



ROYAL NORWEGIAN MINISTRY OF
CLIMATE AND ENVIRONMENT

Convention on Biological Diversity
413 St-Jacques Street West, Suite 800,
Montreal, Quebec H2Y 1N9

Your ref

Our ref

Date

17/311-39

15 April 2019

Post 2020 Global Biodiversity Framework - Submission by Norway

Dear Christiana Pasca Palmer,

Reference is made to the discussion paper CBD/POST2020/PREP/1/1, distributed 25 January 2019.

Norway greatly appreciated the discussion paper on the Post-2020 Global Diversity Framework, prepared with guidance from the Co-chairs of the Open-Ended Intersessional Working Group (OEWG). It provides a good overview of the submissions from the parties, and constitutes a fruitful structure for the discussion of central aspects of the new framework. We would also like to thank the secretariat and co-chairs of the OEWG for facilitating very useful and open-minded regional consultations.

In the following, Norway would like to provide comments on the contents of the post 2020 Global Biodiversity Framework.

1. Ecosystem based management and sustainable use

The Convention on Biological Diversity has three objectives; the conservation of biological diversity, the sustainable use of its components and the fair and equitable sharing of the benefits arising out of the utilization of genetic resources. Norway is largely content with the Aichi-targets. The deficiencies are largely due to lack of implementation. That said, there is a potential for an improved structure in the revised goal set. More attention should be given to help operationalize the concept of sustainable use in the Global Biodiversity Framework, given that most of biological diversity is found outside protected areas. While the designation of protected areas is

Postal address
Postboks 8013 Dep
0030 Oslo
postmottak@kld.dep.no

Office address
Kongens gate 20
www.kld.dep.no

Telephone
+47 22 24 90 90
Org. nr.
972 417 882

Department
Department for Nature
Management

Reference
Gaute Voigt-
Hanssen
+47 22 24 58 94

an important tool to conserve biodiversity in many areas, it cannot replace the need for good management of entire ecosystems.

Biodiversity has to be protected while at the same time fulfilling the sustainable development goals, inter alia sustainable development goal 7 on ensuring access to affordable, reliable, sustainable and modern energy for all and goal 8 on promoting sustained inclusive and sustainable economic growth and full and productive employment and decent work for all. This means we need holistic and ecosystem based management of 100% of all areas. A challenge for Norwegian management is that there are no concrete and cross-sectoral goals for the state of the ecosystems even though several Biodiversity relevant Acts have targets on sustainable management. Concrete and agreed cross-sectoral targets for the desired state of the ecosystems would create a better platform for weighing various societal goals against each other in practical nature management.

The need for an ecosystem approach to management of biological diversity cuts through both conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity and should be given ample consideration in the deliberations of the Post 2020 Global Biodiversity Framework. In this regard we would like to make reference to decision V/6 from COP 5 which contains the Malawi principles on the ecosystem approach. In particular we would like to refer to principle 10 which states that "the ecosystem approach should seek the appropriate balance between, and integration of, conservation and use of biological diversity".

We propose that emphasis is put on the need to describe the state of the ecosystem and development of clear cross-sectoral goals for the management of the ecosystems in a holistic manner in order to make headway in sustainable use management. This is also important to achieve the mainstreaming-agenda. Consideration should also be given to developing a methodology to measure the effect of concrete management measures of sustainable use on the ecosystem so that states can measure their performance.

Building bridges: Ecosystem-based Integrated Ocean Management as an example

While the designation of Marine Protected Areas is an important tool to conserve marine biodiversity in specific areas, it cannot replace the need for good management of entire large marine ecosystems. The discussion between sustainable use and marine protection is often polarized. In Norway, the need to both produce and to protect the ecosystem services the Oceans provide, is largely combined through an ecosystem-based Integrated Ocean Management approach.

The need for ecosystem-based Integrated Ocean Management is certainly not new. Ever since the 1992 UN Rio Conference on Environment and Development, it has

been a global acknowledgement that an integrated and ecosystem-based approach to ocean management is key for sustainable development. Based on the 1998 Malawi Principles, the Johannesburg Rio + 10 agreed in the Plan of Implementation to "Encourage the application by 2010 of the ecosystem approach", and to "Promote integrated, multidisciplinary and multisectoral coastal and ocean management". Recent Reports, in particular the OECD 2016 Report on Ocean Economy, calls for a strengthening of Integrated Ocean Management in order to reach the full potential in the Ocean Economy. Finally, according to Sustainable Development Goal 14.2 States shall by 2020, sustainably manage and protect marine and coastal ecosystems. The indicator for the implementation of Goal 14.2 is the proportion of national exclusive economic zones managed using ecosystem-based approaches. However, it is our impression little has been done to promote the ecosystem approach to management. The lack of good pilot models may be one of the main reasons.

There is no one-size fits all solution. Nevertheless, some principles applied in the Norwegian experience of developing Integrated Ocean Management Plans for each Large Marine Ecosystem within Norwegian jurisdiction may have relevance for other governments. Sharing of the best available knowledge is at the core of the Norwegian approach. In Norway, a cross-sectoral report is developed to present the current state of the marine environment and all ocean-based activities (including fisheries, shipping, offshore oil and gas) in the management plan area. All concerned public agencies and institutions take part this work. Areas of special importance for safeguarding ecosystem production and biodiversity, so-called valuable and vulnerable areas, are identified on the basis of criteria not very different from the EBSA-criteria. This report, together with a public hearing, provides the knowledge base for the Management Plan. The management plan is presented as a white paper to the Parliament.

Thus, the overall ocean policy framework laid down in the Management Plan is anchored at the highest political level. The Norwegian Ministry of Climate and Environment is responsible for coordinating the process. The sectorial Ministries maintain responsibility for implementing the measures laid down in the Management Plan by regulating activities of the ocean industries on the basis of the legislation governing the different sectors. The Management Plans are updated every fourth year. In Norway, the Integrated Management Plans cover the areas beyond the baseline. Near-shore coastal waters and the fjords are covered by a separate system for integrated coastal zone management.

Using this as an example, Norway will suggest to strengthen the focus on the need for the integrated management of ecosystems in the development of the "Post 2020 framework" and propose to condense the essential contents of the Malawi principles.

Norway will also emphasize the importance of identifying and including important areas for biodiversity and biological production in marine spatial planning. This is an important element in implementing ecosystem based integrated ocean management.

2. A tailored implementation mechanism in the Post 2020 Global Biodiversity Framework

- National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans (NBSAPs) could be communicated and updated at least every 5 years as is the case for the Paris agreement NDCs
- Updated NBSAPs could progress in the level of ambition/content so to spur Parties into action.
- The NBSAPs and reports could be published in the CBD Clearing House, accompanied by information which facilitates clarity, transparency and understanding. Basic guidance for such information in order enable more coherent NBSAPs (comparability, aggregation etc. could be developed and agreed by parties at COP 16.
- Parties can report on their progress, every two years under the Convention article 26. This will increase alignment and coordination.
- The reports should undergo a technical expert review.
- The voluntary review mechanism will be a part of the tool kit

Every 5 years there can be a Global stocktake overseen by the SBI to measure progress against the post 2020 Global Biodiversity Targets and the 2050 Vision. This stocktake should be based on scientific input from the IPBES as well as national reports, indicators and other sources. The outcome is to inform the next round of orchestrated NBSAPs. As with the Paris agreement there will be a need to develop a «Rule Book» on more specific technical guidance on how inter alia to measure individual and collective performance. The guidance have to be drafted by or overseen by the SBI/SBSTTA. To help guide the process an implementation committee should be established which could facilitate assistance to countries that need guidance based on signs in the biennial reports. The voluntary review system can be a tool available for parties to make their voluntary commitments.

There is also added value in bringing climate issues and biodiversity issues closer together.

- A robust and transparent Implementation mechanism will assist the parties in their effort to implement the post 2020 framework.
- We should make sure that parties can engage on this issue, and share views on how to best design an implementation mechanism. In our view we need a dedicated thematic discussion on this item, and that the outcome is brought back to discussions under the OEWG.
- We need to carefully consider what elements we can agree on before COP15. In our view, some elements will need to be developed after COP15.

- Preferably, agree on some principles and elements for the post 2020 implementation mechanism at COP15 in China.

3. Integration of Biosafety as a part of the Post 2020 Global Biodiversity Framework

In Norway's view biosafety should be integrated as part of the framework. We refer to our separate submission on this topic.

Yours sincerely

Torstein Lindstad
Deputy Director General

Gaute Voigt-Hanssen
Senior Adviser

This document is signed electronically and has therefore no handwritten signature