



Strasbourg, 28 June 2022

T-PVS(2022)10

CONVENTION ON THE CONSERVATION OF EUROPEAN WILDLIFE
AND NATURAL HABITATS

Standing Committee

42nd meeting
Strasbourg, 28 November - 2 December 2022

WORKING GROUP
ON DEVELOPING A VISION AND STRATEGIC PLAN
FOR THE BERN CONVENTION FOR THE PERIOD TO 2030

5th meeting (*online*)
Friday, 3rd June 2022, 9:30am – 4:00pm (CEST)

-MEETING REPORT-

Document prepared by
the Secretariat of the Bern Convention

1. Opening of the meeting

The Secretariat of the Bern Convention welcomed the participants to the meeting. Those participants who were new to the Working Group introduced themselves.

2. Appointment of the Chair

The Secretariat of the Bern Convention explained that the Chair of the Working Group, Mr Simon Mackown, had had to step down from his position due to other work commitments, but that another member, Mr Jan Plesnik (Czech Republic) had announced his availability to be a candidate. The Working Group expressed its thanks to Mr Mackown for his commitment and dedication to the Group, noting that he would remain a member. Mr Plesnik was thus appointed as the new Chair of the Working Group.

3. Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted with no changes.

4. Strategic Plan: recap on the results of the consultations on the targets

The Chair recalled the process to date, and that, following the 4th meeting of the Working Group, February 2022, and follow-up online consultations during March 2022, 11 targets had been provisionally agreed upon with the understanding that they may need to be refined following discussions on the indicators. A first draft document of possible indicators had then been developed and shared with the members of the Working Group for their feedback, with the aim of today's meeting being to discuss these and establish the Group's preferred way forward.

5. Strategic Plan: presentation of the results of the consultation and discussion focusing on indicators

The Chair thanked the Consultant, Mr Dave Pritchard, and the Bern Convention Secretariat for the work done so far. The Chair also thanked the Contracting Parties and Observers for the comments made on the draft indicators (a compilation of which can be found under Appendix III).

The Chair presented some key principles which should be followed when developing the indicators, and asked members not to take up the limited time available with discussion of minute details on every aspect. The intention of the Working Group should be to identify indicators based, as far as possible, on already existing indicators of the CBD, EU, EEA and other relevant institutions and processes.

The Working Group discussed the draft indicators proposed and comments which had been made, taking into account both their importance and their feasibility in practice:

On **Target 1.1**, there were questions regarding the references to ecosystem type, and potential confusion with habitats. It was suggested to use different sub-indicators for ecosystems and habitat types (as many countries are still working on their inventory of EUNIS habitats). The Chair suggested monitoring both habitats and ecosystem types at first, and a separation later when the indicators are more elaborated. It was also recalled that the overall aim of the Bern Convention is to have good coverage in both area and quality of the habitats/ecosystems, and a proposal was made on monitoring only those habitats that are sufficient in quality, as focusing on area might hide insufficient quality. One member shared their experience in terms of habitat monitoring and identifying protection priorities. The indicators were retained with the possibility of refining them in the future. "Ecosystems restored" was changed to "Ecosystems under restoration".

The members' comments on **1.2** were read out, and no adjustments made.

On **1.3**, one member highlighted the necessity, specificity and measurability of the target but questioned how far the indicator corresponds to the target. The Secretariat pointed towards an indicator that takes into account the overlap between Emerald Network and Natura 2000 sites, showing that

necessary data exists, but that it needs to be integrated into the work of the Convention. The Consultant stated that the wording of the indicator follows the thinking of the CBD's Global Biodiversity Framework (GBF) process and aimed to lead away from the question of legal protection to embrace also other measures like agri-environment schemes. One member shared experiences from Switzerland which would support the indicator as it is, while suggesting that management regimes and their effectiveness need to be assessed, which could be done by only measuring effectively protected areas performance. The Secretariat acknowledged the necessity of such an indicator as well as the issue of ensuring good monitoring. The Consultant stated that multiple indicators to measure management effectiveness exist, but this is not in itself an objective of the target. The indicator was retained for now, but the feedback from the meeting would be considered.

On **1.4**, one member stated that using the conservation status for species and habitats from the reporting under Resolution No. 8 (2012) for this purpose was not suitable, as it concerns the conservation status nationally and not specific sites. The Secretariat stated that the conservation status is in fact partially looked at on the level of Emerald Network sites or Natura 2000 sites, however, the current level of this might not suffice. Another member suggested a further elaboration of "conservation status" in the methodology of the indicators. The indicator was kept, but future elaboration might be necessary.

On **1.5**, one member raised a concern, reflected in the written comments, that having an indicator based on time and numbers of case files might incentivise closing files too soon. The Chair ensured that this should not be the intention of this indicator. The Secretariat clarified the current wording and recalled the usual practice of the Standing Committee towards case-files. The indicators were retained, but with a general opinion that they would need to be further elaborated, and the wording of the target potentially modified.

On **2.1**, some members supported the draft but wondered if the many indicators would be burdensome. Reporting by species group might be suitable because Contracting Parties must report those to other institutions already. The Consultant stated that the aim of the indicators was to focus on a selection of priority species.

On **2.2**, it was proposed that, in order to save resources, looking at how accumulated anthropogenic pressures impact the environment might be preferable over impact at site level. The Secretariat suggested that reporting and monitoring could be integrated into future reporting under Resolution No. 8 (2012). It was suggested to use Resolution No. 8's indicator on level of threats to document whether the level of threat changes over time. The Secretariat suggested that Invasive Alien Species are part of the threats, but that this could be added in the future if regarded as both important and feasible. One member supported the idea of aligning with the GBF. Relying only on the reporting of Resolution No. 8 (2012) might, however, be weak and should be strengthened by other upcoming sources of information.

On **3.1**, the Chair suggested investigating how the Bern Convention could make a statement recognising progress on this subject and showing precisely what its link to the topic is. The Consultant agreed and suggested that this could be achieved by looking at the individual components referred to in the target and its indicators up. One member supported highlighting the value of the Bern Convention in regard to the topic and suggested linking the Bern Convention to other Conventions within the Council of Europe (Convention on Human Rights). The Secretariat suggested a link to the work of other organisations. The indicators were kept with a note that the linkage of the Convention to the target should be stressed more.

On **3.2**, one member highlighted the role of international trade in endangering flora and fauna. The Secretariat provided some clarification on the possible connections of the Strategic Plan to other legal instruments of the Council of Europe.

On **3.3**, some concerns were expressed that the concept of nature-based solutions (NbS) could support greenwashing and business as usual. The Chair suggested to make a very precise description of NbS in the glossary in order to make them agreeable and workable for the Bern Convention. The

Consultant noted that the United Nations Environment Assembly (UNEA-5) definition of NbS was helpful in this regard, in stating that they are required to provide biodiversity benefits.

On **4.1**, it was suggested to link the resourcing indicator not only to the Strategic Plan, but to the work of the Convention as a whole. The Consultant noted however that the agreed Goal 4 specifically concerns implementation of the Plan. The Secretariat updated the meeting participants on developments that have taken place regarding a Fund for the Bern Convention with the aim to increase both the voluntary contributions and the visibility of the donors.

6. Next steps

The Secretariat explained that, following the meeting, the Consultant would integrate relevant changes into the draft Strategic Plan and the next (7th) version would be circulated for comments of the Working Group over the summer, ahead of it being shared with the Bureau at its next meeting in mid-September. The Consultant also stressed the need to reintegrate the recent work on targets and indicators back into the Strategic Plan as a whole, in order to put these elements in their context, and he reminded members of the additional intention to work on a glossary. Finally, the draft Strategic Plan would be shared at the 42nd Standing Committee.

7. Any other business

There was no other business.

APPENDIX I - AGENDA OF THE MEETING

1.	OPENING OF THE MEETING	[Adopted Vision for the Bern Convention] [List of members of the WG]
2.	APPOINTMENT OF THE CHAIR	
3.	ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA	
4.	STRATEGIC PLAN: RECAP ON THE RESULTS OF THE CONSULTATIONS ON THE TARGETS	[Suggested Targets for Inclusion in the Strategic Plan] [6th draft Strategic Plan]
5.	STRATEGIC PLAN: PRESENTATION OF THE RESULTS OF THE CONSULTATION AND DISCUSSION FOCUSING ON INDICATORS	[Monitoring and evaluation of the Strategic Plan – potential indicators of progress towards the targets] [Compilation of comments to the draft indicators document (<i>to follow after consultation deadline</i>)]
6.	NEXT STEPS	[Roadmap 2022]
7.	ANY OTHER BUSINESS	

APPENDIX II - LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

Contracting Parties	Name and Function
Czech Republic	Mr Jan PLESNIK (Chair of the Working Group) Nature Conservation Agency of the Czech Republic Ms Eliška ROLFOVÁ Unit of International Conventions Department of Species Protection and Implementation of International Commitments, Ministry of the Environment Ms Lenka VANOVA Ms Sylva SCHACHERLOVÁ
Estonia	Ms Merike LINNAMÄGI Senior Officer Nature Conservation Department Ministry of the Environment
Georgia	Ms Salome Nozadze Third Category Senior Specialist Biodiversity and Forest Department Ministry of Environmental Protection and Agriculture
Norway	Mr Andreas SCHEI Senior Advisor Norwegian Environment Agency

Poland	Ms Ewa PISARCZYK Chief specialist Nature Management Department General Directorate for Environmental Protection
Slovenia	Ms Katja VRTOVEC Nature Conservation Division Ministry of the Environment and Spatial Planning
Sweden	Ms Linnea SUNDBLAD Senior technical advisor, biodiversity Swedish Environmental Protection Agency
Observers	Name and Function
EUROPARC Federation	Ms Carol RITCHIE Executive Director Germany
FACE European Federation for Hunting and Conservation	Ms Sabrina DIETZ Wildlife Policy Officer Belgium
Planta Europa	Ms Erika PENZESNE KONYA Vice-Chair France
Pro Natura - Friends of the Earth	Mr Friedrich WULF Head, International Biodiversity Policy Switzerland
Independent consultant	Name and Function
	Mr David E. PRITCHARD United Kingdom
Council of Europe Secretariat	Name and Function
	Ms Ursula STICKER Secretary of the Bern Convention Mr Marc HORY Bern Convention Project Manager Mr Eoghan KELLY Bern Convention Project Assistant Ms Roxane BRADACZEK Trainee

APPENDIX III – COMPILATION OF COMMENTS

COMMENTS ON THE POTENTIAL INDICATORS

Compiled from Working Group submissions received by the deadline on the document

“Monitoring and evaluation of the Strategic Plan – potential indicators of progress towards the targets”, May 2022

Target	Suggested indicator(s)	Comments
<p>1.1: Natural and semi-natural ecosystems are maintained and where possible restored or rehabilitated, leading to an overall increase in area, connectivity, integrity and resilience of the natural habitats referred to in the Convention.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Trends in extent and condition of selected ecosystem types. • Extent of degraded ecosystems successfully restored (by ecosystem type). 	<p>➤ The UK believes that measuring extent is one thing (and not always easy); measuring condition is much harder, and going to sub-types of habitats is likely to increase the noise in the system and make it more difficult to see the big picture. Defining terms will be essential (and is not simple). The UK would welcome clarity on when a habitat is considered to be restored (full restoration for some habitats may take decades or more). The UK is not convinced that each Party needs to report on the same habitats; classifications are an issue when one is dealing across the Continent as a whole. The reporting processes under Art 17/12 and Res 8 do not appear to be harmonised – that pre-judges the work of the ad-hoc WG on reporting. <i>[UK]</i>.</p> <p>➤ Ideally, this would be measured by measuring the mapped expanse/area of natural intact/integer ecosystems over time. Some countries already have such a comprehensive mapping of ecosystems. Connectivity could be measured separately. Pro Natura agrees with these indicators. In order to align with reporting towards the CBD targets, it would be good to have a number that includes all criteria - area and quality - in itself, because having only an area % without telling us if the quality is sufficient will only be useful to a limited extent. Pro Natura agrees with the methodology adopted in Resolution 2012 (8) and Document T-PVS/PA 2017 (9) as well as making use of the EU ART.17 HD reporting. <i>[Pro Natura, supported by Bankwatch, who added reference to Art.12 of the Birds Directive]</i>.</p>

		<p>➤ They can be reported as complementary reports, publications or case studies of certain ecosystem types. <i>[Planta Europa]</i>.</p> <p><i>[Comment on who would be responsible for operating the indicator]:</i></p> <p>➤ Not sure what this means. Parties should be providing data but it is for sec/contractor to operate/complete report on indicators. <i>[UK]</i>.</p> <p><i>[Comment on who would be responsible for operating the indicator]:</i></p> <p>➤ As we understand the data for EU countries will come from Nature directives reporting. If the data is available then maybe the Secretariat can operate the indicator for all Parties? Then it could be: “For information provided under Resolution No. 8 (2012), national Bern Convention focal points, and the Convention’s data analysis advisers”. <i>[Poland]</i>.</p>
<p>1.2: Coverage of natural ecosystems by the Emerald Network meets the sufficiency targets set for 2030 in the post-2020 Work Plan for the Network.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Emerald Network Sufficiency Index. 	<p>➤ The UK would like to know how the sufficiency index is implemented in practice, but acknowledges this is a reasonable starting point. The UK has a concern re the lack of progress made on implementing the Emerald Network in some countries – the reasons for that need to be understood better, or the target is set-up to fail. <i>[UK]</i>.</p> <p>➤ Pro Natura fully agrees on using this indicator. <i>[Pro Natura, supported by Bankwatch]</i>.</p> <p><i>[Comment on the target]:</i></p> <p>➤ Check the representation of biogeographical regions of Emerald network sites: https://rm.coe.int/pa11e-2021-updated-list-officially-adopted-emerald-sites-final/1680a4be3d. There is only one Alpin-pannonian site from the Pannonian biogeographical region. We must give solution for that to make the areas more representative considering biogeographical regions in Europe. <i>[Planta Europa]</i>.</p>
<p>1.3: All sites included in the Emerald Network are subject to formal protection or other</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extent to which protected areas and other effective area-based conservation measures (OECMs) 	<p>➤ The UK questions whether there is an underpinning designation for all Emerald Network sites in each Party? The UK would seek further explanation of how this target will be measured, for example the ‘mean’ of the area for sites.</p>

<p>effective [conservation] measures.</p>	<p>cover Emerald Network sites.</p>	<p>PA management effectiveness needs further consideration. The UK is developing an index based on the OSPAR work which may be relevant. It is unclear why KBA coverage is relevant. <i>[UK]</i>.</p> <p>➤ While Pro Natura supports this indicator, it must be ensured that the area based conservation measures covering Emerald sites are effective and governed/ managed in an equitable way, respecting human rights and actively enabling effective participation. Only those areas where this is demonstrably the case should be reported in the indicator. <i>[Pro Natura, supported by Bankwatch]</i>.</p> <p><i>[Comment on related indicators currently proposed for Global Biodiversity Framework]:</i></p> <p>➤ Not SMART. Will be qualitative. CBD will be using this kind of language so will need retaining. Need to provide strong guidance so reports can be combined in a meaningful way. <i>[UK]</i>.</p>
<p>1.4: The species and habitats that are present on sites in the Emerald Network are being maintained at, or progressing towards, a satisfactory conservation status.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conservation status of species and habitats on Emerald Network sites. 	<p>➤ Measuring the condition of features or sites is complex, and needs considerable resources, so the UK would welcome further discussion. The UK has considerable experience in this area through the Common Standards Monitoring protocol. The level of disaggregation that may be requested could raise the bar in terms of resources required to produce the data as this could get very complex and resource intensive. <i>[UK]</i>.</p> <p>➤ Pro Natura agrees on this overall - however, we suggest to use the criteria contained in Resolution 8 (2012) and Document T-PVS/PA (2017) 9. <i>[Pro Natura, supported by Bankwatch]</i>.</p> <p><i>[Comment on the target]:</i></p> <p>➤ The UK believes that ‘satisfactory’ conservation status is not the same as ‘favourable’ conservation status. Parties may need to discuss the definitions and detail of what may be requested in the ad-hoc WG on reporting, and probably also in the Group of Experts on Protected Areas and Ecological Networks. The UK notes that this is not on the agendas of the meetings on 15 June. <i>[UK]</i>.</p> <p><i>[Comment on the target]:</i></p>

		<p>➤ It should be cleared if the target applies also to Natura 2000 sites (it is not clear because in the description there is a reference to EU legislation). <i>[Poland]</i>.</p> <p><i>[Comment on the target]:</i></p> <p>➤ Add after “Emerald Network” “and nationally protected areas of other biogeographical regions of Europe”. <i>[Planta Europa]</i>.</p>
<p>1.5: Specific recommendations arising from individual Case Files are followed up and acted upon; and cases are resolved and closed within timeframes set by the Standing Committee.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • [Indicator based on statistics concerning Case File recommendations (e.g. proportion implemented, partially implemented, not yet implemented)]. • [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>➤ It might be relevant to include the case files that were established already before 2022 to see the trends going backwards in time. If it is not too burdensome to report on. Ideally the data-base that has been proposed by the Secretariat in the parallel reflections on the operation of the Case File system, if this proposal is agreed upon at the next SC, could be designed to be able to produce the data for this indicator without requiring much additional effort from the Secretariat apart from compiling the information from the data-base. <i>[Sweden]</i>.</p> <p><i>[Comment on the narrative re previous discussions]:</i></p> <p>➤ Agree that a more suitable phrasing might be “within a reasonable timeframe”. Each case-file would then need to be evaluated on an individual basis with regards to what constitutes a reasonable timeframe. It would be valuable to both have an overall record of resolution/closure timeframes for Case Files, as well as of the individual status of implementation of each recommendation made by the Standing Committee of a certain case file. <i>[Sweden]</i>.</p> <p>➤ Who makes the judgements and how they will do this requires a very clear process and set of criteria. The UK suggests it may be better to agree the process on how the case file system will work in the future first before seeking to use any reform in the measurement of the Strategic plan. There is also a concern that expecting external advisors to operate the indicators could be very sensitive. <i>[UK]</i>.</p> <p>➤ The indicator could be as follows: “Proportion of implemented, partially implemented, not yet implemented Case Files in the timeframe set in the recommendation”. The indicator would comprise all the Case Files recommendations that should be implemented in the years when the Strategy is valid. <i>[Poland]</i>.</p> <p>➤ While we agree in principle on these suggestions, we are concerned that targets may be set to process a certain number of case files in a given timeframe, increasing the pressure in the</p>

		<p>standing committee to close files even if the recommendations have not fulfilled their purpose yet. It is parties who need to do their best to implement the recommendations, but there should be no case files that are closed only for statistics' sake. A solution for this might be that the complainants need flag their agreement for closing files, i.e. that only case files are regarded as fully implemented when the complainant agrees. <i>[Pro Natura]</i>.</p> <p>➤ We completely agree with ProNatura. There shouldn't be a pressure on the Standing Committee if the Member State hasn't fulfilled its obligations. <i>[Bankwatch]</i>.</p> <p><i>[Comment on the narrative]:</i></p> <p>➤ Pronatura agrees with the statement in the document that "Although the setting of timeframes by the Standing Committee would offer a more specific and measurable approach, doing so is not generally current practice, and for some cases it might be difficult to frame in an appropriate way". <i>[Pro Natura]</i>.</p> <p><i>[Comments on the target]:</i></p> <p>➤ Following Dave's analysis it is clear this target needs to be made more specific. I accept that it will be unclear in some cases whether recommendations have been followed up and acted upon. Resolution and closing of cases is more straightforward to measure. Perhaps just delete 'are followed up and acted upon'?</p> <p>The UK believes that this target should be reconsidered, given the problems with the case file system. It seems unrealistic for some of the long-standing cases, and could be a hostage to fortune if complainants don't agree with the closure of a case. <i>[UK]</i>.</p>
<p>2.1: Threatened species are at or are recovering towards a satisfactory conservation status.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conservation status of species, as reported under Resolution No. 8 (2012). • Red List Index for selected species in the Bern Convention area. • Living Planet Index for selected species in the Bern Convention area. 	<p>➤ The 'Red List Index for selected species in the Bern Convention area' would mostly correspond with the goal as it refers to 'threatened' species. <i>[Poland]</i>.</p> <p>➤ Which would be the basis for concluding on which "selected" species should be the focus in the three proposed indexes, would it be all that are "threatened" or appendices species? <i>[Sweden]</i>.</p> <p>➤ As the paper notes, there are issues with bias and timescales of update on all of the indicators suggested. And costs for updates of cuts of the international indicators. <i>[UK]</i>.</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wild Bird Index for selected species in the Bern Convention area. 	<p>➤ There is a gap between monitoring the plant species on the basis of EU Natura 2000 habitat directive and Emerald network. We suggest to use the status of the species listed in Appendix I. and a biennial report of their conservation status. So we should update Appendix I. and then see the Red List Index for these species. According to IUCN: The numbers of species appearing in each category of threat in The IUCN Red List change each time the Red List is updated. In order to monitor the status of biodiversity, it is important to reassess species periodically”. <i>[Planta Europa]</i>.</p> <p>➤ Pro Natura supports using the indicator system under Resolution 8(2012) and the reporting format contained in document T-PVS (2017) 9 in a comprehensive way, i.e. all species and habitats of the annexes to the Emerald network. <i>[Pro Natura, supported by Bankwatch]</i>.</p> <p><i>[Comment on who would be responsible for operating the indicator]:</i></p> <p>➤ Bern Convention list of plants: Planta Europa Network and Emerald Network. <i>[Planta Europa]</i>.</p> <p><i>[Comment on the narrative]:</i></p> <p>➤ ‘Least Concern’ is not counted to IUCN threatened categories. <i>[Poland]</i>.</p> <p><i>[Comments on the target]:</i></p> <p>➤ The UK feels this target overlaps with Target 1.4 and questions therefore whether it is required. The UK suggests that this target needs considerable discussion if it is to remain before concluding on the best way forward. <i>[UK]</i>.</p>
<p>2.2: Anthropogenic pressures impacting on wild species of fauna and flora are reduced as far as possible to levels that are not detrimental to the conservation of those species, through targeted measures enacted in legislation,</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Trends in frequency and intensity of key anthropogenic pressures impacting on wild species of fauna and flora, as reported under Resolution No. 8 (2012). 	<p>➤ The UK believes that care is needed on determining if legislation is sufficient already or if more is needed, and how that target would be measured – this is extremely complex and sensitive. The UK considers that the differences between pressures and threats is needed, together with clear definitions of when they should be regarded as applying. This will avoid a danger of site managers applying threats which are unlikely or low risk. <i>[UK]</i>.</p> <p>➤ This indicator could either be fulfilled by drawing on the assessments contained in the reporting under Resolution 8 (2012) related to specific habitats and species under the Bern</p>

<p>policy and/or management.</p>		<p>Convention. It could, however, also draw on the indicators of the GBF related to Goal A and B and targets 5-10 - such as the level of pollution of different substances or the % of total agricultural or forest areas that is used sustainably. These pressures have a negative impact on wild fauna and flora even if you do not look at specific linkages for individual species. <i>[Pro Natura, supported by Bankwatch]</i>.</p> <p><i>[Comment on the narrative]:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Pro Natura would also see draft GBF target 10 as pertinent for this target - ensuring all land use (agriculture, forestry, fishery) is sustainable. <i>[Pro Natura]</i>. <p><i>[Comment on the target]:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The UK would welcome more discussion on this target, including on how it should be interpreted. <i>[UK]</i>.
<p>3.1: A thriving natural environment benefits people’s livelihoods, food and water security, community resilience, well-being and quality of life.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Nature-based quality of life assessment (qualitative summary overview). • Trends in air quality. • Trends in water quality. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ As regards food security in the context of Bern Convention and in the European scale, the indicator could refer to the area of ecological agriculture. In Europe the problem of food security can be seen more from the perspective of access to healthy food and food that comes from biodiversity friendly agriculture. The indicators: well-being and quality of life in the context of Bern Convention could measure the area per capita of Natura 2000/Emerald sites. The protected areas are places where human can find rest and place of leisure activities and many other benefits that influence his well-being and quality of life. <i>[Poland]</i>. ➤ Will need clear guidance to ensure that information provided by Parties is comparable. The UK questions whether the indicator proposed is actually suitable. It appears to be more of an assessment? The UK would question how information from the different Parties will be integrated? <i>[UK]</i>. <p><i>[Comment on the narrative]:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The address should be: https://seea.un.org/ecosystem-accounting. <i>[Poland]</i>. <p><i>[Comment on the target]:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Measurement of this target is very challenging. The UK would welcome a simplified and SMARTer target. <i>[UK]</i>.

<p>3.2: Conservation and sustainable use of nature contributes positively to measures relating to human rights, democracy, landscape, cultural heritage and health, and to the prevention and mitigation of major hazards.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Single review assessment of the contribution made by the conservation and sustainable use of nature to other fields of action under the Council of Europe. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The UK recommends that the ad-hoc questionnaire avoids placing a large administrative burden on the Parties. <i>[UK]</i>. ➤ It is important to show the contribution made by conservation and sust use to other fields of action. Those mentioned in the explanation - human rights, democracy, landscape, cultural heritage, health, and the prevention and mitigation of major hazards -are of key importance and Pro Natura agrees on the limitation to these elements. However, it is important not only to show the contribution made, but that human rights and democracy are fully respected. The indicator should report if all human rights, especially land rights, are fully respected and real, effective participation for all has been comprehensively enacted when implementing the Emerald network, in line with target 21 of the draft GBF. <i>[Pro Natura, supported by Bankwatch]</i>. <p><i>[Comment on who would be responsible for operating the indicator]:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Fine. It does raise the question as to whether this is a target to be measured or a report to be commissioned to underpin vision/work plan. <i>[UK]</i>. <p><i>[Comment on the target]:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The UK believes the scope of this target to be too large and difficult to measure. We would welcome a simpler and SMARTer target. The UK has a concern that this is a target for Council of Europe not for the Bern Convention – with the scope being too broad? <i>[UK]</i>.
<p>3.3: Nature-based solutions and ecosystem-based approaches contribute widely to the mitigation of climate change and the adaptation to its effects.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of initiatives involving nature-based solutions or ecosystem-based approaches as reported in Nationally Determined Contributions under the UNFCCC. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The UK believes that the indicator may be difficult to compare across all Parties. The UK questions the relevance of this indicator to Bern. The UK questions what is the facet of climate change that is most relevant to Bern Convention? This may require more focused thought. <i>[UK]</i>. ➤ If this indicator is used, it is vital to ensure that the necessary safeguards are put in place, as mentioned in the UNEA 5 resolution No. 5 regarding NbS. This, in our view, requires to ensure that NbS are beneficial für biodiversity (and not only for climate: eg. no new plantations instead of forests) and additional to the implementation of ongoing obligations (no offsetting, address

		<p>drivers of biodiversity loss at source rather than patching them up. <i>[Pro Natura, supported by Bankwatch]</i>.</p>
<p>4.1: Sufficient resources and capacity, including scientific and technical cooperation, are available to achieve all the goals and targets in the Strategic Plan for the Bern Convention.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Resources and capacity available at international level for implementing the Strategic Plan, as assessed for each financial planning period by the Standing Committee. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The indicator currently suggested will be complex to assess. <i>[UK]</i>. ➤ Overall Pro Natura supports this indicator, but we would like to remind that currently funding by parties to the convention is not even sufficient to adequately finance ongoing activities and the work of the secretariat in the long term. Maybe this indicator could be enlarged to not only assess the funding for the strategic plan, but for the work of the Convention as a whole? <i>[Pro Natura, supported by Bankwatch]</i>. <i>[This also amounts to a comment on the target]</i>. <p><i>[Comment on the target]:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ The UK would welcome a reconsideration of this target to make it more focussed. The UK suggests splitting the target so: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - All contributions to the budget of the Bern Convention are provided in a timely fashion (covering both voluntary contributions and those coming from the Council of Europe) – which should be straightforward for the Secretariat to track. - Parties are engaged in Convention Processes – which could be measured by the number of Parties contributing to meetings of the Groups of Experts. <i>[UK]</i>.
<p>(Other comments):</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ General comment on all targets: we support the effort to try to base as much as possible the indicators on already reported data to resolution 8/art 17 in the Habitats directive for EUMS and other available data sources within the CoE, as well as the indicators of the post-2020 GBF Monitoring framework. <i>[Sweden]</i>. ➤ It would be good to see something setting out high level principles upfront namely (1) that indicators should be used to measure delivery of plan and NOT delivery by Parties. (2) that indicators should draw upon existing data/information to minimise burdens on parties. The UK welcomes the work undertaken and the thought that has gone into it. The UK recognises that whilst there is a need to make progress, given that the GBF is still being negotiated whilst the CoP is further delayed, consideration should be given to a delay in the finalisation of the product.

	<p>The UK believes that refinement of some of the targets is required, and therefore the indicators will need to be further adjusted too.</p> <p>In several of the targets there is a reliance on the outputs of the reporting under Resolution 8. An ad-hoc reporting working group was agreed at Standing Committee 41 (first meeting due afternoon of 15 June). The Resolution 8 reporting needs to be informed by the discussions under the Bern Convention Strategic plan, but given the technical and capacity issues which prompted the formation of the ad-hoc WG, it should not be assumed that the format of the reporting which is recommended by the WG after its deliberations will be the same as that which was trialled in 2019.</p> <p>The UK suggests that issues around what is in the Strategic Plan, and how targets might be measured, should be part of the work of the Group of Experts on Protected Areas and Ecological Networks and the ad-hoc WG on Reporting.</p> <p>The overarching UK view is that the targets and indicators will require a lot of data processing to include accessing data from external sources.</p> <p>The UK is concerned about the introduction of and definition of ‘satisfactory conservation status’ – particularly as observed Resolution 8 refers to favourable conservation status. <i>[UK]</i>.</p>
--	--