

Statement of **Switzerland** on document UNEP /CBD/ SBBSTA/ 17/2/add 3.

Thank you Madame Chair,

Switzerland has a short statement to make regarding the document on Goal C UNEP/17/2/add 3.

Madame Chair, if we generally agree with the analysis and conclusions made in this document, we would like to voice our concern regarding terminology used in the document under target 11 in para 7 and 8.

Switzerland would like to know where we stand regarding decision roman XI/24 taken during the last COP where the mandate was given to the Executive secretariat to define area-based conservation measures. We were surprised to read in para 7 (17/2/ add 3), that a definition for area-based conservation measures was indirectly proposed since in addition to Protected Area , indigenous and local community conserved areas (ICCAs) as well as private protected areas may be included in the total area protected, provided other conditions are met. We wonder if this will become the agreed definition. It is very important to us that clarity on this matter is reached, since measuring progress to the achievement of target 11 can only be done with a clear and agreed definition of what area-based conservation measures are.

Regarding para 8 , in our opinion the criteria concerning the identification of the areas to be conserved and included in target 11 is decisive in defining the quality of what will be achieved under target 11 and as such needs discussion and further clarification. Some of the criteria are directly derived from the target itself, others on the other hand introduce new conditions for the achievement of the target. Several terms such as “ para 8c “genetically representative areas” para 8d “fairly sharing cost and benefits of the areas” are not self- explanatory and need to be defined.

Thank you Madame Chair.