Thank you Mr. Chair

The Norwegian government is really pleased to see the development under IPBES, and we are looking forward to the IPBES plenary in December and the adoption of the IPBES work-programme.

We made some valuable decisions related to IPBES in Hyderabad, and these decisions are of course the basis for the outlining of further details on the linkages between the CBD and the IPBES. In our view it is 2 distinct directions we need to address in due time.

1. How the IPBES will contribute to reaching the objectives of the CBD, and
2. What should we in the CBD, including the CBD secretariat, do to ensure the best possible results in the implementation of the first work-programme of IPBES, as this work also will contribute substantially to the implementation of the Strategic Plan.

In addition capacity-building element relevant for IPBES would clearly also be relevant for the implementation of the strategic plan.

We agree with the SBSTTA document stating that the IPBES global biodiversity assessment will be, or must be, the authoritative biodiversity assessment for the society and all the IPBES clients. We also have to make sure that we are creating synergies and avoid duplication of efforts.

With regard to potential need for a continuation of the GBO-reports we would like to give some general comments, which we need to take into account. In our view it is of utmost importance that the IPBES-global-assessment is not policy prescriptive. The assessment must give the authoritative assessment and analyses which enables solid policy decisions in relevant fora, including in the CBD. The GBOs should not be policy prescriptive either.

We would assume that the SBSTTA would be the appropriate forum to draft recommendations and policy proposals based on the IPBES-report, and in particular it’s summary for policy makers.

We question the need for GBOs after no 4. Ideally they should not be needed, because the interests of biodiversity and the CBD will benefit from optimal use of one authoritative biodiversity assessment.

It might however be too early to take a decision on the need for future editions of GBO as the IPBES work programme only will be adopted in December.

We support the approach taken for objective 2 in the draft IPBES work-programme. We do positively notice objective 2c proposing a global assessment on biodiversity and ecosystem services, in line with the invitation made by COP. We notice however that use of information from national reports is omitted. We believe that the CBD secretariat will
as always prepare an analysis of the national reports, and that this info should be made available to the IPBES.

The important issue just now is to ensure good input from the CBD to the scoping processes for assessments relevant to the CBD to make sure that relevant synergies between CBD and IPBES are addressed from day one. This is in line with decision XI/2 para 28 requesting the ex-sec to collaborate with the IPBES where relevant.

Thank you
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