

Draft daily report
Day 2 – Wednesday 25 May (Morning plenary session)

10:10 – 12:45 Plenary Session of the Standing Committee

Agenda item 20.1: Report of the Subgroup on COP14

1. China provided an oral presentation of recent work undertaken by the Subgroup on COP14, which had most recently met on 23 May. The report of the meeting would be sent to the Secretariat for distribution through its website.
2. Participants expressed concern that there was little detailed information available on the practical arrangements in place, and asked that an alternative plan be prepared, should it not prove possible to host the COP in Wuhan. Several participants stressed the importance of holding the meeting before the end of 2022.
3. The Chair of the Standing Committee asked the Working Group to report back before the end of the present meeting with other possible options for holding the COP.
4. Interventions were made by Algeria, Austria, China, Czech Republic, France as President of the European Union, the United Arab Emirates and Youth Engaged in Wetlands.

Agenda item 24.18: Proposed draft resolution on how to structure, write and handle Convention documents and messages (*Submitted by Sweden*)

5. Sweden introduced document SC59/2022 Doc.24.18, indicating that the draft resolution was intended to improve the efficiency of work done under the Convention.
6. Some participants queried what specific problems the draft resolution was intended to address. Others observed that the subject matter covered in the draft resolution was similar to that included in Decision SC58-19, directed to the Secretariat. It was suggested that this was not an appropriate subject for a resolution of the COP. One participant noted that the draft resolution contained some useful elements.
7. After further discussion and following a suggestion from a participant, the Standing Committee agreed to forward the draft resolution to the COP for further consideration, with all the text of the document included in square brackets.
8. Interventions were made by Australia, Brazil, Colombia, Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, Japan, Sweden, Switzerland and the Secretary General.

9. **Decision SC59/2022-12: The Standing Committee decided to forward the draft resolution on how to structure, write and handle Convention documents and messages contained in document SC59/2022 Doc.24.18 to COP14 for further consideration with all the document's text in square brackets.**

Agenda item 25: Report of the Chair of the Scientific and Technical Review Panel

Agenda item 26. Draft resolution on future implementation of scientific and technical aspects of the Convention for 2023-2025 (*Submitted by the Scientific and Technical Review Panel*)

10. Hugh Robertson (New Zealand) from the Scientific and Technical Review Panel (STRP) presented the panel's report in document SC59/2022 Doc.25 on behalf of the STRP Chair. He thanked the Secretariat for its support in the challenging circumstances of the past triennium. He drew attention to the 13 high priority tasks identified in Annex 2 and noted that these, if approved, could help to ensure that the STRP made a timely start in its work for the next triennium, subject to the availability of resources.
11. In discussion, participants expressed their appreciation for the work of the STRP, particularly commending the special edition of the *Global Wetland Outlook*.
12. Participants were asked to submit to the Secretariat any suggested amendments to the draft resolution in the document, for incorporation into a revised version.
13. Interventions were made by Australia, China, Costa Rica, Sweden and Uruguay.

Agenda item 24.14: Proposed draft resolution on the Ramsar Convention's Scientific and Technical work – The basics (*Submitted by Sweden*) and

Agenda item 24.15: Proposed draft resolution on the Ramsar Convention's Scientific and Technical bodies COP14-COP15 (*Submitted by Sweden*)

14. Sweden introduced documents SC59/2022 Doc.24.14 and SC59/2022 Doc.24.15, indicating that these were intended to improve the governance and efficiency of the Convention's scientific and technical work.
15. During discussion, some participants noted that the work of the STRP had been revised in depth at COP12 and questioned the need for further extensive review. Others sought clarification on the mandate for the proposed resolutions. Some noted that the draft resolutions contained useful elements that could improve the operations of the STRP, particularly in broadening its engagement.
16. The Chair of the Standing Committee asked that an informal open-ended group, to include Australia, Austria, Japan, Sweden, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the representative of the STRP, meet to consider the three draft resolutions and propose a way forward.
17. Interventions were made by Austria, Australia, Brazil, Costa Rica, Japan, Mexico, Uruguay, Sweden, Switzerland, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the Secretary General and the representative of the STRP.

Agenda item 15: Roles and responsibilities of the Standing Committee

18. The Secretariat introduced the draft resolution in document SC59 Doc.15 and its annexes, indicating that it would be updated to reflect changes in Annex 4 and Angola's accession to the Convention.
19. During discussion, it was observed that the roles of the Chair and Vice-Chair of the Standing Committee were not specified. It was recommended that these be included in Annex 3.
20. Participants were asked to send any comments to the Secretariat so that a revised version of the draft resolution could be prepared.
21. Interventions were made by China, France in its capacity as President of the European Union, and Sweden.

Agenda item 24.1: Proposed draft resolution on Protection, management and restoration of wetlands as Nature-based solutions to address the climate crisis (*Submitted by Spain*)

22. In the absence of the proponent, the Secretariat introduced the draft resolution in document SC59/2022 Doc.24.1 Rev.1.
23. During discussion, participants generally expressed support for the draft resolution, though several drew attention to its focus on the Mediterranean region and considered that its scope should be expanded to global level. A number of participants expressed serious reservations about the use of the term "nature-based solutions" as they did not believe that this had a settled definition in a multilateral environmental context and considered that use of such terms should be avoided in official documents. Others drew attention to the recent UNEA-5 meeting, which had agreed a resolution on nature-based solutions for supporting sustainable development.
24. Following further discussion, the Chair of the Standing Committee asked an open-ended group of Contracting Parties, to include Austria, Brazil, Canada, Colombia, Costa Rica, France, Indonesia and Slovenia, to meet informally and propose textual amendments to the draft resolution.