**Template for the Advanced Comments on Draft Documents on Planning, Reporting and Review Mechanisms for the Resumed Session of the Third Meeting of the Subsidiary Body on Implementation**

**TEMPLATE FOR COMMENTS: Modus Operandi of the open-ended forum of SBI for country-by-country review of implementation** **contained in CBD/SBI/3/11/ADD 5**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Advanced comments on the draft documents on Planning, Reporting and Review Mechanisms for the Resumed Session of the Third Meeting of the Subsidiary Body on Implementation** | |
| **Scope of this template for comments** | Modus Operandi of the open-ended forum of SBI for country-by-country review of implementation, contained in the document CBD/SBI/3/11/Add.5, which includes a draft of Annex D to CBD/SBI/3/CRP.5. This template aims to collect feedback on that Annex. |
| ***Contact information*** | |
| **Surname:** | Bohnenblust |
| **Given Name:** | Vincent |
| **Government** (if applicable)**:** | Federal Department of the Environment, Transport, Energy and Communications DETEC |
| **Organization:** | Federal Office for the Environment FOEN |
| **Address:** |  |
| **City:** | Bern |
| **Country:** | Switzerland |
| **Postal Code:** | 3003 |
| **Phone Number** (including country code)**:** | +41 58 462 93 11 |
| E-mail: | vincent.bohnenblust@bafu.admin.ch |
| **Comments** | |
| Please provide any general comments and specific suggestions on the proposed modus operandi of the open-ended forum of the Subsidiary Body on Implementation for country-by-country review of implementation.  Switzerland welcomes the idea that national reports should be reviewed by experts or peers and be discussed in a multilateral setting to get a better understanding of the contributions by parties and to take advantage of the lessons learned. Therefor together with Norway we were supporting the development of a voluntary peer review process. We understand that peer reviews are resource intense and that other forms should also be considered. In that sense we welcome the draft of this annex D to the CRP.5 document. . But such a lighter form of a review of national reports should be compulsory and not voluntary in order to gain a comprehensive overview over actions taken by all parties and thus an assessment of where we stand commonly in the implementation of the GBF. Switzerland remains convinced that there is a benefit of having a voluntary peer review in addition to the review at the open-ended forum as all parties taking part in such an assessment – be it as reviewed party or as reviewing parties – were very positive with regard to the in-depth sharing of experience and learning opportunity.  Regarding the objectives of the country-by-country review (title I of the annex), we would like to suggest an additional point: “to foster implementation, i.a. through peer-learning and discussions in a multilateral setting”.  As for the proposed modus-operandi (title II of the annex), Switzerland is suggesting that each Party will have the possibility to take part in the exercise before the global stocktake. It would in any case make sense to try to have each Party participating the earlier possible in the decade, since this country-by-country review should contribute to achieve the goals of the Post-2020 GBF by creating incentives for Parties to rise ambition and further improve their positive impact on biodiversity. The Parties should have some time to, if necessary, realign their NBSAPs/national policies in order to reach better performances until the end of the decade.  The exhibition idea within Phase 3 is welcomed by Switzerland, but we would rather propose an online platform, where Parties could showcase their implementation successes virtually rather than a physical exhibition. In addition, the concept of international biodiversity awards for outstanding actions by parties as well as by non-state actors could be organized with an event dedicated to the attribution of the awards during the ministerial segment of the conference. The CBD could build this upon the already existing [CHM Awards Process](https://www.cbd.int/chm/award/process.shtml).  In par. 8, we don’t understand why the review reports of the VPR processes should be presented to the SBSTTA. Since we established a specific subsidiary body for implementation, this should be changed into SBI and COP.  As regards to the participation of other stakeholders (par. 9), Switzerland is in favor of opening more broadly the process of the country-by-country review to them than what is planned in the current draft. Inputs from i.a. international NGOs could create an interesting incentive and should not be heard only if the concerned Party authorizes it at the national level. | |