

## IPBES consultation and capacity-building workshop

Bonn, Germany, 4-6 June 2018

Objective 3: consultation on the strategic framework for the future work programme of IPBES

## Compilation of input received regarding the strategic framework of the future IPBES work programme

In response to the call for input to the questionnaire sent on 26 April 2018, with a deadline of 23 May 2018 (EM/2018/07), the IPBES secretariat has received input from 18 governments, 7 organizations, and 4 individuals or groups of individuals. This document represents a compilation of these responses. A draft analysis of the input received is also made available to participants. The outcome of this consultation will contribute to the revision of the draft strategic framework up to 2030 requested by the Plenary in its decision IPBES-6/2.

Abbr.	Category	Name	File received
BE	GOV	Belgium	<a href="https://www.ipbes.net/sites/default/files/input_wp_2_gov_belgium.docx">https://www.ipbes.net/sites/default/files/input_wp_2_gov_belgium.docx</a>
CM	GOV	Cameroon	<a href="https://www.ipbes.net/sites/default/files/input_wp_2_gov_cameroon.docx">https://www.ipbes.net/sites/default/files/input_wp_2_gov_cameroon.docx</a>
CA	GOV	Canada	<a href="https://www.ipbes.net/sites/default/files/input_wp_2_gov_canada.docx">https://www.ipbes.net/sites/default/files/input_wp_2_gov_canada.docx</a>
CO	GOV	Colombia	<a href="https://www.ipbes.net/sites/default/files/input_wp_2_gov_colombia.docx">https://www.ipbes.net/sites/default/files/input_wp_2_gov_colombia.docx</a>
EC	GOV	European Commission	<a href="https://www.ipbes.net/sites/default/files/input_wp_2_gov_eu_1.docx">https://www.ipbes.net/sites/default/files/input_wp_2_gov_eu_1.docx</a> <a href="https://www.ipbes.net/sites/default/files/input_wp_2_gov_eu_2.docx">https://www.ipbes.net/sites/default/files/input_wp_2_gov_eu_2.docx</a>
FI	GOV	FINLAND	<a href="https://www.ipbes.net/sites/default/files/input_wp_2_gov_finland.docx">https://www.ipbes.net/sites/default/files/input_wp_2_gov_finland.docx</a>
FR	GOV	FRANCE	<a href="https://www.ipbes.net/sites/default/files/input_wp_2_gov_france.docx">https://www.ipbes.net/sites/default/files/input_wp_2_gov_france.docx</a>
DE	GOV	GERMANY	<a href="https://www.ipbes.net/sites/default/files/input_wp_2_gov_germany.docx">https://www.ipbes.net/sites/default/files/input_wp_2_gov_germany.docx</a>
GH	GOV	GHANA	<a href="https://www.ipbes.net/sites/default/files/input_wp_2_gov_ghana.docx">https://www.ipbes.net/sites/default/files/input_wp_2_gov_ghana.docx</a>
GN	GOV	GUINEA	<a href="https://www.ipbes.net/sites/default/files/input_wp_2_gov_guinea.docx">https://www.ipbes.net/sites/default/files/input_wp_2_gov_guinea.docx</a>
GW	GOV	GUINEA BISSAU	<a href="https://www.ipbes.net/sites/default/files/input_wp_2_gov_guinee-bissau.docx">https://www.ipbes.net/sites/default/files/input_wp_2_gov_guinee-bissau.docx</a>
JP	GOV	JAPAN	<a href="https://www.ipbes.net/sites/default/files/input_wp_2_gov_japan.docx">https://www.ipbes.net/sites/default/files/input_wp_2_gov_japan.docx</a>

## Compilation of input on strategic framework of next work programme

MX	GOV	MEXICO	<a href="https://www.ipbes.net/sites/default/files/input_wp_2_gov_mexico.docx">https://www.ipbes.net/sites/default/files/input_wp_2_gov_mexico.docx</a>
NL	GOV	NETHERLANDS	<a href="https://www.ipbes.net/sites/default/files/input_wp_2_gov_netherlands.docx">https://www.ipbes.net/sites/default/files/input_wp_2_gov_netherlands.docx</a>
ZA	GOV	SOUTH AFRICA	<a href="https://www.ipbes.net/sites/default/files/input_wp_2_gov_south_africa.docx">https://www.ipbes.net/sites/default/files/input_wp_2_gov_south_africa.docx</a>
TH	GOV	THAILAND	<a href="https://www.ipbes.net/sites/default/files/input_wp_2_gov_thailand.pdf">https://www.ipbes.net/sites/default/files/input_wp_2_gov_thailand.pdf</a>
US	GOV	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA	<a href="https://www.ipbes.net/sites/default/files/input_wp_2_gov_usa.docx">https://www.ipbes.net/sites/default/files/input_wp_2_gov_usa.docx</a>
VE	GOV	VENEZUELA	<a href="https://www.ipbes.net/sites/default/files/input_wp_2_gov_venezuela.pdf">https://www.ipbes.net/sites/default/files/input_wp_2_gov_venezuela.pdf</a>
CMS	ORG	CONVENTION ON MIGRATORY SPECIES	<a href="https://www.ipbes.net/sites/default/files/input_wp_2_org_cms.docx">https://www.ipbes.net/sites/default/files/input_wp_2_org_cms.docx</a>
DHI	ORG	DHI WATER & ENVIRONMENT	<a href="https://www.ipbes.net/sites/default/files/input_wp_2_org_dhi.pdf">https://www.ipbes.net/sites/default/files/input_wp_2_org_dhi.pdf</a>
UN	ORG	JOINT UNEP-UNESCO-UNDP	<a href="https://www.ipbes.net/sites/default/files/input_wp_2_org_unep_unesco_undp.docx">https://www.ipbes.net/sites/default/files/input_wp_2_org_unep_unesco_undp.docx</a>
WCMC	ORG	UNEP-WCMC	<a href="https://www.ipbes.net/sites/default/files/input_wp_2_org_unep-wcmc.docx">https://www.ipbes.net/sites/default/files/input_wp_2_org_unep-wcmc.docx</a>
UNU-IAS	ORG	UN UNIVERSITY - IAS	<a href="https://www.ipbes.net/sites/default/files/input_wp_2_org_unu-ias_isi.docx">https://www.ipbes.net/sites/default/files/input_wp_2_org_unu-ias_isi.docx</a>
WWF	ORG	WORLD WIDE FUND FOR NATURE	<a href="https://www.ipbes.net/sites/default/files/input_wp_2_org_wwf.pdf">https://www.ipbes.net/sites/default/files/input_wp_2_org_wwf.pdf</a>
ZALF	ORG	CENTRE FOR AGR. LANDSCAPE RESEARCH	<a href="https://www.ipbes.net/sites/default/files/input_wp_2_org_zalf.docx">https://www.ipbes.net/sites/default/files/input_wp_2_org_zalf.docx</a>
UFZ	ORG	HELMHOLTZ CENTRE FOR ENVIRONMENTAL RESEARCH	<a href="https://www.ipbes.net/sites/default/files/input_wp_2_org_ufz_general.pdf">https://www.ipbes.net/sites/default/files/input_wp_2_org_ufz_general.pdf</a> <a href="https://www.ipbes.net/sites/default/files/input_wp_2_org_ufz_pstm.docx">https://www.ipbes.net/sites/default/files/input_wp_2_org_ufz_pstm.docx</a>
IF	PER	IPBES FELLOWS	<a href="https://www.ipbes.net/sites/default/files/input_wp_2_per_ipbes-fellows.docx">https://www.ipbes.net/sites/default/files/input_wp_2_per_ipbes-fellows.docx</a>
KD	PER	KIRSTEN DAVIES	<a href="https://www.ipbes.net/sites/default/files/input_wp_2_per_kirsten-davies.docx">https://www.ipbes.net/sites/default/files/input_wp_2_per_kirsten-davies.docx</a>
DS	PER	DONALD SAWYER	<a href="https://www.ipbes.net/sites/default/files/input_wp_2_per_donald-sawyer.docx">https://www.ipbes.net/sites/default/files/input_wp_2_per_donald-sawyer.docx</a>
JB	PER	JOSE BRILHA	<a href="https://www.ipbes.net/sites/default/files/input_wp_2_per_jose-brilha.docx">https://www.ipbes.net/sites/default/files/input_wp_2_per_jose-brilha.docx</a>

Table of Contents

- 1 General comments..... 4**
- 2 How to further strengthen and better integrate the four functions of IPBES? ..... 7**
  - 2.1 How to improve processes, activities and deliverables that have been undertaken during the first work programme (for all four functions)? ..... 9**
  - 2.2 Is there a need for other types of processes, activities, and deliverables to strengthen these functions?... 11**
  - 2.3 How to strengthen the assessment function? ..... 13**
    - 2.3.1 Would it be a good idea to develop technical papers from the finalised assessments targeted at specific audiences? 15
    - 2.3.2 Should there be distinct fast track assessments to answer more short-term assessment needs? ..... 17
    - 2.3.3 Do you have other suggestions? ..... 18
  - 2.4 How to strengthen the policy support function? ..... 20**
    - 2.4.1 Would it be a good idea to undertake methodological assessments focusing on the effectiveness of various policy instruments and policy support tools, and afterwards to catalyse their further development (similar to what has been done for scenarios and models)? ..... 23
    - 2.4.2 Do you have other suggestions? ..... 25
  - 2.5 How to strengthen the capacity building function? ..... 27**
    - 2.5.1 Can you suggest activities not addressed by the current plan for capacity-building (Annex I to decision IPBES-5/1), to more systematically and effectively catalyse the building of capacity? ..... 27
    - 2.5.2 Do you have other suggestions? ..... 28
  - 2.6 How to strengthen the knowledge generation function? ..... 29**
    - 2.6.1 What further activities could IPBES undertake to more systematically and effectively identify knowledge needs and catalyse the generation of knowledge to address these needs? ..... 30
    - 2.6.2 Do you have other suggestions? ..... 31
  - 2.7 How to better integrate the four functions of IPBES? ..... 31**
    - 2.7.1 In what way could the 4 functions be conceptually more effectively integrated? ..... 31
    - 2.7.2 What institutional arrangements could help the further integration of the functions? ..... 33
  - 2.8 How to keep the work programme “rolling”? ..... 33**
    - 2.8.1 What processes are needed for allowing recurrent requests for deliverables to be received, considered and approved? ..... 33
- 3 How to further strengthen institutional arrangements established to implement the four functions? ..... 35**
  - 3.1 Plenary sessions: What sequence of Plenaries (at IPBES-6 an 18-month sequence emerged as a possibility) would seem optimal? ..... 35**
  - 3.2 Engagement of policy makers and practitioners: What mechanisms could be proposed to strengthen engagement of policy makers and practitioners (e.g. more informal/technical consultation workshops)? ..... 36**
  - 3.3 Expert groups and task forces ..... 38**
    - 3.3.1 What task forces are needed and how would they be constituted? ..... 38
    - 3.3.2 Do you have a suggestion on ways to do things differently, if necessary? ..... 41
  - 3.4 Indigenous and local knowledge (ILK) ..... 41**
    - 3.4.1 How could the work with ILK be further improved to implement the approach? ..... 41
    - 3.4.2 Do you have suggestions regarding the implementation of the participatory mechanism? ..... 42
  - 3.5 Engagement with partners ..... 43**
    - 3.5.1 How to further strengthen the engagement of relevant Multilateral environmental agreements and UN agencies? 43
    - 3.5.2 How to further strengthen and broaden the engagement of other types of partners? ..... 45
  - 3.6 Communication and outreach: How to further strengthen the IPBES communication and outreach? ..... 45**
  - 3.7 Mobilisation of resources for IPBES: Do you have a suggestion to make the allocation of resources to IPBES more sustainable? ..... 48**
- 4 Other issues not easily fitting into the ‘guiding questions’ ..... 49**
- 5 Suggestions regarding possible thematic topics ..... 50**

1 General comments

<p>EC</p>	<p><b>On functions of IPBES</b></p> <p>What regards the overall ambition of IPBES as science-policy platform, the policy support should be up-scaled in ambition and resource allocation. More interaction with users would be welcome. Currently, IPBES is focused towards the generation of assessments but should improve its policy function in order to increase its impact.</p> <p>Concerning the delivery of outputs of the 1st WP on the four functions of IPBES, it has been successful for assessments, whilst the delivery of its functions supporting policy formulation and implementation, catalysing efforts to generate new knowledge and building capacity are not fully developed yet. The four functions of IPBES should be better balanced in the next WP, to go beyond assessments and to fulfil all four functions of the Platform.</p> <p>We would ask to better integrate the four functions into all deliverables of IPBES, i.e. through the scoping of assessments, which could define how outputs linked to assessments should be used for capacity building, policy support, and knowledge generation.</p> <p><b>On structure of the work programme</b></p> <p>We support strategic planning up to 2030, in particular taking into account the needs of the international policy processes, such as the post-2020 Biodiversity Framework, the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, the Paris Agreement on Climate Change, the Sendai Framework for Disaster Reduction and the Habitat III Urban Agenda.</p> <p>The IPBES work programme needs to be flexible to some extent in order to take into account emerging science-policy needs e.g. of the biodiversity related conventions. Several calls for requests/inputs and suggestions should be organised – to allow for a ‘rolling’ Work Programme that addresses policy issues in a timely manner. This could include, for example, needs identified through assessments completed in the current work programme.</p> <p>Additional to the requested flexibility, the long-term framework of the IPBES work programme should allow research organizations, programmers and funding agencies to plan in a timely manner relevant supporting activities, particularly to pick up key knowledge gaps identified through the assessments that have been completed. This long-term structure should allow identifying upcoming deliverables about 4 years before they start, which gives research funders just enough time to support upcoming IPBES deliverables with calls delivering timely science results, and building up expertise.</p> <p>IPBES should take into account lessons learned from the First Work Programme including the workload of the Platform as well as the undertaking of the three pending assessments from 2018 until 2023. The number of assessments that are launched simultaneously and performed in parallel should be limited.</p> <p><b>On guidance towards contents:</b></p> <p>The currently implemented process of seeking input to the second work programme of IPBES might lead to a broad range of topics. To reduce the workload on stakeholders, governments, scientists and the organizing bodies of IPBES, a limitation on the number of assessments and a clear prioritization on topics that are essential for the post-2020 goals may be necessary.</p> <p>Processes within IPBES should make sure to avoid duplication of work of relevant MEAs and other international processes and make use of existing knowledge. Currently, as example, SBSTTA and IPBES share a common set of task and objectives. Care should be taken to avoid work overlap between the separate bodies and a duplication of efforts.</p> <p>Lessons learnt from the first work programme of IPBES, as well as priority research needs and knowledge gaps identified in assessments, policy tools and methodologies, capacity building and the IPBES-internal process, which has just started for catalysing the generation of new knowledge, should guide the identification of topics to be covered by the next work programme.</p> <p>We recommend a discussion how models and scenarios developed in the regional assessments and in the upcoming global assessment can be further developed.</p>
-----------	--

	<p>Lessons learnt from the outcomes and impact of the thematic, regional and global assessments should be considered before deciding on how another global assessment would handle regional dimensions. At the same time, we see merit in assessment reports cycles, such as those of the IPCC reports. Aside from 'traditional' global and methodological assessments, nexus assessments and other products might be developed. There seems to be a need for deliverables in size and ambition smaller than full assessments (which could be fast-track assessments).</p> <p>Knowledge generation in IPBES, derived from products such as assessments but also from policy support tools and capacity building, is still not much developed. A structured participatory process for knowledge generation, based on identified research gaps and knowledge needs, with defined results, and adequate resources, should be set up.</p>
<p>MX</p>	<p>The construction of a second program of work requires to consider the vision of IPBES for the following years and particularly, how we visualize IPBES in the short, medium and long term. It will also be crucial to assess the impacts of the 4 functions (in terms of which are operating correctly, and which require improvement), and use the experience and lessons learned from the first program of work.</p> <p>Some recommendations and identified needs, based on relevant experiences within the first program of work, include:</p> <p><b>Functions:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Analyze how the 4 functions and the conceptual framework have been covered and to what degree.</li> </ul> <p><b>1. Assessments:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Ensure scientific independence.</li> <li>○ Improve and make more streamline the experts nomination process.</li> <li>○ Improve balance and effective participation of experts from different regions and the inclusion of relevant information from different regions in the assessments also in a balanced manner.</li> <li>○ Improve the dynamics of IPBES assessments and internal decision making processes (relation between CCs, CLAs, LAs; respecting and considering different positions; streamline).</li> <li>○ Use factual language (rather than soft language, which may affect or qualify the real scope and importance of scientific findings) in SPMs (elephant in the room not mentioned).</li> <li>○ Strengthen the relation and dynamics between experts and delegates for a better understanding of scientific findings for the adoption of SPMs (transit from "the assessment experts to our experts").</li> <li>○ Connect with a broader public (not only policy and decision makers, but different key stakeholders as agents of change) and thus ensuring that IPBES deliverables are in fact being used by them. Emphasize facts, trends and options.</li> <li>○ Promote applicability of assessments at the local level (national and subnational) and review its usefulness.</li> </ul> <p><b>2. New knowledge:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Promote establishment and use of diverse platforms to gather and access to new information from various sources (eg. Environmental monitoring – Geo-Bonn, citizen science, iNaturalist, GBIF, etc.).</li> <li>○ Identify information gaps and needs and produce knowledge to address specific priorities, rather than producing just information (eg. ask Ministers which are their top problems regarding biodiversity and ecosystem services, and target are those needs).</li> <li>○ Consider the value of gray literature.</li> <li>○ Invest in generation of knowledge to address particular identified needs of knowledge.</li> <li>○ Cover gaps of knowledge identified in approved assessments.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Identify new information needed to address causes of biodiversity loss, including uncovered issues such as pollution.</li> </ul> <p><b>3. Policy Tools:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Usefulness of existing tools;</li> <li>○ Identify who uses them and how;</li> <li>○ Opportunities for improvement;</li> <li>○ Needs for new tools and aim; and</li> <li>○ Identify best practices.</li> </ul> <p><b>4. Capacity building:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Identify capacity needs and address those specific needs. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ To develop national/local assessment with the IPBES scope.</li> </ul> </li> <li>○ Based on identified tools and assessments, design capacity building programs to apply cover gaps.</li> </ul> <p><b>Mainstreaming:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Promote and strengthen the collaboration with other sectors and stakeholders to ensure biodiversity mainstreaming (Beyond the usual suspects).</li> <li>• Disseminate IPBES deliverables suited to different audiences beyond the environmental sector and promote their use.</li> </ul> <p><b>Review of the Platform:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Take into account the results of the Review of the Platform: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Internal: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ efficient financial resource management and administration.</li> </ul> </li> <li>○ External: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Global and local impact and usefulness of IPBES deliverables</li> <li>▪ Monitor efficiency of public awareness policy.</li> <li>▪ Emphasize on lessons learned and opportunities.</li> <li>▪ Identify needs for new structures or interphases to downscale implementation of IPBES deliverables at regional or national levels.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> </ul> <p><b>Stakeholders:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Promote consultation models and mechanisms for early participation in IPBES processes by IPLC, academy and other relevant stakeholders at national level (topic selection for assessments and other deliverables).</li> <li>• Recognize the relevance and respect multiple participation and views, while taking into account the diverse contexts between countries and regions.</li> </ul> <p><b>International context:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Alignment to Agenda 2030 and its SDGs.</li> <li>• Alignment to the Post-2020 Biodiversity Framework and NBSAPs.</li> <li>• Alignment to the Paris Agreement and NDCs.</li> <li>• Collaboration with international organizations to promote biodiversity mainstreaming in other sectors as a permanent process: agriculture, forestry, fisheries, tourism, water, health, education, energy, etc.).</li> <li>• Consideration of needs and priorities of developing and megadiverse countries.</li> </ul> <p><b>Task forces:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Analyze the convenience to renew and amend mandates of existing task forces and to define temporality.</li> <li>• Consider to create new task forces to address relevant needs identified by the new program of work.</li> </ul> <p><b>Rolling program:</b></p>
--	--

## Compilation of input on strategic framework of next work programme

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Develop the work agreed under the second program of work, while remaining flexible to discuss and analyze the convenience to include new and emerging issues.</li> <li>• Develop a process and clear criteria for new and issues</li> </ul>
WCMC	<p>Many of the 'guiding questions' provided are more operational in nature than strategic, therefore we would like to suggest an emphasis on the following as the strategic framework is considered:</p> <p>a) Building close working relationships with the secretariats and advisory bodies of the major global biodiversity related conventions and intergovernmental agendas so that IPBES is well positioned to support implementation of agreements that its member governments have already entered into. This support may be through new activities, but it may equally be through better promotion and use of existing deliverables.</p> <p>b) Building close working relationships with other international assessment processes addressing biodiversity-relevant issues, so that IPBES is well positioned to play a key role in increasing collaboration amongst those carrying out biodiversity-relevant assessments and associated functions, and to increase the alignment of approaches, communications and engagement.</p> <p>c) Plan a process to deliver universal membership, so that IPBES is able to become an even stronger voice in delivering support at the science-policy interface, and build on this through a programme of increased engagement of focal points as ambassadors for IPBES and as contributors to IPBES delivery.</p> <p>d) Ensure a continued focus on delivering on all four of the IPBES functions in an integrated manner, so that IPBES is even more clearly perceived as a relevant player at the science-policy interface, and not just as another interpreter of science for policymakers.</p> <p>e) Focus on building better arrangements for collaboration, partnerships and stakeholder engagement, so that IPBES is able to leverage significant additional support from like-minded organizations, resulting in a major increase in opportunities for further developing the science-policy interface at all levels.</p>

## 2 How to further strengthen and better integrate the four functions of IPBES?

EC	<p>What regards the overall ambition of IPBES as science-policy platform, the policy support should be up-scaled in ambition and resource allocation. More interaction with users would be welcome. Currently, IPBES is focused towards the generation of assessments but should improve its policy function in order to increase its impact.</p> <p>Concerning the delivery of outputs of the 1st WP on the four functions of IPBES, it has been successful for assessments, whilst the delivery of its functions supporting policy formulation and implementation, catalysing efforts to generate new knowledge and building capacity are not fully developed yet. The four functions of IPBES should be better balanced in the next WP, to go beyond assessments and to fulfil all four functions of the Platform.</p> <p>We would ask to better integrate the four functions into all deliverables of IPBES, i.e. through the scoping of assessments, which could define how outputs linked to assessments should be used for capacity building, policy support, and knowledge generation.</p>
FR	<p>In the call for requests, it would be useful to remind IPBES members that these requests may cover any action related to the four functions of the Platform. In the general discussions in preparation of and during IPBES-6, it sometimes seemed that requests meant topics for potential assessments only. We strongly support the idea of better integrating the four functions of the Platform. It could be reflected in the call for requests by adding several fields in the request format. Building on the template as shown in doc IPBES/2/INF/9 where science and policy relevance, implications for work programme and resource requirements are detailed, additional columns could invite the requester</p>

Compilation of input on strategic framework of next work programme

	<p>to specify to what extent the requests relates to the capacity building, assessment production, knowledge generation and communication functions of IPBES.</p>
<p>MX</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Categorize assessments in 2 fashions: fast track (urgent and/or sufficient information available) and full assessments.</li> <li>• Map deliverables as a value chain, a workflow with traceability from the origin, to its final product for users and assess its usefulness.</li> <li>• Possible ways to assess deliverables usefulness:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Establish a feedback mechanism from users (voluntarily but seeking to incentivize participation).</li> <li>○ Identify integration of IPBES deliverables in national polices, through a structural analysis tool to calculate text similarities between IPBES assessments and national policies (<i>Annex</i>).</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<p>UN</p>	<p>Authors producing assessments as well as TSUs or partner organizations for the different IPBES deliverables should systematically collect information on gaps of suitable data, information, expertise or resources. This will help informing the future iterations of the work programme and can be helpful for partner organizations (especially research oriented ones) and institutions to design for instance their research agenda. These gaps could be compiled in an annual 'gap report' linked to the report on the implementation of the work programme. This can be considered part of the knowledge generation function.</p>
<p>UNU- IAS</p>	<p>Conceptually, the four functions are well integrated. However, from the experience from the first work programme it is clear that more effort is needed to communicate the interlinkedness of these functions even as the assessments are getting underway. Basically this means that assessment teams and all relevant stakeholders involved in the different functions understand how their contributions relate to the other functions- and strive to see from the outset how they may be picked up and used in different contexts.</p>
<p>UFZ</p>	<p>On balance of functions:</p>



	<p>There was a widely held view during the workshop, that a fundamental challenge that would need to be addressed in the upcoming review is the balanced implementation of each of IPBES’ four functions: assessments, capacity building, policy-support, and knowledge generation. [...]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To improve the balance of functions, IPBES could ask governments and stakeholders to provide their requests more explicitly for all functions (not only for the assessment function), and to provide arguments for the requests. The solicitation and scoping processes can benefit from longer periods of time, including additional feedback loops and informal spaces for interactions among policy makers and stakeholders. This is necessary to identify the needs to develop the four functions with respect to different thematic foci. A better share and allocation of resources among the different functions would also be essential to accomplish a balanced implementation of all IPBES functions.</li> </ul> <p>On nominations and selection:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To foster the representation of disciplines, regions and genders and to avoid the current overrepresentation of particular voices and disciplinary perspectives, the diversity of profiles of nominated experts should be increased.</li> <li>To improve transparency of nomination and selection procedures for experts, nominations could include recommendation letters. Also maintaining publicly available the information of selected and non-selected experts can increase transparency in selection processes.</li> </ul> <p>On multiple knowledge systems</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To realize synergies between knowledge systems, the uptake of non-indigenous local knowledge and practical knowledge should be encouraged (parallel to the mobilization of indigenous knowledge) given that less attention has been paid to this type of knowledge and most focus has been on scientific knowledge and indigenous knowledge.</li> <li>To bring ILK more effectively into the assessments and increase the overall representation of IPLCs in the assessment processes the nomination and selection of IPLCs members as authors should be encouraged and a fellowship program dedicated to IPLC could also enhance their engagement.</li> <li>To promote the engagement of social sciences and humanities, their participation should be encouraged from the outset in the overall discussion of the work programme and the development of deliverables, namely during the scoping phase, in order to allow the co-definition of relevant questions, concepts and deliverables. This should also enable social sciences and the humanities to get more easily engaged in later stages of the work.</li> <li>To improve ways to accommodate conflicting views the review should also record, reflect and propose the use of different knowledge synthesis methods. IPBES could also add the role of a “dissent facilitator”, which could help to incorporate dissensus into assessments with strongly contested elements.</li> </ul> <p>(a more detailed description of these items is presented in the workshop report received as input)</p>
--	--

## 2.1 How to improve processes, activities and deliverables that have been undertaken during the first work programme (for all four functions)?

BE	Careful follow up on the outcomes of the Review (internal & external) of the Platform
CA	The proposal to address the work of the IPBES as a flexible plan within a strategic framework that aligns with related international goals and processes is a positive step that will allow greater flexibility for the Platform to improve its relevance by addressing emerging issues in a timely manner.
CO	The online platform can be a little more user-friendly, as it can sometimes be confusing to use, especially is it’s the first time you’re doing so. The easier it is to manage, the more participation from a wider public.

## Compilation of input on strategic framework of next work programme

	<p>There is a need for outreach to a wider audience, since many people still don't know that IPBES exists and how they can get involved. The Platform must make use of working hand in hand with other secretariats and organizations in order to gain more visibility.</p> <p>Many countries that are members of IPBES don't fully understand the processes and how the Platform actually works, so it's difficult to promote it and incentivize people to participate in activities relates to IPBES. For instance, many people don't know they can make actual proposals regarding work programmes or future thematic assessments.</p> <p>It is necessary to make a link between the different activities, processes and deliverables with policy instruments and policy support tools taking into account the objective of the Platform. It is also important to define where it is going the objective and activities on capacity building.</p> <p>Regarding the language in which the deliverables are being prepared specially the SPMs, it is important to try develop a common language between scientists and decision makers. We need a clear language (for instance in terms of communications and outreach), also in terms of wording and meaning.</p> <p>It will be very useful if the SPMs are prepared by the experts of the assessments jointly with the National Focal Points. For this, it will be suitable to generate bridges between them in order to strengthen the science and policy dialogue (workshops, meetings, calls, etc.).</p>
EC	<p>Better integrate the four functions into all deliverables of IPBES, i.e. through the scoping of assessments defining how use of products linked to assessments should be used for capacity building, policy support, and knowledge generation. The other way round, one standard task in the scoping should be to use and enhance where necessary, available IPBES products or products in the making. Both ways need to have adequate funding.</p>
FR	<p>To answer this question, a large scale survey could be conducted, addressed to any person who was involved in IPBES since the beginning of its work programme: all experts and authors, IPBES bodies, NFPs, stakeholders... Examples of questions to be answered can be found in the survey organised among the community of French experts participating to IPBES in late 2015 (see link). This survey could be undertaken as part of the review of the Platform, and its results presented at IPBES-7 and taken into account in finalizing the strategic framework of IPBES work programme.</p> <p>FR: If some experts selected for assessments were to work with the task forces to better align their work with the needs of the assessments, this could support the integration of IPBES areas of work. However, it should be made very clear during the call for nomination of experts since it would imply a significant dedication of experts' working time for IPBES (as authors of an assessment and as experts within a task force).</p> <p>FR: Engaging resource persons from partner organizations to contribute to the expert groups and task forces should be handled with care for questions of transparency, legitimacy and ownership of IPBES products by its members. The resource persons should be invited to contribute to the work of the expert group or task force by its members (those nominated by IPBES Governments and stakeholders). The resource persons, no matter whether they come from developing or developed countries, would have to be self-funded.</p> <p>FR: It seems that several groups and task forces faced the issue of "ghost experts" who did not participate to the group for which they were nominated and selected, thus putting a strain on the other experts and creating a geographic, gender and disciplinary imbalance. The Plenary could consider allowing the GEM to use the procedure for filling gaps in the availability of experts (see Annex I to decision IPBES-4/3) when such case arise. The National Focal Point or nominating stakeholder body should be notified when an expert that it nominated does not attend the expert meeting or does not submit its contributions to the Platform as expected.</p>
GH	<p>Processes and activities to date are ok. Need to strengthen technical and financial capacity of National focal points to be entry points for visibility and dissemination of products at the country level.</p>
GN	<p>In our opinion, we believe that it is important to reinforce the mission of IPBES by expanding the team of the first program with proven competencies and enhancing the achievements of this first work program; also establish a conceptual plan. In addition, as the focal points are expected to</p>

Compilation of input on strategic framework of next work programme

	<p>contribute more to the realization of the activities of the process, it is important to give them the necessary training to appropriate the functions of IPBES and to carry out these activities. (translated by google translate)</p>
ZA	<p>For all of the four functions: South Africa supports the four functions and still consider them important. However, additional approaches to create a value a chain approach could be useful, in this regard the methodology and policy tools component needs to be streamlined directly into the assessments.</p> <p>While the program has been excellent in assessing the current situation, we need to develop strategies for addressing some of the critical findings and arresting further critical losses in biodiversity and ecosystem services. In particular this will require the formulation of work plans where those working on assessments work with government officials in understanding the implications of the findings and work towards finding appropriate ways forward.</p> <p>Processes can be improved through more active engagement of national focal points and task forces. There is need to strengthen the role of national focal points by supporting networking and sharing of good practice among them. Better coordination and integration of the task forces can also result in more effective implementation of deliverables.</p> <p>Implement monitoring process and develop a limited number national and regional initiatives based on already existing good practices (to serve as examples for duplication elsewhere).</p> <p>Consult more experts from more countries as contributing authors, not simply those that are well established experts. Some more effort has to be put into soliciting contributions from other experts than those listed as lead authors.</p>
DHI	<p>The first work programme has thus far been a success especially with the approvals of thematic and regional assessment reports. The current modus operandi to provide the deliverables of the first work programme (as detailed in the Annex of Decision IPBES-2/3) should not be changed.</p>
KD	<p>It would be great to see a stronger involvement and representation of organisations and individuals that are focusing on Coupled Human and Nature Systems (or socio-ecological).</p>

2.2 Is there a need for other types of processes, activities, and deliverables to strengthen these functions?

BE	<p>At some point, there should be an analysis of the actual impact of IPBES’ work on policy at global, regional and national level. Showcasing the impact (demonstrating the added-value and usefulness of IBES) could also help to mobilize a more diverse range of stakeholders/actors/funders. (For more suggestions, see 1.2.)</p>
CO	<p>The purpose of IPBES is to include science and research into decision making processes that impact public policies, a lot of the work has to do with the language itself. Many issues arise when decision makers don’t understand scientific language, and scientists have a difficult time expressing their information in simple terms that can be easily understood by people outside their sector. In this regard, maybe the Secretariat can think about including the services of a ‘communicator’ or ‘editor’ when the Summary for Policy Makers are being constructed, since they can give an insight on whether the information presented in the SPMs is easily understood or not.</p> <p>It is important and relevant to find a regional balance into the Secretariat staff. This could strengthen the Secretariat for instance, in terms of languages (the staff should speak the official United Nations languages).</p>

## Compilation of input on strategic framework of next work programme

	<p>It is really important to develop deliverables, products and processes to the wider society: primers, press releases, info graphs, etc.</p>
EC	<p>We would hope that IPBES review and knowledge generation processes give indications which processes should be improved, which would then define possible activities. There seems to be a need for deliverables in size and ambition smaller than full assessments (which could be fast-track assessments).</p>
FR	<p>It would be useful to develop guidelines and, if needed, exchanges between TSU staff to ensure coherence among the various institutions supporting IPBES expert groups. The Secretariat could highlight good practice examples among TSUs that should be distributed and implemented across all TSUs.</p> <p>We do not deem necessary for IPBES to adopt an additional approach to complement strategic partnerships and allow IPBES to engage in a more informal manner with other partners. IPBES already engages de facto in many partnerships for the implementation of its work programme and these are in most cases informal, if informal means that they do not require approval by the Plenary. Officialising "informal partnerships" could lead to "subcontract" partners to implement IPBES work programme if the Platform does not have the relevant human or financial resources. This would be a problem for the legitimacy of IPBES outputs.</p> <p>Communication of IPBES findings, including vulgarisation of the scientific elements, should improve towards the general public. Experts in science communication should be following the production of IPBES deliverable closely (e.g. as members of the TSUs) in order to facilitate this process.</p>
GN	<p>Before proposing any other process, it is important to first assess the relevance, effectiveness and sustainability of the ongoing process. Once the state of the art in terms of results is known, it will be considered useful or not other types of process. In all cases, IPBES and its members seek only the best qualification in the exercise of its sovereign functions. (translated by google translate)</p>
ZA	<p>A more interactive process between the assessments and the knowledge generated is required. In particular, the processes, activities and deliverable need to be integrated for capacity building to be addressed.</p> <p>The proposal to convene regional consultations to seek relevant strategic inputs from government and stakeholders on the revised Draft Framework for the second work programme is very much supported.</p> <p>Connections with national, regional and other international initiatives.</p> <p>Giving the constituted experts to review the composition of the teams and suggest additional participants that they are aware of from poorly represented countries or regions to be considered for inclusion as authors. Also, suggest Co-ordinating lead authors should be voted by means of consensus by assembled teams of experts and not assigned by IPBES. This will help making assessments a team effort as far as possible, equally drawing on the experience of all team members. This is especially important in more multidisciplinary assessment chapters.</p> <p>A more interactive process between the assessments and the knowledge generated is required. In particular, the processes, activities and deliverable need to be integrated for capacity building to be addressed.</p> <p>The proposal to convene regional consultations to seek relevant strategic inputs from government and stakeholders on the revised Draft Framework for the second work programme is very much supported.</p> <p>Connections with national, regional and other international initiatives.</p> <p>Giving the constituted experts to review the composition of the teams and suggest additional participants that they are aware of from poorly represented countries or regions to be considered for inclusion as authors. Also, suggest Co-ordinating lead authors should be voted by means of consensus by assembled teams of experts and not assigned by IPBES. This will help making assessments a team effort as far as possible, equally drawing on the experience of all team members. This is especially important in more multidisciplinary assessment chapters.</p>

## Compilation of input on strategic framework of next work programme

DHI	<p>Relevant stakeholders and observers should also be given the mandate to at least have the ability to propose deliverables or proposals, taking the example of the Ramsar Convention on Wetlands. The Convention allows observers to submit proposals (draft resolutions) which then be put to vote once it is sponsored by a Contacting Party. At the moment, as per Annex IV of Decision IPBES/1/3 it is unclear whether observers are able to do so.</p> <p>Documenting the meetings of the authors and the MEP is also suggested as it shows transparency and continuity. Others may find this benefitting them when why a decision to include or not to include a section/issue/component arise during the review of assessments.</p>
KD	<p>Although I understand, and endorse that IPBES does not engage in research, I believe that stronger linkages, of mutual benefit, could be made between IPBES science/ policy activities and adjunct research activities.</p>

### 2.3 How to strengthen the assessment function?

FR	<p>We question the applicability and relevance for decision-makers of such broad assessments as those proposed as "nexus" assessments. The ecosystem services for food and water provision, health, energy etc could be covered by dedicated assessments with narrower scopes. We think that a narrower scope would allow assessments to be better targeted to decision-makers. Besides, dealing with nexus weakens the focus on biodiversity and shifts towards broader environment and development issues. We do not think that IPBES should take this road, but instead improve its focus on biodiversity issues, as the unique institution in the landscape in a position to do so.</p> <p>We therefore somewhat disagree with the MEP's presentation at IPBES-6 that the programme of work up to 2030 could focus on the link between nature's contributions to people and a good quality of life. The importance of biodiversity to achieve development should indeed be highlighted, but IPBES should not focus too much on an anthropocentric view where nature serves human beings. This causes IPBES to tend to overlook nature's intrinsic values. We think IPBES key role is to address the indirect and direct human drivers of biodiversity loss and this should remain at the core of its work programme. IPBES could highlight for example the multiple benefits of biodiversity-friendly policies to address environmental, social and cultural drivers, thus achieving broader targets for sustainable development, as included in policy processes such as the next CBD strategic plan for biodiversity, the Paris Agreement and the Sustainable Development Goals</p>
DE	<p>The total number of pages should be limited in order to keep the assessment reports easy to handle and easy to read.</p> <p>We would like to recall a Letter of the Bureau/MEP to the co-Chairs of the regional assessments and the land degradation and restoration assessment from 27 June 2017 (Annex III to the attached report) and its requests and criteria for assessment reports.</p>
US	<p>US: We suggest that member states have an additional opportunity to review the SPM after the initial country reviews and development of the next version prior to the plenary. SPM's produced during the first work program changed substantially from the 1st review to the next draft, so an additional round of review may be beneficial. This could be added into the timeline for future assessments and may help reduce the time needed for negotiations at the meeting.</p>
UN	<p>Future assessments should include substantial work such as assessing most recent developments on methodologies for indicators, monitoring (including remote sensed biodiversity monitoring), updated scenarios and policy options (to give an example such as for maintaining biodiversity urbanization), etc. all in the light of the post 2020 global biodiversity framework and the SDG process. Assessment should focus on drivers for biodiversity change and areas where major changes are expected to happen.</p> <p>Specific technical papers for specific audiences could be very helpful to increase uptake of the assessment. Audiences could be technical experts in governments, capacity-building agents, teachers and other quite specific groups. The technical papers should include attractive</p>

## Compilation of input on strategic framework of next work programme

	<p>presentable (power-pointable) graphics and underlined with data. Such graphics (including maps and figures) could be prepared by a specific team.</p> <p>The issues of the periodicity of the assessments and data used compared to other biodiversity periodic reports could be raised. For IPBES assessment reports to become long term references, the issue of methodologies and data used and needed have to be discussed. Common settings and methodologies can facilitate updates and long term monitoring with increased ownership by a variety of research institutions and stakeholders.</p> <p>Continuous efforts are required to strengthen interlinkages, or to conduct joint studies, between IPBES assessments and other UN and MEA studies/works (including i.e. the Global Environment Outlook, the IPCC Reports, etc.) and align the assessments' key messages with those of other ongoing MEA processes in support of the 2030 agenda. Many delegates at IPBES6 recommended to develop more concise SPMs, with simpler, more punchy and more relatable messages. "Messages" in the future may not be limited only to written formats but include recorded or more visual formats. The idea of developing context/audience-specific technical papers is great, and such a function may be outsourced to partners with more prominent presence at regional levels in close coordination with IPBES.</p>
WCMC	<p>Thematic and methodological assessments: Increase consideration of thematic and methodological assessments which can be clearly focused on needs of particular target audiences and policy fora, and therefore have potentially greater impact.</p> <p>'Fast-track' assessments: Further consideration of fast-track assessments needs to be based on review of experience with the pollination and scenarios assessments, both of which were fast-track assessments. It may be that in reality fast-track assessments need to be more narrowly focused in order to be able to deliver in a shorter time-frame.</p> <p>Policy relevance and uptake: Ensure that when assessments are scoped full attention is given to understanding the needs of the policy fora into which these assessments will be delivered, so as to increase focus and impact. Also ensure their appropriate engagement in the scoping process before the document comes to Plenary.</p> <p>Audience-focused synthesis: Develop technical papers which interpret assessment findings for specific audiences, so as to increase the outreach and impact for assessments.</p>
UNU- IAS	<p>Yes, it would be good to have more thematic assessments as they tend to address specific issues in a focused manner. It is also good to develop technical papers out of the assessment outcomes for more visibility and quicker uptake. Importantly, it is also good to motivate strategic partners, countries and stakeholders to develop citizen-friendly communication materials coming out of the assessments that can be easily translated and contextualized at regional, national and sub-national levels to motivate desirable action. Engaging actively with multistakeholder networks and other networks of different stakeholder groups including Academies of Science, ILK forums and the like will help get creative inputs to and out of the assessment process.</p> <p>The process in producing regional assessment is very top down from the global one, particularly on the conceptual framework development. There is no room for regions to provide inputs or negotiate. For example, in the debate between ecosystem services and nature contribution to people, and the overall global framework of IPBES. This is not healthy as there should be room for improvement for any conceptual frameworks that have been decided globally to be contextual to the status of knowledge and conditions of each region.</p>
IF	<p>We recognize the IPBES model for conducting highly inclusive biodiversity and ecosystem services assessments that explicitly recognise and incorporate multiple knowledge systems is exceptional and unique and sets precedence for future assessments. Bringing together such diversity and reaping the most from what it can offer, however, is still a challenge to addressed within IPBES. We have identified cultural diversity as a particular asset to the IPBES process and believe that integration of cultural awareness into the next IPBES work programme could directly address this challenge and provides an opportunity to greatly strengthen the IPBES assessment approach, the experience of being an author in assessments, and the outcome of assessments. Adding a cultural awareness element to the work programme will strengthen and better integrate the four functions of IPBES, specifically assessment and knowledge generation processes (i.e., guiding</p>

	<p>question 1.1 and 1.4) through building capacity among assessment authors and leaders (i.e., guiding question 1.3).</p> <p>Today, effective participation in international scientific teamwork requires not just learning to work effectively with people from a wide range of cultural backgrounds, but also having the skill sets to help multi-cultural groups collaborate effectively with one another. For IPBES assessments to be successful, assessment authors and support teams must navigate through the different cultural lens of how people think and get things done. Unless participants know how to decode other cultures and avoid easy-to-fall-into cultural traps, the assessment process is vulnerable to inefficiency; teams may not work to their utmost potential, and assessments may not fully deliver on their inclusiveness aspects. This is especially critical at the level of Chapter author teams who are required to work together intensively, coherently, and productively for three years to produce a scientific report of the highest possible standard.</p> <p>Based on our experience, which we intend to validate with an IPBES-wide survey of authors (if approved by the Secretariat), the dominant work culture operating in many Chapters has not been sensitive to the cultural dimension of effective collaboration. We believe that Chapters might have lost, along the way, the contribution of those not comfortable with dominant workstyles. Consequently, although the list of chapter authors may look extensive and diverse, a claim to input and a sense of ownership of chapter content might only be possible for those who are most comfortable with the dominant working style or those who can adapt to it effectively.</p> <p>We believe a ‘multiple ways of working’ philosophy within IPBES would greatly enhance the assessment experience and complement IPBES’s current philosophy of inclusion of ‘multiple ways of knowing.’ We recommend that the next work programme should include a specific component aimed at facilitating cultural sensitivity and inclusion of cultural awareness in work and leadership styles within IPBES. More specifically, we suggest that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• CLAs, as principal leaders of chapter processes, are sensitised to the cultural dimension of working in global teams and that they are provided with the skill sets through a cultural sensitivity and leadership training to lead culturally diverse teams by: a) recognising when culture is impeding the process and outcomes of the chapter; b) adjusting workstyles to take into account multiple cultures; and c) leveraging on the diversity of teams to improve positive experiences of working in the chapter.</li> <li>• That authors (LAs in particular) are also sensitised to the cultural dimension of workstyles and leadership and provided with the skill sets through a cultural awareness training module to recognise their own cultural position and how they could adjust it to facilitate positive experiences of collaboration in global teams.</li> </ul> <p>The survey of IPBES authors which we aim to conduct will provide us with more insight into how culture differences have manifested themselves in Chapters, to what extent they have enhanced or impeded the experiences and outcomes of Chapters, and the strategies that CLAs and LAs have implemented to diffuse tensions or reap the benefits of diversity. We believe that the outcomes of this survey can guide the further development and refinement of a specific component of the next work programme to support training development on cultural awareness for assessment authors.</p>
--	---

2.3.1 Would it be a good idea to develop technical papers from the finalised assessments targeted at specific audiences?

BE	Not very clear what is meant here (concrete example could be useful to assess whether this could fit the IPBES mandate)
CA	A discussion on whether the development of technical papers, based on completed assessments, is a role for the Platform or for the science community, catalysed by the findings of the assessment, would be helpful. Considerations are the additional time commitment for authors and additional costs added to an assessment.

## Compilation of input on strategic framework of next work programme

CO	<p>Possibly, but you have to be very aware of what the purpose for the technical papers would be. Would they aid in other assessments or specific needs for certain countries, or would they be for the scientific community to use as they see fit? These technical papers would require more man hours and resources that could have an effect on the established work programme.</p> <p>Is it also relevant to identify the audiences and which is the relevant product for each one of the audiences.</p>
EC	Yes, to try out.
FR	Yes, and this would allow for a better engagement with IPBES various stakeholders. At the moment, there is probably a limited number of stakeholders (e.g. public environmental administrations, NGOs and research institutions and network) who can readily use IPBES summaries for policy-makers. Formats and messages could be adapted from the summaries for policy-makers once adopted, especially for the private sector, top-ranking officials, and public administrations dealing with sectors other than the environment (e.g. agriculture, finance, health, industry, trade...).
GH	Yes, if it will be possible
GN	This is undoubtedly the ideal. However, a good understanding of these technical documents must be in place and should be addressed to the specific audiences consequently prepared for this purpose; otherwise, there is a risk of experiencing the challenge of developing CDM projects as part of the implementation of the Kyoto Protocol. Also, documents must be developed and available in the languages of IPBES (English, French, Spanish, Portuguese, etc.). (translated by google translate)
JP	It would be useful to have short and concise technical papers targeted at specific audiences, subject to availability of financial and operational resources, because whole assessment reports are too long for most of the audiences. If the targeted audience is the general public, it would be better to make electronic presentation materials available online rather than papers, for wide use at national or international meetings.
MX	Yes.
ZA	<p>Yes it would be a good idea, it could be done through specific communication and outreach channels. It would be useful for both academic and technical papers.</p> <p>A guideline is needed that highlights how IPBES findings need to be incorporated into current biodiversity commitments and international policies like CBD etc. Also the links to the SDGs and the IPBES findings could be more clearly sketched out in a guide for policy makers.</p>
US	Yes, it would be helpful to develop technical papers targeted at specific audiences. This might allow IPBES findings to reach a broader audience and stakeholders that otherwise might not read the entire report to find relevant information.
VE	Yes, this could contribute to the dissemination of the information generated by the Platform, as well as to the generation of new concepts and knowledge about biological diversity and ecosystem services. (translated by google translate)
DHI	<p>Yes. Technical papers are useful in order for the message to be disseminated to a wider audience. This also ensures that the assessments are given the scientific acknowledgement.</p> <p>Although this is the case, having technical papers may not be appropriate if the audience is the policy-maker, in which a simpler note suffice.</p>
ZALF	Yes, technical papers addressed to main stakeholders groups (Farmers, Industry, NGO's, Nature Conservation groups, Consumers, ...) are essential to improve the efficiency of knowledge exchange. There is a great challenge to tailor the contents and main messages to the specific stakeholder groups. These technical papers should also address main options for action to foster the activity of the different actor groups.



## Compilation of input on strategic framework of next work programme

### 2.3.2 Should there be distinct fast track assessments to answer more short-term assessment needs?

BE	This should not be excluded, indeed. Timely response to urgent needs could help to increase the policy relevance and uptake of IPBES products. However, overlap should be avoided with other bodies
CA	The pollination and the models and scenarios assessments were undertaken as fast track assessments and were considered to be highly successful in influencing agendas of the CBD and individual governments and in stimulating researchers to address issues and gaps identified in the reports. Although the process is described in 3.2 of annex 1 to decision IPBES-3/3, improved understanding of the expectations for a fast-track assessment and how it is distinguished from a standard assessment would be helpful.
CO	<p>What is a fast track assessment? How can we define short-term assessment needs?</p> <p>We could think in intersessional fast track assessment</p> <p>There needs to be a solid base and evidence in order to justify the need for one of these short-term assessments.</p> <p>How would these short-term needs be identified and prioritized? How would these affect the capacity, the budget and work schedule for authors and reviewers?</p> <p>It will be useful to think about different deliverables: summary and analytic documents.</p>
EC	Yes
FR	The current duration of an assessment (3-4 years) seems rather good, and a truly rolling programme would allow IPBES to be fairly responsive to assessment needs. However, we do not think that IPBES should aim to be a platform reacting faster to urgent issues. Its credibility comes from the time it dedicates to its various areas of work and topics. Allowing for more fast track assessments may put a strain on the research community and national focal points with an increased pace of calls for nominations of experts, for comments on drafts and preparation of adoption in plenaries. Shorter-term assessments make a multi-stakeholder approach more difficult to implement (it takes time to involve experts from different fields and different geographic areas) and this approach is one of IPBES core added values in the institutional biodiversity landscape.
GH	Yes, if need be.
GN	In the event that these rapid assessments are a step in the overall monitoring and evaluation system, we believe that this would be a good technical step to ensure the effective execution of a program through the identification and resolution of problems and issues that arise during the implementation phase. It should aim at mid-term reevaluation, as implementation progresses, of the program's objectives and the means to achieve them, in the light of experience and new developments. (translated by google translate)
JP	It depends on the contents of the societal needs.
MX	Yes, only and its if enough information is available.
ZA	<p>Yes. However, the methodology would need to be outlined and criteria determined.</p> <p>In the African regional assessment, assessments were hampered by a lack of published material. Here expert opinion in particular local understanding and knowledge should be gathered in plugging some of the very clear literature assessment gaps. This would involve the initiation of strategic and focussed workshops that look to shed light on specific issues that assessments weren't able to effectively tackle.</p> <p>The approach such as rapid evidence assessment which could be conducted in 1-6 months may be useful through the synthesis of existing evidence. Prioritisation and production of such could be aligned to various global policy priorities and meetings.</p>
US	Yes, this would allow IPBES to have the flexibility to respond to emerging issues and provide relevant information to policy-makers.

## Compilation of input on strategic framework of next work programme

VE	Yes, this type of evaluations could contribute not only to respond to the most immediate needs on the different topics of current interest for biological diversity and ecosystem services, but also, they would be contributing to the reduction of knowledge gaps in relation to the aspects suggested in those evaluations. (translated by google translate)
DHI	Fast track assessments are good as issues can be addressed rapidly although this should be executed cautiously as it may reduce the quality of the assessment to the rapidity of the assessments. It should also adhere to Item 3.2 of the Annex to Decision IPBES-2/3.
ZALF	Yes, even for the short-term activities and small-scale options there is a great demand. We regard especially the interactions between the management of agricultural land and natural resources and their impacts on biodiversity and biodiversity driven ESS is largely underestimated. Land management decisions will be taken at small scales and with a short-term perspective, but they may have impacts at larger spatial or time scales. Even these inter-scale dependencies are of high importance and need more reflection.

### 2.3.3 Do you have other suggestions?

BE	<p>Establish a mechanism/process to allow for updates of the assessments</p> <p>The Peer review of draft IPBES materials remains only possible through a cumbersome registration process which includes password protection, which risks compromising the quality of IPBES' outputs. Indeed, because of these unnecessary hurdles, several MS experienced significant problems to mobilize experts. Ideally, drafts for review (and templates for reviewer comments) should be placed online, marked "not for citation", to ensure a broad review;</p> <p>The current IPBES practice is that responses to peer review comments are only made available after the completion of each deliverable. We recommend modifying this practice to make responses to reviewer comments available after each round of review, to respect the huge contributions of volunteer reviewers</p> <p>Engage with professional science communicators to make the key messages of the SPMs straightforward &amp; easy to understand (good balance between scientific correctness &amp; comprehensibility)</p> <p>We received very good feedback from the face-to-face author meetings – excellent opportunity to make good progress, network &amp; regain motivation.</p> <p>Feedback from TSUs could be more hands-on in some cases</p> <p>Better planning and communication on author deadlines &amp; meetings</p>
CO	It might be interesting to have a workshop (virtual seminar) with the authors, as well as the revisers in order to understand what their biggest challenges were and what lessons they took from the last two plenaries where there was actual negotiation and feedback from the Parties.
EC	Ensure coherence, collaboration and synergy with other assessments, e.g. IPCC. It is important that the assessments do not compete with one another, there must not be a "hierarchy", but they should speak with one mutually reinforcing voice, stressing the links between them.
FR	We support the following approach for the next IPBES global assessment: a larger group of experts working on a global assessment, from which regional syntheses can be drawn. We agree with the suggested calendar to have a new global assessment for 2028-9. It may be useful for IPBES to prepare special geographic reports by large ecosystems which were mostly identified as knowledge gaps in IPBES four regional assessments, due to, among others, the lack of relevance expertise in the groups. It may include: small islands developing states in Oceania, the Arctic zone including Greenland, the open ocean...
GH	Future assessments could focus on specific ecosystem type to enable comprehensive assessments to be conducted and policy options to address threats preferred.

## Compilation of input on strategic framework of next work programme

GN	We propose that a "digest and inclusive" evaluation system be defined that would allow the interpretation of data and its use to improve the performance of IPBES members. Mechanisms must be put in place to ensure that the necessary information is produced and used in a timely and efficient manner. (translated by google translate)
JP	As the Global Assessment is the priority, it would be efficient to conduct thematic assessments considering the necessary information of the Global Assessment so that they can support the development of the Global Assessment.
MX	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure that relevant information and comments provided by NFP, experts and stakeholders, are not lost in the process of the assessment.</li> <li>• Ensure balance in the dynamics and contents of the assessments.</li> <li>• Foster early participation of experts in the design of activities within assessments.</li> <li>• Ensure the incorporation of different types of knowledge.</li> <li>• Promote the use of technical papers/information to cover gaps, provide specialized data or further information, and/or update information on finalized assessments.</li> <li>• Consider fast track assessments for new and emergent issues with specific criteria, subject to the approval of the Plenary.</li> <li>• Promote transparency and ensuring that no new agenda items are included based on secured funding (no earmarked resources).</li> <li>• Improve worldwide dissemination of IPBES deliverables to ensure their use by different stakeholders (particularly policy makers) and promote the exchange of experiences on IPBES implementation at the national level. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Dissemination designed for specific audiences.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Promote national workshops with the participation to review and feedback for IPBES deliverables preparation (Mexico's experience).</li> <li>• Invite NFPs and experts to work closer on external reviews and review process of SPMs for balance between scientific rigor and policy language.</li> <li>• Continue promoting multidisciplinary participation, while encouraging participation of other actors and sectors (biodiversity mainstreaming).</li> <li>• Promote national activities to disseminate SPMs and reflect on national application among different sectors.</li> </ul>
ZA	<p>For African region, the issue of limited data and knowledge gaps was a key element under the assessments conducted under the first work programme. It is therefore an imperative for this to be addressed as an integral part of the scoping of assessments.</p> <p>Global equity issues were not well covered in the past assessments. In particular equity issues that deal with the power dynamics between developed and developing regions. These need to be more widely explored (as uncomfortable as this may be) in highlighting ecosystem service flows and the key drives that cause the erosion of these services in particular regions.</p> <p>Develop an assessment guideline and monitoring process.</p>
US	We suggest that the approval and future scoping of new priorities should emphasize shorter term, focused, and policy relevant questions as opposed to longer term, broad assessments. Further, the summaries for policymakers should be shorter and more solution-oriented to increase the summaries' utility and relevance. The background information that is currently included in SPMs could be an executive summary at the beginning of the report for individuals looking for more detailed information, rather than in the SPM itself.
VE	It is suggested to develop short bulletins with a quarterly periodicity, covering current issues in the framework of biological diversity and ecosystem services, including strategies and actions

Compilation of input on strategic framework of next work programme

	implemented by Member States for the sustainable use and conservation of biodiversity. (translated by google translate)
DHI	<p>Assessment should be expanded to focus on sub-regional areas (e.g. Southeast Asian region or South Asian region) in order to focus on the problems/issues identified by the regional assessments on the particular region(s). This can also be in the form of a technical paper that expands and focuses on the findings of the finalized assessment.</p> <p>Assessment should also now focus on thematic issues particularly ecosystem-based assessment (e.g. coral reef, mangrove, seagrass, etc.) in order to assess in detail, the problems already mentioned in the regional assessment reports. Suggest also to have an assessment of the impacts of climate change to ecosystem services. Although IPCC and CBD have carried out this assessment, an assessment focusing on ecosystem assessment has not been carried out.</p>

2.4 How to strengthen the policy support function?

UN	The policy support function should be closely linked to the other functions and address the change makers in governments, businesses and organizations. A new analysis of the situation is necessary to provide the directions into the new work programme and the IPBES UN partners could contribute to such an analysis.
WCMC	<p>Engagement with policy fora: Ensure that when all assessments are scoped full attention is given to understanding the needs of the policy fora to which these assessments will be delivered, so as to increase focus and impact. During the assessment processes work with the secretariats of these policy fora prepare for uptake of findings when assessments are completed.</p> <p>More methodological assessments: Consider undertaking further methodological assessments focusing on the effectiveness of specific groups of policy tools and methodologies, or policy instruments, in order to increase access to and use of such tools, methodologies and instruments.</p> <p>Identifying policy support tools and methodologies, and policy instruments, in assessments: Build identification of policy support tools and methodologies, and policy instruments, more effectively into assessment processes so that relevant initiatives can be quickly promulgated through the IPBES Catalogue as assessments are undertaken and when they are completed.</p> <p>Building capacity in using policy support tools and methodologies: Work with partner organizations and those responsible for particular policy support tools and methodologies in order to increase capacity-building in use of tools, noting that this is particularly valuable for tools and methodologies associated with IPBES methodological assessments.</p> <p>Greater engagement of practitioners: Look for ways to increase the engagement of those working with policy support tools and methodologies in IPBES, so that they can share experience of the use of different policy support tools and methodologies, including through support for capacity-building.</p>
UFZ	<p><b>Challenges linked to overall framework conditions and the complexity of global biodiversity policy</b> (a description of these challenges is presented in the report of the workshop received as input):</p> <p>To overcome these challenges we suggest that more attention should be paid to these questions: “Which role does IPBES intend to play? What are its aim(s) and representation, and which gaps does it strive to fill?”</p> <p>Possible actions in this regard include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) A review of the available relevant gap-analyses would be useful to reflect once more on the niche IPBES intends to fill (taking into account also possible comments on this</li> </ul>

	<p>question arising from the external review of IPBES soon to be initiated/currently underway), and this would then result in a clear description of the IPBES-niche.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. This description should be made available to and be used by governments, MEAs and other stakeholders that are invited to submit requests for IPBES activities under the second work programme.</li> <li>b. IPBES experts should be aware of this description and reflect on it during the preparation of the deliverables and the Plenary, and remain mindful of these reflections during assessment acceptance/approval processes.</li> </ul> <p>(ii) If parallels or overlaps between IPBES and other processes are identified by the review in (i) above, IPBES and the UN IPBES partners should seek to streamline these processes, e.g. the launches of assessments and efforts to support their uptake by policy. This could potentially increase the impact of assessments, reduce costs and help to avoid decrepitness of assessments, which are released within a short time frame and can potentially “out-date” each other too soon.</p> <p><b>Challenges linked to the delivery of policy support as an integrated element within the deliverables other than 4c</b> (a description of these challenges is presented in the report of the workshop received as input):</p> <p>Building on the overarching importance of policy support across all functions, the following actions could be envisaged:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) A new deliverable could be built into the next IPBES work programme focusing on procedures, approaches and participatory processes for ensuring effectiveness of policy support as a cross-cutting issue in IPBES. This could involve setting up special arrangements or a mechanism that focuses on policy support<sup>1</sup> (a task force may be appropriate but may also not suit the particular needs of this theme). The mission of this potential mechanism will be to ensure policy support is considered in the development of all IPBES products and also to ensure policy relevance of the products and facilitate their uptake. Moreover, this potential mechanism could encourage the broad inclusion of practitioners from different sectors.</li> <li>(ii) In general, assessments should be more coordinated with the actual needs of policy makers: In order to achieve this, a much stronger degree of co-production is necessary, in particular when the draft scoping document is developed. Other possible actions contributing to such enhanced co-production could include the initiation of more interaction among IPBES experts and policy makers, possibly at events similar to the IPBES Capacity Building fora (or by engaging more practitioners at these fora).</li> <li>(iii) A final chapter with case examples of good practices of implementation under different contexts (taking into account e.g. different scales and national contexts) could be added to the assessments. This could help to increase the understanding and facilitate uptake of the assessments at national and sub-national level. Furthermore, this final chapter could also make a link to the IPBES catalogue on policy support tools and methodologies where further guidance on suitable policy support tools and methodologies as well as the conditions for their use could be explained.</li> <li>(iv) Furthermore, it may be worth considering whether some assessments, or spin-off products from major assessments, should tackle more specific issues (e.g. narrower questions, geographic focus, targeted to a particular user group). These could potentially be delivered by IPBES in a shorter time frame than assessments that cover a broader range of issues, which could make such assessments or products potentially even more suitable for a timely uptake.</li> </ul>
--	--

<sup>1</sup> Regionally based but meeting largely virtually, coming together immediately before each Plenary to provide policy context and commentary on the deliverable to be considered for Platform members

	<p><b>Challenges linked to the delivery of policy support by means of deliverable 4c</b> (a description of these challenges is presented in the report of the workshop received as input):</p> <p>It is suggested that the following points may be taken into account during further reflections on the future of the expert group for deliverable 4c and the IPBES catalogue of policy support tools and methodologies.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) Structural and procedural considerations: With regard to the policy support function in the narrow sense, it is suggested to continue the methodological work that has been started during the first work programme (see e.g. IPBES/4/INF/14), e.g. via an extension of the mandate of the respective expert group. Nonetheless, if the mandate for the current expert group will be renewed, it is strongly suggested that its composition is critically reflected, given longer inactive time periods and few physical meetings in the past and potential withdrawals. This is particularly relevant to ensure its functionality and its balance among genders, regions and disciplines. It is further suggested to clarify the mandate of the expert group, to provide them with the necessary resources (also for physical meetings), and with sufficient support from the Technical Support Unit.</li> <li>(ii) Resource limitation and sustainability of finance has been an underlying challenge for the IPBES process in general, and particularly for 4c where face-to-face expert meetings had not been held since 2015. These are the matters to be considered in the next work programme, and will also be discussed within the review process. Therefore, there is a need to critically reflect on the level of resources (financial and human) that should be further spent on the catalogue, also taking into account the following considerations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. The scope and uptake of the catalogue and its comprehensiveness regarding its initial aim needs to be clarified (level of ambition: is the catalogue intended to replace existing tools, or rather to provide one possible entry point to identifying a broad array of policy support tools and methodologies).</li> <li>b. The responsibility for populating validating the IPBES catalogue in its initial phase and its maintenance in the longer run also needs clarification; ensuring content quality seems to be crucial.</li> <li>c. A better understanding of the range of intended users, their needs, capacities and motivations is needed: the application of policy support is context and scale dependent. This makes it challenging to specify how a catalogue of policy support tools and methodologies that is developed at global level could be used at other levels and how assessments could be translated from one level to another.</li> <li>d. Furthermore, many similar portals are available with slightly different but overlapping objectives. It is required to more explicitly emphasize the added value of the IPBES catalogue.</li> </ul> </li> <li>(iii) A potential option to ensure a high quality of the content of the catalogue with a reasonable amount of resources could be to limit its core to examples extracted from IPBES products such as the assessments. For example, case studies as presented in the assessments could be included, because they have been reviewed by experts and governments and accepted by the Plenary. As a second component of the catalogue, cross-references to external sources/case studies can be included, for instance this could be linked to the NSBAP Forum<sup>2</sup>. This feature would complement the IPBES-derived content and would avoid duplication of databases and platforms. Regarding legal protection and reputation, it is critical to separate these two components transparently to demonstrate that IPBES is not responsible for external sources.</li> </ul>
--	--

<sup>2</sup> The NBSAP Forum is a global partnership aiming to support the revision and implementation of National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plans (NBSAPs). <http://nbsapforum.net/>

2.4.1 Would it be a good idea to undertake methodological assessments focusing on the effectiveness of various policy instruments and policy support tools, and afterwards to catalyse their further development (similar to what has been done for scenarios and models)?

BE	YES. Focus should be on use in different national/policy contexts; and using case studies to make things more concrete & easy-to-understand
CM	it would be good to really be assured that the instruments and support tools are truly implemented by Governments and really help to conserve biodiversity and ecosystem services. But this will mean more means to be spend by IPBES.
CA	Yes. Tools such as conservation or biodiversity offsets are often cited as potential options. An assessment of the outcomes from practical applications of a suite of related tools would be useful.
CO	<p>It's important to keep in mind that we're dealing with different types of policy instruments and support tools depending on the country we're dealing with and their national realities, so it's key to know for sure what the purpose of an assessment like this would be and whether or not it is of actual use.</p> <p>It's risky to work with hypothetical models and scenarios without a proposal for concrete actions to be taken.</p> <p>It's necessary to highlight that an expert group developed a document regarding this and it will be more important to strengthen the catalogue of policy support tools and methodologies.</p> <p>Is this going to strengthen in science and policy interface?</p>
EC	Yes, absolutely, this should be a priority.
FR	We fully support the suggestion of a methodological assessment on policy support tools. Besides, the work on policy support tools seems a good opportunity to try and better integrate different functions of IPBES: experts working on the governance and policy tools chapters of the future assessments could also constitute a task force in charge of populating and updating the catalogue with the tools identified in the assessments. IPBES partners could focus their activities of capacity building on using the tools listed in the catalogue, and this could be promoted during the next capacity building forum for example. Regarding the development of new tools however, it may be more important to foster the use of existing ones by decision-makers instead. This is more linked to capacity-building than to catalysing new research (even though knowledge gaps will need to be identified and stated clearly). The methodological assessment could work closely with capacity-building partners for the promotion of policy instruments and tools that were assessed as performing well, through training at the regional or national level for example.
GH	Yes
GN	<p>In our opinion, we believe that the capacity-building function is aimed at carrying out activities in communication, management and knowledge sharing in the fields of IPBES.</p> <p>In these circumstances, it is important for the IPBES secretariat to take stock of the shortcomings in terms of capacity building on the themes of knowledge, skills and know-how, both internally and from the points of view. focal; define the technical and financial needs; establish a focal point capacity building plan by geographical region; identify the training locations and expertise needed, including:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. the creation of a WEB site by geographical region;</li> <li>2. the organization of training sessions for focal points, the administration of IPBES, communication technicians and knowledge management of IPBES areas;</li> <li>3. the production and dissemination of audiovisual media on IPBES;</li> <li>4. the production of promotional materials and advocacy;</li> </ol>

## Compilation of input on strategic framework of next work programme

	<p>5. the establishment and formation of a network of journalists for IPBES;</p> <p>6. the realization of the networking of the focal points, the configuration of the evaluation software;</p> <p>7. Development of communication activity documents in all IPBES languages dedicated to evaluation for the dissemination of results, good practices and lessons learned.</p> <p>(translated by google translate)</p>
JP	<p>Application of policy instruments and policy support tools significantly varies depending on each country's situation. By methodological assessments, we should evaluate such instruments and tools at a more general level than the previous time, and include also national or transboundary case studies in the assessments (for example, which types of instruments and tools worked well and which did not) in a separate paper or other forms. This approach would be more efficient and effective as governments and institutions can take some elements of these studies as examples that fit to specific needs of each country.</p>
MX	<p>Yes.</p>
ZA	<p>There would limited uptake in policy support tools, we may require a different mechanism given the sovereign nature of policy.</p> <p>Yes this would be a very good idea - The IPBES process clearly highlights even where we have very clear and engaging policy this does not guarantee the best outcomes for biodiversity and ecosystem services. Here understand the drivers that are impacting on BES is critical such as teleconnections is needed. International policy instruments in particular those that highlight how grow and development (even resilience issues) in different countries and regions plays in relation to policies in other regions and countries, would be highly informative.</p> <p>Yes, this idea is supported. Policy makers should be engaged so that they can prioritise the policy instruments and tools that should be assessed.</p> <p>No, don't think so. Methodological issues around policy instruments and support tools could have space in the core assessments. Unnecessary additional effort/cost if done separately.</p> <p>It would be good to really be assured that the instruments and support tools are truly implemented by Governments and really help to conserve biodiversity and ecosystem services. But this will mean more means to be spend by IPBES.</p>
US	<p>We suggest that instead of a stand-alone assessment on policy instruments and support tools, we should make all assessments more policy-focused and solution oriented. We suggest identifying a suite of effective policy instruments for specific issues in each of the assessments that policymakers could use as a "go to" when trying to determine policy options for that assessment topic.</p>
VE	<p>Yes, this type of evaluation would provide Member States with information on strategies, decisions and actions that once implemented have had a positive and / or negative impact on the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity. (translated by google translate)</p>
DHI	<p>Yes</p>
UNU- IAS	<p>Undertaking methodological assessments focusing on the effectiveness of various policy instruments and policy support tools would be useful, especially if done by a team of multiple stakeholders and revealing multiple priorities. Strengthening the participation of local stakeholders in the assessment process would be essential.</p> <p>Indeed, there are lots of policy gaps identified by the academic assessments. IPBES might have several national pilots to advocate policy recommendations as its outputs.</p>
ZALF	<p>YES, from our research we underpin the relevance and impact of the various policy instruments. Nowadays, there is no single instrument to solve the problems and many of the traditional instruments are of low efficiency. Therefore is quite important to spread the information about the spectrum of available instruments and their potential impacts, as well as to spread the information about best practice examples. Exemplarily we'd like to draw the attention e.g. to the potential impact of "civil- public- private-partnerships (<a href="http://cp3-project.eu/">http://cp3-project.eu/</a>)" or on Climate-</p>



Compilation of input on strategic framework of next work programme

	<p>public-private partnerships or on marketplaces for nature conservation activities (<a href="http://project2.zalf.de/AgoraNatura/">http://project2.zalf.de/AgoraNatura/</a>). Other innovative policy instruments are a.a. societal partnership agreement for sustainable development in agriculture (see German Environmental Ministry January 2018)</p>
--	---

2.4.2 Do you have other suggestions?

<p>BE</p>	<p>Adequate resources and staffing. E.g. – the work on policy support tools &amp; methodologies should likely be supported by a full-fledged TSU with clear mandate and sufficient resources.</p> <p>More interactions with policy makers (co-creation) during the entire process of assessment writing. As such, assessment experts stay up-to-date on needs &amp; framings that relate to policy questions. Also need for stronger engagement with practitioners.</p> <p>Content of the Catalogue of Policy support tools should be validated/there should be a coordinated quality control (could be done through an independent review process). Also more efforts should be directed to populate the catalogue, , increase its usefulness (incl a better understanding of potential users), and avoid reduncancy with other portals.</p> <p>Other: Maybe consider Horizon scanning exercises. This could help policy makers in governments to take a longer-term strategic approach, and makes present policy more resilient to future uncertainty. In developing policy, horizon scanning can help policy makers to develop new insights and to think ‘outside the box’.</p> <p>Better inform on the possible solutions for the main causes of Biodiversity decline (overconsumption, infrastructure development, agriculture, fisheries etc...).</p> <p>For Agriculture (for food, feed, fibers and energy), it would be very beneficial to have inputs on the benefits, including income benefits, for farmers to apply agro ecology principles, to keep hedgerows, to lower pesticides applications etc. Information on the sustainability of the yields in the coming decades for traditional versus “agro ecology”</p> <p>On overconsumption, like SSP (shared socio economic pathways) shows, keep on giving information on the fact that overconsumption will harm the global economy and countries’ GDP in a only few decades (it already does at small scales), as well as social aspects and the environment.</p> <p>Better inform on the risks of disconnecting production and consumption, and give advice on how to counteract them based on agreed data.</p> <p>Give agreed data on the benefits of protected area for human health, economies through all the ecosystem services they provide.</p> <p>Keep an eye on all new/emerging technologies, even the ones that are replacing current harmful ones, in order to be sure we are not creating a new pressure on B.</p> <p>Also inform consumers! Eg: If a European consumer buys an electric car, he feels he’s doing something to save the planet, but he doesn’t know where the lithium or other component of its battery comes from (usually outside EU as our environmental legislations are too restrictive to allow for their exploitation).</p> <p>More info is needed on agriculture which can be sustainably intensive (meaning high yields but without compromising sustainability, health, the environment including all biodiversity components) such as permaculture, but also on small scale agriculture, agro forestry: on their yields, their income generation, their contribution to other ecosystem services and SDGs etc, to the social and economic dimension, eg at the local level but also at national/global level.</p> <p>Info on plastics in agricultural lands due to water sewage sludge fertilization?</p>
<p>CO</p>	<p>There could be a formal consultation through the IPBES and CBD focal points regarding the ‘needs’ of policy makers and decision makers as to what they’d like to see (in regards to types of information) when dealing with environmental topics. Have a questionnaire that should be shared with decision-makers across all sectors asking on their comprehension on environmental issues and</p>

## Compilation of input on strategic framework of next work programme

	<p>what they'd like to know about and in what way they would like the information to be presented. This could give a better and further insight as to how they think and process information.</p> <p>Think about the effectiveness of the Platform to incorporate their deliverables at national, regional and local levels. How to develop innovative methodologies to make this possible?</p>
EC	<p>Policy support should be up-scaled in ambition and resource allocation. More interaction with users would be welcome. Currently, IPBES is focused towards the generation of assessments but should improve its policy function in order to increase its impact. IPBES outcomes should also contribute to trigger stepping up the implementation of policy and stepping up the implementing solutions which work (see the examples in drawdown <a href="http://www.drawdown.org/">http://www.drawdown.org/</a>)</p>
FR	<p>The catalogue of policy support tools is promising but need to be given life now. Maybe an expert group newly built, including experts who participated in the relevant chapters of the assessments, could be in charge of populating the catalogue with the identified tools, by contacting their developers and presenting them the catalogue. In partnership with the capacity-building team, they could develop workshop material for trainings on the use of the tools, supported by regional environmental organisations (e.g. SPREP, African Union...), partners of the capacity building forum, national focal points...</p>
GN	<p>The IPBES Secretariat should provide the regional coordinators with the necessary means to evaluate, between two sessions, the implementation efforts of the Program.</p> <p>(translated by google translate)</p>
MX	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Assessing the effectiveness of policy instruments and tools, while analyzing the key elements for their success.</li> <li>• Considering that some policy tools and instruments may only be adequate for particular contexts or conditions, the assessment should initially focus on those which are more extended and/or being used the most.</li> <li>• Continue to feed the catalogue with useful instruments and tools, as well as with relevant case studies and success stories, specifying their particularities for success, and find innovative ways to have policy makers using this catalogue to address their needs.</li> </ul>
ZA	<p>It is important that policy makers are more engaged in the work of the Platform. Ensuring the uptake of assessment findings is critical for the success of the Platform.</p> <p>Yes, as the effectiveness of a policy is not the policy itself but rather the way it is implemented. So, attention should be given to the process (rather than tools/instruments).</p> <p>Policy analysis focusing on the impact evaluation phase of policy cycle may be useful 3iE has some example approaches.</p> <p>Make this a specific focus in relevant assessments.</p>
US	<p>Rather than having a task force on policy support tools and methodologies, we suggest that all assessments should cover these topics. This may require the addition of more authors with a science-policy background to the author teams to ensure policy support tools and methodologies become integrated into the overall assessment.</p>
VE	<p>It is suggested that these evaluations were not aimed at measuring the effectiveness, but rather, to measure the multiple variety of measures and actions that could be carried out by member countries, and the impact these measures generate on variables such as: knowledge indigenous and local communities, the different components of biological diversity, among others. (translated by google translate)</p>
ZALF	<p>YES: we suggest to focus more on the drivers of biodiversity loss, doing so setting the basis for more efficient counter actions.</p>

## 2.5 How to strengthen the capacity building function?

UN	<p>It should build on the recent experiences but expand to enhanced partnerships and lessons learned from the first work programme &amp; Knowledge (including provision of data, graphics, infographics...).</p> <p>An important focus of work would be to encourage governments, scientists and indigenous peoples to engage in dialogues and capacity building at national and regional scales on how to contribute to IPBES assessments and implement and use the products and policy tools from these assessments, within the framework of the Indigenous and Local Knowledge (ILK)-science-policy interface. Further, encouraging state and non-state actors to review the use of ILK in past assessments, and then following the response of ILK holders, research institutions and national governments this may contribute to creating road maps and approaches to capacity building. A distinction should be made between capacity building in relation to ILK methods and impacts, and the other distinct process of the ILK-science-policy interface to achieve complementarity.</p> <p>Training in biodiversity and ecosystem monitoring and assessment including standards and best practices in observations, data management, scientific analysis, modelling and output visualizations.</p>
WCMC	<p>Capacity-building rolling plan: Continue to undertake the capacity-building rolling plan welcomed by the Plenary in decision IPBES-5/1, reviewing and revising it as necessary to respond to the new work programme rather than starting again.</p> <p>Capacity-building at the start of assessments: Recognise that all 'experts' are going to need at least familiarization with IPBES guidance and procedures, however experienced they are, and that this needs to be addressed at the start of each assessment through familiarization and capacity-building programmes.</p> <p>Webinars and online training: Significantly increase the use of webinars and other online methods for communicating IPBES-related findings, experience and guidance, including making them available in multiple languages, so that they become a major resource for training now and in the future.</p> <p>Regional and sub-regional capacity-building workshops: Work proactively with partner organizations in the regions and sub-regions to convene capacity-building workshops on topics relevant to the regions, making generic training materials available that can be drawn on by those facilitating the workshops.</p>
UNU- IAS	<p>Related to point 1.2, there should be more intensive capacity building at the national level as currently IPBES in some countries is not well recognized, and has no advocacy power.</p>

### 2.5.1 Can you suggest activities not addressed by the current plan for capacity-building (Annex I to decision IPBES-5/1), to more systematically and effectively catalyse the building of capacity?

BE	<p>Guidelines/support to develop national uptake events, showcasing how the IPBES assessments can be useful to day-to-day policy at national level.</p> <p>Capacity to create further momentum for biodiversity issues in the policy agenda, and to induce transformative (social) change</p> <p>Motivate the educational system to teach the future generations on the importance of knowing the consequences of the choices we make today, of the urgency to act. This should be done at all level of education, and for all kinds of orientations. At university level especially, it should be taught to future economists, engineers, scientists, social scientists, political scientists, doctors etc. ...</p>
----	--

## Compilation of input on strategic framework of next work programme

CO	It is very important to strength the capacity to incorporate information to the assessment in all the official United Nations languages (the previous approved assessment incorporated principally information in English).
EC	The current plan for capacity building should be fully implemented.
FR	The capacity building forum may be more efficient if it convenes on a specific issue. This could be for example on building capacity to use policy support tools. It would make it more concrete for partners participating to the forum to see how they can support IPBES and its objectives, and it would also help IPBES to identify specialized partners who are more likely to get on board.
	As for the capacity building of a government, some kind of manuals might be useful because governmental officers change positions frequently and the developed capacity in a government is often lost due to it.
MX	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Identify particular needs of capacity building, and address those needs rather than investing on general/random capacities.</li> <li>• Analyze capacity needs of the other 3 functions and provide capacity building accordingly.</li> <li>• Strengthen cross-sectoral capacities (biodiversity mainstreaming), while promoting participation of key stakeholders, such as productive sectors and private sector.</li> <li>• Support capacities to develop methods to assess the impact of impacts of different sectors on different ecosystems.</li> <li>• Capacity building (webinars, virtual libraries, videos) on IPBES key findings and deliverables addressed for policy makers.</li> <li>• Create a virtual roster of worldwide experts that have participated in IPBES for consultation on specific issues of interest of policy makers.</li> <li>• Promote the elaboration of short papers and dissemination materials in coordination with other MEAs, BRCs and international organizations such as FAO, WHO, and UNWTO, among others.</li> <li>• Support and promote triangular cooperation initiatives for capacity building for more effective transfer based on regional proximity, language, culture by technical providers (Financial Supporter-Technical Provider-Recipient).</li> </ul>
ZA	<p>The capacity building function requires a direct link to IPBES deliverables. Every deliverable should include capacity building targets to be incorporated and reported upon.</p> <p>First capacity needs to be assessed – where do we have capacity to undertake and to understand assessments produced by processes such as IPBES? Where do we have capacity, and how can those capacitated countries help, or be supported to help less developed neighbours in growing there capacity and there by enhance regional capacity, is needed.</p> <p>Capacity building needs to continue to be the thread that runs through the work programme of the Platform. Building networks and partnerships is key for taking this forward.</p> <p>Develop capacity building actions devoted to high level policy makers (finances) to provide them with sufficient understanding of the economic value of a well preserve natural environment.</p>
VE	It is suggested to create a web portal, where online courses are taught, on the development and preparation of thematic and methodological evaluations carried out by IPBES. (translated by google translate)
DHI	The current plan is comprehensive covering all related activities for capacity building. As such, no additional activity is suggested.

### 2.5.2 Do you have other suggestions?

## Compilation of input on strategic framework of next work programme

EC	Capacity building for the use of policy tools and use of policy instruments for implementation should be strengthened.
GN	We believe that IPBES with various themes could contribute to national focal points to designate contact persons for each theme (biodiversity, ecosystem services, traditional knowledge, etc.) and network them under the coordination of the national focal point. (translated by google translate)
ZA	Develop online teaching/learning material and links this with master or other programs on development/natural resources management, etc.  Capacity for government officials to actively provide technical review. Government units responsible for promoting science-policy interface are often less capacitated in terms of number of officials dedicated to perform the function vs expected role.
US	Capacity building should be built into the assessments, either via the fellows program or some other mechanism
DHI	Suggest that this plan is appropriately disseminated to relevant stakeholders in order to ensure they are well-informed of the opportunities under IPBES. It is unlikely that stakeholders (including IPBES members) are aware of the opportunities under the plan.  There should also be a well-defined process on how stakeholders can participate in the capacity building activities.
UN	If we are to respond to the need expressed in the various assessments to integrate biodiversity into education and awareness-raising and communication programmes, then the capacity building function should include activities around teacher education / training of trainers.  Capacity building should have elements that encourage empowerment and participation. There is a need to encourage more participation of local communities, children and youth and other stakeholder groups in decision-making processes and implementation actions.  It is a very positive step to engage partners in order to fill in gaps within IPBES to carry out this function, as practiced through the call to support the implementation of activities under three priority areas of its capacity-building rolling plan. IPBES should place stronger focus on facilitating/coordinating these partner efforts with higher transparency and clearer guidance on how-to. For example, response to the “call” is highly one-sided without feedback/guidance from IPBES on whether the supporting activity is implemented in the adequate manner, or if there is any area of improvement in the supporting activity. Currently there is no tool to find out other ongoing/planned supporting activities and no mechanism to review/learn from past activities.

### 2.6 How to strengthen the knowledge generation function?

MX	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Identify the needs of new knowledge of members within the other 3 functions and support those needs, taking into account the diverse contexts and realities.</li> <li>• Promote/assess the use of remote sensing, global databases and citizen science tools such as iNaturalist and e-Bird, to engage general public in the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity, while producing immediate information to support formal science.</li> <li>• Promote spaces to exchange new and existing knowledge to address IPBES information gaps and needs.</li> <li>• Support the publication (physical or online) of articles, papers, compilation of case studies, and others, related to IPBES functions and activities.</li> <li>• Strengthen the technical contents on IPBES website.</li> </ul>
UN	The principle of drawing on ILK in assessments and the monitoring of biodiversity indicators is well-established in IPBES processes. The challenge remains that the bulk of ILK is undocumented. By the time an assessment is underway, it is difficult to expect detailed observations, data or ILK analyses to be influential in an assessment if they have not already been documented and published. IPBES

## Compilation of input on strategic framework of next work programme

	is already influencing research agendas. It would help to systematically scope for good examples of relevant ILK research and research partnerships which provide guidance on appropriate or useful methodologies, and to actively seek to stimulate the kind of research and initiatives that over time will generate knowledge and data that have greater relevance to assessments.
WCMC	Identifying knowledge gaps in assessments: Build identification of knowledge gaps more systematically into assessment processes, and manage their communication to science strategy and funding bodies rapidly following completion of assessments.
UNU- IAS	Specifically engaging with networks of what may be regarded as ‘communities of practice’ representing multiple stakeholders at the sub-national levels would be essential to identify gaps in policies, implementation, methodologies, etc .
ZALF	we suggest to set a specific focus on the emerging areas or target areas of biodiversity conservation (e.g. the protected area networks). There exists plenty of knowledge from that areas. These topics are of global interest/relevance.

### 2.6.1 What further activities could IPBES undertake to more systematically and effectively identify knowledge needs and catalyse the generation of knowledge to address these needs?

BE	<p>Closer interaction (e.g. through the set-up of an MOU) with research funders and programmers</p> <p>Always include boxes in the SPM specifically focusing on knowledge gaps/research needs, so that they can be more easily detected and addressed.</p> <p>Carefully reflect, as part of the assessments, on what could be next for IPBES</p>
CM	IPBES could encourage focal points to organize online exchanges with IPBES experts in their respective countries so that these needs are identified, synthesized and reported at the regional level. Those exchanges are really lacking.
CA	Each assessment could include an annex compiling knowledge gaps that are identified in the assessment. Co-chairs or lead authors might use this as a basis for a technical paper or journal article that could be published and presented to relevant conferences and research society meetings.
CO	Continue close work with the secretariats of other MEAs as well as NGOs and other relevant organizations, in order to understand their needs and why they are prioritizing certain topics or areas of work. These all carry out assessment work with the Parties and relevant stakeholders, so it can be a huge insight for what is needed from IPBES.
EC	Knowledge generation in IPBES, derived from products such as assessments, is still in its infancy. Regarding the bilateral meetings with relevant representatives of generators/mobilisers of knowledge and data, and users of knowledge, this approach is by no means sufficient. A structured participatory process for knowledge generation, based on identified research gaps and knowledge needs, with defined results, and adequate resources, should be set up.
FR	<p>IPBES could consider establishing partnerships with data synthesis centres, in order to promote meta-analysis and the production of data synthesis papers in the areas where IPBES identified gaps.</p> <p>A dedicated group within IPBES could organise a mapping of biodiversity research funders at all level, from national (e.g. NSF), to regional (e.g. European research strategy, BiodivERSA) to global (e.g. Belmont Forum) and then align agendas to ensure that IPBES provides timely input to strategic research planning processes. This group could involve decision-makers and practitioners from the research funding agencies.</p>
GH	The assessment process provides an avenue to identify knowledge gaps. I suggest all assessors are made to fill a questionnaire to be developed at the end of their assessment to elicit information on the above.

## Compilation of input on strategic framework of next work programme

GN	IPBES could build strong ties with national focal points and by signing partnerships with other Multilateral Environment Agreement Secretariats. This is the case of CITES, the Bonn Convention, the Biodiversity Convention, etc. (translated by google translate)
JP	Knowledge needs should be identified based on the completed assessment reports. Identified knowledge needs should be compiled and shared with governments, experts and other stakeholders in a timely manner.
ZA	<p>A key element is the human and financial resources required for knowledge generation. Further activities in this regard, would include undertaking a self-capacity assessment.</p> <p>The current assessments highlight critical gaps in knowledge, and could be used to guide the selection of areas, regions, counties that require support in strengthening knowledge generation capacity. Requests for training programmes could also be entertained.</p> <p>There could be funding needs and opportunities identified in the same space/network so parties can contact each other and initiate partnerships, these being facilitated by IPBES formally.</p> <p>IPBES could encourage focal points to organize online exchanges with IPBES experts in their respective countries so that these needs are identified, synthesized and reported at the regional level. Those exchanges are really lacking.</p>
US	The assessments themselves should identify knowledge gaps and needs in a specific section of the assessment. IPBES could then engage on those priorities with potential research funding institutions and other funding organizations.
VE	To identify knowledge needs, surveys could be implemented, through a digital platform that allows Member States to raise knowledge gaps and needs regarding biodiversity and ecosystem services. These surveys would be carried out through calls or calls on a quarterly or biannual basis as provided by IPBES. (translated by google translate)
DHI	To implement a simpler scoping activity as the current system is complicated especially by the fact that a scoping document can only be approved by the Plenary.
ZALF	New forms of knowledge generation e.g. "citizen science" need to be integrated into the work of IPBES.

### 2.6.2 Do you have other suggestions?

CO	<p>There are a number of initiatives within these MEAs and NGOs, such as the FERI from the CDB, or the Drought Initiative from the UNCCD. These are all opportunities for IPBES to put forth the thematic assessments and show how they relate directly to the goals and objectives of these initiatives.</p> <p>Open the IPBES scope being more strategic, build capacity outside the "IPBES family".</p>
UN	This is where a big push should be made in favour of citizen science, in particular involving for instance matching schools and research institutions in the process – see for example what happen related to climate change a few years back, the Carboschools initiative ( <a href="http://www.carboeurope.org/education/index.php">http://www.carboeurope.org/education/index.php</a> ). Something of a similar nature might be explored related to biodiversity issues.

## 2.7 How to better integrate the four functions of IPBES?

### 2.7.1 In what way could the 4 functions be conceptually more effectively integrated?

## Compilation of input on strategic framework of next work programme

BE	Policy support function needs to be better integrated, and needs proper financial support (see also 1.2)
CO	Showing how they all directly relate to one another, and not having them as separate actions.
EC	See above
FR	<p>For any assessment, define a list of associated deliverables directly addressing the other functions. E.g. for the assessment on invasive species, there could be training material for custom officers (capacity-building), the recording of policy-support tools and methodologies identified in the assessment into the catalogue of policy-support tools (support to decision-making) and a meeting with key research groups working on IAS to foster further research (knowledge generation).</p> <p>The identification of clear deliverables for the non-assessment functions will enhance the visibility of what IPBES does in these fields.</p>
DE	The three functions policy support, capacity building and knowledge generation could be strengthened by integrating them into the assessment reports e.g. by adding additional chapters on these functions to each assessment.
GH	Strengthened linkages.
GN	the four functions of IPBES could be better integrated into the Conceptual Plan by establishing for each function an action plan reflected in the AWPB (Annual Budget Work Plan). (translated by google translate)
MX	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Problem solving approach.</li> <li>• Encourage national political process for policy makers and practitioners from other sectors to know, understand and contribute IPBES.</li> <li>• Broader dissemination of the concept of NCPs.</li> <li>• Measure progress on the activities set out on the work program by setting base lines and using (performance and impact) indicators.</li> <li>• Design contents for different audiences.</li> </ul>
ZA	<p>I cannot quite see how IPBES is generating new knowledge outside of the assessment processes. Possibly there are other activities happening that I am not aware of. To me it seem that there are 3 key functions that are currently underway – and that they are appropriately linked. However, capacity development and policy formulation have been carried out in a way such they are secondary to assessment (they have not received the same weighing in terms of time, focus and effort).</p> <p>Increased integration across the four functions will strengthen the implementation of the work programme. Structuring the second work programme in a more integrated manner will enhance the achievements of the platform’s objectives. It is proposed that an IPBES theme includes all the components (assessment, capacity building, and policy support and knowledge generation).</p> <p>In each assessment’s executive summary a specific section of text could elaborate on how these four sections have been integrated and state the benefits of doing so. Some specific case studies could be highlighted here, and/or in the main assessment.</p>
US	<p>All 4 functions should be better integrated into the assessment process. For example, all assessments should provide policy options to support decision-making, identify knowledge gaps, and support capacity building activities such as the Fellows program. Following assessments, IPBES could work with funding organizations to help catalyse knowledge generation on identified gaps.</p> <p>Having sections clearly laid out in the scoping report that address the four functions of IPBES could also ensure better integration into each of the products.</p>
DHI	A small working group within the MEP should be mandated to assist in the integration.
	Gaps in the assessment function could inform the knowledge and capacity building functions. Policy support function could inform more the scoping of the assessments. Different functions



## Compilation of input on strategic framework of next work programme

	should be more aware of the interfaces they have to the other functions. Maybe a diagram could be drawn to show this.
WCMC	Integration of activities: In addition to the specific activities identified above, the key issue is to develop an integrated plan where each of the activities are appropriately cross-related, and to think of the activities as related one to another and not as a set of discrete activities, and to take steps to achieve this.
UNU- IAS	IPBES needs 'proofs of concepts' thus pilots with various typologies to conduct implementations on the ground are very useful to integrate the four functions of IPBES. As the consequences, IPBES needs to broaden its partnership networks with funding agencies, and national actors.

### 2.7.2 What institutional arrangements could help the further integration of the functions?

EC	Set up a dedicated reporting on the integration of the four functions for the plenaries, and clearly indicate in the financial reporting to which function the expenses relate to. This could trigger reflections on the weight of each function in the overall IPBES work stream.
GH	Formation of Regional IPBES groups to undertake specific activities of the platform at the regional level following agreed rolling work plan.
GN	to define a participatory and inclusive institutional framework of all stakeholders in the expanded IPBES functions of regional coordinators and focal points. (translated by google translate)
ZA	Develop interfaces with other key international institutions.
US	Rather than adding additional task forces and expert groups, an effort should be made to incorporate these processes into the assessment process. This could include having more diverse author groups for the assessments that includes not only those with the scientific expertise but policy and capacity-building knowledge as well.
UN	Functions don't necessarily need to be more integrated but the interfaces between functions need to be enhanced. Clarifying roles and responsibility usually helps cooperation.

## 2.8 How to keep the work programme "rolling"?

### 2.8.1 What processes are needed for allowing recurrent requests for deliverables to be received, considered and approved?

CA	As part of the identification of knowledge gaps (1.4) areas where assessments would be useful (e.g. areas related to a completed assessment but outside the approved scope) could be identified.  Updates on completed assessments (a review of new knowledge) might be carried out periodically. However, there is a danger that over time this process could snowball to a level impossible to continue within the current capacity of the Platform.
CO	The current process has been working properly.  There should be a wide anonymous consultation regarding the approval of recurrent requests, which would include authors, reviewers, focal points, TSUs, MEP and Bureau members, and other relevant stakeholders.

## Compilation of input on strategic framework of next work programme

EC	A long-term structure is needed which allows identifying upcoming deliverables about 4 years before they start, which gives research funders just enough time to support IPBES requests with up-to-date science results, and building up expertise.
FR	Having a rolling programme with several calls for requests is good for IPBES to remain flexible. IPBES should find a cruising pace to ensure that no more than 3 concurrent assessments are ongoing and no more than 2 are adopted per plenary. Defining such a pace will help to frame the calls for requests to avoid having a very long wish list out of the first call for requests which would occupy the work programme until 2030. It will give the pace of the regular calls and the number of assessments that may be launched out of them.
DE	The work programme should be kept “rolling” by not scheduling and finalizing topics for all possible assessment under the work programme at the very beginning, but by keeping capacities in order to serve the assessment needs e.g. arising from the post-2020 global biodiversity framework as well as the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development in relation to biodiversity and ecosystem services (see also attached document CBD/SBSTTA/22/11 IV. B.).
GN	processes that respond to NICTs adapted to the objectives of the IPBES functions and the achievements to be achieved. This could result in the creation of a communication cell using the various channels and sources of information and communication. (translated by google translate)
JP	In order to allow governments for a deliberate consideration on inputs to the programme, we would like to suggest that the secretariat share drafts of relevant documents early in the process of producing final documents for the Plenary.
MX	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The new work program must first address those priority key topics to address biodiversity loss with large gaps of information (e.g. pollution, including agrochemicals) as part of fixed activities of the program, and then evaluate other issues that may be complementary.</li> <li>• Develop a mechanism to analyse the relevance of addressing, under clear criteria, a limited number of new and emerging issues as well as the technical and financial feasibility to address them. Some suggested criteria: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Avoid including topics that are being addressed by other processes.</li> <li>○ Avoid discussing topics that are not of common interest and with global impact and have not gone through a thorough SWOT analysis.</li> <li>○ Ensure new issues are directly related to identified needs of information.</li> <li>○ Assess urgency of the topic</li> <li>○ Determine if new and emerging issue accepted needs a Fast Track or regular assessment</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Once the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework is approved, new topics may be added accordingly to the main elements agreed on the program.</li> <li>• Analyse main national needs, both from the environmental sector, and from other sectors.</li> </ul>
ZA	<p>Unsure, but regional requirements for information need to be considered in the consideration and approval process.</p> <p>Regular consultations with experts, policy makers, etc.</p> <p>I think new requests should be possible to table without a specific country initiating it but would then be formally supported by interested countries. Requests could come from the scientific community, NGO's or sectorial bodies.</p>
US	IPBES should solicit requests for deliverables on a recurring basis, perhaps every 3 years to coincide with the length of individual assessments. Selection of assessment topics should occur in a transparent and open fashion. All requested topics submitted should be shared with member states as they are submitted. To ensure that approved assessments are still relevant, the length between selection of topics, scoping, and undertaking the assessment should be minimized. This

	<p>could perhaps be facilitated by only selecting 2 to 3 assessment topics after each call for requests. The Plenary should have the option not to undertake an assessment with an approved scoping document or to postpone it until after other assessments if higher priority issues are identified by the Plenary.</p> <p>IPBES should also allow for the flexibility of topics related to new current events, shifts in priorities, or new cross-cutting, high impact issues that arise during the interim 3 year period of requests to be suggested and considered by member states.</p>
VE	<p>The following process is recommended:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Calls: Quarterly calls can be made to allow the Member States of IPBES to submit their applications.</li> <li>• Selection: The Secretariat, the Bureau, and the Multidisciplinary Panel of Experts, would select the proposals presented by the Member States, Observers, and other relevant actors, based on the functions and criteria stipulated by the Platform.</li> <li>• Approval: It is suggested to carry out digital surveys (in real time) addressed to the Member States, in order to evaluate and approve the previously selected applications.</li> </ul> <p>(translated by google translate)</p>
	<p>Through establishing a formal link to the decisions-making bodies of the biodiversity-related MEAs which have different cycles thus allowing considering requests from these bodies.</p>
DHI	<p>The current procedures suffice.</p>
UN	<p>The development of the new deliverables should start from the desired outcomes. Member states, observers and stakeholders should be asked what they really need from IPBES in order to be able to do their work better. In the scoping of the assessments focus should be on asking policy relevant questions first before for instance setting out the geographical scope.</p>
WCMC	<p>Timing of calls: Make clear well in advance when calls for requests and suggestions are expected to be made, possibly also linking the timing to the timetables of major intergovernmental meetings so as to link with key intergovernmental processes.</p>

### 3 How to further strengthen institutional arrangements established to implement the four functions?

#### 3.1 Plenary sessions: What sequence of Plenaries (at IPBES-6 an 18-month sequence emerged as a possibility) would seem optimal?

BE	<p>Once per year is ideal (spread of workload and timely follow up), if budget allows.</p>
CA	<p>Now that most of the rules, processes and procedures have been developed, it could be considered at each Plenary, based on material ready for Plenary decision, when the next meeting should be scheduled, rather than set a fixed recurrence time.</p>
CO	<p>18 months could be an option. The most important thing to keep in mind, is that there is enough work to be done at each Plenary and that we're not trying to find things to do in order to keep a full</p>

## Compilation of input on strategic framework of next work programme

	work programme and agenda. This also will allow to adjust the budget properly and it is according to the assessments schedule (one assessment would take two Plenaries to be approved).
EC	We would be in favour to switch to an 18-month sequence.
FR	The Plenary has to meet annually since many Governments are in a position to make annual pledges only.
GH	Sequence can be staggered based on work programme of the platform in a particular year. 1-2 years cycle could be used as appropriate.
GN	the duration will depend on the topics to be discussed and the importance attached thereto. (translated by google translate)
JP	We prefer the current sequence of Plenaries if sufficient resources are available but do not object to the option of 18-month sequence when necessary. However, for efficiency, each Plenary should be limited to and not exceed the maximum number of days held in the past Plenaries.
MX	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Having Plenary meetings once a year allows a closer follow up on the progress made on the implementation of the work program. However, the cost of each Plenary meeting is very high, so holding them every 18 months would result in important savings and more time for experts and NFPs to prepare and review chapters and SPMs of assessments.</li> <li>• Considering that CBD COPs take place every 2 years, we suggest that IPBES Plenaries could also take place every 2 years (in the intersessional period in between CBD COPs), resulting in even larger savings that could be used for the implementation of the work program's deliverables.</li> </ul>
ZA	18-month frequency is best. The sequence of plenaries could happen on a bi-annual basis in a cycle that alternates with the CBD.
US	An 18-month sequence for the Plenary would be optimal, as it aligns with the 3-year terms of Bureau and MEP members.
VE	Yes, a sequence of 18 months would allow enough time for a better preparation of the documents to be discussed in the Plenary, allowing: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Have versions of documents (evaluations) in the different languages of the United Nations.</li> <li>b. Have more time to review the evaluations.</li> </ol> (translated by google translate)
DHI	The current annual Plenary should be maintained in order to provide continuity and relevance.

### 3.2 Engagement of policy makers and practitioners: What mechanisms could be proposed to strengthen engagement of policy makers and practitioners (e.g. more informal/technical consultation workshops)?

BE	See under 1.2 and 1.3.
CA	Based on numerous interventions at IPBES-6 to introduce and "negotiate" text that was often not mentioned in the technical report, effort directed toward improved understanding of and promotion of how a science-policy interface can function as a bridge to benefit both the science and policy communities could be helpful and increase engagement of policy makers.
CO	Policy makers usually get involved when there is something to be gained from participating, such as having a joint declaration on a certain issue, a bilateral meeting regarding a project, the presentation of an important initiative that requires support or endorsement, etc. If the workshops

## Compilation of input on strategic framework of next work programme

	<p>are technical and/or informal, they will always send a delegate who has the technical knowledge on the topics.</p> <p>It is important to understand how to permeate at national and local levels the decision makers and practitioners.</p>
EC	<p>Workshops and webinars could be some of the means to strengthen engagement. A horizontal TSU could be built up explicitly to support this. Another way of strengthen engagement of policy makers is a changed, more interactive, way of revising assessment drafts (no clarity why, whether, to which amount comments submitted have been taken into account in assessment revision process).</p>
FR	<p>Policy-makers seems already fairly well engaged within IPBES but practitioners is a very wide category which should be better identified: practitioners of what? In which field? Several specialised workshops could be organised according to the targeted stakeholders, resorting to IPBES stakeholder networks. Consistency of actions across sectors is also critical but can be envisioned once IPBES knows its stakeholder networks better. This implies that stakeholder engagement is a specific area of work at IPBES, linked but distinct from the communication and outreach activities.</p> <p>At plenaries, interpretation in the 6 UN languages throughout the day and in all contact groups is critical to ensure participation of all members and stakeholders.</p>
GH	<p>Organisation of a ministerial segment in some cases during plenary meetings.</p>
GN	<p>on the one hand, we believe that we can use the diploma or consular path of the IPBES member countries represented in different countries to address the relevant ministries of IPBES. On the other hand, use letters addressed to the parent ministries of IPBES with a copy to the focal point of IPBES to better disseminate information to users. (translated by google translate)</p>
JP	<p>Regular informal/technical consultations could be an option.</p>
MX	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Linkage with the Secretariats of other conventions (take advantage of the Biodiversity Liaison Group of CBD <a href="https://www.cbd.int/blg/">https://www.cbd.int/blg/</a> , the Consortium of Scientific Partners on Biodiversity <a href="https://www.cbd.int/cooperation/csp/">https://www.cbd.int/cooperation/csp/</a>) and Bio-bridge initiative.</li> <li>• Find ways to make IPBES applicable at the national level, such as:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Problem solving approach.</li> <li>○ Asking Ministers, the main problems they are facing to conserve and use sustainably biodiversity and their most important needs of information.</li> <li>○ Identify specific elements that may be shared through webinars for processes such as the development national reports to CBD.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Invite members and stakeholders to share successful case studies on the implementation of IPBES deliverables at the national level and showcase them in a workshop (or online).</li> <li>• Technical workshops/webinars for policy makers and practitioners at different levels and from different sectors for a better understanding of IPBES deliverables and key findings, and to exchange experiences and views.</li> <li>• Promote a closer collaboration between NFPs of IPBES and all Biodiversity Related Conventions (BRC) and policy makers.</li> </ul>
ZA	<p>More direct technical consultation workshops directly linked to the development of IPBES products throughout the process and prior to finalisation. Strengthening the IPBES interactions undertaken under the hospices of the CBD.</p> <p>I think that policy maker's engagements could be more practically orientated. Instead of information sharing, workshops where practitioners and policymakers co-design and co-develop policy drafts and white papers would be effective.</p> <p>It is important for the Platform to find ways to more actively engage with Governments around their key challenges. This can be facilitated through the national focal points and should involve senior policy makers. In addition to this, sub-regional dialogues should be held to engage policy</p>

## Compilation of input on strategic framework of next work programme

	<p>makers on the outcomes of the assessments and policy support tools and methodologies that are produced.</p> <p>More work/consultation on best practices and success stories</p> <p>Continue efforts for joint scoping and joint interpretation of assessments.</p> <p>Example given is a great idea.</p>
US	<p>Engaging policy makers and practitioners in the assessment scoping process could facilitate greater uptake of the assessments, and allow assessments to answer questions relevant to policymakers.</p> <p>IPBES could potentially provide a list of tools and suggestions to member state's focal points to help better engage their policymakers.</p> <p>Following the approval of the SPMs, report findings could be presented to policymakers, allowing them ask questions about the SPMs and policy options identified. Perhaps this could take place at the Plenary or in a webinar following the Plenary.</p>
VE	<p>Technical workshops could be implemented to provide policy makers with knowledge about the development of evaluations and how to integrate this knowledge into national programs and plans. (translated by google translate)</p>
DHI	<p>Relevant stakeholders, especially from the financial sector like the International Finance Corporation (IFC), World Bank, Asian Development Bank (ADB), etc. should be engaged and allowed to be represented in the Plenary. Technical consultation workshops.</p>
UN	<p>It may not be considered very cost-effective to physically and directly engage policy makers and practitioners. Besides the creation of enabling spaces (e.g. online/virtual), it is highly recommended to strengthen liaison with those partners who work regularly closely with these target stakeholders as knowledge-policy-practice interface. These supporting efforts should be recognized more prominently and better guided and supported technically/operationally.</p>
WCMC	<p>Familiarization workshops: Use regional and national workshops to increase understanding of IPBES and the relevance of its deliverables, and to also provide alumni with the tools and knowledge to further communicate this understanding.</p> <p>Note comments elsewhere about increasing engagement with policy fora.</p>
UNU- IAS	<p>Facilitating with partners 'peer learning' on various themes at various levels of implementation would be helpful. Facilitating regular country meetings with relevant stakeholders who have linked to IPBES works are essential.</p>

### 3.3 Expert groups and task forces

#### 3.3.1 What task forces are needed and how would they be constituted?

BE	Policy support function
EC	At least one task force per function is permanently needed.
FR	<p>We could support a special attention to the work on indicators as a future element of the work programme given the importance of this topic, especially regarding socio-economic aspects. We consider that collaboration between IPBES and the Biodiversity Indicators Partnership is sufficient to provide for ecological indicators, but both initiatives could gain from a collaboration over socio-economic indicators for biodiversity, which are at a much earlier stage of development.</p> <p>The way this work on indicators could be implemented is to be discussed. A task force seems a good format for such work but we are concerned by the transparency of the work and the legitimacy and ownership of IPBES on this work when it comes to the many partnerships it needs to enter. For sure IPBES cannot and shouldn't embark on this alone but the nominated experts of the task force have to play a major, leading role, and decide collectively on the needs and required partnerships.\</p>

## Compilation of input on strategic framework of next work programme

	<p>A task force on scenarios and models would be useful, and would support the knowledge generation function of IPBES. Clear deliverables have to be defined.</p> <p>For all task forces or dedicated expert groups (e.g. scenarios) which would continue from IPBES first work programme, one should reflect on the composition of the expert group and the continuation of the TSU. The expert group should be renewed, (at least 75%) in order to free up the experts who already dedicated their time for 4-5 years and to allow new expertise to come in. The continuation of the TSU should be checked with the host institution.</p>
GN	<p>the need for a group depends on the concerns of IPBES. There is a need for guidance from IPBES. In any case, we believe that a group could consist of a chairman, a facilitator and two scientific and technical rapporteurs. (translated by google translate)</p>
MX	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Categorize 2 types of task forces: permanent and temporary.</li> <li>• A task force on biodiversity mainstreaming could be constituted as an additional permanent task force in order to ensure that IPBES assessments are addressed under a holistic and cross-cutting approach, enhancing the participation of other sectors (beyond the environmental sector). This task force should also be aligned to the implementation of Agenda 2030 and its SDGs, and to the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework.</li> </ul>
NL	<p>Consider establishing one combined taskforce which would be focusing on Capacity building as well as on the catalysing of efforts regarding the generation of new knowledge and additional policy support tools. The rationale for having only one combined taskforce for these three IPBES functions is the need for improved integration and coherence. Another possible consideration however, could be to have more than just one group dealing with the policy support, knowledge generation and capacity building functions of IPBES in order to numerically balance the (on average) three expert groups on assessments.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ To be co-chaired by bureau members.</li> <li>○ With representatives from: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ MEP;</li> <li>▪ expert groups of ongoing assessments (in order to enhance integration of functions) and;</li> <li>▪ from strategic partners organizations (in order to further stimulate a reinforced impact of IPBES).</li> </ul> </li> <li>○ To be facilitated by secretariat/TSU (An important prerequisite for having one combined taskforce for the three IPBES functions will be the availability of sufficient facilitative capacity.)</li> <li>○ With the following responsibilities: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ to support the stepping up of Efforts in catalysing the generation of new knowledge and policy support tools (in particular addressing knowledge gaps identified in the Platform's assessments);</li> <li>▪ to support the organization of the forum;</li> <li>▪ to review (and potentially revise) on a regular basis the Capacity-building Rolling Plan;</li> <li>▪ to oversee and advice regarding those elements of the CB Rolling Plan that are organised predominantly by IPBES itself and supported by the trust fund (e.g. elements of strategy 1 of the rolling plan on Learning and engagement such as the <i>Fellowships Programme</i> and the <i>Training and Familiarisation Programme</i>).</li> </ul> </li> <li>○ With a number of subgroups (expert groups), aiming at enhanced involvement of partners organizations in concrete activities relevant to the work programme (Through means such as increasing alignment of activities, providing direct support, building and managing relationships and facilitating stakeholder engagement (IPBES-3/4, Annex III, paragraph 1). <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Consisting of a core group of taskforce members and a wider (expanding) circle of collaborative partners;</li> <li>▪ To be co-chaired by one of the MEP members of the Taskforce and one representative of a strategic partners organization;</li> <li>▪ To be facilitated by a strategic partners organization.</li> </ul> </li> <li>○ Potential subgroups: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Policy support tools (this group to advise on further development of the Catalogue and with a focus on catalysing of new tools);</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

## Compilation of input on strategic framework of next work programme

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Indicators (with an emphasis on catalysing of new indicators) ;</li> <li>▪ ILK (this group to be instrumental in operationalization of the participatory mechanism) ;</li> <li>▪ Conceptualization of multiple values (this group to focus on capacity building following the assessment);</li> <li>▪ Scenarios and models (this group to be focussing on catalysing new scenarios);</li> <li>▪ Strengthening national and regional capacities (i.e. strategy 3 of the Rolling plan, this group to be focussing on the provision of guidance).</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ These subgroups also as the main vehicle to implement strategies 2 of the CB Rolling Plan on Facilitating access to expertise and information by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Building and supporting communities of practice;</li> <li>▪ Bridging with indigenous and local knowledge systems; and</li> <li>▪ Facilitating access to data, information and knowledge</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
ZA	<p>Task forces established to explore how IPBES results can be implemented into a diversity of conventions and even were possible national legislation, other than those related to Biodiversity, Environment and Conservation. There crosscutting nexus issues could help in establishing clear linkages between food, water and energy and how conventions policies that work in synergy need to be established.</p> <p>Need to have one task force on ecosystem resilience / Climate Change, pollution and other anthropic activities.</p> <p>The secretariat should but forward desired assessments and then propose task forces. There should then additionally be possible to make amendments suggestions for task force focal topics.</p> <p>Already existing working groups are good from my point of view. But doing the job well requires spending precious time that IPBES does not pay for. If the organization of the plenaries can take this into account I think that the expert groups would be more efficient. For instance, we do not need to house experts who are above all technicians in very expensive hotels, over-feed them and leave them with empty pockets. We could take things in the opposite direction. In fact this is how some have been thinking in expert groups.</p>
US	<p>We suggest not initiating any new task forces at this time, and instead focus on incorporating these elements into the assessments and other IPBES activities. In fact, we should explore whether the current task forces are really necessary and have added value to the process.</p>
VE	<p>It is suggested to have a Working Group on Indigenous and Local Knowledge (ILK). This working group would be constituted by actors from indigenous and local communities, nominated by the Member States, Observers and relevant stakeholders. (translated by google translate)</p>
DHI	<p>There should be a task force to address the cooperation between IPBES and the private sector. A clear mechanism is needed especially since the private sector is also an important decision-maker and practitioner. At the moment, no clear processes and activities are available to include decision-makers and practitioners.</p>
UN	<p>For some Task Forces, a more flexible and responsive system for assembling the experts and expertise needed for specific tasks or streams of work, on a time scale appropriate to the task, could be very helpful. This is as opposed to a single group of individuals who are expected to perform most functions over an extended period of time, as has been the case for the First Work Plan.</p>
WCMC	<p>Task forces as partner focus groups: Reconstitute task forces as representatives of partner organizations working with IPBES to support delivery of particular aspects of the work programme. The primary purpose would be coordination and alignment of activities, and opportunities to increase the engagement of the organizations concerned. Some task forces might be ongoing for the life of the work programme, while others might be time bound for a specific task.</p> <p>Expert groups as time-bound advisory groups: Expert groups should be established for specific issues where advice is needed, or guidance documents need to be drafted. However in order to ensure cross-linkage, the experts need to be familiar with other IPBES activities and deliverables, and this needs to be considered when discussing modalities for establishment of such groups. It is</p>



## Compilation of input on strategic framework of next work programme

	conceivable that an ongoing issue (such as capacity-building may need both an expert group to provide advice, and a task force to support delivery.
ZALF	We suggest a task force on management impacts (How to use our land and biodiversity resources in a more sustainable way?) and on the available options to do so. Another task force could working on hot spots or emerging areas for biodiversity.
KD	Speaking personally, and for others I know , the lack of funding to reimburse travel costs for experts from developing countries has created a barrier to their engagement. While we are prepared to donate our time, it becomes difficult if we are also expected to personally fund related travel expenses.

### 3.3.2 Do you have a suggestion on ways to do things differently, if necessary?

CM	Already existing working groups are good from my point of view. But doing the job well requires spending precious time that IPBES does not pay for. If the organization of the plenaries can take this into account I think that the expert groups would be more efficient. For instance, we do not need to house experts who are above all technicians in very expensive hotels, over-feed them and leave them with empty pockets. We could take things in the opposite direction. In fact this is how some have been thinking in expert groups.
CA	The efficacy of task forces might be improved if they were constituted with the understanding that they were time-bound and issue oriented.
CO	Concentrate more on the language that is used to produce the SMPs. Most of the issues during the negotiations at the 6th Plenary had to do with the use of terminology and language that wasn't apt in a political context, but had no problem in a scientific context. These differences are the ones that need to be met in order for both sides to understand one another.
ZA	Yes, need to work on case study bases and then see how to duplicate experiences. Need to be policy implementation orientated.
UA	The existing task forces have not always produced clear products and outcomes, so we suggest clarifying what the current task forces have accomplished. Additionally, we should ensure that products generated by the task forces are incorporated into assessments.

## 3.4 Indigenous and local knowledge (ILK)

### 3.4.1 How could the work with ILK be further improved to implement the approach?

CO	Members should be consulted regarding the networks of local communities and indigenous peoples that are present in their respective countries. For instance, Colombia has noticed that the roster the CBD uses to contact participants for ILK workshops and other types of events is quite limited and doesn't represent the reality of all the groups that exist in the country. It would be a great opportunity if we could actually have an inclusive list that represents that national reality.
GN	it is to be in direct contact with the representatives of ILK, by being inspired by their traditional knowledge and knowledge. Also, organize international meetings for ILK as the Convention on Biological Diversity does, in any case, in the 90s, through one of the articles of the text of the Convention dedicated to traditional knowledge. (translated by google translate)
MX	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Continue the work of this task force making sure that it does not compete with the work conducted for article 8j of CBD.</li> <li>Include representatives from IPLCs to collaborate since the design of the work program and its deliverables (coproduction), seeking for a broader representation beyond the usual participants (eg. Networks of distinction centers).</li> </ul>

## Compilation of input on strategic framework of next work programme

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Dissemination of tools, experiences and successful case studies on ILK that may contribute to the assessments.</li> <li>• Asses the use and awareness of IPBES deliverables by IPLC.</li> </ul>
ZA	<p>The use of case studies that investigate ILK and its integration for the local level to the National, and Global should be explored in more detail. Here the focus should be on method for integrating this knowledge across scales such that the contributions and both appropriate recognised and yet are not over inflated in their significance.</p> <p>By seeing how it has been used wisely and how it can be implemented effectively in selected situations.</p> <p>Specifically compile experts to do assessments in a more interdisciplinary way by including ILK experts in that specific topic/field before assessments are started. With the pollinator assessment there was only one such expert include as an author. Think at least three would be required for future assessments.</p> <p>I think we (IPBES) should ask ourselves: how far are the focal points working to ensure that ILK are really taken into account in national programs and projects?</p>
VE	<p>It is necessary to reflect in the evaluations carried out by IPBES, the recognition of indigenous peoples and local communities, who provide their knowledge to the Platform. On the other hand, it is important that these communities know the results of the final products (evaluations), as well as being part of the Multidisciplinary Panel of Experts. (translated by google translate)</p>
UN	<p>IPBES could engage in a methodological assessment of ILK in biodiversity research, monitoring and assessments, looking at projects that have successfully bridged from local knowledge into national and international level research and data collection. The aim would be to provide an overview of the current state of research on ILK and biodiversity, clear case studies and lessons learnt, and guidelines that can both inform IPBES' work on ILK, and which could also be a useful tool for organisations, researchers and indigenous and local communities doing assessments and research at international, regional, and local levels. Such an effort could be highly prestigious for IPBES, and could greatly advance methodological understandings of how to engage with ILK at national and international levels.</p> <p>As part of the above work, it would be valuable to do a formal review of the steps and methodologies taken to draw ILK into completed assessments and their SPMs, including the pollinators assessment, scenarios assessment, the regional assessments, and the global assessment. This could then be used to provide guidelines and lessons learnt for future assessments. (An example is the planned work on reviewing ILK content and processes for the pollinators assessment).</p> <p>Further focus on specific gaps identified in past assessments (e.g. a lack of ILK and indigenous participation in building scenarios and models), could also be a strong stream of work for IPBES.</p>
WCMC	<p>Action across all functions and activities: Further thought might need to be given to how ILK is addressed across all four functions of IPBES, as well as in associated communication and outreach. The focus at present seems to be on ILK in assessments, and this needs to be built upon.</p>
UNU- IAS	<p>Engagement with partners who are part of/ co-ordinate ILK networks and developing various approaches to consult and communicate with ILK holders and practitioners will be useful across the different functions of IPBES.</p>
KD	<p>I endorse the separation of indigenous peoples and local communities (IPLC), they are different and should be understood as such.</p>

### 3.4.2 Do you have suggestions regarding the implementation of the participatory mechanism?

CM	<p>I think we (IPBES) should ask ourselves: how far are the focal points working to ensure that ILK are really taken into account in national programs and projects?</p>
----	--

## Compilation of input on strategic framework of next work programme

EC	Identify ILK leaders and try to get them involved and their support
FI	Collaboration with the The University of the Arctic (UArctic) should be considered. UArctic a cooperative network of universities, colleges, research institutes and other organizations concerned with education and research in and about the North. Biodiversity, ecosystem service and sustainable development are included in many thematic networks of UArctic ( <a href="https://www.uarctic.org/about-uarctic/">https://www.uarctic.org/about-uarctic/</a> )
GH	An assessment of Regional ILK could foster the implementation of this.
GN	not now, probably waiting to see the current mechanism. (translated by google translate)
ZA	The work of ILK is complex and could be integrated through the relevant UN structures as well as other working sessions like CBD article 8j and the World Heritage Convention.  Have on board policy makers.
UN	The participatory mechanism needs to be understood as a series of different processes and participation at different levels. The underlying question is how indigenous and local knowledge holders or those in research partnerships with ILK holders effectively engage with IPBES along the chain of knowledge production, generating assessments, drawing forth the ILK components into the SPMs, capacity building, as well as the higher level governance processes which ensures transparency, accountability and a voice for indigenous peoples and local communities. It would be highly beneficial to review the effectiveness of participation in previous assessments, to work on the post-assessment processes (which would include ILK holders reflecting on the outcomes and articulating their agency in the capacity building and national policy processes), as well as accompanying new assessments to facilitate and learn from the opportunities and challenges of effective participation.

### 3.5 Engagement with partners

#### 3.5.1 How to further strengthen the engagement of relevant Multilateral environmental agreements and UN agencies?

BE	Clear(er) delineation of the specific roles of IPBES with regard to biodiversity-related MEAs and UN partners. This could be determined through a gap analysis  Sufficient exchange regarding parallel assessments under different processes to avoid competition (e.g. in terms of financial, expert's willingness to contribute, media attention etc) and ensure coherence (e.g. framings, methodologies, data usage etc.) > streamlining  further clarification of the collaboration with UNDP
CO	Joint side events, workshops, webinars, etc. That way the IPBES name can be more recognized and the impact the thematic and global assessments have in the efforts of different MEAs. There are a number of initiatives within these MEAs and NGOs, such as the FERI from the CDB, or the Drought Initiative from the UNCCD. These are all opportunities for IPBES to put forth the thematic assessments and show how they relate directly to the goals and objectives of these initiatives.
EC	Pro-active engagement with MEAs and UN agencies beyond core biodiversity policy is needed (i.e. with UN Habitat and UNISDR regarding the Sendai Framework)
FR	Make sure that there is a space for IPBES or IPBES experts to talk in MEAs and UN agencies' fora, even more when biodiversity does not seem the central topic to be discussed. This would help UN agencies members to get familiar with IPBES. E.g. FAO is now well engaged in agroecology for development and nutrition, but agroecology needs biodiversity as well and IPBES speakers could highlight this, based on several assessments' findings. In our example, this would help highlighting that agroecology is a converging challenge for biodiversity, food and social development.

## Compilation of input on strategic framework of next work programme

GH	Need to expand relationship with related conventions and MEAs by negotiating MOUs and undertaking activities geared towards meeting their objectives.
GN	translate this commitment into the signature of yet more technical partnerships with the most active Multilateral Environmental Agreement (MEA) Secretariats (the three Rio Conventions, CITES, CMS, the International Convention for the Protection of (FAO), etc., and organizations such as WRI, IUCN, the Scientific and Technical Technical Group of the Ramsar Convention, etc. Another aspect is to ensure that IPBES participates in the meetings. subsidiary groups of MEAs. (translated by google translate)
MX	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Consider recommendations of CBD IAG on synergies document CBD/SBI/2/10/Add.1 on the implementation of options to enhance synergies among the biodiversity-related conventions.</li> <li>Leverage the work done within CBD for biodiversity mainstreaming, particularly with FAO, UNWTO, WHO and UNEA.</li> <li>Consider collaboration with convention clusters outside biodiversity realm such as pollution, business and health conventions.</li> </ul>
TH	The future work programme should be linked to other conventions related to biodiversity, for instance, the Convention on Migratory Species (CMS), the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species (CITES), and the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change.
ZA	<p>This requires the recognition of the need for partnerships, and the formulation of these partnerships. These need to mutually supportive and beneficial. Here clearly defined roles and responsibilities need to be defined. Here the IPBES process needs to be seen less as a UN activity but more and a collaborative effort where structure, and output is co-designed with those who will ultimately take results and finding forwards at later stages.</p> <p>Further strengthening of engagement with MEAs and UN agencies is very important for the success and relevance of the Platform. The more integration and synergies among IPBES and the MEAs, the more effective the Platform will be.</p> <p>Develop common platform of intervention and share competency around common themes such as the blue governance.</p> <p>Allow for additional time/opportunities for expert participants of these agreements and agencies to interact with assessment teams during the length of the assessment process.</p>
US	We suggest IPBES leadership should meet with the leadership of the relevant UN Agencies to assure broader engagement of coordinating UN bodies. The concern we see is that the engagement outside of UNEP does not extend throughout the entire UN agency.
CMS	Through the establishment of formal mechanisms through which biodiversity-related MEAs' decisions and resolutions feed into IPBES priority setting. And viceversa, IPBES outputs are considered by these MEAs as a basis for their decision-making processes. Without such link, IPBES work may duplicate individual MEAs' efforts and create parallel processes. (see comments above)
DHI	<p>Prepare engagement plan to include a list of MEAs and UN agencies to engage based on a scoping exercise.</p> <p>An officer/team specifically for engagement with relevant MEAs and UN agencies.</p>
UN	On ILK, there is the opportunity to consider how ILK messages and observations in the SPMs are relevant to the UNCBD, UNCCD, CITES and Ramsar Wetlands Convention. Each of these instruments has an ILK legal or policy component. It would be valuable to have a roundtable between the ILK TF, IIPFBES, ILK TSU and representatives of IPBES Secretariat, the MEP, the supporting UN agencies and these three MEAs.
WCMC	Increase engagement: Continue with the approaches to engagement with partners originally discussed in the task force on capacity-building, and use this as a basis for significantly increasing engagement with IPBES. This also relates to stakeholder engagement, as many stakeholders are also potential partners in delivery.

## Compilation of input on strategic framework of next work programme

	UN partners: Identify ways to increase engagement with UN Environment, UNESCO, FAO and UNDP both individually and together in the context of the collaborative agreement. It seems likely that each of the organizations has strengths relevant to IPBES that could be drawn on further.
--	--

### 3.5.2 How to further strengthen and broaden the engagement of other types of partners?

CO	Same exercise with different stakeholders, NGOs, etc. Identify common spaces.
EC	This means step up networking and outreach. This needs resources to identify key individuals, build trust and engage others, building the network chain which makes growing the network of networks
GH	Informing them about the functions and product of the platform and its benefits. Inviting them to participate in plenary and to provide technical expertise in the assessments if they are found to have it.
GN	reinvigorate collaboration, ensure the participation of IPBES members in the MEA Conference of Parties and vice versa; promote collaboration with organizations and institutions involved in IPBES. (translated by google translate)
ZA	Much more effort needs to be made to formalise and strengthen key partnerships. This has been slow in the first programme and needs to be accelerated, going forward. Implementation of the Stakeholder Engagement Strategy needs to be fast-tracked. Development of a network of partners will strengthen the work of the Platform. These should include the broad range of stakeholders from intergovernmental organisations to the private sector and community-based organisations, to name just a few.  Develop initiatives with highly collaborative countries. The idea is to concentrate efforts on a small number of initiatives and publicise the results for duplication.  Allowing additional informal queries from non-government partners as suggested in the proposed new IPBES work approach is sufficient.
US	IPBES should assure that all partners can see an opportunity to engage, either through submission of possible assessment topics, participation on the assessment teams and as reviewers of the document.
DHI	A task force to address the cooperation between IPBES and the private sector.

### 3.6 Communication and outreach: How to further strengthen the IPBES communication and outreach?

BE	More outreach beyond the launch of the assessments and targeting a wider audience, to raise the profile of biodiversity on the policy agenda and induce transformative (social) change  Creating specific outreach products to increase the uptake of the IPBES deliverables  Toolkit for national focal points to present IPBES, its products and its impact/relevance
CM	One of the solutions to improve what is already done is that to encourage the Focal Points to set up online groups for the systematic sharing of information
CO	Coordinate with other platforms from MEAs and other relevant organisms to have joint communications and outreach efforts.  Design follow-up and monitoring mechanisms into the IPBES communications strategy regarding the use of the IPBES deliverables by decision makers.
EC	see above and identify journalists and people who are responsible for TV channels and other media who will continuously report on IPBES. The media coverage after IPBES 6 was great, but we

## Compilation of input on strategic framework of next work programme

	need to have a continuous information flow and uptake in the media. It must become a continuous news item; people must understand the seriousness of the situation we are in.
FI	Cooperation, e.g. workshops with UArctic network (See above, point 2.4.). More focus on education: Online learning materials for university students and engagement of university teachers.
FR	Create a range of more targeted, shorter outputs out of the large assessment processes: 4-pager for focused sectors or geographical areas, especially the ones with a lower level of engagement into IPBES: e.g. small islands developing states, agriculture or mining sectors. These outputs would be designed with support from the target audience, in order to enhance the level of uptake.
GH	As part of the negotiation with other MEA and Conventions, it will be useful to have the IPBES link on their platform. NFP to be create awareness in their respective countries on the platforms work and products.
GN	serve decision-makers, industry, scientists, environmental organizations and act as an intermediary between users and providers of IPBES information; provide specialists with useful information on IPBES; strengthen the autonomy of focal points to better communicate and raise awareness among politicians, administrators, users and information providers. (translated by google translate)
JP	The deliverables, particularly IPBES assessments reports, could be translated into languages other than UN languages and shared among member states by uploading the translation to the IPBES website. Also, domestic events related to IPBES (not necessarily involving the IPBES secretariat), could be shared on the website as information for other member states.
MX	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Improve the image and contents of IPBES website: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ more languages – multicultural</li> <li>○ profiles for diverse audiences</li> <li>○ section for donors (recognition)</li> <li>○ dissemination of regional/national activities related to IPBES deliverables</li> <li>○ literature related to IPBES deliverables</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Promote collaborations with museums and partnerships with relevant universities, international research institutions and centers of excellence on biodiversity (eg. Members of the Consortium of Scientific Partners on Biodiversity -CSP).</li> <li>• Work on partnerships with relevant international environmental media such as BBC, National Geographic, Discovery, Deutsche Welle, etc., and with renowned personalities such as Sir David Attenborough, Jane Goodall, Al Gore, etc.</li> <li>• Build and strengthen communication with CBD-CHM National Focal Points, to promote the dissemination of IPBES findings.</li> <li>• Continue to use social media to disseminate the work of IPBES, related papers and facts from SPMs.</li> </ul>
ZA	<p>A global communication campaign with key messages needs to be implemented. Prominent third party spokes people, e.g. Goodwill ambassadors could be deployed.</p> <p>The approaches taken regarding communication and outreach are good and have been effective in communicating with assessors and policy makers. However, the broader public, even students with in the ecosystem field have little to know knowledge of IPBES and communication needs to be expanded to reach these audiences. This could be done through YouTube post and in particular podcasts. So diversification of communication strategies.</p> <p>After the initial slow start in the first programme, it is pleasing to see the progress that has been made in the last few months. By equipping member states and partners with the materials and</p>

## Compilation of input on strategic framework of next work programme

	<p>information, they are better able to communicate and raise awareness about the Platform and its work.</p> <p>Touch the kids at school. Develop tailor made program for young kids.</p> <p>List such activities specifically under each country and promote with in country cross-sectorial information flow.</p> <p>One of the solutions to improve what is already done is that to encourage the Focal Points to set up online groups for the systematic sharing of information</p>
	<p>Future assessment scoping documents should include a strategic communications plan that outlines how products will feed into policy development. The plans should identify the specific stakeholders to disseminate information to and the types of policy and decision makers that communications of the products should target.</p>
	<p>See comment above- if IPBES outcomes are relevant and/or respond to MEAs needs, joint efforts ca be achieved in terms of communication and outreach and resource mobilization (see below) thus maximizing results and minimizing individual investments.</p>
DHI	<p>Continue using mass media (like Twitter, Facebook, etc.) as the main medium for communication and outreach</p> <p>Collaborate with major media to further IPBES' mandate</p> <p>Ambassador programme</p>
UN	<p>Communications &amp; Outreach is on a good track and UN Environment is contributing to that through the Communications Division and the 'synergies' project.</p> <p>Similar to capacity building function, communication and outreach function of IPBES works can be more outsourced by better utilizing respective partners' wide network. If this pathway is to be pursued, clearer and practical guidance are required on how better to communicate IPBES messages and how to/where to reach out these messages. In this regard, IPBES Secretariat's instructions ahead of IPBES6 were very helpful. Such good practices must be continued. In addition, IPBES should be more strongly committed to two-way communications and not only support communications from IPBES to partners but also vice versa on issues of the shared BES agenda.</p> <p>Communication and outreach is critical to build momentum around ILK contributions. IPBES is still relatively a new process at global scale and the motivation for ILK actors to self-mobilise to contribute to assessments involves both proactively doing outreach to communities and institutions handling relevant ILK as well as generating dialogue on how to create easier pathways for participation.</p> <p>Making clearer links to the CEPA (Communication, Education, Promotion and Awareness raising) activities of the Rio Conventions and harmonizing/synergizing with public awareness about the importance of biodiversity, ecosystem services and nature (Aichi Biodiversity Target 1) and the relevant SDGs.</p> <p>Improving / developing more public outreach documents (infographics, etc...).</p> <p>Partnering with major media.</p> <p>The IPBES website should be further developed / refined.</p>
WCMC	<p>Policy support: Outreach and communication also need to be considered as a part of the efforts to increase the ways in which IPBES deliverables are used by different policy fora. This needs targeted action to understand needs and timetables, and engagement with intergovernmental processes in the correct manner.</p> <p>Website: Significantly improve the website as a means of accessing information on IPBES and its deliverables, and as a tool for those working on IPBES deliverables.</p> <p>Communication relating to all IPBES functions: Not surprisingly, there seems to be a far higher communication of assessments and assessment findings than other IPBES deliverables, in large</p>

## Compilation of input on strategic framework of next work programme

	measure because there are obvious release dates. Ways need to be found to increase promotion of other IPBES activities and deliverables to appropriate audiences.
UNU- IAS	<p>It will be useful if more audio-visual materials, and materials that can be easily understood by lay public are developed that can be easily translated/ adapted to local contexts. It has to be emphasized that the IPBES deliverables target decision makers on the ground to motivate local assessment and actions.</p> <p>It is not easy to find information under the IPBES website. The website needs restructuring and completing the data, particularly the authors of various assessment. It is difficult to know who are your national colleagues joining IPBES, for example.</p>

### 3.7 Mobilisation of resources for IPBES: Do you have a suggestion to make the allocation of resources to IPBES more sustainable?

CM	My contribution is that the experts are traveling in economy class, which is already good. We must also lower the standards of hotels where they must stay without forgetting the wasted side of food.
EC	Build on discussions in budget group of IPBES plenaries to continue reflections between plenaries, so that progress is made towards agreements on sustainable budget; i.e. actively come up with scenarios on possible financing models (including the business as usual one). Successful communication and outreach will have a positive impact on resource mobilisation.
FR	Crowdfunding could be considered as a way to raise funds for IPBES work.
GH	Improve fundraising for programme of work from Donors. Institute payment of dues to platform.
GN	Given these allocations according to the AWPBs between sessions, audit the expenses, ensure the technical and financial follow-up and evaluation of the speeches and especially develop a cycle of planning and monitoring-evaluation of the IPBES programs, namely: planning framework AWPB, follow-up template, evaluation framework, planning steps. (translated by google translate)
JP	It might be one option to request each IPBES member state to make a minimum contribution (500 USD, for example) in order to maintain its member status.
MX	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Provide recognition to cash donors, as well as to experts and institutions contributing in kind, for their important contributions.</li> <li>• Include a section of donors in IPBES website acknowledging their contributions.</li> <li>• Foster the participation of private sector, avoiding earmarked contributions.</li> <li>• Promote decentralization (not only Europe) of IPBES functions (particularly TSUs) to access additional sources of funds (e.g. TSU on Values in Mexico would not have received financial support from GIZ or SwedBio if it had been established in Europe).</li> <li>• Strengthen the fundraising unit.</li> </ul>
ZA	<p>Resources for IPBES could be mobilised from users of PIBES products if they are appropriately structured. In this regards, the private and international science bodies could be a key resource.</p> <p>I feel the best way to make IPBES resources more sustainable is to invest in developing capacity in those undertaking IPBES assessments, those implementing the results of the assessments an those working on formulating policy associated with assessments at a national level.</p> <p>Yes, run more focus workshop with limited number of people. Ask institutions to host workshop to keep that at low cost.</p> <p>Joint funding applications with various government departments in the identified policy priorities.</p> <p>My contribution is that the experts are traveling in economy class, which is already good. We must also lower the standards of hotels where they must stay without forgetting the wasted side of food.</p>



US	We suggest that IPBES should plan for future shortfalls in funding by setting up a contingency fund and paying into it each year, with the goal of building up one year's operating funds in reserve.
KD	Philanthropy?

#### 4 Other issues not easily fitting into the 'guiding questions'

MX	<p>On workflow</p> <p>The proposal is to formalize a workflow around the collection and development of “proposals of interest for the conservation of biodiversity” (exactly the same exercise for “key messages” and “key findings”).</p> <p>The whole concept proposed can be articulated around a repository of these proposals, a data base of ideas. Each idea is associated with the proposing country, scope of coverage of the proposal, as well as other control and monitoring metadata considered appropriate.</p> <p>Each proposal will be associated to two key elements of management and agreement:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Degree of support based on scientific evidence, and;</li> <li>2. Degree of satisfaction for its adoption in decision making.</li> </ol> <p>In summary, the proposal consists in:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. To create and maintain the permanent repository; and</li> <li>2. Use the workflow on entry, rating (support and satisfaction), publication and impact of the proposals registered in the repository.</li> </ol>
MX	<p>On repository</p> <p>The repository should include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Potential issues, concerns, hypothetical assertions.</li> <li>2. This suggests that there is a path that can be marked as the proposal evolves: from idea (0) to social adoption (10).</li> <li>3. Take note of sources of support that will result in a confidence level.</li> <li>4. Level of satisfaction to use in decision making, from not satisfactory at all (0) to completely adequate (10).</li> </ol>
MX	<p>On attributes of the proposals</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Take note of proposals suggested by members with level 0 of support and satisfaction.</li> <li>2. Gather sources of evidence for technical groups to dictate the confidence level.</li> <li>3. Based on the evidence and social concern, the members agree the level of satisfaction.</li> <li>4. Communicate the proposals in SPMs including (as is already being done) the diagnostic documents that fully argue the formulation of “key messages” that are useful for decision making.</li> <li>5. Assess the impact of the proposals in the design and application of public policy supported by automated semantic text analysis, which compare the registered and published proposals with national instruments and reports on the subject.</li> </ol>
WCMC	<p>On Access to data and knowledge for assessments:</p> <p>Indicators: Develop a more robust and ongoing process for providing access to the indicators and associated storylines needed by assessment authors, working with appropriate partners involved</p>

## Compilation of input on strategic framework of next work programme

	<p>in delivering and using biodiversity-related indicators. This would include wrking closely with the Biodiversity Indicators Partnership, who are already supporting the CBD in this regard.</p> <p>Access to published literature: Negotiate access to relevant journals for assessment authors where access is through a paywall, and access to tools for searching literature. Also ensure effective archiving of all sources used in assessments as set out in Annex II to the procedures for preparation of Platform deliverables.</p>
WCMC	<p>On Support for implementation of the work programme</p> <p>Technical support units: If a call is put out for technical support units to support implementation of components of the work programme, then these calls should be accompanied by terms of reference which clarify exactly what the TSU is expected to deliver, and what skill sets are required. This is important in helping those responding to put together realistic bids, and in helping the Secretariat and Bureau to assess who is best placed to provide the necessary services.</p>

## 5 Suggestions regarding possible thematic topics

EC	<p>EC: On possible topics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A combined assessment on the nexus of food, agriculture, health and biodiversity should be a priority of the second work programme, given FAO is a UN partner organization, and would provide an excellent input to the implementation of the SDGs;</li> <li>• A methodological assessment on the metrics to be used in gauging corporate impacts on biodiversity;</li> <li>• A methodological assessment focusing on the effectiveness of various policy instruments and policy support tools, and afterwards to catalyse their further development (similar to what has been done for scenarios and models);</li> <li>• The role and potential of ecosystem-based approaches/nature-based solutions should be essential part of each assessment, and be reflected in each of the four functions of the platform;</li> <li>• Development of models and scenarios that mechanistically describe feedbacks from changes in species/populations to the climate system (beyond biomass and carbon sequestration), which is an acknowledged knowledge gap;</li> <li>• Development of models and scenarios extending SSP scenarios to show impacts on biodiversity and developing a new set of “nature’s futures” scenarios; including on global socio-economic impacts (e.g. on sustainable growth, economic resilience, security, poverty alleviation, conflict mitigation) of future changes in biodiversity;</li> <li>• A possible IPBES assessment on marine biodiversity and ecosystem services, which is lacking at the moment (the Assessment of Assessments is not at all comparable to IPBES process).</li> </ul>
TH	<p>The future work programme may focus more on marine ecosystems as well as continuing on the studies of terrestrial ecosystems, for instance:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Assessment of impacts from the reduction of tropical forest areas to the status of biodiversity and climate change;</li> <li>• Assessment of capacity of coral reef and ecosystems in climate change adaptation;</li> <li>• Economic valuation of coral reefs and beaches ecosystems.</li> </ul>
WWF	<p>Suggestion 1: IPBES/IPCC Special Report on Biodiversity and Climate Change</p> <p>Rationale: Throughout the completed four regional and two thematic assessments the linkage between biodiversity and climate change was often addressed. Climate change is recognized as one of the most important drivers of biodiversity loss and change of species composition of ecosystems, which will heavily affect the sustainable provision of ecosystem services and nature’s contribution to people.</p> <p>As emphasised in decision IPBES/6/11, Annex para 8, “the second work programme would cover the period 2020–2030, when the science-policy interface for biodiversity and ecosystem services will be dominated by efforts to implement the follow-up to the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011–2020, the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, including the Sustainable</p>

<p>Development Goals, and the Paris Agreement on Climate Change” the linkage of biodiversity change and climate change must be taken into account more prominently. It is obvious that much evidence could be sourced from different assessments, a various array of literature, lots of examples and field studies and monitoring programmes. However, the evidence of such interlinkages is scattered and currently not compiled in a comprehensive way.</p> <p>Furthermore, it appears that the science-policy ‘community’ of IPBES and IPCC perceive the issue from different angles and background with the result of proposed pathways for solutions which may not be consistent to achieve the goals and targets of the above mentioned global agreements. IPBES Second work programme</p> <p>WWF believes that a IPBES/IPCC special assessment could bring the two communities to a better understanding of a common and mutually accepted approach to address the ‘two sides of the ecological coin’.</p> <p>In addition, WWF is convinced that a joint IPBES/IPCC report could lift this inevitable linkage to a higher recognition by politicians and decision-maker.</p> <p>Suggestion 2: Modelling the global socio-economic impacts of future changes in biodiversity and ecosystem services</p> <p>Rationale: Robust evidence is necessary on the potential global socio-economic consequences of future environmental change. A major area of focus is on identifying how changes in biodiversity and ecosystem services may affect key macro-economic impact indicators, e.g. GDP, productivity, trade, income, jobs etc.</p> <p>WWF identified a critical gap in the global knowledge base on how future changes on biodiversity and ecosystem services may affect such macro-economic indicators and the likely implications of these effects for economic growth, resilience, food/water security, human development and other socio-economic goals.</p> <p>There are currently no ‘off the shelf’ models that can generate this kind of information. However, there is potential to combine and tailor existing models, tools and approaches to do this. It also appears that this is possible within the timeframe required to generate information to feed into the post 2020 policy discussions to achieve the follow-up to the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011–2020, the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, including the Sustainable Development Goals, and the Paris Agreement on Climate Change.</p> <p>WWF assumes that modelling such impacts will resonate with those stakeholders and policy decision-makers that are primarily concerned with economic growth, resilience and security (e.g. Heads of State, Ministries of Finance/Planning, Central Banks). These audiences are critical influencers of future policy processes, yet they currently seem to have limited understanding of the socio-economic consequences of environmental degradation, nor the evidence to identify, justify and take appropriate action.</p> <p>WWF has identified an urgent need for such evidence to be undertaken and included in the second IPBES work programme. This task appears particular relevant for the next phase of the work on scenarios and models.</p>
--