

Madame Chairperson,

Goal A.

The Strategic Plan and the Aichi targets 2011-2020 including the revision of NBSAPs on national level forms the main framework for halting the loss of biodiversity.

Finland thanks the Secretariat for the background documents to this meeting; UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/17/2 addenda) which addresses the challenges to implementation in terms of policy, science and technical issues.

On the proposals and the way forward we would like to stress, that possible deficiencies in tools and guidance can't be the reason for failing in implementation of the Strategic Plan. The main information and knowledge is well known. The political and institutional weakness is the main driver high jacking us and for not getting issues implemented.

The results of notification 2013-005 highlights that some 70 policy support tools and methodologies has been developed under the CBD, incl. strategies, programmes of work, tools, guidelines or principles.

Finland strongly encourages enhanced cooperation and coordination on all levels between biodiversity related conventions (CITES, Ramsar, CMS, FAO/IT, WHC, CBD), agreements (such as the Forest Europe for Forest), organisations (World Bank, UNDP, FAO, OECD, ITTO, IUCN), and improved coherence in ongoing technical and scientific, monitoring schemes should be the driver instead of processing and developing tools and guidance ourselves; for instance ministries dealing with issues related to poverty reduction and SDG's or those dealing with valuation, accountability and accounting systems. We need to make use of already existing data and compile it in new forms, targeted to the users. The issue on resilience is critical.

Indicators and reporting based on these will have a high impact on policy, when they measure the success of implementation and the state of biodiversity on national level (impacts of the effects of measures). Here the NBSAP Forum is an

interesting proposal. Reporting should build on existing data with the aim to mainstreaming biodiversity into different levels/sectors, and thereby encouraging cooperation between different knowledge holders/products.

National clearing house mechanisms (CHM) allow for information to be shared with multiple stakeholders and to keep them informed of biodiversity issues within a country. Addressing the direct and underlying drivers of biodiversity loss will ultimately require behavioral change by individuals, communities, organizations, industries, businesses and governments.

Finland supports under **T1** the use of the Biodiversity Barometer (2013) and we note with satisfaction that awareness is slowly growing. The scale of monitoring the awareness and data availability should be overcome by using new techniques incl. websites and social media channels. CEPA is critical. Children and youth, health aspects and the green movement are critical for our mission.

All in all Finland would like to stress the need to further develop the indicator framework (para 49 (doc. 17/2)) and we welcome, the new Aichi Passport launched here at SBSTTA-17. We would like to see further work done by the Biodiversity Indicators framework and we recommend an AHTEG on Indicators as outlined in para 52 (document 17/2) with a focused ToR.

T2: Value of biodiversity in decision making and poverty reduction strategies are important. There is work ongoing (incl. national TEEB, WAVE, CBD Technical series 4 on forests, 27 valuing wetlands and 28 on methodologies), we support the proposals on operational draft indicators, and we concur with the proposal that a Global database or data set which would allow progress towards T2 should be considered, with those organizations/partners having the best capabilities for concerted action.

T3. Harmful biodiversity incentives and subsidies. An exercise is ongoing in Finland in line with our new NBSAP 2012-2020. The lesson learned is, that it is possible, when the Ministry of Finance takes the lead (centralized level) to move forward. A step-by step approach is followed in Finland, and the results will be finalized by July 2015. The guidance on global level is difficult, because of national taxation policy/systems and different instruments in place differs, but possibilities lies in sharing experiences on how this has been done.

T4. Finland would like to advocate the Business and Biodiversity initiatives (private sector) and work done elsewhere also on consumption and production pattern. We think these indicators are important and they are related to status and trends of biodiversity. Several indicators and underlying observation systems exist at different levels. We can continue to build sectoral approaches – targeted and solution oriented.

Thank you for your attention.