union of Japan  
Kobayashi Satoshi, Japan, Kushiro Public University  
Park In-Ja, South Korea, Rice Field Ecosystem Network Korea  
Park Byung-Sam, South Korea, Korea Wetlands NGOs Network

## Annex 4

### Statement of the Argentine Republic under Agenda item IX

Unofficial translation [provided by the Argentine Delegation]

The Argentine Delegation to the Eleventh Conference of the Parties of the Convention on Wetlands of International Importance especially as Waterfowl Habitat presents its compliments to the Conference of the Parties, and in relation to what is indicated in United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland's National Report, the Argentine Republic recalls that the Malvinas Islands, South Georgias and South Sandwich Islands and the surrounding maritime areas are an integral part of the Argentine national territory and that, being illegitimately occupied by the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, are the object of a sovereignty dispute between both countries recognized by the United Nations.

The General Assembly of the United Nations adopted Resolutions 2065 (XX), 3160 (XXVIII), 31/49, 37/9, 38/12, 39/6, 40/21, 41/40, 42/19 and 43/25, in which it recognizes the existence of a sovereignty dispute between the Argentine Republic and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and requests both governments to resume negotiations in order to find, as soon as possible, a just, peaceful and lasting solution to the sovereignty dispute.

Likewise, in the framework of the Organization of American States, UNASUR, MERCOSUR and the Iberoamerican Summit, CELAC, Rio Group and also G77 and China, among other fora, there are numerous pronouncements responding to the same lines.

The Argentine Republic reiterates the terms of its statement upon its ratification of the Ramsar Convention on Wetlands – signed on the 2<sup>nd</sup> February 1971 – deposited the 4<sup>th</sup> of May 1992, and of its declaration formulated in its document of accession to the amendment of articles 6 and 7 of the Ramsar Convention on Wetlands – adopted in Regina, Canada, the 28<sup>th</sup> May 1987 – the 2<sup>nd</sup> May 2001, by which Argentina rejects the United Kingdom's pretended territorial expansion of the Agreement to the Malvinas Islands, South Georgias and South Sandwich Islands, and the surrounding maritime areas.

Argentina reiterates also the terms of its note of the 24<sup>th</sup> of October 2001, in which it expresses its rejection to the British designation as Ramsar sites of the illegally occupied and illegally designated territories of "Sea Lion Islands" and "Bertha's Beach", due to the fact that, belonging to the archipelago of Malvinas, [they] are an integral part of its national territory. Argentina also rejects that in the British National Report there are references to the designation of "Specially Protected Areas" or "Environmentally Sensitive Areas" in South Georgias and South Sandwich Islands, since both archipelagoes are an integral part of Argentina's national territory.

Moreover, the Argentine Government rejects any reference to alleged and illegitimate "authorities" of the Malvinas, South Georgias and South Sandwich Islands.

Due to the existence of this internally recognized sovereignty dispute, Argentina requests to the [Secretariat] of the Ramsar Convention on Wetlands the application of the Editorial Directive of United Nations, ST/CS/SER.A./42 of 3<sup>rd</sup> August 1999 in all documents circulated in the framework of this Convention in which the Malvinas Islands, South Georgias and South Sandwich Islands are mentioned.

The Argentine Republic reaffirms its sovereignty rights over the Malvinas Islands, South Georgias and South Sandwich Islands, and the surrounding maritime areas.

The Argentine Delegation asks that the present note be circulated and annexed in the Final Report of the Eleventh Conference of the Parties.

The Argentine Delegation to the Eleventh Conference of the Parties of the Convention on Wetlands of International Importance especially as Waterfowl Habitat renews to the Conference of the Parties the assurances of its highest consideration.

## Annex 5

### Statement of the United Kingdom under Agenda item IX

The United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland presents its compliments to the Executive Secretary of the Ramsar Convention on Wetlands and has the honour to refer to the note presented by the Republic of Argentina under agenda item IX in the plenary session on Saturday 7<sup>th</sup> July 2012.

The United Kingdom has no doubt about its sovereignty over the Falkland Islands and South Georgia and the South Sandwich Islands and the surrounding maritime areas of both Territories and its ability to designate Ramsar sites in either territory in consultation with the authorities of the Falkland Islands and South Georgia and the South Sandwich Islands.

The British Government attaches great importance to the principle of self-determination as set out in Article 1.2 of the Charter of the United Nations and Article 1 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. That principle underlies our position on the Falkland Islands. There can be no negotiations on the sovereignty of the Falkland Islands unless and until such time as the islanders so wish.

The democratically elected representatives of the Falkland Islands once again expressed their own views clearly when they visited the United Nations for the 2012 Decolonisation Committee. They asked the Committee to recognize that they, like any other people, were entitled to exercise the right of self-determination. They reiterated the historical facts that the Falkland Islands had no indigenous people, and that no civilian population was removed prior to their people settling on the islands over eight generations ago. They confirmed that they are and have been the only people of the Falkland Islands and they did not wish for any change in the status of the Islands.

Furthermore, the UK would like to make it clear that the United Nations Resolutions referred to by Argentina do not, as suggested, acknowledge a sovereignty dispute in respect of South Georgia and the South Sandwich Islands. South Georgia and the South Sandwich Islands is a separate British Overseas Territory that is not considered under the Falkland Islands at the United Nations. It has no permanent settled population, and thus no people with a right of self-determination, and it is not a listed territory within the United Nations Decolonisation Committee. The United Kingdom rejects any and all claims or references that suggest South Georgia and the South Sandwich Islands are considered by the United Nations as part of the Falkland Islands.

The United Kingdom has no doubt about its sovereignty over South Georgia & the South Sandwich Islands and their surrounding maritime areas. In that regard, the UK has no doubt about our ability to manage our maritime areas. In addition, it remains wholly committed to the principles and objectives of the Convention for the Conservation of Antarctic Marine Living Resources - CCAMLR. The UK may promulgate any national measures it deems appropriate within the waters of South Georgia and the South Sandwich Islands, a point which was confirmed in the Statement by the Chairman of the Conference on the Conservation of Antarctic Marine Living Resources, made on 19 May 1980. The UK intends to ensure that the highest standards of fisheries management as well as appropriate spatial and temporal marine protection will be implemented in its jurisdictional waters – through licensing and inspections, and also through the enactment of legislation and tough management measures that are in line

with, and reinforce, the provisions of CCAMLR. In that respect the sustainable-use Marine Protected Area designated by the Government of South Georgia & the South Sandwich Islands on 27 February 2012 builds on those management measures already in place to further underpin the sustainable management and environmental stewardship of the islands, and contributes to the United Kingdom's wider commitment to the conservation of the Southern Ocean through its leading role within CCAMLR. The Marine Protected Area covers over one million square kilometres of the Territory's maritime zone, and is now one of the largest sustainably managed areas of ocean in the world.

We would further note that UN Editorial Directive ST/CS/SER.A/42 applies in respect of references to the Falkland Islands appearing in documents and publications emanating from the UN Secretariat and does not apply to other bodies and organisations.

The United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland requests that the Ramsar Convention Secretariat include this note as part of the official report of the Eleventh Conference of the Parties and takes this opportunity to renew to the Executive Secretary of the Ramsar Convention the assurances of its highest consideration.

London, 09 July 2012

## Annex 6

### Statement by Australia concerning the Murray-Darling Basin

We would like to make a comment specifically in relation to the process of water reform in the Murray-Darling Basin.

As you may be aware, the Water Act 2007 is the legislative mechanism to enable the Australian Government in conjunction with the Murray-Darling Basin States to manage the Murray-Darling Basin water resources in the national interest and to give effect to relevant international agreements including the Ramsar Convention.

The Act established the Murray-Darling Basin Authority and charged it with preparing a strategic plan to ensure the sustainable use of the Murray-Darling Basin's water resources. The strategic plan is to protect and restore the ecosystems, natural habitats and species which are reliant on the Murray-Darling Basin's water resources.

The Act sets out the purposes of the Plan which include:

- giving effect to international agreements including the Ramsar Convention;
- the establishment of sustainable limits for surface water and ground water extraction from Basin water resources;
- promoting the wise use of all the Murray-Darling Basin water resources; and,
- the conservation of declared Ramsar wetlands.

A draft strategic plan, referred to as the draft Basin Plan, was released on 28 November 2011. The Authority has undertaken public consultation on the draft Basin Plan and has considered all submissions received and submitted a revised draft to governments.

The Water Act requires that the Basin Plan take into account the best available scientific knowledge and socio-economic analysis. To that end, the Authority has recently released a review of the science underpinning the draft Basin Plan and a report that brings together the socio-economic work considered by the Authority.

Consistent with Goal 1 of the current Ramsar Convention Strategic Plan, the Australian Government believes that local communities need to be engaged in the management of river systems in their area. Localism is about helping local people to find localised solutions to achieve the objectives of the Basin Plan.

Some water currently used for human purposes in the Murray-Darling Basin is being recovered and returned to the environment to restore its health and underpin a sustainable future for its industries. Considerable progress is already being made towards the recovery targets which will be set in the final Basin Plan.

For example the Australian Government is providing \$4.8 billion for infrastructure projects and water management in the Murray-Darling Basin. These projects benefit the economy by making irrigation more productive, and improve the health of our rivers and wetlands by returning water to the environment and support communities by putting water use on a sustainable footing.

The Australian Government is committed to making a final plan for the Murray-Darling Basin in 2012.

The outcome sought by Goal 1 of the Strategic Plan is the wise use of all wetlands, including through more participative management of wetlands, and conservation decisions being made with an awareness of the importance of the ecosystem services provided by wetlands. Opportunities for local input have been built into development of the Basin Plan to ensure that communities are given the chance to have their say on the ongoing development and implementation, including the management of environmental water. The Australian government recognizes there are challenges in transitioning to a future with less water and is working with communities and industries to identify impacts and solutions.



## Annex 7

### Report of the Chair of the Contact Group on DR14 (climate change)

Upon establishment, the Contact Group began to incorporate into Rev. 1 all concerns with the original DR text raised by Contracting Parties at plenary, submitted to the Secretariat or presented in the Contact Group. Comments of Contracting Parties who had not had the opportunity to make an intervention in plenary, but had signaled their intention do so, were also considered. Where conflicting perspectives were present, the Contact Group incorporated an agreed change to the original text after discussing the alternate perspectives. Rev. 1 was then released and all Contracting Parties were again invited in plenary to attend the Contact Group in hopes that any Party who felt that their views were not reflected in the DR would join the Contact Group. A number of Contracting Parties joined the Contact Group at this stage.

After Rev. 1 was prepared, and while each Party waited for official responses to Rev. 1 from their countries, the Contact Group began the hard work of negotiating a DR that reflected the stated interests of all Contracting Parties. Each paragraph was reviewed and a consensus text began to emerge that varied significantly from Rev.1. At the same time, Parties began to receive feedback from their governments on the text of Rev. 1. The Parties worked to incorporate this feedback within the consensus text. It quickly became clear, however, that distance between Brazil's interests and the consensus text that was emerging was growing. Nonetheless the Contact Group, including Brazil, attempted to find a common ground between Brazil's interests and the consensus text that has become Rev. 2.

Last night, a proposal was presented to the Contract Group by Brazil that outlined their concerns. Quite simply, the Contact Group decided that there was not sufficient time, given the nature and the amount of changes being requested by Brazil, to address each of Brazil's changes and still have a Rev. 2 available for the final day of plenary. Thus the Contact Group decided to continue to work without Brazil to reach a Rev. 2 that all other members of the Contact Group could accept. Once Rev. 2 was finalized it was sent to Brazil in order provide Brazil the opportunity to reference their proposal to Rev. 2. Brazil will make that proposal available to anyone who is interested in reviewing it.

## Annex 8

### Closing statement on behalf of NGOs present at COP11

Members of the World Wetland Network representing NGOs from all regions thank the President for this opportunity to make a closing statement.

We understand that the difficult decision on hosting arrangements for the Ramsar Convention caused serious delays in the COP 11 proceedings, and respect the process of consensus used by Ramsar. However, we wish to express our regret that the Ramsar Secretariat addressed this delay partly by preventing interventions by observers from the floor. This not only reduced our ability to take part in the discussions, but also sent out a very negative signal about the participation of the NGO community as a whole.

The Ramsar Convention was born out of civil society's deep commitment to the wise use of wetlands and conservation of migratory waterbirds. It has been carried forward by cooperative and participatory efforts of governments and NGOs over the past forty years.

NGO members are local custodians who actively implement the Ramsar Convention on the ground at wetlands around the world. We play a vital role in local delivery of wetland conservation. Discussion without NGO involvement is a discussion without considering the real wetland itself, and without the knowledge that comes from local connections and working in-situ.

NGOs advocate for wetlands, notifying Contracting Parties about degradation and notifying the Ramsar Secretariat when governments fail to make their own reports. The Secretariat has noted its concern that Contracting Parties are slow to report changes in the ecological character of Ramsar sites.

We respectfully request that processes and mechanisms for interventions are considered so that NGO contributions are not stifled at future COPs. We appreciate the Ramsar Secretariat's long-standing commitment to the principles of participation and cooperation and trust that this spirit will continue.

We have already started planning work towards COP12, to engage NGO networks and support their positive input to the process, and hope there will be more opportunity for local NGOs and the general public to be involved at future COPs. We look forward to positive cooperation with Ramsar over the next three years and beyond.

**World Wetland Network**

## Annex 9

### **Closing statement by the International Water Management Institute on behalf of the five International Organization Partners (IOPs)**

Speaking on behalf of the five IOPs, the International Water Management Institute thanks the conference committee for following the tradition established at COP10 and inviting the IOPs to make a closing statement.

The IOPs congratulate Romania for their excellent arrangements for COP11. This amazing building, the extraordinary hospitality and flawless organization of the conference has been greatly appreciated by all. We thank you sincerely.

We also thank the Ramsar Secretariat and marvelous volunteers for their dedication and stamina during the COP processes and for enabling the participation to COP11 of as many Contracting Party delegates as possible, especially from developing countries.

We are pleased that, following on so closely from Rio+20, the Parties have reiterated their support to the central role of the Ramsar Convention in developing solutions to environmental problems and contributing to sustainable development. In our view the Ramsar Convention has an increasingly large responsibility to continue to champion the need to sustain and restore wetlands as a contribution to addressing the major global issues including water security, food security, poverty eradication, and climate change.

The IOPs are disappointed that observers were prevented from intervening in some plenary discussions of draft resolutions during this COP. Whilst we appreciate the need to move COP business forward, we do not think that muzzling observers is a constructive or effective approach to dealing with tight timelines. It also seems inconsistent with the professed objective of building synergies between all supporters of global wetland conservation. We trust that future COPs will revert to the more open approach that has been characteristic of Ramsar in the past, and that we believe has benefited the Convention.

The decision to freeze the budget of the Convention is of great concern to the IOPs. We worry that budget limitations will significantly constrain Convention activities and seems to be at odds with the Parties' request for the Convention to increase its profile. At the same time we call on all Parties to consider increasing their efforts for voluntary contributions – especially given the critical items that are in the non-core budget such as the Small Grants Fund, advisory missions, and the redevelopment of the Ramsar Sites Information Service. With such core budget limitations, the work of the Convention Partnership Coordinator is of greater importance than ever before.

IOPs would also like to urge Contracting Parties to reach out better and faster to different sectors and ministries to improve the efficiency of their work, better safeguard the ecological condition of the world's aquatic heritage, and achieve the wise use of all wetlands. Synergies between Multilateral Environmental Agreements should be urgently strengthened to more efficiently tackle global threats to wetlands such as climate change, extractive industries, world population growth, etc.

The IOPs recognize the outstanding work of the STRP, reflected in the high quality of guidance and the technical information provided to this COP. This work is central to the Convention and we express our appreciation to all members of the STRP who have contributed in the past triennium, with a very special tribute to the STRP Chair for her amazing voluntary work.

Arising from the work of STRP, we would like to highlight adoption of the new Ramsar Site Information Sheet in Resolution 8 as a major step forward in updating Ramsar's approach to collecting and managing data. We believe this will mark a significant improvement in monitoring and evaluating the state of Wetlands of International Importance, and meeting expectations for this important information to be both accurate and accessible.

The IOPs also welcome Resolution XI.16, the review of science delivery for the Convention. Translating scientific and technical knowledge and advice into effective implementation at the ground level remains a major challenge, and we have high expectations that this review will help point the way forward. In our view it is crucial that the review engage closely with those involved with implementation at national level – including focal points for the other biodiversity-related conventions – and field level. As partners to the Convention, with a strongly practical focus, the IOPs are already contributing significantly to the translation of science into action and are keen to support the proposed review process. We look forward to discussing how we can contribute further. We also hope that this review will not be funded from the already limited STRP budget.

The IOPs note that this is the last COP of the current Secretary General. We express our deep gratitude to Anada Tiega for his permanent consideration and appreciation of the NGO contribution to the Convention's objectives over the past five years. We very much hope that the next Secretary General will be as open, transparent and encouraging to wide cooperation and partnerships with all sectors.

Finally, the IOPs remain deeply concerned about the ongoing degradation of Ramsar Sites and wetlands in general. Those sites highlighted as being threatened at the beginning of this conference, such as the Bay of Panama in the Americas, Virunga in Africa, and many more, remain threatened today. Resolutions on their own do not protect wetlands. It is essential that the Contracting Parties ensure that they are urgently and efficiently translated into actions on the ground. The IOPs stand ready to help in this endeavor and look forward to working closely with the Ramsar Administrative Authorities, the Standing Committee and Secretariat over the years to come.

## Annex 10

### **Testimonial by Secretary General Anada Tiéga in recognition of Dr Herbert Raffaele as a “Wetland Person of International Importance”**

There are so many things to say about Herb Raffaele and his 35 years of experience in international conservation. Herb was formerly director of wildlife planning for Puerto Rico. And he is a recipient of Alexander F. Skutch Medal for Excellence in Neotropical Ornithology.

Herb is one of the principal contributors to Neotropical Ornithology in the Caribbean, having authored many publications such as a guide to birds of Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, the guide to the birds of the West Indies, and *Birds, beasts and bureaucrats: A naturalist on a Caribbean island*. He is presently working on a new book on environmental values.

Herb currently serves as the Division Chief of International Conservation in the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. He oversees the Wildlife Without Borders Program that annually contributes an average of 15-20 million dollars to international conservation projects worldwide with an emphasis on developing human resources locally and addressing the root problems threatening the world's fauna and flora through global, regional and species programmes.

Herb has also made significant contributions to the implementation and consolidation of the Ramsar Convention on Wetlands' activities and programmes through his support for Regional Initiatives and the creation of the internship program in the Ramsar Secretariat in 1997. He also spearheaded the establishment of the Wetland for the Future Fund to support the implementation of the Convention in Latin America and the Caribbean and has supported the development of the Ramsar Secretariat and Ramsar programmes in other regions.

One could continue talking about his many activities to enhance wetland conservation. Herb has been and continues to be involved, so now here at the 11<sup>th</sup> Meeting of the Convention on Wetlands, we want to recognize his excellence and outstanding contributions to the Ramsar Convention and to global wetland conservation.