



Convención de Lucha contra la Desertificación

Distr. limitada
2 de octubre de 2009
Español
Original: inglés

Conferencia de las Partes

Noveno período de sesiones

Buenos Aires, 21 de septiembre a 2 de octubre de 2009

Tema 15 del programa

**Inclusión de actividades de organizaciones de la sociedad
civil en el programa de trabajo oficial de la Conferencia
de las Partes: sesiones de diálogo abierto**

Declaración de las organizaciones de la sociedad civil que asistieron al noveno período de sesiones de la Conferencia de las Partes

Proyecto de decisión presentado por el Presidente de la Conferencia de las Partes

La Conferencia de las Partes,

Habiendo escuchado la Declaración formulada por el Sr. Raúl Edmundo Bustamante Flores, de la Asociación Ambientalista ECO-CLUB San Juan de la Argentina, en nombre de los 224 representantes de 80 organizaciones de 39 países que asistieron al noveno período de sesiones de la Conferencia de las Partes,

1. *Toma nota con reconocimiento* de la Declaración;
2. *Decide* incluir la declaración como anexo en el informe de la Conferencia de las Partes sobre su noveno período de sesiones.

Anexo

[English only]

Cop 9 – CSO Closing statement

Distinguish Mr. Chairman, Mr. Executive Secretary, Delegates from Country Parties, Representatives of the International Organisations, Ladies and Gentlemen,

Despite the great hopes sown in COP-8, from Madris to Buenos Aires, we have moved forward very little regarding the challenges identified for the poor sister of the three environmental Conventions...

Unfortunately, a limited financial commitment of the Parties to effectively combat desertification still remains. The economic contributions not only must ensure the maintenance of this inefficient bureaucratic structure, but provide an effective response to the problem. Something that, to the present day, has not been achieved and is far from been reached, unless direct financing on projects to combat desertification is allocated.

And not only do we not progress in the fight against desertification: no sufficient common indicators have even been established to assess the global state of the problem.

In addition, the proposal made by the CST should have been reviewed with an approach that considers the socioeconomic aspects of desertification, beyond its purely biophysical component.

As noted by the Brazilian Minister, we would have liked that this conference had unanimously demanded that the sequestration of soil carbon could be considered a valid alternative as a strategy for mitigating climate change. Yet you continue to attend the debacle of the planet from your seats, without taking action. Meanwhile, the protagonists of this story migrate in search of a better life.

In Buenos Aires, you have lost a golden opportunity by failing to agree to demand that in Copenhagen, at least one third of the funds for climate change adaptation are diverted to combat desertification in developing countries.

Investing in adaptation in the drylands, is betting on improving the quality of life of the people living in them.

Key sectors for improving the livelihood of people affected by desertification are agriculture and livestock. In this regard, this Conference has missed an invaluable opportunity to promote technology transfer and capacity building as well as to ease the commercial rule regulating export and import of technology and capacity building programmes to effectively combat against desertification.

Moreover, the experience of civil society organizations in the fight against desertification is still undermined. We have been granted recognition as a tool to legitimize the process but our potential as partners is been ignored.

It is unacceptable that the draft decision including the criteria of eligibility for the sponsorship of CSO, to be discussed in the COW sessions, has been released in the very last moment.

Just as useless as to pretend to be listening to civil society towards the end of the Conference, when there is little time to react. But it is even more ridiculous to convene the

Open Dialogue Session when only a small number of party countries are not engaged in other meetings and can approach the Plenary to listen to our proposals.

The impossibility to modify the agenda, moving one Open Dialogue Session to the first week, and the reduction of another ODS in one and a half hour, are evident examples of the lack of interest of country parties to know the priorities of their people.

In this context, we feel ourselves compelled to revise and rebuild our relation with country parties and with the UNCCD Secretariat. The fact that the High Level Segment of the COP opened the floor to civil society organizations is a positive example to take into account.

But if this line of work is discontinued, as civil society we will have to reconsider our participation in UNCCD forum, if we will be just be considered as mere spectators.

Notwithstanding the above, we will reinforce our work to improve the livelihood of populations affected by desertification. We will continue working in order to ensure that the advances in the fight against desertification will be an answer to the needs of the most disadvantaged and not to the agenda of governments and international organisations.
