



February 2021

Statement by Switzerland for the informal session in preparation of CBD SBSTTA-24 on agenda item 3 (post-2020 global biodiversity framework)

- For an effective implementation of the post-2020 framework, we need a simple way to assess progress towards its goals and targets. Therefore, Switzerland welcomes the suggested approach of a monitoring framework that consists of a small set of compulsory headline indicators and a list of component and complementary indicators. As time is limited at SBSTTA-24, we should put a focus in our discussions under this agenda item on headline indicators.
- Switzerland agrees with several of the proposed headline indicators, especially in areas where a lot of experience exists (e.g. Goal A). At the same time, we see a lack of relevant and established indicators in other areas.
- Switzerland would like to highlight the following elements with regard to headline indicators:
 - Headline indicators should be compulsory (i.e. each Party should have to report its progress towards the goals and targets based on agreed headline indicators).
 - They should be based, where appropriate, on already well established and used indicators by relevant MEA and the SDGs (a good example is the red list index, which is suitable also for reporting inter alia under the CMS and towards SDG 15.5).
 - Headline indicators need to be quantitative, consistent, comparable across countries and should allow for effective communication.
- Switzerland considers it important that the headline indicators are adopted at CBD COP-15 at the same time as the goals and targets of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework.
- Switzerland strongly supports target 2 known as “30by30”. The headline indicator for this target should measure protected area and OECM coverage by using an established methodology such as the IUCN protected area categories. In addition, we should ensure that the quality of such areas is also taken into account at the level of headline indicators. Management effectiveness represents a prerequisite for a sufficient ecological quality. An indicator such as “protected area management effectiveness” could therefore be used as the second headline indicator for target 2.
- We will submit further comments on specific headline indicators related to goals A and D and targets 2, 3, 5, 9, 14, 17 in writing (see Annex 1 of this document). Switzerland will make additional comments on headline indicators at the formal SBSTTA-24 meeting.
- Switzerland is of the view that the monitoring framework is an integral part of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework and falls clearly under the mandate of the open-ended working group (OEWG). As a result, SBSTTA-24 should adopt its draft recommendations on the monitoring framework for the consideration of OEWG.
- As unfortunately it is unlikely to agree besides the headline indicators on all the details of the monitoring framework, we see a need to finalize this work after CBD COP 15 and to design a way how this could be achieved. Switzerland is of the view that a technical expert group can contribute to establish a solid monitoring framework and to help building new experience while supporting the implementation of the indicators. The expert group should get a time bound mandate to present its work at the SBSTTA preceding CBD COP 16, and focus its work on goals and targets where there is a lack of relevant established indicators. Regarding its composition, we suggest to include a representative of the Global Biodiversity Information Facility (GBIF) to include the main global biodiversity database in the discussion. This because indicators cannot exist without data.



Annex 1: Proposed changes by Switzerland to selected headline indicators as proposed in document CBD/SBSTTA/24/3, Annex 1

The proposed changes do not prejudice the Swiss position in the upcoming discussions and negotiations but is a presentation of reflections Switzerland is currently undertaking to prepare its position for the upcoming meetings in the negotiation process for a post-2020 global biodiversity framework and the 15th meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity.

Goal A	<p>“A.0.5 The proportion of populations maintained within species**”</p> <p><i>Rationale: We consider this indicator not suitable as it is unclear how it should be measured at the national level</i></p>
Goal D	<p>“D.0.2 National funding and international public and private financial flows for the implementation of the goals and targets of the Global Biodiversity Framework**”</p> <p><i>Rationale: We believe this wording is too narrow and does not allow measuring the means of implementation to achieve ALL goals and targets of the Biodiversity Framework</i></p>
Target 2	<p>2.0.1 Protected area coverage of important biodiversity areas <u>Protected area and other effective area-based conservation measures coverage (the coverage is be reported according to IUCN Protected Area Categories)</u></p> <p><i>Rationale: The coverage of PAs and OECMs should be reported according to IUCN Protected Area Categories. An example of reporting by a Party could be the following: Total= 26% ; PA=17% (Categories IUCN 1-2=2%, 3-4=15%), OECM=9% (following IUCN guidelines)</i></p> <hr/> <p>2.0.2 Species Protection Index <u>Headline indicator related to the quality of PAs and OECMs such as e.g. “Protected area management effectiveness”</u></p> <p><i>Rationale: The headline indicator 2.0.2 on Species Protection Index is not suitable for target 2. There is a lack of information on the available data and methodology for this indicator, and it does not appear directly relevant to Target 2. In addition to the headline indicator “Protected area and other effective area-based conservation measures coverage”, we should ensure that the quality of such areas is also taken into account at the level of headline indicators for target 2. Management effectiveness represents a prerequisite for a sufficient ecological quality. A headline-indicator such as “Protected area management effectiveness” could therefore be used as the second headline indicator.</i></p>
Target 3	<p>3.0.1 Protected areas management effectiveness <u>Number of endangered species that are benefitting from conservation action (+over the number of threatened species)</u></p> <p><i>Rationale: The proposed indicator is not meaningful towards the target and should be moved to target 2. As an alternative, we suggest to use the number of endangered species that are benefitting from conservation action (+over the number of threatened species). The Appendices such as the ones of CMS and AEWA should serve as a basis.</i></p>
Target 5	<p>5.0.2 Rate of invasive alien species impact <u>Proportion of countries adopting relevant national legislation and adequately resourcing the prevention or control of invasive alien species (SDG 15.8.1)</u></p>

	<p><i>Rationale: The proposed headline indicator 5.0.2 is not suitable as it is unclear how to measure the impact. Instead, the well-established SDG indicator 15.8.1. should be applied. Indicator SDG 15.8.1 is also suitable for reporting against SDG 15.8. and reporting under the CMS and its sub-treaties.</i></p>
Target 9	<p>9.0.1 Proportion of agricultural area under productive and sustainable agriculture Proportion of sustainable agriculture to the total area used for agriculture, [and so on with the other uses]</p> <p><i>Rationale: The focus of the indicator should be on sustainability. It should be a pairwise comparison: “Proportion of sustainable agriculture to the total area used for agriculture, [and so on with the other uses]”.</i></p> <p><u>Headline indicator on soil biodiversity</u></p> <p><i>Rationale: To address the importance of soil biodiversity, a second headline indicator addressing the health of the soil such as the “Soil Health Index” should be considered.</i></p>
Target 14	<p>14.0.1 Potential population and species loss from terrestrial and marine human modification* “Number of countries implementing sustainable public procurement policies and action plans, that address biodiversity “</p> <p><i>Rationale: The proposed headline indicator 14.0.1 is not suitable. It is not clear and does not include the supply chain aspect. We therefore suggest an alternative indicator</i></p>
Target 17	<p>17.0.1 Biodiversity relevant taxes, charges and fees on payments for ecosystem services and on biodiversity relevant tradable permit schemes as a percentage of GDP</p> <p><i>Rationale: The proposed headline indicator 17.0.1 is not suitable for target 17 and should be deleted.</i></p> <p>“17.0.2 Potentially harmful elements of government support to agriculture, fisheries and otherall sectors (including environmentally harmful incentives and subsidies) as a percentage of GDP”</p> <p><i>Rationale: To ensure the indicator capture all the elements of target 17, we propose expanding the description of the indicator and mention “including environmentally harmful incentives and subsidies”. Relevant taxes, change and fees can be subsumed under “negative incentives”.</i></p>