



13 August 2020

## **Submission by Switzerland responding to the invitation to participate in the review process on draft documents related to agenda item 3 of SBSTTA-24 (post-2020 global biodiversity framework)**

---

File reference: BAFU-061.6-02.3-01-01-8/8/5/1/2/14

This submission responds to Notification 2020-045 (Ref.: SCBD/SSSF/AS/KM/VA/88724). It is complementary to the previous Swiss submissions on this matter. It does not prejudge 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.

### **1. General comment on the need for a simple way to assess progress towards goals/targets**

In the draft monitoring framework published for peer review, most goals and targets are split into several components and monitoring elements. For the different goals and targets, a total of 228 indicators are listed. This figure is much higher than what is needed. We should aim at having one single indicator per monitoring element. The fact that the number of indicators per monitoring element and component is variable, from none to many, makes it very complicated to assess the general progress towards goals, targets and 2030 milestones. Therefore, in addition to a broader set of indicators encouraged for use in the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, a reduced number of compulsory indicators of a higher tier or so called headline indicators should be proposed to measure the global progress towards goals/targets/milestones and make communication effective.

The proposed monitoring framework could serve as a basis for discussion at SBSTTA-24 on a small set of compulsory headline indicators that are quantitative, consistent and comparable across countries. In many cases, those headline indicators could be an aggregation of a selection of relevant indicators. For example, the extent of natural ecosystems could be easily summed from the extent of each ecosystem (forest, coral reef, land, desert and so on).

### **2. General comment on the framework ability to monitor implementation**

The aim of the monitoring framework should be to monitor the implementation of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework. For reviewing the implementation, multiple sources of information are needed: national reporting (including national and regional indicators), global indicators, reports of multilateral environmental agreements and international organizations, etc.

### **3. Detailed comments on the document for peer review “Draft monitoring framework for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework”**

In this context and keeping in mind that we need a simple way to assess progress towards goals/targets, Switzerland has commented the proposed monitoring framework in detail (see Annex 1), assuming that this will improve the basis for an informed discussion on a small set of compulsory headline indicators of a higher tier.



### **Comments on the monitoring elements**

National reports under the CBD can only tell part of the story, the reporting frameworks of biodiversity related MEAs as well as other international agencies need to complement information gathered through the monitoring framework. This should be considered in the development of the monitoring elements. The framework should strengthen the concepts of nature's contribution to people and transformative change. This has to be reflected throughout the monitoring elements.

### **Comment on indicators**

To the extent possible, the GBF should build on existing and well-established indicators (see the list of important criteria below). However, to capture the entire scope of the goal and target system, additional indicators will need to be developed. This especially at the higher tier level. The clearer the monitoring element is shaped, the more targeted the development of new indicators will be. In this context, we welcome the information document "Indicators for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework" prepared for SBSTTA24 by UNEP-WCMC in collaboration with the Biodiversity Indicators Partnership. The analysis presented within will be of great help to update the monitoring framework.

When updating the proposed draft monitoring framework for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, the following aspects should be considered:

#### **- 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 extent in the context of a target on natural ecosystem area is for example not sufficient. Regarding indicators for goals and targets addressing people, it might be appropriate in certain cases to choose well established indicators (e.g. SDG indicators) with a scope beyond biodiversity.

#### **- 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) including in the other Rio-Conventions 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, regionally where appropriate, and globally. This will ensure national endorsement and allow parties to compare their indicator value to the global average.

#### **- One indicator for each monitoring element**

Until now, the number of indicators present on the various existing lists has been ever increasing. This is a good thing as it shows the progress of data and analyses on biodiversity. Nevertheless, a monitoring element should as far as possible ideally only have one appropriate indicator. A single indicator for each monitoring element ensures consistent and comparable use of indicators by all Parties to assess progress and results in an unambiguous reporting.

**4. Detailed comments on the document for peer review “Linkages between the post-2020 global biodiversity framework and 2030 Agenda for sustainable development”**

The detailed comments on the document “Linkages between the post-2020 global biodiversity framework and 2030 Agenda for sustainable development” are contained in Annex 2.