



31 January 2020

## Submission by Switzerland responding to the invitation to provide views on possible targets, indicators and baselines for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework

---

File reference: BAFU-061.6-02.3-01-01-8/8/5/1/2/13

This submission responds to Notification SCBD/OES/DC/KM/88539. It is complementary to the Swiss submissions of 19 December 2018, 23 April 2019 and 30 September 2019. It does not prejudice the Swiss position in the upcoming negotiations but is a presentation of reflections Switzerland is currently undertaking to prepare its position for the upcoming preparatory process of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework and the 15th meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity.

### Views on possible indicators

This submission focusses on views on indicators for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. When defining indicators for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, the following aspects should be considered:

- **Use only "BIP-approved" indicators**

We note with satisfaction that many of the proposed indicators in the information documents CBD/SBSTTA/23/INF/4 and CBD/SBSTTA/23/INF/3 have been developed by the Biodiversity Indicators Partnership (BIP). Taking advantage of the work done by the BIP is of high importance for Switzerland. We expect that the majority of the indicators chosen to inform on the targets of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework will stem from the BIP indicator portfolio.

- **Unambiguous indicators**

For Switzerland, an indicator should measure unambiguously the level of achievement of a specific target. The units of the target should be the unit of the indicator. In addition, the indicator should as much as possible match the scope of the target. Measuring only forest extant in the context of a target on natural ecosystem area is for example not sufficient.

- **Synergies with other reporting processes**

Switzerland strongly emphasizes the importance of looking for synergies within approved indicator sets. Indicators developed in the context of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) or used in the reporting of other Multilateral Environment Agreements (MEAs) should be selected in priority.

- **Choosing "institutionalized" indicators**

Many institutions already provide well-documented indicators. For example, the World Database on Protected Areas (WDPA) is the reference for indicators on protected areas and the International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN) provides indicators based on the red lists. Switzerland recognizes the excellent work carried out by these institutions and others and favors the use of their indicators.

- **Global and national scale**

Scale is another factor of importance. Indicators must be as much as possible calculable both nationally and globally. This will ensure national endorsement and allow parties to compare their indicator value to the global average.



- **One indicator for each target**

Until now, the number of indicators present on the various existing lists (such as both information documents) has been ever increasing. This is a good thing as it shows the progress of data and analyses on biodiversity. Nevertheless, a target should eventually only have one (sometimes two) appropriate indicator. There may be cases when one indicator could be disaggregated into several others such as, for example, the area of natural ecosystems that could then be split by habitat (forest, coral reef, desert and other habitats). Effective communication requires simple messages. This can only be achieved if the number of indicators is small.