**EU and its Member States comments on the 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**

**Version 28.02.2022**

**TEMPLATE FOR COMMENTS: Revised guidance and template for the seventh and eighth reports contained in annex to CBD/SBI/3/11/ADD1/AMEND1**

|  |
| --- |
| **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**  | Revised guidance and template for the seventh and eighth national reports, contained in annex to the document CBD/SBI/3/11/ADD1/AMEND1 which includes a draft of Annex C to CBD/SBI/3/CRP.5. This template aims to collect feedback on that Annex.  |
| ***Contact information*** |
| **Surname:** |  |
| **Given Name:** |  |
| **Government** (if applicable)**:**  | European Union and its Member States |
| **Organization:** | European Union and its Member States |
| **Address:**  |  |
| **City:** |  |
| **Country:** |  |
| **Postal Code:** |  |
| **Phone Number** (including country code)**:**  |  |
| E-mail: | adele.fardoux@diplomatie.gouv.fr,Jan.Brojac@mzp.cz;Anne-Theo.Seinen@ec.europa.eu |
| **Comments** |
| Please provide any general comments on the structure of the draft template for the seventh and eighth national reports, as well as the introduction to the template. The EU and its Member States welcome the publication of this revised annex, as it will be an essential component of the enhanced mechanism for planning, monitoring and reviewing the post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework. This part should be extensively negotiated, however EU and its Member States would like to stress a few general points:* To ensure consistency and coherence, the template should remain the same for the whole GBF period. It should not change between the 7th and 8th national reporting exercise.
* Some references in the introduction text such as the Sharm-el-Sheikh to Kunming Action Agenda (para 6) and the country-by-country reviews (para 10 c.), set of headline indicators (para 11) may need to be reviewed once the final recommendations of the CRP/L document are approved.
* For paragraph 4, the format/template does not include a field on how the financial reporting will be done. Capacity building and development could also be added for reporting.
* We are considering on whether or not introducing again a section on the implementation of the Global Strategy for Plant Conservation.
* For paragraph 9, it should be useful to indicate what kind of materials and tools will be used. These need to be ready for COP16 at the latest. The CHM working group under the TSC IAG could be used to review these materials in the preparation process.
* For paragraph 12 Parties should also be encouraged to make use of the previous national biodiversity reports as appropriate. The reports will be used for assessing implementation and progress. The information will be important for the Global Biodiversity Outlook.
* For paragraph 13, a reference to the CHM and Bioland tool should be made after “pre-filled from relevant regional/global data sets”.
* For the paragraph 13, the online reporting tool should have the same functions than as Microsoft Word in order to ensure a practical use of it. In addition, the EU and its Member States strongly support that Parties should be able to choose whether to use an online tool or an offline version, depending on national circumstances. It should be ensured, that the offline version has a clear and same formatting as the online tool.
* The EU and its Member States regret that the link with the SDGs is missing, compared to the 6NR, especially for the 2030 action targets.
* An additional upload option for maps/diagrams etc. should be added into the template. Thus, visualization of the national progress would be enhanced.
 |
| Please use the table below to provide any specific comments on the template:  |
| **Section** | **Comment** |
| I | Please include comments or specific suggestions for Section I. Executive summary of the seventh and eighth national reports. |
| II | Please include comments or specific suggestions for Section II. Brief overview of the process of preparation of the report |
| III | Please include comments or specific suggestions for Section III. Status of the updated or revised NBSAP in the light of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework (This section is for the seventh national report only) * For the first question “*Has your country updated or revised its NBSAP or biodiversity action plan in the light of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework?*”, the answer “no” should be followed by an explanation about the process, system in place or plans to implement GBF at a national level. The second field could be under No option and read : *“If you answered no in the field above have you submitted national targets yes/no*………”.
* For the third question “*please indicate the type of policy instrument your country’s updated NBSAP or biodiversity action plan has been adopted as*” as well as the follow up question “if you answered yes .......” the EU and Member States would like clarification how this will be used for the global stocktake.
 |
| IV | Please include comments or specific suggestions for Section IV. Assessment of progress towards the 2050 goals of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework.* This section relies on the decision to have Headline Indicators for objectives. Important discussions are still needed on this topic. and the section should be updated accordingly during or after COP15.
* Only HI for which methodology is publicly available and approved by the governments and where methodology exists at a national level should ideally be used.
 |
| V | Please include comments or specific suggestions for Section V. Progress towards the 2030 action targets* The 4 last questions (national values, sources of data, current level of national progress and other indicators) should be put at the beginning of the section as they are the most important for the exercise.
* The word count (100 – 300) in the first section seems too restrictive. It will also be difficult to compare between national reports if this is narrative so the use of these fields will be limited. A solution might be that for each action you give straight away information on its effectiveness and if not effective. This would mean a field for the activity with additional effectiveness which could be repeated so you can have several activities for a target.
* For the third question (effectiveness and impacts) there should be references to existing guidance on how to measure effectiveness to harmonize the analysis. It is the same for the following question to describe how success was achieved.
* The term “value of headline indicator” should be clarified.
* The current list of headline indicators, contained in the non-paper for SBSTTA-24 Item 3, is not yet suitable for national reporting purposes, and some may be compiled at global level, rather than at national level. This discussion will be held under SBSTTA24 item 3. A fall back option in case the list of headline indicators cannot be revised or completed is to complement them with accompanying questions, such as the ones contained for each Aichi Target in the UNDP/UNEP technical guidance manual for the 6th national report: https://www.cbd.int/doc/nr/6NR-Technical- Guidance-en.pdf. This could be a transitional solution while headline indicators are being further developed.
* For the last section “*If your country has used other indicators or tools to assess progress, indicated above, please provide details here*” the term “*other*” should be replaced by “*component and complementary or national indicators*” to be coherent with the language on the discussion under SBSTTA 24 discussions. All the information on these indicators in one text field will not be useful to compare between national reports. Maybe a text field for each additional indicator would be more useful.
 |