

Intervention from Norway-, post 2020 SBSTTA February 17th

Thank you Madame chair,

We need to create a strong, future proof implementation structure for the post 2020 framework, that is ready to be rolled out when the new goals and targets are adopted. Developing a robust scientific monitoring framework in parallel with negotiation of the GBF is key in that regard.

We welcome the discussion on the draft monitoring framework at SBSTTA-24, and the work undertaken by the secretariat. However, we underline that considerable work remains before the monitoring framework can serve its purpose of effectively tracking implementation.

Firstly, SBSTTA has a mandate from COP, OEWG1 and 2 to provide technical and scientific advice on indicators to the GBF. Therefore, contact groups should be established at the formal meeting of SBSTTA to allow for thorough discussions among parties.

Secondly, we welcome the request to have the Executive Secretary update the monitoring framework based on input from SBSTTA and to make it available for OEWG-3. It is crucial that every element of the GBF is considered when we convene at the final Open Ended Working Group.

Thirdly, we also expect further work on the monitoring framework to be done by the Secretariat after OEWG-3, refining it into a harmonized final draft before COP 15.

Regarding the suggested monitoring framework;

We see merit in the suggested three-tiered structure, and we especially like the idea of having a limited set of headline indicators as part of reporting requirements in national reports. This may increase the feasibility of having coordinated reporting streams from parties, as it would both help target their reporting efforts and reduce the strain on their national implementation capacity, acknowledging the varying levels of reporting capabilities among Parties.

The headline indicators will however only provide a partial and limited coverage of the elements that make up the goals and targets of the GBF. It is very unclear to us how we plan to use the levels of component and complementary indicators. Both of these levels contain indicators important to get the full picture of implementation, these levels should not get neglected.

Lastly, the selection criteria do not answer the question of whether or not the indicators are relevant for the targets they are supposed to measure progress against. We need to make sure that the indicators reflect the targets adequately as we move forward.

We welcome the opportunity to exchange ideas during the informal sessions of SBSTTA, and believe our discussions over the coming days will provide valid input to Conference room papers that will be published during the formal meeting of SBSTTA.