



CBD Alliance
SBI 3 online sessions, March 2021

Agenda item 9. Mechanisms for reporting, assessment and review of implementation

Madam / Mr chair, this statement is on behalf of the CBD Alliance, which gathers a diverse range of views and proposals from civil society.

The often used phrase “the Aichi targets have failed” seems to justify spending time and energy on a new and better set of targets for a post 2020 GBF. However, the Aichi targets’ failure is not rooted in the targets themselves, but in their lack of implementation. A new GBF will fail in the same way if the **implementation** of the CBD is not substantially improved.

If the new GBF will be the basis on which progress on implementation is measured, it needs to include all aspects of the CBD so that no targets or indicators run counter to the CBD’s objectives. This is not yet the case.

Parties to the CBD have **unmet international obligations**, such as those in the Convention’s articles 3, 4b, 7c and 8l, which oblige parties to ensure that activities within their jurisdiction or control **do not cause damage to the environment of other States**. Industrialized countries must take measures to curb consumption that wreaks havoc for the biodiversity of other, often poorer countries. According to Art. 2 of the Convention, sustainable **use** needs to ensure that use of biodiversity does not lead to its long-term decline, which is not **at all** ensured if we measure it against the amount of benefits and products they provide, as currently suggested in the updated zero draft and the SBSTTA draft on indicators.

The post 2020 goals and targets must be **in full compliance** with these CBD obligations.

But just as importantly, a robust, transparent and inclusive reporting, assessment and review mechanism must be implemented together with the GBF. It should include

1. Standardized NBSAPs on the basis of a whole government approach, with a structure in line with that of the GBF, putting into action all obligations under the CBD.
2. Standardized and synchronized reporting and comparable landmarks.

3. Transparency on how parties measure up to these landmarks - applicable for their specific situation so that reporting does not become an unbearable task for developing country parties. There should be commensurate provision of resources in accordance with Article 20.
4. In case of noncompliance, reporting should also explain the reasons for not achieving the party's obligations, considering the reasons for noncompliance by developing country parties and providing the support they may need.
5. The process must be participatory, inclusive and equitable for developing countries and representative at national level and enable "*Non-State actors, IPLCs and civil society to report on the actions taken to implement the framework*", and integrate their inputs to the national reports.
6. Review should be mandatory understanding it is an opportunity to take stock and present the national **situation**, share experiences and discuss with peers on how to solve challenges while catalyzing action. We welcome the country-by country review processes as they allow for analysis at the same level as concrete decisions are taken.
7. Ensure that cross-cutting aspects of the GBF, especially a rights-based approach, inter-generational equity, gender equity and equality, recognition of IPLCs rights and other effective actions on enabling conditions for the implementation of the framework are also duly reported, assessed and reviewed.

On the proposal and options for an enhanced planning, reporting and review mechanism contained in Document 3/11, we do have concerns about the role of the commitments. Are these national **targets** that a country strives to achieve, or are these **actions** parties will undertake in order to achieve the obligations of the CBD and the GBF? How do they relate to the National Biodiversity strategies and action plans? Are they mandatory? They should be. And they should be globally commensurate with the achievement of the CBD goals and targets set out in the GBF.

We understand that countries present their actions and **efforts** undertaken in the national reports. However, as the state of biodiversity is still getting worse, we need to see how these relate to the parties' **achievement** of the CBD and the goals and targets of the post 2020 framework. We need standardized and synchronized assessments of the **state** of biodiversity in **each country**, of the national **gaps** towards the goals and targets of the CBD and the post-2020 GBF, and ambitious action to be taken as a result.

Thank you