

Seminario/taller “**Coaliciones público-privadas para la protección de bosques: buenas prácticas y perspectivas**”

CEPAL, Santiago de Chile, 17 Y 18 de noviembre 2008

EXPOSICIÓN SR. JOCHEN FLASBARTH

Mr. Gómez, Mrs. Thurau, Mr. von Brunn, colleagues and friends, thanks very much for this very friendly introduction. It's indeed a pleasure and an honor for me to attend this very important workshop on the private sector engagement in forest protected areas.

I want to applaud specially UN ECLAC for inviting me to such a meeting. It shows that UN ECLAC is at the forefront where these discussions take place. It's an important issue not only for Latin America, but also for the whole world, if you look at post-Kyoto discussions on climate change. I will come back to this later in my presentation.

Well, Doris mentioned a little bit about my CV... maybe I can add what I usually don't do, one tiny little detail which is not important usually when I'm introduced, but maybe I will do so at this workshop. Before I went to work for the NGO, I worked for five years in the private sector as a product manager at a publishing house, which gave me some insight on the rules and the necessities of the private industry, there, I learned that money does not fall from the sky like *mana* and that it has to be generated, income has to be generated, by some kind of production processes or by providing services. Regarding the private sector's engagement in protected areas, it can generally be driven into two lines. One of them forms part of the very normal production process, offsetting any damages done by the production process, offsetting damages as part your company's overall process.

The second way of dealing with this, or way of engaging the private sector to protected areas, and woodland protected areas, is simply by way of

volunteering or philanthropy, by contributing to the overall task of saving nature's beauty and the wealth of our planet.

Before moving to the tough topic of protected areas, let me at the onset mention some key issues of the global biodiversity agenda.

As you might know, Germany is since May of this year heading the presidency of the convention on biological diversity CBD. We hosted the last conference in May this year at our UN site in the city of Bonn. Approximately 7000 delegates from all over the world participated in this conference and now for a cycle of two years, Germany will hold the presidency until 2010 when we pass the chairmanship over to our friends in Japan at the next COP in late October 2010 in Nagoya.

We have in these two years some crucial work to do on the overall biodiversity agenda. For Global Biodiversity, the year 2010 is of utmost importance. Heads of governments and states decided in 2002 in Johannesburg at the World Summit of Sustainable Development to slow down the deterioration process of biodiversity. It was stated how we want to significantly reduce the current rate of damage on biodiversity. To be honest, it is not a very tough target to reach, a quite vague objective as no one knew at that time what the current rate of biodiversity loss was, therefore, we don't know what is expected for the future, although it's very obvious.

The aim is not very clear and not very ambitious it's very obvious we will fail to meet this not-very-ambitious-target by 2010. Loss of biodiversity has been continuous, we are in a world where unsustainable use of biodiversity is constant, the loss of ecosystems is rampant, species and diversity within species is lost each and every day. Therefore, one of our key tasks, an assignment for the German chairmanship in concert with our colleagues all over the world is to provide a straightforward assessment by 2010. At that point, we will explain to the public at large the state of affairs, we will then try to analyze why we will fail to meet the target and explore whether there are encouraging examples in the world. We will attempt to seek examples in regions that were

able to meet the 2010 target and try to understand how this took place, whether it was just by accident, or whether these regions or governments implemented some unique procedure, whether they provided some kind regulation or ruling, from which the rest of the world could gain knowledge of.

Our task for the next decade involves developing a new target, a biodiversity target. We feel that it is necessary to guide the world again, we need to show how to deal with biodiversity, what issues to tackle, which concrete targets to follow, and develop the new target in a very inclusive manner, inviting scientists, NGOs, governments, stakeholders, the private industry and thereby allocating broad ownership to the new target, which should be resolved at a UN general assembly special session in September 2010.

Returning to the question: why are we going to fail to meet the 2010 target? Looking at the big picture, we discovered there are two key reasons for that:

One is that biodiversity is still underestimated by decision-makers, in governments but also by the private sector. Biodiversity is not thoroughly understood as crucial for economic development. It is not just something for idealists. It is essential, it's the basis of our economic development, not only in small countries, in some small part of the world, not only in the south, or in biodiversity-rich countries. It's the world's economic asset, and making public decision-makers better understand what we are discussing is of great significance. With the help of the G8 + 5 we commissioned a study similar to the Stone Report on climate change, we also commissioned a study called "The Economics of Ecosystems, Services and Biodiversity"(TEEP), in basic terms to find out how biodiversity is linked to global economies, to better understand how essential it is to persevere with biodiversity instead of exhausting it. And we were very lucky to find a well-known economist, Mr. Pavan Sukhdev, Pavan is Indian economist. He worked for the Deutsche Bank, Global Markets in London, and he has just begun an international research team to come up with a study by 2010. In Bonn, Pavan Sukhdev provided us with some very brief insights into the subject and I just wanted to mention two or three examples he showed us.

One refers to the gross production values of protected areas around the globe which is equal to joining the gross production value of global cars, steel and the IT industry. This is not some vague estimation, this is real economics, these are values produced all over the world in protected areas, not referring to biodiversity outside protected areas. The second example he gave us, a more impressive one for me, is not counting diversity in dollars or Euros, but relating it to people's needs. That is, one dollar is something very different depending where you are in the world. One dollar in the centre of Berlin has a different value than somewhere in India, or in African countries. Therefore, the example he gave us on his country, India, where 500 million people, in their poor existence depend upon their proper ecosystems. It is clear what we are referring to, destroying biodiversity will take all the people with it, it will take the world's poorest first. The third and last example refers to fishing. If we refer to fishing in the world's oceans, the simple reality published by FAO is that by 2050 there will no longer be a basis for commercial fishing, because supplies will cease to exist. And if you correlate that to the fact that one billion of the poorest people in the world depend on protein consumption from fish, it is unmistakable we are not referring to something pleasant we would like to withhold, on the contrary, it becomes something vital for the future of inhabitants on Earth.

The second grounds we identified, as to why we will not meet the 2010 target regarding loss of biodiversity is that scientific findings on biodiversity and ecosystems are not appropriately introduced to decision-makers.

Various reviews are available, however, in Germany, when we decided to invite parties to the CBD conference, I explained to my Minister what this was all about, and after a half-hour discussion, he asked me: "Can't you simplify this a little?. It's so packed, it's so difficult to understand!". That's the expected reaction because biodiversity is diverse, and if you talk about the Tropical Rainforest, it's something very different than talking about the Savannahs or referring to the high seas, therefore it becomes complicated to find the key that solves all the questions.

Nevertheless, we found the need to emphatically acquaint politicians, decision-makers and government officials with scientific findings, in addition to the private industry, an instance similar to the IPCC for the climate change debate. Consequently, we began with France, and now with the help of UNAD, we are establishing a scientific policy inter-phase on biodiversity. Just last week, Sarah and I were together in Kuala Lumpur where the first intergovernmental discussions, negotiations on the establishment of what we call IP Bass International Platform for Biodiversity and Ecosystems Services took place. It is meant to provide us with easy-to-understand key results, scientific findings that will enable politicians to make better decisions. I really hope we will be able to finalize these negotiations in the course of the next two years.

Another issue of key importance for the next two years is to establish – and this is something that has been specially requested by the developing countries, and understandably so – is to establish an international legally-binding regime against bio-piracy, this is under discussion since Rio de Janeiro, and developing countries, particularly, the mega-diverse countries, will no longer accept the lack of a legal framework that clearly establishes and defines how monies and profit will be shared. Genetic resources, biological resources, from mega-diverse countries, from biodiversity in other countries, are not operating under a legal framework that establishes how profits are shared between those who will use these genetic resources in industrialized countries and those who provide them by protecting their biodiversity within their own nations. We discussed these issues extensively. For a long time, industrialized countries refused to establish such a framework, however, for Germany it has become our main concern: to solve this problem and to come up by 2010 with such a framework.

Lastly, on the overall issues of biodiversity, I just wanted to mention that I am here at a meeting with the private industry. We commissioned an initiative called Business and Biodiversity. We drafted a leadership declaration for companies committed to improving biodiversity protection within their management structures. This is not aimed mainly at companies that are by definition environmentally sound. Obviously talking to a company involved in

organic food production, it would not surprise you they will do their best to protect nature. On the other hand, when dealing with specific industries, say infrastructure, oil, or pulp and paper, it becomes impossible for them to avoid zero impact on the environment.

Therefore, what we want to do with our business and our biodiversity initiative is to provide instruments that will advance their environmental performance in biodiversity. We were happy to present 35 companies from all over the world in Bonn who took this leadership role, and I am very happy that we were able to commission this initiative together with our friends from GTZ who did this job for the German Ministry of the Environment.

Now, let me refer to the protected areas:

We have been talking about this topic for decades. It's obvious that around the globe there are still some missing links to the global network of protected areas and network safety net, to cover all species, to cover all ecosystems and biomes in such a net, and it's also evident that many of the protected areas are highly under-funded. Therefore, in reference to these very obvious gaps, we have had exhausting debates and negotiations over days and weeks and months, always repeating more or less the same things. The world asks, specially the mega-diverse countries, the countries in the south, to pursue more action, more appropriate engagement on protecting their biodiversity. On the other hand, developing countries have not stopped in their insistence that engagement in protecting biodiversity is unfeasible without new and additional funding to support their crucial and important task.

When preparing the CBD in Bonn, as a hosts, we wanted to stop the useless ping-ponging and began to dwell upon how to go from discussion to action, and what we developed is a so-called Live EP Initiative. This is simply to invite, and this is what we decided in Bonn, countries, bio-diverse countries to designate potential, additional protected areas. Hence, where and which areas would they be willing to protect if they did not have a lack of funding. The second decision we took was to invite donor countries, in addition to NGOs, foundations

and the private sector to make use of these announcements for the allocation of funding. Consequently, that's what we did, because it was so easy, everyone doubts whether this could really be a German idea, but there is nothing more behind it, it's simply some kind of marketplace and by using the word "inviting", a very voluntary action, we trust countries who have, who host the world's biodiversity to undertake their responsibility if they have the means to do so.

We were very pleased that already in Bonn we received an announcement from quite a number of countries and their readiness to designate and protect more areas. If you count the size of this proposal and what occurred in Bonn, it would represent the size of Portugal, a huge protected area, and I will come to the financing part of it in a few minutes. Although, everything sounds very easy to achieve, it's still very easy to make mistakes when dealing with protected areas, and I want to use this opportunity to do away with some of the prejudices regarding protected areas.

In general, the first aspect is that protected areas need not be no-touch areas. We need some no-touch areas around the world where you don't use anything at all, but most of the protected areas will be areas where biodiversity comes first, not excluding the possibility of sustainable use, or naturally sound use of these areas, and we have lots of very good examples on how to combine sustainable use with protected areas. You will be dealing with these issues in the course of this conference.

Secondly, promoting additional protected areas does not exclude the public from the decision-making process. I can't imagine that wherever you are in the world that you can simply be at the Ministry, at your desk and simply decide "Ah, now we have this map and there are these species and these ecosystems and now this will be a protected area". Of course you have to involve public, you have to make the process evident for the inhabitants living in that area, they are used to handling it in a special way and in most cases, I am quite sure you will reach a mutual understanding that it is useful to have these newly assigned areas protected.

Thirdly, and I will simply mention it since in the past it is generally misunderstood, protected areas are not overruling the rights of indigenous people. It's very often the case that the most vulnerable ecosystems are also places where indigenous people live and it is very important to clarify that we don't seek to assault the way of life of those people who have demonstrated over centuries that they were able to live sustainably in their own surrounding.

And fourth, as I just mentioned ABS protected areas are also not undermining an ABS regime, this was misunderstood by some of the developing countries, especially when you come to private sector engagement into protected areas, this might be a way for companies of the north to buy their protected areas and use the resources, any industry use such as developing pharmaceuticals or others.

I mentioned a couple of minutes ago this has an financial aspect to it, also the story is not just protecting these areas, the problem is how to get additional funding. In the past it was always the same, that the ministers of the environment from the rich countries promised they will do their best to help the developing world obtain additional funding for their protected areas. As soon as they came back to their capital-cities, they meet with their ministers of finance and the story was over. Now we try to find a way forward and in Bonn we were very lucky and happy that Germany could announce that to the year 2112 an additional half a billion Euros will be allotted for protected areas in developing countries, and after 2112, beginning 2113, half a billion Euros will be assigned to protected areas in developing countries per year. This is based on a current funding of 200 million Euros per year, this is what we did up to now, 260 million coming from the Ministry of Economic Cooperation and Development and 40 million from the Ministry of Environment this year. I just want to share this experience with you. This additional 40 million and half a billion in the future, are coming, this money is coming out of the auctioning of commission certificates in our country, in Germany.

We make use of part of the income of the revenues from emissions trading to protect biodiversity, and this makes a lot of sense. One fourth to one third depends how you count and to whom you talk of the climate change problems is coming out of the destruction of carbon storing ecosystems. So if this is a fact, then it makes a lot of sense that you invest one fourth to one third of the revenues of the emission trading in the system to protect especially those ecosystems that are able to store carbon dioxide or greenhouse gases and at the same time essential for biodiversity. We are also advocating that other countries should follow this line of action. This is crucial for us when we are going to talk in Copenhagen about the post-Kyoto regime. We have doubts about including non-deforestation into the emissions trading itself because it causes a great deal of problems, rules and regulations must be very detailed, which usually doesn't tally up to a market mechanism, however, we strongly support using an appropriate part of the emission trading revenues for forests, for biodiversity, for ecosystem protection.

Coming to the end, I want to point out that, as I said previously, the private sector is important as a provider of funds for protected areas, and for offsetting any damages to biodiversity caused by their business, or voluntary offsetting of greenhouse gases or certainly by means of donations, this is something I want to underline to the very end. For private sector engagement, it's absolutely important that you follow the same procedure as governments do. You must not give the impression that there is simply somebody rich coming, getting his wallet and telling people "no, I buy your forest to protect it for the future". It's very important to be inclusive in such a process, to involve people, to be transparent. People should know that it's not someone coming to buy our land, they should see someone ready to support sustainable development, and protecting the area's biodiversity.

At the very end, I want to thank you for allowing me to share some of my views and our results regarding private sector engagement in forest area protection, but also on the overall issues on biodiversity, which is what we're dealing with now. As I said in the beginning of my talk, there is little time left, we are too fast at destroying the wealth of our globe, and too slow at providing appropriate

answers to that. I always take the opportunity to ask everyone to be ambitious for the future, not to count small change and to work together on appropriate answers on a global scale. Thank you very much.