

THEME 7 : Global Indicators under Protect the planet - environment, climate change, and sustainable energy (goal 7. 12. 13,14, 15)

Oral Statement 27 October 2015

Thank you Co-chair for giving us this opportunity,

On behalf of the Stakeholders, we would like to address indicators related to Goals 7 (Energy), 12 (Sustainable Consumption and Production), 13 (Climate), 14 (Marine ecosystems”, 15 (terrestrial ecosystems)

Goal 7 -Sustainable Energy for all

We call upon you to make Target 7.1. more specific. It should take into account the varied needs of the poor, and ensure the quality of supply.

On 7.1.2 we applaud the improvement made yesterday to focus on clean fuels and technologies. We call on you to include the requirement that these fuels and technologies are “efficient” In this way it also aligns with the indicator being used by the UN Global Tracking Framework methodology of Sustainable Energy for All.

For 7.2 we call for inclusion of a guarantee that large scale renewable energy does not come at the cost of negative environmental and social impacts, including supplanting food production.

Goal 12 Sustainable Production and Consumption

12.6, we suggest to refine as follows: *“Percentage of the total top 100 companies per country that disclose sustainability information which would be instrumental to assess adoption of sustainable practices and impacts on the SDGs”*. This should be done possibly through credible, independently verified sustainability standards’ that will bring together environmental and social criteria, including human rights.

For 12.7 on public procurement, we align with governments to use a meaningful indicator, such as the UNEPs original proposal to measure actual implementation of sustainable public procurement policies, focusing on specific product groups.

Goal 13 - Climate Change

Regardless of the color coding, the incorrect omission of SIDS from Target 13.b must be immediately corrected as per multilaterally agreed 2030 Agenda, and reflected in any Target 13.b.1 agreed by IAEG-SDG.

13.b Promote mechanisms for raising capacity for effective climate change-related planning and management in least-developed countries including focusing on women, youth and local and marginalized communities.

Reference UN A/RES/70/1 dated 21 October 2015

Which reads 13.b Promote mechanisms for raising capacity for effective climate change-related planning and management in least-developed countries **and small island developing states**, focusing on women, youth and local and marginalized communities.

For 13 a.1, we propose as follows, “Mobilized amount of new and additional funding of USD per year to the GCF from developed country Parties”. This is required to track progress toward minimum agreed USD 100 billion commitment by 2020, to operationalize GCF, and to delineate new and additional climate change finance ‘to address the needs of developing countries’ as per SDG Target 13.a.

Overall, SDG 13 indicators must consistently **reference all areas of climate change and DRR including mitigation, adaptation, loss and damage, technology, capacity building, finance and means of implementation.**

Goal 14 - Marine ecology

For sustainable fisheries practices, target 14.4, we propose to follow UNEPs proposal to sharpen the measurements to include the indicator developed by the Biodiversity Indicators Partnership based on certification (BIP), which is also currently in use to measure the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) Aichi Biodiversity target 6.

Goal 15 : Terrestrial ecosystems

A fundamental concern we have with 15.1. is the definition of “forests” – the definition needs to be revisited, as FAOs definition is way too broad and insufficient, as “Forests’ alone doesn’t tell us anything about forest biodiversity and sustainable use. Without this precision, expansion of plantations could legitimize deterioration of terrestrial ecosystems.

Suggestion for 15.1.1, Forest area as a percentage of total land area *should be disaggregated into “primary, secondary forests, plantations”*

15.2. Sustainable Forest Management is a complex but very important objective, which has environmental, social and economic dimensions. It needs to be part of the indicators, but with the commitment to improve the concept in the coming years. We call for ensuring customary rights of indigenous peoples and forest communities as part of the definition. Furthermore, we support those that have proposed to include forest certification as one specific element of this indicator. Forest certification is globally applied and well documented at national level.

We are not in favour of replacing sustainable forest management with “carbon stock in biomass”, which would cover only one aspect.

15.3 Trends in land degradation

We recommend further considering to include an analysis of the root cause of trends in land degradation, such as land grabs for industrial bioenergy production, industrial agriculture, and the livestock industry.

15.4 Coverage of Protected Area

We would like to suggest adding indicator on coverage of protected areas, adding, “other effectively and equitably conserved territories and areas’.

Target 15c.2 refers to “increasing the capacity of local communities to pursue sustainable livelihood opportunities” but the indicator does not measure it. We support a proposal made by UNEP earlier this year to monitor the *“Existence of policies that protect and enhance sustainable practices by women and men pastoralists, farmers, fishers, forest dwellers on common lands, including mobility”*.

We will make a written version available with more explanations.

Thank you

WRITTEN STATEMENT SUPPORTING OUR ORAL CONTRIBUTION

Explanation Stakeholder contributions to discussions on indicators related to Goals 7 (Energy), 12 (Sustainable Consumption and Production), 13 (Climate), 14 (Marine ecosystems), 15 (terrestrial ecosystems)

We have comments related to Goals 7 (Energy), 12 (Sustainable Consumption and Production), 13 (Climate), 14 (Marine ecosystems) and 15 (Terrestrial ecosystems).

This statement does not replace the contributions made by civil society in the recent consultation, compiled by the Secretariat in “Detailed inputs from civil society, academia, and private sector” published early October. The comments below support the oral statement made on the 27th October about indicators related to the before mentioned goals.

In general, we call for indicators that not only measure but have impact on government action.

Goal 7 on Energy

Target 7.1 by 2030, ensure universal access to affordable, reliable and modern energy service

We call upon you to improve the two indicators on target 7.1, and make use of the “Sustainable Energy For All” Global Tracking Framework (GTF) led by UN and Worldbank.

Energy access (Indicator 7.1.1): We call upon you to make Target 7.1 more specific. It should take into account the varied needs of the poor, and ensure the quality of supply. This would read as “Percentage of population with electricity access of at least Tier 3 of the Global Tracking Framework”, which would align the indicator with the UN GTF methodology. *Tier 3 includes medium power peak capacity, duration and reliability, as well as positive quality affordability, legality and health and safety*

Reliance on non-solid fuels (indicator 7.1.2.): We call upon you to replace this with “*Percentage of households primarily using clean and efficient cooking fuels and technologies*”. This indicator better captures the spectrum of household energy solutions than the current proposal as it measures not only the cooking fuel, but also the cooking technologies. This is important, given that many households, particularly in Sub-Saharan African and South Asia, will continue to use solid-fuels for cooking but with more efficient technologies can realize environmental and socio-economic benefits. The indicator we propose also measures “use” and cooking energy by household, not by population, since people access cooking energy at the household level. The data for this indicator can be drawn from The Sustainable Energy for All Global Tracking Framework.

Renewable Energy production (7.2.1.) In the consultations, the Stockholm Environment Institute rightfully pointed at the need of this indicator to include consideration of wider environmental impacts of renewable production (e.g. for hydro), and/or conflicts with agricultural systems (in the context of biomass) production (e.g. for hydro), and/or conflicts with agricultural systems (in the context of biomass). We support this concern and call for specification of the chosen indicator in the following way:
“Renewable energy share in the total final energy consumption (%) produced WITHOUT NEGATIVE IMPACTS IN ENVIRONMENTAL AND/OR SOCIAL TERMS, INCLUDING SUPPLANTING FOOD PRODUCTION AND THREATS TO LOCAL COMMUNITIES”

Goal 12 on Sustainable Production and Consumption

We call upon you to revisit in particular indicators 12.6.1.and 12.7.1.

Sustainable practices and reporting large and transnational companies (Indicator 12.6.1.): In response in particular to comments made by Ecuador and Germany, as well as stakeholders, we propose to refine the indicator it as follows: *“Percentage of the total top 100 companies per country that disclose sustainability information which would be instrumental to assess adoption of sustainable practices and impacts on the SDGs”*. Rather than focusing in the existence of plans and policies, we need indicators that measure real performance. In addition, to measure impact of company’s behavior, we propose to use the indicator produced by UNEP in May[1] to become 12.6.2. *“Market share of goods and services certified by independently verified sustainability labelling schemes”* whereby we insist to focus on such schemes that indeed bring together environmental and social criteria, including human rights.

Sustainable public procurement practices (Indicator 12.7.1.) : As stressed by Denmark, Germany, the World Bank, and the Fair Trade Advocacy Office, the currently suggested indicator *‘Number of countries implementing Sustainable Public Procurement policies and action plans’* is not clear on how it can or would measure implementation. It will only capture the adoption of political commitments rather than actual increases or decreases in sustainable public procurement: it is still not a representative or accurate measurement. An indicator on the adoption of action plans or policies could be included but this should be a secondary, complementary indicator, with a clear delineation of what such policies should cover.

In line with comments from governments, we instead propose to use the 2nd proposal made earlier this year by UNEP: *“% of Sustainable Public Procurement in total public procurement for a set of prioritized product groups”*. Any government with a sustainable public procurement policy should have its tools to measure impact so that such data can be compiled for all countries where sustainable procurement policies are being put in practice.

Goal 13 on Climate Change

Regardless of the color coding, the incorrect omission of SIDS from Target 13.b must be immediately corrected as per multilaterally agreed 2030 Agenda, and reflected in any Target 13.b.1 agreed by IAEG-SDG.

13.b Promote mechanisms for raising capacity for effective climate change-related planning and management in least-developed countries including focusing on women, youth and local and marginalized communities.

Reference UN A/RES/70/1 dated 21 October 2015

Which reads 13.b Promote mechanisms for raising capacity for effective climate change-related planning and management in least-developed countries and small island developing states, focusing on women, youth and local and marginalized communities.

Climate change affects every aspect of sustainable development, and if indicators are to accurately measure sustainable development advancement, then we must consider climate change under goal 13, but also across goals 5, 7, 9, and all SDGs. Further, We strongly reiterate that for coherence, SDG 13 indicators must consistently **reference all areas of climate change and DRR including mitigation, adaptation, loss and damage, technology, capacity building, finance and means of implementation.**

Affected people (13.1.1): we agree with this indicator, provided already-stated overall input on human rights and gender-differentiated statistics and indicators underpin such data, and attention to monitoring inequalities within States including inter alia, age, sex, gender, sexual orientation and gender identity and expression, geography, income, disability, race, ethnicity, indigeneity and other factors as relevant to monitoring inequalities.

However, we do not agree with the suggestion to measure per 100,000 people. Several atoll, frontline climate affected and small island states have populations smaller than 100,000 total population, so if used, the magnitude of impact in all contexts, large and small, will not be accurately reflected.

Also we call for additional socio-economic indicators to show wider climate change impact on already fragile economies such as LDCs, Atoll frontline Climate affected states, SIDS, LLDCs, Africa, Middle income countries, Conflict affected countries, etc. As raised in overall Agenda 2030 negotiations, any economic indicators have specific and limited value, and their usefulness is in showing multiple dimensions of national climate change related socio-economic and environmental impact of climate change related disasters, and take into account existent loss and damage, and levels of resilience.

Disaster risk reduction development strategies (13.2.1): As proposed by a large group of civil society organisations[2] we call upon you to adjust this indicators into: *“number of countries which have formally reviewed their nationally policies, strategies and planning in order to mainstream and indicate gender responsive climate change measures”*

As raised in the Stakeholder consultation, binary indicators cannot gauge progress in disaster reduction reduction (DDR) over the course of the next 20 years. A scoring rubric would therefore enable understanding of both the quantity and quality of DRR and climate change mitigation plans globally, through computation of a weighted score. This would help to gauge an increase in the number of global DRR plans, advancement of their content, and identify possible gaps and patterns.

On the basis of Centre for Human Rights and Climate Change Research & WEDO proposed language, in line with latest science on safest global mitigation target, and agreed national mitigation targets of over 100 countries of 1.5 degrees maximum rise above 1990 levels, including G77, LDCs and AOSIS group positions, we call to structure the scoring criteria of DRR and climate change plans in such an indicator as follows:

- 0.0 - no DRR or climate change plans draft or finalized
- .25 - DRR or climate change mitigation plans in draft state
- .50 - Both DRR and climate change mitigation plans in draft state
- .75- Both DRR and climate change mitigation plans formally reviewed and adopted
- 1.0 - Both DRR and climate change mitigation plans formally reviewed and adopted including a transparent and detailed deep decarbonization strategy, consistent with increase of maximum of 1.5°C rise above 1990 levels, or even below, of global carbon budget, and with GHG emission targets for 2020, 2030 and 2050.

Mobilised funding from developed countries towards the 100 billion USD

commitment (13.a.1): For 13 a.1, we propose as follows, “Mobilized amount of new and additional funding of USD per year to the GCF from developed country Parties”. This is required to track progress toward minimum agreed USD 100 billion commitment by 2020, in order to operationalise GCF. This indicator must delineate new and additional climate change finance ‘to address the needs of developing countries’ (SDG Target 13.a)

Specialized support to LDCs (13.b.1): We remind the IAEG that in the final negotiated and agreed SDGs in the 2030 Agenda, Small Island Development States is included in target 13.b.1. We call for correction of the omission in IAEG documents. With many SIDS being climate most affected States this has consequence for the proposed indicator. Additionally, the indicator should target amount of resources flowing to states rather than merely the number of states receiving support. Our proposal for 13.b.1: *“Amount USD per year in targeted support to SIDS and LDCs, for mechanisms for raising capacities for effective climate change related planning and management, including focusing on women, youth, local and marginalized communities.”* Such an indicator will provide better indication of status of funding and gaps, and facilitate policy response.

Goal 14 on Marine resources

Ending overfishing (14.4):

We propose to follow UNEPs proposal to include the indicator developed by the Biodiversity Indicators Partnership (BIP), based on the certification process of the Marine Stewardship Council, to measure increasing or decreasing threats to fish biodiversity. This BIP indicator is currently in use to measure the Aichi Biodiversity target 6 of the Biodiversity Convention (“by 2020 all fish and invertebrate stocks and aquatic plants are managed and harvested sustainably, legally and applying ecosystem based approaches”).

As summarized by the BIP: “The Marine Stewardship Council’s standard for sustainable fishing comprises three core principles that every fishery in the program must meet: (1) Health of the target fish stock; (2) Impact of the fishery on the environment; and (3) Effective management of the fishery. Therefore, an increase in the representative global tonnage by MSC certified fisheries indicates an increased commitment of fisheries management systems globally to attain sustainable practices.” See <http://www.bipindicators.net/certifiedfisheries>.

[1]See “List of Proposals” produced by the UNSD Secretariat in May.

[2] Organisations proposing in the Stakeholder Consultations included United Nations Foundation, Plan International, Girl Effect, CARE, International Women's Health Coalition, Girls Not Brides, World Association of Girl Guides and Girl Scouts, European Parliamentary Forum, International Center for Research on Women, Advocates for Youth, FHI360, Equality Now, Mercy Corps, Let Girls Lead, International Rescue Committee

Goal 15: Terrestrial Ecosystems

A fundamental concern we have with 15.1. is the definition of “forests” – the definition needs to be revisited, as FAO's definition is way too broad and insufficient, as “Forests’ alone doesn't tell us anything about forest biodiversity and sustainable use. We would like to support Germany's recommendation and further suggest for 15.1.1, to include, “Forest area as a percentage of total land area *should be disaggregated into “primary, secondary forests, plantations”*”

While we acknowledge forests playing a key role in biodiversity conservation, forest cover does not indicate conservation outcomes. The crux of the problem lies in the significant gaps regarding the forest definition, including FAO's faulty definition of forests that includes industrial tree plantations, rubber plantations, highly degraded forest, and clearcuts[1], all guised as “plantation forests[2].” If this is not explicitly defined, the expansion of 'forest cover'[3] could actually lead to the deterioration of terrestrial ecosystems whereby indigenous peoples land and territories are grabbed, exploited, cut and reforested in the guise of plantation forests.

We agree with Norway to have two separate indicators on deforestation and reforestation, but also afforestation should also be separated. We propose this to become part of the indicator(s) under 15.1.

As regards 15.2, we submit that Sustainable Forest Management is a complex but very important objective, which has environmental, social and economic dimensions. It needs to be part of the indicators, but with the commitment to improve the concept in the coming years. We call for ensuring customary rights of indigenous peoples and forest communities as part of the definition.

Furthermore, we support the proposals of Statistics Denmark, Federal Statistical Office of Germany, UNEP, IUCN, FSC, WWF and Stockholm Environment Institute to include forest certification in the indicator for sustainable forest management.

We do not agree with FAO's argument that certification does not need specific mentioning as its own system would already implicitly deal with this. Forest Certification is the most clear and universally applicable tool to promote and practice sustainable forest management. It mobilizes not only governments, but society as a whole, as lawmakers, producers, investors, consumers. It combines environmental, social and economic objectives. It is applied by public and private forest owners as well as by forest communities. Crucially, certification provides verification of the actual implementation of sustainable forest management plans.

While forest certification is based on multi-stakeholder non-governmental initiatives, it is de facto recognized by many governments (in most cases in their public procurement policies or by using certification for state-owned forests). Relevant international agencies

and bodies, such as ITTO, CBD, UNEP, UNECE, when analyzing progress with sustainable forest management, use forest certification as their main indicator.

Introducing forest certification as an indicator for sustainable forest management does not oblige governments to see this as the main tool, but encourages them to consider the effectiveness in their specific situation and possible political support.

In terms of data collection, reliable and publicly accessible databases exist, on a country by country basis. The Biodiversity Indicators Partnership, mandated by the Convention for Biological Diversity is validating and publishing these data on a regular basis. <http://www.bipindicators.net/forestcertification>.

When addressing SFM, it would be important that the concept will not be applied to primary forests. This is what is happening in a few places, such as Tasmania; logging a primary forest is not sustainable even if it is reforested, as it will be a different, less complex ecosystem.

With regards to Colombia and UNSSO's two alternate position, we recommend revisiting the definition of 'net' forest emission and bring it to a realistic dimension given that the whole concept of 'offsets' is based on a false assumption that CO2 emissions from deforestation can be compensated with plantations and other harmful technologies. To avoid covering up conversion of natural forests into plantation, forest emissions should be measured separately for primary forest, natural forest and planted forests. Criteria for SFM should be specified, in line with country obligations under human rights treaties and Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD). It must be rights based, meaning the rights of indigenous peoples and forest communities to land, culture and participation is not only respected but ensured.

We are not in favour of the second alternative of replacing sustainable forest management with "carbon stock in biomass", which would cover only one aspect.

15.3 Trends in land degradation

We recommend further considering to include an analysis of the root cause of trends in land degradation, such as land grabs for industrial bioenergy production, industrial agriculture, and the livestock industry. For a culture and livelihood so intrinsically connected with the land, it is essential to value patterns of interaction between ecological and social variables across time and space.

15.4 Coverage of Protected Area

We would like to suggest adding indicator on coverage of protected areas, adding, "other effectively and equitably conserved territories and areas" including, Indigenous and Local communities territories and areas (ICCAs). We encourage you to recognize such examples of existing different governance structures and provide legal recognition and protection to the collective land tenure rights of indigenous peoples and local communities, including women.

We cannot only count on IUCN categories I-IV. In many European countries, the vast majority of protected areas falls under IUCN categories V and VI, which are more tourist areas than really protected. If these were counted, half of Germany would be protected – as opposed to roughly 17% in reality. In Switzerland, if you counted Nature parks and Biosphere reserves, you would quadruple the extent of protected areas.

15.5 We agree with the Red List Index, but what about habitats? They are not accounted for in any way.

15.6.: Implementation of the Nagoya Protocol. We welcome and agree with India. However, ratification alone is not enough, the indicator should reflect where the provisions of the protocol have been effectively been put in place.

15.8.1 we are in agreement with this indicator

15.9.1 we are in agreement with this indicator

15.1.1 we are in agreement with this indicator

15.b.1 we are in agreement with this indicator

15.c.1 we are in agreement with this indicator

15.c.2 We consider fundamental to include a specific indicator on the sustainable practices and management of local communities to match the ambition of the Targets, which explicitly mentions them as primary actors. We therefore fully support current indicator 15.c.2, and only suggest a slight revision in the formulation: *“Existence and quality of policies and regulations that legally protect and enhance sustainable practices and management by women and men pastoralists, farmers, and fishers, forest dwellers on common lands, including national and trans-national mobility”*.

This is essentially an output indicator, and therefore feasible, cost-effective and easy to use. Countries will be encouraged to enhance their legislation, track progress on their implementation, and share best practices in a constructive way. This indicator has strong inter-linkages across the Agenda, being one of the few that really links poverty with planet stewardship. This includes not just the recognition of indigenous peoples and local communities, but also ensure their full and effective participation in their pursuit of sustainable livelihoods. The data needs to be disaggregated data for indigenous peoples and for gender, age, disability and other social factors.

[1] A clearcut forest according to FAO, is a “temporary unstocked forest”.
<http://www.redd-monitor.org/2015/09/09/deforestation-denial-fao-claims-that-forest-loss-has-halved-while-global-forest-watch-raises-the-alarm-about-dramatic-forest-loss/>

Accessed 29 October 2015

[2] Food and Agriculture Organisation (FAO). (2010). *Key findings: newest information and knowledge about the worlds’s Global Forest Resources*.

[3] According to World Rainforest Movement, the definition that WRM and FAO uses are different. FAO uses a figure of 10% crown cover, whereas Global Forest Watch uses 30%. GFW measures whether trees are there or now, so a cleared plantation counts as forests loss in that year’s figures, unlike FAO that includes “clearcuts” as forests.