

**Intergovernmental Science-Policy
Platform on Biodiversity and
Ecosystem Services**Distr.: General
11 April 2017

Original: English

**Plenary of the Intergovernmental Science-Policy
Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services
Fifth session**

Bonn, Germany, 7–10 March 2017

**Report of the Plenary of the Intergovernmental Science-Policy
Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services on the work of
its fifth session****I. Opening of the session**

1. The fifth session of the Plenary of the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES) was held in Bonn, Germany, from 7 to 10 March 2017. Regional consultation meetings were held on 6 March 2017 as well as in the morning of each day during the session.
2. The session was opened at 10 a.m. on 7 March 2017 by the Chair of IPBES, Mr. Robert T. Watson, with the viewing of a video presentation on the role of IPBES, its achievements to date and potential next steps. Opening remarks were made by Mr. Watson; Ms. Anne Larigauderie, IPBES Executive Secretary; Mr. Edoardo Zandri, Chief, Scientific Assessment Branch, United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP); Ms. Christiane Paulus, Deputy Director-General for Nature Conservation and Sustainable Development, Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation, Building and Nuclear Safety of Germany; and Mr. Reinhard Limbach, Deputy Lord Mayor of Bonn.
3. Keynote addresses were then delivered by Mr. Richard Kinley, Deputy Executive Secretary of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, and Mr. Guy Midgley, Professor, Stellenbosch University, on the relationship between biodiversity and climate change.
4. In his remarks Mr. Watson said that the goal of IPBES was to strengthen the science-policy interface and that a major challenge in achieving that goal was to convince decision makers in all spheres that the loss of biodiversity posed as great a threat to human well-being as did climate change. IPBES had already made significant progress in strengthening the science-policy interface through its capacity-building activities and the approval of its first two major assessments. The endorsement and use of the key messages of the assessment on pollination, pollinators and food production by the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity at its thirteenth meeting, as well as the establishment of the coalition of the willing to protect pollinators, showed that IPBES had an important role to play in providing transparent and credible knowledge and evidence. Other assessments under way would further strengthen the science-policy interface by assessing interactions with climate change and progress towards the achievement of the Aichi Biodiversity Targets and setting trends regarding the viability of the Sustainable Development Goals relating to food, water and energy security and human health. They would also show what must be made clear to decision makers: that a failure to address climate change and biodiversity together would make the Sustainable Development Goals impossible to achieve. While IPBES' first published assessments were having the desired impact, their drafts had been reviewed by only a few Governments, and it was critical for more members to become more deeply involved in the preparation of future assessments. In outlining the issues on the agenda for the current meeting, he expressed confidence that the members of IPBES would address them in the congenial manner that had characterized their work to date.
5. Noting that the current meeting would involve more than 645 participants from 121 countries, including 99 of the 126 members of IPBES, Ms. Larigauderie outlined activities that had taken place

in 2016, the third year of IPBES' first work programme. More than 20 meetings had been held around the world, and more than 900 experts were actively contributing time and ideas representing an in-kind contribution of at least \$14 million since 2014. Work on the global assessment to be released in 2019, in time for the review of the Aichi Targets under the Convention on Biological Diversity, had begun; good progress had been made on the four regional assessments and on the land degradation and restoration assessment; innovative work on scenario analysis and modelling of biodiversity and ecosystem services and the diverse conceptualization of multiple values was continuing; and the assessments of pollination and of scenarios and models were being disseminated and used by Governments, entities such as the Convention on Biological Diversity and the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) and the scientific community, including as a basis for policy-making. New technical support units had been established, through in-kind support provided by their hosts, in Mexico and the Netherlands and at the UNEP World Conservation Monitoring Centre, and since 2016 the Platform had also been receiving support from the International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN), which came in addition to technical support units established in 2014 and 2015 in South Africa, Colombia, Japan, Switzerland, Norway, the Netherlands, the Republic of Korea and at the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO). Furthermore, IPBES had continued to receive support from FAO, the United Nations Development Programme, UNESCO and UNEP. In outlining the agenda for the current meeting she said that the Plenary would consider an approach to working with indigenous and local knowledge; terms of reference for a review of IPBES; the possibility of launching pending assessments; and a process for developing a second IPBES work programme for ; as well as a prototype online catalogue of policy support tools and methodologies; a rolling plan for capacity-building; progress in a number of areas, including communication and collaboration with stakeholders. In closing she thanked the German Government for its unfailing support and wished the meeting participants a fruitful meeting.

6. Mr. Zandri, speaking on behalf of FAO, UNDP, UNEP and UNESCO, said that decisions aimed at meeting global and national commitments to conserve and sustainably use biodiversity had to be based on the best available scientific information and traditional knowledge. The four bodies for which he spoke remained committed to helping IPBES to assess such information. While the first deliverables of a maturing IPBES had already been completed and progress had been made at the regional level, at the current meeting decisions would have to be made on providing the knowledge base for such critical matters as invasive alien species, the diverse conceptualization of the multiple values of nature and its benefits, marine living resources and terrestrial ecosystems, including in the context of efforts to implement the Sustainable Development Goals. In doing so the Plenary should ensure that IPBES products contributed to and benefitted from synergies with other processes such as the Global Environment Outlook and the Environment Live data platform. It also needed to decide on what role it wished to play in mainstreaming biodiversity into other areas such as agriculture, forestry, fisheries and tourism and reaching out to those beyond the traditional biodiversity and ecosystem services community, strengthening cross-sectoral partnerships while maintaining IPBES' independence. While existing partnerships were effectively implementing the current work programme there was plenty of room to consolidate them and to develop new ones in areas such as agriculture, trade, development, transport, energy, water and others. FAO, UNDP, UNEP and UNESCO welcomed IPBES' increased focus on capacity-building and its strengthened communications capacity, and they looked forward to the implementation of the stakeholder engagement strategy, all of which was key to facilitating contributions to IPBES and the increased uptake of its products. In the implementation of the current work programme and the development of a new one in difficult financial times, it was important for IPBES to build on its achievements and to make the most of in-kind contributions in order to retain its ambition to make a real difference in the world. In closing he expressed thanks to the members of the Bureau, the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel and the secretariat, the growing list of authors, reviewers and other experts and Governments and other stakeholders for the critical support that they provided in many different forms, including not least financial, and pledged the continuing support of the United Nations family for IPBES and its members in the months and years to come.

7. In her remarks Ms. Paulus said that the German Government was honoured to host the fifth session of the Plenary and remained strongly committed to the work of IPBES. IPBES, she said, had made a strong entry onto the global scientific stage with the swift approval of two high-quality, comprehensive, global scientific assessments that were key to the implementation of national biodiversity strategies and instrumental in the implementation of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011–2020, the Aichi Biodiversity Targets and many of the Sustainable Development Goals. IPBES assessments would also contribute to the work under the Convention on Biological Diversity after 2020, to which end the IPBES regional assessments and global assessment of biodiversity and ecosystem services were eagerly awaited. A first step in implementing the recommendations of IPBES' approved assessments had been taken with the establishment of a coalition of the willing on

pollinators at the thirteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity, which saw 13 countries committing to a number of steps to protect pollinators based on the recommendations set out in the assessment of pollinators, pollination and food production. The coalition, she said, was open to all, and she urged others to join. The current meeting would see a beginning to the development of IPBES' second work programme, which must both build on experience to date and take into account financial limitations while being sufficiently flexible to facilitate post-2020 work under the Convention on Biological Diversity and to address new and emerging issues. Germany was greatly concerned about IPBES' financial situation, as committed funds were insufficient to cover even ongoing assessments. She therefore urged all to acknowledge the value of IPBES by supporting it financially. In that spirit, she was pleased to announce that her Government would continue its active support for IPBES with a contribution of \$1.1 million in 2017. IPBES, she concluded, was maintaining valuable momentum, and she urged its members to adopt decisions at the current meeting that would enable it to achieve its full potential.

8. In his remarks Mr. Limbach welcomed the meeting participants to his city, saying that Bonn was proud to host the secretariat of IPBES, which he described as part of a true powerhouse of sustainability comprising 19 United Nations organizations based in Bonn and supported by Governments, development partners, business, non-governmental organizations and others, including not least the city of Bonn itself. IPBES, he said, provided indispensable scientifically sound and broad-based evidence that contributed to the credibility of decision makers around the world. It provided an interface between science and policy, striving to place biodiversity firmly at the heart of sustainable development. To continue to succeed it needed to build bridges between various agendas, such as those for biodiversity and climate change. The building of such bridges would be one of the challenges for the global assessment of biodiversity and ecosystem services to be completed in 2019, which would provide information and policy options relevant to the implementation of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and the achievement of its Sustainable Development Goals. Bonn, he said, was a great platform for debate and cooperation in the field of sustainability, where global agendas were brought together at all levels. One example was BION, the Bonn Science Network, a group of more than 40 organizations active in interdisciplinary biodiversity research. Another was Bonn's longstanding engagement with the biodiversity programme of ICLEI Local Governments for Sustainability, which had its world headquarters in Bonn and for which the Lord Mayor of Bonn currently served as First Vice-President. In 2017 Bonn would host the twenty-third session of the Conference of the Parties to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, which would be a good occasion to highlight the links between relevant issues and organizations, the object of increasing focus since the adoption of the Paris Agreement on climate change and the 2030 Agenda. Bonn, he said, was the perfect place to catalyse cooperation, and he expressed confidence that the current meeting would yield a fruitful exchange of knowledge, a true interface between issues, structures and policy-making leading to further scientific excellence.

9. In his keynote address Mr. Kinley said that there was a strong link between the biodiversity and climate change communities, and he outlined developments in respect of climate change and ways in which that link could be enhanced. Credible and reliable science, and therefore the role of the IPBES, was critical, and he urged the members of IPBES to be resolute in fulfilling their mandate and enabling Governments to make decisions in the interests of their citizens and the planet. The rapid entry into force of the Paris Agreement and its ratification by 133 countries were very encouraging and the global direction seemed clear and irreversible. Limiting global average temperature increase to 1.5 degrees Celsius would require reducing emissions and building resilience, which could in turn minimize biodiversity loss. For Governments to successfully implement their climate change action plans at the national level they must integrate them fully into national development and investment planning, including plans to achieve the Sustainable Development Goals. The biodiversity community needed to involve itself in such efforts, because they afforded the opportunity to more strongly integrate biodiversity objectives and priorities into national policies, ensuring that climate change policies and investments supported biodiversity objectives. Governments would soon begin the process of developing new nationally determined contributions, which were to be complete as early as 2020. IPBES' global assessment due in 2019 could make a significant contribution to decision-making on those contributions and to the low-carbon development strategies that they would require, and the better IPBES' evidence the more ambitious they would be. A failure of ambition would have serious consequences, including accelerated rates of species loss, severe weather events, climate variability, land degradation and ocean acidification. The ambition could be achieved, however, by maximizing synergies arising from healthy soils, forests, peatlands, oceans and wetlands, including mangroves, salt marshes and seagrasses, all of which played powerful roles in absorbing and storing carbon and thus preventing climate change. Mangroves, salt marshes and seagrasses captured up to 70 per cent of the carbon currently in the oceans and absorbed half of the world's transport emissions, and sustainable land management could trap fully half of the emissions that needed to be cut by 2030, yet

cost-effective and nature-based actions were often overlooked. The challenge was how to bring such solutions to bear, how to bring them into national policy-making. IPBES, along with fully engaging in national initiatives to internalize the Sustainable Development Goals and the Paris Agreement, would play a crucial role. Sound science was important, and IPBES would help the world to understand the vital role of nature in development and contribute to the nature-based solutions that were needed to deliver a truly sustainable and climate-safe future.

10. Using slides to illustrate his remarks, Mr. Midgley spoke of the contributions of biodiversity to mitigating climate change and of some potential negative consequences for biodiversity of doing so. Starting with good news, he said that global carbon emissions had increased only slightly over the previous three years during a period of economic growth. The scenarios for the future, however, were still sobering, and it was believed that current nationally determined contributions under the Paris Agreement would be inadequate to limit global average temperature increases to 2 degrees Celsius and would be more likely to lead to increases of around 3 degrees Celsius.

11. Biodiversity conservation efforts could help to fill that gap, however, and thus IPBES had a critical role to play in providing the scientific underpinning for such efforts. To illustrate the potential and need for ecosystem approaches to mitigation he showed that the oceans and land had acted as sinks, each on its own absorbing more than 25 per cent of the carbon that humans had released through burning fossil fuels and land use changes. The effectiveness of these natural mechanisms could be reduced, however, through further stresses: thus research had shown that the operation of the land sink was significantly impaired under hot, dry conditions such as those caused by El Niño, a hint that further warming could further impair the land sink.

12. Options for reducing emissions included reducing deforestation and forest degradation; increasing carbon sequestration through ecosystem restoration such as reforestation; afforestation; and the use of biofuels and bioenergy coupled with carbon capture and storage. Each of these options was associated with both opportunity and risk.

13. Reducing deforestation and forest degradation was the subject of much activity under the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change and promised major benefits ranging from 2 to 5 gigatonnes of carbon sequestration annually in the case of deforestation and from .3 to 1.7 gigatonnes for degradation. Reforestation could be done on many scales, including globally, on up to two billion hectares of land, with the potential for sequestering 4 gigatonnes of CO₂ per year. Restoration of other ecosystems could result in carbon sequestration as well; wetlands could serve as substantial carbon stores and provided enormous ecosystem services, including livelihoods and jobs, and a plant that played a key role in ecosystem restoration turned out to have the capacity to store large amounts of carbon. Other plants might have the same capacity. Ecosystem restoration could also be practiced on abandoned agricultural lands, again offering extensive co-benefits in terms of biodiversity and mitigation objectives.

14. These approaches did carry risks, however, which varied from approach to approach. Afforestation, for example, was typically targeted at areas considered to be of marginal utility, but some of those areas, such as ancient grasslands in Madagascar, were in fact of significant ecological value, already serving as substantial carbon stores and endowed with considerable biodiversity. There was always the risk, therefore, that the wrong land would be targeted, with negative consequences for both climate change and biodiversity. The use of biofuels could result in the conversion of natural ecosystems to croplands on a large scale, with obvious implications for biodiversity. Research showed that reforestation and afforestation, appropriately deployed, could exceed the carbon sequestration benefits of biofuels. Thus, very careful decision-making was needed before any mitigation strategy was employed, and conservation science had a critical role to play in assessing the risks to underpin that decision-making.

15. In conclusion he said that global CO₂ emissions had stabilized for the time being, but significant efforts in renewables and land-based approaches would be needed along with other actions to maintain that trend and strengthen it to achieve the 2 degree global goal; that the land sink would play a significant role in mitigating warming, while ecosystem approaches would be critical to maintaining and enhancing the land sink; that afforestation and biofuels might be necessary but could have significant implications for biodiversity and should be carefully considered and employed; and that conservation-related analytical efforts informed by expanding databases and tools played an increasingly important role in informing sustainable efforts to achieve the 2 degree goal and needed to be intensified to reduce the uncertainties.

16. Following his presentation, in response to a question about the extent of blue carbon sinks, he said that coastal and many other terrestrial ecosystems such as peatlands and grasslands appeared to offer significant carbon storage capabilities, that more were being discovered all the time and that

science had an important role to play in continuing to identify such ecosystems. In response to a question about how to inspire the biodiversity and climate change communities to join forces to mobilize their respective scientific communities to work together, he said that the role of science in charting a path was of increasing importance because the margin for error appeared to be narrowing; while the technology existed it was not cheap, but the cost of failure had to be made clear. In response to the latter question, the Chair added that one way to catalyse cooperation between the two communities was to involve the same experts in both IPBES assessments and work under the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, both formally and informally, as had already been done in a number of cases.

17. Following those remarks, representatives speaking on behalf of regional groups, members and stakeholders who had met in preparation for the current meeting made general statements in which they spoke of the progress of IPBES to date, the activities in support of IPBES of those for whom they spoke and their expectations for the current session and the future work of IPBES. In addition, representatives of Mexico and of the secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity reported on the thirteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention, which had taken place in Cancun, Mexico, from 4 to 17 December 2016, in particular with regard to matters of relevance to IPBES.

II. Organizational matters

A. Adoption of the agenda and organization of work

18. The Plenary adopted the following agenda on the basis of the provisional agenda (IPBES/5/1/Rev.1).

1. Opening of the session.
2. Organizational matters:
 - (a) Adoption of the agenda and organization of work;
 - (b) Status of the membership of the Platform;
 - (c) Election of alternate members of the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel.
3. Admission of observers to the fifth session of the Platform.
4. Credentials of representatives.
5. Report of the Executive Secretary on the implementation of the work programme 2014–2018.
6. Work programme of the Platform:
 - (a) Capacity-building;
 - (b) Indigenous and local knowledge systems;
 - (c) Knowledge and data;
 - (d) Methodological assessment regarding the diverse conceptualization of multiple values of nature and its benefits;
 - (e) Thematic assessment on invasive alien species;
 - (f) Thematic assessment on the sustainable use of biodiversity;
 - (g) Policy support tools and methodologies;
 - (h) Communication, stakeholder engagement and strategic partnerships.
7. Financial and budgetary arrangements for the Platform:
 - (a) Budget and expenditure for the period 2014–2018;
 - (b) Trust Fund.
8. Review of the Platform.
9. Planning for future sessions of the Plenary:
 - (a) Provisional agenda, organization of work, dates and venues of the sixth and seventh sessions of the Plenary;
 - (b) Process for the development of a second work programme for the Platform.

10. Institutional arrangements: United Nations collaborative partnership arrangements for the work of the Platform and its secretariat.
11. Adoption of the decisions and report of the session.
12. Closure of the session.

B. Status of the membership of the Platform

19. The Chair reported that Estonia and Romania had joined IPBES since the fourth session of the Plenary. IPBES thus had the following 126 members: Afghanistan, Albania, Algeria, Andorra, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Benin, Bhutan, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Botswana, Brazil, Burkina Faso, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Comoros, Congo, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Croatia, Cuba, Czech Republic, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, El Salvador, Estonia, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Japan, Kenya, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Liberia, Libya, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Monaco, Montenegro, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Peru, Philippines, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Slovakia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Tajikistan, Thailand, Togo, Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia and Zimbabwe.

20. Also under the item the representative of Slovakia, speaking on behalf of the member States of the European Union that were members of IPBES, introduced a proposal (IPBES/5/INF/27) relating to the participation of the European Union in IPBES. Recalling that paragraph 2 of Rule 5 of the rules of procedure for the Plenary of IPBES (decisions IPBES-1/1, annex I, and IPBES-2/1) was enclosed in square brackets, reflecting a continuing lack of consensus regarding whether regional economic integration organizations should be permitted to be members of IPBES, he proposed that pending the achievement of consensus on that question the European Union be granted enhanced observer status, including the right to speak in turn, the right to respond, the right to make proposals, and the right to speak on and support, financially and otherwise, the implementation of the work programme. Such status would not confer the right to vote or to be represented on the Bureau. It was proposed that the enhanced observer status be conferred by means of a decision without effecting any change in the rules of procedure.

21. Several representatives expressed support for the proposal but two, speaking on behalf of the countries of their regions, expressed the desire for more information on its potential ramifications, including with regard to the establishment of a precedent, the treatment of other regional economic integration organizations or similarly situated entities, and the rules of procedure.

22. It was agreed that interested members would undertake informal consultations with the European Union, with the assistance of the Senior Legal Officer supporting the secretariat, and subsequently that the matter would be further discussed in a friends of the chair group facilitated by Mr. Fundisile Mketeni (South Africa) and then in the contact group established as described in paragraph 63 below. Following the work of the contact group, the Chair, in his function as the co-chair of the contact group, reported that the group had reached agreement on a draft decision on the matter for consideration by the Plenary.

C. Election of alternate members of the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel

23. Introducing the sub-item the chair reported that since the fourth session of the Plenary Ms. Sandra Diaz (Argentina), Ms. Maja Vasiljević (Croatia), Mr. György Pataki (Hungary) and Ms. Charlotte Karibuhoye (Senegal) had resigned from the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel. In the case of Ms. Diaz, he noted, her resignation had been prompted by her election as a co-chair of the global assessment.

24. In accordance with rule 31 of the rules of procedure, the Plenary then elected the following new members of the Panel to serve the remainder of the terms of the resigning members:

From African States:

Mr. Mariteuw Chimère Diaw (Cameroon)

From Eastern European States:

Ms. Katalin Török (Hungary)

Mr. Mersudin Avdibegović (Bosnia-Herzegovina)

From Latin American and Caribbean States:

Mr. Marcelo Cabido (Argentina)

25. During discussion of the sub-item one representative, speaking on behalf of the countries of his region, recalled decision IPBES-4/3, by which the Plenary had adopted a procedure for filling gaps in the availability of experts. Saying that the mechanism should not be employed in a manner that eroded the prerogative of Governments to appoint experts, he said that not enough information had been provided with regard to its application and the selection of experts since the Plenary's fourth session. It was agreed that the secretariat would prepare a paper on the subject to provide relevant information and address the concerns expressed.

III. Admission of observers to the fifth session of the Plenary of the Platform

26. Introducing the item, the Chair recalled that at its fourth session the Plenary had decided that the policy and procedures for the admission of observers to its second, third and fourth sessions would be applied to determine the admission of observers to its fifth session (see IPBES/4/19, para. 105), on the understanding that observers admitted to its first, second, third and fourth sessions would be among those admitted to its fifth session (see IPBES/1/12, para. 22, IPBES/3/INF/12, IPBES/4/INF/23, annexes I and II, and IPBES/5/INF/21), and that it would resume consideration of the admission of observers at its fifth session.

27. In accordance with the Plenary's decisions at its previous meetings, the following organizations were admitted as observers at the current session in addition to those States, conventions, multilateral organizations, United Nations bodies and specialized agencies and other organizations that had been approved as observers at the first, second, third and fourth sessions: Administrative Staff College of India; Ahmadu Bello University; Anatrack Ltd; Applied Environmental Research Foundation; Association Congolaise pour la Préservation de l'Environnement et le Développement Communautaire; Association de l'Education Environnementale pour les Futures Générations; Ateneo de Manila University; Autonomous University of the State of Mexico; Banaras Hindu University; Baghdad University; Biodiversity Action Journalists; Biodiversity Science-Policy-Interfaces Network for Early Career Scientists; Centre for Biodiversity Strategies; University of Bern; Centre for Integrated Community Development; Centre for Ecological Restoration; Chemtek Associates; College of Micronesia-FSM; Corporación Social & Ambiental Jóvenes por Cundinamarca; Croatian Agency for the Environment and Nature; Disaster Reduction Nepal; Eastern University, Sri Lanka; ECO Institute of Environmental Science and Technology; El Colegio de la Frontera Sur; Engajamundo; Fondation Deserts du Monde; Forschungszentrum für Umweltpolitik; Fundacion Biosfera; Fundación CoMunidad; Fundación Vision Amazonica y COICA; German Centre for Integrative Biodiversity Research; Global Partnership for Sustainable Development; Global Water Watch México; Griffith University; Hasselt University; Hiroshima City University; Institute for Sustainable Development and Research; Institute of Geographical Sciences and Natural Resources Research; Institute of International Relations in Prague; Instituto Socioambiental; International Association for Impact Assessment; International Chamber of Commerce; International Federation of Organic Agriculture Movements; University of Abomey-Calavi; Latin American Energy, Mining and Biodiversity Dialogue NGO; Lilongwe University of Agriculture and Natural Resources; Living Green Empowerment Organization; Luonnonvarakeskus (Luke) (Natural Resources Institute Finland); M. S. Swaminathan Research Foundation; Marine Ecosystems Protected Areas Trust; Marwell Wildlife; Maya Nut Institute/Ramon Nativa; Mercator Research Institute on Global Commons and Climate Change; Namibia Nature Foundation; National Academy of Science (Armenia); National Centre for Sustainable Coastal Management; Nature and Biodiversity Conservation Union; NGO Bagna; North Private University; NOVA IMS; Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development; Pollinator Partnership; Pontificia Universidad Javeriana; RCE Kyrgyzstan;

RCP-Network/OLESDK-NGO; Royal Society for the Protection of Birds; SS Enterprize BD; S.N.D.T. Women's University; Sabima; Sajha Foundation; Sankalp Jan Seva Samiti; Sheda Science and Technology Complex; Sichuan University; Sinop University; Social Welfare Environment and Educational Society; Society for Health of Ocean Resources and Environment, India; Society of Fisheries and Life Sciences; State University of Campinas; State University of New York, Plattsburgh; Suez Canal University; Syngenta; Terre des Jeunes Haiti; TH Köln – University of Applied Sciences; Transform International; Tropical Biology Association; Unified Media Council; Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México; Universidade Federal de Sao Joao del Rei; Università degli Studi di Torino; University for Development Studies, Tamale; University of Agriculture Peshawar; University of Auckland; University of Balamand; University of Bayreuth; University of Botswana; University of Cambridge; University of Cape Coast; University of Dschang; University of Freiburg; University of Ibadan; University of Kwa Zulu Natal; University of Potsdam; University of Salamanca; University of Sofia; University of Tehran; University of the Aegean; University of The Gambia; University of Tokyo; Urban Biodiversity and Design Network; Wetlands International; Wildlife Institute of India; Wolf Lake First Nation; Woodland Trust; Yunnan Academy of Social Science.

28. The Chair then drew attention to a proposed policy and procedures for the admission of observers (IPBES/5/14), which had been the subject of disagreement at the Plenary's first, second, third and fourth sessions, in particular with regard to paragraphs 14 and 16, which had accordingly remained enclosed in square brackets. He asked whether any member had changed its position with regard to the matter addressed in those paragraphs since the fourth session of the Plenary. No requests for the floor were made, and the Plenary accordingly decided that the interim procedure for the admission of observers to sessions of the Plenary, as described in paragraph 22 of the report of the first session of the Plenary (IPBES/1/12) and applied at its second, third, fourth and fifth sessions, would be applied at its sixth session. It also decided that at its sixth session it would again consider the draft policy and procedures for the admission of observers.

IV. Credentials of representatives

29. In accordance with rule 13 of the rules of procedure, the Bureau, with the assistance of the secretariat, examined the credentials of the representatives of the 95 members of IPBES participating in the current session. The Bureau found that the following 72 members had submitted credentials of their representatives issued by or on behalf of a Head of State or Government or minister for foreign affairs, as required by rule 12, and that those credentials were in good order: Algeria, Antigua and Barbuda, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Belgium, Bhutan, Brazil, Burundi, Cambodia, Canada, Chad, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Denmark, Ecuador, Egypt, Estonia, Ethiopia, Finland, France, Gabon, Georgia, Germany, Ghana, Grenada, Guatemala, Guinea-Bissau, Honduras, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Israel, Japan, Kenya, Latvia, Malaysia, Maldives, Mexico, Monaco, Morocco, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Norway, Pakistan, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Slovakia, South Africa, Spain, Sudan, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Tunisia, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay and Zambia.

30. The representatives of 23 other IPBES members participated in the current session without valid credentials. Those members were accordingly considered to be observers during the current session.

31. The Plenary approved the report of the Bureau on credentials.

V. Report of the Executive Secretary on the implementation of the work programme 2014–2018

32. Introducing the item, the Executive Secretary reported on the implementation of the work programme to date, outlining the information in the relevant note by the secretariat (IPBES/5/2) and related information documents as indicated therein. Covering progress on each of the four objectives of the work programme, she placed particular emphasis on those deliverables that Plenary would not consider under a separate agenda item at the current session, including progress in the four regional assessments of biodiversity and ecosystem services, in the land degradation and restoration assessment and in the global assessment of biodiversity and ecosystem services; finalization of the chapters of the two approved reports on pollinators, pollination and food production and on scenarios and models of biodiversity and ecosystem services, related publications and the use by Governments and non-governmental stakeholders of the approved assessments. She also reported on ongoing additional work on scenarios and models and on diverse conceptualizations of multiple values of nature and its

benefits, seeking an extension of the mandates of the two relevant expert groups until the seventh session of the Plenary. She also briefly presented the new classification of “nature’s contributions to people”, that had been approved by the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel.

33. Regarding lessons learned, she explained how the gap filling procedure adopted by the Plenary at its fourth session had been instrumental in improving the overall disciplinary balance between the natural and social sciences in the selection of experts for the global assessment. She also conveyed a message from the Bureau to the effect that the engagement of Governments should be strengthened, especially with regard to commenting on assessment drafts, and explained that a proposal was being developed to strengthen the capacity of national focal points in that regard. The Bureau was also of the view that developed countries and organizations that nominated experts or members of the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel should ensure that their nominees received the support necessary to enable them to attend relevant meetings.

34. Finally she reported that the recruitment of secretariat staff members was complete.

35. In the ensuing discussion statements were made by the representatives of Brazil, China, Costa Rica, France, India, Indonesia, Japan, Mexico, Morocco, the Russian Federation, Slovakia, speaking on behalf of the European Union member States that were members of IPBES, and Switzerland; of the Division of Ocean Affairs and Law of the Sea of the Office of Legal Affairs of the United Nations, Future Earth and IUCN.

36. Several representatives thanked the Government of Germany for hosting the current session and welcomed the report of the Executive Secretary. They also commended the secretariat and the various experts on their work since the last session of the Plenary.

37. Several representatives raised points regarding support for the participation of experts and members of the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel in relevant IPBES meetings. One called on countries to recognize the contributions of experts by providing financial support for their attendance at relevant IPBES meetings and by deeming contributions to assessments to be equivalent to contributions to peer-reviewed publications, as was done in the context of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. Two representatives, referring to members of the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel in particular, said that they agreed with the Bureau that developed country Governments should ensure that their nominees received sufficient support to enable them to participate in IPBES activities. Another suggested focusing on webinars as a cost-effective alternative to in-person meetings. One representative urged members of IPBES to continue nominating experts from developing countries to assessments and task forces in order to ensure that they were adequately represented.

38. Several representatives said that there was a need to further strengthen communication within IPBES, in particular by ensuring the notification of national focal points regarding the outcome of nominations of experts to fill gaps in expert groups; by enhancing access to documentation in advance of meetings and reviews, including by removing password protection to facilitate broad review; by making author responses to review comments available with each draft revision; by clearly documenting literature search protocols; by establishing strict cut off dates for literature inclusion; by enhancing the comprehensiveness and reliability of information, including by publishing a schedule of external review dates and other information on the IPBES website; and by giving advance notice of indicative meeting dates and deadlines for document review.

39. Two representatives added that the strengthening of communication should extend to other stakeholders such as UNDP and its BES-Net initiative, scientific institutions and civil society. Another said that assessments under IPBES, IPCC, the Global Sustainable Development Report and the Regular Process for Global Reporting and Assessment of the State of the Marine Environment, including Socioeconomic Aspects, should be mutually supportive, avoid duplication of efforts and take regional assessments into account. Another said that it was important to maintain regular communication between potential users of IPBES assessment reports and the experts compiling them so that users were aware of their required contributions at all stages of the assessment process.

40. Several representatives expressed the hope that the needs of developing countries would be taken into account, including through the contributions of additional donors.

41. One representative expressed a preference for first-hand verbal reporting to the Plenary by the co-chairs of ongoing assessments as a means of identifying challenges and determining the degree to which assessment reports were aligned with one another. He also suggested that the reports themselves, rather than the scientific publications associated with them, should be referred to so that the scientific articles did not supplant the reports.

42. One representative asked for clarification on the publication of information on the diverse conceptualization of multiple values given that the related assessment had not yet been undertaken. Two others, including one speaking on behalf of a group of countries, asked whether the uptake of the concept of "nature's contributions to people" and associated terminology would be discussed in plenary. The Chair explained that the adoption of the concept had been the result of an evolution in thinking that was a natural extension of IPBES' mandate to consider various knowledge systems and diverse conceptualizations of multiple values.
43. One representative expressed concern that limited progress had been made with regard to the deliverables related to the sustainable use of biodiversity and invasive alien species as well as the budget for the implementation of the work programme. Another said that it was necessary to be able to measure the effectiveness and efficiency of IPBES deliverables in order to improve them.
44. The Plenary took note of the information presented.

VI. Work programme of the Platform

A. Capacity-building

45. In introducing the sub-item, the representative of the secretariat reported that, in line with decision IPBES-4/1, section I, the capacity-building task force established in decision IPBES-2/5 was focusing its efforts for the period 2016–2017 on the development of a comprehensive framework, or "rolling plan", for capacity-building. This rolling plan was intended to provide a coherent approach to addressing capacity-building needs through the end of the first work programme. A summary of the rolling plan was set out in the note by the secretariat on work on capacity-building (IPBES/5/3). The full plan, along with the report of the second IPBES capacity-building forum, which was convened in the margins of the seventy-first session of the United Nations General Assembly on 23 September 2016, was set out in document IPBES/5/INF/3. The Plenary was invited to welcome the rolling plan, including its executive summary as set out in the annex to document IPBES/5/3, with any amendments that it deemed appropriate.
46. In the ensuing discussion, statements were made by the representatives of Belgium, Colombia, the Dominican Republic, Indonesia, Morocco and South Africa.
47. One representative said that Governments, should be more involved in IPBES processes and voiced support, along with several other representatives, for the proposal to conduct consultations on the content of the ongoing regional and land degradation and restoration assessments.
48. Several representatives encouraged the strengthening of engagement with existing and potential partners to promote complementarity and avoid duplication of efforts. One representative asked for clarification on the role of BES-Net in the development of the IPBES matchmaking facility; while another suggested that clarification was needed regarding the link between the work of IPBES and academic and other partners with common interests, including the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora and the Convention on Biological Diversity.
49. Two representatives said that there needed to be a clearer focus on developing countries with regard to the use of IPBES deliverables such as assessments; one said that in-kind contributions to the rolling plan were important; and another mentioned that there was a need for flexibility to respond in a timely manner to the needs of IPBES members and that more detail on immediate priorities could ease engagement with existing and new partners.
50. Following its discussion, the Plenary established a contact group, co-chaired by Mr. Ivar Baste (Norway) and Mr. Mketeni, to further discuss the issue.

B. Indigenous and local knowledge systems

51. In introducing the sub-item, the representative of the secretariat invited the Plenary to consider, for approval, a proposed approach for addressing indigenous and local knowledge in IPBES deliverables, encompassing the participatory mechanism for working with indigenous and local knowledge systems and a roster including all registered individuals or entities as well as all indigenous and local knowledge experts currently or formerly involved in IPBES, as set out in the note by the secretariat on indigenous and local knowledge systems (IPBES/5/4, annex). He noted that additional information, including an evaluation of the experience gained in piloting indigenous and local knowledge dialogue workshops and information on the approach to addressing indigenous and local knowledge in the global assessment on biodiversity and ecosystem services, was provided in document IPBES/5/INF/4. In line with decision IPBES-4/1, section II, the work undertaken in 2016 had focused on the continued piloting of indigenous and local knowledge dialogue workshops and the

development of the participatory mechanism and the roster and their integration into the proposed overall approach to addressing indigenous and local knowledge in the context of IPBES.

52. The Chair thanked Brigitte Baptiste and Tamar Pataridze, co-chairs of the task force on indigenous and local knowledge, and Eduardo Brondizio, co-chair of the global assessment of biodiversity and ecosystem services, for their work on the approach over the past year, saying that the approach was relevant across IPBES deliverables.

53. In the ensuing discussion statements were made by the representatives of Antigua and Barbuda, Colombia, Guatemala, India, Indonesia, Malaysia, Mexico, Morocco, Norway, Pakistan, the Russian Federation, Slovakia on behalf of the member States of the European Union that were members of IPBES, Uruguay and a coalition of non-governmental organizations.

54. Several representatives said that it was important that the repository of relevant resources of indigenous and local knowledge meet prior informed consent requirements consistent with the voluntary guidelines set out in decision XIII/18 of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity. One of them also sought further clarification regarding who would have access to the repository and what type of information would be displayed. One representative said that IPBES work on indigenous and local knowledge should take into account the progress in other multilateral forums such as work on traditional knowledge associated with genetic resources under Article 8 (j) of the Convention on Biological Diversity and work under the World Intellectual Property Organization on protection of traditional knowledge. One representative also said that it was important to recognize the sources of indigenous and local knowledge.

55. Two representatives said that to be effective IPBES should focus on engaging with organizations and networks that worked with indigenous peoples and local communities, rather than individuals.

56. Two representatives noted that the title of the annex to document IPBES/5/4 in Spanish referred to the use of indigenous and local knowledge, and suggested that in the spirit of IPBES “use” be changed to “integrate”. Regarding definitions related to indigenous and local knowledge, one representative said that the terminology referring to indigenous and local knowledge holders, indigenous and local knowledge experts and experts on indigenous and local knowledge in the approach needed to be consistent with already agreed procedures.

57. One representative said that it was necessary to be explicit in the proposed approach about actions to be taken and objectives to be achieved.

58. Regarding the participatory mechanism, two representatives said that web-based tools would need to be accompanied by other methods that used existing communication networks. One of them added that gender balance was important. Another said that the budgetary implications of face-to-face involvement, which was necessary for the effective participation of indigenous peoples and local communities, should be discussed in a contact group. One representative said that the approach should be revised to better address the integration of indigenous and local knowledge into the assessment process.

59. One representative suggested that representatives of indigenous peoples and local communities and minorities should be better represented at future sessions of the Plenary. One representative said that, considering IPBES’ focus on nature’s contributions to people, the converse contributions of people to nature in the context of indigenous and local knowledge should also be reflected in the approach, suggesting that funding be made available for a workshop on the subject.

60. One representative said that the uptake of lessons learned and good practices should be listed as a priority and that the compilation of literature, data and cases studies from other IPBES assessments and related reports should be considered. One representative cautioned about the amount of time that would be required to gain the buy-in of indigenous peoples and local communities. One representative said that the role of national focal points in the participatory mechanism for working with indigenous and local knowledge systems should be well considered, in line with relevant decisions of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity and other related multilateral agreements.

61. One representative said that there was a need for national legislation to complement the work of IPBES on indigenous and local knowledge.

62. One representative said that the contributions of indigenous peoples and local communities with respect to their knowledge and world views; important pressures undermining those contributions; and policy responses, measures and processes for improving and strengthening the

governance of nature and nature's contributions to people with regard to indigenous peoples and local communities and their knowledge and practices should be discussed in a contact group.

63. Following its discussion, the Plenary decided to establish a contact group co-chaired by Mr. Watson and Mr. Diego Pacheco Balanza (Bolivia) to consider the approach in detail.

C. Knowledge and data

64. In introducing the sub-item, the Executive Secretary outlined the three areas under which the task force on knowledge and data had grouped its work mandated by the Plenary in decision IPBES-3/1, section II: indicators and data for IPBES assessments; web-based infrastructure in support of data and information management needs; and knowledge generation catalysis.

65. She invited the Plenary to take note of progress to date and to approve the proposed work plan for 2017 and 2018 set out in the note by the secretariat (IPBES/5/5, annex). She also noted that additional information on the work undertaken by the task force, in particular on support for IPBES assessments with regard to indicators, was provided in document IPBES/5/INF/5.

66. The Chair thanked the task force on knowledge and data and its co-chairs Mr. Youngbae Suh (Republic of Korea) and Mr. Asghar Mohammadi Fazel (Islamic Republic of Iran), member of the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel Mr. Paul Leadley and the many organizations that had contributed to the work over the previous year.

67. In the ensuing discussion, statements were made by the representatives of Australia, Belgium, Colombia, Finland, France, India, Indonesia, Japan, Mexico, Pakistan, Republic of Korea, South Africa, Sweden, Switzerland, the United States, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and Future Earth.

68. Several representatives said that there was a need for collaboration with agencies generating the kinds of knowledge and data presented in the proposed work plan, and for clarifying the conditions of that collaboration, in order to ensure alignment with related processes, avoid duplication and provide mutual support. One representative drew attention to an ongoing study conducted by the UNEP World Conservation Monitoring Centre aimed at harmonizing approaches to indicator use by various agencies. One representative asked about the approach used for selecting indicators and, supported by others, expressed a desire for more information from expert group members during contact group discussions. Several representatives said that it was important that indicators and other knowledge and data resources, including indicators related to indigenous and local knowledge, were readily available for use by stakeholders and appropriately disseminated.

69. Two representatives said that the web-based infrastructure should be easier to navigate and one said that as a repository of key resources it should be finalized as soon as possible. Another representative said that the web-based infrastructure was important as a means for making data broadly available and promoting transparency and harmonization between, for example, regional assessments. One representative expressed concern about potential inconsistency in applying the datasets across regional assessments, rendering challenges in feeding into the global assessment.

70. With regard to knowledge generation, two representatives said that more information could have been provided, with one suggesting that the planned follow-up questionnaire on suggestions for priority research areas based on the findings of the thematic assessment on pollinators, pollination and food production, be disseminated not only to co-chairs and coordinating lead authors of completed and ongoing assessments but to all lead authors to maximize input. Another representative said that the three-step process should include consultations with Governments and other stakeholders, but that seeking feedback from the scientific community need not be repeated. Another representative said that consideration should be given to an approach for involving industries sourcing bio-resources in the feedback process.

71. Several representatives said that it was important to identify gaps in the list of indicators, and another said that he hoped that research priorities would respond to the gaps identified. One representative said that additional information was required on how the provided indicators would be measured. One representative said that there was still a lack of socio-economic indicators, although efforts were being made to rectify the situation.

72. Regarding the identification of priority research areas, one representative said that it would be better to avoid labelling areas of research as high-priority and instead use more neutral language merely to indicate the presence of knowledge gaps.

73. One representative said that each assessment should have a data and information plan for biodiversity as part of its scoping document and that such plans should be developed for ongoing assessments.
74. One representative said that there was a need for close integration of the elements of the work programme and guidance from the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel. Another said that further interaction between members of IPBES and the task force on knowledge and data would improve understanding of the task force's work.
75. Two representatives said that they would have liked to receive more information on milestones towards the deliverables discussed in the work plan, with one saying the same regarding each of the task groups listed.
76. Mr. Leadley responded to some of the statements above. With regard to the alignment of indicators with other processes, he said that indicators were selected from a variety of sources and partnerships with data holders sought. With regard to the availability of indicator data to IPBES members he said that the priority was to request permission for assessment experts to access data, but that this could change as time and resources allowed. As to the quality of data, they were often not appropriate to be viewed at the national or even subregional scale due to the existence of significant data gaps. Preparing and making data available, he said, involved a considerable amount of work.
77. The Plenary decided that the contact group established as described in paragraph 63 above should consider the matter further.

D. Methodological assessment regarding the diverse conceptualization of multiple values of nature and its benefits

E. Thematic assessment on invasive alien species

F. Thematic assessment on the sustainable use of biodiversity

78. The Plenary considered sub-items 6 (d) (Methodological assessment regarding the diverse conceptualization of multiple values of nature and its benefits), 6 (e) (Thematic assessment on invasive alien species) and 6 (f) (Thematic assessment on the sustainable use of biodiversity) together.
79. Introducing the sub-items the Chair drew attention to the relevant documents (IPBES/5/6, IPBES/5/7, IPBES/5/INF/10, IPBES/5/INF/11 and IPBES/5/INF/12).
80. The Executive Secretary recalled that by decision IPBES-4/1 the Plenary had approved the scoping report for the methodological assessment regarding the diverse conceptualization of multiple values of nature and its benefits, including biodiversity and ecosystem functions and services, set out in annex VI to the decision and the scoping report for the thematic assessment of invasive alien species and their control, set out in annex III to the decision, had decided to consider initiating them at the current session and had requested the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel to undertake further scoping of the thematic assessment on the sustainable use of biodiversity.
81. In accordance with the decision the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel had prepared a revised scoping report for the thematic assessment on the sustainable use of biodiversity and in the course of the re-scoping process had decided to change the name of the assessment to refer to "wild species" rather than "biodiversity". The Plenary at the current session, she said, might wish to consider and approve the revised scoping report (IPBES/5/7, annex); it might also wish to consider when to initiate the assessment, the methodological assessment regarding the diverse conceptualization of multiple values of nature and its benefits and the thematic assessment on invasive alien species (hereinafter referred to as the "pending assessments"), bearing in mind the challenges associated with undertaking any of the pending assessments under the budgetary and human resources constraints currently facing IPBES.
82. The Chair noted that the Plenary would need to adopt the revised scoping report for a thematic assessment on the sustainable use of wild species before the assessment could be initiated. The Chair also conveyed a number of recommendations from the Bureau, including that, if the Plenary decided to undertake any of the pending assessments, each of them should be carried out over a period of three years; that the budget for each of the pending assessments should amount to \$997,000, which included the minimum number of authors considered necessary for a successful assessment and three fully inclusive author meetings and would allow for the technical support units open for a minimum of three months after the closure of the session of the Plenary at which the assessment would be considered. In terms of sequence, the Bureau had recommended that methodological assessments be scheduled to start early in the work programme so that they could inform and support the other assessments and other work of IPBES and suggested that the Plenary might therefore wish to consider launching the values assessment first. The Chair added a plea that the Plenary not reduce what he said

was already a minimal number of experts proposed for each chapter of the three assessments as a means of reducing their cost.

83. In the ensuing discussion, statements were made by the representatives of Antigua and Barbuda, Bosnia and Herzegovina, on behalf of Eastern European States, Brazil, Cameroon, on behalf of African States, China, Colombia, Denmark, France, Guatemala, Japan, Germany, Malaysia, Mexico, Morocco, New Zealand, Norway, Pakistan, Peru, South Africa, Sudan, Sweden and the United States of America.

84. Representatives expressed a range of views regarding when the three assessments should be launched. Several representatives said that the assessments should be delayed until adequate funding and human resources were available. Several others said that one or more should commence despite current resource limitations, on the assumption that resources would be found during the course of the current work programme.

85. Those arguing for delay cited capacity constraints on the part of experts, secretariat staff members and members of the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel. Several representatives said that waiting for the outcomes of the ongoing regional and land degradation and restoration assessments would also benefit the pending assessments through the information that they would provide. One representative said that the preliminary guide regarding diverse conceptualization of multiple values of nature and its benefits, including biodiversity and ecosystem functions and services (IPBES/4/INF/13), offered some of the guidance that would be provided by the proposed full methodological assessment regarding the diverse conceptualization of multiple values of nature and its benefits.

86. Several representatives pointed out that the pending assessments were not new deliverables because their implementation had been agreed upon with the adoption of the first work programme. One representative said that if they were delayed until the second work programme there would be implications for new deliverables.

87. Several representatives said that ways of making the delivery of the pending assessments more efficient should also be sought, including the engagement of Governments and other partners to co-host meetings, as was being planned with FAO for the hosting of the third author meeting for the land degradation and restoration assessment. One representative said that her Government would stand ready to nominate experts to undertake the assessments. Another representative suggested that experts that completed their work on ongoing assessments by the end of 2017 might become available to work on the pending assessments.

88. Several representatives said that the methodological assessment regarding the diverse conceptualization of multiple values of nature and its benefits should be the first of the three assessments to start, with two arguing that that assessment would provide a foundational tool that should be made available to policymakers as soon as possible and one saying that it would inform the global assessment and suggesting that it be two years in duration to facilitate that outcome. Several other representatives, however, said that the thematic assessment on the sustainable use of wild species should be conducted first.

89. The representative of France conveyed an offer by her Government to host a technical support unit for the thematic assessment on the sustainable use of wild species once that assessment was launched.

90. One representative proposed foregoing the proposed discussion to consider, with a view to approving, the revised scoping report for a thematic assessment on the sustainable use of wild species, stating that the revised scoping report could become dated and therefore no longer relevant if the thematic assessment itself were not to commence during the current work programme. Several others, however, opposed that suggestion. One representative said that the scope of the revised scoping report for the thematic assessment on the sustainable use of wild species needed to be narrowed down, an exercise that might need to continue after the current session and take into account regional assessment outcomes. One representative said that there was a knowledge gap regarding domesticated species, which could be addressed partly through the expertise and knowledge of indigenous peoples and local communities.

91. Following its discussion, the Plenary decided that the contact group established as described in paragraph 50 above should further discuss the question of whether and when to commence the pending assessments.

G. Policy support tools and methodologies

92. Introducing the sub-item, the representative of the secretariat recalled that one of the four functions of IPBES was to support policy formulation and implementation by identifying policy-relevant tools and methodologies. In decision IPBES-4/1, section VI, the Plenary had requested that the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel, supported by the expert group on policy support tools and methodologies, continue the development of the online catalogue and that experts, Governments and stakeholders submit relevant policy support tools and methodologies for inclusion in the catalogue of policy support tools and methodologies. He then reported on progress in the implementation of the decision, outlining the information in documents IPBES/5/8 and IPBES/5/INF/14 and presenting the prototype of the online catalogue. The Plenary, he said, might wish to review the catalogue, provide comments and consider the proposals for further developing the catalogue, as well as the methodological guidance for assessments, and to review the role of the expert group.

93. The Chair thanked the expert group and its co-chairs and the relevant members of the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel for their work.

94. The Plenary decided that the contact group established as described in paragraph 50 above should consider the matter further.

H. Communication, stakeholder engagement and strategic partnerships

95. In introducing the sub-item, the Executive Secretary reported on an update on strategic partnerships as requested in decision IPBES-4/4, outlining relevant information in the note by the secretariat (IPBES/5/9). A representative of the secretariat then reported on progress on communication activities, outlining the information in documents IPBES/5/9, IPBES/5/INF/15 and IPBES/5/INF/16.

96. In the ensuing discussion statements were made by the representatives of Belarus, Belgium, Brazil, Costa Rica, France, Germany, Indonesia, Japan, Sweden and the United States of America; the Convention on Migratory Species of Wild Animals and IUCN.

97. Several representatives said that the existing memorandums of cooperation with strategic partners were of considerable importance. One representative queried whether memorandums of cooperation with the secretariats of the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification in those Countries Experiencing Serious Drought and/or Desertification, Particularly in Africa and the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change should be concluded, and two representatives requested that IPBES establish a strategic partnership with IPCC. The Executive Secretary confirmed that a close working relationship with IPCC already existed and said that it was possible to formalize it.

98. There was also some discussion of the IPBES logo and acronym usage, with several representatives saying that the guidelines on their use were too restrictive. A representative of the secretariat said that the current guidelines for logo usage, which had been approved by the Plenary at its fourth session, and further specified by the Bureau, allowed for the accommodation of some of the requests for its use that had been received. The Chair suggested that the Bureau discuss the need to further modify the guidelines taking into account the discussion of the matter at the current session.

99. Several representatives questioned the use of opinion editorial pieces and the role of the Executive Secretary and the Chair in this context. A representative of the secretariat clarified that the term opinion editorial piece was a journalistic term for a newspaper piece that appeared in a certain part of a newspaper. Such pieces could be utilized to highlight the importance of the work of IPBES, highlighting the substance of ongoing assessments.

100. The Plenary took note of the information presented.

I. Outcome of the work of the contact groups on the work programme of the Platform

101. Following the work of the contact groups on the work programme of IPBES their co-chairs reported on the groups' deliberations, saying that they had reached agreement on most issues and had produced draft decision text and revised versions of the texts pertaining to the matters that they had been asked to discuss for consideration by the Plenary. On areas where agreement could not be reached text was enclosed in square brackets to indicate a lack of agreement. The draft decision text and revised documents, the latter of which, once adopted, would form the annexes to the decision on the work programme, was set out in documents IPBES/5/1/Add.2, draft decision I, sections I and VIII; IPBES/5/L.2; IPBES/5/L.4; IPBES/5/L.6; IPBES/5/L.7; IPBES/5/L.11; and IPBES/5/L.12.

VII. Financial and budgetary arrangements for the Platform

102. The Plenary took up agenda sub-items 7 (a) (Budget and expenditure for the period 2014–2018) and 7 (b) (Trust fund) together.

103. Introducing the sub-items, the Chair thanked those countries and organizations that had contributed to the trust fund and contributed in-kind support to the work of IPBES, as well as the hundreds of experts from developed and developing countries that had contributed their time and expertise. He recalled that since the fourth session of the Plenary he had sent two letters drawing the attention of IPBES members to an impending major budget shortfall that in the absence of significant additional contributions would become manifest in 2017. As described in document IPBES/5/10, the predicted shortfall could be as much as \$8 million and could affect the completion even of those deliverables on which work was already under way.

104. The Executive Secretary then outlined the information provided in document IPBES/5/10, prepared in response to decision IPBES-4/2, in which the Plenary had adopted the budget for IPBES for 2016–2017; invited pledges and contributions to the IPBES trust fund; requested the Executive Secretary to report to the Plenary on expenditures for 2015–2016; and requested the Executive Secretary, in consultation with the Bureau, to proactively seek funding, to pursue continuous improvements in efficiencies in the operations of IPBES and to develop a strategy for fundraising. The document provided information on cash and in-kind contributions to IPBES and on expenditures for the biennium 2015–2016 and set out a proposed revised budget for 2017–2018, a revised indicative budget for 2019 and, in its annex, a draft fundraising strategy.

105. The Chair asked the Plenary to consider the cost of undertaking the methodological assessment regarding the diverse conceptualization of multiple values of nature and its benefits and the thematic assessments on invasive alien species and on the sustainable use of biodiversity. He also drew attention to the potentially bigger challenge of the availability of members of the scientific community to serve as authors and reviewers; the failure of many Governments to date to nominate experts and to provide review comments; and the limited size of the secretariat. The Bureau, he reported, recommended that no work on the abovementioned methodological and thematic assessments be commenced until after the regional assessments and land degradation and restoration assessment had been completed, thus freeing up the capacity of those involved in those deliverables. Speaking on behalf of the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel, one of its Co-Chairs voiced support for the Bureau's recommendation, saying that the experts involved were already working at full capacity. The Chair then opened the floor, calling for new pledges to the trust fund.

106. In the ensuing discussion, statements were made by the representatives of Argentina, Australia, Cameroon, Colombia, France, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Japan, Mexico, the Netherlands, Norway, Peru, South Africa, Sweden, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United States of America and Uruguay.

107. A number of representatives provided information on their countries' contributions to the trust fund and in-kind contributions. The representatives of Colombia, France, Japan, Mexico, the Netherlands, Norway, South Africa, Sweden and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland pledged to provide further financial support in-kind or to the trust fund or reported on pledges already made.

108. Several representatives thanked donor countries for their contributions. Some said that additional contributions were necessary, and one said that private sector funding should be sought to support IPBES.

109. There was a divergence of views regarding when pending assessments should commence. Several representatives said that they should not begin until financial and human capacity were available to support them, while others said that their schedules had already been agreed on by the Plenary as part of the current work programme, which was a response to the dire need for action to address biodiversity loss, and that delaying them would deprive end users of their products. One representative suggested that in the worst case the assessments could be postponed but should not be cancelled, while another said that once the regional and land degradation and restoration assessments were complete at least human resources could be deployed to begin the pending methodological and thematic assessments.

110. While suggestions for efficiencies in response to the budgetary deficit were acknowledged, two speakers expressed concern over the suggestion to increase the use of remote conferencing, with one citing weak internet in some regions and the other the need for face-to-face contact to facilitate interaction and knowledge exchange.

111. One representative asked that the land degradation and restoration assessment specifically address certain key environmental issues in his country.
112. A budget group, co-chaired by Bureau members Mr. Asghar Mohammadi Fazel (Islamic Republic of Iran) and Mr. Spencer Thomas (Grenada), was established with the mandate to consider the item further with the aim of resolving differences and proposing a way forward.
113. Following the work of the budget group its co-chair reported that the group had reached agreement on a draft fundraising strategy for consideration by the Plenary. The group had been unable to reach agreement, however, on budgets for 2017, 2018 and 2019. The contact group had prepared a draft decision (IPBES/5/L.8) and accompanying annexes, including square brackets around text that had not been agreed, for consideration by the Plenary.
114. At the request of the Chair the Executive Secretary then presented a document showing the amounts required to operate the secretariat and undertake the programme of work in 2017, 2018 and 2019, along with the cumulative amount of available funds and resulting funding surplus or shortfall in each of those years. Explaining the assumptions regarding the projected available funds and noting that the amounts required to undertake the programme of work did not include the approximately \$1 million that would be needed to undertake each of the three pending assessments, she said that, as shown in the document, there would be a surplus at the end of 2017 of approximately \$708,000 followed by shortfalls of approximately \$2 million for 2018 and approximately \$3.5 million for 2019.
115. In the ensuing discussion agreement was rapidly reached to adopt the draft fundraising strategy and on the amount of the budget for 2017, for which there were adequate funds pledged and on hand. There was considerable debate, however, regarding the amount that should be budgeted for 2018. Several representatives argued that the adopted budget should provide funds at least adequate to complete the activities in the first programme of work that had already been begun, while others added that it should also include funds sufficient to undertake the pending assessments. Other representatives, however, expressed disquiet at the prospect of adopting a budget that was significantly larger than the funds that were currently expected to be available. Several representatives said that the Plenary must address the issue of fundraising in a considered manner at its next session, while the Chair remarked that the Plenary had just approved a fundraising strategy and that it was vital that the resource mobilization officer to be sponsored by the French Government in accordance with that strategy begin his or her work as soon as possible.
116. Taking into account the amount required to operate the secretariat, conduct the sixth session of the Plenary and carry out activities that had already been begun, the Plenary approved a 2018 budget in the amount of \$5 million, agreeing that it would revisit the matter at its sixth session and that the secretariat would undertake an analysis of possible budgets both below and above that amount for consideration at that session. Owing to a lack of time the Plenary decided not to discuss the budget for 2019 and to take it up at its sixth session.

VIII. Review of the Platform

117. The Executive Secretary introduced the item, outlining the information set out in the relevant note by the secretariat (IPBES/5/11), including terms of reference for the review of IPBES at the end of its first work programme (annex), and a draft questionnaire to be used in the review process (appendix).
118. In the ensuing discussions statements were made by the representatives of Australia, Brazil, Cameroon (on behalf of African States), Colombia, Japan, Norway, Mexico, South Africa, Slovakia (on behalf of members States who were members of IPBES), Senegal, Switzerland, the United States of America and Future Earth.
119. Several representatives said that the review of IPBES was of the utmost importance and that the results of the review should inform the second work programme. One, however, said that it should be postponed so that resources could be allocated to pending assessments. Another said that the review should be undertaken once the work programme had been completed.
120. Several representatives said that it was important for the review to be undertaken in an efficient and transparent manner. While they preferred that it be undertaken by a professional organization, however, they could support its being undertaken by a secretariat staff member reporting to the review panel.
121. Several representatives said that the Plenary should appoint the review panel but in view of time constraints could accept that the Bureau would do so in consultation with the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel based on nominations by members and stakeholders. One representative said that the

review panel should be diverse, including indigenous and local knowledge experts and other stakeholders.

122. Two representatives expressed the view that an internal committee was not required for the review process. Several said that the questionnaire to be used for the review required considerable work and should focus on the process by which IPBES developed and implemented its work programme. One representative said that it was too early to review the impact of IPBES deliverables. Another, however, said that the questionnaire should contain a section on the specific impacts on the implementation of and decisions made under multilateral environmental agreements. One representative said that the questionnaire should not include open-ended questions, and another said that it should be finalized by whoever carried out the review.

123. Two representatives said that the questionnaire should not be the only means of gathering information and that the review should make use of interviews conducted in the margins of other meetings, as well as by electronic means. One representative asked for national focal points to be recognized as a category for the focus group discussions.

124. The Plenary decided that the contact group established as described in paragraph 63 above should consider the matter further.

125. Following the work of the contact group its co-chair reported on the group's deliberations, saying that it had reached agreement on a draft decision and draft terms of reference (IPBES/5/L.10) for the review of IPBES at the end of its first work programme for consideration by the Plenary.

IX. Planning for future sessions of the Plenary

A. Provisional agenda, organization of work, dates and venues of the sixth and seventh sessions of the Plenary

126. In introducing the sub-item the Executive Secretariat drew attention to document IPBES/5/12, which provided information on the draft preliminary agendas, draft organizations of work and dates for the sixth and seventh sessions of the Plenary.

127. In the ensuing discussion statements were made by the representatives of Colombia, France, the United States of America and IUCN.

128. Several representatives said that the agendas for the meetings posed challenges and stressed the importance of interpretation during discussions on the regional assessments. One representative requested that fundraising be added to the agendas for both sessions.

129. The representative of Colombia conveyed an offer by her Government to host the sixth session of the Plenary in March 2018, which the Plenary welcomed.

130. Subsequently the Plenary considered a draft decision on the matter prepared by the secretariat (IPBES/5/L.3).

B. Process for the development of a second work programme for the Platform

131. Introducing the sub-item, the Executive Secretary recalled that the first work programme of IPBES would conclude with the consideration of the global assessment on biodiversity and ecosystem services by the Plenary at its seventh session, in mid-2019. She outlined possible steps in the development of a potential second work programme, as discussed in the relevant note by the secretariat (IPBES/5/12).

132. In the ensuing discussion statements were made by the representatives of Brazil, Iraq, Japan, Slovakia (on behalf of member States of the European Union who were members of the Platform), South Africa, Switzerland and the United States of America.

133. Several representatives said that the second work programme should prioritize high-quality deliverables rather than seek to produce a large number of deliverables; it was also said that the timing of assessments was important.

134. One representative said that there was a need for flexibility in the work programme so that it was responsive to the needs of international processes such as the follow-up to the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011–2020, developed under the Convention on Biological Diversity, the Paris Agreement on climate change and the Sustainable Development Goals, that it was able to address new and emerging issues and that it could take into consideration financial constraints. It was also suggested that the work programme be formulated as a rolling work plan.

135. Another representative supported the idea of a rolling work plan, saying that such a plan would allow the schedules for the production of deliverables to be adjusted to take into account the availability of funding. He also said that while global assessments were important their timing was critical: thus another global assessment should not be started for at least another 10 years to allow for new information to be made available.

136. Several representatives expressed support for a process in which members would designate priority issues and the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel and the Bureau would draft an initial work programme, outlining the assumptions on which it was based and including a preliminary cost estimate.

137. One representative said that there was a need to reflect on mistakes in the first work programme. He suggested, therefore, that the start of the second work programme be delayed for two years and the review of IPBES be delayed for one year to allow for completion of the first work programme.

138. The Plenary decided that the contact group established as described in paragraph 63 above should consider the matter further. Following the work of the contact group the Chair introduced a draft decision on the matter produced by the contact group for consideration by the Plenary (IPBES/5/L.5), including square brackets around text on which agreement had not been reached.

X. Institutional arrangements: United Nations collaborative partnership arrangements for the work of the Platform and its secretariat

139. Introducing the item, the Executive Secretary recalled that by decision IPBES-2/8 the Plenary had approved a collaborative partnership arrangement between the Plenary of IPBES and UNEP, UNESCO, FAO and UNDP. She drew attention to a report (IPBES/5/INF/18) providing information on action that those four organizations had taken to support IPBES and its work programme. The representative of UNEP then provided further information about the four organizations' substantive and programmatic contributions to the implementation of the IPBES work programme for 2014–2018.

140. The Plenary took note of the information presented.

XI. Adoption of the decisions and report of the session

141. The Plenary adopted decisions IPBES-5/1–IPBES-5/6, as set out in the annex to the present report, as follows:

IPBES-5/1: Implementation of the first work programme of the Platform (adopted on the basis of documents IPBES/5/1/Add.2, decision I, sections I and VIII; IPBES/5/L.2, as orally amended in respect of both the decision text and the related annex to the decision; IPBES/5/L.6, as orally amended in respect of both the decision text and the related annex to the decision; IPBES/5/L.11, as orally amended in respect of both the decision text and the related annex to the decision; the decision text contained in IPBES/5/L.12, as orally amended; IPBES/5/L.7, as orally amended; and IPBES/5/L.4);

IPBES-5/2: Review of the Platform (adopted on the basis of document IPBES/5/L.10, as orally amended in respect of the decision text and without change in respect of the annex to the decision);

IPBES-5/3: Development of a second work programme of the Platform (adopted on the basis of document IPBES/5/L.5, as orally amended);

IPBES-5/4: Enhanced participation of the European Union in the sessions of the Plenary of the Platform (adopted on the basis of document IPBES/5/L.9);

IPBES-5/5: Provisional agendas, dates and venues of the sixth and seventh sessions of the Plenary (adopted on the basis of document IPBES/5/L.3);

IPBES-5/6: Financial and budgetary matters (adopted on the basis of document IPBES/5/L.8, as orally amended in respect of the decision text and annex I to the decision and without change in respect of annex II to the decision).

142. During the discussion of decision IPBES-5/1, several representatives objected to text in the draft approach to recognizing and working with indigenous and local knowledge produced by the contact group (document IPBES/5/L.6, para. 9 bis) indicating that consent to the use of such knowledge would be sought "as appropriate". Arguing that such consent should be sought in all cases, they called for the deletion of the phrase "as appropriate". Following discussion those objecting to the

language agreed to its retention in the approach as approved on the condition that the task force on indigenous and local knowledge discuss the issue and, through the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel and the Bureau, report on the outcome of its discussions to the Plenary at its next session.

143. Also during the consideration of the draft decisions and their annexes, several representatives expressed concern that in some cases the decisions and annexes had not been available in all six official languages of the Plenary when the Plenary was ready to discuss them during the final meeting of the session; as a result it had been necessary to consider the English language versions only. Concern was also expressed that interpretation for the final meeting had ended while the meeting still had some way to go, meaning that representatives had no choice but to conclude the negotiations on the draft decisions and their annexes in English only. That, said several, was irregular and prejudicial to those members whose representatives were not native English speakers. Representatives said that the secretariat should endeavour to avoid such difficulties at the next session, with one suggesting that arrangements be made to ensure the availability of interpretation on the last day of each session when decisions were being considered for adoption, perhaps by eliminating interpretation for contact group meetings.

144. In response the Chair recalled that at its fourth session the Plenary had decided that the current session should last only four days rather than the six days of previous sessions. One result of that was less time in which to produce in-session documents for consideration by the Plenary. In addition, debate on some agenda items at the current session had lasted well beyond the time that had been allocated to those items, and it had been necessary to hold three unscheduled night meetings of the contact groups and the Plenary and – with the consent of the Plenary – to conduct meetings of both contact groups and the budget group at the same time, contrary to the usual practice. In addition, the contact groups had only finished their work at around midnight on the penultimate night of the session, creating a bottleneck in the editing and translation of the documents.

145. Saying that he understood representatives' frustrations, in particular those of representatives who were not native speakers of English, he suggested that the experience at the current session argued for caution in estimating how much work could be accomplished in a given amount of time. Noting that the Plenary had agreed that its sixth session would last seven days, and observing that it would have a very heavy agenda, he suggested that the Plenary authorize the secretariat and the Bureau to assess whether seven days would be sufficient to conclude the work of that session and, if not, to add an eighth day. The Plenary agreed to the suggestion of the Chair.

146. Owing to a lack of time to consider the draft report of the session, the Plenary decided that IPBES members would have two weeks to comment on the draft report text set out in documents IPBES/5L.1 and Add.1, following which the Rapporteur with the assistance of the secretariat would finalize the report of the session, including those sections of the report reflecting the proceedings on the last day of the session, taking any such comments into account.

XII. Closure of the session

147. The Chair declared the session closed at 11.15 p.m. on 10 March 2017.

Annex**Decisions adopted by the Plenary of the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services at its fifth session**

IPBES-5/1: Implementation of the first work programme of the Platform

IPBES-5/2: Review of the Platform

IPBES-5/3: Development of a second work programme of the Platform

IPBES-5/4: Enhanced participation of the European Union in the sessions of the Plenary of the Platform

IPBES-5/5: Provisional agendas, dates and venues of the sixth and seventh sessions of the Plenary

IPBES-5/6: Financial and budgetary arrangements

IPBES-5/1: Implementation of the first work programme of the Platform

The Plenary,

Welcoming the report of the Executive Secretary on the implementation of the first work programme of the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services,¹ which includes challenges faced and lessons learned during the third year of implementation of the work programme,

Acknowledging the outstanding contributions made by all experts to date in the implementation of the work programme and thanking them for their unwavering commitment,

Encouraging Governments and organizations to participate actively in the implementation of the work programme, in particular through the nomination of experts and the review of draft deliverables,

I

Implementation of the first work programme of the Platform

Decides to proceed with the implementation of the first work programme of the Platform in accordance with the present decision and the approved budget set out in decision IPBES-5/6;

II

Capacity-building

1. *Welcomes* the Platform's capacity-building rolling plan,² including its executive summary set out in annex I to the present decision, noting that the rolling plan is a living document intended to guide the work of the Platform and collaboration among partners aimed at the implementation of deliverables 1 (a) and 1 (b) of the Platform's first work programme;
2. *Requests* the task force on capacity-building to implement the capacity-building rolling plan, subject to the availability of financial resources, and to report on progress to the Plenary at its sixth session;
3. *Encourages* members and observers of the Platform to take advantage of the regional consultation meetings planned under the capacity-building rolling plan for 2017 to enhance members' and observers' contributions to the finalization of the regional assessments;
4. *Welcomes* the initial efforts of partner organizations in support of capacity-building initiatives under the rolling plan and invites other organizations to join those efforts by offering technical and financial contributions that further match identified capacity-building needs;
5. *Requests* the task force on capacity-building to further enhance collaboration transparently with other organizations in the implementation of the rolling plan;
6. *Requests* the Bureau, in collaboration with the task force on capacity-building, to consider what would be the most effective way of leveraging additional support for capacity-building, to consider whether a third meeting of the capacity-building forum is needed, and to report on its work to the Plenary at its sixth session;

III

Knowledge foundations

1. *Approves* the approach to recognizing and working with indigenous and local knowledge set out in annex II to the present decision and requests the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel, supported by the task force on indigenous and local knowledge, to implement it;
2. *Invites* indigenous peoples and local communities and their representatives, as well as experts on indigenous and local knowledge, to engage in the activities described in the approach, in particular through the participatory mechanism;

¹ IPBES/5/2.

² IPBES/5/INF/3.

3. *Invites* Governments, stakeholders, strategic partners and others to support activities that mobilize indigenous and local knowledge where such knowledge is needed but not available in readily available formats and that increase the capacity of indigenous peoples and local communities to engage in and benefit from the Platform;
4. *Requests* the Executive Secretary to make the arrangements necessary to implement the approach, including arrangements for the establishment of the participatory mechanism, subject to the availability of resources;
5. *Takes note* of the outline workplan for the task force on knowledge and data for 2017 and 2018 set out in annex III to the present decision;
6. *Requests* the task force on knowledge and data, subject to the availability of resources, to further develop the outline workplan with clear deliverables and milestones for 2017 and 2018, taking into account the comments received during the fifth session of the Plenary, in consultation with relevant multilateral environmental agreements, international processes and organizations, to provide further updates during the intersessional periods through the Platform website and to report on progress to the Plenary at its sixth and seventh sessions;
7. *Encourages* the task force on knowledge and data to develop terms of reference to specify the modalities of its collaboration on specific tasks with partner organizations;
8. *Takes note* of the outcome of the expert group mandated to take into account the evolution of thinking on ecosystem services and of the transition from ecosystem services to nature's contributions to people to be in line with the inclusive approach of the IPBES conceptual framework.
9. *Notes* that the concept of nature's contributions to people will be used in the Platform's current and future assessments;

IV

Global, regional and subregional assessments

Welcomes the progress made in the undertaking of the global assessment of biodiversity and ecosystem services³ and the regional and subregional assessments of biodiversity and ecosystem services;⁴

V

Thematic assessments

1. *Welcomes* the activities undertaken to disseminate and communicate⁵ the summary for policymakers of the assessment report on pollinators, pollination and food production⁶ and the individual chapters of the assessment report and their executive summaries,⁷ and the consideration by all relevant bodies of the findings in the summary;
2. *Also welcomes* the progress made in the undertaking of the assessment of land degradation and restoration;⁸
3. *Approves* the scoping report for a thematic assessment of sustainable use of wild species set out in annex IV to the present decision;
4. *Requests* the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel, in consultation with the Bureau, to evaluate the need for any changes to already approved scoping documents based on major scientific findings of other Platform assessments and to report to the Plenary if any significant modifications are needed;

³ IPBES/5/INF/8.

⁴ IPBES/5/INF/7.

⁵ IPBES/5/INF/1.

⁶ Decision IPBES-4/1, annex II

⁷ IPBES/4/INF/1/Rev.1.

⁸ IPBES/5/INF/9.

VI

Methodological assessments

1. *Welcomes* the activities undertaken to disseminate and communicate⁹ the summary for policymakers of the assessment report on scenarios and models of biodiversity and ecosystem services¹⁰ and the individual chapters of the assessment report and their executive summaries;¹¹
2. *Welcomes* the progress made and next steps planned in the implementation of the work plan for the second phase of IPBES work on scenarios and models;¹²
3. *Requests* the expert group on scenarios and models established in accordance with paragraph 2 of section V of decision IPBES-4/1 to continue its work in accordance with the terms of reference set out in annex V to decision IPBES-4/1 and to report on progress at the sixth and seventh sessions of the Plenary;
4. *Welcomes* the progress made and next steps planned in the work of the expert group on values established in accordance with paragraph 5 of section V of decision IPBES-4/1 to ensure that values and valuation are incorporated appropriately into all Platform assessments;¹³
5. *Extends* the mandate of the expert group on values until the seventh session of the Plenary and requests the expert group to report on progress at the sixth and seventh sessions of the Plenary;

VII

Catalogue of policy tools and methodologies

1. *Welcomes* the progress made and next steps planned in the work of the expert group on policy support tools and methodologies;¹⁴
2. *Takes note* of the development of the online catalogue of policy support tools and methodologies and the support provided for ongoing Platform assessments;¹⁵
3. *Requests* the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel, in consultation with the Bureau and supported by a reconstituted task-specific expert group on policy support tools and methodologies and the secretariat, to continue, subject to the availability of resources, to address the requests made in decision IPBES-4/1 and, in addition:
 - (a) To submit the prototype online catalogue of policy support tools and methodologies for review by members, observers and stakeholders;
 - (b) To further develop the catalogue in cooperation with relevant international processes and interested partners;
 - (c) To work with the task force on capacity-building to explore ways to more effectively promote and facilitate the future use of policy support tools and methodologies at appropriate scales that meet the needs of policymakers;
 - (d) To undertake an evaluation of the use and effectiveness of the online prototype of the catalogue in the context of the review of the Platform (deliverable 4 (e)) and to report to the Plenary at its sixth session;

VIII

Technical support for the work programme

1. *Welcomes* the offers of in-kind contributions to support the implementation of the work programme received as at 10 March 2017, as listed in table 1 of the annex to decision IPBES-5/6, and invites the submission by 30 April 2017 of additional offers of in-kind contributions to support the implementation of the work programme and offers to host the seventh session of the Plenary;

⁹ IPBES/5/INF/2.

¹⁰ Decision IPBES-4/1, annex IV

¹¹ IPBES/4/INF/3/Rev.1.

¹² IPBES/5/INF/2.

¹³ IPBES/5/INF/13.

¹⁴ IPBES/5/8 and IPBES/5/INF/14.

¹⁵ Ibid.

2. *Requests* the secretariat, in consultation with the Bureau and in accordance with the approved budget set out in the annex to decision IPBES-5/6, to establish the institutional arrangements necessary to operationalize the technical support required for the work programme.

Annex I to decision IPBES-5/1

IPBES rolling plan for capacity-building

Executive summary

A. Rationale and objectives

1. The Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES) promotes knowledge concerning the diversity of life on earth (biodiversity) and its contributions to humanity (ecosystem services). This concern is reflected in the United Nations 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and its Sustainable Development Goals, together with other key aspirations of society, many of which are also causing human impacts on biodiversity and ecosystem services. Efforts to conserve and sustainably use biodiversity involve balancing the interests of different sectors, and this could benefit from an effective science policy interface. Established in 2012, essentially as an independent body on the lines of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), IPBES aims at strengthening this interface. It does so by undertaking international assessments and promoting national ones; by catalysing knowledge; by promoting the development of policy-support tools; and by undertaking and facilitating capacity-building.

2. IPBES identifies and prioritizes capacity-building needs for improving the science-policy interface at appropriate levels and provides, calls for and facilitates access to the necessary resources for addressing the highest priority needs directly relating to its activities. The role of capacity-building in IPBES is embedded in both the agreed functions of the Platform and in its operating principles. The capacity-building role of IPBES is operationalized through the following two deliverables in the work programme for the period 2014-2018:¹⁶ deliverable 1 (a): “priority capacity-building needs to implement the Platform’s work programme matched with resources through catalysing financial and in-kind support”; and deliverable 1 (b): “capacities needed to implement the Platform’s work programme developed”.

3. The objective of the capacity-building rolling plan is to identify the principles, strategic directions, modalities and actions for building and further developing the capacities of individuals and institutions based on the priority needs¹⁷ established by the IPBES Plenary. The approach involves outlining aims to achieve the capacity-building deliverables under the first IPBES work programme and is financed through the IPBES trust fund, with in-kind support from partners and the task force on capacity-building¹⁸ and its technical support unit, as well as support from other sources including through the capacity-building forum with conventional and potential sources of funding. The intention is that over time the activities described will also leverage additional financial and technical resources through matchmaking in cooperation with partners.

4. The plan is envisaged as a living document and sets out the principles, strategic directions and modalities for building and further developing individual and institutional capacities based on the priority needs established by the IPBES Plenary. In addition, the plan will contain a regularly updated list of activities that IPBES plans to undertake alone and in collaboration with partners. In addressing agreed priority capacity-building needs, the plan is based on the principles of identifying needs; building for the future; leveraging impacts; working collaboratively with others; using resources efficiently; learning lessons; and ensuring quality.

¹⁶ The work programme was adopted by the IPBES Plenary through decision IPBES-2/5 and is set out in annex I to that decision.

¹⁷ See decision IPBES-3/1, by which the IPBES Plenary adopted priority capacity-building needs based on advice from its task force on capacity-building.

¹⁸ The terms of reference of the task force on capacity-building were agreed in decision IPBES-2/5 and are set out in annex II to that decision.

B. Strategies

1. Strategy 1: Learning and engagement

5. The primary focus of learning and engagement is on support for implementation of the work programme itself and for learning associated with that implementation. The strategy will contribute to the investment in IPBES deliverables, which are credible and relevant to all regions of the world. It focuses on building and developing capacity across disciplines and knowledge systems through:

(a) *The IPBES fellowship programme*, which allows junior research officers and other professionals to engage with IPBES activities, working alongside more experienced colleagues. The programme is administered by the technical support unit with additional support from task force members. Activities are mainly supported by the capacity-building component of the IPBES budget under the trust fund, together with some in-kind support. Further contributions from partners may also be solicited. The fellows are selected by the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel with support from the management committees for the assessments based on nominations. Fellows are linked to specific chapters, assigned mentors and invited to attend authors' meetings and training sessions, for which fellows from eligible developing countries receive travel support. This is a non-sponsored fellowship scheme, and selected fellows are expected to work pro bono (as do other experts) but will be duly acknowledged in the final reports;

(b) *The IPBES training and familiarization programme*, which is tailored to IPBES needs and will enhance individual and institutional capacities for supporting the development and use of IPBES deliverables. It is based on existing guidance material produced by IPBES, in particular the guide on assessments – work programme deliverable 2 (a). It will be delivered through training workshops; hands on capacity-building integrated into workshops and consultations for the production of IPBES deliverables; and webinars, e-learning tools and other online approaches made available on the IPBES website. The programme is administered by the technical support unit with support from task force members, IPBES experts and partners. Activities are mainly funded from the capacity-building component of the IPBES budget under the trust fund and include support for travel to workshops and the development of training material. Activities also benefit from in-kind contributions, and further support may be solicited from partners. Partners may also contribute technically to IPBES training activities and material or offer to host and run such activities. Those trained will be encouraged to pass on their experience to others, so as to broaden the potential impact of training activities;

(c) *Promoting secondments and internships* by encouraging, advertising and, where appropriate, supporting secondments and internships within the secretariat and technical support units to foster shared knowledge and understanding and build experience while contributing to the work of the secretariat.¹⁹ This will involve individuals working in or remotely supporting the secretariat, including technical support units, for a certain period. The process will be overseen by the technical support unit with support from task force members, while being administered by the receiving or providing institutions. Efforts entail working with the secretariat and interested organizations to develop terms of reference and legal agreements for secondments and internships, including approaches to mentoring and ways of promoting the transfer of knowledge and experience to the home institutions of seconded staff members and interns. It is anticipated that activities will mainly be undertaken through contributions by partners. Opportunities for collaboration include seconding staff to the IPBES secretariat, including technical support units, or to other organizations supporting IPBES; and hosting seconded staff members and interns working on IPBES-related activities and supporting their learning;

(d) *Promoting exchange visits and study tours* by encouraging and, where appropriate, supporting exchange visits and study tours among individuals and institutions relevant to the work of IPBES, which will promote peer-based learning and, at the same time, strengthen cooperation among institutions working on IPBES-related activities.²⁰ While the initiative is promoted and overseen by

¹⁹ The secretariat has benefited from the secondment of three staff members, one from UNEP, one from the Government of China and one member of the IPBES Asia-Pacific technical support unit, and also from the contribution of interns. A seconded staff member from the capacity-building task force and the University of Montreal is currently supporting the technical support unit of the Africa regional assessment on biodiversity and ecosystem services. These secondments and internships have to date been achieved without the need for significant advertising.

²⁰ One of the officers of the technical support unit for the task force on knowledge and data worked at the secretariat in Bonn for a period, and the full team of the technical support unit visited the UNEP World Conservation Monitoring Centre in Cambridge. Further visits have been associated with meetings and workshops.

the technical support unit with support from task force members, it would be administered by the receiving or providing institutions or both. It is anticipated that activities will mainly be undertaken through contributions by partners. Opportunities for collaboration include hosting and participating in study tours and exchange visits so as to increase the understanding and experience of those working on IPBES-related activities and providing financial support to assist those undertaking study tours and exchange visits.

2. Strategy 2: Facilitating access to expertise and information

6. Efforts to facilitate access to expertise and information aim to support the implementation of the IPBES work programme and increase the reach and impact of work programme deliverables. These efforts will be assisted by other capacity-building activities, the work of the other IPBES deliverables and the focus on the uptake and implementation of IPBES guidance and deliverables through the following initiatives:

(a) *Building and supporting communities of practice* among experts, policymakers and practitioners based on IPBES work programme deliverables.²¹ This initiative will promote the increased use of IPBES products and the further development and sharing of associated information and experience by individuals and institutions taking part in communities of practice. It will contribute to expanding stakeholder involvement in efforts to strengthen the science-policy interface. Under this initiative, partners will be invited to help develop communities of practice based on IPBES deliverables such as the guidance on scenarios and models, the guidance on the conceptualization of values, the catalogue of policy-support tools and completed assessments. It is expected that activities will mainly be undertaken through contributions by partners;

(b) *Facilitating the consideration of indigenous and local knowledge* through capacity-building for the effective use of indigenous and local knowledge in assessments and other relevant deliverables and for dialogue among different knowledge systems. This would be carried out in support of the work of the task force on indigenous and local knowledge systems, responding directly to priority needs identified by the Plenary, when acknowledging the special capacity-building needs related to the development and strengthening of indigenous and local knowledge approaches and procedures. It will contribute to the more effective use of indigenous and local knowledge systems in developing IPBES deliverables, and at the same time to the increased recognition of the potential value of such knowledge systems to national decision-making processes relating to biodiversity and ecosystem services. The initiative will be developed jointly by the task force on capacity-building and the task force on indigenous and local knowledge systems, supported by their respective technical support units, with responsibilities for implementation that have been mutually agreed. It is anticipated that activities will mainly be undertaken through contributions by partners;

(c) *Facilitating access to data, information and knowledge* through developing the necessary capacities of those involved in working on IPBES deliverables, as set out in the strategies of the IPBES data and information management plan,²² and in decision-making processes relating to biodiversity and ecosystem services. The initiative would be developed jointly by the task force on capacity-building and by the task force on knowledge and data, supported by their respective technical support units, with responsibilities for implementation that have been mutually agreed. It is expected that activities will mainly be undertaken through contributions by partners.

3. Strategy 3: Strengthening national and regional capacities

7. Efforts to strengthen national and regional capacities will draw heavily on the experience of partner organizations and will be implemented with their substantive support. Support will mainly be achieved through partnerships and matchmaking activities on the part of IPBES aimed at addressing the approved priority capacity-building needs, and in particular the second priority area on enhancing the capacity to undertake, use and improve national assessments of biodiversity and ecosystem services, through the following initiatives:

(a) *Promoting and facilitating national capacity self assessment*, including in respect of capacities for locating and mobilizing financial and technical resources in the science-policy interface as it relates to biodiversity and ecosystem services. Efforts aim to contribute to the increased

²¹ The UNDP Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services Network initiative has indicated an interest in promoting what it refers to as “trialogues” (bringing together knowledge holders, policymakers and practitioners) on the use of IPBES products. In addition, the task force is working with the Sub-Global Assessment Network, which is an existing community of practice among ecosystem assessment practitioners.

²² The IPBES data and information management plan was agreed on in decision IPBES-3/1 and is set out in annex II to that decision.

identification at the national level of priority capacity-building needs relevant to IPBES and of the manner in which they can be addressed, at the same time providing evidence to potential supporters of nationally recognized needs. The task force members will develop an approach to self-assessment working with appropriate organizations, which will then be available for use by the appropriate national authorities with the support, where necessary, of interested partner institutions. Where necessary, support could be sought through matchmaking. It is anticipated that activities will mainly be undertaken through contributions by partners;

(b) *Promoting and facilitating national and sub-global assessments of biodiversity and ecosystem services* by relevant national and subregional authorities, in order to encourage responses to the priority capacity-building needs identified by the Plenary. Efforts aim to contribute to improved capacity at the national and, where relevant, subregional levels to undertake national and subregional assessments of biodiversity and ecosystem services and to use their findings effectively. This will necessarily include the engagement of all relevant stakeholders and relevant sectors. The task force will consider ways to promote and facilitate national and subregional assessments, in particular through the capacity-building forum and the matchmaking functions. It is expected that activities will mainly be undertaken through contributions by partners;

(c) *Promoting and facilitating national and regional platforms and networks* on biodiversity and ecosystem services, drawing on existing experience, networks and platforms. These platforms would support engagement in IPBES and its work programme and support the development, implementation and use of national and subregional assessments. They would facilitate increased cooperation and collaboration among scientists and other knowledge holders, policymakers and decision makers, practitioners and other stakeholders, leading to the more effective generation and use of knowledge in decision-making. The task force will consider ways to promote and facilitate the development of national and regional platforms, in particular through the forum and the matchmaking functions. It is expected that activities will mainly be undertaken through contributions by partners.

C. Priorities and criteria for implementing the strategies

8. The task force has developed a set of criteria based on the agreed priority capacity-building needs to be used for reviewing proposed activities and offers of technical and financial support prior to their acceptance as IPBES-relevant activities. These criteria are not intended as a reinterpretation of the priorities set by the Plenary, but as an operationalization of those priorities in a pragmatic manner for each of the three strategies described above and operationalized through the rolling plan.

1. Strategy 1: Learning and engagement

9. The primary focus should be on those activities supporting implementation of the work programme itself, and on learning associated with that implementation. In order, as mandated by decision IPBES-3/1, to focus on the ability to participate in Platform deliverables, primarily addressed through the proposed fellowship, exchange and training programme, with the priority placed on Platform regional assessments, criterion 1 should apply, along with at least two of the other criteria:

(a) *Criterion 1:* Proposed activities should be consistent with strategy 1 of the capacity-building rolling plan and with one or more of its programmes and initiatives;

(b) *Criterion 2:* Proposed activities should directly support capacity needs relating to achieving implementation of the IPBES work programme, and in particular the regional assessments on biodiversity and ecosystem services;

(c) *Criterion 3:* Proposed activities should be consistent with and complement the work of IPBES subsidiary bodies, expert groups and task forces and the secretariat, including the technical support units;

(d) *Criterion 4:* Proposed activities should arise directly from the work of the IPBES task force on capacity-building, helping to pilot, demonstrate and further communicate the work that it is undertaking.

2. Strategy 2: Facilitating access to expertise and information

10. Activities should primarily aim to draw on other IPBES deliverables, and in particular the work of task forces and expert groups, in order to increase access to expertise and information for supporting the implementation of the IPBES work programme and to increase the reach and impact of work programme deliverables. In order, as mandated by decision IPBES-3/1, to focus on the development and implementation of pilot or demonstration activities addressing other categories of needs, one or more of the following criteria should apply:

(a) *Criterion 5:* Proposed activities should promote multi-stakeholder engagement and networking in implementation of the work programme, including for facilitating the use of IPBES deliverables;

(b) *Criterion 6:* Proposed activities should build and support communities of practice arising directly from the work of one of the following IPBES deliverables, helping to pilot and demonstrate application of the guidance arising from these deliverables:

- IPBES regional and global assessments
- IPBES thematic assessments
- IPBES work on scenario analysis and modelling
- IPBES work on conceptualization of values
- IPBES work on policy support tools and methodologies

(c) *Criterion 7:* Proposed activities should facilitate the consideration of indigenous and local knowledge, drawing on the work of the IPBES task force on indigenous and local knowledge systems and helping to pilot, demonstrate and further communicate its work, thereby addressing, as mandated by decision IPBES-3/1, the specific capacity-building needs related to the development and the strengthening of the participatory mechanism and indigenous and local knowledge approaches and procedures;

(d) *Criterion 8:* Proposed activities should facilitate access to data, information and knowledge, drawing on the work of the IPBES task force on knowledge and data, and helping to pilot, demonstrate and further communicate the work that it is undertaking.

3. Strategy 3: Strengthening national and regional capacities

11. Activities will mainly be carried out and facilitated through partnerships and matchmaking activities. In order, as mandated by decision IPBES-3/1, to focus on enhancing the capacity to undertake, use and improve national assessments of biodiversity and ecosystem services, criteria 9 and 10 should apply, along with either criterion 11 or criterion 12. Those criteria are as follows:

(a) *Criterion 9:* Activities should demonstrate how all relevant IPBES guidance, processes and procedures would be taken into account in planning and implementation;

(b) *Criterion 10:* Activities in support of national efforts should demonstrate a national need and, where appropriate, be undertaken in consultation with the relevant IPBES national focal points;

(c) *Criterion 11:* Activities should address the undertaking and use of national and subregional assessments of biodiversity and ecosystem services or similar approaches (including the promotion of national and regional platforms and networks) that have the following characteristics:

- They cover all ecosystems within a country or other geopolitical unit or are clearly defined as thematic or methodological assessments at the appropriate level
- They demonstrate the involvement of all relevant stakeholders during all stages
- They demonstrate how indigenous and local knowledge will be considered

(d) *Criterion 12:* Activities should address the national capacity self-assessments, including in respect of capacities for locating and mobilizing financial and technical resources.

D. Approach to building collaboration and engagement

12. A wide range of institutions are involved in capacity-building activities that relate directly to the IPBES work programme and to the priority capacity-building needs approved by the IPBES Plenary:

(a) *The IPBES task force on capacity-building*, with the support of a technical support unit established at the Norwegian Environment Agency, oversees the development and implementation of the rolling plan. In doing so it works closely with resource persons and partner organizations that can contribute to its effective implementation;

(b) *The IPBES capacity-building forum* is a key vehicle for increasing engagement and facilitating cooperation among partners for the implementation and further development of the rolling plan. When planning and holding meetings of the capacity-building forum, the task force will work

closely with the Bureau of the IPBES Plenary to regularly invite organizations that fund, undertake or otherwise support relevant capacity-building activities; to develop the list of invitees and an engagement strategy for promoting their involvement in the forum well in advance of each meeting of the forum; to invite contributions from forum participants to the development and pilot implementation of the rolling plan as supported by matchmaking activities; to develop and implement appropriate communication and follow-up to the meetings of the forum to further strengthen engagement in IPBES-related capacity-building initiatives; and to regularly review the effectiveness and modalities of work in the context of the forum together with partners.;

(c) *IPBES matchmaking*: The strategies, programmes and initiatives described in the present executive summary, and the activities described in the IPBES capacity-building rolling plan, will help frame cooperation among partners on how to match identified priority needs with financial and technical resources. The focus on matchmaking has seen a gradual shift from an attempt to develop a prototype facility to an incremental development of the matchmaking functions and their web-based support structures. While there are currently no plans to issue further open calls for project submissions, as was done in the trial call during the initial work on the matchmaking facility, specific calls under the rolling plan may be conducted in collaboration with strategic partners representing both implementers and conventional and potential sources of funding.

E. Options for organizations wishing to contribute

13. Institutions may choose to fund, undertake or otherwise support relevant capacity-building activities in order to help support implementation of the IPBES capacity-building rolling plan. Collaborative arrangements can take a number of forms, based on the parties' degree of involvement. The IPBES guidance on the development of strategic partnerships and other collaborative arrangements²³ sets out a number of the key considerations, and also the types of collaboration that may be necessary for supporting IPBES implementation. Contributions may be made directly or indirectly through one or more of the following approaches:

(a) *Contributions to the IPBES trust fund through the budget agreed by the Plenary*, which already supports parts of the work described in the rolling plan. Contributions to the rolling plan can therefore be made through contributions to the IPBES trust fund itself or by direct funding through earmarked contributions to the IPBES trust fund.²⁴ Any institution wishing to provide direct funding through earmarked contributions to the IPBES trust fund should contact the IPBES secretariat. Acknowledgement of contributions to the trust fund is primarily conveyed through the report of the Executive Secretary to the Plenary on the trust fund;

(b) *In-kind contributions to the capacity-building work of IPBES* through various degrees of involvement where institutions may wish:

- (i) To provide partial or complete support to capacity-building activities under the rolling plan that are being administered by the technical support unit or otherwise organized by IPBES. Examples of such support might include instances where the capacity-building activity is led by IPBES but carried out with the technical or financial support of one or more partner institutions or, conversely, led by a partner institution with support from the IPBES secretariat;
- (ii) To offer to administer or undertake activities themselves, working in collaboration with IPBES. This might include instances where institutions already have or would like to plan activities in order to support delivery of the IPBES capacity-building rolling plan and wish to seek acknowledgement or endorsement from IPBES for so doing. An endorsement or acknowledgement will require a review of the proposed activity to ensure that it is aligned with IPBES priority capacity-building needs, operating principles, relevant procedures and criteria;

²³ IPBES guidance on the development of strategic partnerships and other collaborative arrangements was agreed on in decision IPBES-3/4, and is set out in annex III to that decision.

²⁴ The financial procedures for IPBES state that "...additional contributions for specific activities approved by the Plenary may be accepted. Single contributions in excess of 300,000 United States dollars per contributor per activity require approval by the Plenary. Single contributions not exceeding 300,000 United States dollars per contributor per activity require approval by the Bureau" (IPBES Financial Procedures, Rule 10).

(c) Providing direct technical or financial support to other institutions (for example to organizations in other countries) to enable them to address in a more effective manner priority capacity-building needs. The activities may be explicitly identified in the rolling plan and may include types of training or support for fellows or be inferred from the descriptions of the capacity-building approaches described above, for example support for national ecosystem assessments;

(d) Alignment of capacity-building activities, whereby institutions may wish to consider how their capacity-building activities can take more account of the objectives, deliverables and ongoing work of IPBES. Alignment of interests may be facilitated through, for instance, supporting the uptake and use of any IPBES guides, methodological assessments or other deliverables. The IPBES capacity-building forum also provides an opportunity for further exploring modalities for achieving the alignment of activities.

Annex II to decision IPBES-5/1

Approach to recognizing and working with indigenous and local knowledge in the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services

I. Overall framework

1. The present approach to working with indigenous and local knowledge in the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES) is multifaceted; applies across the four functions of IPBES; considers various scales, from local to global; and involves activities to be undertaken or catalysed by IPBES (see section II below).
2. The present approach will be undertaken in line with the approved rules and procedures of IPBES and in accordance with internationally recognized rights of indigenous peoples and relevant commitments related to local communities.
3. Indigenous and local knowledge experts selected by IPBES for the preparation of IPBES deliverables will engage in the approach, which will, in addition, involve a wide community of stakeholders via the participatory mechanism for working with indigenous, local and diverse knowledge systems set out in section III below.
4. The approach is based on a number of overall considerations, understanding of terms and the identification of challenges as described in the following paragraphs.
5. In terms of **overall considerations** regarding the mandate, functions, means and operating principles of IPBES, the approach will:
 - (a) Rely on activities undertaken by IPBES at the global, regional and, where appropriate, subregional levels, using available knowledge, which will be gathered, synthesized, reviewed and evaluated, and rely on the promotion and catalysis of activities by appropriate partners such as the mobilization of knowledge that is not readily available, the generation of new knowledge or capacity-building activities;
 - (b) Besides funding that may be available from the trust fund, rely on in-kind support from, and collaborative activities with, strategic partners;
 - (c) Involve collaboration with relevant initiatives and build on appropriate work, guidelines and best practices that have been developed and agreed on by relevant multilateral agreements and/or other entities;
 - (d) Use clear, transparent and credible processes for the exchange, sharing and use of data, knowledge, information and technologies from all relevant sources.
6. The approach is based on the following **understandings** of key terms, concepts and categories:
 - (a) Indigenous and local knowledge systems are in general understood to be dynamic bodies of integrated, holistic, social and ecological knowledge, practices and beliefs pertaining to the relationship of living beings, including people, with one another and with their environments. Indigenous and local knowledge is grounded in territory, is highly diverse and is continuously evolving through the interaction of experiences, innovations and various types of knowledge (written, oral, visual, tacit, gendered, practical and scientific). Such knowledge can provide information, methods, theory and practice for sustainable ecosystem management. Many indigenous and local knowledge systems are empirically tested, applied, contested and validated through different means in different contexts;
 - (b) Maintained and produced in individual and collective ways, indigenous and local knowledge is at the interface between biological and cultural diversity. Manifestations of indigenous and local knowledge are evident in many social and ecological systems. In this context, the approach understands “biocultural diversity” as biological and cultural diversity and the links between them;
 - (c) The approach does not intend to create or develop new definitions of what constitutes “indigenous and local knowledge” or “indigenous peoples and local communities”, as these definitions are often context specific and vary within and across regions;

(d) *Indigenous and local knowledge holders* are understood to be persons situated in the collective knowledge systems of indigenous peoples and local communities with knowledge from their own indigenous peoples and local communities; *indigenous and local knowledge experts* are understood to be persons from indigenous peoples and local communities who have knowledge about indigenous and local knowledge and associated issues (they may also be indigenous and local knowledge holders); and *experts on indigenous and local knowledge* are understood to be persons who have knowledge about indigenous and local knowledge and associated issues, not necessarily from indigenous peoples and local communities.²⁵

7. Engaging indigenous and local knowledge in a dialogue with other knowledge systems can bring important new perspectives to IPBES. This dialogue will need to respect the following **best practices**:

(a) An effective dialogue will require the building of mutual trust and confidence between indigenous and local knowledge holders and natural and social scientists through cultural respect and sensitivity;

(b) The approach will need to provide opportunities for dialogue with indigenous peoples and local communities focusing on topics relevant to IPBES, through the development of initiatives by and/or in collaboration with IPBES members and existing networks of indigenous peoples and local communities and of experts on indigenous and local knowledge;

(c) The approach should acknowledge the time needed for decision-making by customary and traditional institutions through dialogues at various levels (for example, extended family groups, women, elders and youth and indigenous peoples who may hold different rights with respect to knowledge) with relevant institutions in order to identify common goals in the development of IPBES deliverables;

(d) The approach should work in culturally appropriate environments, respecting diverse and interactive styles of engagement, using effective tools and strategies to allow effective dialogue across diverse knowledge systems;

(e) The approach should promote a participatory and empowering dialogue based on non-discrimination, inclusiveness and the recognition of social, cultural, economic and political plurality in the world;

(f) The approach should recognize, strengthen and promote the conservation of the *in situ* knowledge systems of indigenous peoples and local communities where knowledge is gathered, used, applied, renewed, enhanced, tested, validated, transmitted, shared and governed, as well as the dialogue between knowledge systems as an iterative two-way process. It should deliver policy-relevant knowledge and policy options to indigenous peoples and local communities in meaningful and useful forms.

8. The approach seeks to address a broad range of **general challenges**, including the following:

(a) *Scale*. Scale matters in the definition, collation, compilation and aggregation of knowledge both horizontally (e.g., across local communities) and vertically (scaling knowledge up and down). While most indigenous and local knowledge is inherently local and contextual, IPBES operates at the regional and global levels and critically evaluates policy-relevant knowledge. Mobilizing relevant indigenous and local knowledge, and ensuring validation through the indigenous and local knowledge system from which it comes, while avoiding the loss of legitimacy, represents a major challenge. Related challenges include representation and participation (addressed in subparagraph (b) below) and analytical challenges, as the type and level of complementarity across knowledge systems will vary according to the context, the issue addressed and the desired outcomes;

(b) *Participation and representation*. Meaningful participation and engagement of indigenous peoples and local communities play an important role in working with indigenous and local knowledge. The challenge is to find ways and means that allow for meaningful participation and adequate representation, including regional and gender balance, within the existing mandate, rules and procedures and available resources of IPBES;

²⁵ In the “Procedures for working with indigenous and local knowledge systems” (Decision IPBES-4/3, annex), the terms “indigenous and local knowledge experts” refer both to “indigenous and local knowledge experts” and to “experts on indigenous and local knowledge” according to the understanding of those terms set out in the present paragraph.

(c) *Formats.* Indigenous and local knowledge exists in many languages, often in written formats other than peer-reviewed literature, such as grey literature, or in other forms, such as ritual, ceremonial, oral, dance, song and visual manifestations, including symbols, documentaries and artwork. Sometimes knowledge holders have not recorded their knowledge in any form, or their knowledge has been transmitted in a non-tangible form. The variety of formats and the difficulty of accessing them pose a major challenge;

(d) *Methods and tools.* Many of the methods and specific tools needed for this work, such as guidance and methods for addressing the variety of available indigenous and local knowledge formats, do not yet exist and may need to be developed by IPBES, to the extent that doing so falls within its mandate and within available resources, or by appropriate partners, taking into account all of the above.

9. This approach, which is breaking new ground, should be understood as a first step in an iterative process in which indigenous peoples and local communities are key partners. The approach should be evaluated as part of the review of the Platform.

II. Overall approach to recognizing and working with indigenous and local knowledge

10. The approach described in the present section, which applies across the four functions of IPBES, sets out activities for each of the four functions.

11. Within the approach, free prior informed consent will be sought, as appropriate, for accessing indigenous and local knowledge, and the activities should not occur where they would prejudice the internationally recognized rights of indigenous peoples and interests of local communities as affirmed in paragraph 2. Best practices and ethical guidelines, as appropriate, should be consulted to make decisions regarding the use of indigenous and local knowledge.

A. Assessments

12. Assessing available knowledge forms the backbone of this approach. It includes four phases:

13. The **first phase**, the collaborative definition of problems and goals, is to be realized during the scoping of an assessment and should result in the development of key questions specific to the assessment. In general, it is suggested that the following broad groups of questions may be considered and adapted as necessary to the specific subject of the assessment:

(a) What are the contributions of indigenous peoples and local communities in terms of their knowledge, practices and world views to the management and conservation of nature, the delivery of nature's contributions to people and ensuring a good quality of life at the regional and global scales?

(b) What are the most important pressures and factors undermining these contributions, as well as affecting the quality of life of present and future generations of indigenous peoples and local communities?

(c) What policy responses, measures and processes exist for strengthening and improving the governance of nature and nature's contributions to people with regard to indigenous peoples and local communities and their knowledge and practices?

14. The **second phase**, occurring once the undertaking of an assessment has been approved, is about synthesizing, and incorporating into the assessment, a wide array of evidence and data from multiple sources of indigenous and local knowledge related to the assessment itself, including, as appropriate:

(a) Literature reviews, synthesis reports, geospatial data and sources of indigenous and local knowledge documented in accessible written form;

(b) Recorded, referenceable and accessible indigenous and local knowledge manifested in forms such as ritual, ceremonial, oral, dance, song and visual manifestations, including symbols, documentaries and artwork;

(c) Compilations of literature, data and cases from other IPBES assessments and related reports;

(d) Reports, including meta-analysis and data from international research centres and institutions and relevant regional centres;

(e) Spatially explicit data and geospatial data sources.

15. The **third phase** focuses on appropriately engaging indigenous peoples and local communities in the review of the various drafts of a specific assessment.

16. The **fourth phase** aims at sharing knowledge and insights gained through an assessment with indigenous peoples and local communities once the assessment is concluded.

17. Important procedural components and activities of these **four phases** include:

(a) Appropriate representation of indigenous and local knowledge experts and experts on indigenous and local knowledge in the expert groups scoping and performing an assessment in line with the procedures for working with indigenous and local knowledge and the principles presented above;

(b) A series of broad web-based consultations via the participatory mechanism during the first, second and third phases to ensure broad participation by indigenous peoples and local communities, and reflection of their perspectives and of indigenous and local knowledge, in the scoping exercise (first phase); the fine-tuning of questions to be addressed by an assessment and the identification, mobilization and gathering of relevant indigenous and local knowledge where such knowledge exists in recorded, shareable and referenceable form (second phase); and the review of the successive drafts of the assessment (third phase);

(c) Dialogue workshops, to allow for direct exchanges on the scope and the content of drafts. These workshops would bring together the indigenous and local knowledge experts of the scoping expert group (first phase) or of the indigenous and local knowledge liaison group (third phase) with a representative selection of experts on indigenous and local knowledge and representatives of indigenous peoples and local communities. The format (in person or virtual), number and timing of the dialogue workshops should take into account financial considerations;

(d) The synthesis, during the second phase, of the indigenous and local knowledge gathered in accordance with the procedures for the preparation of the Platform's deliverables, using established methods such as the reflection of confidence levels as defined in the guide for assessments (IPBES/5/INF/6), seeking to balance large-scale synthesis and spatial upscaling of literature and geospatial data sources with a rich illustration of cases from different parts of the world portraying the practices, world views, voices and faces of indigenous peoples and local communities. This synthesis would include the description of different understandings resulting from different epistemologies and/or ontologies;

(e) The promotion and catalysis of activities to be undertaken by appropriate partners, such as local dialogue workshops to fill knowledge gaps when relevant knowledge does not exist in readily available formats (first and second phase), or the building of the capacity of indigenous peoples and local communities to engage in and benefit from IPBES (throughout all four phases). These efforts are part of the knowledge mobilization and capacity-building approach to indigenous and local knowledge (further described in paragraphs 18 and 20 below).

B. Knowledge and data

18. In line with its mandate regarding knowledge and data, IPBES will within the present approach:

(a) Identify, in coordination with indigenous and local knowledge holders, indigenous and local knowledge experts and experts on indigenous and local knowledge, a set of practices to help manage evidence and data that will be collected in the assessments;

(b) Facilitate, as appropriate, via the IPBES web-based infrastructure, the accessing and management of available sources of indigenous and local knowledge, both for internal use in developing assessments and for decision makers and scholars drawing on the work of IPBES to support their own work, in line with relevant standards and conventions;

(c) Promote and catalyse the mobilization of indigenous and local knowledge, as appropriate, where such knowledge does not exist in readily available formats in ways that reflect the concepts of parallel validation or co-production processes, with the support of appropriate partners, focusing on gaps that emerge during each phase of an assessment; and

(d) Take into account appropriately those aspects relevant to indigenous and local knowledge and indigenous peoples and local communities in the list of indicators, classifications of units of analysis and classification of nature's contributions to people,²⁶ including ecosystem services and nature's gifts.

C. Policy support tools and methodologies

19. In line with its mandate regarding policy support tools and methodologies, IPBES will within the present approach:

(a) Identify, describe and facilitate the use of relevant tools and methods for implementing the four phases of the proposed approach. Where such tools and methods still need to be developed, IPBES will promote and catalyse their development with appropriate partners;

(b) Ensure that policy responses, decision-making instruments and processes relevant to indigenous and local knowledge and indigenous peoples and local communities are reflected in IPBES assessments.

D. Capacity-building

20. In line with its mandate regarding capacity-building, IPBES will, within the present approach:

(a) Identify, prioritize and build capacity critical to its implementation, within the means available, through, for example, training workshops and webinars on the approaches to and procedures for recognizing and working with indigenous and local knowledge in assessments or participation in the fellowship programme; and

(b) Promote and catalyse the undertaking of capacity-building activities in support of broader capacity-building needs involving, among other mechanisms, strategic partnerships where such needs go beyond the means of IPBES. In this context, the participatory mechanism could strengthen the ability of indigenous peoples and local communities to take part in, contribute to and benefit from IPBES deliverables.

III. Institutional arrangements and the participatory mechanism supporting the implementation of the approach

21. In order to implement the approach outlined in section II, IPBES will draw on relevant existing arrangements, which will need to be complemented by the participatory mechanism.

A. Existing arrangements relevant to the implementation of the approach

22. The **Multidisciplinary Expert Panel** will oversee the implementation of the approach and any further developments under it.

23. **Indigenous and local knowledge liaison groups** will be established for each assessment. Such groups will comprise the indigenous and local knowledge experts and experts on indigenous and local knowledge selected for the various chapters of each individual assessment. The groups will be responsible for developing the key questions and topics pertaining to indigenous peoples and local communities to be covered in each assessment, for synthesizing all relevant knowledge and for ensuring that each assessment adequately reflects the perspectives resulting from different knowledge systems in accordance with the procedures for the preparation of the Platform's deliverables.

24. **Other task forces and expert groups** will also provide support for the implementation of the approach.

25. The **secretariat, including its technical support units**, will provide support for the implementation of the approach.

B. Participatory mechanism for working with indigenous and local knowledge systems

26. The objective of the participatory mechanism for working with indigenous and local knowledge systems is to facilitate the effective and meaningful engagement of indigenous and local knowledge holders, indigenous and local knowledge experts and their organizations or networks in order to strengthen their ability to contribute to and benefit from IPBES at all scales.

²⁶ Referred to in the guide for assessments (IPBES/5/INF/6).

27. In line with the rules and procedures of IPBES, the participatory mechanism is to achieve this objective by inter alia:

- (a) Providing a *web-based platform* to facilitate the effective and meaningful engagement of existing networks of indigenous peoples and local communities and relevant experts and allowing new, perhaps self-organizing, networks to develop;
- (b) Promoting, through *consultations*, a dialogue with various networks, relevant experts and policymakers to mobilize inputs and disseminate results during all four phases of the assessment process, including both web-based consultations and dialogue workshops;
- (c) Creating opportunities for shared learning and exchange through dedicated *discussion forums* on the web-based platform or in the context of the contribution to and use of the catalogue of policy support tools and methodologies; and
- (d) Supporting IPBES, by means of *strategic partnerships*, in promoting and catalysing activities by appropriate partners that build the capacity of indigenous peoples and local communities to engage effectively and meaningfully in IPBES and that mobilize indigenous and local knowledge in formats accessible to IPBES when such knowledge is missing.

28. The central component of the participatory mechanism will be a **web-based platform**, managed by the secretariat and hosted on the IPBES website <http://www.ipbes.net/ilk-participatory-mechanism>, comprising the following elements:

- (a) A *registry* linked to the IPBES stakeholder registry, inclusion in which is mandatory for all actors wishing to participate, including individuals, social organizations, institutions and networks;
- (b) A *roster* including all registered individuals or entities as well as, with their consent, all indigenous and local knowledge experts currently or formerly involved in IPBES. This roster will be searchable according to a variety of criteria and will be publicly available;
- (c) A *repository of relevant resources of indigenous and local knowledge* displaying a broad range of relevant sources of information, knowledge and data sets related to indigenous and local knowledge, or links to such information, knowledge and data sets, and thus forming an institutional database to facilitate the mobilization of data and knowledge relevant for gap-filling and dialogue. This repository and these links must comply with the conditions set out in paragraph 11;
- (d) A *display of ongoing activities* pertaining to indigenous and local knowledge, including those described in section II above, such as web-based consultations, dialogue workshops, capacity-building activities and activities mobilizing accessible indigenous and local knowledge;
- (e) A *discussion forum* creating opportunities for shared learning and exchanges between indigenous and local knowledge systems and other knowledge systems;
- (f) A *place to self-organize* for registered individuals or entities, including for subgroups that members may seek to establish, such as dedicated groups providing support for specific IPBES assessments.

29. The participatory mechanism will support the dedicated **consultations** foreseen as part of the four phases.

30. Through the participatory mechanism, IPBES will engage in **strategic partnerships** to:

- (a) Promote the broad reach of and engagement in the online consultation and dialogue workshops;
- (b) Promote and catalyse the mobilization of indigenous and local knowledge in accessible formats to address gaps identified by appropriate partners;
- (c) Promote and catalyse the undertaking of capacity-building activities that strengthen the ability of indigenous peoples and local communities to take part in, contribute to and benefit from IPBES deliverables;

31. Raise awareness and understanding of indigenous and local knowledge systems and the application of the IPBES approach to recognizing and working with indigenous and local knowledge.

Annex III to decision IPBES-5/1

Outline workplan for 2017 and 2018

<i>Activity</i>	<i>2nd quarter 2017</i>	<i>3rd quarter 2017</i>	<i>4th quarter 2017</i>	<i>1st quarter 2018</i>	<i>2nd quarter 2018</i>	<i>3rd quarter 2018</i>	<i>4th quarter 2018</i>	<i>1st quarter 2019</i>
Support to experts working on assessments regarding the selection and use of indicators, metrics and related data	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Survey regarding the utility of the web-based infrastructure and its further refinement	X	X	X					
Update of the web-based infrastructure with finalized IPBES products	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Development of the web-based infrastructure into a repository of key resources pertaining to IPBES deliverables		X	X	X	X	X	X	X
Identification of research gaps emerging in the context of ongoing and completed assessments	X				X			
Consultations on suggested priority areas for knowledge generation	X	X				X		
Engagement with potential research funding organizations on priority areas for knowledge generation			X	X			X	X
Other activities related to knowledge and data in support of IPBES assessment experts	X	X	X	X	X	X	X	X

Annex IV to decision IPBES-5/1

Scoping report for a thematic assessment on the sustainable use of wild species: deliverable 3 (b) (iii)

I. Scope, coverage, rationale, utility and methodological approach

A. Scope

1. The objective of the proposed thematic assessment is to consider various approaches to the enhancement of the sustainability of the use of wild species of all organisms within the ecosystems that they inhabit and to strengthen related practices, measures, capacities and tools for their conservation through such use. The assessment will focus on the sustainability of the use of wild species, and will recognize the inherent interdependencies between the use of wild species and its wider socio-ecological contexts. The assessment will be solution-oriented, with the overall aim of identifying challenges and opportunities to establish or further strengthen measures and conditions that ensure and promote the sustainable use of wild species and the halting of their unsustainable use. Relevant dimensions of the sustainable use of wild species will be analysed, and the status of and trends in the sustainable use of wild species will be assessed along with direct and indirect drivers of change and the contributions that they provide. The assessment will further explore future scenarios for the use of wild species and the consequences for wild species and their evolutionary fate and will examine the range of challenges to and opportunities and policy options for the further enhancement of ensuring that the use of wild species is sustainable. The time frame of analyses will cover current status, trends up to 2020 (going back as far as 50 years) and plausible future projections, with a focus on various periods between 2030 and 2050.

2. The assessment will result in the elaboration of a common understanding of the term "wild species" that is consistent with the assessment's overall approach and the IPBES conceptual framework and takes into account existing definitions used under the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES), the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), the Convention on Biological Diversity and other relevant international bodies, as well as various knowledge systems recognizing that, depending on the context, there is often a continuum between what is considered wild and what is considered domestic or captive. As a starting point, the term refers to non-domesticated species and wild populations of domesticated species. The assessment will therefore not address, for example, the management of crops or livestock on farms or of populations in aquaculture facilities or in artificial plantations except insofar as they may provide alternatives to the use of wild populations.

3. The assessment will recognize the inseparable unity of nature and humanity, including ecosystem functions and nature's contributions to people and a good quality of life, as outlined in the IPBES conceptual framework. It will therefore take into account not only the positive and negative ecological and social effects of the use of wild species but also the effects of various approaches, practices and technologies in a range of sociopolitical contexts and their relationship to various knowledge systems, including indigenous and local knowledge and practices.

4. The assessment will focus on the consumptive and non-consumptive uses of a number of wild species across a representative group of taxa and uses. The assessment will take into account a wide range of aspects of the actual use of wild species, including spatial and temporal scales; subsistence, commercial and recreational purposes; and customary, legal and illegal contexts. To reflect the breadth and complexity of the uses of wild species, the assessment will cover a range of the IPBES terrestrial and aquatic units of analysis, including marine ones, and their contiguity and connectedness. The assessment will not replicate the work of other assessments, but will review existing work in the context of the mandate of IPBES and the present scoping report.

5. Building on internationally recognized definitions and principles of sustainable use, such as the definition and recommendations for the sustainable use of biodiversity under article 2 of the Convention on Biological Diversity, the Addis Ababa Principles and Guidelines for the Sustainable Use of Biodiversity, adopted by its Conference of the Parties (decision VII/12), and the concept of "non-detriment findings" under CITES, and on the guidance developed for their formulation in accordance with the various species characteristics, the assessment will include the elaboration of what could reasonably be included under the sustainable use of wild species in the context of international targets such as the Aichi Biodiversity Targets and the Sustainable Development Goals.

6. The assessment will identify opportunities and challenges in respect of the establishment or further strengthening of the conditions and measures conducive to promoting the sustainability of the use of wild species within the ecosystems that they inhabit. The assessment will be based on the understanding of sustainable use of wild species that are important elements in the present and future functioning of ecosystems and their contributions to people. Where the assessment finds that the use of wild species is not sustainable, it should explore possible policy options as to what level of use (if any) could be sustainable and when all use should be curtailed in order for species to recover, taking into account the ecological conditions for such recovery. Drawing on lessons learned from a wide range of perspectives and knowledge systems, the assessment will analyse the strengths and weaknesses of relevant governance systems, legislative and trade regimes, methodologies and practices.

7. The assessment will address the following questions of relevance to decision makers dealing with the sustainable use of wild species:

- (a) How can the sustainable use of wild species be appropriately conceptualized and operationalized (chapter 2)?
- (b) What methods and tools exist for assessing, measuring and managing the sustainable use of wild species (chapter 2)?
- (c) What are the positive and negative impacts of various uses of wild species and other direct drivers on nature and nature's contributions to people (chapter 3)?
- (d) Who is likely to be the main beneficiaries of the sustainable use of wild species (chapter 3)?
- (e) What are the indirect drivers that affect the sustainability of the use of wild species, including systemic obstacles and perverse incentives preventing sustainable use (chapter 4)?
- (f) What are the different scenarios related to the sustainable use of wild species (chapter 5)?
- (g) What policy options and governance pathways relating to various scenarios of the use of wild species, including socioeconomic and ecological considerations, can lead to the achievement of sustainability of the use of wild species in the ecosystems they inhabit (chapter 5)?
- (h) What policy responses and methods and tools for assessing, measuring and managing sustainable use of wild species have proved to be appropriate and effective, in which contexts and over what time frames? To what extent can they be replicated in other contexts (chapter 6)?
- (i) What gaps in data and knowledge regarding status, drivers, impacts, policy responses and policy support tools and methods need to be addressed in order to better understand and implement the variety of options and opportunities for enhancing conservation through the sustainable use of wild species (chapter 6)?
- (j) What opportunities does the sustainable use of wild species offer with regard to alternative land uses (for example, replacing less sustainable land use activities) (chapter 6)?

B. Geographic coverage of the assessment

8. The coverage of the assessment will be global, including terrestrial and aquatic (including marine) socio-ecological systems at a range of spatial scales, from local to global.

C. Rationale

9. There is a need for a comprehensive assessment of the status of and trends in the use of wild species, and of possible future scenarios of such use, in terms of the sustainability of current use in its socio-ecological context as well as the status of and trends in the direct and indirect drivers that affect that sustainability. The assessment will take into account the multiple worldviews, knowledge systems, cultural traditions and values that operate within different socio-ecological contexts.

10. The use of wild species is of critical importance to all communities, particularly those that live in biodiversity-rich countries or regions earmarked for global conservation efforts. The assessment provides an opportunity to address good quality of life, including the needs of indigenous peoples and local communities. For many countries the very essence of the cultures and livelihoods of their people is based on the natural resources to which they have access and the ecosystems of which they form a part. Many species are also used by populations outside the countries where they are located – for example, through international trade and tourism.

11. There is a general desire to protect wild species from extinction and decline, especially in the case of the most visible mammal and bird species. The use of these species is regarded, and publicly criticized, as a major cause of their decline. If improperly managed the use of wild species can lead to extinction, yet the sustainable use of wild species can also be a driver for long-term conservation. The sustainable use of wild species, rather than non-use, is an important aspect of sustainable and socioeconomically just development and policy that conserves the biodiversity on which people depend.

12. The assessment will yield options for policy scenarios and governance pathways that could promote the conservation of biodiversity and the maintenance of socio-ecological functions such as nature's contributions to people. The assessment will contribute to the development of a strengthened knowledge base relating to both the concept of sustainable use of wild species and the direct and indirect drivers of unsustainable practices and ways of countering those practices. It will focus both on existing policy instruments and policy support tools and on their effectiveness and will catalyse the development of additional policy support tools and methodologies.

D. Utility

13. The assessment will provide users and the general public, including Governments, multilateral organizations, the private sector and civil society, including indigenous peoples and local communities, and non-governmental organizations, with a relevant, credible, legitimate, authoritative, evidence-based and comprehensive analysis of the sustainable use of wild species based on the current state of knowledge stemming from scientific and other knowledge systems, including indigenous and local knowledge.

14. The assessment will contribute to the second objective of the Convention on Biological Diversity, which focuses on the sustainable use of biodiversity. It will also support the implementation of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011–2020 and Aichi Biodiversity Targets 6 (on sustainable consumptive use of fish and invertebrate stocks and aquatic plants) and 12 (on conservation of threatened species) and elements of targets 3 (on incentives), 4 (on sustainable consumption and production), 7 (on sustainable management in particular of forests), 16 (on the Nagoya Protocol) and 18 (on customary use of biological resources). The assessment will also support the implementation of a number of decisions adopted by the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity, including on the Addis Ababa Principles and Guidelines for the Sustainable Use of Biodiversity and on the differentiation of subsistence uses, legal and illegal hunting, overharvesting and domestic and international trade in specimens of wild species and products.

15. The assessment will contribute to attainment of the goal of CITES, which is to ensure that international trade in endangered wild animals and plants does not threaten their survival in the wild. The assessment will contribute by providing information to CITES parties that they may use in the issuance of permits. It will also provide information as to whether international trade will be detrimental or beneficial to the survival of species and will demonstrate the importance and value of sustainable practices for species conservation. The assessment will take into account the knowledge needs of national scientific and management authorities to foster the use of applied science for the implementation of CITES, including the making of non-detriment and legal acquisition findings and related trade decisions. It will also contribute to the exploration of the conditions that contribute to the sustainable use of wild species and the identification of methods and tools for assessing, measuring and managing the sustainable use of wild species.

16. Countries could make use of the assessment while working to achieve the Sustainable Development Goals, specifically goals 2 (on ending hunger), 12 (on sustainable production and consumption), 13 (on combating climate change), 14 (on conservation and sustainable use of oceans, seas and marine resources), 15 (on sustainable use of terrestrial ecosystems) and 17 (on revitalizing the Global Partnership for Sustainable Development). In addition, the assessment aims to contribute to efforts to counter the unsustainable and illegal use of wild species, which undermines the achievement of broader societal goals and targets. It will also contribute to goals 1 (on ending poverty), 3 (on ensuring healthy lives and well-being), 5 (on achieving gender equality), 6 (on sustainable water and sanitation), 7 (on sustainable energy) and 16 (on peaceful and inclusive societies).

E. Methodological approach

17. The assessment will be based on existing scientific literature, national assessments and sources from other knowledge systems, including indigenous and local knowledge, and will draw on the work of existing institutions and networks (see section IV below, on relevant stakeholders and initiatives). It will consider relevant work such as CITES advances on the context of non-detriment findings and the definition of sustainable use and trade of wildlife. It will also take into account the IPBES regional and

global assessments of biodiversity and ecosystem services, as well as its assessment of land degradation and restoration, which cover many aspects of sustainable use. The assessment should also take into account the preliminary guide on the conceptualizations of values of biodiversity and nature's contributions to people (IPBES/4/INF/13). Materials collected during the scoping process, including references to published and grey literature, will be available to the assessment expert group. The preparation of the assessment will follow agreed procedures. Confidence terms, as outlined in the IPBES guide for assessments, will be assigned to all key findings in the executive summaries of the technical chapters in the assessment report and to the key messages in the summary for policymakers.

18. The assessment expert group should ensure disciplinary, regional and gender balance, should represent a diversity of worldviews and will comprise 2 co-chairs, 12 coordinating lead authors, 36 lead authors and 12 review editors, who will be selected in accordance with the procedures for the preparation of the Platform's deliverables following a call for nominations after approval of the scoping report by the Plenary.

19. Technical support for the assessment will be provided by a technical support unit working as part of the secretariat.

20. The assessment will be prepared over three years. The preparation process and timetable are outlined in section VI below.

II. Chapter outline

21. The thematic assessment will consist of a set of six chapters and their executive summaries and a summary for policymakers drawing key messages from those chapters. The assessment will also include a glossary with all relevant terms and definitions.

Chapter 1. Setting the scene

22. Chapter 1 will set the scene for the assessment by outlining how the sustainable use of wild species and their contributions will be addressed in the context of the IPBES conceptual framework. Chapter 1 will define what is meant by "wild species", taking into consideration definitions used under CITES, FAO, the Convention on Biological Diversity and other relevant international bodies, as well as various knowledge systems, and their sustainable use, taking into account biological, ecological and evolutionary aspects.

23. This chapter will provide a road map and overarching rationale for the sequence of chapters in the assessment, as well as for the focus on consumptive and non-consumptive uses of a number of wild species across a representative group of taxa and uses. The assessment will take into account a wide range of aspects of the actual use of wild species, including spatial and temporal scales; subsistence, commercial or recreational purposes; and customary, legal and illegal contexts. The chapter will explain the integrative socio-ecological approach taken, recognizing the inseparable unity of nature and humanity, including ecosystem functions and nature's contributions to people and a good quality of life. The chapter will outline how the assessment will strengthen related practices, measures, capacities and tools and help to achieve relevant internationally agreed targets and goals such as the CITES goals, the Aichi Biodiversity Targets and the Sustainable Development Goals.

Chapter 2. Conceptualizing the sustainable use of wild species

24. Chapter 2 will elaborate on the conditions that are necessary for the sustainable use of wild species and on the criteria and elements that are essential to ensure that the impacts of wild species use are socially sound and within ecological limits. The chapter will provide a critical assessment of sustainable use principles, including recognized standards for the sustainable use of wild species.

25. Building on internationally recognized definitions, principles and concepts of sustainable use, the chapter will elaborate on what sustainable use of wild species means in the context of international targets such as the Aichi Biodiversity Targets and the Sustainable Development Goals and its implications for conventions such as CITES. It will reflect on the methods and tools needed to assess, measure and manage the use of wild species sustainably, as well as the contributions that they provide, taking into account a wide range of aspects of their actual use, including spatial, temporal and quantitative scales, subsistence commercial or recreational purposes, sustainable customary use, legal or illegal contexts, how they are perceived and classified by local people and other considerations. It will also consider the non-anthropocentric value of sustainable use of species, particularly for maintaining the evolutionary perspectives of ecosystems and species. The chapter will draw on the preliminary guide on the conceptualizations of values of biodiversity and nature's contributions to people.

Chapter 3. Status of and trends in the use of wild species and its implications for wild species, the environment and people

26. Chapter 3 will assess the use of wild species and its effect on their conservation status and trends and the positive and negative environmental aspects of the various categories of consumptive and non-consumptive uses introduced in chapter 1 with regard to a selection of wild species covering a range of taxa, and relevant terrestrial and aquatic units of analysis, including marine ones. This will be done in relation to the Aichi Biodiversity Targets and the Sustainable Development Goals. Thus it will undertake an analysis of the sustainable use of wild species covering all of the IPBES regions, taking a balanced approach to the treatment of taxa and of species in each taxon and building on relevant work such as CITES non-detriment findings. Criteria for the selection of wild species could entail risk of extinction, importance to communities, examples of best practices, and division into consumptive and non-consumptive use.

27. The chapter will assess knowledge on what levels of use (if any) could be sustainable and/or when management is required in order for species to recover, taking into account ecological conditions for such recovery. Looking at various management practices, in particular those promoted in the context of CITES, the Convention on Biological Diversity, the Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals and other relevant conventions, as well as assessments carried out by FAO and regional fisheries management organizations, the chapter will assess the impact of the use of selected wild species on nature, including its effects on the ecology, dynamics and genetic diversity of species populations or on corresponding ecosystem functioning. In assessing the environmental context of the use of wild species, the chapter will also take into account relevant direct drivers such as degradation, land-use change, habitat conversion, urban development, pollution, acidification, eutrophication, invasive alien species and climate change.

28. Chapter 3 will also assess the implications of the use of wild species with regard to nature's contributions to people and to a good quality of life, taking into account the conditions, criteria and elements of the sustainability of their use elaborated in chapter 2. The chapter will draw on the preliminary guide on the conceptualization of values of biodiversity and nature's contributions to people.

Chapter 4. Indirect drivers of the sustainable use of wild species

29. Chapter 4 will assess the positive and negative indirect drivers of the sustainable use of wild species, exploring institutional arrangements, governance regimes and the sociopolitical, economic, legal, cultural and technological context of the use of wild species across scales. It will assess conditions such as tenure systems, urban management, land-management practices and relevant environmental legislation and schemes of illegal use. The indirect drivers considered will include demography, income levels, consumption patterns, value systems and others. Consideration will be given to how institutional and governance arrangements contribute positively and negatively to changes in the use of wild species, interactions among drivers and environmental outcomes.

Chapter 5. Future scenarios of the sustainable use of wild species

30. Chapter 5 will present possible future scenarios for sustainable use and its effects on the conservation of wild species in their wider socio-ecological context. In assessing trends in and scenarios for the use of wild species, the chapter will take into consideration the conditions, criteria and elements fundamental to the sustainability of such use elaborated in chapter 2 and the analysis of the direct and indirect drivers as assessed in chapters 3 and 4. In considering the scenarios, the chapter will also draw on the IPBES methodological assessment of scenarios and models of biodiversity and ecosystem services (decision IPBES-4/1, section V, paragraph 1 and annex IV), the preliminary guide to the conceptualizations of values of biodiversity and nature's contributions to people and the assessment of the effectiveness of policy responses provided in chapter 6. It will make use of exploratory scenarios for plausible futures for wild species and the contributions they provide, subject to levels of use, and will also examine policy-screening scenarios and governance pathways that could lead to more sustainable futures. The possible futures and scenarios for the sustainable use of wild species will take into account regional specificities, including those of small island States.

Chapter 6. Policy options and responses

31. Chapter 6 will assess knowledge on the effectiveness of policy responses with regard to the sustainable use of wild species and will outline possible options for and impediments faced by decision makers regarding the policy-relevant issues discussed in the preceding chapters. Options explored will include various policy instruments, including legal and regulatory instruments, and best practices. Options explored should also include communication measures that promote sustainable use through awareness-raising, networking and capacity-building. In addition, the combining of policy

instruments and their integration with other environmental policy and governance pathways will be emphasized as policy strategies for promoting the sustainable use of wild species and their habitats.

32. The chapter will explore options at various hierarchical, spatial and temporal scales, looking at a range of governance systems and considering knowledge about who would gain from them or bear the costs and benefits of their implementation. It will look at knowledge on both statutory and traditional tenure systems and at the role of informal institutions and will also identify existing data, the enabling environments and limitations for policy uptake and lessons learned, including solutions and methods for ensuring success and capacity-building needs in diverse contexts.

III. Indicators, metrics and data sets

33. With support from the IPBES task force on knowledge and data, and taking into account the core and highlighted indicators selected for the regional and global assessments of biodiversity and ecosystem services and the assessment of land degradation and restoration, the assessment will review the use and effectiveness of existing indicators for assessing sustainable use, such as those developed by the Biodiversity Indicators Partnership, and will explore other possible indicators and data sets that could be used.

34. The assessment will survey the extent to which data are available and current and will determine data and knowledge gaps. Data selected for use in the assessment should allow for disaggregation according to relevant variables such as biotope, taxa and level of income. Attention will be given, in accordance with the data and information management plan of IPBES, to ensuring access to metadata and, whenever possible, to the corresponding underlying data, through an interoperable process to ensure comparability between assessments. In addition, the task force on data and knowledge will develop recommendations and procedures to ensure that data and information used in the assessment is widely available for future IPBES assessments and other uses.

35. The assessment will also identify and seek access to any other relevant data and information sources that may exist or emerge. Such sources include global, regional and national institutions and organizations, as well as literature by scientific and indigenous and local communities. The requirements of the assessment process will be communicated widely in order to identify and encourage the sharing of relevant data and information.

36. The task force on indigenous and local knowledge systems, together with relevant indigenous and local knowledge-holders and experts, will guide the procedures for the analysis and use of indigenous and local knowledge. The collective ability to perform these tasks will be strengthened through capacity-building, knowledge-sharing and international collaboration.

IV. Relevant stakeholders and initiatives

37. Under the operating principles of IPBES, partnerships are important in order to avoid duplication and promote synergies with ongoing activities. Strategic partnerships are a critical subset of the many possible forms of partnership with IPBES. In the context of the assessment on the sustainable use of wild species, strategic partnerships are those that promote, for example, relationships with multiple relevant bodies under a single global umbrella. Strategic partners for the assessment process should be identified in accordance with the IPBES guidance on the development of strategic partnerships and other collaborative arrangements (decision IPBES-3/4, annex III). Other interested organizations are invited to engage with the assessment process.

38. Indigenous and local people generally possess significant knowledge on the wild species that surround them, including knowledge about their habitat, seasonal availability, species ethology in the case of animal species and other matters, and they often use them for subsistence and other purposes. Consequently, indigenous and local people are major stakeholders and key partners for national Governments and international agencies seeking to safeguard biodiversity through conservation measures or regulatory interventions. The livelihoods of indigenous and local people are often strongly intertwined with the use of wild species. Incentives for the sustainable use of wild species can be used by local populations as tools for the sustainability of the use of wild species.

V. Capacity-building

39. A key objective of the assessment is to support the development and improvement of approaches to ensure that the use of wild species is sustainable and to strengthen related practices, measures, techniques, capacities and tools. The assessment will aim to strengthen the scientific underpinnings of informed decision-making on this issue. It will provide the basis for

capacity-building activities to improve human, institutional and technical capacities to foster the implementation of its key messages. This includes building capacities to provide the science-based data necessary to determine the sustainability of wild species use. Capacity-building will aim in the long term at the development and use of policy support tools and methodologies and improving access to the necessary data, information and knowledge and to indigenous and local knowledge systems.

40. In addition, capacity-building activities will be designed to enable the effective participation of experts from developing countries in the assessment. The assessment will be supported by the task force on capacity-building, in particular through the implementation of the IPBES capacity-building rolling plan. In line with the plan, capacity-building will also include strengthening the effectiveness of the contributions of indigenous and local knowledge systems to assessments.

VI. Process and timetable

41. The proposed process and timetable for preparing the assessment report, including actions, milestones and institutional arrangements, are set out below.

<i>Date</i>	<i>Actions and institutional arrangements</i>
Year 1	
First quarter	The Plenary approves the conduct of the thematic assessment of sustainable use of wild species, asks for offers of in-kind technical support for the assessment and requests the secretariat, advised by the Bureau, to establish the necessary institutional arrangements to put technical support in place The Chair, through the secretariat, requests nominations of experts from Governments and other stakeholders
Second quarter	The Secretariat compiles lists of nominations The Multidisciplinary Expert Panel selects the assessment co-chairs, coordinating lead authors, lead authors and review editors using the approved selection criteria Meeting of the Management Committee (co-chairs, head of the technical support unit and Multidisciplinary Expert Panel and Bureau members) to plan first author meeting Selected nominees contacted, gaps filled and the list of co-chairs, authors and review editors finalized
Second and early third quarters	First author meeting with 56 participants: 2 co-chairs, 12 coordinating lead authors, 36 lead authors, 6 Panel and Bureau members
Fourth quarter	Zero-order drafts of chapters prepared and sent to the secretariat (technical support unit)
Year 2	
First quarter	First-order drafts of chapters prepared and sent to the secretariat (technical support unit) Compilation of chapters into first-order draft (6 weeks)
Second quarter	First-order draft sent for external expert peer review (6 weeks, June and July) Review comments collated by technical support unit and sent to authors (2 weeks)
Early third quarter	Second author meeting with 68 participants: 2 co-chairs, 12 coordinating lead authors, 36 lead authors, 12 review editors and 6 Panel and Bureau members
Third quarter	Second-order drafts of chapters and first-order draft of summary for policymakers prepared (5–6 months)
Year 3	
First quarter	Second-order draft of the assessment and first-order draft of the summary for policymakers sent for review by Governments and experts (2 months)
First quarter	Review comments collated by technical support unit and sent to authors (2 weeks)
Second and early third quarters	Third author meeting with 68 participants: 2 co-chairs, 12 coordinating lead authors, 36 lead authors, 12 review editors and 6 Panel and Bureau members
Third and fourth quarters	Final revisions of assessment and summary for policymakers (6 months)

<i>Date</i>	<i>Actions and institutional arrangements</i>
Year 4	
First quarter	Translation of the summary for policymakers into the 6 official languages of the United Nations
First quarter	Submission of the assessment, including the translated summary for policymakers, to Governments for final review prior to the Plenary session (6 weeks)
First quarter	Final government comments on the summary for policymakers considered by authors prior to the Plenary session
May (to be confirmed)	Plenary approves the summary for policymakers and accepts the chapters and their executive summaries
Second and third quarters	Communication activities in relation to the assessment

VII. Cost estimate

42. The table below shows the estimated cost of conducting the assessment and preparing the assessment report. The cost includes three author meetings, all involving the lead authors. The total estimated cost is \$997,000.

<i>Year</i>	<i>Cost item</i>	<i>Assumptions</i>	<i>Estimated costs (United States dollars)</i>
Year 1	Management meeting on assessment (with co-chairs and members of the secretariat, technical support unit, Multidisciplinary Expert Panel and Bureau)	Cost of venue (1/2 week, 6 participants, in Bonn) Travel and daily subsistence allowance (4 × \$3,750)	0 15 000
	First author meeting (participants: 2 co-chairs, 12 coordinating lead authors, 36 lead authors and 6 Multidisciplinary Expert Panel and Bureau members)	Cost of venue (corresponding to 75 per cent, to be complemented with 25 per cent in kind); 56 participants (42 supported) Travel and DSA (42 × \$3,750)	18 750 157 500
	Technical support unit	Corresponding to half the costs of one full-time equivalent professional position, including travel and overhead (to be matched by an in-kind offer of an equivalent value)	75 000
	Total year 1		266 250
Year 2	Second author meeting (participants: 2 co-chairs, 12 coordinating lead authors, 36 lead authors, 12 review editors and 6 Multidisciplinary Expert Panel and Bureau members)	Cost of venue (corresponding to 75 per cent, to be complemented with 25 per cent in kind); 68 participants (51 supported) Travel and daily subsistence allowance (51 × \$3,750)	20 000 191 250
	Technical support unit	Corresponding to half the costs of one full-time equivalent professional position, including travel and overhead (to be matched by an in-kind offer of an equivalent value)	75 000
	Total year 2		286 250

<i>Year</i>	<i>Cost item</i>	<i>Assumptions</i>	<i>Estimated costs (United States dollars)</i>
Year 3	Third author meeting (participants: 2 co-chairs, 12 coordinating lead authors, 36 lead authors, 12 review editors and 6 Multidisciplinary Expert Panel and Bureau members)	Cost of venue (corresponding to 75 per cent, to be complemented with 25 per cent in kind); 68 participants (51 supported)	20 000
		Travel and daily subsistence allowance (51 × \$3,750)	191 250
	Technical support unit	Corresponding to half the costs of one full-time equivalent professional position, including travel and overhead (to be matched by an in-kind offer of an equivalent value)	75 000
	Dissemination and outreach		50 000
Total year 3			336 250
Year 4 (assessment launch and post-launch activities)	Participation of 8 experts, including 2 co-chairs and 6 coordinating lead authors or lead authors, in the Plenary session	Travel and daily subsistence allowance 8 participants (6 supported) (6 × \$3,750)	22 500
		Technical support (for 3 months after launch of the assessment report at the Plenary session)	18 750
	Dissemination and outreach		67 000
Total year 4			108 250
			997 000

IPBES-5/2: Review of the Platform

The Plenary

1. *Approves* the terms of reference for the review of the Platform at the end of its first work programme set out in the annex to the present decision;
2. *Also approves* the execution of an internal review by the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel and the Bureau and transmission of its conclusions to the external reviewers;
3. *Requests* the Bureau, in consultation with the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel, taking into account comments received at the fifth session of the Plenary, to revise the questionnaire set out in the appendix to the terms of reference;
4. *Requests* the Secretariat to make the revised questionnaire available to members and stakeholders of the Platform for review for a period of two weeks after the fifth session of the Plenary;
5. *Requests* the Bureau, in consultation with the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel, to finalize the questionnaire, taking into account the comments received during the period referred to in paragraph 4 above;
6. *Requests* the Executive Secretary to call for the nomination of candidates for the review panel, with a view to ensuring regional representation, and to conduct a competitive bidding process for an external professional organization to coordinate the review with a view to initiation of the work of the organization by the beginning of 2018, subject to the availability of financial resources;
7. *Requests* the review panel, in accordance with the terms of reference, to provide a final report on the review, including recommendations on the implementation of the second work programme of the Platform, to the Plenary at its seventh session;
8. *Requests* the internal review team to provide the report called for in paragraph 11 of the terms of reference to the Plenary at its sixth session.

Annex to decision IPBES-5/2

Terms of reference for the review of the Platform at the end of its first work programme

I. Objectives, timing and expected outputs of the review

1. A single review of IPBES will be undertaken at the end of its first work programme (hereinafter referred to as “the review”). The review will evaluate the effectiveness of IPBES as a science-policy interface. In particular, the review will analyse IPBES with regard to its effectiveness and efficiency and, where possible, relevance, as measured against its current objectives, operating principles, four functions and administrative and scientific processes for implementing the work programme as set out in the report of the second session of the plenary meeting to determine the future Platform’s modalities and institutional arrangements (document UNEP/IPBES.MI/2/9). It will also evaluate the efficiency of the delivery of the work programme and established support structures, as governed by the rules of procedure (see decision IPBES-1/1, annex), the procedures for the preparation of IPBES deliverables (see decision IPBES-3/3, annex I) and other relevant decisions by the IPBES Plenary. The review will evaluate:

- (a) Implementation of the four functions of IPBES;
- (b) Application of the operating principles of IPBES;
- (c) Effectiveness of the procedures for the development of IPBES deliverables, including the policy on conflict of interest and its implementation procedures;
- (d) Effectiveness of the institutional arrangements of IPBES, including the Plenary, the Bureau, the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel and the secretariat, including technical support units, the United Nations collaborative partnership arrangement and other arrangements with strategic partners and their interactions and procedures;
- (e) Effectiveness of the IPBES task forces and expert groups, including the management of their work and the level of commitment of members;
- (f) Effectiveness of the implementation of the financial and budgetary arrangements, including fundraising strategies;
- (g) Effectiveness of processes for stakeholder engagement and communication.

2. The review will be used as the basis for the development of a second work programme for IPBES with lessons learned from the implementation of the first work programme and recommendations that will enable IPBES to strengthen implementation of its four functions and, ultimately, its effectiveness as a science-policy interface.

3. The results of the review will be considered by the Plenary at its seventh session, in May 2019. A report on progress in the review process and interim results will be made available for the information of the Plenary at its sixth session. The review will integrate an internal and an external element.

4. The review will result in a report on the performance of IPBES with regard to the dimensions listed in paragraph 1 above. The report will include proposals on how to improve the effectiveness of IPBES. In particular, it will include, as necessary, recommendations regarding the amendment of existing institutional arrangements, including procedures and structures, to support implementation of the second work programme.

II. Institutional structure of the review

A. Internal element

5. The Bureau and the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel have designated an internal review team comprising the IPBES Chair, a member of the Bureau, a co-chair and two members of the Panel and the Executive Secretary, which will coordinate the internal review and, working in consultation with the Bureau and Panel, develop a report that summarizes the findings of the internal review.

B. External element

6. The external review will be conducted by a review panel and coordinated by a competent external professional organization. The review panel and the external professional organization will be subject to the IPBES conflict of interest policy. It will be guided by the questionnaire set out in the appendix to the present annex.
7. The review panel will comprise no more than 10 reviewers with a balanced composition of government representatives, scientists and representatives of non-governmental organizations. The members of the panel will be selected, in response to a call from the IPBES Chair and using agreed criteria (as listed in para. 9 below), by the Bureau in consultation with the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel.
8. The review will be coordinated by an external professional organization selected by the Bureau and the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel in response to a call for expressions of interest by the IPBES Chair.
9. The selection of the external professional organization, and of members of the review panel, will be guided by the following criteria:
 - (a) Relevant qualifications of the organization and the reviewers to conduct institutional reviews at the global level;
 - (b) Demonstrated track record of the organization and the reviewers in working with science-policy interfaces and in understanding the roles and functions of a global environmental assessment process in general and of IPBES in particular.
10. The Bureau working with the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel will develop a request for proposals based on the present terms of reference, on the basis of which the Secretariat will then conduct a competitive bidding process. The Secretariat working with the Bureau will review the proposals and if no proposals meet the criteria outlined in paragraph 9 of the terms of reference or fall within the financial resources available the Bureau may choose to hire an administrative officer located outside of the Secretariat to coordinate the review.

III. Methodology

A. Internal element

11. The internal element consists of a self-assessment based on the questionnaire contained in the appendix, finalized in accordance with paragraphs 3–5 of decision IPBES-5/2. The questionnaire will be distributed to former and current members of the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel and the Bureau; the secretariat, including the technical support units; members of IPBES task forces; co-chairs and coordinating lead authors of completed and ongoing IPBES assessments; and national focal points. On the basis of the results of the questionnaire, the internal review team (see para. 5 above) will prepare, in consultation with all members of the Bureau and Multidisciplinary Expert Panel, a report from an internal perspective. The report will be presented for the information of the Plenary at its sixth session, and will serve as an input to the overall review process.

B. External element

12. The methods to be used by the reviewers are to include:
 - (a) The review of the internal report, relevant documents and literature produced by IPBES and relevant expert and stakeholder communities;
 - (b) The use, as guidance for the review, of the questionnaire set out in the appendix to the present annex, finalized in accordance with paragraphs 3–5 of decision IPBES-5/2, tailored as appropriate and soliciting the views of Governments and relevant stakeholders on issues to be reviewed. An external organization will support the review panel in the collation and analysis of responses to the questionnaire.
13. Where useful, methods could also include:
 - (a) Interviews with key informants, including members of the Bureau and the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel, the secretariat and technical support units, experts involved in the work of IPBES, United Nations collaborative partner agencies, other strategic partners, Governments and stakeholders;

(b) Focus group discussions or focused workshops, held in conjunction with other meetings organized under the auspices of IPBES, where resources permit, or by teleconference, on particular issues relating to IPBES, such as IPBES institutional arrangements, the policy relevance of IPBES or the IPBES approach to indigenous and local knowledge systems. These discussions could involve a representative range of members of the Bureau and the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel, the secretariat (including relevant technical support units), experts involved in the work of IPBES, the United Nations collaborative partner agencies, other strategic partners, Governments and stakeholders;

(c) Direct observation during key IPBES meetings in 2017 and 2018, including a session of the Plenary, and meetings of the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel, the Bureau, task forces and assessment expert groups.

14. The Multidisciplinary Expert Panel, the Bureau and the secretariat, including its technical support units, will support the review panel by providing information on administrative and operational aspects for preparation of IPBES deliverables.

15. The review panel will prepare a report to the Plenary. The report will include recommendations as outlined in paragraph 4.

V. Budget

16. The requested budget of \$183,160 will cover the following costs:

(a) Technical and administrative support for the review is estimated at \$63,160, based on half of the cost per year of a professional position at the P-2 level in the United Nations system (\$126,320) for a one-year period starting shortly before the sixth session of the Plenary and ending shortly after its seventh session;

(b) It is assumed that the members of the review panel will provide their services on a pro-bono basis;

(c) Travel support and a daily subsistence allowance will be provided to reviewers from all regions based on the following maximum rate: \$3,750 per person per meeting. The members of the panel are expected to have one initial and one final meeting, which, to save costs, will be held back-to-back with scheduled IPBES meetings, which the panel would be invited to observe. A subset of the panel would also attend the sixth session of the Plenary to observe and conduct interviews and the seventh session to present the outcome of the report (two members). The schedule is as follows:

- (i) Initial meeting back-to-back with the sixth session of the IPBES Plenary (March 2018);
- (ii) Sixth session of the IPBES Plenary (March 2018), to observe and conduct interviews;
- (iii) Eleventh meetings of the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel and the Bureau (mid-2018), to observe and conduct interviews;
- (iv) Final meeting held back-to-back with the twelfth meetings of the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel and the Bureau (late 2018);
- (v) Seventh session of the IPBES Plenary (May 2019).

17. The projected costs are summarized in the following table and amount to \$183,160.

<i>Item</i>	<i>Cost in United States dollars</i>
Administrative support	63 160
Travel support plus daily subsistence allowance for 10 people to attend sixth session of the Plenary	37 500
Travel support plus daily subsistence allowance for 10 people to attend the eleventh meetings of the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel and the Bureau	37 500
Travel support plus daily subsistence allowance for 10 people to attend the twelfth meetings of the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel and the Bureau	37 500
Travel support plus daily subsistence allowance for two reviewers to attend the seventh session of the Plenary	7 500
Honorariums for reviewers	Not included
Total	183 160

Appendix

Draft questionnaire for the review of IPBES at the end of its first work programme

1. This questionnaire will be finalized in line with the procedure set out in paragraphs 3–5 of decision IPBES-5/2.
2. Respondents will be asked to identify themselves as belonging to specific predefined categories (for example, Government, non-governmental organization, multilateral environmental agreement, United Nations agency, scientist involved in IPBES, scientist not involved in IPBES, member of the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel or the Bureau, member of a task force, etc.) so that responses can be analysed in terms of the various categories of stakeholders.
3. Each question will be supplemented by the following subquestion in order to elicit additional suggestions from respondents: “What are the weaknesses or gaps and how could the situation be improved?”

Section I: How well are the functions of IPBES being implemented?

Question 1: Was the process used to receive and prioritize requests satisfactory?

- (a) Were the call for requests and the mechanism proposed by the IPBES secretariat for responding to the call clear and efficient?
- (b) Did you hold an internal consultation before responding to the call for requests?
- (c) Are you satisfied with the way the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel processed the requests and presented a prioritized list to the Plenary?
- (d) Would you say that the list of the deliverables in the work programme, which stems from the requests, meets the needs of the stakeholders and is policy-relevant?

Question 2: How well is IPBES performing regular and timely assessments of knowledge on biodiversity and ecosystem services and their interlinkages that support the science-policy interface?

- (a) Are the IPBES assessments contributing to the science-policy interface in a manner that ensures legitimacy, relevance and credibility?
- (b) Is the assessment scoping process working well?
- (c) Is the process for the nomination and selection of authors (co-chairs, coordinating lead authors, lead authors, review editors) working well?
- (d) Is the peer-review mechanism working properly?
 - Are Governments providing adequate inputs and comments?
 - Are experts providing adequate inputs and comments?
- (e) Do IPBES assessments properly identify confidence limits?
- (f) Are the summaries for policymakers being written in an appropriate style that is not too technical to be understood by a wide range of audiences and stakeholders?
- (g) Do the summaries for policymakers address the policy-relevant issues without being policy-prescriptive?
- (h) Are the lengths of the summaries for policymakers appropriate?
- (i) Do the assessments incorporate all relevant data and knowledge?
- (j) Do the assessments address the policy needs, particularly at the regional and subregional scales?
- (k) Do the assessments address terrestrial, marine and inland water biodiversity and ecosystem services and their interactions in a balanced manner?
- (l) Do the assessments appropriately use national, subregional and regional assessments and knowledge?

- (m) Do the assessments recognize, respect, adequately address and incorporate indigenous and local knowledge?
- (n) Have the assessments produced to date appropriately identified options for policymaking?
- (o) Does the pollination assessment meet the standards to be expected of an IPBES product?
- (p) Does the scenario assessment meet the standards to be expected of an IPBES product?

Question 3: Does IPBES identify and provide policy-relevant tools and methodologies, arising in particular from its assessments, to support policy formulation?

- (a) Have the assessments produced to date appropriately identified policy-relevant tools and methodologies?
- (b) Have deliverables other than assessments appropriately identified and provided policy-relevant tools and methodologies?
- (c) Given that the catalogue of policy support tools is at an early stage of development, is the catalogue user-friendly and appropriately structured to support policy formulation?
- (d) Are there any other ways and means of further enhancing efforts by IPBES to deliver on this function?

Question 4: Is IPBES performing its capacity-building function properly?

- (a) Is IPBES effectively matching the priority capacity-building needs identified by the Plenary with resources by catalysing financial and in-kind support?
- (b) How successful has the capacity-building forum been and how can it be strengthened?
- (c) Is IPBES effectively developing the capacities needed to implement its work programme?
- (d) Is the pilot fellowship programme working well? Is the nomination and selection process working well?
- (e) Are the pilot training activities based on existing guidance material supporting the implementation of the work programme in an effective manner?
- (f) What other avenues are needed to further catalyse and leverage funding for capacity-building?

Question 5: Is IPBES performing its knowledge and data function properly?

- (a) Does IPBES use clear, transparent and scientifically credible processes for the exchange, sharing and use of data, information and technologies from all relevant sources, including non-peer-reviewed literature?
- (b) Is the process used to manage the data and information used in assessments in a sustainable way adequate?
- (c) Is the process used to identify policy-relevant knowledge gaps and to promote, prioritize and catalyse the generation of new knowledge adequate?

Section II: Are the operating principles of IPBES being put into practice?

Question 6: Is IPBES collaborating adequately with existing initiatives?

Is IPBES adequately collaborating with existing initiatives on biodiversity and ecosystem services, including multilateral environmental agreements, United Nations bodies and networks of scientists and knowledge holders?

Question 7: Is IPBES incorporating indigenous and local knowledge adequately?

- (a) Does IPBES recognize, respect and adequately address indigenous and local knowledge in its work?
- (b) Given that the work of IPBES on indigenous and local knowledge is still at a pilot stage, are the processes for working with indigenous and local knowledge in IPBES activities appropriate?

Question 8: Are geographical, disciplinary and gender balances appropriate in the work of IPBES?

- (a) Has IPBES achieved appropriate regional representation and participation in its structure and work?
- (b) Has IPBES taken an appropriate interdisciplinary and multidisciplinary approach that incorporates all relevant disciplines, including social and natural sciences, in all its activities?
- (c) Has IPBES achieved appropriate gender balance in all relevant aspects of its work?

Question 9: Is IPBES delivering policy-relevant results?

- (a) Have the completed IPBES assessments been policy-relevant?
 - Was the pollination assessment sufficiently policy-relevant?
 - Is the scenarios assessment providing useful guidance to other IPBES assessments and, beyond those, to a broader community of scientists, funding agencies, policy support practitioners and policymakers wishing to make use of scenarios and models to inform decision-making on the local to global scales?
- (b) Are other IPBES deliverables and products policy-relevant?
- (c) Have IPBES processes supported the policy relevance of deliverables?
 - Was the scoping process conducive to the preparation of policy-relevant deliverables?
 - Was the composition of expert groups conducive to the preparation of policy-relevant deliverables?

Section III: Are the procedures for developing deliverables effective?**Question 10: Is IPBES communication adequate?**

Is IPBES communicating and reaching out in a satisfactory manner?

Question 11: Is IPBES following its rules of procedure?

Are IPBES rules and procedures being followed, including with regard to conflict of interests?

Question 12: Has IPBES developed appropriate partnerships?

Have partnership arrangements been developed for the conduct of IPBES activities and are they being properly implemented?

Section IV: Are institutional arrangements (Plenary, Bureau, Multidisciplinary Expert Panel and secretariat) effective?**Question 13: How well is the Plenary functioning?**

- (a) Is the documentation presented to the Plenary allowing it to play its role in an effective manner?
- (b) Is the decision-making by the Plenary conducive to effective implementation by the secretariat, the Bureau and the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel?
- (c) Are the sessions of the Plenary organized and conducted in an effective manner?
- (d) Is the Plenary properly advised on coordination between IPBES and other relevant institutions?

Question 14: How well is the Bureau functioning?

- (a) Are members of IPBES and regional groups properly supported by their respective Bureau members?
- (b) Has the Bureau effectively followed up on requests addressed to it by the Plenary in its decisions?
- (c) Has the Bureau effectively conducted its roles related to chairing and contributing to task forces and expert groups?

- (d) Has the Bureau properly discharged its administrative functions of:
- Overseeing communications and outreach activities?
 - Reviewing progress in the implementation of Plenary decisions?
 - Monitoring the secretariat's performance?
 - Organizing and conducting the sessions of the Plenary?
 - Reviewing observance of the platform's rules of procedure?
 - Reviewing the management of resources and observance of financial rules?
 - Advising the plenary on coordination between IPBES and other relevant institutions?
 - Identifying donors and developing partnership arrangements?

Question 15: How well is the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel functioning?

- (a) Is the Plenary properly advised by the Panel on scientific and technical aspects of the IPBES programme of work?
- (b) Has the Panel effectively followed up on requests addressed to it by the Plenary in its decisions?
- (c) Has the Panel effectively fulfilled its roles related to chairing and contributing to task forces and expert groups?
- (d) Is the Panel providing adequate advice and assistance on technical and scientific communication matters?
- (e) Is the peer-review process properly managed and does it ensure the highest levels of scientific quality, independence and credibility for all products delivered by IPBES at all stages of the process?
- (f) Are the scientific community and other knowledge holders properly engaged with the IPBES work programme, given the need for various disciplines and types of knowledge, gender balance, and effective contribution and participation by experts from developing countries?
- (g) Is there enough scientific and technical coordination among structures set up under IPBES?

Question 16: How well is the secretariat functioning?

- (a) Is documentation of high quality and delivered on time?
- (b) Are sessions of the Plenary and meetings of the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel and Bureau and other technical meetings well organized?
- (c) Has the secretariat effectively followed up on requests addressed to it by the Plenary in its decisions?
- (d) Is the secretariat providing adequate support for the delivery of the work programme according to the decisions of the Plenary?
- (e) Are the size, composition and set-up of the secretariat, including its technical support units, appropriate given the responsibilities and challenges arising in implementation of the work programme?
- (f) Has the system of technical support units worked well?
- (g) Is the interaction between the various bodies of IPBES functioning well?

Section V: How effective are the task forces and expert groups?

Question 17: How well are the task forces and expert groups fulfilling their terms of reference as mandated by the Plenary?

- (a) How effective are the task forces and the expert groups in the following areas:
- Indigenous and local knowledge?
 - Capacity-building?
 - Data and knowledge?
 - Values?
 - Scenarios and models of biodiversity and ecosystem services?
 - Policy-support tools?
- (b) Is there appropriate interaction between the task forces and expert groups?

Section VI: Effectiveness of budgetary management and fiscal rules

Question 18: Are resources properly managed and financial rules observed? Are requirements for reporting to donors and to the Plenary met?

- (a) Are financial resources properly managed and financial rules observed?
- (b) Are the budget documents presented to Plenary adequate?
- (c) Have donors been appropriately identified?
- (d) With regard to financial support:
- What are the incentives for and barriers to the provision of financial support?
 - What could be done to increase the provision and use of financial support?
- (e) With regard to in-kind offers:
- Does IPBES effectively mobilize and use the potential of in-kind offers?
 - What are the incentives for and barriers to the provision of in-kind support?
 - What could be done to increase the provision and use of in-kind support?
- (f) With regard to the involvement of third parties:
- Does IPBES effectively mobilize and use the leveraging potential of promoting and catalysing activities and impact through third parties such as strategic partners?
 - What are the incentives for and barriers to the provision of activities and impact through third parties?
 - What could be done to increase the promotion and catalysis of activities and impact through third parties such as strategic partners?

IPBES-5/3: Development of a second work programme of the Platform

The Plenary

1. *Requests* the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel and the Bureau, with support by the secretariat, to develop, for consideration by the Plenary at its sixth session, initial draft elements of a framework for a rolling work programme, including a potential structure, guidance on a call for requests, a process for receiving and prioritizing requests, and preliminary estimates of costs and human resource needs, considering in particular:

- (a) The time frame for the second work programme in the context of a 10-year horizon, the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, including the Sustainable Development Goals, the biodiversity-related conventions and other biodiversity and ecosystem service processes;
- (b) Any opportunities that might arise through strategic partnerships;
- (c) Options for the number and timing of methodological and thematic assessments, and for assessments at various spatial scales, with the provision that flexibility by the Plenary is required to address needs that may arise during the period of the work programme;
- (d) That the second work programme should reflect the implementation of the four functions of the Platform based on the results of the review of the Platform (deliverable 4 (e)) and recommendations stemming therefrom;
- (e) The modalities for the implementation of the second work programme, building on any early outcomes of the review of the Platform with regard to the modalities for the implementation of the first work programme of the Platform, in particular the structure of technical support, task forces and expert groups and the composition of the secretariat.

IPBES-5/4: Enhanced participation of the European Union in sessions of the Plenary of the Platform

The Plenary,

Recalling ongoing discussions on the status of regional economic integration organizations in the Platform,

Taking note of the request of Slovakia in document IPBES/5/INF/27 and the commitment of the European Union to providing active support to the Platform,

Noting the unique nature of the Platform,

1. *Decides*, in this context, to allow the enhanced participation of the European Union in its capacity as observer in the sessions of the Plenary of the Platform;
2. *Also decides* that such enhanced participation includes the right to speak in turn; the right to reply; the right to introduce proposals; the right to provide views; and the ability to support the implementation of the work programme of the Platform through financial support, among other means;
3. *Further decides* that the rights referred to in paragraph 2 above are exclusive and do not grant the ability to vote or to be elected to the Bureau of the Platform;
4. *Decides* that the foregoing paragraphs apply on an interim basis, pending the resolution of the status of regional economic integration organizations in the Platform in the rules of procedure.

IPBES-5/5: Provisional agendas, dates and venues of the sixth and seventh sessions of the Plenary

The Plenary

1. *Decides* that the sixth session of the Plenary of the Platform will be held from Sunday, 18 March 2018, to Saturday, 24 March 2018;
2. *Also decides* to accept with appreciation the offer by the Government of Colombia to host the sixth session of the Plenary in Medellin, Colombia, subject to the successful conclusion of a host country agreement;
3. *Requests* the Executive Secretary to continue consultations with the Government of Colombia, to negotiate a host country agreement in conformity with General Assembly resolution 40/243 and in compliance with the provisions of United Nations administrative instruction ST/AI/342 with a view to concluding and signing the host country agreement as soon as possible, to organize the sixth session of the Plenary in close collaboration with the host country and to invite the members and observers of the Platform to participate in the session;
4. *Invites* members in a position to do so to consider hosting the seventh session of the Plenary, which is scheduled to take place from Monday, 13 May 2019, to Saturday, 18 May 2019;
5. *Requests* the Executive Secretary, under the guidance of the Bureau, to consult members of the Platform that may, during the period leading up to the sixth session of the Plenary, offer to host the seventh session of the Plenary;
6. *Also requests* the Executive Secretary to report to the Plenary at its sixth session on progress in the consultations referred to in paragraph 5 above, with a view to the Plenary's deciding, at that session, on the venue and date of its seventh session;
7. *Takes note* of the draft preliminary agenda for the sixth session of the Plenary²⁷ and requests the Executive Secretary to finalize the proposed organization of work for the session in line with comments received at the fifth session of the Plenary.

²⁷ The draft preliminary agenda is set out in annex I to document IPBES/5/12.

IPBES-5/6: Financial and budgetary arrangements

The Plenary,

Welcoming the cash and in-kind contributions received since the inception of the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services in 2012,

Taking note of the status of cash and in-kind contributions received to date as set out in tables 1 and 2 of annex I to the present decision,

Taking note also of the pledges for the period beyond 2016, as set out in table 1 of annex I to the present decision, and of the status of expenditures in the biennium 2015–2016 as set out in tables 3 and 4 of annex I to the present decision, as well as the level of savings incurred during the biennium,

1. *Urges* members and observers to recognize the projection of significant revenue shortfalls in 2018 and beyond, which create a risk to the future stability of the Platform and the quality of its deliverables;

2. *Invites* pledges and contributions to the trust fund of the Platform, as well as in-kind contributions, from Governments, United Nations bodies, the Global Environment Facility, other intergovernmental organizations, stakeholders and others in a position to make such contributions to support the work of the Platform, including regional economic integration organizations, the private sector and foundations;

3. *Requests* the Executive Secretary, working under the guidance of the Bureau, to report to the Plenary at its sixth session on expenditures for the biennium 2016–2017;

4. *Adopts* the revised annual budget for 2017 amounting to \$8,732,772 as set out in table 5 of annex I to the present decision;

5. *Will consider* at its sixth session, subject to the availability of sufficient funds, the pending thematic assessment on the sustainable use of wild species, the pending methodological assessment regarding the diverse conceptualization of multiple values of nature and its benefits and the pending thematic assessment on invasive alien species;

6. *Adopts* the revised annual budget for 2018 amounting to \$5,000,000 as set out in table 5 of annex I to the present decision and will revisit the matter at its sixth session;

7. *Requests* the secretariat to examine the implications of a \$5,000,000 budget and of options both above and below that amount;

8. *Requests* experts from developed countries, prior to accepting roles as members of Platform expert groups or subsidiary bodies, to commit themselves to obtaining the financial means necessary for their participation in the work of the Platform;

9. *Approves* the fundraising strategy for the Platform set out in annex II to the present decision and requests the Executive Secretary, in accordance with the financial procedures of the Platform and working under the guidance of the Bureau with the support of members, to start implementing the strategy and to report on progress in its implementation to the Plenary at its sixth session.

Annex I to decision IPBES-5/6

Financial and budget tables

I. Status of cash and in-kind contributions to the Platform

1. Table 1 sets out the status of the cash contributions received since the establishment of the Platform in 2012, as well as confirmed pledges as at 10 March 2017.

Table 1

Status of cash contributions received and pledges made since the establishment of the Platform in April 2012 (from 1 May 2012 to 10 March 2017)

(United States dollars)

Country	Contributions						Pledges per United Nations exchange rate of 1 March 2017				
	2012	2013	2014	2015	2016	2017	Total	2017	2018	Total	Total
	1	2	3	4	5	6	(7) = (1)+(2)+(3)+ (4)+(5)+(6)	8	9	(10)=(8)+(9)	(11)= (7)+(10)
Australia		97 860			68 706		166 566			0	166 566
Belgium					118 243		118 243			0	118 243
Canada		38 914	36 496	30 098	30 616		136 124	30 098		30 098	166 222
Chile				23 136	14 966		38 102	15 000		15 000	53 102
China			160 000	60 000	2 005		222 005			0	222 005
Denmark			37 037				37 037			0	37 037
Finland		25 885	275 626				301 511	8 484		8 484	309 995
France		270 680	247 631	264 291	252 218		1 034 819	227 996		227 996	1 262 815
Germany	1 736 102	1 298 721	1 850 129	1 582 840	1 119 991	543 478	8 131 261	530 223	1 060 445	1 590 668	9 721 929
India		10 000	10 000				20 000			0	20 000
Japan		267 900	330 000	300 000	300 000		1 197 900	203 333		203 333	1 401 233
Latvia			4 299	3 944	3 889	3 726	15 858			0	15 858
Malaysia				100 000			100 000			0	100 000
Netherlands			678 426		636 943		1 315 369			0	1 315 369
New Zealand *		16 094	17 134	18 727	34 091		86 046			0	86 046
Norway		140 458	8 118 860	58 357	372 420		8 690 095	654 195	295 000	949 195	9 639 290
Republic of Korea		20 000					20 000			0	20 000
South Africa			30 000				30 000			0	30 000
Sweden		228 349	194 368	128 535	116 421		667 673	165 000		165 000	832 673
Switzerland		76 144	84 793	84 000	84 000		328 937	84 000	83 207	167 207	496 144
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland		1 285 694	1 046 145		228 956		2 560 795	186 567	186 567	373 134	2 933 929
United States of America	500 000	500 000	500 000	477 500	541 306		2 518 806			0	2 518 806
Total	2 236 102	4 276 699	13 620 944	3 131 427	3 924 771	547 204	27 737 147	2 104 895	1 625 220	3 730 115	31 467 262

* New Zealand's 2016 contribution includes contributions for 2016 and 2017.

2. Table 2 shows the in-kind contributions received by 10 March 2017, since the fourth session of the Plenary, and their corresponding estimated values in United States dollars, as provided or estimated according to the corresponding costs in the work programme. In-kind contributions correspond to support for activities either scheduled as part of the work programme (e.g., technical support, meeting facilities and local support) or organized in support of the work programme and not received by the trust fund.

Table 2
In-kind contributions received by 10 March 2017
(United States dollars)

<i>Government/institution</i>	<i>Activity</i>	<i>Type of support</i>	<i>Corresponding value as estimated</i>
1. In-kind contributions related to technical support			
Norway	Technical support unit for the task force on capacity-building (deliverables 1 (a) and (b))	Technical support	300 000
United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization	Technical support unit for the task force on local and indigenous knowledge systems (deliverable 1 (c))	Technical support	150 000
Republic of Korea	Technical support unit for the task force on knowledge and data (deliverable 1 (d))	Technical support	300 000
South Africa	Technical support unit for the regional assessment for Africa (deliverable 2 (b))	Technical support, meeting facilities	150 000
SwedBio to CSIR	Work of the IPBES technical support unit for Africa	Technical support	73 095
China	Consultant in the Platform secretariat in support of the delivery of regional assessments (deliverable 2 (b))	Technical support	140 000
Colombia	Technical support unit for the regional assessment for the Americas (deliverable 2 (b))	Technical support, meeting facilities	150 000
Japan	Technical support unit for the regional assessment for Asia and the Pacific (deliverable 2 (b))	Technical support, meeting facilities	150 000
Switzerland	Technical support unit for the regional assessment for Europe and Central Asia (deliverable 2 (b))	Technical support, meeting facilities	271 429
Germany	Technical support unit for the global assessment (deliverable 2 (c))	Technical support	96 957
Netherlands	Technical support unit for the assessment on scenario analysis and modelling (deliverable 3 (c))	Technical support	250 000
Mexico	Technical support related to work on values (deliverable 3 (d))	Technical support	22 180
United Nations Environment Programme - World Conservation Monitoring Centre	Technical support for the work on the catalogue of assessments and the catalogue of policy support tools and methodologies (deliverables 4(c))	Technical support	30 000
United Nations Environment Programme	Technical support for the Platform secretariat	Technical support	223 100
Subtotal			2 306 761
2. In-kind contributions related to meetings scheduled as part of the approved work programme			
United Nations Development Programme	Second meeting of the IPBES capacity-building forum, New York, United States of America (deliverable 1 (a))	Meeting facilities, technical and local support	2 500
Hungarian Academy of Sciences	Fourth meeting of the task force on capacity-building in Budapest, Hungary (deliverable 1 (a))	Meeting facilities, catering and local support	7 320

<i>Government/institution</i>	<i>Activity</i>	<i>Type of support</i>	<i>Corresponding value as estimated</i>
Hungarian Academy of Sciences	IPBES capacity-building dialogue with Eastern European stakeholders (deliverable 1 (a))	Meeting facilities, catering and local support	2 440
Germany	Second author meetings of the regional assessments (deliverable 2 (b)) and the land degradation and restoration assessment (deliverable 3 (bi))	Meeting facilities, local support	176 471
Germany	Global assessment chapter 3 meeting (deliverable 2 (c))	Travel support, meeting facilities, local support	55 439
Subtotal			244 170
3-In-kind contributions in support of the approved work programme			
Germany	Fifth session of the Plenary	Meeting venue, facilities, equipment and supplies	466 569
Germany	Travel support for the fifth session of the Plenary	Travel support	104 602
Germany	Branding/software application	Communication support	20 920
Malaysia	Fourth session of the Plenary	Meeting facilities, hospitality, equipment and supplies	974 000
Malaysia	Fourth session of the Plenary: host country contribution	Travel support	194 099
United Kingdom	Travel costs of the IPBES Chair to represent the Platform	Travel support	20 000
Institute for Global Environmental Strategies	Institute for Global Environmental Strategies/Japan Biodiversity Fund (IGES/JBF) capacity-building project for IPBES (deliverable 1 (a))	Staff cost	75 000
Japan Biodiversity Fund	IGES-JBF capacity-building project for IPBES (deliverable 1 (a))	Capacity-building workshops, support for subregional dialogue workshop with indigenous and local knowledge holders	1 000 000
Foundation for Research on Biodiversity	Dialogue meeting for the establishment of national IPBES committees in French-speaking African countries, Rabat (deliverable 1 (a))	Meeting facilities	12 406
Ministry of Foreign Affairs, France	Dialogue meeting for the establishment of national IPBES Committees in French speaking African countries, Rabat (deliverable 1 (a))	Meeting facilities	22 297
United Nations Development Programme	Technical support for capacity-building in the context of the Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services Network (deliverables 1 (a) and (b))	Technical support	390 000
Switzerland	Second meeting of the European and Central Asian expert group, Zadar, Croatia (deliverable 2 (b))	Travel, accommodation, meeting facilities and local support	54 372
SwedBio and Council for Scientific and Industrial Research	African values workshop (deliverable 3 (d))	Travel, accommodation, meeting facilities and local support	77 343
SwedBio and Humboldt Institute	Latin American values workshop (deliverable 3 (d))	Travel, accommodation, meeting facilities and local support	75 792
SwedBio and Wildlife Institute of India	Asia Pacific values workshop (deliverable 3 (d))	Travel, accommodation, meeting facilities and local support	62 985

<i>Government/institution</i>	<i>Activity</i>	<i>Type of support</i>	<i>Corresponding value as estimated</i>
SwedBio to Forest Peoples Programme (FPP)	Travel funds to allow members of the FPP to attend IPBES meetings	Travel, accommodation, meeting facilities and local support	19 000
SwedBio	Support for UNDP/BES-Net	Web site	50 000
Oppla	Provision of ready to use web architecture as a basis for the catalogue of policy support tools and methodologies (deliverables 4 (c))	Software and technical support	150 000
International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN)	Technical support for the implementation of the stakeholder engagement strategy (deliverables 4 (d))	Technical support	70 000
IUCN	Stakeholder days preceding the fourth session of the Plenary	Meeting facilities and support	9 500
IUCN	Organization of two IPBES events at the World Conservation Congress	Meeting facilities and support	5 000
Future Earth	Support for the organization of the stakeholders days at the fourth session of the Plenary	Meeting facilities and support	12 615
Future Earth	Support for the task force on knowledge and data generation	Meeting facilities and support	75 840
Subtotal			3 942 340
Grand total (1+2+3)			6 493 272

II. Expenditures for 2015

3. Table 3 shows the expenditures for 2015, as at 31 December 2015, against the budget for 2015 approved by the Plenary at its third session (decision IPBES-3/2) on a modified cash basis (i.e., including actual expenses and commitments).

Table 3
Expenditures for 2015
(United States dollars)

<i>Budget item</i>	<i>2015 budget</i>	<i>2015 expenditures</i>	<i>Balance</i>
1. Meetings of the Platform bodies			
1.1 Annual session of the Plenary			
Travel costs for the third Plenary session participants (travel and daily subsistence allowance (DSA))	480 000	434 156	45 844
Conference services (translation, editing and interpretation) and venue	600 000	522 735	77 265
Plenary reporting services ^a	60 000	–	60 000
Security services (local and United Nations security) ^b		99 475	-99 475
Subtotal 1.1 Annual session of the Plenary	1 140 000	1 056 366	83 634
1.2 Bureau and Multidisciplinary Expert Panel sessions			
Travel and meeting costs of participants for Bureau sessions	103 500	50 357	53 143
Travel and meeting costs of participants for Multidisciplinary Expert Panel sessions	240 000	82 578	157 422
Subtotal 1.2 Bureau and Multidisciplinary Expert Panel	343 500	132 935	210 565
Subtotal 1.3 Travel costs of the Chair to represent the Platform	20 000	–	20 000
Subtotal 1 Meetings of the Platform bodies	1 503 500	1 189 301	314 198
2. Implementation of the work programme	1 658 750	1 087 211	571 539
2.1 Objective 1: strengthen the capacity and knowledge foundations of the science-policy interface to implement key Platform functions			

<i>Budget item</i>	<i>2015 budget</i>	<i>2015 expenditures</i>	<i>Balance</i>
2.2 Objective 2: strengthen the science-policy interface on biodiversity and ecosystem services at and across the subregional, regional and global levels	1 871 250	1 962 758	-91 508
2.3 Objective 3: strengthen the knowledge-policy interface with regard to thematic and methodological issues	1 620 000	1 238 510	381 490
2.4 Objective 4: communicate and evaluate Platform activities, deliverables and findings	342 500	192 950	149 550
Subtotal 2 Implementation of the work programme	5 492 500	4 481 429	1 011 071
3. Secretariat			
3.1 Personnel			
3.1.1 Professional and higher category			
Head of Secretariat (D-1)	283 600	201 571	82 029
Programme Officer (P-4)	223 100	165 398	57 702
Programme Officer (P-4) ^c	–	–	–
Programme Officer (P-3)	186 100	18 264	167 836
Programme Officer (P-3)	186 100	94 740	91 360
Associate Programme Officer (P-2)	161 800	82 531	79 269
Associate Programme Officer (P-2)	93 933	0	93 933
Subtotal 3.1.1 Professional and higher category	1 134 633	562 505	572 128
3.1.2 Secretariat: Administrative personnel			
Administrative support staff member (G-6)	113 000	60 690	52 310
Administrative support staff member (G-6)	56 500	–	56 500
Administrative support staff member (G-5)	56 500	29 498	27 002
Administrative support staff member (G-5)	113 000	59 489	53 511
Administrative support staff member (G-5)	113 000	59 713	53 287
Subtotal 3.1.2 Administrative personnel	452 000	209 390	242 610
Interim secretariat support arrangements			
Interim technical and secretariat support	–	171 426	–171 426
Subtotal 3.1.3 Interim support arrangements	–	171 426	–171 426
Subtotal 3.1 Personnel	1 586 633	943 321	643 312
3.2 Secretariat: operating costs (non-personnel)			
3.2.1 Travel on official business			
Official travel	100 000	76 708	23 292
Subtotal 3.2.1 Travel on official business	100 000	76 708	23 292
3.2.2 Staff training			
Project management professional training	10 000	8 325	1 675
Umoja and competency-based interviewing staff training	12 000	233	11 767
Subtotal 3.2.2 Staff training	22 000	8 557	13 443
3.2.3 Equipment and office supplies			
Expendable equipment (items under \$1,500 each)	4 500	4 374	126
Office supplies	12 000	5 751	6 249
Subtotal 3.2.3 Equipment and office supplies	16 500	10 126	6 374
3.2.4 Premises			
Contribution to the cost of common services at the United Nations campus in Bonn, Germany (maintenance of office space, security, switchboard service, etc.)	45 000	44 000	1 000
Subtotal 3.2.4 Premises	45 000	44 000	1 000

<i>Budget item</i>	<i>2015 budget</i>	<i>2015 expenditures</i>	<i>Balance</i>
3.2.5 Printers, photocopiers, IT support and miscellaneous			
Operation and maintenance of printers and photocopiers	5 000	887	4 113
Acquisition of four Microsoft Project and four Adobe office software licenses	4 000	–	4 000
Information technology (IT) services 2015 ^d		22 000	-22 000
Subtotal 3.2.5 Printers, photocopiers, IT support and miscellaneous	9 000	22 887	-13 887
3.2.6 Telephone, postage and miscellaneous	–		
Postage and miscellaneous	2 000	2 814	-814
Subtotal 3.2.6 Telephone, postage and miscellaneous	22 000	13 577	8 423
3.2.7 Hospitality			
Hospitality	5 000	–	5 000
Subtotal 3.2.7 Hospitality	5 000	–	5 000
Subtotal 3.2 Operating costs (non-personnel)	219 500	175 855	43 645
Subtotal 3 Secretariat (personnel and operating costs)	1 806 133	1 119 176	686 957
Subtotal 1+2+3	8 802 133	6 789 906	2 012 226
Programme support costs (8 per cent)	704 171	543 192	160 978
Total cost to the trust fund	9 506 304	7 333 098	2 173 204
Contribution to working capital reserve (10 per cent) ^e	20 476	798 223	(777 747)
Total cash requirement	9 526 780	8 131 321	1 395 457

^a The cost of the plenary reporting services of the Earth Negotiations Bulletin for the third session of the Plenary was reflected in 2014.

^b Security costs, amounting to \$99,475, were incurred for the third session of the Plenary and charged to 2015. They included the costs of local security staff provided through the United Nations Volunteers programme and the United Nations security force at the United Nations Office in Vienna.

^c P-4 secondment from UNEP.

^d The United Nations Volunteers programme provides IT services to all UNEP-related offices based in Bonn through a service-level agreement. The services include a help desk, local area network, internet security, domain name system (DNS) services, server hosting and subscriptions to Microsoft Office 365 Enterprise E3. Under the agreement, which has been in effect since 1 January 2015, the fee charged each year depends on the number of users; in 2015 it was \$22,000.

^e No allocation was made in the 2014 financial year for the purposes of a contribution to the 2014 working capital reserve. The amount was therefore transferred to the reserve in 2015, together with the allocation for 2015 (\$20,476), resulting in a total transfer of \$798,223.

III. Estimated expenditures for 2016

4. Table 4 shows the estimated expenditures for 2016, as at 31 December 2016, against the budget for 2016 approved by the Plenary at its fourth session (decision IPBES-4/2).

Table 4
Estimated expenditures for 2016
(United States dollars)

<i>Budget items</i>	<i>2016 approved budget</i>	<i>2016 estimated expenditures</i>	<i>Estimated balance</i>
1. Meetings of the Platform bodies			
1.1 Annual session of the Plenary			
Travel costs of fourth Plenary session participants (travel and DSA)	500 000	410 045	89 955
Conference services (translation, editing and interpretation)	765 000	770 912	-5 912
Plenary reporting services	65 000	59 998	5 002
Security for the Plenary ^a	100 000	–	100 000
Subtotal 1.1 Annual session of the Plenary	1 430 000	1 240 955	189 045
1.2 Bureau and Multidisciplinary Expert Panel sessions			
Travel and meeting costs of participants for two Bureau sessions	70 900	66 083	4 817
Travel and meeting costs of participants for two Panel sessions	240 000	153 906	86 094
Subtotal 1.2 Bureau and Multidisciplinary Expert Panel sessions	310 900	219 990	90 910

<i>Budget items</i>	<i>2016 approved budget</i>	<i>2016 estimated expenditures</i>	<i>Estimated balance</i>
Subtotal 1.3 Travel costs of the Chair to represent the Platform	25 000	–	25 000
Subtotal 1 Meetings of the Platform bodies	1 765 900	1 460 945	304 955
2. Implementation of the work programme			
2.1 Objective 1: strengthen the capacity and knowledge foundations of the science-policy interface to implement key functions of the Platform	1 317 500	1 209 859	107 641
2.2 Objective 2: strengthen the science-policy interface on biodiversity and ecosystem services at and across the subregional, regional and global levels	1 598 750	1 189 557	409 193
2.3 Objective 3: strengthen the knowledge-policy interface with regard to thematic and methodological issues	651 500	444 894	206 606
2.4 Objective 4: communicate and evaluate Platform activities, deliverables and findings	275 000	227 268	47 732
Subtotal 2 Implementation of the work programme	3 842 750	3 071 578	771 172
3. Secretariat			
3.1 Personnel			
3.1.1 Professional and higher category			
Head of Secretariat (D-1)	290 700	192 068	98 632
Programme Officer (P-4)	228 700	132 454	96 246
Programme Officer (P-4) ^b	–	–	–
Programme Officer (P-3)	190 800	97 885	92 915
Programme Officer (P-3)	190 800	148 138	42 662
Associate Programme Officer (P-2)	165 900	90 747	75 153
Associate Programme Officer (P-2)	165 900	73 321	92 579
Subtotal 3.1.1 Professional and higher category	1 232 800	734 613	498 187
3.1.2 Administrative personnel			
Administrative support staff member (G-6)	115 900	41 280	74 620
Administrative support staff member (G-6)	115 900	24 937	90 963
Administrative support staff member (G-5)	115 900	59 485	56 415
Administrative support staff member (G-5)	115 900	58 432	57 468
Administrative support staff member (G-5)	115 900	41 494	74 406
Subtotal 3.1.2 Administrative personnel	579 500	225 628	353 872
Subtotal 3.1 Personnel	1 812 300	960 240	852 060
3.2 Secretariat: operating costs (non-personnel)			
3.2.1 Travel on official business			
Official travel	120 000	66 898	53 102
Subtotal 3.2.1 Travel on official business	120 000	66 898	53 102
3.2.2 Staff training			
Staff training	25 000	14 499	10 501
Subtotal 3.2.2 Staff training	25 000	14 499	10 501
Secretariat operating costs			
3.2.3 Equipment and office supplies			
Expendable equipment (items under \$1,500 each)	4 500	2 849	1 651
Office supplies	12 000	10 106	1 894
Subtotal 3.2.3 Equipment and office supplies	16 500	12 955	3 545
3.2.4 Premises			
Contribution to common costs (maintenance of office space, common security, switchboard service, etc.)	45 000	41 812	3 188
Subtotal 3.2.4 Premises	45 000	41 812	3 188

<i>Budget items</i>	<i>2016 approved budget</i>	<i>2016 estimated expenditures</i>	<i>Estimated balance</i>
3.2.5 Printers, photocopiers, IT services and miscellaneous			
Operation and maintenance of printers and photocopiers	5 000	4 101	899
Software and other miscellaneous expenses	4 000	1 000	3 000
IT support services ^c	20 000	49 000	-29 000
Subtotal 3.2.5 Printers, photocopiers and IT services	29 000	54 101	-25 101
3.2.6 Telephone, postage and miscellaneous			
Telephone	20 000	9 843	10 157
Postage and miscellaneous	2 000	335	1 665
Subtotal 3.2.6 Telephone, postage and miscellaneous	22 000	10 178	11 822
3.2.7 Hospitality			
Hospitality	5 000	0	5 000
Subtotal 3.2.7 Hospitality	5 000	0	5 000
Subtotal 3.2 Operating costs (non-personnel)	262 500	200 444	62 056
Subtotal 3 Secretariat (personnel and operating costs)	2 074 800	1 160 684	914 116
Subtotal 1+2+3	7 683 450	5 693 208	1 990 242
Programme support costs (8 per cent)	614 676	455 457	159 219
Total cost to the trust fund	8 298 126	6 148 664	2 149 462
Contribution to the working capital reserve (10 per cent)	126 873	126 873	0
Total cash requirement	8 424 999	6 275 537	2 149 462

^a According to the security risk assessment conducted by the United Nations Department of Safety and Security, Malaysia was at security level I (the lowest level). As a result, the United Nations was not requested to provide security services and security was instead provided by the host Government, at its own expense, in accordance with the host government agreement between UNEP and the Government of Malaysia.

^b P-4 secondment from UNEP.

^c The United Nations Volunteers programme provides IT services to all UNEP-related offices based in Bonn through a service-level agreement. The services include a help desk, local area network, internet security, DNS services, server hosting and subscriptions to Microsoft Office 365 Enterprise E3. Under the agreement, which has been in effect since 1 January 2015, the fee charged each year depends on the number of users. In 2015 the fee was \$22,000; in 2016 it increased to \$49,000 owing to an increase in the number of users as well as an increase in the help desk fee charged by the United Nations Volunteers programme.

IV. Budget for the biennium 2017-2018²⁸

Table 5
Approved budgets for 2017-2018
(United States dollars)

<i>Budget items</i>	<i>2017</i>	<i>2018</i>
1. Meetings of the Platform bodies		
1.1 Annual sessions of the Plenary (fifth and sixth)		
Travel costs for Plenary session participants (travel/DSA)	500 000	500 000
Conference services (translation and editing) and venue	830 000	1 065 000
Plenary reporting services	65 000	65 000
Security for the Plenary	100 000	100 000
Subtotal 1.1, sessions of the Plenary	1 495 000	1 730 000

²⁸ By its decision IPBES-5/6, the Plenary adopted a revised annual budget for 2017 amounting to \$8,732,772. The Plenary further adopted a revised budget of \$5,000,000 for 2018. Accordingly, table 5 provides the approved budgets for 2017 and 2018. The budget for 2018 is based on the proposal made by the secretariat in document IPBES/5/10, adjusted in consultation with the Bureau to the \$5,000,000 figure agreed to by the Plenary. The secretariat, in response to the request from the Plenary, will examine, in consultation with the Bureau, the implications of a \$5,000,000 budget and options both above and below that amount, for consideration by the Plenary at its sixth session.

<i>Budget items</i>	<i>2017</i>	<i>2018</i>
1.2 Bureau and Multidisciplinary Expert Panel sessions		
Travel and meeting costs for participants for two Bureau sessions	70 900	70 900
Travel and meeting costs for participants for two Panel sessions	170 000	170 000
Subtotal 1.2, Bureau and Multidisciplinary Expert Panel sessions	240 900	240 900
1.3 Travel costs of the Chair to represent the Platform	25 000	30 000
Subtotal 1, meetings of the Platform bodies	1 760 900	2 000 900
<u>2. Implementation of the work programme</u>		
2.1 Objective 1: strengthen the capacity and knowledge foundations of the science-policy interface to implement key functions of the Platform	798 000	
2.2 Objective 2: strengthen the science-policy interface on biodiversity and ecosystem services at and across the subregional, regional and global levels	2 703 750	
2.3 Objective 3: strengthen the knowledge-policy interface with regard to thematic and methodological issues	507 000	
2.4 Objective 4: communicate and evaluate Platform activities, deliverables and findings	150 000	
Subtotal 2, implementation of the work programme	4 158 750	1 272 350
<u>3. Secretariat</u>		
3.1 Personnel		
3.1.1 Professional and higher category		
Head of Secretariat (D-1)	298 000	305 400
Programme Officer (P-4)	234 400	240 300
Programme Officer (P-4) ^a		-
Programme Officer (P-3)	195 600	200 500
Programme Officer (P-3)	195 600	200 500
Associate Programme Officer (P-2)	170 000	174 300
Associate Programme Officer (P-2)	170 000	174 300
Subtotal 3.1.1, Professional and higher category	1 263 600	1 295 300
3.1.2 Administrative personnel		
Administrative support staff member (G-6)	118 800	121 800
Administrative support staff member (G-6)	118 800	121 800
Administrative support staff member (G-6)	118 800	121 800
Administrative support staff member (G-6): part-time	59 400	59 400
Administrative support staff member (G-5)	118 800	121 800
Administrative support staff member (G-5)	118 800	121 800
Subtotal 3.1.2, Administrative personnel	653 400	668 400
Subtotal 3.1, personnel	1 917 000	1 963 700
3.2 Secretariat: operating costs (non-personnel)		
3.2.1 Travel on official business		
Official travel	80 000	80 000
Subtotal 3.2.1, travel on official business	80 000	80 000
3.2.2 Staff training		
Staff training	15 000	15 000
Subtotal 3.2.2, staff training	15 000	15 000

<i>Budget items</i>	<i>2017</i>	<i>2018</i>
3.2.3 Equipment and office supplies		
Expendable equipment (items under \$1 500 each)	10 000	10 000
Office supplies	12 000	12 000
Subtotal 3.2.3, equipment and office supplies	22 000	22 000
3.2.4 Premises		
Contribution to common costs (maintenance of office space, common security, switchboard service, etc.)	45 000	45 000
Subtotal 3.2.4, premises	45 000	45 000
3.2.5 Printers, photocopiers and IT services		
Operation and maintenance of printers and photocopiers	5 000	5 000
Software and other miscellaneous expenses	4 000	4 000
IT support services	61 250	61 250
Subtotal 3.2.5, printers, photocopiers and IT services	70 250	70 250
3.2.6 Telephone, postage and miscellaneous		
Telephone	10 000	10 000
Postage and miscellaneous	2 000	2 000
Subtotal 3.2.6, Telephone, postage and miscellaneous	12 000	12 000
3.2.7 Hospitality		
Hospitality	5 000	5 000
Subtotal 3.2.7, hospitality	5 000	5 000
Subtotal 3.2, operating costs (non-personnel)	249 250	249 250
Subtotal 3, secretariat (personnel + operating)	2 166 250	2 212 950
Subtotal, 1+2+3	8 085 900	5 486 200
Programme support costs (8 per cent)	646 872	438 896
Total cost to the trust fund	8 732 772	5 925 096
Contribution to working capital reserve (10 per cent)		(925 096)
Total cash requirement	8 732 772	5 000 000

Annex II to decision IPBES-5/6

Draft fundraising strategy

I. Fundraising under IPBES: three types of resources

1. IPBES relies on three types of resources to successfully and effectively implement its mandate and reach its objective of strengthening the science-policy interface for biodiversity and ecosystem services: cash contributions to the trust fund; in-kind contributions to support the implementation of the work programme; and the leveraging of activities of partners in support of IPBES.

2. Cash contributions to the trust fund support the basic operations of IPBES, including the sessions of the Plenary, the Bureau and the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel, the operation of the secretariat and the implementation of the work programme. According to rule 5 of the IPBES financial procedures, adopted by the Plenary in decisions IPBES-2/7 and IPBES-3/2, cash contributions to the trust fund are to be made as non-earmarked contributions. As an exception, single contributions in excess of \$300,000 per contributor per activity are allowed with the approval of the Plenary. Single contributions not exceeding \$300,000 per contributor per activity may be accepted with the approval of the Bureau. To date, cash contributions to the trust fund have been received exclusively from Governments. Some donor Governments are contributing to the trust fund on a regular basis, while other contributions have been irregular, and the range of contributions has varied.

3. In-kind contributions are defined as direct support, not received by the trust fund, for activities either scheduled as part of the work programme, which otherwise would have to be covered by the trust fund, or organized in support of the work programme. Providers of in-kind contributions range from individuals to institutions and Governments, and their contributions cover a wide range of activities, including:

(a) Provision of time and expertise at no cost to IPBES by the experts that are members of assessment and other expert groups – an in-kind contribution without which the implementation of the work programme of IPBES would not be viable within the current financial limits;

(b) Costs of participation in IPBES meetings by experts from developed countries that are not eligible for financial support;

(c) Provision of technical support for specific deliverables by institutions hosting technical support units;

(d) Provision of meeting facilities and logistical support for specific meetings;

(e) Provision of data such as data relevant to indicators, access to knowledge otherwise available only for a fee, or free access to built digital infrastructure.

4. The leveraging of activities of partners in support of IPBES does not directly contribute to the implementation of the IPBES work programme, but it does indirectly play an important role in ensuring the overall success of IPBES. Such leveraging includes building the foundations on which IPBES can draw in its operations and that enable the successful uptake and practical application of IPBES deliverables. In this vein, partners contribute to the work of IPBES by, for example, promoting and catalysing activities aimed at responding to priority capacity-building needs, supporting the generation of knowledge in areas where IPBES has identified and prioritized gaps and enabling the engagement of indigenous and local communities within IPBES.

5. Fundraising for IPBES needs to address all three types of resources. As a well-resourced trust fund is most central to the functioning of IPBES, emphasis should be placed on the raising of cash contributions to the trust fund. At the same time, however, in-kind contributions and the leveraging of activities of partners are also crucial in ensuring the success of IPBES.

II. Activities to strengthen fundraising

6. The following activities are suggested to strengthen fundraising for IPBES:

(a) Increasing understanding of the current structure of IPBES donors and identifying potential donors or partners for each of the three types of resources, noting that, while engaging philanthropic foundations and the private sector should be one objective of IPBES fundraising activities, Governments are likely to remain the key group of donors to the trust fund;

- (b) Increasing understanding of incentives, motivation, disincentives and barriers in respect of donors providing funds, in-kind contributions and supporting activities;
- (c) Enhancing efforts to increase the membership of IPBES;
- (d) Actively communicating the importance of the work of IPBES and its benefits to potential donors and partners;
- (e) Increasing the awareness of potential donors and partners with regard to available avenues for supporting IPBES;
- (f) Creating opportunities for engagement with potential donors and partners, including in the margins of high-level events and through bilateral meetings;
- (g) Working with existing donors willing to champion fundraising efforts;
- (h) Widely acknowledging the contributions of donors and partners.

III. Priority activities for 2017

7. A resource mobilization officer, sponsored by the French Government, will coordinate the implementation of the fundraising strategy for the first work programme of IPBES starting in September 2017. It is suggested that the following activities be undertaken between the fifth and sixth sessions of the Plenary:

- (a) Formal invitation to countries not members of IPBES to become members;
 - (b) Production of communication materials to showcase the value of the work of IPBES to potential partners and donors, using tangible examples and narratives and outlining specific avenues for the provision of support, including contributions to the trust fund, the provision of earmarked funds to the extent that the financial rules permit, the more flexible option of in-kind contributions and the undertaking of supporting activities;
 - (c) Identification of a number of donor champions and collaboration with them in the organization of fundraising meetings, including meetings in the margins of the high-level political forum on sustainable development that will be held from 10 to 19 July 2017 in New York, subject to the availability of resources;
 - (d) Preparation of an analysis, including through consultations with members and other potential donors, of the current structure of IPBES contributions and the incentives, motivations, disincentives and barriers faced in providing funds, contributions and support and the identification of strategies for enhancing incentives, overcoming obstacles and engaging additional potential donors and partners;
 - (e) Engagement with targeted Governments, foundations, businesses and existing relevant fundraising events in line with the strategies identified;
 - (f) Development and maintenance of a list of contributors to IPBES on the IPBES website.
-