



Strasbourg, 18 July 2024



T-PVS(2024)06

CONVENTION ON THE CONSERVATION OF EUROPEAN WILDLIFE  
AND NATURAL HABITATS

**WORKING GROUP ON OVERSEEING IMPLEMENTATION OF THE  
BERN CONVENTION STRATEGIC PLAN TO 2030**

## **- STRATEGIC PLAN INDICATORS -**

**Results of Working Group Consultation April-May 2024,  
and Next Steps**

*Document prepared by  
the Mr Dave Pritchard, Independent expert*

---

## CONVENTION ON THE CONSERVATION OF EUROPEAN WILDLIFE AND NATURAL HABITATS

**WORKING GROUP ON OVERSEEING IMPLEMENTATION OF THE  
BERN CONVENTION STRATEGIC PLAN TO 2030**

**Strategic Plan indicators – results of Working Group consultation April-May 2024, and next steps**

29 May 2024

At its first meeting on 10<sup>th</sup> April 2024, the Working Group considered document T-PVS/Inf(2024)10 on [Advancing work on indicators for the Strategic Plan](#), which provides updated details of the suggested approach, metrics, data sources, baseline considerations, linkages, responsibilities and other information (to varying degrees) for each of the sixteen agreed indicators in the Plan.

The Working Group noted that further work is required to bring the indicator set into full operation (i.e. generating results), and agreed to provide detailed written comments following the meeting on the “Advancing work” document, advice on concrete actions required to operationalise each of the indicators, and on the overall monitoring regime for the Strategic Plan.

A brief two-part pro-forma template for this was duly circulated on 17 April requesting feedback within the timeframe agreed at the meeting. Due to a lack of responses the deadline was extended, resulting eventually in just four completed forms (three Parties and one Observer). These have now been collated in the present document, along with some comments and suggestions from the Consultant.

### **A. Summary of suggestions arising from the consultation**

Based on the responses tabulated in sections B-D below and the annotated Consultant comments alongside them, the following is a summary of the suggestions (also from the Consultant, so subject to further Working Group discussion) for possible next action steps.

Indicator	Suggestions for next action
<b>1.1.a</b> Trends in extent and condition of selected habitat and ecosystem types	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Commit to using the Resolution 8/Art 17 process for this indicator, and assume that GBF indicator A2 will also play a role.</li> <li>- With the assistance of the WG on Reporting, develop the detail of exact metrics, analysis and timeframes etc.</li> <li>- Work with IUCN SDC/CEM on accessing a Bern-relevant disaggregation of the Red List of Ecosystems.</li> </ul>

<b>1.1.b</b> Extent of degraded ecosystems under restoration (by ecosystem type)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Commit to using national data reported for GBF indicator 2.1 as the basis for this Bern Convention indicator 1.1.b.</li> <li>- Supplement the information with FAO’s data on restoration initiatives and projects.</li> </ul>
<b>1.2</b> Emerald Network Sufficiency Index	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Updated information on the targets and other methodological issues concerning the Index, following the April GoEPAEN meeting, to be shared with the Strategic Plan Working Group when the details become available.</li> </ul>
<b>1.3 (a)</b> Extent to which protected areas and other effective area-based conservation measures (OECMs) cover Emerald Network sites	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Elaborate the detailed process (including allocation of responsibilities) for undertaking the digital polygon cross-matching analysis (and the repetition intervals for this) between the Emerald Network Database and the World Databases on PAs and OECMs.</li> </ul>
<b>1.3 (b)</b> Proportion of adopted Emerald Network sites with implemented management plans	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Confirm (or update) the definition/ interpretation of “management plan” as given in the Glossary of the adopted Strategic Plan.</li> <li>- With input from the WG on Reporting, develop the details of how the existence of implemented management plans for Emerald sites will be documented and reported, including intervals for updating the information.</li> <li>- Commission the compilation of a short guidance document on available (rapid, low-cost) methods for voluntarily assessing management effectiveness of PAs and OECMs.</li> </ul>
<b>1.4</b> Contribution of the Emerald Network to the conservation status of habitats	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Seek input from GoPAEN on the most feasible approaches for operating this indicator, in light of the earlier metadata document and latest views from the SP Working Group.</li> </ul>
<b>1.5.a</b> [Indicator based on statistics concerning Case File recommendations (e.g. proportion implemented, partially implemented, not yet implemented)]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Invite the UK to present the methodology it is developing for tracking the status of Recommendations concerning its own Case Files, and explore how this might be adopted/ adapted for general use as a way of operationalising this indicator.</li> </ul>
<b>1.5.b</b> [Indicator based on statistics concerning numbers of Case Files (e.g. numbers per country; number of years each case has been on Standing Committee agendas)]	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Investigate further the current intentions regarding a Case File “barometer”, as a resource on which to base the operation of this indicator.</li> </ul>
<b>2.1</b> Conservation status of species, as reported under Resolution No. 8 (2012)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Proceed to use the Resolution No. 8 reporting process (with EU Arts 17 &amp; 12) as the basis for this indicator, with findings framed in the way outlined in document T-PVS/Inf(2024)10.</li> </ul>
<b>2.2</b> Trends in frequency and severity of key anthropogenic pressures impacting on species of wild flora and fauna, as reported under Resolution No. 8 (2012) and the EU nature Directives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Work with the Working Group on Reporting to develop the details of methods and data to be provided for this indicator.</li> </ul>
<b>3.1.a</b> Nature-based quality of life assessment (qualitative summary overview)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Confirm an intention to use a subset of information that will feed into GBF indicator B1 as the basis for this indicator 3.1.a.</li> <li>- Decide on a common “core set” of priority ecosystem services (chosen from the global reference list) to be recommended for inclusion in a Bern Convention “cut” of GBF indicator B1 information.</li> </ul>

<b>3.1.b</b> Trends in air quality	- Discuss a preferred choice from existing air quality indicator regimes as the basis for operating Bern SP indicator 3.1.b.
<b>3.1.c</b> Trends in water quality	- Discuss a preferred choice from existing water quality indicator regimes as the basis for operating Bern SP indicator 3.1.c.
<b>3.2</b> Single review assessment of the contribution made by the conservation and sustainable use of nature under the Bern Convention to other fields of action under the Council of Europe	- Delegate a task to a sub-group or individual to develop a draft Terms of Reference document for the envisaged “single review assessment”, drawing on inputs made to date and other consultations, including further input from the Working Group.
<b>3.3</b> Number of initiatives involving nature-based solutions or ecosystem-based approaches as reported in Nationally Determined Contributions under the UNFCCC, with ecosystem extent data where available	- Delegate a task to a sub-group or individual to develop a draft Terms of Reference document (with input from the wider Working Group) for a single assessment of NDC information to provide the basis for this indicator.
<b>4.1</b> Resources and capacity available at international level for implementing the Strategic Plan, as assessed for each financial planning period by the Standing Committee	- Establish with the Secretariat the intended process for generating summary data on the overall total budgets for operating the Convention and available capacity in terms of the Secretariat, Groups of Experts, training initiatives and other resources, as the basis for operating this indicator. - Discuss further how information from reporting on the indicators for GBF Goal D might usefully augment the picture provided by this indicator.
<b>Other matters</b> (Comments from Section D)	- Secretariat and Chair to advise on best methods/timing for sharing materials with the Reporting Working Group, and ensuring coordination of related work between that Group and the Strategic Plan WG. - Discuss the UK suggestion regarding Party capacity assessments. - Develop a suggested outline/ contents list for the anticipated Monitoring & Evaluation Guide.

## B. Opinions as to relative operational readiness of each of the indicators

The first section of the consultation template asked for an overall opinion on each indicator's relative state of readiness to be operated, according to five broad categories (A-E). A majority of the indicators were judged to have some relevant data-generation systems currently in existence, but to need some adaptation/enhancement work to become properly operational. Views however clearly diverge considerably on this question, and out of the 48 ratings given, fewer than half (21) involved agreement by two or more respondents (relating to just 7 of the 16 indicators). It is probable also that some respondents had their own national context in mind, while others were offering a judgement (as the question intended) about readiness to operate at a Europe-wide level. Responses (some were left blank) were as follows:

Indicator	State of readiness				
	A: Systems for generating relevant information already exist; and results could be being reported from 2025 onwards.	B: Elements of relevant data-generation systems exist, but some adaptation/enhancement work is required. Results might begin emerging in 2025, but otherwise could be expected from 2026 onwards.	C: A new measurement or assessment process needs to be created (technical/coordination challenge).	D: A new measurement or assessment process needs to be created (technical/coordination challenge and investment of resources required).	E: State of readiness unknown/ unclear at present.
<b>Totals:</b>	<b>8.5 ratings (7.5 indicators)</b>	<b>24 ratings (14 indicators)</b>	<b>3 ratings (3 indicators)</b>	<b>4 ratings (4 indicators)</b>	<b>8.5 ratings (7.5 indicators)</b>
<b>1.1.a</b> Trends in extent and condition of selected habitat and ecosystem types	UK Europarc	France Monaco			
<b>1.1.b</b> Extent of degraded ecosystems under restoration (by ecosystem type)		UK		Monaco	France Europarc
<b>1.2</b> Emerald Network Sufficiency Index		UK France Europarc			

<b>1.3 (a)</b> Extent to which protected areas and other effective area-based conservation measures (OECMs) cover Emerald Network sites	Europarc (for Natura 2000 component only)	UK France			Europarc (for OECM component only)
<b>1.3 (b)</b> Proportion of adopted Emerald Network sites with implemented management plans	France	UK			Europarc
<b>1.4</b> Contribution of the Emerald Network to the conservation status of habitats		France			Europarc
<b>1.5.a</b> [Indicator based on statistics concerning Case File recommendations (e.g. proportion implemented, partially implemented, not yet implemented)]	UK				
<b>1.5.b</b> [Indicator based on statistics concerning numbers of Case Files (e.g. numbers per country; number of years each case has been on Standing Committee agendas)]	UK				
<b>2.1</b> Conservation status of species, as reported under Resolution No. 8 (2012)	Europarc	France Monaco			
<b>2.2</b> Trends in frequency and severity of key anthropogenic pressures impacting on species of wild flora and fauna, as reported under Resolution No. 8 (2012) and the EU nature Directives		UK France Europarc	Monaco		
<b>3.1.a</b> Nature-based quality of life assessment (qualitative summary overview)		UK	Monaco	France	Europarc
<b>3.1.b</b> Trends in air quality	Monaco	UK		France	Europarc
<b>3.1.c</b> Trends in water quality	Monaco	UK		France	Europarc
<b>3.2</b> Single review assessment of the contribution made by the conservation and sustainable use of nature under the Bern Convention to other fields of action under the Council of Europe		UK France			Europarc
<b>3.3</b> Number of initiatives involving nature-based solutions or ecosystem-based approaches as reported in Nationally Determined Contributions under the UNFCCC, with ecosystem extent data where available		UK France Monaco			
<b>4.1</b> Resources and capacity available at international level for implementing the Strategic Plan, as assessed for each financial planning period by the Standing Committee		UK	France		

### C. Main comments on the individual indicators, and Consultant responses

The table below presents a verbatim compilation of the comments received from the four respondents, together with some observations in response from the Consultant (Dave Pritchard). Both make reference to the Working Group's previous document T-PVS/Inf(2024)10 on [Advancing work on indicators for the Strategic Plan](#) ., where greater detail on possible approaches and data sources etc. can be found.

Indicator	Comments on approach	Specific next action steps required	Consultant comments
<p><b>1.1.a</b> Trends in extent and condition of selected habitat and ecosystem types</p>	<p><b>UK:</b> Agree that Resolution 8 and Article 17 reporting could be used to assess the extent and condition of selected habitat and ecosystem types that are Bern specific however, GBF Headline Indicator <i>A.2 Extent of Natural Ecosystem</i> could have applications here for assessing the extent statistics. This indicator will group habitats based on the IUCN's Global Ecosystem Typology as Ecosystem Functional Groups. In its simplest form, this indicator can be shown as natural and semi-natural ecosystems as a proportion of total area. Of the 110 EFG in the IUCN, 98 are considered natural or semi-natural. We would suggest these are used as a basis for grouping ecosystem types for this indicator to ensure consistency across reporting mechanisms. It was suggested that this indicator may include a condition element however this will not be included in Headline Indicator A2. Headline Indicator <i>A.1 Red List of Ecosystems</i> is ready for implementation and could be used for this purpose. This indicator uses the outcomes of Red List of Ecosystems assessments, ideally at national scales, but data from sub-national or above-national assessments (e.g. regional assessment) could also be used. Countries</p>	<p><b>UK:</b> Clarity on how the extent statistic will be developed. Should this be based on Resolution 8 reporting or the UNSEEA data that will underpin Headline Indicator A.2. Clarity on how the condition element will be developed. Again, should this be based on Resolution 8 reporting or the headline Indicator A.1 Red List of Ecosystems. Detailed assessment is needed on how the results from the extent and condition statistics will be aggregated into one headline indicator. Is there a target for this indicator? Goal 1 aims for 30% of protected area and OECM coverage, however Resolution 8 reporting only accounts for sites within the Emerald Network. What would a favourable extent measure for this indicator consider as this will be different depending on how the indicator is developed (i.e. on GBF data or Bern reporting).  <b>MONACO:</b> For Monaco: Plans and programs are planned as part of the National Biodiversity Strategy - horizon 2030, adopted in 2021. This Strategy</p>	<p>The UK comments are helpful, and in line with the earlier document. Concerning extent, it might be perverse to consider this as a <i>choice between</i> using Resolution 8 <i>or</i> GBF A.2, if that meant potentially deciding <i>not</i> to use the Bern Convention's own (Res 8) mechanism. Perhaps the question is only whether to use A2 <i>in addition</i>. The best suggestion for the time being might be to consider drawing on both, since both processes will advance in any case. My understanding is that the aspiration for Res 8 reporting is that it would <i>not</i> be restricted only to Emerald sites (see eg T-PVS/PA (2020) 04). The word "selected" in the indicator title acknowledges that the approach is a "sampling" one, not a comprehensive assessment of everything - but in principle an "Emerald-only" focus is the subject of other indicators, with the scope of this one being wider. Concerning condition, as the UK notes, this is also expected to be addressed by Res 8/Art 17. The searchable database for the Red List of Ecosystems does not yet appear to offer a geographical disaggregation that would allow</p>

Indicator	Comments on approach	Specific next action steps required	Consultant comments
	<p>should report on the number of ecosystem types per risk category in each ecosystem functional group (from the Global Ecosystem Typology). Otherwise, the condition element could be based on Resolution 8 and Article 17 reporting. The UK already reports on the Status of UK habitats of European importance in <a href="#">UK Biodiversity Indicator C3a</a> which was developed for reporting to the Aichi targets. The UK will retain this indicator for GBF and other wider reporting which could act as the UKs contribution to the condition element of this target in the Strategic Plan.</p> <p>We are keen to align reporting to the Strategic Plan with other reporting requirements, specifically indicators for the GBF and national reporting, to reduce reporting burden and ensure consistency across reporting mechanisms.</p> <p><b>MONACO:</b> This indicator is important and seems the easiest to implement by the Parties. For Monaco, inventories of habitats and ecosystems have been carried out and are being monitored. They are sectoral on the land environment – Monaco being highly urbanized. They mainly concern the marine environment.</p> <p><b>EUROPARC:</b> Nothing to add to the information in the document T-PVS/Inf(2024)10.</p>	<p>is based on the Aichi Objectives and the SDGs.</p>	<p>isolation of the Bern Convention area, but this should be possible in future.</p> <p><b>Suggestions:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Commit to using the Resolution 8/Art 17 process for this indicator, and assume that GBF indicator A2 will also play a role.</li> <li>- With the assistance of the WG on Reporting, develop the detail of exact metrics, analysis and timeframes etc.</li> <li>- Work with IUCN SDC/CEM on accessing a Bern-relevant disaggregation of the Red List of Ecosystems.</li> </ul>
<p><b>1.1.b</b> Extent of degraded</p>	<p><b>UK:</b></p>	<p><b>UK:</b></p>	<p>The UK’s comments add helpfully to the information on FERM in the earlier document,</p>



Indicator	Comments on approach	Specific next action steps required	Consultant comments
ecosystems under restoration (by ecosystem type)	<p>The Ad Hoc Technical Expert Group of the GBF have now released metadata for the development of <i>Headline Indicator 2.1 Area under restoration</i>. This indicator is still under development but is expected to be finalised in 2024. National reports to the GBF will provide data for this indicator in 2026 and 2029. Data is being compiled by the FAO for the development of the Framework for Ecosystem Restoration Monitoring (FERM) that harmonises and collects area-based data on ecosystem restoration projects and programs. The FERM is a compilation of various available data sources which contains area-based estimates that are aggregated from restoration initiatives and projects, as well as country scale, directly reported tabular data from existing processes. The reporting will include both the area under restoration in appropriate units (e.g., number of hectares of forests, number of kilometres of rivers), and the ecosystem(s) being restored.</p> <p>When an area contains multiple ecosystems, the corresponding area under restoration should be disaggregated by ecosystem, to enable aggregation of areas by ecosystem. Ecosystems should be reported using national ecosystems, and the Ecosystem Functional Groups (EFGs) of the IUCN Global Ecosystem Typology, to which the national/local ecosystem type has been cross-walked. Guidelines and tools for cross-walking existing national ecosystem classifications to the EFGs of the IUCN Global Ecosystem Typology are currently under development, along with cross-walks with other</p>	<p>A decision is required on whether to adopt Headline Indicator 2.1 Area under restoration for reporting to this target in the Strategic Plan. Alignment with GBF reporting will greatly reduce the capacity required to develop these indicators.</p> <p><b>MONACO:</b> For Monaco: Current projects concerning the “renaturation” of the city. Objective which is part of the National Biodiversity Strategy. Objective of renaturing at least 20% of road areas by 2030 and tree planting program.</p>	<p>and refer to the recent metadata (<a href="https://gbf-indicators.org/metadata/headline/2-2">https://gbf-indicators.org/metadata/headline/2-2</a>), and in document CBD/SBSTTA/26/INF/14) for its use in the GBF.</p> <p>Since a main element of this comes from national reporting to the CBD, countries in the Bern Convention area could use the information they report in that way as their input also to Bern Strategic Plan indicator 1.1.b. In addition, FAO is compiling country-level data from restoration initiatives and projects, which could be extracted centrally to provide accompanying narrative content.</p> <p><b>Suggestions:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Commit to using national data reported for GBF indicator 2.1 as the basis for this Bern Convention indicator 1.1.b.</li> <li>- Supplement the information with FAO’s data on restoration initiatives and projects.</li> </ul>

Indicator	Comments on approach	Specific next action steps required	Consultant comments
	<p>classifications (e.g. IPCC land use categories). Guidance on using the EFGs and related national ecosystems will be integrated into the metadata once developed.</p> <p>Parties are in the process of developing this indicator in preparation for the CBD 6<sup>th</sup> National report in February 2026.</p> <p>We would advise that Bern makes use of this indicator for reporting to target 1.1 of the Strategic Plan.</p> <p><b>MONACO:</b> More difficult to assess.</p> <p><b>EUROPARC:</b> Nothing to add to the information in the document T-PVS/Inf(2024)10.</p>		
<p><b>1.2</b> Emerald Network Sufficiency Index</p>	<p><b>UK:</b> Based on the recent outcomes of the GoEPAEN meeting, and the reporting requirements of the EN Sufficiency Index under the Emerald Network Strategic Workplan, we are keen to include this indicator in the Monitoring Framework for the Strategic Plan.</p> <p>As discussed at GoEPAEN, no systematic (species-by species) network sufficiency assessment has been done for birds in the EU and the UK's Emerald Network may still need to be evaluated as regards to bird species. Consequently, at this stage we are not given a sufficiency index score.</p> <p>The UK will be working with the Secretariat over the next 12-18 months to agree on a</p>	<p><b>UK:</b> For the UK, agree a process to determine the Sufficiency Index for bird species over the next 12-18 months.</p>	<p>Now that GoEPAEN has deliberated on the 2030 sufficiency targets for the Network, it would seem that there is no impediment to the activation of this indicator.</p> <p>(No Consultant's "suggestion" is specified here concerning the matter raised by the UK concerning their national sufficiency score, as that is more appropriately addressed in bilateral consultations).</p> <p><b>Suggestion:</b> - Updated information on the targets and other methodological issues concerning the Index, following the April GoEPAEN meeting, to be shared with the Strategic Plan Working Group when the details become available.</p>

Indicator	Comments on approach	Specific next action steps required	Consultant comments
	<p>process to determine our sufficiency. The UK also agreed on the targets for the Sufficiency Index discussed at the recent GoEPAEN meeting, emphasising that these were minimal values to be achieved.</p> <p><b>MONACO:</b> Monaco does not have an Emeraude site.</p> <p><b>EUROPARC</b> Nothing to add to the information in the document T-PVS/Inf(2024)10.</p>		
<p><b>1.3 (a)</b> Extent to which protected areas and other effective area-based conservation measures (OECMs) cover Emerald Network sites</p>	<p><b>UK:</b> We are keen on the approach of this indicator. Data is already available through the EN database as well as protected area data from the WDPA and WDOECMs. Metadata is now available for GBF Headline indicator <a href="#">3.1 Coverage of protected areas and other effective area-based conservation measures</a>. This indicator will use WDPA and WDOECM data for reporting. We welcome streamlining data sources and reporting between different frameworks across conventions as suggested.</p> <p><b>EUROPARC:</b> The data on coverage of nationally designated protected areas and Natura 2000 sites is already gathered and there is an established tradition in doing this (A). The work on OECMs is in its initial steps in many countries and thus data</p>	<p><b>UK:</b> There are no specific next steps for this indicator as the data are already becoming available however Headline Indicators will not be ready for reporting in the UK until at least February 2026. Clarity on ‘distance to target’ element of this indicator. What is the target for the extent statistic of PAs and OECMs coverage of EN sites?</p> <p><b>EUROPARC:</b> National implementation of OECMs.</p>	<p>While data on OECMs are less developed than data on PAs, as Europarc mentions, there are nevertheless systematic global data collection platforms for both, as the UK mentions (i.e. the two World Databases that are maintained by UNEP-WCMC).</p> <p>Regarding the UK’s question about the target for coverage, I believe it has been assumed that all Emerald Network sites should be the subject of conservation measures, whether that is by protected area status or by other effective measures – in other words the target is 100%.</p> <p><b>Suggestion:</b> - Elaborate the detailed process (including allocation of responsibilities) for undertaking the digital polygon cross-matching analysis (and the repetition intervals for this) between the Emerald Network Database and the World Databases on PAs and OECMs.</p>

Indicator	Comments on approach	Specific next action steps required	Consultant comments
	available on OECMs is scarce at the moment (E).		
<p><b>1.3 (b)</b> Proportion of adopted Emerald Network sites with implemented management plans</p>	<p><b>UK:</b> A mechanism is required to ensure that the management plans recorded in this indicator are complete and accurate, and that they adequately implement conservation objectives with regular monitoring and review in place. This requires capacity to verify this information. Guidance on what constitutes a management plan (time bound, effective, monitored and reviewed) is required to effectively capture the management effectiveness of the EN. Alternatively, the UK have developed a <a href="#">MEPCA indicator</a>, based on the existing qualitative OSPAR management status four question approach. It is a framework indicator capable of absorbing existing PA/OECM effectiveness data where they exist or has the ability to make a new assessment, for a streamlined assessment approach. Importantly, the indicator draws focus to the delivery of conservation outcomes, as a proxy for understanding management effectiveness. With the above elements in mind, the indicator is considered relatively simple, easy to understand, and flexible, so that it is globally applicable. The MEPCA indicator could be included in the UKs reporting on management effectiveness under Bern.</p> <p><b>EUROPARC:</b></p>	<p><b>UK:</b> Guidance on what constitutes a management plan for the EN and how this will be verified is essential in reporting target 1.3(b).</p> <p><b>EUROPARC:</b> There is work being done in the framework of the GBF Monitoring Framework relating to management effectiveness. It would be good to follow that process and then decide if that approach could be used here as well. EUROPARC Federation will be part of a project dealing with protected area management effectiveness. The project will start in September 2024. EUROPARC is happy to report on that work to the Working Group when it is advancing.</p>	<p>While Europarc’s comments are well taken, the indicator title has been agreed by the Standing Committee, and it represents the outcome of previous discussions about the practicality of requiring effectiveness assessments for all sites in all countries. Target 1.3 refers to effective management, and this <i>remains the objective</i> that Parties have agreed for all their Emerald sites. In terms of a universal <i>measurement</i> method however, the compromise for the <i>assessment indicator</i> (not for the policy objective) was to refer to “implementation” as the universally assessable parameter (and being more than just “existence” of a plan), and then to provide for assessments of “effectiveness” on a more discretionary basis where this is possible, with various available methods being suggested (including the MEPCA one that the UK mentions). It will remain valid on a voluntary basis to press for the fullest possible coverage of these effectiveness assessments, in conjunction with the more “mandatory minimum” reporting of “implementation” data.</p> <p>The UK asks about a definition of what can constitute a “management plan” for the purposes of this indicator. The Glossary in Annex 3 of the adopted Strategic Plan includes an interpretation entry for “management plan”, so it would be useful to know whether that meets the need, or whether it should be changed in some way. (The</p>

Indicator	Comments on approach	Specific next action steps required	Consultant comments
	<p>The Target 1.3 calls for effectively managed sites. If a site has a management plan, this is not a guarantee that the site is effectively managed. Of course, <u>implementation</u> of the management plan does give an indication that the site is managed but it does not indicate whether the site is <u>effectively</u> managed. In this sense, the indicator does not really reflect the Target 1.3. The better way would be to evaluate the management effectiveness of the sites. Management effectiveness evaluation is defined “as the assessment of how well the protected area is being managed – primarily the extent to which it is protecting values and achieving goals and objectives. The term management effectiveness reflects three main themes: 1) design issues relating to both individual sites and protected area systems; 2) adequacy and appropriateness of management systems and processes; and 3) delivery of protected area objectives including conservation of values” (IUCN 2006).</p>		<p>Glossary acknowledges that some of its interpretations may need to evolve as time advances).</p> <p><b>Suggestions:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Confirm (or update) the definition/ interpretation of “management plan” as given in the Glossary of the adopted Strategic Plan.</li> <li>- With input from the WG on reporting, develop the details of how the existence of implemented management plans for Emerald sites will be documented and reported, including intervals for updating the information.</li> <li>- Commission the compilation of a short guidance document on available (rapid, low-cost) methods for voluntarily assessing management effectiveness of PAs and OECMs.</li> </ul>
<p><b>1.4</b> Contribution of the Emerald Network to the conservation status of habitats</p>	<p><b>UK:</b> Resolution 8 data is not useful here as the first reporting trial only assessed 9 habitat types which doesn’t provide a full picture of the EN. Further work needs to be done here, possibility of looking at another indicator? Could the Red List Index of Ecosystem (RLIe) have applications for this target? Could we filter this indicator for habitat types that are captured within the EN and assess the status over time? Although RLIe doesn’t provide a conservation</p>	<p><b>UK:</b> Consider other existing data, such as the IUCN Red List of Ecosystems, or the IUCN global Green List of Protected and Conserved Areas. Note that the latter does not have a complete database of sites with no assessment available in the UK. However, the Red List of Ecosystems is operational, and is adopted as a Headline Indicator of the GBF. The Red List of Ecosystems has applications in over 110 countries across all</p>	<p>The earlier document referred to the Green List, though not (in this context) to the Red List Index of Ecosystems. The difficulty with those in relation to this indicator is how to isolate/ attribute the contribution made by the Emerald Network. This is why the document placed more reliance on the Monitoring Framework for the Emerald Network (and the acknowledged need for this to move beyond Resolution No. 8 data). Some limitation to a selected number of habitat types for which data are available may be</p>

Indicator	Comments on approach	Specific next action steps required	Consultant comments
	<p>status ((based on status categories such as “satisfactory stable”, “stable but at risk”, “unsatisfactory improving” or “unsatisfactory declining”) it will provide information on ecosystems that are most at risk (and alternatively ecosystems that are improving), and the drivers of ecosystem loss and degradation. It will also capture trends over time, and as it is a Headline Indicator for the GBF, its use will reduce reporting burdens for parties.</p> <p>Alternatively, the IUCN Green List of protected and conserved areas is relevant here, however only 23 sites have been assessed across Europe and none of these are in the UK. This indicator does not currently have sufficient data to report to this target.</p> <p><b>EUROPARC:</b> Nothing to add to the information in the document T-PVS/Inf(2024)10.</p>	<p>continents, with over 4,000 ecosystem units assessed at different spatial scales, through both strategic and systematic assessments. At this point, only a limited part of this information has been populated into the database. The AHTEG guidance advises that for countries where assessments are not available, global terrestrial assessments are anticipated to be available for key ecosystems by 2026-2027, in particular key terrestrial and freshwater ecosystem types, with anticipated updates every 5 years.</p>	<p>acceptable, given that indicators can only ever be an “indication” (for example by a strategy of “sampling”) rather than being a comprehensive assessment.</p> <p>This probably needs further input from GoPAEN on feasible approaches for operating the indicator.</p> <p><b>Suggestion:</b> - Seek input from GoPAEN on the most feasible approaches for operating this indicator, in light of the earlier metadata document and latest views from the SP Working Group.</p>
<p><b>1.5.a</b> [Indicator based on statistics concerning Case File recommendations (e.g. proportion implemented, partially implemented, not yet implemented)]</p>	<p><b>UK:</b> The data is available for this indicator through the Recommendations and Government and Complainant reports for each case file. These documents will need to be reviewed.</p> <p>The UK is currently developing a similar database in preparation for the 44<sup>th</sup> Standing Committee. We are identifying Recommendations from all active case files and whether they have been implemented or not. This will be used as a reactive database during StC to inform the UKs position on case files.</p>	<p><b>UK:</b> Coordinate work being led by the UK with the Bern Secretariat on the assessment of the Recommendations within the case files.</p> <p>We would suggest and welcome that the data for this indicator be presented on the Bern website, or shared directly with parties, prior to StC to help inform positions on case files.</p>	<p>The national context work described by the UK could be a very useful pilot of a method to use for this indicator at Convention level.</p> <p><b>Suggestions:</b> - Invite the UK to present the methodology it is developing for tracking the status of Recommendations concerning its own Case Files, and explore how this might be adopted/ adapted for general use as a way of operationalising this indicator.</p>

Indicator	Comments on approach	Specific next action steps required	Consultant comments
	<p>This assessment can support the development of this indicator. We would welcome the opportunity to discuss this further to assess how the work we have been leading can feed into the production of this indicator.</p> <p><b>EUROPARC:</b> Nothing to add to the information in the document T-PVS/Inf(2024)10.</p>		
<p><b>1.5.b</b> [Indicator based on statistics concerning numbers of Case Files (e.g. numbers per country; number of years each case has been on Standing Committee agendas)]</p>	<p><b>UK:</b> No concerns on the development of this indicator.</p> <p><b>FRANCE:</b> These indicators on Case File are not necessary from our point of view.</p> <p><b>MONACO:</b> Very interesting and useful for tracking files.</p> <p><b>EUROPARC:</b> Nothing to add to the information in the document T-PVS/Inf(2024)10.</p>	<p><b>UK:</b> The UK support further assessments on the operation of the Case File system, as well as the statistical ‘barometer’.</p>	<p>There appears to be a wide difference of view (France v others) about the utility of this indicator and the preceding one. As these have already been agreed by the Standing Committee however, this is perhaps not open to discussion.</p> <p>The previously highlighted “case file reflection” process appears now to concern just the issue of the volume of new complaints rather than any other aspects of the process, and therefore may not now contribute to working out how to operate this indicator. If the reflection process results however in a stricter “gatekeeping” standard for admission of new complaints, that will need to be taken into account as a potential discontinuity in any analysis of numerical trends over time. Apart from this, the position with the “barometer” should be explored as a probable element of operating this indicator.</p> <p><b>Suggestion:</b> - Investigate further the current intentions regarding a Case File “barometer”, as a resource on which to base the operation of this indicator.</p>

Indicator	Comments on approach	Specific next action steps required	Consultant comments
<p><b>2.1</b> Conservation status of species, as reported under Resolution No. 8 (2012)</p>	<p><b>UK:</b> The approach to this indicator sounds reasonable. Data is already collected for reporting requirements under the EN and Natura 2000, thus limiting reporting burden.</p> <p><b>MONACO:</b> Inventories accompanied by monitoring of the fauna and flora present in Monaco are carried out.</p> <p><b>EUROPARC:</b> Nothing to add to the information in the document T-PVS/Inf(2024)10.</p>	<p><b>UK:</b> More clarity is needed on whether parties report on the agreed indicator or whether disaggregation's are expected. This may significantly increase capacity needs which need to be assessed at this stage. Regarding the conservation conclusion for birds, are parties expected to analyse this data at a national level or does the Birdlife International and IUCN assessment include both data collected from Article 12 of the EU Wild Birds Directive and Resolution 8 reporting? Again we would like to understand the capacity requirements of for parties in conducting this assessment.</p> <p><b>MONACO:</b> Could an indicator on invasive alien species be considered? For Monaco: Programs and action plans are planned as part of the National Biodiversity Strategy.</p>	<p>The reference in the earlier document to possible disaggregations probably related to possibilities for central analysis of the overall European dataset, and there should be no implication of any burden for this falling on Parties. Regarding the UK's question about the assessments by BirdLife and IUCN, my understanding is that they use a range of data sources, including EU reports and others, though not specifically Resolution 8 reports - but that the assessments do also cover the countries and species of relevance to the Bern Convention. Other WG members may have more information on this, but I do not read it as requiring any additional capacity from Parties. Monaco's suggestion regarding invasive species probably belongs better in the context of indicator 2.2 on pressures, rather than 2.1 which is about the status of species that are being conserved.</p> <p><b>Suggestion:</b> - Proceed to use the Resolution No. 8 reporting process (with EU Arts 17 &amp; 12) as the basis for this indicator, with findings framed in the way outlined in document T-PVS/Inf(2024)10.</p>
<p><b>2.2</b> Trends in frequency and severity of key anthropogenic pressures impacting on</p>	<p><b>UK:</b> It is suggested that the inclusion of only 'pressures' and not 'threats' in the target wording may exclude relevant information for this indicator. We would suggest that the target wording is amended to <i>include</i> pressure and</p>	<p><b>UK:</b> Confirmation on who will be leading on the development of this indicator.</p> <p><b>MONACO:</b></p>	<p>The target wording and the indicator title now both appear in the Strategic Plan as text adopted by the Standing Committee – amending them would involve the Committee adopting a revision of the Plan, and that could be problematic (not least in potentially opening up other parts of the</p>



Indicator	Comments on approach	Specific next action steps required	Consultant comments
<p>species of wild flora and fauna, as reported under Resolution No. 8 (2012) and the EU nature Directives</p>	<p>threats, making the distinction between these, in line with proposed reporting for under Resolution 8.</p> <p>Additional sources of data are suggested, such as one-off case studies and party questionnaires that allow a more narrative overview of pressures and threats. We would support this suggestion, as a voluntary approach, as it does offer context to the indicator, however an assessment of the capacity required to undertake this by parties should first be considered.</p> <p>The text references alternative indicators that may be used for reporting (Spread of invasive species, by catch of vulnerable species, illegal trade in CITES) many of which are adopted as component and complementary indicators of the GBF. It is agreed that there is a preference to use Resolution 8 reporting due to its specific relevance to Bern activities and that this data is already collected. Not all parties will be reporting on component and complementary indicators of the GBF.</p> <p><b>MONACO:</b> The impact study tool could be useful for this indicator. Impact studies exist in Monaco for certain cases.</p> <p><b>EUROPARC:</b> Agree to have “threats” included with “pressures”. Otherwise nothing to add to the information in the document T-PVS/Inf(2024)10.</p>	<p>For Monaco, regulations on impact studies are in progress.</p> <p>The objective of alleviating pressure on ecosystems is included in the National Biodiversity Strategy.</p>	<p>agreed 2030 agenda to possible amendments). The solution proposed in the earlier document was instead to work with an <i>interpretation</i> of the term “pressures” that would not exclude any important issues that might otherwise be regarded more properly as “threats”. It has been accepted that the Glossary annexed to the Plan could evolve as understandings evolve, and that might be one place to address the issue (it currently does not define “pressure” or “threat”), but a better solution may lie just with some operational guidance on Indicator 2.2 (perhaps in the “Monitoring &amp; Evaluation Guide”, on which comments are made further below).</p> <p>Concerning the UK’s comment about capacity for providing voluntary additional information, hopefully the sense of that comment is that each Party will make its own judgement about what it might wish and be able to provide – not that some kind of capacity assessment process needs to be undertaken <i>before the principle of this</i> can be agreed. Reference to Resolution No. 8 and EU nature Directives reporting was specified by the previous Working Group as a limit on what would be universally expected for this indicator, but various readily available additional sources will add useful value where they can be provided on a voluntary basis.</p> <p><b>Suggestion:</b> - Work with the Working Group on Reporting to develop the details of methods and data to be provided for this indicator.</p>

Indicator	Comments on approach	Specific next action steps required	Consultant comments
<p><b>3.1.a</b> Nature-based quality of life assessment (qualitative summary overview)</p>	<p><b>UK:</b> The GBF Headline Indicator <i>B.1 Services provided by ecosystems</i> aims to track trends in the provision of ecosystem services, responding to the wording in Goal B of the GBF that ecosystem services should be “maintained and enhanced, with those currently in decline being restored. The <a href="#">metadata</a> is now available for this indicator, which had not been produced at the time of writing the SP framework. We welcome the inclusion of this indicator for assessing target 3.1 of the SP, and for Bern convention parties to agree a common core set of priority services that will be included in this statistic. It should be relatively easy to adapt Headline Indicator B1 to align with Bern priorities and adopting this approach, will significantly reduce reporting burdens for parties ratified to both Bern and the CBD.</p> <p>It will be difficult to assess all components of this target, particularly community resilience, well-being and quality of life. As suggested in the SP framework document, there are no corresponding indicators that would fit this purpose.</p> <p>We would suggest focusing on a subset of ecosystems services that are applicable to Bern, using methodology from HI B1 Services provided by ecosystems. It may also be worth changing the name of this indicator to something more appropriate based on these suggestions.</p> <p><b>FRANCE:</b></p>	<p><b>UK:</b> Agree on what approach to take forward for this indicator and assess whether contracting parties are happy to adopt HI B1 for this purpose.</p> <p><b>FRANCE:</b> take over an existing indicator from an international organization</p> <p><b>MONACO:</b> For Monaco: The National Strategy for Biodiversity has included as strategic orientation n°1 to contribute to the living environment and well-being of populations through the benefits of biodiversity.</p>	<p>The UK’s comments are very helpful, and in line with the earlier document, which mentioned potentially choosing a relevant subset of services from the Goal B GBF indicator.</p> <p>As suggested above however, the wording of the indicator title is contained in the Strategic Plan as adopted by the Standing Committee, so evolving thinking now may best be reflected in interpretations and guidance rather than a proposal to revise the text.</p> <p><b>Suggestions:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Confirm an intention to use a subset of information that will feed into GBF indicator B1 as the basis for this indicator 3.1.a.</li> <li>- Decide on a common “core set” of priority ecosystem services (chosen from the global reference list) to be recommended for inclusion in a Bern Convention “cut” of GBF indicator B1 information.</li> </ul>

Indicator	Comments on approach	Specific next action steps required	Consultant comments
	<p>Probably too ambitious.</p> <p><b>MONACO:</b> It is difficult to assess quality of life based on nature. This indicator is difficult to define and the objective is very subjective. The elements given as reference will be useful.</p> <p><b>EUROPARC:</b> Nothing to add to the information in the document T-PVS/Inf(2024)10.</p>		
<p><b>3.1.b</b> Trends in air quality</p>	<p><b>UK:</b> As suggested, there are various indicators that report trends in air quality that could be used to report to this target. The UK currently produces UK Biodiversity Indicator <a href="#">B5a Air pollution</a> which shows trends in areas affected by acidity and nitrogen. This indicator is adapted from the annual <a href="#">Air Pollution Trends report (2023)</a>. Data for these indicators are provided by the UK Centre for Ecology and Hydrology. The UK would like to adopt this indicator for reporting on air quality in target 3 of the SP. Alternative indicators on air quality include various Sustainable Development Goal indicators: <b>11.6.2</b> Annual mean levels of fine particulate matter (e.g. PM2.5 and PM10) in cities (population weighted)</p>	<p><b>UK:</b> Agree on the approach parties will take on reporting this indicator. The UK are keen to use existing indicators to report to this target whether that is the UK Biodiversity Indicators or SDG indicators or a collation of these data sources.</p> <p><b>FRANCE:</b> take over an existing indicator from an international organization</p>	<p>Good existing indicator/ reporting processes are in operation, but the comments suggest that countries may have different individual preferences about which ones to favour. The earlier document suggested that air quality indicator approaches by the OECD and the European Commission might be most easily considered for universal adoption in the Bern Convention context, but this probably needs more discussion. Indicators for greenhouse gas emissions (as referenced by the UK) may however be less relevant to the intent of indicator 3.1.b on “air quality” as such, and are perhaps better considered in a context of climate change.</p> <p><b>Suggestion:</b></p>

Indicator	Comments on approach	Specific next action steps required	Consultant comments
	<p>Data provided by WHO  <b>13.2.2</b> Total greenhouse gas emissions per year  Data provided by the UK environment accounts and published by the Office of National Statistics  And for consideration;  <b>3.9.1</b> Mortality rate attributed to household and ambient air pollution  Data provided by Air Quality and Public Health - UK Health Security Agency  These indicators were adopted as component and complementary indicators of the GBF however not all parties will be reporting on these in the context of CBD but may report these as SDG indicators.</p> <p><b>FRANCE:</b>  Probably too ambitious.</p> <p><b>MONACO:</b>  Use air quality monitoring carried out by each Party when such a program exists. See the measured items.  Air quality monitoring has been carried out in Monaco since the 1990s.  There are 5 fixed pollutant measurement stations and 7 microsensors in specific areas.</p> <p><b>EUROPARC:</b>  Nothing to add to the information in the document T-PVS/Inf(2024)10.</p>		<p>- Discuss a preferred choice from existing air quality indicator regimes as the basis for operating Bern SP indicator 3.1.b.</p>
<b>3.1.c</b> Trends in water quality	<b>UK:</b>	<b>UK:</b>	As with air quality above, good existing indicator/reporting processes are in operation on water

Indicator	Comments on approach	Specific next action steps required	Consultant comments
	<p>As with air quality, there are various indicators that report on water quality that could be adopted for reporting to the SP.</p> <p>The UK currently produces UK Biodiversity Indicator <a href="#">B7 Surface water status</a>. This indicator shows the percentage of surface water bodies in each status classification of the Water Framework Directive and assesses the change in the percentage of water bodies in the UK that achieved a good or high surface water status classification.</p> <p>There are also various Sustainable Development Goal indicators that report of water quality. These include;</p> <p><b>6.3.2</b> Proportion of bodies of water with good ambient water quality Data from the WFD and</p> <p><b>6.1.1</b> Proportion of population using safely managed drinking water services Data provided by WHO/UNICEF Joint Monitoring Programme (JMP) for Water Supply, Sanitation and Hygiene.</p> <p><b>FRANCE:</b> Probably too ambitious.</p> <p><b>MONACO:</b> See the monitoring programs put in place by the Parties and the elements taken into account in the measures. Bathing water quality monitoring exists in Monaco.</p> <p><b>EUROPARC:</b></p>	<p>Agree on the approach parties will take on reporting this indicator.</p> <p>The UK are keen to use existing indicators to report to this target whether that is the UK Biodiversity Indicators or SDG indicators or a collation of these data sources.</p> <p><b>FRANCE:</b> take over an existing indicator from an international organization.</p>	<p>quality, but the comments suggest that countries may have different individual preferences about which ones to favour. The earlier document suggested on this too that indicator approaches by the OECD and the European Commission might be most easily considered for universal adoption in the Bern Convention context, but this probably needs more discussion.</p> <p><b>Suggestion:</b> - Discuss a preferred choice from existing water quality indicator regimes as the basis for operating Bern SP indicator 3.1.c.</p>

Indicator	Comments on approach	Specific next action steps required	Consultant comments
	Nothing to add to the information in the document T-PVS/Inf(2024)10.		
<p><b>3.2</b> Single review assessment of the contribution made by the conservation and sustainable use of nature under the Bern Convention to other fields of action under the Council of Europe</p>	<p><b>UK:</b> The first approach to developing this indicator should rely on the institutions and processes of the Council of Europe and The Council of Europe’s reporting on the Bern Convention’s contribution to the UN Agenda for Sustainable Development. There is consideration of whether this indicator can be developed with information from contracting parties on policy integration and cross sectoral coordination at national level. Further information is required to understand what level of detail is required in this reporting and what capacity commitments are expected from parties. The GBF indicators suggested in the paper, namely one on ecosystem services involving protection from hazards and extreme events (proposed as a headline indicator for GBF draft Target 11) was not adopted as an indicator for the GBF and is not operational. GBF indicator B.1 Services provided by ecosystems may have relevance here and can possibly be adapted to align with this target however a detailed assessment of the methodology is required.</p> <p><b>EUROPARC:</b> Nothing to add to the information in the document T-PVS/Inf(2024)10.</p>		<p>The best approach to this might be to delegate a task to a sub-group or individual to develop a draft Terms of Reference document for the envisaged single review assessment, drawing on the earlier document, the comments here from the UK, and other consultations including further input from the Working Group.</p> <p><b>Suggestion:</b> - Delegate a task to a sub-group or individual to develop a draft Terms of Reference document for the envisaged “single review assessment”, drawing on inputs made to date and other consultations, including further input from the Working Group.</p>
	<b>UK:</b>	<b>MONACO:</b>	

Indicator	Comments on approach	Specific next action steps required	Consultant comments
<p><b>3.3</b> Number of initiatives involving nature-based solutions or ecosystem-based approaches as reported in Nationally Determined Contributions under the UNFCCC, with ecosystem extent data where available</p>	<p>The use of NDCs submitted to the UNFCCC seems reasonable, although further detail is needed on what will be included in the suggested one off study-based approach on NBS of submitted NDCs and what this means in terms of capacity commitments for contracting parties.</p> <p>The GBF indicators referred to in the text were not adopted for GBF Goal B and are not in operation. However, a series of binary indicators have been developed by the Ad Hoc Technical Expert Group of the CBD which may have purpose for reporting to this target.</p> <p>Binary Indicator Goal B of GBF</p> <p><i><b>B.b</b> Number of countries with policies or action plans for [[implementing and monitoring] the sustainable use of biodiversity and the maintenance and enhancement of nature’s contributions to people, including ecosystem functions and services [in a manner supportive of sustainable development]][and processes to value biodiversity as well as policies to ensure the provision of ecosystem services for present and future generations]][promoting the achievement of Goal B].</i></p> <p>Binary Indicator Target 8 of GBF</p> <p><i><b>8.b</b> Number of countries with agreed policies to minimize the impact of climate change and ocean acidification on biodiversity and that minimize negative and foster positive impacts of climate action on biodiversity.</i></p> <p><b>MONACO:</b> Seeing the different contributions of the Parties to the UNFCCC is an interesting approach.</p>	<p>For Monaco: The development of innovative solutions based on nature is included in the National Strategy for Biodiversity, particularly taking into account climate change.</p>	<p>Since the adopted indicator title specifies “as reported in NDCs”, the earlier references to GBF indicators (and the UK’s response on those) may now be less relevant, and it may now be best just to focus on what can be extracted from NDC data themselves.</p> <p>As noted previously, in the timespan of the Bern Strategic Plan, submission of countries’ NDCs will occur only once; hence the indicator would operate as a single assessment. As with indicator 3.2 above therefore, the best approach might be to delegate a task to a sub-group or individual to develop a draft Terms of Reference document for such a single assessment.</p> <p><b>Suggestion:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Delegate a task to a sub-group or individual to develop a draft Terms of Reference document (with input from the wider Working Group) for a single assessment of NDC information to provide the basis for this indicator.</li> </ul>

Indicator	Comments on approach	Specific next action steps required	Consultant comments
	<p>Monaco contributes to the reports to be provided within the framework of the UNFCCC (UNFCCC).</p> <p>The following actions were mentioned in the “nationally determined contribution of the Principality of Monaco” document updated in 2020 and communicated to the UNFCCC:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Program to strengthen the place of nature in the city</li> <li>- Urban heat island adaptation program</li> <li>- Coastal zone adaptation program</li> </ul> <p><b>EUROPARC:</b> Nothing to add to the information in the document T-PVS/Inf(2024)10.</p>		
<p><b>4.1</b> Resources and capacity available at international level for implementing the Strategic Plan, as assessed for each financial planning period by the Standing Committee</p>	<p><b>UK:</b> The approach to developing this indicator is reasonable. We support the use of summary data on the overall budgets and capacity for the Bern Convention.</p> <p>As suggested, this should be complemented by the Headline indicators for Goal D and Target 19 of the GBF, which now have metadata available. These indicators include:</p> <p><i>D.1 International public funding, including official development assistance (ODA) for conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity and ecosystems</i></p> <p><i>D.2 Domestic public funding on conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity and ecosystems</i></p>	<p><b>UK:</b> This indicator is close to operational. The data exists for both the Bern finance reporting as well as GBF reporting within the UK.</p> <p>We request confirmation on the approach taken to develop this indicator.</p>	<p>Comments suggest good confidence in the operability of this indicator, and even at a highly summarised/ approximated level, its results might be expected to have significant political resonance among Parties and within the organs of the Council of Europe. This could be the case even without the identified potential additional information from the GBF reporting provisions, though the latter will enrich the picture further, albeit without a directly traceable link to the Bern Convention Strategic Plan.</p> <p><b>Suggestion:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Establish with the Secretariat the intended process for generating summary data on the overall total budgets for operating the Convention and available capacity in terms of the Secretariat, Groups of Experts, training</li> </ul>



Indicator	Comments on approach	Specific next action steps required	Consultant comments
	<p><i>D.3 Private funding (domestic and international) on conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity and ecosystems</i></p> <p>The UK already reports on public sector expenditure, non-governmental organisation expenditure and UK public expenditure on international conservation and the sustainable use of biodiversity and ecosystems through the UK Biodiversity indicator <a href="#">E2 Expenditure on UK and International Biodiversity</a>. This indicator will be expanded to include private funding, in line with GBF requirements, and will be available for reporting to the 6<sup>th</sup> National report to the CBD in February 2026.</p> <p><b>EUROPARC:</b></p> <p>As for this and the other indicators, it would be good to follow what is happening with the GBD Monitoring Framework, as is of course already done in the document T-PVS/Inf(2024)10. In order to keep the reporting burden not too heavy on the Contracting Parties, it makes sense to try to have synergies with other processes as also suggested in the document T-PVS/Inf(2024)10.</p>		<p>initiatives and other resources, as the basis for operating this indicator.</p> <p>- Discuss further how information from reporting on the indicators for GBF Goal D might usefully augment the picture provided by this indicator.</p>

#### D. Other advice on the monitoring & evaluation regime

Document T-PVS/Inf(2024)10 included five questions for comment by the Working Group. Responses to questions (i)-(iii) are covered in the tables above. Responses to the remaining two questions (concerning more general advice on the Strategic Plan's monitoring & evaluation regime), together with those in an additional box for "any other comments", are presented below.

Comments on the most effective ways of working on indicators for the Strategic Plan in conjunction with the parallel <i>ad hoc</i> Working Group on Reporting	Consultant comments
<p><b>UK:</b> At a national level, we have been coordinating responses to this questionnaire with the UK leads on the Working Group on Reporting, however it would be beneficial to align conversations across all parties in both groups. The first step would be to collate the responses to this questionnaire and decide on the next steps to these indicators – which will be adopted, amended, or replaced with more suitable reporting mechanisms. This should then be shared with the Reporting Group, through a project report, assessing areas where reporting data may need to be further aligned with the data requirements of these indicators. An assessment will be required at this stage to assess parties’ capacity to collect extra data before indicators are agreed. The UK have a strong stance on not introducing further reporting burdens to parties and suggest that we align this framework with other monitoring regimes where possible (particularly Headline Indicators of the GBF) to reduce capacity concerns across parties. We would welcome the opportunity for a joint meeting with the Reporting Group once the above steps have been communicated have reviewed.</p> <p><b>FRANCE:</b> Developing indicators seems to be a difficult task for just one working group. It would be better to develop these indicators in advance (consultant?), and to have the working group focus their finalization on particular points that deserve discussions.</p> <p><b>MONACO:</b> Importance that the working groups on reporting and the strategic plan work together. It is also important to rely on existing tools implemented by the Berne Convention (reporting, files, etc.) to avoid an overload of work. Refer to plans already put in place by other international instruments such as the SDGs and the Aichi Targets to facilitate the work of the Parties. Importance of not making comparisons between the Parties.</p> <p><b>EUROPARC:</b> It would be useful to know how monitoring of the Strategic Plan and the reporting for the Bern Convention are in sync. Again, here it would make the most sense to try to gather as much information from one set of monitoring to serve all the others. The same goes with reporting on the EU Nature Directives.</p>	<p>Cross-representation between the two Working Groups was planned, but appears not to have been fully realised. It remains the intention however, as the UK describes, for there to be full coordination between the two, and sharing of documents/perhaps some joint discussion will be important.</p> <p>The present document provides the collation of responses and next step suggestions that was also planned, and to which the UK also refers. The Secretariat and the Chair will advise on best methods/timing for sharing with the Reporting WG.</p> <p>Agreement to the indicator <i>titles</i> has already occurred (at Standing Committee 43); discussion now is on the means by which they may be operated.</p> <p>Alignment with existing monitoring &amp; reporting systems, and avoidance of unnecessary reporting burdens, have been core principles of this process from the beginning, and stressed in the various documents (including the Strategic Plan itself), and this remains the case. The issue of Party capacity assessments is a new suggestion and one which the Working Group may wish to discuss.</p> <p>The suggestion from France is noted. It would however require a larger investment in consultancy support than the few days that are currently provided for, and (having also in mind the UK’s points above about Party perspectives on capacity etc, as well as the specialist expertise that is brought by the nominated members of the WG) it may be prudent to continue engaging members in the methodological development of the indicators.</p> <p>Monaco’s point about comparisons has been previously emphasised, including in document T-PVS/Inf(2024)10 and in the Strategic Plan itself.</p> <p><b>Suggestions:</b></p>

- |  |  |
|--|--|
|  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- Secretariat and Chair to advise on best methods/timing for sharing materials with the Reporting Working Group, and ensuring coordination of related work between that Group and the Strategic Plan WG.</li><li>- Discuss the UK suggestion regarding Party capacity assessments.</li></ul> |
|--|--|

Suggestions on the way forward for the anticipated “Monitoring & Evaluation Guide”	Consultant comments
<p><b>UK:</b> It is essential that a Monitoring and Evaluation guide is produced for parties to accurately and effectively produce and report on these indicators. We would suggest a template is created on the layout of the guide, which includes the information that is required for reporting each indicator (data availability, methodology, disaggregation options etc). Depending on which indicators are adopted, information is currently available for Headline Indicators of the GBF which can be used to start to populate this guide. For indicators that are specific to the Bern Convention, a methodology should be defined and then reviewed by the Working Group of the Strategic Plan to ensure that all parties have capacity and data availability to implement these indicators.</p> <p><b>FRANCE:</b> We don’t see clearly the added value of this guide.</p> <p><b>MONACO:</b> A guide would be welcome because it seems difficult to implement all the objectives listed without having precise orientations and perhaps operational examples.</p> <p><b>EUROPARC:</b> It would be good to see what progress there is for the GBF Monitoring Framework and also how indicators are being developed for the EU Biodiversity Strategy. There is a lot of information available on that in here <a href="https://europa.eu/europa/en/biodiversity/strategy/monitoring">EU Biodiversity Strategy Dashboard (europa.eu)</a>. Also it is possible to see that some indicators are still being developed for EU BD Strategy so synergies with that process and that of the GBF are very important in order to keep the monitoring burden not too heavy for the Contracting Parties.</p>	<p>It would seem that there is some difference of view (France v others) about the value of the Guide. (Note that the Guide is already mentioned in the text of the Strategic Plan). Capacity and resources for its production have not yet been identified, but in the meantime it should be possible, following the UK’s suggestion, to construct an initial outline in the form of a proposed contents list, and to seek agreement on this.</p> <p><b>Suggestion:</b> - Develop a suggested outline/ contents list for the anticipated Monitoring &amp; Evaluation Guide.</p>

Any other comments?
<p><b>FRANCE:</b> The level of complexity and ambition of the indicators is very heterogeneous indeed, and may give the impression of an unbalanced approach to the goals. We need to ensure a balanced approach in the human and financial resources dedicated to these indicators.</p> <p><b>MONACO:</b> Thank you for this work and for the documents provided.</p> <p><b>EUROPARC:</b> There is urgency in implementing biodiversity actions and so it would be prudent to use resources for that and try to have as much synergies in all reporting processes so that not all resources are used for reporting. Monitoring is very important as is reporting but resources are urgently needed for implementation as much as possible.</p>

[END]