



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
17/311-

Date
18 December 2018

Views on the preparation, scope and content of the post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework

Dear Christiana Pasca Palmer,

Reference is made to notification SCBD/OES/DC/RH/KNM/87538.

The negotiation process

Norway supports a party-led, transparent, participatory and inclusive post 2020 process, in line with the decision from COP14 in Egypt. We believe ambitious biodiversity targets post 2020 are more likely with participation and mobilisation of various stakeholders, and that strong ownership will facilitate the implementation of the post 2020 framework.

We need to make good use of the time we have left before COP15 in China. Clear guidance early on is needed to facilitate complex negotiations that will guide us towards the adoption of a new global framework in Beijing. We are pleased that the negotiations to develop the post-2020 global biodiversity framework will be undertaken by a dedicated open-ended working group under the leadership of two co-chairs, appointed in Egypt. The notification on scope and content of the post 2020 Global Biodiversity Framework is an important first step for parties to provide substantial input, and we look forward to examining the discussion paper that will be made available in early 2019. However we stress the need for the OEWG to conduct their first meeting well in advance of SBSSTA 23 to further develop the discussion paper.

The post 2020 targets

The post 2020 framework should strengthen the implementation of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) and its Protocols, and be in line with Agenda 2030 and the SDGs. The new framework should build on the current Aichi targets, and lessons learnt from our current strategic plan. However, we need to be innovative to bring about a significant change

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

of trajectory in the global biodiversity situation. To this end communication is key. A tiered system for the post 2020 targets can help us communicate the need for action in certain key areas, while also keeping in mind the complex interdependence of ecosystems and biodiversity for people and planet. We also see an untapped potential in communicating co-benefits from biodiversity. Recommendations from SBSTTA 22, included in annex of the vision 2050 decision from Egypt highlights that the biodiversity goals reflected in the 2050 Vision could be attained while also reaching broader socioeconomic objectives.

We believe the targets should be ambitious, action oriented, measurable and time-bound. It is also important that indicators and targets are developed in parallel to ensure that we know how to measure progress on the post 2020 targets. The new global diversity targets post 2020 should not be seen as end points in themselves but milestones in a longer term process. We believe the post 2020 process will benefit from having interim targets and milestones that are action-oriented guiding us towards the 2050 Vision.

Recommendations from SBSTTA, included in decision from COP14 in Egypt provides us with a positive message, demonstrating that there is a wide range of plausible pathways to achieve the 2050 Vision. The 2050-Vision will have a stronger motivational effect if we identify concrete tangible milestones that need to be taken in the short and medium term, such as 2030 and 2040 in pursuit of the long term goal.

Implementation and review of the post 2020 framework

Norway further stress the need for a stronger, more concerted and coordinated approach to guide the implementation of the Convention and to create transparency and oversight in the post 2020 framework. We need to make sure that the targets in post 2020 are revisited regularly, and kept under review. There should be steady progression in performance, and the process should be tailored to fit our new framework. The framework should allow progress to be tracked effectively.

Current system of implementation

Biological Diversity is a global asset of tremendous value to present and future generations. The Convention is a framework convention and puts obligations on states but these obligations are of a general character, for instance the duty in article 8 to establish a system of protected areas or areas where special measures need to be taken to conserve biological diversity. However this approach gives room and flexibility for parties to agree on political, non-binding measures and targets such as Aichi target 11. What binds these obligations of general character together is the duty in article 6 to develop national strategies, plans or programmes for the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity or adapt for this purpose existing strategies, plans or programmes which shall reflect, inter alia, the measures set out in this Convention relevant to the contracting Party concerned and integrate, as far as possible and as appropriate, the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity into relevant sectoral or cross-sectoral plans, programmes and policies.

The approach has served the Convention and the Parties well especially as a flexible approach where COP MOP has a mandate to make appropriate decisions. But the implementation of

the Aichi targets has been limited. This might partly be because the Convention and the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 has no clear structure to guide parties in their efforts. This is clearly a gap that needs to be filled. It is the view of the Norwegian Government that the New Post 2020 Global Biodiversity Framework would need to be more effective than the Aichi targets in spurring Parties into action.

In Norway's view there is a need for a more coordinated and concerted approach to guide the implementation of the Convention and to create guidance and oversight. A mechanism could improve Parties' individual and collective performance and would relate to the multidimensional review approach where voluntary peer review is an essential element. Several models are possible but have to be tailored to fit the Convention.

The Paris model

The "international guidance and oversight" model under the Paris Agreement in relation to Parties' nationally determined contributions (NDCs) consists of several aspects:

1. In order to meet the global goal/target, each party puts forward a nationally determined contribution which reflects its highest possible ambition. The content of NDCs is voluntary/not legally binding.
2. NDCs shall be accompanied by information which facilitates clarity, transparency and understanding. Parties agreed on basic guidance for such information in order enable more coherent NDCs (comparability, aggregation etc.)
3. NDCs are communicated in a public registry: Increases transparency.
4. NDCs shall be communicated every 5 years and progress in their level of ambition from the previous one. The requirements of repetitiveness of the processes and stepping up of ambition, ensures that the "climate issue" stays on the "political agenda" and that the Parties' actions increase in terms of environmental protection.
5. The Agreement further establishes a strong transparency framework: Parties have to report biennially on the progress made in implementing their NDC: this gives an indication of how well they are doing and which challenges they are facing – in order to address early signs of non-implementation. The progress reports undergo a technical expert review.
6. Every 5 years Parties will assess their collective progress towards the goal of the Agreement in a Global Stocktake. This Stocktake is based on scientific input from the IPCC as well from the individual reports by parties
7. The outcome of the Global Stocktake is to inform the next NDC.
8. There is a mechanism to facilitate implementation and promote compliance which aims at helping Parties to overcome implementation/compliance challenges.

A tailored implementation mechanism in the New Post 2020 Global framework

There is no need of reinventing the wheel. The National Biodiversity Plans (NBSAPs) should still be the central vehicle for Parties to make and bring forward their nationally determined voluntary biodiversity commitments see the Convention, article 6, and the National reports see the Convention article 26, should remain the main tool for parties to provide information on measures taken for the implementation of the Convention and the effectiveness of these measures.

But it is the view of the Norwegian Government that we need to take a close look at existing mechanisms in other multilateral environmental agreements and make an effort to update and improve the CBD implementation structure, building on lessons learnt from these experiences to better support the implementation of the new post 2020 framework.

We believe the new post 2020 framework has to be supported by a robust structure of international guidance and oversight to assist Parties in their endeavours. Parties need help to improve their individual and collective capacities to more effectively implement the Convention. The approach taken under the Paris Agreement could give some guidance and inspiration, not excluding other approaches. This should be studied more in detail. We need to ensure that the CBDs implementation mechanism is both appropriate and relevant, and provide guidance for parties in implementing the new global biodiversity targets. Under the Paris Agreement, Parties have the legal obligation to communicate nationally determined contributions (NDCs) –The duty in the CBD to develop national biological diversity strategy plans (NBDSPs) as contained in art. 6 of the CBD and to report on measures which parties have taken for the implementation of the provisions of the Convention and their effectiveness bare resemblance / corresponds to the NDC process under the Paris-agreement. We therefore suggest to have a look into a updated implementation structure building on existing CBD-mechanism, inspired by the Paris Agreement and other relevant mechanisms for implementation. If we use the Paris Agreement as a benchmark, an improved structure could have the following features:

- The new structure could revolve around the NBSAPS, a Global Stocktake and the New post 2020 Global Biodiversity Framework.
- 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 the added value of bringing climate issues and biodiversity issues closer together.

In any case: Particular attention should be paid to ensure consistency between the 2030 Agenda and the implementation mechanism for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework

Yours sincerely

Torstein Lindstad(by authorization)
Deputy Director General

Gaute Voigt-Hanssen
Senior Adviser

This document is signed electronically and has therefore no handwritten signature