

**Intergovernmental Science-Policy
Platform on Biodiversity and
Ecosystem Services**Distr.: General
12 January 2015

Original: English

**Plenary of the Intergovernmental Science-Policy
Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services
Third session**
Bonn, Germany, 12–17 January 2015**Report of the Plenary of the Intergovernmental Science-Policy
Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services on the work of
its third session****I. Opening of the session**

1. The third session of the Plenary of the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services was held in Bonn, Germany, from 12 to 17 January 2015.
2. The session was opened at 10.15 a.m. by the Chair of the Plenary, Mr. Zakri Abdul Hamid. Calling it a landmark event in the history of the Platform to date, he said that the session, attended by representatives of 145 Governments and an equal number of organizations, was an opportunity both to reflect on achievements and lessons learned and to continue planning for the years to come. Recalling the achievements of the first two sessions of the plenary in establishing the Platform's procedures and structures and adopting an initial work programme, he expressed satisfaction at the progress made so far on the 18 deliverables of the work programme and the number of experts that were with great enthusiasm contributing their time and expertise to the Platform. The current rate of decline in biodiversity, 100 to 1,000 times greater than the natural rate, made plain the critical importance of the Platform in providing policymakers with sound scientific information as the basis for policymaking aimed at reversing biodiversity loss, raising awareness of and fostering appreciation for the importance of biodiversity and the ecosystem services that it provided and building the capacity of developing countries to measure and assess biological and genetic resources and value ecosystem services. Expressing thanks to those that had already contributed in cash and in kind, he said that a further \$19 million would be needed to implement the Platform's initial work programme fully, and he urged all to contribute as much as possible to the Platform trust fund. Concluding with thanks to all for the work to date, he wished participants a productive meeting in the constructive spirit that had prevailed thus far.
3. Welcoming remarks were then made by Ms. Anne Larigauderie, Executive Secretary of the Platform secretariat; Ms. Jacqueline McGlade, Chief Scientist and Acting Director, Division of Early Warning and Assessment, United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP); Ms. Barbara Hendricks, Federal Minister for the Environment, Nature Conservation and Nuclear Safety of Germany; and Mr. Juergen Nimptsch, Lord Mayor of Bonn.
4. Ms. Larigauderie, expressing thanks for the trust placed in her by virtue of her appointment as Executive Secretary, said that the year since the second session of the Plenary had been an active one. Considerable progress had been made in implementing the programme of work for 2014–2018, with all of its 18 deliverables at various stages of progress, and the year had seen the establishment of 14 expert groups, the conduct of 20 meetings and the selection of more than 500 experts from among nearly 1,700 nominees. Those experts had already contributed their time and had expressed the desire to continue their involvement, and the Platform had been warmly welcomed by the scientific community and other knowledge holders on whom its success depended. The year had also seen the testing of the Platform's conceptual framework and rules of procedure, lessons from which would be discussed at the current session; the recruitment of all secretariat staff; the further development of

collaboration with the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), UNEP and the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO); and the establishment of technical support units in the Netherlands, Norway, the Republic of Korea and UNESCO. The Plenary would have much to consider at the current session as a result of those activities, including seven scoping reports, two guides, two catalogues and the outcomes of three task forces, and it was hoped that additional partnerships made possible through the provision of in-kind support would be announced during the current session. Thanking the Government of Germany and the City of Bonn for both financial and logistical support and a warm welcome, she wished the participants a fruitful meeting.

5. Ms. McGlade, speaking on behalf of FAO, UNDP, UNEP and UNESCO, said that the partnership between those organizations and the Platform was emblematic of efforts across the United Nations to deliver as one. The four organizations were committed to ensuring that biodiversity and ecosystem services were taken into account in the broader policy dialogue taking place across the globe through various means such as national reporting under relevant multilateral environmental agreements, including ecosystems accounting and the Biodiversity Indicators Partnership; capacity-building, including through the Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services Network; inter-agency agreements such as the memorandum of understanding between FAO and UNEP on food security and ecosystem-based management; interdisciplinary and transdisciplinary approaches to data collection and knowledge management; and links to the Global Environment Facility. Evidence continued to mount that human activities were causing unprecedented changes in the Earth's systems, while global leaders sought to end poverty and transform the economy through a post-2015 development agenda that included a strengthened science-policy interface and agreed sustainable development goals, raising the question whether the Platform community was ready to influence decision-making by providing high-quality data and frameworks for tracking changes and progress in the use of resources, biodiversity and ecosystem services. For their part the four organizations, already deeply involved in ensuring that biodiversity and ecosystem services were embedded in the sustainable development goals, targets and indicators, stood ready to help the community to do so.

6. In her remarks, Ms. Hendricks said that the Government of Germany was honoured to host the current session and greatly valued the trust placed in it as the host of the Platform. Biodiversity and ecosystem services, she said, were critical to sustainable development, yet the loss of biodiversity and intact ecosystems continued unabated. To halt that, policymakers needed the Platform to provide detailed proposals for action and specific recommendations on how to achieve the Aichi biodiversity targets by 2020 and implement the post-2015 development agenda. The current session would help to determine whether the platform could become a vital instrument for the environment and sustainable development in the twenty-first century, and four areas were of particular importance in that regard. First, the platform needed to produce assessments of issues for which policymakers had not yet implemented effective measures, as such assessments could play a major role in convincing all ministries and sectors to factor biodiversity into their daily work. In particular, the assessment on sustainable use should be conducted as an independent assessment to ensure that it did justice to the importance of the issue, and it should examine a wide range of issues. Second, the Plenary should adopt an effective communications strategy aimed at raising awareness of the importance of biodiversity for prosperity and well-being. Third, stakeholder participation was critical to the success of the Platform. Germany had established a national coordination office aimed at promoting participation by scientists, policymakers and citizens, and it hoped that the Plenary would adopt a stakeholder engagement strategy at the current session. Fourth, the balanced participation of scientists, policymakers and the public was critical to the position of the Platform around the globe, and capacity-building was therefore needed, particularly in the context of development cooperation. To that end, Germany would give particular consideration to the needs of partners, for example in the context of projects supported under the environment ministry's International Climate Initiative. Impressed by the progress to date and pleased with the efforts of the secretariat, Germany would do all it could to support the Platform, including through its voluntary contribution of 1 million euros per year to the Platform trust fund. In closing, she called on all to maintain the momentum and to adopt decisions allowing the Platform to reach its full potential.

7. Mr. Nimptsch welcomed the participants to Bonn and to what he said was an auspicious venue for the current session. The plenary hall in which the session would take place was the former home of the German Parliament, and a 2000-year old conference hall for 1,000 people had recently been discovered on the site. Such a deep history of debate augured well for the Plenary's discussions. The Platform, with its close links to climate change and desertification, fitted in perfectly at the United Nations campus in Bonn and would contribute to cross-sectoral synergies with the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification in those Countries Experiencing Serious Drought and/or Desertification, Particularly in

Africa, academic institutions and non-governmental organizations. As was the Federal Government, Bonn was committed to biodiversity and to its role as the Platform's host. Urging participants to be ambitious at the current session, he expressed the hope that they would find time to see Bonn and its green surroundings and that they would take home with them a feeling of "Freude", or joy, a sentiment that featured in both the Bonn city motto and Ludwig van Beethoven's ninth symphony.

8. Following those welcoming remarks, representatives speaking on behalf of regional groups, stakeholders that had met in preparation for the current meeting and multilateral environmental agreements made general statements in which they spoke of the progress of the Platform to date, the activities of those on behalf of whom they spoke in support of the Platform and their expectations for the current meeting and the future implementation of the Platform.

II. Organizational matters

A. Adoption of the agenda and organization of work

9. The Plenary adopted the following agenda on the basis of the provisional agenda (IPBES/3/1):
 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) Admission of observers to the third session of the Plenary of the Platform.
 3. Credentials of representatives.
 4. Report of the Executive Secretary on the implementation of the work programme 2014–2018.
 5. Initial work programme of the Platform:
 - (a) Task forces on capacity-building, knowledge and data (including data and management plan/system) and indigenous and local knowledge systems;
 - (b) Guides on assessments, policy support tools and methodologies, and preliminary guides on scenario analysis and modelling and the conceptualization of values;
 - (c) Scoping documents for regional assessments, land degradation and restoration and the conceptualization of values.
 6. Financial and budgetary arrangements for the Platform:
 - (a) Budget and expenditure for 2014–2018;
 - (b) Trust Fund;
 - (c) Technical support units.
 7. Rules and procedures for the operation of the Platform:
 - (a) Nomination and selection of members of the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel;
 - (b) Procedures for the preparation of Platform deliverables;
 - (c) Procedure for the review of the Platform;
 - (d) Policy and procedures for the admission of observers;
 - (e) Conflict of interest policy.
 8. Communications and stakeholder engagement:
 - (a) Communications and outreach strategy;
 - (b) Stakeholder engagement strategy;
 - (c) Guidance on strategic partnerships.
 9. Institutional arrangements: United Nations collaborative partnership arrangements for the work of the Platform and its secretariat.
 10. Provisional agenda, date and venue of future sessions of the Plenary.

11. Adoption of decisions and report of the session.

12. Closure of the session.

10. The Plenary also agreed that it would hear a presentation from Mr. Rajendra Pachauri, Chair of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, on the experience of the Panel's fifth assessment and the findings presented in the report on that assessment, and that it would consider a non-paper containing draft decisions that had been circulated on 30 December 2014.

11. With regard to the organization of work, one representative said that his delegation was concerned regarding time management and the holding of night sessions and multiple parallel meetings of contact groups, saying that they caused unnecessary difficulties, especially for small delegations. Two representatives also expressed concern that contact group meetings were to be held without the benefit of interpretation, saying that such a practice was inconsistent with the principles of the United Nations and would undercut the effectiveness of the session. In response, the representative of the secretariat explained that budgetary constraints precluded the provision of interpretation for contact group meetings, and highlighted the fact that all decisions would be adopted during sessions of the Plenary, at which interpretation would be provided. At the last meeting of the session, one representative expressed concern that several documents before the Plenary for adoption at that session were available only in English.

B. Status of the membership of the Platform

12. The Chair reported that Afghanistan, Belarus, Cameroon, the Czech Republic, Greece, Maldives, Viet Nam and Zambia had joined the Platform since the second session of the Plenary. The Platform, as at 12 January 2015, thus had the following 123 member States: 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, 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, 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 Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Viet Nam, Yemen, Zambia and Zimbabwe.

C. Admission of observers to the third session of the Plenary of the Platform

13. Introducing the item, the Chair recalled that at its second session the Plenary had decided that it would resume consideration of the admission of observers at its third session (see IPBES/2/17, para. 54) and that the policy and procedures for the admission of observers to its second session would be applied to determine the admission of observers to its third session, on the understanding that observers admitted to both its first and second sessions would be among those admitted to its third session (see IPBES/1/12, para. 22, and IPBES/3/INF/12).

14. In accordance with the Plenary's decision at its second session, 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 and second sessions: African Development Association; ALTER-Net; Association Fauna; Association Nodde Nooto; Australian National University; Bangalore University; Bangladesh Unnayan Parishad; Benin Environment and Education Society; Biodiversity Action Journalists, Gambia; Centre for Development Research, Bonn; Centre for Environmental Management, University of Nottingham; Centre for Natural Resources and Environmental Studies; Consortium of European Taxonomic Facilities; Chinese Academy of Sciences; Climate Reality Project, Climate Reality Leadership Corps; Department of Sustainable Development of Sepasad Group; DesertNet International; Earthindicators; Finnish Environment Institute; Forest Action Nepal; Forest Stewardship Council; Fund For Sustainable Development; Future Earth; Georg-August-Universität Göttingen; German Network-Forum for Biodiversity Research; GLOBAL 2000/Friends of the Earth Austria; Global Change Ecology; Global Conservation Standard; Global Forest Coalition; Global South Initiative, Global Youth Biodiversity Network; Graduate School of Sciences, Kyusyu

University; Group on Earth Observations Biodiversity Observation Network; IAV Hassan II; Institute for Culture and Ecology; Institute of Soil and Water Conservation, CAS and MWR, Northwest A&F University; International Forestry Students' Association; Japan Agency for Marine-Earth Science and Technology; Kasisi Agricultural Training Centre; Leibniz Association; Leibniz Centre for Agricultural Landscape Research; Luc Hoffmann Institute; Marquette University; Mindrol Changchup Choeling; National Institute for Environmental Studies, Japan; National Network of Indigenous Women; Nepal Indigenous Nationalities Preservation Association; Network for Environment and Sustainable Development in Africa; Norwegian Institute for Nature Research; Observatoire du Sahara et du Sahel; Pacari Network; Paribartan Nepal; Pgaz K' Nyau Association for Sustainable Development; Pro Natura - Friends of the Earth Switzerland; Quaker Earthcare Witness; Red de Cooperación Amazónica/Amazon Cooperation Network; Sokoine University of Agriculture; Task Force on Systemic Pesticides; the Small Earth Nepal; Universidad Autónoma de Madrid; University of California, Berkeley, Department of Environmental Science, Policy and Management; Universidad del Norte; University of Saskatchewan; University of Zurich, Department of Geography; Wildlife and Environmental Conservation Society of Zambia; and Williams College, United States.

III. Credentials of representatives

15. 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 members of the Platform participating in the current session. The Bureau found that the following 87 members of the Platform 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, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Burundi, Cambodia, Cameroon, Canada, Central African Republic, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Czech Republic, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Grenada, Guatemala, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Japan, Kenya, Latvia, Liberia, Luxembourg, Madagascar, Malawi, Malaysia, Maldives, Mali, Mauritania, Mexico, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Pakistan, Peru, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Republic of Moldova, Russian Federation, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Swaziland, Sweden, Switzerland, Togo, Tunisia, Turkey, Uganda, United Kingdom, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Yemen and Zimbabwe.

16. The representatives of 11 other Platform members participated in the current session without valid credentials. Those members were accordingly considered to be observers during the current session.

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

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

18. Introducing the item, the Chair recalled that in decision IPBES-2/5 the Plenary had adopted the work programme for the Platform for the period 2014–2018. The Executive Secretary, with the support of members of the Bureau and the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel, then reported on progress in the implementation of the work programme, outlining the information set out in the note by the secretariat (IPBES/3/2) on activities under way on the work programme's 18 deliverables, challenges and lessons learned in 2014 in the implementation of the work programme, and four options for its further implementation.

19. In the ensuing discussion participants expressed appreciation for the work done by the secretariat, as well as a range of opinions about which of the four options should be pursued. Most speakers expressed support for either continuing with the previously agreed work programme, in which thematic assessments were discrete processes separate from regional assessments (option one), or a more integrated approach in which thematic assessments were an essential part of the proposed regional assessments (option four). Most speakers said that the proposed regional assessment on the open oceans should be delayed, pending the outcome of the World Ocean Assessment being carried out as a part of the Regular Process for Global Reporting and Assessment of the State of the Marine Environment, including Socio-economic Aspects. Several speakers expressed concern that the work programme was overambitious, saying that there was a need to consider carefully what was achievable given the available time and resources. In that context a number of participants said that discussion of the work programme during the current session should be closely coupled with the discussion of the

Platform budget. The representatives of China, Colombia, Ethiopia, Japan, the International Council for Science and the International Union for Conservation of Nature said that their countries and organizations were willing to provide in-kind support for various activities.

20. Following its discussion, the Plenary agreed to establish a contact group, co-chaired by Mr. Ivar Baste (Norway) and Mr. Alfred Oteng-Yeboah (Ghana), to address the issues raised during the discussion in plenary on various approaches to implementing the regional and thematic assessments and issues relating to the work programme that would be raised under agenda item 5. The outcome of the work of the contact group is described in section V below, on the initial work programme of the Platform.

V. Initial work programme of the Platform

A. Task forces on capacity-building, knowledge and data (including data and management plan/system) and indigenous and local knowledge systems

1. Capacity-building

21. Introducing the sub-item, the representative of the secretariat recalled that in its decision IPBES-2/5, the Plenary had established a task force on capacity-building and requested it to develop a proposed programme of fellowship, exchange and training programmes for consideration by the Plenary at its third session. He also recalled that, in accordance with its mandated functions, the Platform was expected to prioritize key capacity-building needs and provide and call for financial and other support for the highest priority needs related directly to its activities, as decided by the Plenary in paragraph 4 (d) of annex I of its decision IPBES-2/5. He then summarized progress with regard to the work programme deliverables relating to capacity-building (IPBES/3/3 and IPBES/3/INF/1), introduced a list of proposed priority capacity-building needs (IPBES/3/3, annex I) and a draft fellowship, exchange and training programme proposed by the task force (IPBES/3/3, annex II) and reported on other activities related to capacity-building.

22. The Plenary was invited to approve the draft list of priority capacity-building needs and to consider both the programme on fellowships, exchange and training and the preliminary plans for convening the Platform's first capacity-building forum with representatives of conventional and potential sources of funding.

23. In the ensuing discussion, participants said that capacity-building was of fundamental importance and that it was necessary to move quickly to implement capacity-building activities working in collaboration with other organizations at all appropriate levels. A number of participants made suggestions on additional activities that might be included in the list of priority capacity-building needs, in particular concerning indigenous and local knowledge. There was broad support for the draft programme on fellowships, exchange and training, with some participants suggesting that it should focus on building institutional capacity as well as individual capacity and that a mechanism should be developed to evaluate its impact.

24. Following its discussion, the Plenary agreed that the contact group established under agenda item 4 (see sect. IV above) would consider the issue of capacity-building further in the context of the full range of work programme activities.

2. Knowledge and data

25. Introducing the sub-item, the representative of the secretariat recalled that in its decision IPBES-2/5 the Plenary had established a task force on knowledge and data and had requested the secretariat, working with the Bureau and with the support of the task force, to develop a data and information management plan that would be implemented to support future assessments. He then presented a draft data and information management plan prepared by the task force (IPBES/3/4) and reported on other task force activities, outlining the information presented in the relevant note by the secretariat (IPBES/3/INF/3), including on the preparation of a draft knowledge and data strategy to guide the work of the task force in meeting priority knowledge and data needs for policymaking by catalysing efforts to generate new knowledge and increase networking. The Plenary was invited to approve the data and information management plan and to note the progress made in the development of a draft knowledge and data strategy.

26. In the ensuing discussion participants welcomed the draft data and information plan, although several made specific suggestions for improving it, including by clarifying roles, responsibilities and relationships. In addition, several participants said that wherever possible the plan should provide for recognizing, building on and seeking to influence existing data and information initiatives rather than

developing new ones. It was also suggested that data and information management plans should be prepared for all current Platform assessments for consideration by the Plenary at its fourth session.

27. Following its discussion, the Plenary agreed that the contact group established under agenda item 4 (see sect. IV above) would consider the issue of knowledge and data further in the context of the full range of work programme activities.

3. Indigenous and local knowledge systems

28. Introducing the sub-item, the representative of the secretariat recalled that in its decision IPBES-2/5 the Plenary had established a task force on indigenous and local knowledge systems and had requested the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel and the Bureau, with support from the task force, to establish in 2014 a roster and network of experts and a participatory mechanism for working with various knowledge systems. In addition the Panel and Bureau had been requested to work with the task force to develop for consideration by the Plenary at its fourth session draft procedures for and approaches to working with indigenous and local knowledge systems. A report on progress on those matters (IPBES/3/INF/2) was before the Plenary. The Plenary was invited to note the progress to date on activities related to indigenous and local knowledge systems and to consider agreeing to further piloting activities for testing draft procedures and approaches.

29. In the ensuing discussion, participants said that interaction between task forces was important to ensure, for example, that issues related to indigenous and local knowledge were appropriately addressed by the task force on knowledge and data and that the task force on capacity-building was fully aware of capacity-building relevant to indigenous and local knowledge. It was also said that the participatory mechanism was important, and participants welcomed the experience gained from the global dialogue workshop held in Panama from 1 to 5 December 2014, which had brought together experts working on the pollinators, pollination and food production assessment report, indigenous and local knowledge holders, and other experts on indigenous and local knowledge systems.

30. Following its discussion, the Plenary agreed that the contact group established under agenda item 4 (see section IV above) would consider the issue of indigenous and local knowledge further in the context of the full range of work programme activities.

B. Guides on assessments, policy support tools and methodologies, and preliminary guides on scenario analysis and modelling and the conceptualization of values

31. Introducing the sub-item, the representative of the secretariat recalled that in its decision IPBES-2/5, the Plenary had requested the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel in consultation with the Bureau, supported by a time-bound and task-specific expert group, to develop a guide to the production and integration of assessments from and across all levels. Following establishment of the expert group, the guide on assessments had been developed, incorporating guidance for a number of other deliverables, and subjected to expert review. The current draft of the guide (IPBES/3/INF/4) had been circulated for review by Platform members and stakeholders, with a deadline of 31 January 2015 for the submission of comments. In decision IPBES-2/5, the Plenary had also approved the development of a preliminary guide on the conceptualization of values of biodiversity and nature's benefits to people. An expert group had been established for that purpose, *inter alia*, and had developed a preliminary guide (IPBES/3/INF/7). The Plenary was invited to take note of the guides and to provide guidance for their further development. In the ensuing discussion there was general agreement that it was important to ensure consistency in Platform assessments and their implementation, in particular with regard to definitions, concepts and use of terminology.

32. In decision IPBES-2/5 the Plenary had requested the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel and the Bureau, supported as necessary by a task-specific expert group, to develop a catalogue of policy support tools and methodologies, to provide guidance on how the further development of such tools and methodologies could be promoted and catalysed in the context of the Platform and to submit the catalogue and guidance for consideration by the Plenary at its third session. Following its establishment, the expert group had developed a proposal for the catalogue (see IPBES/3/5) and provided preliminary guidance (see IPBES/3/INF/8). The Plenary was invited to consider the proposal and preliminary guidance and to provide direction for the further development of the guidance. Participants provided a range of comments on the guidance relating to policy support tools and methodologies, including identifying areas where the guidance could be improved, but some expressed reservations about the scoping reports and suggested that they needed to be discussed further. In doing so they said that while the expert group should be continued, its mandate should be better defined.

33. Following its discussion, the Plenary agreed that the contact group established under agenda item 4 (see sect. IV above) would consider the above guides and catalogues further in the context of the full range of work programme activities.

C. Scoping documents for regional assessments, land degradation and restoration and the conceptualization of values

34. Introducing this sub-item, the representative of the secretariat recalled that in its decision IPBES-2/5 the Plenary had requested the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel and the Bureau to undertake a scoping process for a set of regional and subregional assessments for consideration by the Plenary at its third session, with the support of a time-bound and task-specific expert group. He then outlined the work undertaken in response to the Plenary's request, as described in the relevant notes by the secretariat (IPBES/3/6 and IPBES/3/INF/17), including the preparation of a draft generic scoping report (IPBES/3/6/Add.1) and five regional scoping reports for Africa, the Americas, the Asia-Pacific region, Europe and Central Asia and the Open Ocean region (IPBES/3/6/Add.2–6). He also recalled that in decision IPBES-2/5, the Plenary had approved the initiation of scoping for both a thematic assessment of land degradation and restoration and a methodological assessment on the conceptualization of the values of biodiversity and nature's benefits to people. Following the establishment of a time-bound and task-specific expert group to address each of those two issues, scoping reports for a thematic assessment on land degradation and restoration (see IPBES/3/7 and IPBES/3/INF/18) and for a methodological assessment on the conceptualization of the values of biodiversity and nature's benefits to people (see IPBES/3/8) were prepared for consideration by the Plenary. Finally, the Executive Secretary introduced an initial scoping report for a global assessment that had been prepared by the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel and the Bureau for consideration by the Plenary. The Plenary was invited to consider the scoping documents with a view to adopting them with any necessary amendments, taking into account the discussion at the current session of coupling thematic and regional assessments.

35. In the ensuing discussion, many participants said that there was a need to closely integrate future capacity-building activities into regional assessments. A number of participants said that regional assessments were important building blocks for the global assessment, although others cautioned that the global assessment should not simply be a compilation of regional assessments. Opinion was divided on when and if the proposed Open Ocean assessment should proceed, largely because of the need to avoid potential duplication with the ongoing World Ocean Assessment. There was strong support for the thematic assessment on land degradation and restoration, but questions were raised about the scope of the assessment, and a number of participants questioned whether there was a need for a separate assessment on conceptualization of values. In addition, some concerns were raised by participants who said that the documents provided needed to give more attention to drawing on diverse knowledge systems and ensuring a focus on success stories.

36. Following its discussion, the Plenary agreed that the contact group established under item 4 (see sect. IV above) would consider the issue of scoping documents further in the context of the full range of work programme activities.

D. Outcome of the work of the contact group and adoption of a decision on the work programme of the Platform

37. 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 for consideration by the Plenary. The decision and the eight annexes thereto were set out in documents IPBES/3/L.4 and/Add.1, IPBES/3/L.9, IPBES/3/L.10, IPBES/3/L.11, IPBES/3/L.12, IPBES/3/L.13 and IPBES/3/L.14 and Add.1. The Plenary then adopted the draft decision and the annexes, as orally amended. Decision IPBES-3/1, on the work programme for the period 2014–2018, is set out in the annex to the present report.

38. Following adoption of the decision on the work programme, the representatives of France, the Netherlands and the United Kingdom made statements regarding their countries' overseas territories, with the first two asking that they be reflected in the present report. The representative of France said that information regarding its overseas territories would be treated within the framework of the regional and subregional assessments and that it would propose the provision of necessary expertise that would constitute a significant contribution to the assessments. The representative of the Netherlands said that the Caribbean islands of Aruba, Bonaire, Curaçao, Sint Eustatius, Sint Maartin and Saba were part of the Kingdom of the Netherlands and accounted for a large part of the Kingdom's biodiversity. A number of studies on Dutch Caribbean biodiversity and ecosystem services, as well as information in the Dutch Caribbean database, were relevant to the entire Caribbean region, and information and expertise relevant to overseas territories would be dealt with and made available in the

context of the appropriate regional and subregional assessments. Citing a number of examples, the representative of the United Kingdom said that overseas territories of the United Kingdom were doing excellent work to improve understanding of biodiversity and ecosystem services and that his country looked forward to the continuation of that work in the coming years.

39. Also following adoption of the decision on the work programme, the representative of Egypt said that her Government dissociated itself from the adoption of the annex to that decision setting out the scoping for a regional assessment on biodiversity and ecosystem services for Africa.

40. In addition, representatives of a number of members conveyed offers from their Governments to provide in-kind support. It was agreed that a list of such offers would be set out in an annex to the decision on the financial and budgetary arrangements for the Platform (see decision IPBES-3/2, annex II, sect. I).

41. It was also agreed that the secretariat would produce tables, for posting on the Platform website, providing an overview of the interactions between all the deliverables and the interactions between the thematic and the regional assessments, as well as for each section of the draft decision an indication as to what deliverable was referred to in that section.

VI. Financial and budgetary arrangements for the Platform

A. Budget and expenditure for 2014–2018

B. Trust Fund

42. The Plenary discussed agenda items 6 (a) and 6 (b) together.

43. Introducing the sub-items, the Executive Secretary recalled decision IPBES-2/6, on the status of contributions and expenditures and the budget for the biennium 2014–2015, and decision IPBES-2/7, on financial and budgetary arrangements, and reported on the status of the Platform trust fund and the implementation of the work programme in relation to the budget, outlining the information set out in the note by the secretariat (IPBES/3/10). She also introduced two non-papers, one updating information on income and expenditure for 2014 and the other, prepared by the Bureau, concerning possible updates of the Platform's financial rules and procedures with regard to pledges to the Platform trust fund. A representative of the secretariat drew attention to two further issues where guidance from the Plenary was needed: a possible application for the Platform to be included in the list of organizations eligible for official development assistance as determined by the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD); and guidance on the eligibility of participants for support for attending meetings (IPBES/3/2/Add.1/Rev.1). The Plenary was invited to consider the information provided with a view to approving a revised budget for 2015, a proposed budget for the biennium 2016–2017 and an indicative budget for 2018. It was also invited to review the staffing of the Platform necessary for the efficient and effective implementation of the work programme, to provide guidance on whether to apply for the Platform to be included in the list of organizations eligible for official development assistance as determined by OECD and to provide guidance on the eligibility of participants for financial support for attending meetings.

44. In the ensuing discussion several participants said that discussion of the budget should be closely related to the discussion of the work programme and suggested that further information would be required to facilitate that. There was general support for an application to be made to OECD for the Platform to be included in the OECD Development Assistance Committee list of Official Development Assistance recipients. Opinions varied, however, concerning eligibility for financial support, with a number of participants saying that it was a significant issue with regard to ensuring full participation in the work of the Platform. A number of participants provided additional information on their own contributions to the trust fund and in-kind contributions, and the representatives of Japan, Malaysia and Sweden said that their countries would provide further financial support.

45. Following its discussion, the Plenary established a contact group, co-chaired by Mr. Leonel Sierralta (Chile) and Mr. Jay Ram Adhikari (Nepal), to address the budget of the Platform and related issues.

46. The co-chair of the contact group subsequently reported on the group's deliberations, saying that it had reached agreement on a draft decision on financial and budgetary arrangements (IPBES/3/L.7/Rev.1), including proposed amendments to the financial procedures and rules regarding pledges to the Platform trust fund (IPBES/3/L.3). In addition, the contact group had also considered guidance on whether to apply for the Platform to be included in the list of organizations eligible for

official development assistance as determined by OECD and guidance on the eligibility of participants for financial support for attending meetings.¹

47. The Plenary adopted the decision without amendment. Decision IPBES-3/2, on financial and budgetary arrangements, is set out in the annex to the present report.

48. During adoption of the present report one representative said that during its discussions the budget contact group had agreed that all members of the Platform should explore the use of virtual and other electronic means of conducting meetings, insofar as possible, and that the secretariat should provide an analysis and report on the use of, and savings realized through, such means throughout the Platform at the next session of the Plenary. The Plenary agreed that the agreement of the contact group in that regard should be reflected in the present section.

C. Technical support units

49. Introducing the sub-item, the representative of the secretariat recalled that in its decision IPBES-2/5 the Plenary had welcomed offers of in-kind contributions to support the implementation of the work programme and had requested the secretariat in consultation with the Bureau to establish the institutional arrangements necessary to operationalize technical support. In response to the decision, technical support units had been established for all three task forces and for the thematic assessment on scenario analysis and modelling, and other technical support arrangements had been made for the assessment on pollination and pollinators associated with food production and for supporting the delivery of regional and subregional assessments. Information on the technical support units was presented in a report on the 2014–2018 work programme (IPBES/3/2) and a report on institutional arrangements established to operationalize technical support (IPBES/3/INF/13).

50. The Plenary took note of the information presented.

VII. Rules and procedures for the operation of the Platform

A. Nomination and selection of members of the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel

51. Introducing the sub-item, the representative of the secretariat recalled that in its decision IPBES-2/1 the Plenary had approved amendments to its rules of procedure with regard to the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel. It had also provided further guidance on the process for nominating and selecting members of the Panel at its third session. She also drew attention to a report prepared by the secretariat working with the Bureau on the nomination and selection process for the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel (IPBES/3/11), including a list of nominees submitted by Governments for consideration by the Plenary at its third session, a compilation of information on the nominees (IPBES/3/INF/15 and its addenda) and a note by the secretariat (IPBES/3/INF/16) on guidance to Governments on the nomination and selection process and on a report by the interim Panel on lessons learned with regard to its functioning and the means of improving it. The Chair encouraged members to use the available information and guidance in intraregional and interregional consultations to facilitate the selection of a fully balanced Panel membership.

52. Subsequently the Plenary, in accordance with rules 25–28 of the rules of procedure, elected the following members of the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel:

From African States:

Mr. Moustafa Mokhtar Ali Fouda* (Egypt)

Mr. Sebsebe Demissew* (Ethiopia)

Mr. Jean Bruno Mikissa* (Gabon)

¹ The following issue was discussed by the contact group but not reported directly to the Plenary. The eligibility of the Platform trust fund for official development assistance had been discussed in the budget contact group. The contact group had considered that funds contributed to the trust fund constituted official development assistance by virtue of the trust fund being held and managed by UNEP. In support of further discussions on the matter at the fourth session of the Plenary, the group requested the secretariat to prepare an information document on how other platforms and multilateral environmental agreements provided support to ensure equitable geographical participation in their governance and programmatic processes. In the interim the secretariat would continue to apply the same approach used in the first year of implementation of the work programme. In addition, the representative of the European Union had requested that nationals or residents of European Union member States or experts nominated by European Union member States should not be provided with financial support from the Platform trust fund in future activities.

Ms. Voahangy Raharimalala (Madagascar)

Ms. Charlotte Karibuhoye (Senegal)

From Asian-Pacific States:

Ms. Yi Huang (China)

Mr. Vinod Mathur* (India)

Mr. Rosichon Ubaidillah (Indonesia)

Mr. Yoshihisa Shirayama* (Japan)

Mr. Leng Guan Saw (Malaysia)

From Eastern European States:

Mr. Ruslan Novitsky (Belarus)

Ms. Maja Vasiljević (Croatia)

Ms. Tamar Pataridze* (Georgia)

Mr. György Pataki* (Hungary)

Mr. Günay Erpul* (Turkey)

From Latin American and Caribbean States:

Ms. Sandra Díaz* (Argentina)

Mr. Carlos Alfredo Joly* (Brazil)

Ms. Brigitte Baptiste (Colombia)

Mr. Rodrigo Medellín (Mexico)

Mr. Floyd M. Homer* (Trinidad and Tobago)

From Western European and other States:

Mr. Mark Lonsdale* (Australia)

Mr. Paul Leadley* (France)

Ms. Marie Roué (France)

Mr. Unai Pascual (Spain)

Ms. Marie Stenseke (Sweden)

Members of the Panel whose names are marked with an asterisk in the list above were serving members who were re-elected.

B. Procedures for the preparation of Platform deliverables

53. Introducing the sub-item, the representative of the secretariat recalled that in its decision IPBES-2/3 the Plenary had approved procedures for the preparation of the Platform's deliverables (see IPBES/3/12) but, owing to time constraints, had left some text enclosed in square brackets to indicate that it had not been agreed, with a view to its further consideration at its third session. Agreement on the bracketed text, she said, was necessary for the continued implementation of the work programme. The Plenary established a contact group, co-chaired by Ms. Senka Barudanovic (Bosnia and Herzegovina) and Mr. Robert Watson (United Kingdom), with the aim of reviewing and seeking agreement on the procedures.

54. The co-chair of the contact group subsequently reported on the group's deliberations, saying that it had reached agreement on procedures for the preparation of Platform deliverables (IPBES/3/L.2). He noted that two paragraphs relating to funding for the participation in workshops of experts from developing countries and countries with economies in transition and indigenous and local knowledge holders were enclosed in square brackets, pending resolution of financial and budgetary arrangements.

55. The Plenary then adopted the procedures for the preparation of Platform deliverables as agreed by the contact group without amendment. The procedures as adopted are set out in annex I to decision IPBES-3/3, on rules and procedures for the operation of the Platform, as set out in the annex to the present report.

C. Procedure for the review of the Platform

56. Introducing the sub-item, the representative of the secretariat recalled that in its decision IPBES-2/5 the Plenary had requested the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel, in consultation with the Bureau, to develop a procedure for the review of the effectiveness of the administrative and scientific functions of the Platform. In accordance with the decision, a draft procedure was in the process of being developed and the current draft (IPBES/3/INF/11) was before the Plenary, which was invited to provide guidance to facilitate its further development for consideration at the Plenary's fourth session. Following its discussion the Plenary agreed that the contact group established under agenda item 7 (b) (see section VII B above) would also consider the review of the platform further.

57. Subsequently the co-chair of the contact group reported that the group had discussed the progress report on the development of a procedure for reviewing the effectiveness of the administrative and scientific functions of the Platform (see IPBES/3/INF/11) and had agreed that it would be useful for countries to send comments on the progress report to the secretariat and the Bureau to facilitate consideration of the issue at the Plenary's fourth session. The Plenary then endorsed the suggestion of the group that countries provide comments on the progress report to the secretariat and, through the secretariat, the Bureau.

D. Policy and procedures for the admission of observers

58. Introducing the sub-item, the representative of the secretariat recalled that at its second session the Plenary had not had time to complete discussion of the draft policy and procedures for the admission of observers, although it had agreed to use the procedures agreed upon at its first session (IPBES/1/12, para. 22) at the current session. She went on to introduce a draft policy and procedures (IPBES/3/13). A number of participants expressed views on the bracketed text within the draft text, with strong views expressed relating to each of the two options. The Plenary agreed that the contact group established under agenda item 7 (b) (see sect. VII.B above) would also address the issue of observers, with the aim of reviewing and seeking agreement on the draft procedures.

59. Subsequently the co-chair of the contact group reported that the discussions in the group had revealed that positions regarding whether the admission of observers should be effected by consensus had not changed since the second session of the Plenary. The contact group had therefore not discussed the matter at length. Upon the recommendation of the contact group, 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 and applied for its second and third sessions, would be applied at its fourth session.

60. The Plenary also decided that at its fourth session it would further consider the draft policy and procedures for the admission of observers.

E. Conflict of interest policy

61. Introducing the sub-item, the representative of the secretariat recalled that at its second session the Plenary had not had time to complete discussion of the draft conflict of interest policy. The draft policy had since been revised by the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel and the Bureau in the light of experience since the second session and was before the Plenary for consideration (IPBES/3/14). The Plenary agreed that the contact group established under agenda item 7 (b) (section VII B above) would also address conflicts of interest, with the aim of reviewing and seeking agreement on the draft policy.

62. The co-chair of the contact group subsequently reported on the group's deliberations, saying that it had reached agreement on a draft decision on a conflict of interest policy and implementation procedures (IPBES/3/L.6). The Plenary then adopted the draft decision without amendment. The decision as adopted is set out in paragraph 2 of decision IPBES-3/3, on rules and procedures for the operation of the Platform, as set out in the annex to the present report.

VIII. Communications and stakeholder engagement

A. Communications and outreach strategy

B. Stakeholder engagement strategy

63. The Plenary discussed agenda items 8 (a) and 8 (b) together.

64. Introducing the sub-items, the representative of the secretariat recalled that in its decision IPBES-2/9, on communications and outreach, the Plenary had requested the secretariat to prepare a draft communications and outreach strategy for consideration by the Plenary at the current session and to develop and implement a policy on the use of the Platform logo. The draft communications and outreach strategy (IPBES/3/15 and IPBES/3/INF/9, sect. I) and the policy on the use of the logo (IPBES/3/INF/9, sect. II) were before the Plenary.

65. She also recalled that at its second session the Plenary had not had sufficient time to complete consideration of the draft stakeholder engagement strategy (IPBES/2/13) and had accordingly deferred discussion of it to the current session. The secretariat had since then further revised the draft strategy, including to address comments made during the second session. The strategy as so revised (IPBES/3/16 and IPBES/3/INF/10) was before the Plenary.

66. The Plenary was invited to consider both strategies, and in particular the two proposed options for oversight of the development, operation and implementation of the stakeholder engagement strategy.

67. In the ensuing discussion participants broadly welcomed the documents, saying that their consideration should be completed urgently. There was a difference of opinion, however, concerning oversight of the stakeholder engagement strategy.

68. Following its discussion the Plenary established a contact group, co-chaired by Mr. Leonel Sierralta (Chile) and Mr. Fundisile Mketeni (South Africa), to complete consideration of the issues.

69. The co-chairs of the contact group subsequently reported on the group's deliberations, saying that it had reached agreement on draft decisions on the communications and outreach strategy (IPBES/3/L.5) and on the stakeholder engagement strategy (IPBES/3/L.15).

70. The Plenary then adopted the draft decision on the communications and outreach strategy as orally amended and the draft decision on the stakeholder engagement strategy without amendment. The decisions as adopted are set out in paragraphs 1 and 2 and 3–5, respectively, of decision IPBES-3/4, on communication, stakeholder engagement and strategic partnerships, as set out in the annex to the present report.

C. Guidance on strategic partnerships

71. Introducing the sub-item, the representative of the secretariat recalled that the Plenary had not had sufficient time at its second session to complete consideration of the draft guidance on strategic partnerships and had accordingly deferred discussion to its third session. Since then the secretariat, working with the Bureau, had revised the draft guidance to take account of the views expressed during the second session as well as experience to date in supporting implementation of the work programme (IPBES/3/17). The Plenary was invited to consider adopting the draft guidance with any necessary amendments. In the light of specific comments by one member, the secretariat was requested to prepare a revised draft of the guidance for consideration by the Plenary.

72. The Plenary subsequently adopted a draft decision on strategic partnerships (IPBES/3/L.8). The decision as adopted is set out in paragraphs 6–8 of decision IPBES-3/4, on communications, stakeholder engagement and strategic partnerships, as set out in the annex to the present report.

73. During adoption of the decision one representative expressed her country's understanding that paragraph 2 of the decision invited the secretariats of multilateral environmental agreements to "work with the Bureau" of the Platform through the Platform secretariat rather than directly.

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

74. Introducing the item, the Executive Secretary recalled that in its decision IPBES/2-8 the Plenary had approved a collaborative partnership arrangement with FAO, UNDP, UNEP and UNESCO. A representative of UNESCO, speaking on behalf of the four organizations, then reported on work undertaken relevant to the collaborative partnership agreement, outlining the information set out in document IPBES/3/INF/14 and highlighting a range of contributions to specific Platform deliverables.

75. The Plenary took note of the information presented.

X. Provisional agenda, date and venue of future sessions of the Plenary

76. The Plenary decided that the secretariat, working with the Bureau, would develop the agenda for the fourth session of the Plenary and that the Bureau would decide on the date and venue of the session. Governments in a position to host the session were invited to submit offers to do so to the secretariat by the end of February 2015.

XI. Adoption of decisions and report of the session

77. The Plenary adopted decisions IPBES-3/1–IPBES-3/4 as set out in the annex to the present report.

78. The Plenary adopted the present report on the basis of the draft report set out in document IPBES/3/L.1, on the understanding that the report would be finalized by the secretariat under the supervision of the Bureau.

XII. Other matters

A. Presentation by the Chair of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change

79. Mr. Rajendra Pachauri, Chair of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, gave a presentation on the experience of the Panel in preparing its fifth assessment report. He explained that preparation of the report had involved the efforts of three working groups, each of which involved 200–300 authors and cited around 10,000 scientific publications. Each report had received | 40,000–50,000 comments during its review phase. A synthesis report, which drew on the three reports, had been prepared by a 50-person core writing team, and that report had received some 6,000 review comments. Key messages of the report were that human influence on the climate system was clear; that the more humans disrupted the climate the more they risked severe, pervasive and irreversible impacts; and that humans had the means to limit climate change and to build a more prosperous, sustainable future. He then went on to highlight some of the implications of climate change for biodiversity, extreme weather and climate events and food production. He also spoke about mitigation and adaptation measures. In response to questions from participants he expressed cautious optimism about society's ability to respond to climate change, although he said that some impacts would be inevitable.

80. Following Mr. Pachauri's presentation the representative of Peru drew attention to the Lima 2014 Declaration on Biodiversity and Climate Change from Science to Policy-makers, for Sustainable Development, saying that it resulted from a meeting that had taken place in the margins of the twentieth session of the Conference of the Parties to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change. The meeting had been organized by the Ministry of Environment of Peru, the National Council for Science and Technology, and the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity, with the support of the Inter-American Institute for Global Change Research and German Cooperation for Development.

B. Substitution of a member of the Bureau

81. During the plenary session on the morning of 18 January, the representative of the Eastern European region reported that owing to the press of other duties Mr. Ioseb Kartsivadze (Georgia) would resign from the Bureau. In accordance with rules 16 and 21 of the rules of procedure it was

agreed that the alternate member for the region, Mr. Adem Bilgin (Turkey), would take his place on the Bureau.

C. Twelfth meeting of the Conference of the Contracting Parties to the Convention on Wetlands of International Importance especially as Waterfowl Habitat

82. The representative of Uruguay invited all members of the Platform to attend the twelfth meeting of the Conference of the Contracting Parties to the Convention on Wetlands of International Importance especially as Waterfowl Habitat, which was scheduled to take place in Punta del Este, Uruguay, from 1 to 9 June 2015.

XIII. Closure of the session

83. Following the customary exchange of courtesies, the Chair declared the session closed at 7.15 p.m. on 18 January 2015.

Annex

Decisions of the Plenary of the Platform adopted at its third session

IPBES-3/1: Work programme for the period 2014–2018

IPBES-3/2: Financial and budgetary arrangements

IPBES-3/3: Rules and procedures for the operation of the Platform

IPBES-3/4: Communication, stakeholder engagement and strategic partnerships

Decision IPBES-3/1: Work programme for the period 2014–2018

The Plenary,

Welcoming the report of the Executive Secretary on the implementation of the work programme for 2014–2018,¹ which includes lessons learned and options for the further implementation of the work programme,

Decides to proceed with the implementation of the work programme in accordance with the modalities set out below, the timetable in figure 1 and the approved budget set out in decision IPBES-3/2;

I

Capacity-building

Welcoming the establishment of a task force on capacity-building for the period 2014–2018 for the implementation of deliverables 1 (a) and 1 (b) of the work programme,

1. *Approves* the list of priority capacity-building needs of the Platform set out in annex I to the present decision and requests the task force on capacity-building and its technical support unit to work with all relevant subsidiary bodies under the Platform in ensuring that these needs are fully addressed and that progress in meeting them is kept under review and reported to the Plenary on a regular basis;

2. *Takes note* of the draft programme on fellowship, exchange and training² and requests that the task force on capacity-building and its technical support unit complete the pilot implementation of the draft programme, report on progress with the pilot implementation and make recommendations for the further development and implementation of the programme to the Plenary at its fourth session;

3. *Also takes note* of the preliminary plans for convening, in 2015, the first capacity-building forum of the Platform with representatives of conventional and potential sources of funding and requests the Bureau, with the support of the secretariat, and the task force on capacity-building and its technical support unit, to convene the forum during the second half of 2015 on the basis of a call for expressions of interest to take part in the forum and requests a report on the outcome of the forum to the Plenary at its fourth session;

II

Knowledge foundations

Welcoming the establishment of a task force on indigenous and local knowledge systems to implement deliverable 1 (c) of the work programme and of the task force on knowledge and data to implement deliverables 1 (d) and 4 (b) of the work programme,

1. *Notes* the progress made in the development, for consideration by the Plenary at its fourth session, of draft procedures for and approaches to working with indigenous and local knowledge³ as informed by, inter alia, the pilot global dialogue on indigenous and local knowledge for the assessment of pollination and pollinators associated with food production and the way it might be used in all assessments;

2. *Decides* to continue to pilot the preliminary guide on indigenous and local knowledge approaches and procedures in the thematic assessments and in the four regional assessments (the Americas, Africa, Asia and the Pacific, and Europe and Central Asia);

3. *Notes* the progress made in the establishment of a roster of experts and a participatory mechanism for working with indigenous and local knowledge systems;⁴

4. *Approves* the data and information management plan set out in annex II;

¹ IPBES/3/2.

² See IPBES/3/3.

³ See IPBES/3/INF/2.

⁴ See IPBES/3/INF/3.

5. *Requests* the Secretariat to submit to the Plenary for information, data and information management plans for each ongoing assessment and to develop data and information management plans in the context of any scoping process or report;

6. *Notes* the progress made by the task force on knowledge and data in the development of a knowledge and data strategy⁵ and requests that information about the strategy be reported to the Plenary at its fourth session;

III

Global, regional and subregional assessments

1. *Notes* the development of a draft guide to the production and integration of assessments from and across all levels⁶ and requests that the guide be completed as provided in decision IPBES-2/5 with a view to its becoming a living document that would be regularly reviewed and updated as necessary, building on lessons learned and best practices from the implementation of the work programme of the Platform;

2. *Approves* the undertaking of regional and subregional assessments in accordance with the procedures for the preparation of the Platform's deliverables set out in the annex to decision IPBES-2/3 and the generic scoping report for the regional and subregional assessments of biodiversity and ecosystem services set out in annex III to the present decision, for consideration by the Plenary at its sixth session, as follows:

(a) Regional and subregional assessment for Africa as outlined in the scoping report set out in annex IV to the present decision;

(b) Regional and subregional assessment for the Americas as outlined in the scoping report set out in annex V to the present decision;

(c) Regional and subregional assessment for Asia and the Pacific as outlined in the scoping report set out in annex VI to the present decision;

(d) Regional and subregional assessment for Europe and Central Asia as outlined in the scoping report set out in annex VII to the present decision;

3. *Agrees* to consider at its fourth session the option of undertaking a regional assessment for the Open Ocean region;

4. *Approves* a scoping process for a global assessment of biodiversity and ecosystem services, for consideration by the Plenary at its fourth session, in accordance with the procedures for the preparation of Platform deliverables as set out in the note by the secretariat on the initial scoping report for a global assessment on biodiversity and ecosystem services,⁷ which will largely but not exclusively rely on the compilation and synthesis of current data, knowledge and information from thematic, regional and methodological assessments;

5. *Requests* the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel, in consultation with the Bureau, to develop a coordinated approach among the approved processes for the regional and subregional assessments, the thematic assessments and a global assessment, as resources permit, with a view to ensuring consistency while maintaining the quality of each of the assessments;

IV

Thematic assessments

1. *Notes* the progress made in the ongoing assessments of pollination and pollinators associated with food production;⁸

2. *Approves* the undertaking of a thematic assessment on land degradation and restoration in accordance with the procedures for the preparation of Platform deliverables, as

⁵ Ibid.

⁶ See IPBES/3/INF/4.

⁷ See IPBES/3/9.

⁸ See IPBES/3/INF/5.

outlined in the scoping document set out in annex VIII to the present decision, for consideration by the Plenary at its sixth session;

3. *Also approves* the initiation of scoping, primarily using virtual approaches, for a thematic assessment of invasive alien species, for consideration by the Plenary at its fourth session;

4. *Further approves* the initiation of scoping, primarily using virtual approaches, for a thematic assessment of sustainable use of biodiversity, for consideration by the Plenary at its fourth session;

V

Methodological assessments

1. *Notes* the progress made in the ongoing assessments of scenarios analysis and modelling of biodiversity and ecosystem services;⁹

2. *Approves*, until the fourth session of the Plenary, the continuation of the expert group established for the development of the preliminary guide on the conceptualization of values of biodiversity and nature's benefits to people,¹⁰ which, at the discretion of the Chair, following consultations with the Bureau, could be expanded to include a limited number of resource persons and representatives of strategic partners as resources permit;

3. *Requests* the expert group to revise the preliminary guide following an open review by Governments and stakeholders, to revise the report on scoping for the methodological assessment regarding diverse conceptualization of multiple values of nature and its benefits, including biodiversity and ecosystem functions and services,¹¹ based on comments received following an open review by Governments and stakeholders, for consideration by the Plenary at its fourth session, and to work in a mutually supportive way with the task force on indigenous and local knowledge systems and other expert groups and task forces established with regard to relevant deliverables, including ongoing assessments and the work on the catalogue of policy support tools and methodologies;

VI

Catalogue of assessments

Takes note of the report on the status of the catalogue of assessments¹² and requests the Executive Secretary to continue to maintain the online catalogue of assessments, to collaborate further with existing networks and initiatives to enhance further the online catalogue and to undertake another review of the assessment landscape and lessons learned in time to inform the review of the Platform called for in deliverable 4 (e);

VII

Catalogue of policy tools and methodologies

1. *Notes* the development of a proposed catalogue of policy support tools and methodologies and the guidance for its use,¹³ as well as the development of preliminary guidance on how the further development of such tools and methodologies could be promoted and catalysed in the context of the Platform;

2. *Requests* the Executive Secretary, in consultation with the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel and the Bureau, to submit the proposed catalogue and the preliminary guidance on policy support tools and methodologies in the context of the Platform for review by Platform members, observers and stakeholders and to undertake work to establish the catalogue;

⁹ See IPBES/3/INF/6.

¹⁰ See IPBES/3/INF/7.

¹¹ See IPBES/3/8.

¹² See IPBES/3/INF/20.

¹³ See IPBES/3/5.

3. *Requests* the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel and the Bureau to further develop, as set out in decision IPBES-2/5, guidance for consideration by the Plenary at its fourth session on how policy support tools and methodologies could be promoted and catalysed in the context of the Platform;

4. *Approves* the continuation of the expert group to support the review and to complete its current work on the catalogue and preliminary guide;

VIII

Technical support for the work programme

1. *Welcomes* the offers of in-kind contributions to support the implementation of the work programme that had been received as at 17 January 2015, listed in annex II to decision IPBES-3/2, and invites the submission, by 31 January 2015, of additional offers of in-kind contributions to support the implementation of the work programme;

2. *Requests* the secretariat, in consultation with the Bureau and in accordance with the approved budget set out in the annex to decision IPBES-3/2, to establish the institutional arrangements necessary to operationalize technical support.

Timetable for the work programme 2014–2018

Year	2014				2015				2016				2017				2018				2019						
	1st quarter	2nd quarter	3rd quarter	4th quarter	1st quarter	2nd quarter	3rd quarter	4th quarter	1st quarter	2nd quarter	3rd quarter	4th quarter	1st quarter	2nd quarter	3rd quarter	4th quarter	1st quarter	2nd quarter	3rd quarter	4th quarter	1st quarter	2nd quarter	3rd quarter	4th quarter			
Deliverable					IPBES 3 12–17 Jan					IPBES 4 (8 - 14 Feb) (tbc)					IPBES 5 (6 - 12 Mar) (tbc)					IPBES 6 (9 - 15 Apr) (tbc)						IPBES 7 (13 - 19 May) (tbc)	
1 (a) and 1 (b)	Task force on capacity-building																										
1 (c)	Task force on indigenous and local knowledge systems																										
1 (d) and 4 (b)	Task force on knowledge and data																										
2 (a)	Assessment guide																										
2 (b)		Scoping	Regional/subregional assessments of biodiversity and ecosystem services																								
2 (c)			Scoping	Global assessment of biodiversity and ecosystem services																							
3 (a)	Thematic assessment of pollination																										
3 (b) (i)		Scoping	Thematic assessment of land degradation and restoration																								
3 (b) (ii)			Scoping	Thematic assessment of invasive alien species																							
3 (b) (iii)			Scoping	Thematic assessment of sustainable use of biodiversity																							

3 (c)	Methodological assessment of scenario analysis and modelling		Further development of tools and methods for scenario analysis and modelling	
3 (d)	Scoping and guide review		Methodological assessment of diverse conceptualization of values	Further development of tools and methods on conceptualization of values
4 (a)	Catalogue of assessments			
4 (c)	Catalogue of policy support tools and methodologies			
4 (d)	Communication and stakeholder engagement			
4 (e)			Evaluation	Evaluation

Annex I

Revised list of priority capacity-building needs (deliverables 1 (a) and 1 (b))

1. The Platform prioritizes in accordance with its functions and key capacity-building needs to improve the science-policy interface at appropriate levels and then provides and calls for financial and other support for those needs of highest priority that are related directly to its activities, as decided by the Plenary. The work programme 2014–2018 sets out to ensure that priority capacity-building needs relevant to the implementation of the Platform work programme are matched with resources through catalysing financial and in-kind support.

2. The highest priority capacity-building needs are those that fulfil the following criteria:

(a) They can be addressed through activities that are integrated into deliverables of the Platform work programme (resourced through the Platform trust fund, in-kind contributions, the capacity-building forum and the matchmaking facility);

or:

(b) They can be addressed through activities that enable the implementation of the Platform work programme (resourced through the capacity-building forum and the matchmaking facility);

and in both cases:

(c) They are driven by demands expressed and promote the sustainability of capacity-building over time, including by building on existing initiatives and institutions;

(d) They stimulate awareness of and engagement with the Platform and support the implementation of and interlinkages among multilateral environmental agreements.

3. The Platform acknowledges with appreciation the expressions of capacity-building needs received through submissions and consultations. The expressions are summarized and categorized in the table below. The table also suggests how such needs can be matched with resources.

4. Drawing on the expressions of capacity-building needs identified in the table, the following initial priority needs are proposed, together with the most appropriate approach to identifying sources of support:

(a) 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. This would be resourced through the Platform trust fund and in-kind contributions. The extent and reach of this programme will be increased over time by facilitating the mobilization of resources through the capacity-building forum and the piloting of a prototype matchmaking facility;

(b) Focus on enhancing the capacity to undertake, use and improve national assessments of biodiversity and ecosystem services, by facilitating the development and implementation of proposals based on expressions of interest, and develop the capacity for the use of assessment findings in policy development and decision-making. Facilitation will be resourced through the Platform trust fund and in-kind contributions, while support for the development and implementation of national project proposals will be sought through the capacity-building forum and the piloting of a prototype matchmaking facility;

(c) Focus on the development and implementation of pilot or demonstration projects addressing other categories of needs, by facilitating the development and implementation of proposals based on expressions of interest. Facilitation will be resourced through the Platform trust fund and in-kind contributions, while support for the development and the implementation of national project proposals will be sought through the capacity-building forum and piloting of the matchmaking facility;

(d) Also, the Platform acknowledges the specific capacity-building needs related to the development and the strengthening of the participatory mechanism and indigenous and local knowledge approaches and procedures through the Platform trust fund and in-kind contributions.

Capacity-building needs identified by members and other stakeholders and potential sources of support for addressing their needs

<i>Capacity need categories</i>	<i>Needs identified by Governments and other stakeholders</i>	<i>Potential source of support</i>		
		<i>Trust fund</i>	<i>Matchmaking facility</i>	<i>Notes</i>
1. Enhance the capacity to participate effectively in implementing the Platform work programme	1.1 Develop the capacity for effective participation in the Platform regional and global assessments	✓	✓	Priority for the Platform trust fund, largely delivered through the fellowship, exchange and training programme
	1.2 Develop the capacity for effective participation in the Platform thematic assessments	✓	✓	
	1.3 Develop the capacity for effective participation in the Platform methodological assessments and for the development of policy support tools and methodologies	✓	✓	Supplemented through the Platform matchmaking facility
	1.4 Develop the capacity for monitoring national and regional participation in the implementation of the Platform work programme, and responding to deficiencies identified	✓		
2. Develop the capacity to carry out and use national and regional assessments	2.1 Develop the capacity to carry out assessments, including on different initiatives, methodologies and approaches	✓	✓	Priority for the Platform matchmaking facility
	2.2 Develop the capacity among policymakers and practitioners for the use of assessment findings in policy development and decision-making	✓	✓	
	2.3 Develop the capacity to develop and use non-market-based methods of valuing biodiversity and ecosystem services	✓	✓	
	2.4 Develop the capacity to assess specific priority habitats and ecosystems, including ecosystems that cross ecological and political boundaries	✓	✓	
	2.5 Develop the capacity to develop and effectively use indicators in assessments		✓	
	2.6 Develop the capacity to value and assess management options and effectiveness	✓	✓	
	2.7 Develop the capacity to retrieve and use all relevant data, information and knowledge	✓	✓	
	2.8 Develop the capacity to introduce different worldviews and indigenous and local knowledge systems into the different assessments		✓	

<i>Capacity need categories</i>	<i>Needs identified by Governments and other stakeholders</i>	<i>Potential source of support</i>		
		<i>Trust fund</i>	<i>Matchmaking facility</i>	<i>Notes</i>
3. Develop the capacity to locate and mobilize financial and technical resources	3.1 Develop the institutional capacity to locate and mobilize financial and technical resources	✓	✓	Pilot project(s) through the Platform matchmaking facility
	3.2 Develop the capacity for clearly communicating capacity-building needs to potential providers of financial and technical support		✓	
	3.3 Develop the capacity to identify current investments as well as the gap between identified needs and available resources for the effective strengthening of the science-policy interface on biodiversity and ecosystem services		✓	
	3.4 Develop the capacity to mobilize the institutional and technical resources to manage data and knowledge for the effective monitoring of biodiversity and ecosystem services	(✓)		
4. Improve the capacity for access to data, information and knowledge (including the experience of others)	4.1 Develop the capacity for improved access to data, information and knowledge, including its capture, generation, management and use (including indigenous and local knowledge and knowledge from participatory science, social networks and large volumes of data)	(✓)	✓	Pilot project(s) through the Platform matchmaking facility
	4.2 Develop the capacity to gain access to data, information and knowledge managed by internationally active organizations and publishers		✓	
	4.3 Develop the capacity for enhancing collaboration among research institutions and policymakers at the national and regional levels, in particular for encouraging multidisciplinary and cross-sectoral approaches	✓	✓	
	4.4 Develop the capacity for the conversion of scientific and social assessments of biodiversity and ecosystem services into a format easily understood by policymakers	✓	✓	
	4.5 Develop the effective capacity to promote an interscientific dialogue between different world views, modern science and indigenous and local knowledge systems, including by facilitating the effective engagement of indigenous and local communities, scientists and policymakers	✓	✓	
	4.6 Develop the capacity to gain access to and use technologies and networks that support biodiversity taxonomy, monitoring and research		✓	

<i>Capacity need categories</i>	<i>Needs identified by Governments and other stakeholders</i>	<i>Potential source of support</i>		
		<i>Trust fund</i>	<i>Matchmaking facility</i>	<i>Notes</i>
5. Develop the capacity for enhanced and meaningful multi-stakeholder engagement	5.1 Develop the capacity for effective engagement of stakeholders in assessment and other related activities at the national level, including for understanding who the stakeholders are and how they should be engaged		✓	Pilot project(s) through the Platform matchmaking facility
	5.2 Develop the capacity for effective communication of why biodiversity and ecosystem services are important and why their many values should be used in decision-making	✓	✓	
	5.3 Develop the capacity to effectively use the Platform's deliverables in implementing national obligations under biodiversity-related multilateral environmental agreements	✓	✓	
	5.4 Develop the capacity to strengthen different networks of actors, including those of indigenous and local peoples, for strengthening the sharing of information among different knowledge systems		✓	

Annex II

Data and information management plan (deliverables 1 (d) and 4 (b))

I. Context

1. In order to strengthen the foundations of the science-policy interface, the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services agreed on a work programme for the period 2014–2018. This work programme includes deliverable 1 (d), which aims to ensure that priority knowledge, information and data needs for policymaking are met by catalysing efforts to generate new knowledge and by networking, and deliverable 4 (b), which aims to develop a data and information management plan. The task force on knowledge and data established by the Plenary is responsible for both of these deliverables. Key functions of the task force include the mandate to identify and prioritize key scientific knowledge needed for policymakers at appropriate scales; to facilitate access to requisite knowledge, information and data and to provide guidance on the management thereof; and to catalyse efforts to generate new knowledge in dialogue with scientific organizations, policymakers and funding organizations.
2. The draft data and information management plan was prepared by the secretariat, working with the Bureau and the task force.
3. The primary motivation for the Plenary's request for a data and information management plan (see decision IPBES-2/5, annex III) is to ensure access, in the future, both to the Platform's outputs and to the knowledge, information and data needed for their realization. This is important in respect of both the transparency and the replicability of findings and is therefore a key issue for the credibility of the Platform. Moreover, it is normal practice in the process of producing peer-reviewed publications for the knowledge, information and data on which analyses and findings are based to be disclosed and traceable.
4. The development of the plan will support long-term secure access to the knowledge, information and data gathered through activities of the Platform. The task force, supported by the technical support unit, will implement the plan, building on current international initiatives and reflecting the approach of strategic partnerships or other mechanisms pursued by the Plenary.
5. The plan is being developed by the task force as part of a broader knowledge, information and data strategy (see IPBES/3/INF/3) that aims to guide the work of the task force over the years of its existence, providing a context for other deliverables involving knowledge, information and data while also serving as a source document for other outputs of the task force.
6. The Platform intends to draw rigorously on existing knowledge and catalyse the development of new knowledge from diverse sources of quality-assured data and information. Consequently, it will need to support partners and/or put in place processes and structures to safeguard and improve the quality of data in compliance with various policy objectives; to ensure data longevity; to build partnerships with service contributors and custodians of data and information; and to foster consistency across the deliverables of the Platform and their sharing through supporting community-wide development of standards and guidelines. These processes and structures must be able to accommodate and integrate diverse disciplines and knowledge systems and provide for processes for the review of data.
7. These processes must interact strongly with other activities of the Platform, including the other task forces and assessments. The task force on indigenous and local knowledge systems is developing procedures for and approaches to working with indigenous and local knowledge holders. The task force on capacity-building will drive a wide range of capacity-building activities, including measures to improve access to existing knowledge, information and data. A close working relationship between the three task forces will be established to facilitate full access to the knowledge that will be needed for activities and deliverables related to the Platform. All three task forces will collaborate in the design of methodological guidelines, in the development of indicators and metrics and in the planning and convening of science-policy dialogues for consistent use across the Platform.

8. It is envisaged that the task force on knowledge and data will give advice during the scoping and delivery of the Platform assessments. During the scoping process, the task force will provide advice on data quality by ensuring the rigorous identification of relevant knowledge, information and data. It will ensure that full consideration is given to the identification and use, where appropriate, of common methodologies, measures and indicators, used consistently within and across assessments to ensure data comparability. During the preparation and delivery of an assessment, the task force will provide support with regard to access to and the management and quality control of knowledge, information and data. The task force will also provide support in relaying information on gaps in scientific knowledge and data identified during the assessments to relevant partners and catalyse the process of filling those gaps. In addition, the task force has the mandate to identify key data and information management priorities for policymakers and to facilitate access to the knowledge, information and data needed in decision-making. Accordingly, the task force will support the Platform's work on policy support tools and methodologies by developing and providing data and information management guidelines for assessments and by identifying data and information management gaps.

II. Objectives of the data and information management plan

9. The existing landscape of data, information and knowledge services relevant for the Platform is diverse and evolving, and it lacks coordination. Current sources of data needed by the Platform will be critically reviewed and categorized by the task force in partnership with others during 2015 in order to support delivery of the scheduled assessments and policy support tools and methodologies and provide for long-term access to the data and information used in assessments.

10. The aim of the plan in the first instance is to ensure that the knowledge foundations of the Platform are in place in 2015. To achieve this, the task force has identified the following operational objectives, to be achieved through a set of urgent, high-priority activities (see sect. IV below), as follows:

(a) Establishment of standards and guidelines for managing information and data and identification of possible indicators and metrics to be used in the Platform's products;

(b) Enabling of access to the data, information and knowledge needed in delivering scheduled assessments and using identified policy support tools and methodologies through a sustainable data and information platform;

(c) Identification of means of systematically identifying and addressing the data and information gaps and needs of the Platform;

(d) Formation of close collaboration with relevant international initiatives to support the Platform in implementing the plan.

11. As the Platform's needs develop, along with the proposed strategy for knowledge, information and data, which will survey and formulate broader needs in this area across the Platform, the plan will be revised and updated regularly by the task force.

III. Principles for managing knowledge, information and data in the Platform

12. The following principles build on and expand the Platform's operating principles in the context of knowledge, information and data and will guide implementation of the plan:

(a) *Quality and security.* Developers and users of the Platform's deliverables must be able to rely on the quality of the knowledge on which they are based and the lifespan and integrity of data. Accordingly, the plan will build processes that help, first, to provide access to the best knowledge available for different policy objectives; second, to ensure the long-term security and back-up of data; third, to provide transparency (regarding source, process, provenance and traceability) for data and information and for the Platform's indicators and other knowledge outputs; fourth, to promulgate standards for metadata and possibly other descriptive information; and, fifth, to help ensure consistency and the standardization or appropriate interpretation of data and information collected at multiple scales and often through different methodologies and sampling efforts;

(b) *Building knowledge through partnerships.* The custodians of data and knowledge essential to the Platform's work programme are many and diverse, and the programme can only be delivered through collaboration. Consequently, the plan will, first, enhance delivery across the whole Platform by interacting with and supporting other deliverables; second, avoid duplication by maintaining productive relationships with relevant players; third, recognize the needs and interests of custodians of data and knowledge, such as access rights and intellectual property rights, in particular

the need to respect information provided by and the knowledge of indigenous peoples and local communities, which includes, as appropriate, consideration of seeking prior informed consent or approval and the involvement of indigenous peoples and local communities, who are holders of such information and knowledge, and the sharing of benefits accrued from such information and knowledge; and, fourth, devise schemes to provide incentives for data-sharing and publication;

(c) *Accessibility.* Free and open access to its deliverables and to the material on which they are based is a core value of the Platform. Consequently, the plan will, first, aim for open, permanent access to data and information sources for its deliverables (e.g., in the scientific literature) with minimal restrictions; second, enforce the use of common and accessible file formats in the Platform's deliverables; third, emphasize the need to communicate the availability of data and information; and, fourth, facilitate multilingual discovery and sharing of data and information. The Platform acknowledges that making data and information available online may not always mean it is accessible to member States with limited Internet infrastructure or speed. Therefore, making data and information available in other formats will be crucial for ensuring true accessibility of the data and information produced by the Platform;

(d) *Diverse disciplines and knowledge systems.* Many sources of data, information and knowledge will be critical to the delivery of the Platform's work programme, including natural and social scientific disciplines, along with different types of knowledge such as indigenous and local knowledge systems. For that reason, the plan will foster, first, multidisciplinary; second, knowledge management systems that are inclusive and seek to get the best out of diverse forms of knowledge; third, joint creation of knowledge by both researchers and research users; fourth, equity and balanced regional representation; and, fifth, close collaboration with the task forces on indigenous and local knowledge systems and capacity-building;

(e) *Open science.* The open science approach promotes the generation of knowledge through collaboration based on free and open access to knowledge, information and data. Open science therefore ensures that the work of all the researchers and stakeholders involved is fully recognized and properly attributed. Adoption of these principles and of this approach means a significant cultural change in the ways in which science is done and scientific results and underlying data are shared publicly by authors, journals and research organizations and thus made relevant to society. This cultural change is already happening in various scientific disciplines such as astronomy, neurobiology, molecular genetics and oceanography, among others. In the context of the Platform, the open science approach could engender very significant advances in data integration, analysis and interpretation and could lead to a better understanding of biodiversity and ecosystem services.

IV. Implementing the data and information management plan

13. Taking the objectives outlined above, the task force has identified the high-priority activities set out in the table below.

Proposed implementation of the data and information management plan in 2015

	<i>Activities</i>	<i>By when</i>	<i>Output or outcome</i>
1.	Reviewing and developing data and metadata guidelines	June 2015	Data and metadata guidelines ensuring that Platform products start on a sound and interoperable footing
2.	Providing methodological principles for handling knowledge gaps and uncertainty	June 2015	Principles for handling knowledge gaps and uncertainty ensuring that Platform products start on a sound and interoperable foundation
3.	Developing a proposal for a discovery and access platform for sustainable knowledge, information and data	December 2015	A web-based discovery and access platform, building on a network of relevant initiatives and institutions
4.	Providing ready access to primary research literature for all Platform experts	December 2015	All experts in the assessment expert groups and task forces have access to the full range of literature needed to conduct the assessments
5.	Establishing agreements with key strategic partners regarding knowledge, information and data	December 2015	Long-term collaboration and partnerships in place to provide access to existing data and information needed to support Platform products (e.g., assessments and policy support tools and methodologies)

<i>Activities</i>	<i>By when</i>	<i>Output or outcome</i>
6. Revising data and information management plan based on developments in 2015	December 2015	Plan updated and revised for 2016–2018 based on task forces' proposed knowledge, information and data strategy, consultations across the Platform and findings from other 2015 activities of the task force

14. The activities identified in the table are proposed because they represent either essential long-term planning activities, functions specifically requested by the Plenary or key elements that assessments will need to have in place as the assessment expert groups carry out their tasks. Towards the end of 2015, the broader knowledge, information and data strategy for the period 2015–2018 (see IPBES/3/INF/3) will build on these foundational elements and further develop the knowledge platform of the Platform according to international best practice.

15. The technical support unit will support the task force so that it delivers on its obligations on time and according to its mandate. The Bureau and Multidisciplinary Expert Panel will review all the products of the task force, as appropriate, and ensure links between it and other task forces and relevant expert groups of the Platform. The task force will seek active collaboration with all relevant stakeholders and lead institutions that have oversight and responsibility to drive existing relevant initiatives. These relationships will be developed as defined in the Platform's stakeholder engagement strategy.

16. The following paragraphs describe each of the high-priority activities proposed to implement the plan and identified in the table.

A. Activity 1. Reviewing and developing data and metadata guidelines

17. The task force has identified the following generic types of data, information or knowledge of relevance to the Platform:

(a) **Data:** these are obtained from observations or measurements and form the basis of monitoring, research, assessments and analysis. They may be categorized according to the following aspects:

- (i) Thematic (socioeconomic, ecological, landscape, etc.);
- (ii) Geographical (global, regional, subregional, local);
- (iii) Systematic (taxonomy), descriptive or trait-based;
- (iv) Material from indigenous and local knowledge systems;

(b) **Metadata:** these provide standardized descriptors of data that facilitate their characterization, management and exchange;

(c) **Information:** a quantitative product derived from data through aggregation, integration and analysis. The Platform is likely to rely extensively on the meta-analysis of information in order to produce assessments and knowledge;

(d) **Metrics and indicators:** these provide information that places data in a manner such that they can be used as products to identify trends in key variables, such as the status of a species or ecosystems and ecosystem services. As such, they can effectively feed into policy support tools and methodologies and could be used to support the writing of assessments (in a manner similar to the Global Biodiversity Outlook series of the Convention on Biological Diversity);

(e) **Knowledge and knowledge products:** knowledge is understanding gained through experience, reasoning, interpretation, perception, intuition and learning that is developed as a result of information use and processing. It informs actions that people may take and supports decision-making. In the course of completing its assessments, the Platform will both use and catalyse the generation of knowledge and knowledge products;

(f) **Links and references:** Links, for example those in the form of stable digital object identifiers, and bibliographical references, will provide access to the original data and metadata supporting the Platform's deliverables. In order to guarantee long-term access to that data, the Platform will need to keep an accurate, up-to-date and accessible list of references and links and adopt an open-access policy harmonized across a diversity of sources and knowledge systems.

18. Data and metadata protocols are essential to helping to boost access to, and the usability of, data generated by a community of globally distributed stakeholders. Data that comply with a standard have the same format and meaning (syntax and semantics) and so can be integrated with other data.

For example, in data portals data will be more easily accessed and widely used, allowing for robust analyses. Metadata capture information characterizing the scope and context of collected data vital for their reuse and integration and in this way facilitate their discovery.

19. The task force recommends that internationally accepted data standards and guidelines should be adopted when relevant regarding all types of data that pertain to biodiversity and ecosystem services in a broad sense, which may include species, ecological, agricultural, fisheries, socioeconomic and climate data, among others. Many biodiversity data guidelines (for example those for point occurrence data) have been developed by the community of biodiversity informatics under the umbrella of the biodiversity data standards (www.tdwg.org). Guidelines for many biodiversity and ecosystem data types are still lacking, however.

20. The task force recognizes the existence of many initiatives and systems for biodiversity and ecosystem services where data are not interoperable. The task force recommends an evaluation of data and information types relevant to the Platform that are well covered by existing standards and supports the development of new standards in collaboration with the existing range of stakeholders and organizations at all levels. The task force will work with stakeholders and its strategic partners to foster the interoperability of knowledge and data systems in a manner that promotes general accessibility through well-documented interfaces.

B. Activity 2. Providing methodological principles for handling knowledge gaps and uncertainty

21. Data, derived metrics and models in biodiversity and ecosystem services are imperfect and often limited in their scope. Supporting effective decision-making and policy relies on careful and clear delineation and communication of these limitations. Failing to quantify and document the uncertainty around observations, derived metrics or indicators and predictions may result in false conclusions or unwarranted action, for example regarding trends or prioritization. The guidelines will need to cover the following issues:

(a) Issues surrounding the quality of available raw data (e.g., identification or measurement accuracy and precision) are a key limiting factor for the quality of analyses and the decisions that they support. In addition to preventive or corrective action, data quality should be assessed and reported on in order to inform different types of downstream uses. The Platform will need to provide incentives for actions that contribute to a culture of data quality in biodiversity and ecosystem services, encompassing the development of methods, standards, tools and guidelines for the quality assessment of data and the prevention and correction of errors, policies on data quality and capacity-building;

(b) The results of the aggregation and analysis of available data all have an inherent uncertainty determined by factors including the size and independence of samples, model types and other methodological properties. The Platform's assessments will need to carefully address all sources of potential uncertainty, for example in climate, biodiversity and socioeconomic variables. They are expected to reduce uncertainty through careful methodology, dealing with structural uncertainty, and to characterize the degree of uncertainty in their findings;

(c) The range and scope of biodiversity and ecosystem service data that are available for metrics and analyses often only imperfectly represent the scope of assessment or policy support goals. Usually, data are systematically scarcer for certain regions, taxa, functions and services. Such biases have the potential to distort the Platform's results, indicators and, by extension, knowledge in a way that is not captured by traditional statistical metrics. The task force, with the support of the technical support unit, will develop standards that will allow the Platform's activities carefully and quantitatively to evaluate the congruence between the scope of available information and that of the Platform's assessment and reporting targets. The task force and the technical support unit will support the capacity-building task force in activities that help to document and assess limits to the representativeness of available data for the Platform and the resulting metrics and inference constraints and inform efforts to fill gaps in knowledge.

C. Activity 3. Developing a proposal for a discovery and access platform for sustainable knowledge, information and data

22. The task force, with support from the technical support unit, will develop a web-based infrastructure that facilitates identification and, where possible, access. The Platform's knowledge, information and data discovery and access system will build on and collaborate closely with partners, such as existing networks, to ensure the streamlined linkage of data and information, with appropriate attribution and metadata, into the Platform's assessments and repositories such as its catalogue of assessments. The Platform's knowledge, information and data partners include those generating and storing raw data (e.g., species occurrences, satellite imagery, climate data), indigenous and local community knowledge, indicators and metrics, literature and expert knowledge. The knowledge,

information and data discovery and access infrastructure and associated information and data streams will need clear terms of reference and long-term financial support. These will be developed further in the next update of the plan.

D. Activity 4. Providing ready access to primary research literature for all Platform experts

23. It has become clear to the task force from consultations with experts at various scoping and assessment meetings of the Platform during 2014 that many experts do not have the access to the wealth of primary, peer-reviewed literature that is essential for a well-informed and comprehensive assessment process. Exploring and ensuring access for all of the Platform's appointed experts to as much of this literature as possible will be a core task for the technical support unit, advised and supported by the task force.

E. Activity 5. Establishing agreements with key strategic partners regarding knowledge, information and data

24. Much of the work identified above will be carried out by established key partners in the field through collaborative agreements. The co-chairs of the task force will invite resource persons from various strategic partner organizations to participate in the work of the task force including the following: the International Council for Science, the Group on Earth Observations Biodiversity Observation Network (GEO BON), the United Nations Environment Programme World Conservation Monitoring Centre (UNEP-WCMC), the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) and the Global Biodiversity Information Facility (GBIF).

25. The technical support unit, in its work to support the task force, is launching a discussion process with a range of potential strategic partners. Identifying these partners is a key goal of the plan over the next year. The task force should develop a prioritization procedure for data partners by identifying the major overarching data and information needs that must be met in order to complete assessments and identify partners that can provide information in that regard.

26. Potential partners may include the International Council for Science; GEO BON; the UNESCO Man and Biosphere Programme; UNEP-WCMC; UNESCO; the United Nations Development Programme, with its Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services-Net portal (BES-Net); the International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN), with its Red List of Threatened Species and Red List of Ecosystems; the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, in the area of agriculture and forests under sustainable management and fisheries; TRAFFIC International, a joint programme of the World Wide Fund for Nature and IUCN, with its wildlife trade monitoring network; the Map of Life project, covering species distribution assessment and monitoring; the Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission of UNESCO and the Ocean Biogeographic Information System; the Global Biodiversity Information Facility, with its species occurrence data; the Encyclopedia of Life online collaborative resource, with its species and trait data, and also its literature component; the Biodiversity Heritage Library, an open access repository of biodiversity literature; LifeWatch, the European e-science infrastructure for biodiversity and ecosystem research, with its biodiversity catalogue; the World Bank, with its comparative data on national gross domestic product; the Global Environment Facility assessment of freshwater and marine ecosystems; the World Database on Protected Areas; and the trade database of the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora. They may also include national organizations.

27. Relevant knowledge products may include the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment reports; the Economics of Ecosystems and Biodiversity reports; the Global Biodiversity Outlook reports produced and published by the Convention on Biological Diversity; the United Nations Millennium Development Goal reports; assessment and special reports, technical papers and materials from the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) and the underlying data, technical guidelines and fact sheets from the IPCC Data Distribution Centre; World Bank reports; United Nations World Ocean Assessment reports in progress; and contributions from the Future Earth initiative of the Science and Technology Alliance for Global Sustainability.

28. As regional and subregional assessments are undertaken, potential strategic regional partners may emerge, such as the regional components of GEO BON, including the Arctic Biodiversity Observation Network (Arctic BON), the European Biodiversity Observation Network (EU BON), or the Asia Pacific Biodiversity Observation Network (AP BON). The technical support unit will, therefore, regularly update and review strategic partners to ensure that the Platform's assessments are properly supported by the most up-to-date data and information.

F. Activity 6. Revising data and information management plan based on developments in 2015

29. The task force recommends that the data and information management plan submitted in the present note should be considered as an initial draft that it will update and submit to the Plenary on a regular basis as the needs for data and knowledge management become better defined with the implementation of the work programme.

Annex III**Generic scoping report for the regional and subregional assessments of biodiversity and ecosystem services (deliverable 2 (b))****I. Scope, geographic area, rationale, utility and assumptions****A. Scope**

1. The overall scope of the regional and subregional assessments is to assess the status and trends regarding biodiversity, ecosystem functions and ecosystem services and their interlinkages, the impact of biodiversity, ecosystem functions and ecosystem services and threats to them on good quality of life and the effectiveness of responses, including the Convention on Biological Diversity Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011–2020 and its Aichi Biodiversity Targets and the national biodiversity strategies and action plans developed under the Convention.¹⁴ The assessments will address terrestrial, freshwater, coastal and marine biodiversity, ecosystem functions and ecosystem services.

2. The objective of the regional and subregional assessment processes is to strengthen the science-policy interface on biodiversity, ecosystem functions and ecosystem services at the regional and subregional levels. The assessments will analyse the state of knowledge on past, present and future interactions between people and nature, including by highlighting potential tipping points, feedback and trade-offs. The timeframe of analyses will cover current status, trends (often going back in time several decades) and future projections with a focus on periods ranging from 2020 to 2050, which cover key target dates related to the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity of the Convention on Biological Diversity and the ongoing process of developing the post-2015 development agenda. The conceptual framework of the Platform will guide these analyses of the social-ecological systems that operate at various scales in time and space.

3. The regional and subregional assessments will address the following policy-relevant questions:

(a) How do biodiversity and ecosystem functions and services contribute to the economy, livelihoods, food security, and good quality of life in the regions, and what are the interdependences among them?

(b) What are the status, trends and potential future dynamics of biodiversity, ecosystem functions and ecosystem services that affect their contribution to the economy, livelihoods and well-being in the regions?

(c) What are the pressures driving the change in the status and trends of biodiversity, ecosystem functions, ecosystem services and good quality of life in the regions?

(d) What are the actual and potential impacts of various policies and interventions on the contribution of biodiversity, ecosystem functions and ecosystem services to the sustainability of the economy, livelihoods, food security and good quality of life in the regions?

(e) What gaps in knowledge need to be addressed in order to better understand and assess drivers, impacts and responses of biodiversity, ecosystem functions and services at the regional level?

4. Additional specificities are presented in the complementary scoping reports of each region/subregion.

¹⁴ As expressed in deliverable 2 (b) of the work programme of the Platform (decision IPBES-2/5, annex I).

B. Geographic area of the assessment

5. For the purposes of the regional assessments, the geographic area of each assessment is described in the scoping report for each region. Where appropriate, information about and expertise from observer States, regional economic integration organizations and overseas territories should be made available to relevant regional and subregional assessments according to the rules and procedures of the Platform.

C. Rationale

6. Biodiversity, ecosystem functions and ecosystem services provide the basis for the economies, livelihoods and good quality of life of people throughout the world. The Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011–2020 and its Aichi Biodiversity Targets provide an overarching framework for effective and urgent action to halt the loss of biodiversity in order to ensure that by 2020 ecosystems are resilient and continue to provide essential services, thereby securing the planet's variety of life and contributing to human well-being and poverty eradication. These considerations are also included in the ongoing development of the post-2015 development agenda and its possible sustainable development goals. Regional and/or national biodiversity strategies and action plans are important vehicles for implementing the Aichi Biodiversity Targets and adapting them to regional and national conditions. All these efforts require a strong knowledge base and strengthened interplay between scientists and policymakers and different knowledge systems, to which the regional and subregional assessments are well placed to contribute.

7. The assessments will themselves be a vehicle for implementation of the Platform's functions as they relate to capacity-building, identification of knowledge gaps, knowledge generation and development of policy support tools. Furthermore, such assessments are critical to furthering the Platform's operational principle of ensuring the full use of national, subregional and regional knowledge, as appropriate, including a bottom-up approach.

8. Additional specificities are presented in the complementary scoping reports of each region and subregion.

D. Utility

9. The regional and subregional assessments on biodiversity, ecosystem function and ecosystem services will provide users with a credible, legitimate, authoritative, holistic and comprehensive analysis of the current state of scientific and other knowledge. They will analyse options and policy support tools for sustainable management of biodiversity, ecosystem function and ecosystem services under alternative scenarios and present success stories, best practices and lessons learned. They will identify current gaps in capacity and knowledge and options for addressing them at relevant levels.

10. The assessments will inform a range of stakeholders in the public and private sectors and civil society. In particular, requests to the Platform for regional assessments were made by China, Norway, UNEP, the Pan-European Platform and IUCN, along with a large variety of requests to address the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011–2020 and its Aichi Biodiversity Targets at regional scales (IPBES/2/INF/9). Outcomes of regional assessments will be presented to a broad audience as outlined in the platform's communications strategy, with detailed information including easy-to-understand infographics, maps and geographical information systems' outcomes. The outputs will also include a summary for policymakers, highlighting key policy-relevant, but not policy-prescriptive, findings. The information will be widely disseminated, including by making use of new information and communications technologies.

11. Additional specificities are presented in the complementary scoping reports of each region/subregion.

E. Assumptions

12. The regional and subregional assessments will be based on existing data, scientific literature, and other information, including indigenous and local knowledge. Regional assessments will assess the state of knowledge on subregional-specific issues as an integral part of the overall analysis. This knowledge will be gathered from the published literature, including grey literature, according to guidelines of the Platform, and also through bodies such as national academies of science, national research institutes, scientific societies and other research communities, government environmental agencies and statistical offices. The regional and subregional assessments will also use existing data and information held by global, regional, subregional and national institutions, such as the relevant multilateral agreements. Experts involved in regional assessments will work closely with the task force on indigenous and local knowledge systems to ensure that the multiple sources of knowledge are drawn upon. Attention will be given, in accordance with the Platform's data and information

management plan, to ensure the collection and archiving of the corresponding metadata, and whenever possible the corresponding underlying data, through an interoperable process to ensure comparability between assessments across regions. Also, should new regional assessments be undertaken, data and information should be available for future work of the Platform. Whenever possible, the sets of metadata will thus contain information on the geographical location and temporal reference of the underlying data as well as the scientific protocol with which they were collected.

13. The author expert groups for the different regional and subregional assessments will, in accordance with the procedures, reflect the need for geographic balance within the regions. They will interact with each other, and with similar groups undertaking global, thematic and methodological assessments in order to ensure conceptual and methodological coherence. They will also work closely with the task forces on knowledge and data, indigenous and local knowledge systems and capacity-building taking into account the rights of knowledge holders. The author groups will be supported by the guide to the production and integration of assessments (see IPBES/3/INF/4).¹⁵

14. The assumptions underlying the regional and subregional assessments include the availability of the necessary expertise and the dependence of the assessment on voluntary contributions to the initiative, including financial resources. It is assumed that there will be sufficient direct and in-kind funding and technical support available for the preparation and implementation of the assessments.

15. Additional specificities are presented in the complementary scoping reports of each region and subregion.

II. Chapter outline

Chapter 1. Setting the scene

16. Chapter 1 will present the policy-relevant questions identified for each region and subregion and explain how each assessment reflects the conceptual framework and the framework for the science-policy interface. It will demonstrate how the assessment addresses policy questions, including those related to implementation of the Convention on Biological Diversity Strategic Plan 2011–2020 and its Aichi Biodiversity Targets. It will present regional and subregional aspects of priority thematic challenges identified by the Platform, such as land degradation and restoration, invasive alien species, and sustainable use of biodiversity as addressed in the thematic assessments. It will also outline the methodologies and approaches used in the assessment, including its approach to the use of different knowledge systems, and outline how the assessment will identify and address uncertainties and gaps in data and knowledge. It will identify the relevant stakeholders requesting the regional assessment and their priorities.

Chapter 2. Nature's benefits to people and quality of life

17. Chapter 2 will reflect the conceptual framework boxes “Nature’s benefits to people” and “Good quality of life” and the fluxes between them. It will assess the values of nature’s benefits to people, including the interrelationship between biodiversity, ecosystem functions and society, the geographical difference between the production and use of ecosystem services and the status, trends and future dynamics of ecosystem goods and services and nature’s gifts to people. It will apply methods described in the guide for assessments (IPBES deliverable 2 (a)) and interact closely with the thematic assessments in deliverable 3 (b). It will also assess the different impacts of changes in nature’s benefits to people with regard to food security, energy security, livelihood security and health security and identify aspects of biodiversity and ecosystem functions and services that are critical to social relationships, spirituality and cultural identity. It will also address issues of equity, including intergenerational and intragenerational equity, social relationships, spirituality and cultural identity with respect to biodiversity and ecosystem functions and services. The chapter will reflect in particular Goal D of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity and will address issues related to the three Aichi Biodiversity Targets under this goal (Aichi Biodiversity Targets 14, 15 and 16) as well as target 18.

¹⁵ The guide includes guidance on dealing with scale, indicators, uncertainty terms, use of key methodologies (scenario analysis, consideration of value), how to address policy support tools and methodologies, and on the identification of capacity needs, gaps in knowledge and data and protocols with regard to the integration of diverse knowledge systems.

Chapter 3. Status, trends and future dynamics of biodiversity and ecosystems underpinning nature's benefits to people

18. Chapter 3 will reflect the conceptual framework box “Nature”, emphasizing the components and fluxes that have an impact on “Nature’s benefits to people”. It will assess what is known about the past and current trends and future dynamics of biodiversity and ecosystems and their positive and negative effects on the key ecosystem goods and services identified in chapter 2. It will consider both structural and functional ecosystem diversity and genetic diversity and the area and extent of ecosystems and include fragile habitats and hotspots and species of special concern and importance such as Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES) species, migratory species and International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN) threatened species, taking into account species listed at the national level where relevant. It will also include species that are important for the functioning of ecosystems and livelihoods. Available forecasts on current trends will also be outlined. The chapter will also explore how changes in “Nature” have an impact on “Nature’s benefit to people”. The chapter will reflect in particular Goal C of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity and will address issues related to the three Aichi Biodiversity Targets under this goal (Aichi Biodiversity Targets 11, 12 and 13) as well as relevant aspects of Aichi Biodiversity Target 14.

Chapter 4. Direct and indirect drivers of change in the context of different perspectives on quality of life

19. Chapter 4 will reflect the conceptual framework boxes and fluxes on “Institutions and governance and other indirect drivers” and “Direct drivers”. It will assess the status and trends and future dynamics of indirect drivers, focusing in particular on those affecting “Nature” and “Nature’s benefits to people” as the foundation for “Good quality of life”. It will assess the status and trends in direct drivers, as well as the impact of these drivers on “Nature”, based on future predictions, and analyse the interrelations between and among direct drivers and indirect drivers. Indirect drivers include policy changes, changes in economic activity, population change and technology change. Consideration will be given to how institutional and governance arrangements contribute to changes in biodiversity, ecosystem functions and ecosystem services. Direct drivers include habitat conversion, use of aquatic resources, including through fisheries, land management practices, use of wild species, pollution, invasive alien species, the impact of climate change on nature and extreme events. The chapter will reflect in particular Goals A and B of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity and will address issues covered by the Aichi Biodiversity Targets under this goal (in particular Aichi Biodiversity Targets 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9 and 10).

Chapter 5. Integrated and cross-scale analysis of interactions of the natural world and human society

20. Chapter 5 will reflect all the boxes and fluxes of the conceptual framework. It will build on the analysis in the previous chapter and make extensive use of scenarios and modelling in its analysis. It will focus on the key issues that society is expected to face over the next 40 years that will determine the dynamics of the interactions between society and nature. It will include integrated and cross-scale analysis of these dynamics, including feedback, synergies, time lags, tipping points, resilience, cross-regional interrelations and trade-offs. The chapter will explore various paths towards sustainable development; this involves exploring changes in the trajectories of multiple drivers and the role played by synergies, trade-offs and adaptive behaviour. The chapter will relate to the long-term 2050 vision of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity and will help to identify possible pathways to achieve this vision. It will rely heavily on outputs of the thematic assessment on scenarios and models of biodiversity, ecosystem function and ecosystem services (Platform deliverable 3 (c) and recommendations in the guide for regional and global assessments (Platform deliverable 2 (a)).

Chapter 6. Options for governance, institutional arrangements and private and public decision-making across scales and sectors

21. Informed by the analysis in previous chapters, chapter 6 will reflect the conceptual framework boxes and fluxes on “Institutions and governance and other indirect drivers”. It will examine different policy ideas and possible options for decision makers at the regional and subregional levels in response to the scenario set out in previous chapters, in particular chapter 5. Explorations of options will be policy relevant, but not policy prescriptive, as outlined in the principles of the Platform. Options explored will include different policy instruments, market tools, conservation and management practices and international and regional agreements. The chapter will look at options at different hierarchical spatial and temporal scales, from the international level to local and indigenous communities and households. It will explore options for policy mixes and alignments in polycentric governance systems, assess the effectiveness of such options and consider who would gain or bear

their cost. The chapter will analyse future challenges for sustainable use and conservation in key sectors in each region and assess options for integrating biodiversity, ecosystem function and ecosystem services into poverty reduction strategies and national accounting and, where appropriate, the recognition of the rights of Mother Earth. The analyses will include incentives, subsidies harmful to biodiversity, positive incentives for the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity, ecosystem function and ecosystem services, as well as measures taken to achieve sustainable production and consumption of biodiversity, ecosystem function and ecosystem services and rights-based approaches to address biodiversity conservation. The chapter will also identify the enabling environments and limitations for policy uptake and lessons learned, including solutions and methods for ensuring success and capacity-building needs. It will address issues related to Goals A and E of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity and the relevant Aichi Targets (in particular Aichi Targets 1, 2, 3,4, 17,18, 19 and 20) as well as target 16.

22. Additional specificities are presented in the complementary scoping reports of each region and subregion.

III. Key data sets

23. The regional assessments will draw on a wide variety of data sets addressing all the specific components of the conceptual framework. A key activity of the regional and subregional assessments will be to identify relevant data sets, including those arising from ongoing and planned activities, from a wide range of sources, including global, regional and national institutions and organizations, as well as research projects and analysis of the scientific literature and indigenous and local knowledge. The Platform's catalogue of assessments will also be used as a source of information. The common framework on data standards developed by the knowledge and data task force will be applied to all assessments in order to facilitate intraregional, interregional and subregional comparisons. The task force on indigenous and local knowledge systems will provide guidance and procedures for the analysis and use of indigenous and local knowledge. The capacity to perform these tasks will be strengthened through training, knowledge-sharing and collaboration between subregions and countries where needed.

24. Additional specificities are presented in the complementary scoping reports of each region and subregion.

IV. Strategic partnership and initiatives

25. In accordance with the operating principles of the Platform, partnerships are important in order to avoid duplication and promote synergies with ongoing activities. Strategic partnerships and collaboration will help to deliver the regional and subregional assessments. They could provide scientific and technical support, data sets and reports, administrative support, capacity-building, outreach and networking, experience in bridging science and policy and experience in working with indigenous and local knowledge systems. Strategic partnerships will be formal and informal and attention will be paid to ensuring geographic balance in their development. During the inception phase, each regional and subregional assessment process will identify a list of possible strategic partners, including strategic partners who would ensure repeatability and comparability with other Platform assessments beyond the 2014–2018 work programme.

26. Additional specificities are presented in the complementary scoping reports of each region and subregion.

V. Operational structure

27. The operational structures that could best deliver a particular regional and subregional assessment will need to be identified. A technical support unit, working as part of the secretariat, may be established for each regional and subregional assessment to coordinate the delivery of the assessments.

VI. Process and timetable

28. The proposed process for undertaking the assessments and the timetable are outlined in the following table.

Process and timetable for regional and subregional assessments

<i>Date</i>	<i>Actions and institutional arrangements</i>
2015	
First quarter	<p>Plenary at its third session approves the conduct of the regional assessments coupled with the thematic assessments (starting with land degradation and adding thematic assessments on invasive species and sustainable use if approved by the fourth session of the Plenary), asks for offers of in-kind technical support for the assessments and requests the Bureau and the secretariat to establish the necessary institutional arrangements to put in place technical support</p> <p>The Chair, through the secretariat, requests nominations, from Governments and other stakeholders, of experts to prepare the assessment report</p>
Second quarter	<p>Secretariat compiles lists of nominations</p> <p>The Panel selects the assessment co-chairs, coordinating lead authors, lead authors and review editors, using the approved selection criteria set out in decision IPBES-2/3 (IPBES/2/17, annex)</p> <p>Meeting of the Management Committee (co-chairs, head of the technical support unit and Multidisciplinary Expert Panel/Bureau members) to select remaining expert team and respective roles (i.e., coordinating lead authors, lead authors and review editors)</p> <p>Selected nominees contacted, gaps filled and list of co-chairs, authors and review editors finalized</p>
Third quarter	<p>First author meeting (100 participants per region, including 15 thematic experts embedded in the regional expert groups: co-chairs, coordinating lead authors and lead authors, plus Panel/Bureau members)</p>
2016	
First quarter	<p>First draft of chapters prepared for the regional assessment (6–7 months); drafts sent to secretariat (technical support units)</p>
Second quarter	<p>First draft of regional assessment sent for expert review (6 weeks)</p> <p>Collation of review comments by secretariat and technical support units for first draft of regional assessment sent to authors (2 weeks)</p>
Second/early third quarter	<p>Second author meetings for the regional assessments in the regions coupled with second author meeting for the land degradation assessment and the first author meetings for the invasive alien species and sustainable use assessments, if approved by the fourth session of the Plenary. (100 people per region including the 15 thematic experts embedded in the regional assessments: co-chairs, coordinating lead authors, lead authors and review editors)</p>
Third quarter	<p>Second draft of chapters and first draft of summary for policymakers prepared for the regional assessment (5–6 months)</p>
2017	
First quarter	<p>Second draft of the regional assessment and first draft of the summary for policymakers sent for government and expert review (2 months)</p>
First quarter	<p>Collation of review comments for second draft of the regional assessment and first draft of the summary for policymakers sent to authors (2 weeks)</p>
Second quarter	<p>Third author meeting for the regional assessment coupled with third author meeting for land degradation and second author meetings for invasive alien species and sustainable use assessments (30 participants per region: co-chairs, coordinating lead authors and review editors and Panel/Bureau members)</p>
Third quarter	<p>Final text changes to regional assessment and the summary for policymakers (3 months)</p>
Third quarter	<p>Translation of summary for policymakers into the six official languages of the United Nations (1 month)</p>
Fourth quarter	<p>Submission of the regional assessment, including the translated summary for policymakers, to Governments for final review prior to the Plenary (6 weeks)</p>

Fourth quarter	Final government comments on the summary for policymakers for consideration by authors prior to the next Plenary session
2018	
January (To be confirmed)	Plenary to approve/accept regional assessments, including the summaries for policymakers

VII. Cost estimate

29. The table below shows the estimated cost of conducting the assessments and preparing the assessment reports in all four regions. Cost estimates will need to be adjusted to the expected nature and level of activity of the regional assessments.

<i>Year</i>	<i>Cost item</i>	<i>Assumptions</i>	<i>Cost (United States dollars)</i>
2015	4 x Management committee meeting (2 co-chairs, head of technical support unit, secretariat)	Meeting costs Travel and DSA (3 x \$3,750)	0 45 000
	4 x First author meeting (100 co-chairs, coordinating lead authors and lead authors)	Meeting costs (1 week, regional, 100 participants) (25 per cent in kind) Travel and DSA (80 x \$3,000)	75 000 960 000
	4 x Technical support	2 full-time equivalent professional positions (50 per cent in kind)	600 000
2016	4 x Second author meeting (110 co-chairs, coordinating lead authors, lead authors and review editors)	Meeting costs (1 week, international, 110 participants) (25 per cent in kind) Travel and DSA (88 x \$3,000)	150 000 1 056 000
	4 x Technical support	2 full-time equivalent professional positions (50 per cent in kind)	600 000
	4 x Third author meeting (30 co-chairs, coordinating lead authors and review editors)	Meeting costs (1 week, regional, 30 participants) (25 per cent in kind) Travel and DSA (24 x \$3,750)	37 500 360 000
2017	4 x Technical support	2 full-time equivalent professional positions (50 per cent in kind)	600 000
	2018	4 x Co-chairs' participation in the fifth session of the Plenary 4 x Dissemination and regional outreach (summary for policymakers (3 x 10 pages) and report (200 pages))	Travel and DSA (2 x \$3,750) Translation of summaries for policymakers into all United Nations languages, publication and outreach
Total			4 981 500

VIII. Communications and outreach

30. The regional and subregional assessment report and its summary for policymakers will be published in electronic format. The summary for policymakers will be available in all official languages of the United Nations and will be printed on demand. These reports will be made available on the Platform website. Outreach to a broad set of stakeholders, including the general public, will be based on the Platform's communications and outreach strategy. Dissemination will target all Platform stakeholders and will be adapted to the specific interests of different users, and metadata used in the assessments will be made publicly available in accordance with relevant guidance developed by the Platform.

IX. Capacity-building

31. A key objective of the regional assessments is to build capacity to undertake assessments at the regional and subregional levels and to initiate a broader community capacity-building exercise that will continue after the assessments are complete, including in particular the strengthening of effective contributions of indigenous and local knowledge systems to assessments. The regional and subregional assessments will be supported by the task force on capacity-building and its technical support unit, in particular through the implementation of the proposed programme on fellowship, exchange and

training presented in document IPBES/3/3.16 The regional and subregional assessments will identify a pool of experts that can be used to support capacity-building activities related to the Platform.

32. Additional specificities are presented in the complementary scoping reports of each region and subregion.

Annex IV

Scoping for a regional assessment of biodiversity and ecosystem services for Africa (deliverable 2 (b))

I. Scope, geographic area, rationale, utility and assumptions

A. Scope

1. Within the scope outlined in the generic scoping report for the regional and subregional assessments of biodiversity and ecosystem services (decision IPBES-3/1, annex III), the African assessment will focus on thematic priorities, including the food-energy-water-livelihood nexus; land degradation, including climate-related risks such as desertification and silting; catchment to coast; biodiversity conservation and sustainable use; and invasive alien species. The assessment will also include the following cross-cutting themes to be addressed, as appropriate, as part of the thematic priorities listed above: trade agreements and foreign investment; and environmental health and zoonotic diseases.

B. Geographic area of the assessment

2. The assessment will include countries and territories in five subregions:

<i>Subregions</i>	<i>Countries and territories</i>
East Africa and adjacent islands	Comoros, Djibouti, Eritrea, Ethiopia, Kenya, Madagascar, Mauritius, Mayotte, ^a Reunion, ^a Rwanda, Seychelles, Somalia, South Sudan, Uganda and United Republic of Tanzania
Southern Africa	Angola, Botswana, Lesotho, Malawi, Mozambique, Namibia, South Africa, Swaziland, Zambia and Zimbabwe
Central Africa	Burundi, Cameroon, Central African Republic, Chad, Congo, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Equatorial Guinea, Gabon and Sao Tome and Principe
North Africa	Algeria, Egypt, Libya, Mauritania, Morocco, Sudan, Tunisia and Western Sahara ^b
West Africa	Benin, Burkina Faso, Cabo Verde, Côte d'Ivoire, Gambia, Ghana, Guinea, Guinea-Bissau, Liberia, Mali, Niger, Nigeria, Senegal, Sierra Leone and Togo

^a Overseas territory.

^b Territory under negotiation between the parties concerned, as recognized by the Security Council and the General Assembly of the United Nations in their relevant resolutions.

C. Rationale

3. In the context of the general rationale outlined in the generic scoping report, the present section sets out the rationale specific to the Africa region. Africa is characterized by great biodiversity and varied ecosystems, ranging from desert environments to tropical rainforests, Afro-alpine areas and marine habitats. There is also enormous human diversity, with upwards of 1,500 language and cultural groups, representing a rich heritage and a wealth of indigenous and local knowledge stemming from the longest history of human-environment interactions. These interactions are also most acute in the Africa region, where people are heavily dependent on biodiversity and ecosystem services. The nature of these interactions will drive the degradation of biodiversity and ecosystem services if they are not refocused to harness nature's benefits to people more efficiently, at the same time ensuring the sustainability and resilience of biodiversity and ecosystems. The thematic priorities referred to in section I (A) highlight both the unique biocultural heritage of the region and the critical role that biodiversity and ecosystem services play in improving livelihoods within the context of demographic change (population growth, gender relations and urbanization), economic growth and poverty reduction. The assessment should focus on the links between biodiversity, ecosystem functions and

¹⁶ The programme includes components such as fellowships, a programme for temporary secondment of staff and exchange of individuals, a mentoring scheme and training programmes.

nature's benefits to people, paying particular attention to questions of equity, social relationships, spirituality and cultural identity and diversity. In addition, the assessment should consider the relationship between trade agreements and foreign investments, biodiversity and ecosystem services. The assessment should consider which policy and institutional drivers are internal to the region, as opposed to external drivers with internal impacts.

D. Utility

4. In the context of the general utility outlined in the generic scoping report, the present section sets out the utility specific to the Africa region. The assessment will identify key priorities that will help policymakers to develop policy solutions to meet the specific needs of the Africa region as a whole, as well as the five subregions and their national constituents. The knowledge produced in the assessment, as well as its policy recommendations, will help African Governments and institutions to develop strategies to meet the sustainability and conservation goals set out in the Aichi Biodiversity Targets and the sustainable development goals that will come into force in 2015. The assessment report will also be of interest to the institutions involved in intra-African trade policies, biodiversity and ecosystem services and conservation policy and development such as the African Union, the African Ministerial Conference on the Environment, the Intergovernmental Authority on Development in Eastern Africa, the Commission for the Forests of Central Africa, the Southern African Development Community and the Economic Community of West African States. The knowledge and recommendations produced in this assessment will also be important sources of information for other stakeholders, including the private sector, concerned with the state of biodiversity in Africa and its sustainable future. Interested civil society organizations, such as non-governmental organizations, the media and individuals, may also find the document a useful source of information linking Africa's biodiversity and ecosystem services to human well-being.

E. Assumptions

5. In the context of the general assumptions outlined in the generic scoping report, the present section sets out the assumptions specific to the Africa region. The assumptions underlying the assessment include the idea that it is necessary to ensure that the authors of the assessment are the best qualified, which will require government national focal points to take a proactive approach in nominating experts of the highest calibre. This will ensure not only the quality of the document but also its relevance. In addition, the process assumes a fundamental reliance on the availability of necessary African experts able and willing to contribute to the initiative and sufficient resources, including financial resources. Access to and the availability of global databases and monitoring systems, including relevant information on the Africa region, are central to this assumption. In order to ensure that the document is of the highest quality, national focal points and observers will need to take a proactive approach in nominating experts of the highest calibre. In view of the great need for capacity-building in the region, there is a further assumption that collaboration between countries in the region, their experts and research organizations will be required to ensure the equitable participation of all countries in the assessment. There will also be a need to source data from various sources as defined by the procedures for the use of literature and to rely on indigenous and local knowledge to fill gaps in scientific knowledge and bring a different perspective to a scientific understanding of human-nature interactions and dependence. There will also be a need to support research programmes to address data and knowledge gaps.

II. Chapter outline

6. The assessment of the Africa region will follow the chapter outline set out in the generic scoping report for the regional and subregional assessments of biodiversity and ecosystem services but will focus in particular on the regionally specific scope set out above (see sect. I).

III. Key data sets

7. Beyond the general issues concerning key data sets outlined in the generic scoping report, this section sets out issues related to key data sets specific to the Africa region. All the appropriate sources of information will be considered when preparing the assessment in order to ensure that it comprehensively reflects the regional and subregional situation in Africa from a wide range of sources, including global, regional, national, subnational and local institutions and organizations.

IV. Strategic partnership and initiatives

8. Beyond the general issues related to strategic partnerships and initiatives outlined in the generic scoping report, the present section sets out issues related to strategic partnerships and initiatives specific to the Africa region. Stakeholder mapping will be conducted to identify the following groups: coordinating agencies providing technical support during the assessment process; data centres and scientific institutions providing knowledge, data and resource persons and structural support for the process; economic cooperation communities; private sector data and knowledge providers and potential funders; networks and technical cooperation partners for wider support of data, methods and resources; United Nations agencies and international research programmes; and outreach partners.

V. Operational structure

9. As noted in the generic scoping report, the operational structures best able to deliver the Africa regional assessment, including its capacity-building component, will need to be identified. A technical support unit may be established for the Africa region to coordinate delivery, working as part of the secretariat. In addition, subregions would propose institutions that would provide capacity-building support for the process.

VI. Process and timetable

10. The process and timetable are set out in the generic scoping report for the regional and subregional assessments of biodiversity and ecosystem services.

VII. Cost estimate

11. The cost estimate is set out in the generic scoping report for the regional and subregional assessments of biodiversity and ecosystem services.

VIII. Communications and outreach

12. In addition to what is outlined in the generic scoping report, in Africa the role of technical support units, national focal points, regional and subregional hubs and centres of excellence will be crucial. A clear set of goals and objectives for the communications and outreach strategy relevant to the Africa region will be developed. It is recommended that the stakeholder mapping and communication strategy be undertaken in collaboration with science communication professionals, possibly through a partnership with relevant institutions. Key findings of the assessment should be conveyed to the stakeholders in the appropriate languages and should be accessible and culturally and politically relevant. Traditional communication tools such as presentations, brochures and awareness-raising events will be used to disseminate the findings of the assessment. In addition, appropriate communications and outreach tools should be used, including modern information and communication technologies and media platforms such as social networks, scientific websites and the media.

IX. Capacity-building

13. As noted in the generic scoping report, capacity-building activities will be supported by the work programme of the Platform as implemented by the capacity-building task force. Capacity-building activities will be aligned with the task force work programme and will be carried out continuously throughout the assessment. This will be a learning process. Capacity-building will be implemented through partnerships and target both individuals and institutions. Some of the key priorities identified for capacity-building in Africa include increasing capacity to carry out and use national and regional assessments; improving capacity for policy formulation, access to and generation of data, information and knowledge and lessons learned; increasing capacity for enhanced and meaningful multi-stakeholder engagement; developing capacity to bring together science with local knowledge; improving capacity for interdisciplinary and cross-sectoral communication and collaboration; building capacity to enhance the human resource and skills base, including through North-South and South-South collaboration; and enhancing the capacity to participate effectively in assessments by the Platform.

Annex V

Scoping for a regional assessment of biodiversity and ecosystem services and functions for the Americas (deliverable 2 (b))

I. Scope, geographic area, rationale, utility and assumptions

A. Scope

1. The region's rich biodiversity and its benefits to people provide essential contributions to the economy, livelihoods, the quality of life and the eradication of poverty. The region is also bioculturally diverse, with traditional knowledge of indigenous people and local communities promoting, among other things, the diversification and conservation of many varieties of cultivated plants and domestic animals that are the staple foods of many other regions of the world. The region has successful experiences in biodiversity conservation, restoration and sustainable use, including some carried out by indigenous people and local communities. On the other hand, climate change, population growth and the consequent increase in demand for food, biomass and energy continue to have a serious impact on biodiversity and ecosystem services and functions. These impacts are felt not only in terrestrial ecosystems, but also in wetlands, freshwater, coastal and marine ecosystems. In some areas of the Americas, the degree of these impacts on biodiversity and ecosystem services and functions is threatening the economy, livelihoods and quality of life.

2. Within the scope outlined in the generic scoping report (decision IPBES-3/1, annex III), the objective of this assessment will consider these effects, as well as future threats to biodiversity and ecosystem services and their benefits for a good quality of life in the Americas and its subregions (North America, Mesoamerica, the Caribbean and South America), taking into account their differences and the multiple types of social and economic inequality and distinctive biophysical conditions. Key processes, including urbanization and deruralization, natural resource exploitation, pollution, climate change, loss and degradation of natural habitats (terrestrial, freshwater, coastal and marine) in the subregions, and their impact on biodiversity, as well as the benefits of biodiversity and ecosystem services and functions for people and quality of life, will be taken into account in the assessment of the Americas. The purpose is to make policy-relevant knowledge accessible and useful, using a multidisciplinary and multi-knowledge systems approach, and improving the science-policy interface aiming to improve governance towards sustainable uses of biodiversity and ecosystem services and functions. The assessment will also identify the specific needs of each of the America's subregions regarding support tools at different scales, knowledge gaps and capacity-building needs, including the development of capacity for future sustainable uses of biodiversity.

B. Geographic area of the assessment

3. For the purpose of this assessment, the Americas extend from the Arctic region in the north to the sub-Antarctic region in the south, crossing the equator. There are many ways to subdivide this large region, but for the scope of this regional assessment it has been divided into four subregions: North America, Mesoamerica, the Caribbean and South America:

<i>Subregions</i>	<i>Countries</i>
North America	Canada and United States of America
Mesoamerica	Belize, Costa Rica, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras, Mexico, Nicaragua and Panama
Caribbean	Antigua and Barbuda, Bahamas, Barbados, Cuba, Dominica, Dominican Republic, ^a Grenada, Haiti, Jamaica, Saint Kitts and Nevis, Saint Lucia, Saint Vincent and the Grenadines and Trinidad and Tobago.
South America	Argentina, Bolivia (Plurinational State of), Brazil, Chile, Colombia, Ecuador, Guyana, ^a Paraguay, Peru, Suriname, Uruguay and Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)

^a On socioeconomic, cultural and historical grounds, the Dominican Republic could be considered part of Mesoamerica, and Guyana part of the Caribbean.

Because of the size of North America and South America in relation to the other subregions, their latitudinal extent and varied physiography, additional subdivisions of these subregions will be contemplated in the subregional assessment.

C. Rationale

4. Biodiversity and ecosystem services and functions make essential contributions to the economy, livelihoods and good quality of life of people throughout the world. The Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011–2020 and its Aichi Biodiversity Targets seek to provide an overarching framework

for effective and urgent action to manage biodiversity in order to ensure that by 2020 ecosystems are resilient and continue to provide essential functions and services, thereby contributing to peoples' quality of life and poverty eradication. These considerations are also included in the ongoing development of the post-2015 development agenda. Regional and/or national biodiversity strategies and action plans are important vehicles for implementing the Aichi Biodiversity Targets and adapting them to regional and national conditions. All these efforts require a strong knowledge base and strengthened interplay between scientists and policymakers, and between different knowledge systems to which the regional and subregional assessments are well placed to contribute. The assessments will themselves be a vehicle for the implementation of the Platform's functions as it relates to capacity-building, the identification of gaps, knowledge generation and the development of policy support tools. Furthermore, such assessments are critical to furthering the Platform's operational principle of ensuring the full use of national, subregional and regional knowledge, as appropriate, including by ensuring a bottom-up approach.

D. Utility

5. The assessment will inform a range of stakeholders in the public and private sectors and civil society, including indigenous people and local communities, which will benefit from sharing information and data that allows progress to be made towards the Aichi Biodiversity Targets. The Americas assessment will provide users with a credible, legitimate, authoritative, holistic and comprehensive analysis of the current state of regional and subregional biodiversity and ecosystem services and functions, based on scientific and other knowledge systems, and with options and policy support tools for the sustainable management of biodiversity and ecosystem services and functions under alternative scenarios; it will also present success stories, best practices and lessons learned. It will identify current gaps in capacity and knowledge and options for addressing them at relevant levels. It will be presented both as a source of detailed information with easy-to-understand infographics, maps and other visual tools, including multiple sources of information from indigenous and local knowledge systems, and in the form of a summary for policymakers, highlighting key policy-relevant, but not policy-prescriptive, findings. The information will be widely disseminated, including by making use of new information and communications technologies.

E. Assumptions

6. In the context of the general assumptions outlined in the generic scoping report, the present section sets out the assumptions specific to the region. The central assumption of the scoping for the Americas regional assessment is that science-based knowledge and indigenous and local knowledge are both relevant to the process. These two types of knowledge systems will be utilized in the assessment. In accordance with the rules of procedure of the Platform, the draft assessment report will be open to peer review by experts, policymakers and stakeholders, including indigenous people and local communities. Another critical assumption highlighted by the scoping process is that the assessment will be scale-dependent and that, while carried out at the regional and subregional levels, all scales are equally important for its scope. In addition to findings at the regional or transboundary levels, local-level patterns and processes are also important in addressing biodiversity and biocultural diversity in the subregions, the relative gaps in science-based knowledge, as well as access to and information from indigenous peoples and local knowledge systems. It is further assumed that the region will have two working languages: English and Spanish.

II. Chapter outline

7. The assessment of the Americas region will follow the chapter outline set out in the generic scoping report but will focus in particular on the regionally specific scope set out in section I above. In addition, chapter 2 will examine the intrinsic value of biodiversity beyond its anthropocentric value underpinning nature's benefits to people.

III. Key data sets

8. Beyond the general issues concerning key data sets outlined in the generic scoping report, the present section sets out issues related to key data sets specific to the region. Relevant data sets from ongoing activities drawn from a wide range of sources, including global, regional, national, subnational and local institutions and organizations, will feed into those from the Americas regional assessment. Some examples are national biodiversity and strategic action plans, national reports, United Nations agencies, regional and national government research bodies, relevant data portals and repositories and subregional and national data sets, as well as data sets from literature, research and citizen science projects, in accordance with Platform procedures.

IV. Strategic partnership and initiatives

9. Beyond the general issues concerning strategic partnerships and initiatives outlined in the generic scoping report, the present section sets out issues related to strategic partnerships and initiatives specific to the region. In order to avoid duplication and identify synergies, the Americas regional assessment process will develop strong connections with regionally specific activities of relevant multilateral environmental agreements. It will also build strategic partnerships with United Nations regional agencies and public or private stakeholders that could provide scientific and technical support to the assessment. Regional, national and local community networks, including indigenous people and local community organizations, could help in linking the Americas regional assessment to local and other knowledge systems and could help on outreach and communication, in accordance with Platform procedures.

V. Operational structure

10. As noted in the generic scoping report, the operational structures best able to deliver the Americas regional assessment, including its capacity-building component, will be identified and utilized. A technical support unit may be established for the Americas region to coordinate the delivery of the regional assessment, working as part of the secretariat.

VI. Process and timetable

11. The process and timetable are set out in the generic scoping report for the regional and subregional assessments of biodiversity and ecosystem services.

VII. Cost estimate

12. The cost estimate is set out in the generic scoping report for the regional and subregional assessments of biodiversity and ecosystem services.

VIII. Communications and outreach

13. In addition to what is outlined in the generic scoping report, it is suggested that national and local governments be encouraged to translate relevant material from the Americas regional assessment report into local and native languages. The Platform will also engage with the relevant scientific community, knowledge holders, stakeholders and policymakers through national focal points and a non-exhaustive list of partners, including national science foundations, academies of science, branches of relevant United Nations agencies, biodiversity and ecosystem services and functions, regional and national networks, centres of excellence, research institutions, universities, international organizations, local, subregional and regional non-governmental organizations, and networks and organizations of indigenous people and local communities, as appropriate and needed.

IX. Capacity-building

14. Capacity-building will be based on the priorities submitted to the Platform by Governments and other stakeholders and will target individuals, institutions and indigenous and local communities through fellowships, training programmes and technical support with regard to access to and management of relevant data and information. It will support the establishment and/or strengthening of regional, subregional and national platforms and networks.

Annex VI

Scoping for a regional assessment of biodiversity and ecosystem services for Asia and the Pacific (deliverable 2 (b))

I. Scope, geographic area, rationale, utility and assumptions

A. Scope

1. Within the scope outlined in the generic scoping report for the regional and subregional assessment of biodiversity and ecosystem services (decision IPBES-3/1, annex III), particular challenges found across the Asia-Pacific region include climate change (particularly sea-level rise, increased intensity of extreme storm events, ocean acidification and glacier retreat), population growth, poverty, human consumption of natural resources, land degradation, deforestation, invasive alien species, the impact of trade (including the illegal trade in wildlife and non-timber forest

products), rapid urbanization, coastal pollution, poor governance of natural resources and the impact of altered fire regimes. These factors, together with others that have an impact on biodiversity and ecosystem services, will be considered in the report. There are also positive trends, such as an increase in awareness, forest cover and protected areas and a reduction in the region's carbon footprint. Issues specific to particular Asia-Pacific subregions will also be addressed, for example the interplay between food, water and energy security; biodiversity and livelihoods; waste management; and cooperative management of critical ecosystems shared by more than one country.

B. Geographic area of the assessment

2. The assessment will include countries and territories in five subregions as follows:

<i>Subregions</i>	<i>Countries and territories</i>
Oceania	Australia, Fiji, Kiribati, Marshall Islands, Micronesia (Federated States of), Nauru, New Zealand, Palau, Papua New Guinea, Samoa, Solomon Islands, Tonga, Tuvalu and Vanuatu. Pacific island territories of Cook Islands, New Caledonia, American Samoa, ^a Tokelau, ^a French Polynesia, ^a Niue, ^a Guam, ^a Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, Pitcairn Island ^a and Wallis and Futuna. ^a Oceanic and sub-Antarctic islands in the Pacific region (or Pacific and Indian Ocean regions)
South-East Asia	Brunei Darussalam, Cambodia, Indonesia, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Malaysia, Myanmar, Philippines, Singapore, Thailand, Timor-Leste and Viet Nam
North-East Asia	China, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Japan, Mongolia and Republic of Korea
South Asia	Afghanistan, Bangladesh, Bhutan, India, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Maldives, Nepal, Pakistan and Sri Lanka
Western Asia	Bahrain, Kuwait, Oman, Qatar, Saudi Arabia, United Arab Emirates and Yemen (Arabian peninsula); Iraq, Jordan, Lebanon, State of Palestine and Syrian Arab Republic (Mashreq)

^a Overseas territory.

C. Rationale

3. In the context of the general rationale outlined in the generic scoping report for the regional and subregional assessments of biodiversity and ecosystem services, the present section sets out the rationale specific to the Asia-Pacific region, which hosts some of the world's most important biological, cultural (including indigenous and local knowledge), geographic and economic diversity and has issues common and specific to small island nations such as sea-level rise and invasive alien species. The substantial rate of biodiversity loss in the region has a significant impact on human well-being. The assessment will review the status of biodiversity and ecosystem services pertaining to human well-being in the region through the lens of the sustainable development agenda and the forthcoming sustainable development goals. The

Asia-Pacific region is very diverse socioculturally, typified by rapidly urbanizing nations, wealthy nations and small and large island nations across the Pacific. In view of the contribution of the region's ecosystems to the overall well-being of the population, it is vital to maintain its capacity to provide goods and services. The major policy challenge of many nations in the region is to improve the standard of living in ways that provide equitable access to resources and do not further degrade biodiversity and ecosystem services. As much of the region's biodiversity is outside protected areas, innovative approaches have to be found for the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity and ecosystem services in multiple-use ecosystems. Intraregional trade places further pressure on biodiversity and ecosystem services in the region by displacing environmental effects from one nation to another. The transboundary management of biodiversity and ecosystem services is a significant policy challenge throughout most of the region.

D. Utility

4. In the context of the general utility outlined in the generic scoping report, this section sets out the utility specific to the Asia-Pacific region. The Asia-Pacific regional assessment will report on the status and trends of biodiversity and ecosystem services and the potential impact of loss across relevant scales in an Asia-Pacific context, using scientific information and other knowledge systems. The assessment will help decision makers and policymakers to develop relevant policy solutions, identify practical management options and tools and best practices for biodiversity and ecosystem services conservation in the Asia-Pacific region, its five subregions and national constituents. It will also devise management approaches for dealing with similar ecosystems and issues that are common across the region. Furthermore, it may assist in mainstreaming biodiversity and ecosystem services. The assessment will take into account the disparate national wealth and human population growth rates in the region to increase relevancy at all scales for all end users and decision makers. The

Asia-Pacific region has the most countries and territories and the highest concentration of local and indigenous communities of any region. The regional assessment report therefore needs to pay particular attention to cultural diversity, the interdependency of national economies in the region, intraregional trade impact, financial flows and existing cross-regional policies, among other factors. In order to be relevant to end users, these factors will be taken into consideration along with data sets and tools scalable to a local or contextual level. The regional assessment report will contribute to achieving the sustainability and conservation goals set out in the Aichi Biodiversity Targets, to be met by 2020, as well as the sustainable development goals that are to come into force in 2015. The Asia-Pacific regional assessment report will be valuable to Governments and to intergovernmental agencies (e.g., the Asian Productivity Organization, the Mekong River Commission), United Nations agencies, conservation organizations, scientific and research bodies (Future Earth, the Asia-Pacific Biodiversity Observation Network), scientists, indigenous and local communities and the rest of civil society. The assessment report will also be of interest to those institutions involved in intraregional trade policy, biodiversity and ecosystem services, and conservation policy and development, such as the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation, the Regional Comprehensive Economic Partnership, the World Trade Organization, the Asia-Pacific Network for Global Change Research, the Secretariat of the Pacific Community and the Acid Deposition Monitoring Network in East-Asia. Furthermore, the assessment report will be valuable to funding bodies and economic cooperation organizations that support research involving biodiversity and ecosystem services in the Asia-Pacific region, such as the World Bank, the Global Environment Facility, the Green Climate Fund, the Economic Cooperation Organization and the Asian Development Bank, as well as private investors and philanthropic organizations.

E. Assumptions

5. In the context of the general assumptions outlined in the generic scoping report, the present section sets out the assumptions specific to the Asia-Pacific region. While it is assumed that countries within the Asia-Pacific region will have sufficient experts available and willing to contribute to the assessment report with respect to development, resources, funding, data and knowledge, it is acknowledged that there will be a need for capacity-building across the region. In accordance with the rules of procedure of the Platform, the draft assessment report will be open to peer review by experts, policymakers and stakeholders, including indigenous and local communities. It is assumed that the regional assessment experts will collaborate with national Governments, national experts, research organizations, and local and indigenous communities. It is further assumed that best endeavours will be made to engage Governments, stakeholders and indigenous and local communities represented within the Asia-Pacific expert group. Data, models and scenarios will be adaptable and scalable to develop best management strategies, but there will be significant data gaps across the region.

II. Chapter outline

6. The assessment of the Asia-Pacific region will follow the chapter outline set out in the generic scoping report but will focus in particular on the regionally specific scope set out in section I above.

III. Key data sets

7. Beyond the general issues concerning key data sets outlined in the generic scoping report, this section sets out issues related to key data sets specific to this region. Relevant data sets from ongoing activities drawn from a wide range of sources, including global, regional, national, subnational and local institutions and organizations, will feed into the Asia-Pacific regional assessment. Some examples are national biodiversity and strategic action plans, national reports and data portals (the National Specimen Information Infrastructure (NSII) of China, the Global Biodiversity Information Facility, the Indian Bioresource Information Network, the Group on Earth Observations Biodiversity Observation Network with regional components, the Asia-Pacific Biodiversity Observation Network and subregional or national components, the Japanese Biodiversity Observation Network, and the Korea Biodiversity Observation Network); regional initiatives (the Economics of Ecosystems and Biodiversity for Southeast Asia); regional research institutes (Bioersivity International (Asia Pacific Oceania division), the Ocean Biogeographic Information System, the World Resources Institute, the CGIAR Consortium for Spatial Information, the International Centre for Integrated Mountain Development, the International Union for Conservation of Nature); government research institutes; and non-governmental organizations. Data sets from published scientific literature and citizen science projects, along with indigenous and local knowledge sources, will also be used within the assessment report.

IV. Strategic partnerships and initiatives

8. Beyond the general issues concerning strategic partnerships and initiatives outlined in the generic scoping report for the regional and subregional assessments of biodiversity and ecosystem services, the present section sets out issues related to strategic partnerships and initiatives specific to the Asia-Pacific region. In order to avoid duplication and identify synergies, the Asia-Pacific regional assessment process will develop strong connections with regionally specific activities of the multilateral environmental agreements such as the Convention on Biological Diversity and the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Flora and Fauna; and with regional bodies such as the Pacific Regional Environment Programme. It would also be useful to build a strategic partnership with the Association of Southeast Asian Nations Centre for Biodiversity and the Centre for International Forestry Research, which publish their own biodiversity assessments. Private and other stakeholders that might support scientific and technical support towards the Asia-Pacific regional assessment report include the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation, the South Asia Cooperative Environment Programme, the South Asian Association for Regional Cooperation, the Asian Development Bank, the World Bank, the Economy and Environment Programme for Southeast Asia, the Japan International Cooperation Agency and the Australian Agency for International Development, to name a few institutions that currently support a number of environmental initiatives. Local community networks, such as the Asia Indigenous Peoples Pact, could help to link the Asia-Pacific regional assessment report to local and indigenous communities or help with outreach and network aspects. The assessment will benefit from collaboration with many of the centres of excellence and research hubs based in the region.

V. Operational structure

9. As noted in the generic scoping report, the operational structures best able to deliver the Asia-Pacific regional assessment, including its capacity-building component, will need to be identified. A technical support unit may be established for the region to coordinate the delivery of the regional assessment, working as part of the secretariat.

VI. Process and timetable

10. The process and timetable are set out in the generic scoping report for the regional and subregional assessments of biodiversity and ecosystem services.

VII. Cost estimate

11. The cost estimate is presented in the generic scoping report for the regional and subregional assessments of biodiversity and ecosystem services.

VIII. Communications and outreach

12. In addition to what is outlined in the generic scoping report in this regard, it is suggested that national and local governments should be encouraged to translate relevant material from the Asia-Pacific regional assessment report into local languages. The Platform will also engage with the relevant scientific community, stakeholders and policymakers and decision makers through national focal points and a non-exhaustive list of partners, including centres of excellence (e.g., the Asia Pacific Association of Agricultural Research Institutions), research and academic institutions (the Institute for Global Environmental Strategies, the International Council for Science Regional Office for Asia and the Pacific, the Asia Pacific Institute of Research and the Asia Pacific Energy Research Centre, among others), international organizations, local non-governmental organizations and scientific networks.

IX. Capacity-building

13. As noted in the generic scoping report, capacity-building activities will be supported by the work programme of the Platform as implemented by the capacity-building task force. This would help strengthen the linkage between the science and indigenous and local knowledge components of the regional assessment. The task force on capacity-building will highlight priority issues to be addressed at the subregional level.

Annex VII

Scoping for a regional assessment on biodiversity and ecosystem services for Europe and Central Asia (deliverable 2 (b))

I. Scope, geographic area, rationale, utility and assumptions

A. Scope

1. Within the scope outlined in the generic scoping report for the regional and subregional assessments of biodiversity and ecosystem services, (decision IPBES-3/1, annex III), the key policy-relevant questions concern options and opportunities with regard to biodiversity and ecosystem services and their role for human well-being. The assessment will examine the opportunities for sectoral policies and policy instruments; managing production, consumption and economic development; and ecological infrastructures and ecological technologies. It will explore opportunities to promote food security, economic development and equality while avoiding land and aquatic degradation and conserving cultural landscapes. The Europe and Central Asia assessment will focus in particular on the following questions:

(a) How can ecosystems that provide ecosystem services, such as those underpinning ecosystem-based adaptation to climate change and nature-based solutions to sustainable development, be protected through investments, regulations and management regimes for terrestrial, freshwater, coastal and marine systems?

(b) What are the effects of production, consumption and economic development on biodiversity and ecosystem services and their contribution to human wellbeing? Major links with other regions will be assessed;

(c) How can sectoral policies and new policy instruments make use of opportunities arising from the contribution of biodiversity and ecosystem services to human well-being?

B. Geographic area of the assessment

2. For the purpose of the regional assessment, three subregions have been identified that include the following countries and territories, including marine and coastal areas:

<i>Subregions</i>	<i>Countries and territories within the Europe and Central Asia region</i>
Central and Western Europe	Albania, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Montenegro, Poland, Romania, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and Turkey (Group of Central European countries) Andorra, Austria, Belgium, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Iceland, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Malta, Monaco, Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, San Marino, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland and United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland (Group of Western European countries)
Eastern Europe	Armenia, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Georgia, Republic of Moldova, Russian Federation and Ukraine
Central Asia	Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Tajikistan, Turkmenistan and Uzbekistan

C. Rationale

3. In the context of the general rationale outlined in the generic scoping report, the present section sets out the rationale specific to the region. The assessment will address a number of international and regional issues of high priority as embodied in global and regional agreements, in national policy and in societal expectations. Important priorities include the issues covered by the four thematic assessments in the work programme of the Platform (pollinators, pollination and food production; land degradation and restoration; sustainable use and conservation of biodiversity and strengthening capacities and tools; and invasive alien species), in addition to sustainable agriculture, sustainable forestry, sustainable fisheries and biodiversity in areas sensitive to climate change. The assessment of opportunities for mainstreaming through sectoral policies and new policy instruments (such as certification, labelling, no net loss, offsetting, green infrastructure, national accounting, payment for environmental services schemes and social valuation) will be facilitated by Europe's longstanding policy experience, which puts the region in an excellent position to assess policy impacts with a view to learning lessons and resolving issues relating to trade-offs and associated costs, including the costs of policy inaction. An assessment of the European and Central Asian region will allow for the exploration of several transboundary issues, including water quality and quantity,

fisheries, climate change, air pollution and migratory species. It should raise awareness of shared environmental issues and contribute to the better articulation of policy across the entire region.

D. Utility

4. In the context of the general utility outlined in the generic scoping report, the present section sets out the utility specific to the region. The assessment will contribute to building multiple evidence bases (academic, indigenous and local knowledge, citizen science, etc.) for the links between biodiversity, ecosystem services and human well-being. It will explore options for effective management and policy interventions at appropriate levels of governance, including policy instruments such as environmental accounting systems, payments for ecosystem services and measures of growth that account for natural capital. The assessment will also help to identify capacity-building needs across subregions. The assessment will support parties in implementing global, regional and subregional agreements (see appendix). Furthermore, the assessment will also be relevant to the European Union's ongoing efforts to map and assess the state of ecosystems and their services in national territory (the Mapping and Assessment of Ecosystems and their Services (MAES) initiative). The assessment could also support the implementation of national legislation and, at the national and subnational levels, will provide clear standards, methods and resources (data information and knowledge; strategic partner list; mechanisms for including indigenous and local knowledge) for national and local government to support sustainable development and improve human well-being through maintaining and improving ecosystem services.

E. Assumptions

5. In the context of the general assumptions outlined in the generic scoping report, the present section sets out the assumptions specific to the region. The Europe and Central Asia regional assessment will draw on and, where possible and appropriate, contribute to ongoing and planned national and regional assessments, including those undertaken by the Economics of Ecosystems and Biodiversity initiative and the European Union MAES initiative to value some services and integrate them into accounting systems by 2020. In terms of environmental protection and the sustainable use of ecosystem services, there is substantial subregional variation in the region regarding, for example, the effects of economic development, which in some Central European, Eastern European and Central Asian countries is growing faster than in many Western European countries. Attention will be given to the different political and economic historical developments within and across the subregions. Differences between subregions in terms of their economic and political development offer the opportunity to transfer lessons between subregions. For the Western and Central Europe subregion, the policy opportunities offered by a common governance system are of particular interest. For the Central Asia subregion, opportunities for policies and institutional arrangements for the recovery of degraded terrestrial and aquatic ecosystems and for managing transboundary ecosystems are of particular interest.

II. Chapter outline

6. The assessment of the European and Central Asian region will follow the chapter outline set out in the generic scoping report (decision IPBES-3/1, annex III) but will, within that outline, focus on the regionally specific scope set out in the three questions identified in section I above.

7. In addition, in chapter 2, on nature's benefits to people and quality of life, analysis will also address the impact of ecosystem services on society and how innovation and nature-based solutions are influencing the job market in the region. The chapter will also examine the multiple values of biodiversity. In chapter 4, on direct and indirect drivers of change in the context of different perspectives on quality of life, emphasis will be placed on the regional and subregional aspects of land degradation and restoration as well as on invasive alien species and sustainable intensification of agriculture. Fire and floods will be included as drivers in the European and Central Asian assessment owing to their growing importance in the region. Chapter 5, on integrated and cross-scale analysis of interactions of the natural world and human society, will in particular consider issues that include increasing demand for biological raw materials in a bio-economy context (bioenergy, fibres and organic matter), climate change, food provisioning from land and water, and water availability. It will assess how the value of biodiversity and associated ecosystem services influences indirect drivers and how the integration of such values into national and local development planning and accounting may help address Aichi Biodiversity Target 2. In chapter 6, on options for governance, institutional arrangements and private and public decision-making across scales and sectors, the assessment will in particular consider future challenges for sustainable use and conservation in key sectors in the European and Central Asian region such as nature protection, agriculture, forestry, fisheries, water management, spatial planning, energy (including bioenergy), tourism, infrastructure and incentives

(including subsidies harmful to biodiversity as well as positive incentives for the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity).

III. Key data sets

8. Beyond the general issues related to key data sets outlined by the generic scoping report, the present section sets out issues related to key data sets specific to the region. The assessment will draw on a wide variety of data sets addressing the specific components of the conceptual framework. Relevant data sets could include those arising from ongoing and planned activities, such as the European Union MAES initiative referred to above, as well as those from a wide range of sources, including global, regional and national institutions and organizations, those from research projects, such as earth observation data, and analysis of the scientific literature. Data and information specific to the region might be retrieved from data centres such as the European Environment Agency, the Joint Research Centre, Eurostat, the Organization of the Black Sea Economic Cooperation, the Economic Cooperation Organization and relevant centres collecting earth observation data. They will also be collected from relevant research networks and projects.¹⁷ Other entities, including the Global Biodiversity Information Facility, the Encyclopaedia of Life, the Group on Earth Observations Biodiversity Observation Network and the International Union for Conservation of Nature also hold or provide access to important data and knowledge relevant to the region. Strategic partnerships with data holders will be developed and links to ongoing knowledge generation initiatives and activities established. Data availability for the region is variable with, in general, wider access to environmental data in Western and Central Europe than in Eastern Europe and Central Asia. Lack of data accessibility and compatibility in some countries of Eastern Europe and Central Asia is a key concern to be addressed by the Platform. Special efforts will be made to involve the data and information from indigenous and local knowledge and traditional ecological knowledge holders.

IV. Strategic partnership and initiatives

9. Beyond the general issues related to strategic partnerships and initiatives outlined in the generic scoping report, the present section sets out issues related to strategic partnerships and initiatives specific to the region. Strategic partnerships, whether formal or informal, with the above-mentioned data holders will be developed, and links to ongoing knowledge generation initiatives and activities established. Strategic partnerships should also be established with organizations working with indigenous and local knowledge systems, through societies and associations working with indigenous and local knowledge holders within the region. These include, for example, the Arctic Council, the Arctic Council Indigenous Peoples Secretariat and the European Citizen Science Association. The Pan-European Biodiversity Platform will contribute to the Europe and Central Asia assessment, including through the provision of technical support.

V. Operational structure

10. As noted in the generic scoping report for the regional or subregional assessments of biodiversity and ecosystem services, operational structures will need to be identified that will best deliver the assessment, including related capacity-building. Technical support units may be established to coordinate the delivery of this assessment, working as part of the secretariat. The operational structure will need to take into account existing initiatives and organizations, such as the MAES working group, the European Environment Agency and the pan-European Biodiversity Platform supported by the United Nations Environment Programme. The MAES initiative will be directly supported by ESMEALDA, a coordination support action funded under Horizon 2020, and indirectly by the knowledge generated in several European Union projects (such as OPERAs and OpenNESS) funded under the seventh Framework Programme for Research and Technological Development (FP7) and by knowledge generated by European Union Horizon 2020 projects, including the European Research Area on biodiversity and ecosystem services (BiodivERsA2 and 3), co-funded by the European Union and its member States. The organizational structure will also need to help facilitate cooperation between different subregions.

¹⁷ Relevant research projects and networks include Biodiversity Multi-Source Monitoring System – from Space to Species, Multi-scale Service for Monitoring NATURA 2000 Habitats of European Community Interest, Future Earth, European Biodiversity Observation Network, Operationalization of Natural Capital and Ecosystem Services, Ecosystem Science for Policy and Practice, the Ecosystem Services Partnership and A Long-Term Biodiversity, Ecosystem and Awareness Research Network.

VI. Process and timetable

11. The process and timetable are set out in the generic scoping report for the regional and subregional assessments of biodiversity and ecosystem services.

VII. Cost estimate

12. The cost estimate is set out in the generic scoping report for the regional and subregional assessments of biodiversity and ecosystem services.

VIII. Communications and outreach

13. It is necessary for this regional assessment to operate using existing formal and informal networks and to work across scales from the global to national and – ideally – subnational levels. The role of the technical support units, regional hubs and centres of excellence, together with the national focal points, is crucial in Central Europe, Eastern Europe and Central Asia. In the Central and Eastern Europe and Central Asia subregions, communications and outreach will include capacity-building on forming and sustaining networks, since the current culture of network building is less developed than in Western Europe. Any communications and outreach will need to be consistent with the Platform's communications and outreach strategy.

IX. Capacity-building

14. It is acknowledged that capacity-building needs vary widely within the region, not only from one subregion to another, but even from country to country. It will therefore be necessary to carefully assess capacity-building needs and promote and facilitate capacity-building activities that address those needs. For example, in parts of the region there is an urgent need to improve access to the data, information and knowledge that will help underpin assessment processes. In other parts of the region there is an urgent need for increased experience in developing and using tools such as scenarios and indicators. During implementation of the assessment it will be important to share experience as widely as possible, potentially through fellowship and staff exchange programmes. This should be focused on both individuals and institutional capacity.

Appendix**Examples of potentially relevant regional and subregional agreements**

1. Convention for the Protection of the Marine Environment of the North-East Atlantic (OSPAR Convention)
2. Convention on Access to Information, Public Participation in Decision-making and Access to Justice in Environmental Matters (Aarhus Convention)
3. Convention on the Conservation of European Wildlife and Natural Habitats (Bern Convention)
4. Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals (Bonn Convention)
5. Convention on the Protection of the Alps (Alpine Convention)
6. Convention on the Protection and Use of Transboundary Watercourses and International Lakes
7. European Landscape Convention and the European Union Birds Directive
8. European Union Common Agricultural Policy
9. European Union Common Fisheries Policy
10. European Union Habitats Directive
11. European Union Marine Strategy Framework Directive
12. European Union Nitrates Directive
13. European Union Water Framework Directive
14. Framework Convention on Protection of the Marine Environment of the Caspian Sea (Tehran Convention)
15. Framework Convention on the Protection and Sustainable Development of the Carpathians

16. Interstate Commission for Sustainable Development
17. Convention on Wetlands of International Importance especially as Waterfowl Habitat (Ramsar Convention)

Annex VIII

Scoping for a thematic assessment of land degradation and restoration (deliverable 3 (b) (i))

I. Introduction

1. At the second session of the Plenary of the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services, held in Antalya, Turkey, from 9 to 14 December 2013, member States approved the initiation of scoping for a thematic assessment of land degradation and restoration. Accordingly, a scoping document was developed by an expert group in accordance with the procedures for the preparation of the Platform's deliverables (IPBES-2/3, annex). The expert group met in Beijing from 9 to 11 September 2014, thanks to generous in-kind support received from China. The present note constitutes the scoping document developed by the expert group. Additional information on the work of the expert group is available in document IPBES/3/INF/18.

II. Scope, rationale, utility and assumptions

A. Scope

2. For the purposes of this thematic assessment, “degraded land” is defined as land in a state that results from persistent decline or loss of biodiversity and ecosystem functions and services that cannot fully recover unaided within decadal time scales. “Land degradation”, in turn, refers to the many processes that drive the decline or loss of biodiversity, ecosystem functions or services and includes the degradation of all terrestrial ecosystems. The assessment will include associated aquatic ecosystems that are impacted by land degradation. “Restoration” is defined as any intentional activity that initiates or accelerates the recovery of an ecosystem from a degraded state. The term “rehabilitation” is used to refer to restoration activities that may fall short of fully restoring a biotic community to its pre-degradation state, including natural regeneration and emergent ecosystems. This assessment will include eight chapters, the first four of which will report on the benefits of avoiding degradation and restoring degraded land for human well-being and quality of life (chapter 1); concepts and perceptions of land degradation and restoration, according to different worldviews, including those of indigenous and local people (chapter 2); indirect and direct drivers of degradation processes (chapter 3); the nature and extent of land degradation processes and the resultant loss or decline in biodiversity and ecosystem structure and functioning (chapter 4); and the impact of changes in land degradation and restoration on the delivery of nature's benefits to people and the impact of such changes on the quality of life (chapter 5). The following two chapters will explore the wide range of responses to land degradation by developing and applying a broad framework to assess the effectiveness of interventions intended to prevent, halt, reduce and mitigate processes of land degradation and to rehabilitate or restore degraded land (chapter 6) and a range of development scenarios, including the consideration of different response options and their implications for land degradation regionally and globally (chapter 7). The final chapter (chapter 8) will focus on providing decision support and policy relevant guidance to decision makers at all levels who are responsible for addressing land degradation problems and implementing restoration strategies. The assessment will seek to involve all relevant stakeholders from its inception. The structure of the assessment is based on the conceptual framework adopted by the Plenary of the Platform in its decision IPBES-2/4.

B. Geographic coverage of the assessment

3. The assessment will encompass all the terrestrial regions and biomes of the world, recognizing that land degradation drivers and processes can vary in severity within regions and countries as much as between them. The assessment will encompass the full range of human-altered systems, including but not limited to drylands, agricultural and agroforestry systems, savannahs and forests and aquatic systems associated with these areas.

C. Rationale

4. Land degradation, which is primarily a direct or indirect result of human activities, is a major problem on every continent except Antarctica. The total human cost of land degradation is not known, but the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) estimates the economic impact at more than \$40 billion annually. Building on the work of the Rio conventions

(the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification in Those Countries Experiencing Serious Drought and/or Desertification, Particularly in Africa, the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change and the Convention on Biological Diversity), and the United Nations Conference on Sustainable Development (Rio+20), the goals of halting and reversing land degradation and decoupling economic growth from environmental degradation have been proposed as part of the sustainable development goals. These goals include Convention on Biological Diversity Aichi Biodiversity Targets 5, 7, 14 and 15 and the ongoing process for developing a post-2015 development agenda. In 2011, in recognition of the benefits to people of restoring degraded land, world leaders endorsed the “Bonn Challenge”, a global effort to restore 150 million hectares of deforested and degraded land by 2020. As a first step towards meeting that goal, there is a clear need to assess the extent, causes and processes of land degradation and the consequences for biodiversity and people, as well as evaluating responses to the restoration and rehabilitation of degraded land and the avoidance of future degradation and the benefits that this will deliver to people.

D. Utility

5. This expert-led assessment will provide the information and guidance necessary to support stakeholders working at all levels to reduce the negative environmental, social and economic consequences of land degradation and to rehabilitate and restore degraded land to aid the recovery of nature’s benefits to people. It will draw on information from scientific, indigenous and local knowledge systems to increase awareness and identify areas of concern. It will help to identify potential solutions to the challenges posed by land degradation, informing decision makers in public, private and civil society sectors. It will provide a framework for understanding, monitoring and taking action to halt and reverse land degradation in order to support decision-making at all levels and it will identify critical knowledge gaps and priority areas for new research and investment to enhance capacity in the sustainable management of land and biodiversity and their benefits to people.

E. Assumptions

6. The assessment will be based on both science and other knowledge systems, including indigenous and local knowledge systems. Land degradation is recognized as predominantly anthropogenically driven and as such is ultimately a consequence of the activities of institutions, governance and other indirect drivers (sociopolitical, economic, technological and cultural factors). The restoration of degraded land will be evaluated in its broadest sense, from partial rehabilitation to full restoration of the system to its pre-degradation state. Addressing direct and indirect drivers of degradation, promoting restoration and designing and implementing sustainable land management systems require a participatory process involving the co-production of knowledge with relevant and diverse stakeholders. The assessment will take account of both the negative impact of land degradation and the benefits to people of preventing, halting, reducing and mitigating degradation and restoring degraded land.

III. Chapter outline

7. The assessment will be presented in a summary for policymakers and an eight-chapter report, as set out below. An introduction will briefly review the rationale, utility and assumptions of the assessment, as well as the approach adopted and the rationale for the chapter sequence. An executive summary will present key findings and policy-relevant conclusions.

8. **Chapter 1. Benefits to people from avoidance of land degradation and restoration of degraded land.** This chapter will present a brief summary of the benefits to human well-being and quality of life that can be achieved by the halting, reduction and mitigation of degradation processes as well as the restoration of degraded land. The chapter will draw on information and insights from all other chapters, highlighting examples of success stories of how land conservation and restoration measures have helped to deliver improvements in livelihoods, reduce poverty and strengthen the long-term sustainability of land use and the extraction of natural resources.

9. **Chapter 2. Concepts and perceptions of land degradation and restoration.** This chapter will focus on assessing and comparing differing concepts and perceptions of land degradation and restoration, stemming from both science and other knowledge systems, including indigenous and local knowledge. The chapter will also review concepts and approaches used to assess the diversity of land degradation processes, the status of ecosystems and the impact thereon, as well as concepts and approaches used to describe different responses, including rehabilitation and restoration.

10. **Chapter 3. Direct and indirect drivers of land degradation and restoration.** This chapter will assess how land degradation and restoration are the result of multiple drivers, involving both direct anthropogenic and natural factors and interactions between them, as well as underlying indirect drivers. Direct drivers of degradation (e.g., unsustainable levels of biomass extraction and extractive industries) can result directly in degraded land, including reduction in the productivity of land, or in processes such as soil erosion due to unsustainable land management techniques, and natural drivers, such as floods, wind and drought, that result in land degradation. Direct drivers of restoration, encompassing both passive and active approaches, can result in either halting or reducing degradation and in the recovery of biodiversity and ecosystem functions. Indirect drivers of land degradation and restoration are related to institutions and governance systems, as well as social, cultural, technological and economic factors, including poverty, which underpin direct drivers, at the local to global levels. The chapter will assess the extent and severity of different drivers and how they vary within and between different biomes, regions and land-use systems around the world. The assessment of direct drivers will include anthropogenic drivers at global, national, regional and local scales, including human-driven climate change, as well as natural drivers and interactions between anthropogenic and natural drivers. Particular attention will be paid to climate change and its interaction with other anthropogenic drivers of land degradation, including interactions between processes of land degradation and extreme weather events.

11. **Chapter 4. Status and trends of land degradation and restoration and associated changes in biodiversity and ecosystem functions.** This chapter will focus on the status and trends of land degradation and restoration in terms of changes in biodiversity and ecosystem functioning, as well as the degradation and restoration processes that result in those changes. Degradation processes include soil erosion, contamination, compaction, sealing, sedimentation, loss of organic matter, soil and water salinization, degradation of freshwater systems, invasion of alien species, changes in natural fire regimes and pollution. Degradation can also include landscape-scale processes such as changes in ecological connectivity, land cover and land use and changes in land management practices. Restoration processes include the avoiding, halting and reversing of degradation processes as well as the recovery of biodiversity and ecosystem functions. The chapter will assess levels of land degradation and restoration with regard to the type, extent and severity of changes in both biodiversity and ecosystem structure and functioning in different biomes and under different land-use and management systems. Changes in biodiversity include changes to both wild biodiversity and agrobiodiversity, including both above-ground and below-ground biodiversity. Changes in ecosystem structure and functioning include aspects such as primary productivity, nutrient cycling and the provision of habitat for species. Particular attention will be given to understanding system resilience (capacity to recover systems structure and functions following a perturbation), including the potential for thresholds and sudden changes in key attributes of biodiversity and critical ecosystem functions.

12. **Chapter 5. Land degradation and restoration associated with changes in ecosystem services and functions and human well-being and good quality of life.** This chapter will focus on the impact of land degradation and restoration on changes to the delivery of nature's benefits to people and the resultant impact on quality of life. The chapter will assess land degradation associated with the loss of benefits to people including provisioning services, such as food production, quality and quantity of water resources, and availability of raw materials, as well as regulating, cultural services and other aspects of nature, recognizing a diverse conceptualization of the values of nature. The chapter will analyse changes in benefits to people in terms of the relative contribution of biodiversity and ecosystem structure and functioning and that of anthropogenic assets (e.g., technologies, knowledge) applied by people in the co-production of benefits. The impact on the diverse dimensions of a good quality of life will include the impact on health, poverty, income-generating opportunities, meaningful livelihoods, the equitable distribution of natural resources and rights and values considered important in different cultures. The chapter will consider the diverse costs of land degradation and benefits of restoration for people, including the overall economic and non-economic costs and benefits, encompassing those that are associated with the area of degraded or restored land itself, as well as costs or benefits borne by people in other areas who are affected by degraded or restored sites. For both land degradation and restoration the chapter will examine the type, extent and severity of these changes in different social-ecological systems in different land cover and land management systems, including their implications for social and ecological stability and resilience and cultural integrity.

13. **Chapter 6. Responses to avoid land degradation and restore degraded land.** This chapter will develop a framework for assessing the effectiveness of existing interventions to prevent, halt, reduce and mitigate the processes of land degradation and to rehabilitate and restore degraded land through the recovery of biodiversity and ecosystem structure and functioning and their benefits to people. The chapter will assess how past and current responses to degradation problems and

restoration approaches vary according to context, including the type and severity of land degradation and underlying direct and indirect drivers, as well as the consequences of land degradation and the restoration for nature's benefits to people and quality of life. The chapter will analyse the effectiveness of addressing the indirect causes of land degradation and restoration (institutions, governance systems and other indirect drivers), as compared to efforts to address direct drivers or anthropogenic assets (better techniques, access to training). The chapter will assess the relative success or failure, as well as the potential risks, of different institutional, governance and management response options against a range of social, cultural, economic, technological and political criteria. It will explore how responses to prevent land degradation through sustainable use compare with efforts to deal with its effects through adaptation and restoration. The chapter will also assess different institutional, policy and governance responses based on the type of policy instrument used, as well as support given to research and technology development, institutional reform and capacity-building.

14. **Chapter 7. Scenarios of land degradation and restoration.** This chapter will explore the implications of a range of plausible development scenarios, including the adoption of different response options across multiple scales, and their implications for land degradation and restoration globally, including impacts on human well-being and quality of life and possible trade-offs between social, economic and environmental objectives. Scenarios will be developed using information derived from the assessment and work from across the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services, motivated by a systematic review of other scenario exercises of this type, including the Platform's ongoing methodological assessment of scenario analysis and modelling of biodiversity and ecosystem services, to be released at the end of 2015. The chapter will reveal the variation in plausible land degradation and restoration futures that depend on choices (with associated social and economic implications) made at the landscape, national, subregional, regional and international scales to address indirect and direct drivers and introduce new mechanisms for avoiding land degradation, mitigating its impacts and rehabilitating and restoring degraded sites.

15. **Chapter 8. Decision support to address land degradation and support restoration of degraded land.** This chapter will consolidate and rationalize information necessary to support evidence-based decision-making and institution-building for policymakers and practitioners responsible for selecting and implementing strategies for addressing land degradation problems and restoring degraded land. The chapter will assess actions necessary to develop institutional competencies in the detection and analysis of land degradation problems and the design, implementation, management and monitoring of response strategies, including data, methods, decision support tools and stakeholder engagement. The chapter will place land degradation problems and potential restoration solutions in the wider policy, socioeconomic and environmental context, emphasizing the importance of institutions, governance and other indirect drivers that are the root drivers of both degradation and restoration. It will consider interactions between land degradation and restoration and other major policy areas such as farming and food, flood risk and water resource management, climate change adaptation and mitigation, invasive species and disease management, biocultural diversity conservation, public health and rural, urban and industrial development.

IV. Key information to be assessed

16. The information to be assessed will be drawn from relevant articles, books, regional, national and international assessments, reports by and data from Governments, United Nations bodies and national and international non-governmental organizations and indigenous and local knowledge in accordance with the recommendations of the task force on indigenous and local knowledge,¹⁸ including knowledge that is not available in written form, and in accordance with the procedures for the preparation of Platform deliverables.

V. Operational structure

17. The operational structure will consist of a technical support unit (comprising one full-time equivalent Professional staff member). Two co-chairs, 80 authors and 16 review editors will be selected by the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel, in accordance with the procedures for the preparation of the Platform's deliverables.

18. The head of the technical support unit, the two co-chairs, one representative of the Panel and one representative of the Bureau will hold a management meeting as a first step towards operationalizing the assessment.

¹⁸ Established by the Plenary by decision IPBES-2/5.

VI. Strategic partnership and initiatives

19. The land degradation assessment will identify as possible partners organizations that can contribute their data and knowledge; provide in-kind support; act as clients and users of the assessment; and provide assistance at various stages, including by helping to review the assessment. The partnerships entered into will mostly be informal, but a limited number of strategic partnerships may be established. Collaboration will be developed, in particular with the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification, especially its science-policy interface and its Committee on Science and Technology, as a key user of and a key contributor to the assessment on land degradation. Collaboration should also be developed with the Global Soil Partnership and its Intergovernmental Technical Panel on Soils, which is to produce a first report on the state of the world's soil resources by 5 December 2015.

VII. Process and timetable

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

<i>Date</i>	<i>Actions and institutional arrangements</i>
2015	
First quarter	Plenary at its third session approves the conduct of the land degradation and restoration assessment coupled with the regional assessments of biodiversity and ecosystem services, asks for offers of in-kind technical support for the assessment and requests the Bureau and the secretariat to establish the necessary institutional arrangements to put in place technical support The Chair, through the secretariat, requests nominations from Governments and other stakeholders of experts to prepare the assessment report
Second quarter	Secretariat compiles lists of nominations The Panel selects the assessment co-chairs, coordinating lead authors, lead authors and review editors, using the approved selection criteria set out in decision IPBES-2/3 (IPBES/2/17, annex) Meeting of the Management Committee (co-chairs, head of the technical support unit, and MEP/Bureau members) to select remaining expert team and respective roles (i.e., coordinating lead authors, lead authors and review editors) Selected nominees contacted, gaps filled and list of co-chairs, authors and review editors finalized
Second/early third quarter	First author meeting with 80 participants: co-chairs, coordinating lead authors and lead authors, plus Panel/Bureau members. This group of 80 includes the 20 experts on land degradation involved in the regional assessments (five experts for each of the four regional assessments)
2016	
First quarter	First drafts of chapters prepared (6–7 months) and sent to secretariat (technical support unit) Compilation of chapters into first draft (6 weeks)
Second quarter	First draft of collated regional and subregional land degradation assessments sent for expert review (6 weeks) Collation of review comments by secretariat technical support unit for first draft sent to authors (2 weeks)
Second/early Third quarter	Second author meeting coupled with second author meetings of the regional assessments (80 participants, including the 20 authors involved in the regional assessments): : co-chairs, coordinating lead authors, lead authors and review editors)
Third quarter	Second drafts of chapters and first draft of summary for policymakers prepared (5–6 months)
2017	
First quarter	Second draft of the assessment and first draft of the summary for policymakers sent for government and expert review (2 months)
First quarter	Collation of review comments for second draft of the assessment and first draft of the summary for policymakers sent to authors (2 weeks)
Second quarter	Third author meeting coupled with third author meetings of the regional assessments (4 x 30 participants: co-chairs, coordinating lead authors and review editors and Panel/Bureau members)
Third quarter	Final text changes to the assessment and the summary for policymakers (3 months)
Third quarter	Translation of the summary for policymakers into the six official languages of the United Nations (1 month)
Fourth quarter	Submission of the assessment, including the translated summary for policymakers, to Governments for final review prior to Plenary session (6 weeks)

Fourth quarter	Final government comments on the summary for policymakers for consideration by authors prior to next Plenary session
2018	
January (To be confirmed)	Plenary to approve/accept the land degradation and restoration assessment, including the summaries for policymakers

VIII. Cost estimate

21. The table below shows the estimated cost of conducting and preparing the assessment report.

<i>Year</i>	<i>Cost item</i>	<i>Assumptions</i>	<i>Estimated costs (United States dollars)</i>	
2015	Meeting of co-chairs and secretariat/technical support unit	Meeting costs (1/2 week, 5 participants, in Bonn)	0	
		Travel and DSA (3 x \$3,750)	11 250	
	First author meeting (80 participants: co-chairs, coordinating lead authors and lead authors)	Meeting costs (1 week, 80 participants) (25 per cent in kind)	18 750	
		Travel and DSA (64 x \$3,750)	240 000	
	Technical support	1 full-time equivalent professional position (50 per cent in kind)	75 000	
2016	Second author meeting (participants: co-chairs, coordinating lead authors and review editors)	Meeting costs (1 week, 4 x 15 participants) (25 per cent in kind)	0	
		Travel and DSA (48 x \$3,750)	144 000	
	Joint coordination meeting of co-chairs and technical support unit together with co-chairs and technical support units of other thematic assessments	Meeting costs (1 week, 5 participants)	0	
		Travel and DSA (3 x \$3,750)	11 250	
	Technical support	1 full-time equivalent professional position (50 per cent in kind)	75 000	
2017	Third author meeting (30 participants: co-chairs, coordinating lead authors, review editors)	Meeting costs	0	
		Travel and DSA (75 x \$3,750)	90 000	
		Technical support	1 full-time equivalent professional position (50 per cent in kind)	75 000
		Participation by the two co-chairs and two coordinating lead authors in fifth session of Plenary	Travel and DSA (3 x \$3,750)	11 250
2018	Dissemination and outreach	Translation of summary for policymakers into the six official languages of the United Nations, publication and outreach	117 000	
Total			868 500	

IX. Communications and outreach

22. The assessment report and its summary for policymakers will be published and the summary for policymakers will be made available in the six official languages of the United Nations. The report and the summary will be made available on the Platform's website (www.ipbes.net). Dissemination will target all Platform stakeholders and will be adapted to the specific needs of different users, following the agreed Platform communications and outreach strategy.

X. Capacity-building

23. Capacity-building activities will be organized in accordance with the implementation plan of the task force on capacity-building, in such areas as implementation of the fellowship programme.

Decision IPBES-3/2: 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,

Noting the status of cash and in-kind contributions received to date as set out in annex II to the present decision,

Noting also noting pledges for the period beyond 2014,

Noting further the status of expenditures in the biennium 2013–2014 as set out in annex II to the present decision, as well as the level of savings incurred during the biennium,

1. *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 them to support the work of the Platform;
2. *Requests* the Executive Secretary, working under the guidance of the Bureau, to report to the Plenary at its fourth session on expenditures for the biennium 2014–2015;
3. *Adopts* the revised budget for 2015 amounting to \$9,506,304 as set out in annex II to the present decision;
4. *Takes note* of the proposed budget for the biennium 2016–2017, amounting to \$9,995,346 in 2016 and \$8,506,566 in 2017, noting that it will require further revision prior to its adoption;
5. *Requests* the Executive Secretary, in consultation with the Bureau, to provide to the Plenary at its fourth session a report on established practices of multilateral environmental organizations, the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change and other relevant forums on the funding of experts and meeting participants to facilitate the adoption by the members of the Platform of an informed decision on the eligibility criteria to be used;
6. *Approves* the amendment to the Financial Rules and Procedures through the addition of rules 5, 6 and 7 as set out in annex I to the present decision;
7. *Authorizes* the Executive Secretary, subject to the availability of funds, to engage the resources of the Platform to organize the fourth session of the Plenary at the beginning of 2016.

Annex I

Amendment to the financial procedures and rules of the Platform relating to pledges to the Platform trust fund

The following text is to be inserted following rule 5 of the financial procedures and rules of the Platform; all subsequent rules are to be renumbered accordingly.

Rule 6

At any given time, members and non-members of the Platform may submit voluntary pledges to the Trust Fund. Such pledges must be confirmed in writing, on official letterhead and signed by a duly authorized official of the submitting entity. Written confirmation of pledges should be sent to the Executive Secretary of the Platform secretariat. Pledge letters must contain indications of payment arrangements in terms of timelines and instalments.

Rule 7

Pledge letters received in compliance with rule 6 above will, until payment, be recorded as pledges as part of the contributions table presented at sessions of the Plenary. Pledges will be reflected in United States dollars, applying the prevailing United Nations exchange rate at the time the table is updated. The value of outstanding pledges made in a currency other than the United States dollar will potentially fluctuate every time the contributions table is updated.

Rule 8

All duly submitted formal pledges that have not been converted into actual contributions twelve months following the timeline arrangements disclosed in their corresponding pledge letters will automatically be written off and removed by the secretariat from official documentation presenting the status of contributions to the Platform. Pledges may, on an exceptional basis, be extended by an additional period of twelve months based on receipt by the Executive Secretary of a renewed commitment letter proposing new timelines and instalments. The Chair of the Platform will inform the Plenary of all pledges written off at the subsequent session of the Plenary under the agenda item on financial and budgetary arrangements for the Platform.

Annex II

Financial and budgetary arrangements

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 15 January 2015.

Table 1
Status of cash contributions received and pledges confirmed after the establishment of the Platform in April 2012 (from 1 May 2012 to 15 January 2015)
 (United States dollars)

Country	Contributions				Pledges per United Nations exchange rate as at 14 January 2015				
	2012 (1)	2013 (2)	2014 (3)	Total (4)= (1)+(2)+(3)	2013–2014 (5)	2015 (6)	2016–2018 (7)	Total (8)= (5)+(6)+(7)	Total (9)= (4)+(8)
Australia		97 860		97 860				0	97 860
Canada ^a		38 914	36 426	75 340		40 000	80 000	120 000	195 410
Chile				0	30 000			30 000	30 000
China			160 000	160 000				0	160 000
Colombia				0				0	0
Denmark ^a			37 037	37 037				0	37 037
Ethiopia				0				0	0
Finland ^a		25 885	275 626	301 511				0	301 511
France		270 680	247 631	518 311				0	518 311
Germany ^a	1 736 102	1 298 721	1 850 129	4 884 952		1 219 512	3 658 537	4 878 049	9 763 001
India		10 000	10 000	20 000				0	20 000
Japan		267 900	330 000	597 900		300 000		300 000	897 900
Latvia			4 299	4 299				0	4 299
Malaysia				0		100 000		100 000	100 000
Netherlands			678 426	678 426				0	678 426
New Zealand		16 094	17 134	33 228		19 531		19 531	52 759
Norway		140 458	8 118 860	8 259 318				0	8 259 318
Republic of Korea		20 000		20 000				0	20 000
South Africa			30 000	30 000				0	30 000
Sweden		228 349	194 368	422 717		191 083		191 083	613 800
Switzerland		76 144	84 793	160 937		75 758	227 273	303 031	463 968
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland ^b		1 285 694	1 046 145	2 331 839				0	2 331 839
United States of America	500 000	500 000	500 000	1 500 000				0	1 500 000
Total	2 236 102	4 276 699	13 620 874	20 133 675	30 000	1 945 884	3 965 810	5 941 694	26 075 369

^a Adjustment for the actual conversion of the contribution.

^b The third instalment of the 2013–2015 Department for International Development contribution was double counted in 2014 in the amount of 250,000 pounds sterling, equivalent to \$418,060; the amount shown as collected in 2014 has therefore been reduced.

2. Table 2 shows the in-kind contributions received in 2014 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 to 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 in 2014

(United States dollars)

<i>Government/institution</i>	<i>Activity</i>	<i>Type of support</i>	<i>Corresponding value as provided or estimated</i>
In-kind contributions related to technical support			
China	Full-time consultant in the Platform secretariat in support of the delivery of regional assessments (deliverable 2 (b))	Technical support	140 000
Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations	Technical support to the secretariat on the delivery of the assessment on pollination (deliverable 3 (a))	Technical support	–
International Union for Conservation of Nature	0.5 full-time equivalent of International Union for Conservation of Nature staff to support stakeholder engagement (deliverable 4 (d))	Technical support	–
Norway	Technical support unit for the task force on capacity-building (deliverables 1 (a) and (b))	Technical support	300 000
Netherlands	Technical support unit for the assessment of scenario analysis and modelling (deliverable 3 (c))	Technical support	250 000
Republic of Korea	Technical support unit for the task force on knowledge and data (deliverable 1 (d))	Technical support	300 000
United Nations Development Programme	Technical support related to capacity-building in the context of BES-Net (deliverables 1 (a) and (b))	Technical support	390 000
United Nations Environment Programme	Technical support to the Platform secretariat	Technical support	243 151
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
In-kind contributions related to meetings scheduled as part of the approved work programme			
State of Sao Paulo Research Foundation, Brazil	Second meeting of the task force on capacity-building in Sao Paulo, Brazil (deliverables 1 (a) and (b))	Meeting facilities, support to developing country participants, local support	42 000
China	Scoping meeting for the assessment on land degradation and restoration in Beijing (deliverable 3 (b) (i))	Meeting facilities, support to developing country participants, local support	100 000
Germany	Third Multidisciplinary Expert Panel and Bureau meetings in Bonn, Germany	Meeting facilities	–
	Third Plenary session in Bonn, Germany	Meeting facilities	500 000

<i>Government/institution</i>	<i>Activity</i>	<i>Type of support</i>	<i>Corresponding value as provided or estimated</i>
Norway	First meeting of the task force on capacity-building in Trondheim, Norway (deliverables 1 (a) and (b))	Meeting facilities, local support	–
	Second meeting of the task force on capacity-building in Sao Paulo, Brazil (deliverables 1 (a) and (b))	Meeting facilities, local support	–
Republic of Korea	First meeting of the task force on knowledge and data (deliverable 1 (d))	Meeting facilities, local support	–
United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization	Meeting scoping regional assessments	Contribution to meeting facilities, local support	–
In-kind contributions in support of the work programme			
Germany and Philippines	Extra expert workshop on value/valuation of biodiversity in the context of indigenous knowledge		–
United States of America	Two extra dialogue meetings of indigenous knowledge holders in the context of the assessment on pollination		50 000
In-kind contribution related to other activities of the work programme			
Monaco	Purchase of communication material (USB sticks)	Support for outreach activities	5 000

3. The Platform has received in-kind offers from:

(a) Twelve Governments: Australia, Brazil, China, Germany, Japan, Norway, Monaco, Netherlands, Philippines, Republic of Korea, Switzerland and United States of America;

(b) Twenty-four organizations: Australian Research Council Centre of Excellence for Environmental Decisions, Australia; FAPESP Research Programme on Biodiversity Characterization, Conservation, Restoration and Sustainable Use (BIOTA-FAPESP), Brazil; BIOTA-FAPESP and State University of Campinas, Brazil; Conservation of Arctic Flora and Fauna, Arctic Council; Cropper Foundation; Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations; German Centre for Integrative Biodiversity Research; Global Biodiversity Information Facility; Group on Earth Observations Biodiversity Observation Network; Inter-American Institute for Global Change Research, Brazil; International Council for the Exploration of the Sea; International Council for Science; International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis; International Union for Conservation of Nature; National Biodiversity Institute of Costa Rica; Network of Mediterranean Marine Protected Areas, France; Society for Conservation Biology; Terrestrial Ecosystem Research Network, Australia; United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification in Those Countries Experiencing Serious Drought and/or Desertification, Particularly in Africa; United Nations Development Programme; United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP); UNEP-World Conservation Monitoring Centre (UNEP-WCMC); United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization; University of Agriculture, Faisalabad, Pakistan.

4. The Platform has not yet had the opportunity to consider all of the generous offers received in 2014, given that the work programme is still unfolding. As the work programme progresses, the Bureau and Multidisciplinary Expert Panel will consider how to use additional offers. It is likely that the Platform will be able to effectively draw on some of those offers in the context of the support to be provided to the task forces on capacity-building, indigenous and local knowledge systems and knowledge and data, as well as in the context of regional assessments, among others.

II. Expenditures for the 2013 financial year

5. Table 3 shows the expenditures (as at 31 December 2013) for 2013 against the budget for 2013 approved by the Plenary at its first session.

Table 3

Expenditures for 2013

(United States dollars)

<i>Budget item</i>	<i>2013 approved budget</i>	<i>2013 expenditure</i>	<i>Balance</i>
Meetings of the Platform bodies			
First session of the Plenary (6 days)	1 000 000	295 224 ^a	704 776
First meeting of the Bureau (5 days)	30 000	5 587 ^b	24 413
First meeting of the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel (3 days)	85 000	31 484	53 516
Knowledge systems expert workshop	–	–	–
Draft conceptual framework expert workshop	–	–	–
Second meeting of the Bureau (5 days) (Cape Town)	30 000	29 511	489
Second meeting of the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel (3 days) (Cape Town)	85 000	63 253	21 747
Second session of the Plenary (6 days) ^c	862 500	939 188	(76 688)
Total, meetings of the Platform bodies	2 092 500	1 364 247	728 253
Secretariat (20 per cent of the annual costs for staff in the Professional and higher categories and 50 per cent of the annual costs for staff in the General Service category)			
Head of Secretariat (D-1)	80 310	–	80 310
Programme Officer (P-3/4)	61 100	–	61 100
Programme Officer (P-2/3)	52 110	–	52 110
Programme Officer (P-2/3)	–	–	–
Associate Programme Officer (P-1/2)	–	–	–
Administrative support staff member (G-5)	55 150	33 284	21 866
Administrative support staff member (G-5)	55 150	–	55 150
Administrative support staff member (G-5)	–	–	–
Total, secretariat	303 820	33 284	270 536
Interim secretariat arrangements (personnel costs in advance of the recruitment of the staff of the secretariat for the development of the work programme)			
Interim secretariat costs to support the 2013 intersessional process	370 000	534 212 ^d	(164 211)
Total, interim secretariat arrangements	370 000	534 212	(164 211)
Publications, outreach and communications (website, corporate materials, outreach events, outreach and communications strategy)			
Outreach materials for the second session of the Plenary (website management, printing)	50 000	25 000	25 000
<i>Earth Negotiations Bulletin</i> reporting for the first ^e session of the Plenary	50 000	36 344	13 656
Total, publications, outreach and communications	100 000	61 344	38 656

<i>Budget item</i>	<i>2013 approved budget</i>	<i>2013 expenditure</i>	<i>Balance</i>
Miscellaneous expenses			
Travel of secretariat staff on official business	75 000	66 221	8 779
Monitoring and evaluation (development of draft process for review and evaluation of the efficiency and effectiveness of the Platform)	20 000	–	20 000
Contingency (5 per cent of total budget)	148 000	–	148 000
Total, miscellaneous expenses	243 000	66 221	176 779
Subtotal	3 109 320	2 059 308	1 050 012
UNEP programme support (13 per cent)	404 211	267 446	136 765
Total cost to project	3 513 531	2 326 754	1 186 777

^a A portion of the meeting and travel costs for developing country participants for the first session of the Plenary (January 2013) were accounted for in 2012. In addition, the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) provided a cash contribution to support the Plenary. The total cost of the first session was \$1,064,609.

^b Significant contributions towards the costs of the first Bureau and Multidisciplinary Expert Panel meetings were provided by the Government of Norway in conjunction with its hosting of the seventh Trondheim Conference on Biodiversity, held from 27 to 31 May 2013 in Trondheim, Norway.

^c Originally budgeted for five days, the second session of the Plenary was a six-day meeting, and regional consultations were held prior to the meeting as approved by the Bureau.

^d The interim secretariat costs include dedicated UNEP and UNEP World Conservation Monitoring Centre staff costs supporting the work in 2013 (inclusive of the first and second sessions of the Plenary intersessional work in 2013). Following the arrival of the Executive Secretary of the Platform in February 2014, the process of recruiting the rest of the secretariat was initiated. The total net costs for secretariat support in 2013 resulted in an overall underspend of \$106,324 against the approved 2013 budget (\$270,536 underspend for secretariat costs and \$164,211 overspend for interim secretariat costs).

^e The cost incurred in 2013 for Earth Negotiations Bulletin reporting was for the first session of the Plenary held in January 2013. The cost for Earth Negotiations Bulletin reporting for the second session of the Plenary held in December 2013 is reflected in the 2014 expenditures.

III. Expenditures for the 2014 financial year

6. Table 4 shows the expenditures (as at 30 November 2014) for 2014 against the budget for 2014 approved by the Plenary at its second session (decision IPBES-2/6).

Table 4
Expenditures for 2014, as at 30 November 2014
(United States dollars)

<i>Budget item</i>	<i>Breakdown</i>	<i>2014 approved budget</i>	<i>2014 expenditure</i>	<i>Balance</i>
Meetings of the Platform bodies				
Third session of the Plenary	Meeting costs: \$600,000			–
	Travel costs (120 supported): \$480,000	1 080 000	192 449	887 551
Bureau (2 sessions of 6 days)	Meeting costs: \$10,000			–
	Travel costs (7 supported): \$24,500	69 000	61 974	7 026
Multidisciplinary Expert Panel (2 sessions of 4 days)	Meeting costs: \$20,000			–
	Travel costs (20 supported): \$60,000	160 000	141 218	18 782
Total, meetings of the Platform bodies		1 309 000	395 641	913 359

<i>Budget item</i>	<i>Breakdown</i>	<i>2014 approved budget</i>	<i>2014 expenditure</i>	<i>Balance</i>
Implementation of the work programme for 2014				
Objective 1	Strengthen the capacity and knowledge foundations of the science-policy interface to implement key functions of the Platform	1 155 000	405 112	749 888
Objective 2	Strengthen the science-policy interface on biodiversity and ecosystem services at and across the subregional, regional and global levels	482 500	511 070	(28 570)
Objective 3	Strengthen the science-policy interface on biodiversity and ecosystem services with regard to thematic and methodological issues	997 500	499 460	498 040
Objective 4	Communicate and evaluate Platform activities, deliverables and findings	421 250	189 253	231 997
Total, implementation of the work programme for 2014		3 056 250	1 604 895	1 451 355
Secretariat				
Project personnel				
	Head of Secretariat (D-1)	276 700	213 394	63 306
	Programme Officer (P-4)	174 160	76 702	97 458
	Programme Officer (P-4) ^a		–	–
	Programme Officer (P-3)	145 280	97 306	47 974
	Programme Officer (P-3)	145 280	–	145 280
	Associate Programme Officer (P-2)	126 320	–	126 320
	Administrative support staff (G-6)	88 240	28 836	59 404
	Administrative support staff (G-5)	88 240	22 695	65 545
	Administrative support staff (G-5)	110 300	65 921	44 379
Total, secretariat		1 154 520	504 854	649 666
Interim technical support arrangements				
Interim technical/secretariat support	Personnel costs in advance of the recruitment of the staff of the secretariat and other technical support for the start-up of the programme of work	280 000	305 378	(25 378)
Total, interim technical support arrangements		280 000	305 378	(25 378)
Outreach and communications				
Plenary report services	Reporting services ^b	60 000	46 477	13 523
Total, outreach and communications		60 000	46 477	13 523
Travel				
Travel of secretariat staff on official business	Staff travel to meetings of the Platform bodies and other necessary travel	100 000	88 267	11 733
Travel of Chair	Travel of Chair to represent the Platform	20 000	–	20 000
Total, travel		120 000	88 267	31 733

<i>Budget item</i>	<i>Breakdown</i>	<i>2014 approved budget</i>	<i>2014 expenditure</i>	<i>Balance</i>
Secretariat operating costs				
	Non-personnel operating expenditures (excluding travel)		61 745	(61 745)
Total, secretariat operating costs			61 745	(61 745)
Subtotal		5 979 770	3 007 257	2 972 513
Programme support costs (8 per cent)		478 381	240 581	237 801
Total cost to the trust fund		6 458 151	3 247 838	3 210 314
Contribution to working capital reserve (10 per cent)		777 747	–	777 747
Total cash requirement		7 235 898	3 247 838	3 988 061

^a P-4 UNEP secondment.

^b This expenditure relates to conference services costs for the second session of the Plenary charged in 2014.

IV. Revised budget for the 2015 financial year

7. By its decision IPBES-2/6, the Plenary adopted the budget for the biennium 2014–2015 with the intention of reviewing it at its third session. Accordingly, table 5 shows the revised budget for the 2015 financial year.

Table 5

Revised budget for 2015

(United States dollars)

<i>Budget items</i>	<i>2015</i>		
	<i>Initial</i>	<i>Revision</i>	<i>Revised</i>
1. Meetings of the Platform bodies			
1.1 Sessions of the Plenary			
Travel costs for Plenary session participants (travel/DSA)	480 000	–	480 000
Conference services (translation and editing)	600 000	–	600 000
Plenary reporting services	60 000	–	60 000
Subtotal 1.1, sessions of the Plenary	1 140 000	–	1 140 000
1.2 Bureau and Multidisciplinary Expert Panel sessions			
Travel and meeting costs for participants of Bureau sessions	103 500	–	103 500
Travel and meeting costs for participants of Multidisciplinary Expert Panel sessions	240 000	–	240 000
Subtotal 1.2, Bureau and Multidisciplinary Expert Panel	343 500	–	343 500
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	–	1 503 500
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	1 222 500	436 250	1 658 750
2.2 Objective 2: strengthen the science-policy interface on biodiversity and ecosystem services at and across the subregional, regional and global levels	2 127 500	(256 250)	1 871 250
2.3 Objective 3: strengthen the knowledge-policy interface with regard to thematic and methodological issues	1 728 750	(108 750)	1 620 000
2.4 Objective 4: communicate and evaluate Platform activities, deliverables and findings	361 000	(18 500)	342 500
Subtotal 2, implementation of the work programme	5 439 750	52 750	5 492 500
3. Secretariat			
3.1 Personnel			
3.1.1 Professional and higher category			
Head of Secretariat (D-1)	283 600	–	283 600

<i>Budget items</i>	2015		
	<i>Initial</i>	<i>Revision</i>	<i>Revised</i>
Programme Officer (P-4)	223 100	–	223 100
Programme Officer (P-4) ^a	–	–	–
Programme Officer (P-3)	186 100	–	186 100
Programme Officer (P-3)	186 100	–	186 100
Associate Programme Officer (P-2)	161 800	–	161 800
Associate Programme Officer (P-2) (Entry on duty, 9 September 2015)	–	93 933	93 933
Subtotal 3.1.1, Professional and higher category	1 040 700	93 933	1 134 633
3.1.2 Secretariat: administrative personnel			
Administrative support staff member (G-6)	113 000	–	113 000
Administrative support staff member (G-6) (Entry on duty, 7 July 2015)	–	56 500	56 500
Administrative support staff member (G-5) (Entry on duty, 7 July 2015)	–	56 500	56 500
Administrative support staff member (G-5)	113 000	–	113 000
Administrative support staff member (G-5)	113 000	–	113 000
Subtotal 3.1.2, administrative personnel	339 000	113 000	452 000
Subtotal 3.1, personnel	1 379 700	206 933	1 586 633
3.2 Secretariat: operating costs (non-personnel)			
3.2.1 Travel on official business			
Official travel	100 000	–	100 000
Subtotal 3.2.1, travel on official business	100 000	–	100 000
3.2.2 Staff training			
Project management professional training	–	10 000	10 000
Umoja and competency-based interviewing staff training	–	12 000	12 000
Subtotal 3.2.2, staff training	–	22 000	22 000
3.2.3 Equipment and office supplies			
Expendable equipment (items under \$1,500 each)	–	4 500	4 500
Office supplies	–	12 000	12 000
Subtotal 3.2.3, equipment and office supplies	–	16 500	16 500
3.2.4 Premises			
Contribution to common cost (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 miscellaneous			
Operation and maintenance of printers and photocopiers	–	5 000	5 000
Acquisition of four Microsoft Project and four Adobe office software licenses licences	–	4 000	4 000
Subtotal 3.2.5, printers, photocopiers and miscellaneous	–	9 000	9 000
3.2.6 Telephone, postage and miscellaneous			
Telephone	–	20 000	20 000
Postage and miscellaneous	–	2 000	2 000
Subtotal 3.2.6, telephone, postage and miscellaneous	–	22 000	22 000
3.2.7 Hospitality			
Hospitality	–	5 000	5 000

<i>Budget items</i>	2015		
	<i>Initial</i>	<i>Revision</i>	<i>Revised</i>
Subtotal 3.2.7, hospitality	–	5 000	5 000
Subtotal 3.2, operating costs (non-personnel)	100 000	119 500	219 500
Subtotal 3, secretariat (personnel + operating)	1 479 700	326 433	1 806 133
Subtotal, 1+2+3	8 422 950	379 183	8 802 133
Programme support costs (8 per cent)	673 836	30 335	704 171
Total cost to the trust fund	9 096 786	409 518	9 506 304
Contribution to working capital reserve (10 per cent)	–	20 476	20 476
Total cash requirement	9 096 786	429 993	9 526 779

^aP-4 UNEP secondment.

V. Indicative budget for the biennium 2016–2017

8. In accordance with rule 9 on the budget and rule 2 on the financial year and budgeting period (decision IPBES-2/7, annex), table 6 sets out the indicative budget for the biennium 2016–2017.

Table 6

Indicative budget for the biennium 2016–2017

(United States dollars)

<i>Budget items</i>	2016	2017
1. Meetings of the Platform bodies		
1.1 Sessions of the Plenary		
Travel costs for Plenary session participants (travel/DSA)	500 000	500 000
Conference services (translation and editing)	615 000	615 000
Plenary reporting services	65 000	65 000
Subtotal 1.1, sessions of the Plenary	1 180 000	1 180 000
1.2 Bureau and Multidisciplinary Expert Panel sessions		
Travel and meeting costs for participants for 2 Bureau sessions	70 900	106 350
Travel and meeting costs for participants for 2 Panel sessions	240 000	322 500
Subtotal 1.2, Bureau and Multidisciplinary Expert Panel sessions	310 900	428 850
1.3 Travel costs of the Chair to represent the Platform	25 000	25 000
Subtotal 1, meetings of the Platform bodies	1 515 900	1 633 850
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	1 147 500	1 170 000
2.2 Objective 2: strengthen the science-policy interface on biodiversity and ecosystem services at and across the subregional, regional and global levels	2 729 750	1 383 750
2.3 Objective 3: strengthen the knowledge-policy interface with regard to thematic and methodological issues	1 461 000	1 254 750
2.4 Objective 4: communicate and evaluate Platform activities, deliverables and findings	361 000	359 000
Subtotal 2, implementation of the work programme	5 699 250	4 167 500
3. Secretariat		
3.1 Personnel		
3.1.1 Professional and higher category		
Head of Secretariat (D-1)	290 700	298 000
Programme Officer (P-4)	228 700	234 400
Programme Officer (P-4) ^a	–	–
Programme Officer (P-3)	190 800	195 600
Programme Officer (P-3)	190 800	195 600
Associate Programme Officer (P-2)	165 900	170 000

<i>Budget items</i>	<i>2016</i>	<i>2017</i>
Associate Programme Officer (P-2)	165 900	170 000
Subtotal 3.1.1, Professional and higher category	1 232 800	1 263 600
3.1.2 Administrative personnel		
Administrative support staff member (G-6)	115 900	118 800
Administrative support staff member (G-6)	115 900	118 800
Administrative support staff member (G-6)	115 900	118 800
Administrative support staff member (G-5)	115 900	118 800
Administrative support staff member (G-5)	115 900	118 800
Subtotal 3.1.2, administrative personnel	579 500	594 000
Subtotal 3.1, personnel	1 812 300	1 857 600
3.2 Secretariat: operating costs (non-personnel)		
3.2.1 Travel on official business		
Official travel	120 000	120 000
Subtotal 3.2.1, travel on official business	120 000	120 000
3.2.2 Staff training		
Project management professional training	10 000	–
Umoja and competency-based interviewing staff training	–	–
Subtotal 3.2.2, staff training	10 000	–
3.2.3 Equipment and office supplies		
Expendable equipment (items under \$1 500 each)	4 500	4 500
Office supplies	12 000	12 000
Subtotal 3.2.3, equipment and office supplies	16 500	16 500
3.2.4 Premises		
Contribution to common cost (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 miscellaneous		
Operation and maintenance of printers and photocopiers	5 000	5 000
Software and other miscellaneous expenses	4 000	4 000
Subtotal 3.2.5, printers, photocopiers and miscellaneous	9 000	9 000
3.2.6 Telephone, postage and miscellaneous		
Telephone	20 000	20 000
Postage and miscellaneous	2 000	2 000
Subtotal 3.2.6, Telephone, postage and miscellaneous	22 000	22 000
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)	227 500	217 500
Subtotal 3, secretariat (personnel + operating)	2 039 800	2 075 100
Subtotal, 1+2+3	9 254 950	7 876 450
Programme support costs (8 per cent)	740 396	630 116
Total cost to the trust fund	9 995 346	8 506 566
Contribution to working capital reserve (10 per cent)	126 873	–
Total cash requirement	10 122 219	8 506 566

^a P-4 UNEP secondment.

VI. Indicative budget for the 2018 budget period

9. Table 7 shows the indicative budget for the year 2018.

Table 7

Indicative budget for 2018

(United States dollars)

<i>Budget items</i>	<i>2018</i>
1. Meetings of the Platform bodies	
1.1 Annual sessions of the Plenary	
Travel costs for Plenary session participants (travel/DSA)	504 000
Conference services (translation and editing)	630 000
Plenary reporting services	65 000
Subtotal 1.1, Plenary	1 199 000
1.2 Bureau and Multidisciplinary Expert Panel sessions	
Travel and meeting costs for participants for Bureau session	109 200
Travel and meeting costs for participants for Panel session	330 000
Subtotal 1.2, Bureau and Multidisciplinary Expert Panel sessions	439 200
1.3 Travel costs of the Chair to represent the Platform	30 000
Subtotal 1, meetings of the Platform bodies	1 668 200
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	847 500
2.2 Objective 2: strengthen the science-policy interface on biodiversity and ecosystem services at and across the subregional, regional and global levels	2 013 000
2.3 Objective 3: strengthen the knowledge-policy interface with regard to thematic and methodological issues	1 110 500
2.4 Objective 4: communicate and evaluate Platform activities, deliverables and findings	345 000
Subtotal 2, Implementation of the work programme	4 316 000
3. Secretariat	
3.1 Secretariat personnel	
3.1.1 Professional and higher category	
Head of Secretariat (D-1)	305 400
Programme Officer (P-4)	240 300
Programme Officer (P-4) ^a	–
Programme Officer (P-3)	200 500
Programme Officer (P-3)	200 500
Associate Programme Officer (P-2)	174 300
Associate Programme Officer (P-2)	174 300
Subtotal 3.1.1, Professional and higher personnel	1 295 300
3.1.2 Administrative personnel	
Administrative support staff member (G-6)	121 800
Administrative support staff member (G-6)	121 800
Administrative support staff member (G-6)	121 800
Administrative support staff member (G-5)	121 800
Administrative support staff member (G-5)	121 800
Subtotal 3.1.2, administrative personnel	609 000
Subtotal 3.1, personnel	1 904 300
3.2 Secretariat: operating costs (non-personnel)	
Secretariat travel	
3.2.1 Travel on official business	
Official travel	130 000
Subtotal 3.2.1, travel on official business	130 000

<i>Budget items</i>	<i>2018</i>
3.2.2 Staff training	
Project management professional training	–
Umoja and competency-based interviewing staff training	–
Subtotal 3.2.2, staff training	–
3.2.3 Equipment and office supplies	
Expendable equipment (items under \$1,500 each)	4 500
Office supplies	12 000
Subtotal 3.2.3, equipment and office supplies	16 500
3.2.4 Premises	
Contribution to common cost (maintenance of office space, common security, switchboard service, etc.)	45 000
Subtotal 3.2.4, premises	45 000
3.2.5 Printers, photocopiers and miscellaneous	
Operation and maintenance of printers and photocopiers	5 000
Software and other miscellaneous expenses	4 000
Subtotal 3.2.5, printers, photocopiers and miscellaneous	9 000
3.2.6 Telephone, postage and miscellaneous	
Telephone	20 000
Postage and miscellaneous	2 000
Subtotal 3.2.6, telephone, postage and miscellaneous	22 000
3.2.7 Hospitality	
Hospitality	5 000
Subtotal 3.2.7, hospitality	5 000
Subtotal 3.2, operating costs (non-personnel)	227 500
Subtotal 3, secretariat (personnel + operating)	2 131 800
Subtotal 1+2+3	8 116 000
Programme support costs (8 per cent)	649 280
Total cost to the trust fund	8 765 280
Contribution to working capital reserve (10 per cent)	(925 096)
Total cash requirement	7 840 184

^a P-4 UNEP secondment.

Decision IPBES-3/3: Procedures for the preparation of Platform deliverables

The Plenary

1. *Adopts* the procedures for the preparation of the Platform’s deliverables set out in annex I to the present decision;
2. *Also adopts* the conflict of interest policy and implementation procedures set out in annex II to the present decision.

Annex I

Procedures for the preparation of Platform deliverables

Contents

1.	Definitions.....	74
1.1	Governance structures.....	74
1.2	Deliverables	74
1.3	Clearance processes	75
2.	Overview of clearance processes for the Platform’s deliverables	75
3.	Procedures for the preparation of the Platform’s deliverables	75
3.1	Standard approach for thematic or methodological assessments	75
3.2	Fast-track approach for thematic and methodological assessments	77
3.3	Approach for regional, subregional or global assessments	78
3.4	Scoping for Platform deliverables	79
3.5	General procedures for preparing Platform reports	80
3.6	Preparation of reports.....	81
3.6.1	Compilation of lists of potential report co-chairs, coordinating lead authors, lead authors, review editors and of government-designated national focal points	81
3.6.2	Selection of report co-chairs, coordinating lead authors, lead authors and review editors	81
3.6.3	Preparation of draft reports	81
3.6.4	Review.....	82
3.7	Acceptance of reports by the Plenary	83
3.8	Preparation and approval of summaries for policymakers.....	83
3.9	Preparation, approval and adoption of synthesis reports by the Plenary.....	84
3.10	Addressing possible errors.....	84
4.	Clearance processes for technical papers	85
5.	Platform supporting material.....	86
6.	Workshops	86
6.1	Platform workshops	86
6.2	Co-sponsored workshops	87
7.	Nomination and selection process for task forces	87
Appendices		
I.	Tasks and responsibilities of report co-chairs, coordinating lead authors, lead authors, contributing authors, review editors and expert reviewers of Platform reports and other deliverables and of government-designated national focal points	88
II	Procedure on the use of literature in the reports of the Platform	90
III	Procedure for the recognition and incorporation of indigenous and local knowledge (to be developed)]	91

1. Definitions

The definitions of terms used in this document are as follows:

1.1 Governance structures

“**Platform**” means the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services.

“**Plenary**” means the Platform’s decision-making body, comprising all the members of the Platform.

“**Bureau**” refers to the body of elected members of the Bureau of the session of the Plenary as set forth in the rules of procedure for the Plenary of the Platform.¹⁹

“**Multidisciplinary Expert Panel**” refers to the subsidiary body established by the Plenary that carries out the scientific and technical functions agreed upon by the Plenary, as articulated in the functions, operating principles and institutional arrangements of the Platform (UNEP/IPBES.MI/2/9, annex I, appendix I).

“**Session of the Plenary**” means any ordinary or extraordinary session of the Platform’s Plenary.

1.2 Deliverables

“**Reports**” means the main deliverables of the Platform, including assessment reports and synthesis reports, their summaries for policymakers and technical summaries, technical papers and technical guidelines.

“**Assessment reports**” are published assessments of scientific, technical and socioeconomic issues that take into account different approaches, visions and knowledge systems, including global assessments of biodiversity and ecosystem services, regional and subregional assessments of biodiversity and ecosystem services with a defined geographical scope, and thematic or methodological assessments based on the standard or the fast-track approach. They are to be composed of two or more sections including a summary for policymakers, an optional technical summary and individual chapters and their executive summaries.

“**Synthesis reports**” synthesize and integrate materials drawing from assessment reports, are written in a non-technical style suitable for policymakers and address a broad range of policy-relevant questions. They are to be composed of two sections: a summary for policymakers, and a full report.

“**Summary for policymakers**” is a component of any report providing a policy-relevant but not policy-prescriptive summary of that report.

“**Technical summary**” is a longer detailed and specialized version of the material contained in the summary for policymakers.

“**Technical papers**” are based on the material contained in the assessment reports and are prepared on topics deemed important by the Plenary.

“**Supporting material**” is material that has been prepared for the Platform and may include the following:

(a) Dialogue reports based on the material generated by discussions, which may include intercultural and inter-scientific dialogue, at the regional and subregional levels, among members of academic, indigenous peoples, local and civil society organizations and which take into account the different approaches, visions and knowledge systems that exist as well as the various views and approaches to sustainable development;

(b) Reports and proceedings of workshops and expert meetings that are either commissioned or supported by the Platform;

(c) Software or databases that facilitate the preparation or use of the Platform’s reports;

(d) Policy-relevant tools and methodologies that facilitate the preparation or use of the Platform’s reports;

(e) Guidance materials (guidance notes and guidance documents) that assist in the preparation of comprehensive and scientifically sound Platform reports and technical papers.

¹⁹ IPBES/1/12, annex I.

1.3 Clearance processes

“**Validation**” of the Platform’s reports is a process by which the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel and the Bureau provide their endorsement that the processes for the preparation of Platform reports have been duly followed.

“**Acceptance**” of the Platform’s reports at a session of the Plenary signifies that the material has not been subjected to section-by-section or line-by-line discussion and agreement by the Plenary but nevertheless presents a comprehensive and balanced view of the subject matter.

“**Adoption**” of the Platform’s reports is a process of section-by-section (and not line-by-line) endorsement, as described in section 3.9, at a session of the Plenary.

“**Approval**” of the Platform’s summaries for policymakers signifies that the material has been subject to detailed, line-by-line discussion and agreement by consensus at a session of the Plenary.

“**Preliminary acceptance, adoption and approval**” of regional reports will be undertaken by the relevant regional representatives at a session of the Plenary, and such reports will then be further reviewed and may be accepted, adopted and approved by the Plenary as a whole.

Acceptance, adoption and approval are done by consensus.

2. Overview of clearance processes for the Platform’s deliverables

The various deliverables as defined in section 1.2 are subject, as appropriate, to different levels of formal endorsement. These levels are described in terms of acceptance, adoption and approval, as defined in section 1, as follows:

(a) In general, Platform reports are accepted and their summaries for policymakers are approved by consensus by the Plenary. Technical summaries are accepted by the Plenary. Regional and subregional reports and their summaries for policymakers are preliminarily accepted and approved by the relevant regional representatives of the Plenary and subsequently accepted and approved by the Plenary. In the case of the synthesis report, the Plenary adopts the full report, section by section, and approves its summary for policymakers. The definition of the terms “acceptance”, “adoption” and “approval” will be included in the Platform’s published reports;

(b) Technical papers are not accepted, approved or adopted by the Plenary, but are finalized by the authors in consultation with the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel, which performs the role of an editorial board;

(c) Supporting materials are not accepted, approved or adopted.

Clearance processes for Platform deliverables

<i>Platform deliverables</i>	<i>Validation</i>	<i>Acceptance</i>	<i>Adoption</i>	<i>Approval</i>
Assessments				
• Thematic and methodological assessment reports (based on standard or fast-track approach)	MEP/Bureau	Plenary	N/A	N/A
• Thematic and methodological assessment SPMs (based on standard or fast-track approach)	MEP/Bureau	N/A	N/A	Plenary
• Regional/subregional assessment reports	MEP/Bureau	Plenary	N/A	N/A
• Regional/subregional assessment SPMs	MEP/Bureau	N/A	N/A	Plenary
• Global assessment reports	MEP/Bureau	Plenary	N/A	N/A
• Global assessment SPMs	MEP/Bureau	N/A	N/A	Plenary
Synthesis reports	MEP/Bureau	N/A	Plenary	N/A
Synthesis SPMs	MEP/Bureau	N/A	N/A	Plenary
Technical summaries	MEP/Bureau	Plenary	N/A	N/A
Technical papers	MEP/Bureau	Authors and MEP	N/A	N/A
Supporting materials	MEP/Bureau	N/A	N/A	N/A

Abbreviations: MEP, Multidisciplinary Expert Panel; N/A, not applicable; SPM, summary for policymakers.

3. Procedures for the preparation of the Platform’s deliverables

3.1 Standard approach for thematic or methodological assessments

(a) Consistent with decision IPBES/1/3 the requests, inputs and suggestions received by the secretariat will be considered and prioritized by the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel and the Bureau,

in accordance with paragraphs 7 and 9 of decision IPBES/1/3; this process may include an initial scoping, including feasibility and estimated cost;

(b) The Multidisciplinary Expert Panel and the Bureau will prepare a report containing a prioritized list of requests, with an analysis of the scientific and policy relevance of the requests as referred to in paragraph 7 of decision IPBES/1/3, including the implications of the requests for the Platform's work programme and resource requirements;

(c) Should the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel and the Bureau conclude that additional scoping is required to complete the prioritization of certain requests, the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel will submit a proposal to that end to the Plenary for consideration and decision together with the list and analysis referred to in subparagraph (b) above;

(d) If the Plenary approves detailed scoping, it will then need to decide whether to request the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel to submit a detailed scoping study for the Plenary's review and decision to proceed with an assessment or whether instead to request the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel to proceed with an assessment, with an agreed budget and timetable, following the completion of the detailed scoping study;

(e) If the Plenary approves the issue for detailed scoping, the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel, through the secretariat, will request nominations from Governments and invite relevant stakeholders²⁰ to present names of experts to assist with the scoping. The secretariat will compile the lists of nominations, which will be made available to Multidisciplinary Expert Panel;

(f) The Multidisciplinary Expert Panel will then select experts from the lists of nominations, of which experts selected from those presented by relevant stakeholders should not exceed twenty per cent, and then oversee the detailed scoping, including outline, costs and feasibility;

(g) If the Plenary has requested the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel to proceed to an assessment, the detailed scoping report is sent to members of the Platform for review and comment over a four-week period and made available on the Platform website;

(h) Based on the results of the detailed scoping exercise and comments received from members of the Platform and other stakeholders, the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel and the Bureau decide whether to proceed with the assessment, assuming that it can be conducted within the budget and timetable approved by the Plenary. If however, the Panel and the Bureau conclude that the assessment should not go forward, they will so inform the Plenary for its review and decision;

(i) If the decision is to proceed with the assessment, the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel requests nominations from Governments and invites relevant stakeholders to present names of experts to contribute to the preparation of the report;

(j) The Multidisciplinary Expert Panel selects the report co-chairs, coordinating lead authors, lead authors and review editors using the selection criteria (section 3.6.2) from the lists of nominations, of which experts selected from those presented by relevant stakeholders should not exceed twenty per cent;

(k) The report co-chairs, coordinating lead authors and lead authors prepare the first draft of the report;

(l) The first draft of the report is peer reviewed by experts in an open and transparent process;

(m) The report co-chairs, coordinating lead authors and lead authors prepare the second draft of the report and the first draft of the summary for policymakers under the guidance of the review editors and the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel;

(n) The second draft of the report and the first draft of the summary for policymakers are reviewed concurrently by both Governments and experts in an open and transparent process;

(o) The report co-chairs, coordinating lead authors and lead authors prepare final drafts of the report and the summary for policymakers under the guidance of the review editors and the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel;

²⁰ In the context of these procedures, relevant stakeholders are qualified national, regional and international scientific organizations, centres of excellence and institutions known for their work and expertise, including experts on indigenous and local knowledge on issues related to the Platform's functions and programme of work.

(p) The summary for policymakers is translated into the six official languages of the United Nations and prior to distribution is checked for accuracy by the experts involved in the assessments;

(q) The final drafts of the report and the summary for policymakers are sent to Governments for final review and made available on the Platform website;

(r) Governments are strongly encouraged to submit written comments to the secretariat at least two weeks prior to any session of the Plenary;

(s) The Plenary reviews and may accept the report and approve the summary for policymakers.

3.2 Fast-track approach for thematic and methodological assessments

(a) Consistent with decision IPBES/1/3 the requests, inputs and suggestions for assessments, including those specifically requested for fast-track treatment, received by the secretariat will be considered and prioritized by the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel and the Bureau in accordance with paragraphs 7 and 9 of decision IPBES/1/3; this process may include an initial scoping, including feasibility and estimated cost;

(b) The Multidisciplinary Expert Panel and the Bureau will prepare a report containing a prioritized list of assessments to be developed using a fast-track approach, with an analysis of the scientific and policy relevance of the requests as referred to in paragraph 7 of decision IPBES/1/3, including the implications of the requests for the Platform's work programme and resource requirements;

(c) If the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel and Bureau agree that the Plenary may deem an issue to be an important issue for fast-track assessment, the Panel, in conjunction with the Bureau, identifies a small team of experts to assist the Panel in scoping the proposed issue, including feasibility and cost;

(d) The Plenary reviews the scoping and decides whether to approve or reject the undertaking of the fast-track assessments. The Plenary based on the advice of the Panel may also decide that a fast-track approach involving a robust review procedure is appropriate for a topic given the level of complexity of the issue concerned. If the Plenary does not approve the fast tracking of an assessment it can be considered under the standard approach;

(e) If the Plenary approves an issue for fast-track assessment, the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel will request nominations from Governments and invite relevant stakeholders²¹ to present names of experts to contribute to the preparation of the report based on the scope developed during the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel scoping exercise;

(f) The Multidisciplinary Expert Panel will select the report co-chairs, coordinating lead authors, lead authors and review editors using the selection criteria (section 3.6.2) from the lists of nominations, of which experts selected from those presented by relevant stakeholders should not exceed twenty per cent;

(g) The report co-chairs, coordinating lead authors and lead authors prepare first drafts of the report and the summary for policymakers;

(h) The first drafts of the report and the summary for policymakers are reviewed by Governments and experts in an open and transparent process;

(i) The report co-chairs, coordinating lead authors and lead authors revise the first drafts of the report and the summary for policymakers with the guidance of the review editors and the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel;

(j) The summary for policymakers is translated into the six official languages of the United Nations and prior to distribution is checked for accuracy by the experts involved in the assessments;

(k) The final drafts of the report and the summary for policymakers are sent to Governments for final review and made available on the Platform website;

(l) The Plenary reviews and may accept the report and approve the summary for policymakers.

²¹ Ibid.

3.3 Approach for regional, subregional or global assessments

(a) Consistent with decision IPBES/1/3 the requests, inputs and suggestions received by the secretariat will be considered and prioritized by the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel and the Bureau in accordance with paragraphs 7 and 9 of decision IPBES/1/3; this process may include an initial scoping, including feasibility and estimated cost;

(b) The Multidisciplinary Expert Panel and the Bureau will prepare a report containing a prioritized list of requests, with an analysis of the scientific and policy relevance of the requests as referred to in paragraph 7 of decision IPBES/1/3, including the implications of the requests for the Platform's work programme and resource requirements;

(c) Should the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel and the Bureau conclude that additional scoping is required to complete the prioritization of certain requests, the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel will submit a proposal to that end to the plenary for consideration and decision together with the list and analysis referred to in subparagraph (b) above;

(d) The Plenary reviews the initial scoping and decides to approve or reject the undertaking of a detailed scoping of one or more of the proposed assessments;

(e) If the Plenary approves an issue for a detailed scoping, the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel, through the secretariat, will request nominations from Governments and invite relevant stakeholders²² to present names of experts to assist with the scoping. For regional and subregional assessments emphasis is placed on expertise from, as well as relevant to, the geographic region under consideration. The secretariat will compile the lists of nominations, which will be made available to the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel;

(f) The Multidisciplinary Expert Panel will then select experts from the lists of nominations, of which experts selected from those presented by relevant stakeholders should not exceed twenty per cent. For regional and subregional assessments, the Panel will, in particular, take into account the views of the Panel members from the relevant regions as well as those with experience with the geographic region under consideration;

(g) The Multidisciplinary Expert Panel and the Bureau oversee a detailed scoping, including outline, costs and feasibility;

(h) The detailed scoping report is sent to the secretariat for distribution to Governments and experts in an open and transparent process for consideration at the following session of the Plenary; if the Plenary decides, based on the detailed scoping report, to approve the preparation of the report, the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel will request nominations from Governments and invite relevant stakeholders to present names of experts to contribute to the preparation of the report;

(i) The Multidisciplinary Expert Panel will select the report co-chairs, coordinating lead authors, lead authors and review editors using the selection criteria (section 3.6.2) from the lists of nominations, of which experts selected from those presented by relevant stakeholders should not exceed twenty per cent. The Multidisciplinary Expert Panel will, in particular, take into account the views of the Panel members from the relevant region as well as those with experience with the geographic region under consideration;

(j) The report co-chairs, coordinating lead authors and lead authors prepare the first draft of the report;

(k) The first draft of the report is peer reviewed by experts in an open and transparent process. The review of regional and subregional reports will emphasize the use of expertise from, as well as relevant to, the geographic regions under consideration;

(l) The report co-chairs, coordinating lead authors and lead authors prepare the second draft of the report and the first draft of the summary for policymakers with the guidance of the review editors and the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel;

(m) The second draft of the report and the first draft of the summary for policymakers are reviewed concurrently by both Governments and experts in an open and transparent process;

(n) The report co-chairs, coordinating lead authors and lead authors prepare the final drafts of the report and the summary for policymakers with the guidance of the review editors and the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel;

²² Ibid.

(o) The summary for policymakers is translated into the six official languages of the United Nations and prior to distribution is checked for accuracy by the experts involved in the assessments;

(p) The final drafts of the report and the summary for policymakers are sent to Governments for final review and made available on the Platform website;

(q) Governments are strongly encouraged to submit written comments on the final draft of the summary for policymakers at least two weeks prior to any session of the Plenary;

(r) The Plenary reviews and may accept the report and approve the summary for policymakers.

3.4 Scoping for Platform deliverables

Scoping is the process by which the Platform will define the scope and objective of a deliverable and the information and human and financial requirements to achieve the objective. There are three types of scoping process, of varying complexity:

(a) Pre-scoping is the examination of preliminary scoping material, usually provided by the body making the original request for assessment;

(b) Initial scoping is a scoping process carried out by the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel (for scientific issues) and the Bureau (for administrative issues); it is obligatory before any proposal may be considered by the Plenary;

(c) Full scoping is a detailed scoping process, overseen by the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel, involving a scoping workshop with the experts selected by the Panel:

- (i) The scoping process should include the following scientific and technical elements:
 - a. Main issues related to biodiversity and ecosystem services to be covered by the assessment or other activities in relation to the Platform functions and its conceptual framework;
 - b. Main policy questions and users that might be addressed through the assessment or other activities;
 - c. Rationale and timeliness of the activity and how it will contribute to other processes or decisions;
 - d. Possible constituent chapters for any assessment report and the scope of each chapter;
 - e. Any known significant limitations in the existing knowledge that will hinder undertaking the assessment;
 - f. Potential additional activities and outputs that could be derived from an assessment and undertaken to support other functions of the Platform (e.g., capacity-building, policy support, etc.);
 - g. Evidence of the integration of the four Platform functions, e.g., scoping an assessment should look not only at existing knowledge and knowledge gaps, but also at existing capacity and capacity-building gaps and potentially at policy support tools and methodologies as well;
 - h. Methodologies to be used;
 - i. Geographic boundaries of the assessment;
 - j. List of scientific disciplines, types of expertise and knowledge needed to carry out the assessment;
- (ii) Procedural or administrative elements to be incorporated in the scoping process might include:
 - a. Overall activity schedule and milestones;
 - b. Operational structures that might be necessary, and the roles and responsibilities of the various entities to be involved, including the identification of strategic partners in delivering the activity, and the means by which the procedures for the implementation of the work programme

will be carried out to ensure effective peer review, quality assurance and transparency;

- c. Estimated costs of the activity and potential sources of funding, including from the Platform trust fund and other sources, as appropriate;
- d. Capacity-building interventions that may be required to deliver the activity, which might be included as activities in the general report delivery plan;
- e. Communications and outreach activities that might be appropriate for the specific deliverable, including for the identification of gaps in knowledge and for policy support;
- f. Consideration of data and information management for assessments;

(d) The full scoping is presented to the Plenary for its consideration. The Plenary will then decide whether or not to proceed with the preparation of the report.

Each of the Platform's global, regional and subregional assessment reports, thematic and methodological assessment reports and synthesis reports, as defined in section 1 of these procedures, should, except for those assessments approved for the fast-track process, be preceded by a full scoping exercise approved by the Plenary to develop the report's draft outline, explanatory notes and means of implementation, as appropriate.

In some instances, a fast-track approach to scoping may be considered appropriate for thematic or methodological assessments where a demand for policy-relevant information is deemed appropriate by the Plenary. This would involve undertaking the assessment on the sole basis of an initial scoping exercise, based on prior approval of the scoping by the Plenary.

3.5 General procedures for preparing Platform reports

In the case of assessment reports and synthesis reports, report co-chairs, coordinating lead authors, lead authors, reviewers and review editors of chapter teams are required to deliver technically and scientifically balanced assessments. Authors should use language that expresses the diversity of the scientific, technical and socioeconomic evidence, based on the strength of the evidence and the level of agreement on its interpretation and implications in the literature. Thus guidance on tackling uncertainties will be developed by the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel. Assessments should be based on publicly available and peer-reviewed literature, as well as reports and other materials, including indigenous and local knowledge, which is not published in the peer-reviewed literature but is available to experts and reviewers.

The working language of assessment meetings will normally be English. Subregional and regional assessment reports may be produced in the most relevant of the six official languages of the United Nations. All summaries for policymakers presented to the Plenary will be made available in the six official languages of the United Nations and checked for accuracy prior to distribution by the experts involved in the assessments.

The review process for Platform reports will generally comprise three stages:

- (a) Review by experts in an open and transparent manner of Platform reports;
- (b) Review by Governments and experts in an open and transparent manner of Platform reports and summaries for policymakers;
- (c) Review by Governments of summaries for policymakers and/or synthesis reports.

The Multidisciplinary Expert Panel and Bureau will ensure that the reports are scoped, prepared and peer reviewed in accordance with the present procedures.

The Multidisciplinary Expert Panel and the Bureau will assist the authors to ensure that the summary for policymakers includes the appropriate policy-relevant materials.

The report co-chairs and the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel will be responsible for ensuring that proper review of the material occurs in a timely manner as outlined in sections 3.1 and 3.3 for the standard approach to thematic and methodological assessments and regional, subregional or global assessments and section 3.2 for the fast-track approach to assessments.

Expert review should normally be allocated up to eight weeks, but not less than six weeks, except by decision of the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel. Government and expert reviews should not be allocated less than eight weeks, except by decision of the Bureau and Multidisciplinary Expert Panel

(e.g., six weeks for a fast-track assessment). All written review comments by experts and Governments will be made available on the Platform website during the review process.

The following will be made available on the Platform's website as soon as possible after acceptance by the Plenary and the finalization of a report or technical paper:

- (a) Drafts of Platform reports and technical papers that have been submitted for formal expert and/or government review;
- (b) Government and expert review comments;
- (c) Author responses to those comments.

The Platform considers its draft reports, prior to their acceptance, adoption and approval by the Plenary, to be provided in confidence to reviewers and to be not for public distribution, quotation or citation.

3.6 Preparation of reports

3.6.1 Compilation of lists of potential report co-chairs, coordinating lead authors, lead authors, review editors and of government-designated national focal points

The Multidisciplinary Expert Panel, through the Platform secretariat, will request nominations from Governments and invite relevant stakeholders to present names of experts to act as potential coordinating lead authors, lead authors or review editors to participate in the preparation of reports.

The tasks and responsibilities of report co-chairs, coordinating lead authors, lead authors, review editors and government-designated national focal points are outlined in annex I to the present procedures. To facilitate the nomination of experts and later review of reports by Governments, Governments should designate Platform national focal points responsible for liaising with the secretariat.

3.6.2 Selection of report co-chairs, coordinating lead authors, lead authors and review editors

Report co-chairs, coordinating lead authors, lead authors and review editors are selected by the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel from the lists of nominations, of which experts selected from those presented by relevant stakeholders should not exceed twenty per cent.

The composition of the group of coordinating lead authors and lead authors for a given chapter, report or summary should reflect the range of scientific, technical and socioeconomic views and expertise; geographical representation, with appropriate representation of experts from developing and developed countries and countries with economies in transition; the diversity of knowledge systems that exist; and gender balance. The Multidisciplinary Expert Panel will inform the Plenary on the selection process and the extent to which the above-mentioned considerations were achieved therein, and on the persons appointed to the positions of report co-chairs, coordinating lead authors, lead authors and review editors for the various chapters. Every effort should be made to engage experts from the relevant regions on the author teams for chapters that deal with specific regions, but experts from other regions may be engaged when they can provide an important contribution to an assessment.

The coordinating lead authors and lead authors selected by the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel may enlist other experts as contributing authors to assist with the work.

3.6.3 Preparation of draft reports

The preparation of the first draft of a report should be undertaken by report co-chairs, coordinating lead authors and lead authors. The report co-chairs, through the secretariat, should make available information on the topics to be covered by the assessment and the time frame for contributing materials.

Experts who wish to contribute material for consideration in the first draft should submit it directly to the lead authors. Such contributions should be supported as far as possible with references from the peer-reviewed and internationally available literature as well as with copies of any unpublished material cited and outputs deriving from indigenous and local knowledge. Clear indications of how to access such material should be included in the contributions. For material available in electronic format only, the location where such material may be accessed and a soft copy of such material should be sent to the secretariat for archiving.

Lead authors will work on the basis of these contributions as well as the peer-reviewed and internationally available literature. Unpublished material, and outputs deriving from indigenous and local knowledge, may be used in assessments, provided that their inclusion is fully justified in the context of the Platform's assessment process and that their unpublished status is specified. Such

materials will need to be made available for the review process and their sources identified by the report co-chairs, who will ensure that appropriate knowledge and data safeguards are in place.

Procedures, approaches and participatory processes for working with indigenous and local knowledge systems will be developed by the Platform's Task Force on Indigenous and Local Knowledge for consideration by the Plenary at its fourth session. Preliminary guidelines were presented and reviewed at the third session of the Plenary in order to inform the various assessments and to incorporate the lessons learned in fulfilling deliverable 1 (c) of the work programme for 2014–2018. Detailed guidelines for the use of literature in Platform assessments will be developed by the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel for consideration by the Platform at its fourth session.

In preparing the first draft of a report and at subsequent stages of revision after review, lead authors should clearly identify disparate views for which there is significant scientific, technical or socioeconomic support, together with the relevant arguments. Sources of uncertainty should be clearly identified, listed and quantified where possible. The implications for decision-making of the findings, including knowledge gaps, contrasting evidence and minority opinions, should be explicitly discussed. Technical summaries will be prepared, if deemed necessary by the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel, under the leadership of the Panel.

3.6.4 Review

Three principles govern the review process: first, the Platform's reports should represent the best possible scientific, technical and socioeconomic advice and be as balanced and comprehensive as possible. Second, as many experts as possible should be involved in the review process, ensuring representation of independent experts (i.e., experts not involved in the preparation of the chapters they are to review) from all countries. Third, the review process should be balanced, open and transparent and record the response to each review comment.

The Multidisciplinary Expert Panel should normally select two review editors per chapter (including for the chapter's executive summary) and per technical summary of each report based on the lists of experts nominated as described in section 3.6.2.

Review editors should not be involved as authors or reviewers of material for which they will act as review editors. Review editors should be selected from among nominees from developed and developing countries and countries with economies in transition, with a balanced representation of scientific, technical and socioeconomic expertise.

Report co-chairs should arrange a comprehensive review of reports in each review phase, seeking to ensure complete coverage of all content. Sections of a report that deal with issues similar to issues addressed in other reports should be cross-checked through the relevant authors and report co-chairs.

3.6.4.1 First review (by experts)

The first draft of a report should be circulated by the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel through the secretariat for review.

Governments should be notified of the commencement of the first review process. The first draft of a report should be sent by the secretariat to government-designated national focal points for information purposes. A full list of reviewers should be made available on the Platform's website.

The secretariat should make available to reviewers on request during the review process any specific material referenced in the document being reviewed that is not available in the internationally published literature.

Expert reviewers should provide their comments to the appropriate lead authors through the secretariat.

3.6.4.2 Second review (by Governments, experts, in an open and transparent manner)

The second draft of the report and the first draft of the summary for policymakers should be distributed concurrently by the Platform secretariat to Governments through the government-designated national focal points, the Bureau of the Plenary, the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel and the report co-chairs, coordinating lead authors, lead authors, contributing authors and expert reviewers.

Government focal points should be notified of the commencement of the second review process some six to eight weeks in advance. Governments should send one integrated set of comments for each report to the secretariat through their government-designated national focal points. Experts should send their comments for each report to the secretariat.

3.6.4.3 Preparation of a final draft of a report

The preparation of a final draft of a report that reflects comments made by Governments and experts, for submission to the Plenary for acceptance, should be undertaken by report co-chairs, coordinating lead authors and lead authors in consultation with the review editors. If necessary, the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel working with authors, review editors and reviewers can try to resolve areas of major differences of opinion.

Reports should describe different, possibly controversial, scientific, technical and socioeconomic views on a given subject, particularly if they are relevant to the policy debate. The final draft of a report should credit all report co-chairs, coordinating lead authors, lead authors, contributing authors, reviewers and review editors and other contributors, as appropriate, by name and affiliation, at the end of the report.

3.7 Acceptance of reports by the Plenary

Reports presented for acceptance at sessions of the Plenary are the full scientific, technical and socioeconomic assessment reports. The subject matter of these reports shall conform to the terms of reference and to the workplan approved by the Plenary or the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel as requested. Reports to be accepted by the Plenary will have undergone review by Governments and experts. The purpose of these reviews is to ensure that the reports present a comprehensive and balanced view of the subjects they cover. While the large volume and technical detail of this material places practical limitations upon the extent to which changes to the reports may be made at sessions of the Plenary, “acceptance” signifies the view of the Plenary that this purpose has been achieved. The content of the chapters is the responsibility of the coordinating lead authors and is subject to Plenary acceptance. Other than grammatical or minor editorial changes, after acceptance by the Plenary only changes required to ensure consistency with the summary for policymakers shall be accepted. Such changes shall be identified by the lead author in writing and submitted to the Plenary at the time it is asked to approve the summary for policymakers.

Reports accepted by the Plenary should be formally and prominently described on the front and other introductory covers as a report accepted by the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services.

3.8 Preparation and approval of summaries for policymakers

Summaries for policymakers for global, regional, subregional and thematic and methodological assessments should be subject to simultaneous review by Governments and experts. Written comments by Governments on revised drafts should be submitted to the secretariat through the government-designated national focal points²³ before final approval by the Plenary. Regional summaries for policymakers should, as a preliminary step, be approved by their respective regional members of the Platform prior to further review and approval by the Plenary.

Responsibility for preparing first drafts and revised drafts of summaries for policymakers lies with the report co-chairs and an appropriate representation of coordinating lead authors and lead authors, overseen by the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel and the Bureau. The summaries for policymakers should be prepared concurrently with the main reports.

The first review of a summary for policymakers will take place during the same period as the review of the second draft of a report by Governments and experts in an open and transparent manner.

The final draft of a summary for policymakers will be circulated for a final round of comments by Governments in preparation for the session of the Plenary at which it will be considered for approval.

Approval of a summary for policymakers signifies that it is consistent with the factual material contained in the full scientific, technical and socioeconomic assessment accepted by the Plenary.

Report co-chairs and coordinating lead authors should be present at sessions of the Plenary at which the relevant summary for policymakers is to be considered in order to ensure that changes made by the Plenary to the summary are consistent with the findings in the main report. The summaries for policymakers should be formally and prominently described as reports of the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services.

²³ Until such time as Governments have designated national focal points, the secretariat will send all communications to existing government contacts.

3.9 Preparation, approval and adoption of synthesis reports by the Plenary

Synthesis reports that are approved and adopted by the Plenary provide a synthesis of assessment reports and other reports as decided by the Plenary.

Synthesis reports integrate materials contained in the assessment reports. They should be written in a non-technical style suitable for policymakers and address a broad range of policy-relevant questions as approved by the Plenary. A synthesis report comprises two sections: a summary for policymakers, and a full report.

The Multidisciplinary Expert Panel will agree on the composition of the writing team, which could consist, as appropriate, of report co-chairs, coordinating lead authors, and Panel and Bureau members. In selecting the writing team for a synthesis report, consideration should be given to the importance of the full range of scientific, technical and socioeconomic views and expertise; appropriate geographical representation; representation of the diversity of knowledge systems; and gender balance. Those Bureau and Panel members with appropriate knowledge who are not authors will act as review editors.

The Chair of the Plenary will provide information to the Plenary on the selection process, including the application of the selection criteria for participation and any other considerations. An approval and adoption procedure will allow the Plenary at its sessions to approve the summary for policymakers on a line-by-line basis and ensure that the summary for policymakers and the full report of the synthesis report are consistent and that the synthesis report is consistent with the underlying assessment reports from which the information has been synthesized and integrated.

Step 1: The full report (30–50 pages) and the summary for policymakers (5–10 pages) of the synthesis report are prepared by the writing team.

Step 2: The full report and the summary for policymakers of the synthesis report undergo simultaneous review by Governments and experts.

Step 3: The full report and the summary for policymakers of the synthesis report are revised by the report co-chairs and lead authors with the assistance of the review editors.

Step 4: The revised drafts of the full report and the summary for policymakers of the synthesis report are submitted to Governments and observer organizations eight weeks before a session of the Plenary.

Step 5: The full report and the summary for policymakers of the synthesis report are submitted for discussion by the Plenary:

(a) At its session, the Plenary will provisionally approve the summary for policymakers on a line-by-line basis;

(b) The Plenary will then review and adopt the full report of the synthesis report on a section-by-section basis in the following manner:

(i) When changes in the full report of the synthesis report are required, either for the purpose of conforming to the summary for policymakers or to ensure consistency with the underlying assessment reports, the Plenary and the authors will note where such changes are required to ensure consistency in tone and content;

(ii) The authors of the full report of the synthesis report will then make the required changes to the report, which will be presented for consideration by the Plenary for review and possible adoption of the revised sections on a section-by-section basis. If further inconsistencies are identified by the Plenary, the full report of the synthesis report will be further refined by its authors with the assistance of the review editors for subsequent review on a section-by-section basis and possible adoption by the Plenary;

(c) The Plenary will, as appropriate, adopt the final text of the full report of the synthesis report and approve the summary for policymakers.

The synthesis report consisting of the full report and the summary for policymakers should be formally and prominently described as a report of the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services.

3.10 Addressing possible errors

The review processes described above should ensure that errors are eliminated well before the publication of Platform reports and technical papers. However, if a reader of an accepted Platform report, approved summary for policymakers or finalized technical paper finds a possible error (e.g., a

miscalculation or a factual inaccuracy) the issue should be brought to the attention of the secretariat, which will implement the following process for error correction.

Error correction. The secretariat will in the first instance ask the report co-chairs to investigate and rectify the possible error in a timely manner, reporting back to the secretariat on the conclusion. If the report co-chairs find that an error has been made, the secretariat will notify the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel co-chairs, who will decide on the appropriate remedial action in consultation with the report co-chairs. Appropriate remedial action may include an assessment of the implications of the error and the publication of a provisional correction and an accompanying assessment of the impact of the error on the report and/or its summary for policymakers, to be made available on the Platform website. The correction would be subject to consideration and ratification by the Plenary at its next session. Any correction to the report that is required must be made without undue delay. If no remedial action is deemed necessary, a written justification from the report co-chairs (upon advice from the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel co-chairs and the secretariat) must be provided to the claimant and the Plenary.

4. Clearance processes for technical papers

Technical papers are prepared on scientific, technical and socioeconomic issues that are deemed appropriate by the Plenary. Such papers are:

- (a) Based solely upon material referenced or contained in the accepted and approved assessment reports;
- (b) On topics agreed upon by the Plenary;
- (c) Prepared by a team of lead authors, including a report co-chair, selected by the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel in accordance with the provisions set out in appendix I to the present procedures, on the selection of report co-chairs, lead authors and coordinating lead authors;
- (d) Submitted in draft form for simultaneous review by Governments and experts at least six weeks before their comments are due;
- (e) Revised by the report co-chairs and lead authors on the basis of comments received from Governments and experts, with the assistance of at least two review editors per technical paper who are selected in accordance with the procedures for selecting review editors for assessment reports and synthesis reports set out in section 3.6.2 and carry out their roles as described in section 5 of appendix I to the present procedures;
- (f) Submitted in revised form to Governments and experts for their review at least four weeks before their comments are due;
- (g) Finalized by the report co-chairs and lead authors, in consultation with the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel functioning as an editorial board, based on the comments received.

If necessary, with guidance from the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel, a technical paper may include in a footnote the differing views expressed in comments submitted by Governments during their final review of the document if these are not otherwise adequately reflected in the paper.

The following guidelines should be used in interpreting requirement (a) above. The scientific, technical and socioeconomic information in technical papers shall be derived from:

- (a) The text of Platform assessment reports and the portions of material in cited studies that such reports were based on;
- (b) Relevant scientific models and their assumptions and scenarios based on scientific, technical and socioeconomic assumptions as were used to provide information in the assessment reports.

Technical papers shall reflect the range of findings set out in the assessment reports and support and/or explain the conclusions drawn in the reports. Information in the technical papers should, as far as possible, include references to the relevant subsections of the relevant assessment reports and other related material.

Sources and consequences of uncertainty should be explicitly delineated, and quantified where possible. The implications of knowledge gaps and uncertainty for decision-making should be discussed.

Technical papers are publicly available and each should contain a prominent declaration that it is a technical paper of the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem

Services and, as such, has undergone expert and government review but has not been considered by the Plenary for formal acceptance or approval.

5. Platform supporting material

This section refers to supporting material as defined in section 1.2.

Procedures for the recognition of workshops are set out in sections 6.1 and 6.2. Arrangements for the publication and/or e-publication of supporting material should be agreed upon as part of the process of workshop recognition or such publication should be commissioned by the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel for the preparation of specific supporting material.

Any supporting material as described in subparagraphs (a), (b), (c) and (d) in section 1.2 under “supporting material” should contain a prominent declaration stating that it is supporting material for the Platform and, as such, has not been subjected to the formal Platform review processes.

Guidance material, as described in subparagraph (e) of section 1.2, is intended to assist authors in the preparation of comprehensive and scientifically consistent Platform reports. The preparation of guidance material is usually commissioned by the Plenary and overseen by the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel for consideration by the Platform but is not subjected to the formal Platform review processes.

6. Workshops

6.1 Platform workshops

Platform workshops are defined as meetings that provide support for Plenary-approved activities. Such workshops can focus on:

- (a) A specific topic bringing together a limited number of relevant experts;
- (b) A cross-cutting or complex topic requiring input from a broad community of experts;
- (c) The provision of training and capacity-building.

Through the secretariat, the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel will request nominations of workshop participants by government-designated national focal points and other stakeholders. The Multidisciplinary Expert Panel may also nominate experts and will select workshop participants. The Panel will function as a scientific steering committee to assist the secretariat in organizing such workshops.

The composition of workshop participants shall aim to reflect:

- (a) The relevant range of scientific, technical and socioeconomic views and expertise;
- (b) Appropriate geographical representation;
- (c) The existing diversity of knowledge systems;
- (d) Gender balance;
- (e) Appropriate stakeholder representation, for example, representatives from the scientific community, Governments, universities, non-governmental organizations and the private sector.

[The Platform will ensure that funding is made available for the participation in workshops of experts from developing countries and countries with economies in transition as well as indigenous and local knowledge holders, as appropriate.]

The list of participants invited to a workshop should be made available to government-designated national focal points and other stakeholders within two weeks of the selection having taken place, including a description of the application of the selection criteria and any other considerations for participation in that regard.

The proceedings of Platform workshops will be made available online and should:

- (a) Include a full list of participants, describing their affiliation;
- (b) Indicate when and by whom they were prepared;
- (c) Indicate whether and by whom they were reviewed prior to publication;
- (d) Acknowledge all sources of funding and other support;

(e) Indicate prominently at the beginning of the document that the activity was held pursuant to a decision of the Plenary but that such decision does not imply the Plenary's endorsement or approval of the proceedings or any recommendations or conclusions contained therein.

6.2 Co-sponsored workshops

Workshops may be co-sponsored by the Platform if the Bureau and the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel determine in advance that they are supportive of Plenary-approved activities. Co-sponsorship by the Platform of a workshop does not necessarily convey any obligation by the Platform to provide financial or other support. In considering whether to extend Platform co-sponsorship to a workshop, the following factors should be taken into account:

- (a) Implications for the reputation of the Platform;
- (b) Multidisciplinary Expert Panel involvement in the steering committee for the design and organization of, and selection of experts for, the workshop;
- (c) Level of funding for the activity available from sources other than the Platform;
- (d) Whether the activity will be open to government experts as well as experts from other stakeholder entities, including non-governmental organizations, and indigenous and local knowledge holders participating in the work of the Platform;
- (e) [Whether provision will be made for the participation of experts from developing countries and countries with economies in transition;]
- (f) Whether the proceedings will be published and made available to the Platform in a time frame that is relevant to its work;
- (g) Whether the proceedings will:
 - (i) Include a full list of participants and affiliation;
 - (ii) Indicate when and by whom they were prepared;
 - (iii) Indicate whether and by whom they were reviewed prior to publication;
 - (iv) Specify all sources of funding and other support;
 - (v) Prominently display a disclaimer stating that Platform co-sponsorship does not imply Platform endorsement or approval of the proceedings or any recommendations or conclusions contained therein, and that neither the papers presented at the workshop nor the report of its proceedings have been subjected to Platform review.

7. Nomination and selection process for task forces

The secretariat will request nominations from Governments and invite relevant stakeholders²⁴ to present names of experts to participate in task forces. The secretariat will compile lists of such nominations, which will be made available to the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel and the Bureau.

The Multidisciplinary Expert Panel and the Bureau will then select experts from the lists of nominations.

²⁴ In the context of these procedures, relevant stakeholders are qualified national, regional and international scientific organizations, centres of excellence and institutions known for their work and expertise, including experts on indigenous and local knowledge on issues related to the Platform's functions and programme of work.

Appendix I

Tasks and responsibilities of report co-chairs, coordinating lead authors, lead authors, contributing authors, review editors and expert reviewers of Platform reports and other deliverables and of government-designated national focal points

1. Report co-chairs

Function:

To assume responsibility for overseeing the preparation of an assessment report or synthesis report.

Comment:

Report co-chairs are responsible for ensuring that a report is completed to the highest scientific standard. The names of all report co-chairs will be acknowledged prominently in the reports that they are involved in preparing.

Report co-chairs are nominated and selected as described in sections 3.6.1 and 3.6.2 of the procedures.

2. Coordinating lead authors

Function:

To assume overall responsibility for coordinating major sections and/or chapters of an assessment report.

Comment:

Coordinating lead authors are lead authors who have the added responsibility of ensuring that major sections and/or chapters of a report are completed to a high standard and are completed and delivered to the report co-chairs in a timely manner and conform to any overall standards of style set for the document.

Coordinating lead authors play a leading role in ensuring that any cross-cutting scientific, technical or socioeconomic issues of significance to more than one section of a report are addressed in a complete and coherent manner and reflect the latest information available. The skills and resources required of coordinating lead authors are similar to those required of lead authors together with the additional organizational skills needed to coordinate a section, or sections, of a report. All coordinating lead authors will be acknowledged in the reports.

3. Lead authors

Function:

To assume responsibility for the production of designated sections or parts of chapters that respond to the work programme of the Platform on the basis of the best scientific, technical and socioeconomic information available.

Comment:

Lead authors typically work in small groups that are responsible for ensuring that the various components of their sections are put together on time, are of a uniformly high quality and conform to any overall standards of style set for the document.

The role of lead authors is a demanding one and, in recognition of this, lead authors will be acknowledged in final reports. During the final stages of report preparation, when the workload is often particularly heavy and when lead authors are heavily dependent upon each other to read and edit material, and to agree to changes promptly, it is essential that their work should be accorded the highest priority.

The essence of the lead authors' role is to synthesize material drawn from the available literature or other fully-justified unpublished sources as defined in section 3.6.3 of the procedures.

Lead authors must have a proven ability to develop text that is scientifically, technically and socioeconomically sound and that faithfully represents, to the greatest extent possible, contributions made by a wide variety of experts and adheres to the overall standards of style set for a document. When revising text, lead authors and review editors are required to take account of the comments made during reviews by Governments and experts. The ability to work to deadlines is a necessary practical requirement.

Lead authors are required to record in the report views that cannot be reconciled with a consensus view²⁵ but are, nonetheless, scientifically, technically or socioeconomically valid.

Lead authors are encouraged to work with contributing authors, using electronic means as appropriate, in the preparation of their sections or to discuss expert or government comments.

4. Contributing authors

Function:

To prepare technical information in the form of text, graphs or data for inclusion by the lead authors in the relevant section or part of a chapter.

Comment:

Input from a wide range of contributors is key to the success of Platform assessments. The names of all contributors will therefore be acknowledged in the Platform's reports. Contributions are sometimes solicited by lead authors but unsolicited contributions are also encouraged. Contributions should be supported, as far as possible, with references from the peer-reviewed and internationally available literature and with copies of any unpublished material cited along with clear indications of how to access the latter. For material available in electronic format only, the location where such material may be accessed should be cited. Contributed material may be edited, merged and, if necessary, amended in the course of developing the overall draft text.

5. Review editors

Function:

To assist the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel in identifying reviewers for the expert review process, ensure that all substantive expert and government review comments are afforded appropriate consideration, advise lead authors on how to handle contentious or controversial issues and ensure that genuine controversies are adequately reflected in the text of the report concerned.

Comment:

In general, there will be two review editors per chapter, including its executive summary. In order to carry out the tasks allocated to them, review editors will need to have a broad understanding of the wider scientific, technical and socioeconomic issues being addressed.

The workload for review editors will be particularly heavy during the final stages of report preparation, including attending meetings at which writing teams consider the results of the review rounds.

Review editors are not actively engaged in drafting reports and may not serve as reviewers for text that they have been involved in writing. Review editors may be drawn from among members of the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel, the Bureau or other experts as agreed by the Panel. Although responsibility for the final text of a report remains with the relevant coordinating lead authors and lead authors, review editors will need to ensure that where significant differences of opinion on scientific issues remain, such differences are described in an annex to the report.

Review editors must submit written reports to the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel and, where appropriate, will be requested to attend meetings convened by the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel to communicate their findings from the review process and to assist in finalizing summaries for policymakers and, as necessary, synthesis reports. The names of all review editors will be acknowledged in the reports.

6. Expert reviewers

Function:

To comment on the accuracy and completeness of the scientific, technical and socioeconomic content and the overall balance between the scientific, technical and socioeconomic aspects of the drafts.

Comment:

Expert reviewers comment on text according to their knowledge and experience. The names of all expert reviewers will be acknowledged in the reports.

²⁵ Consensus does not imply a single view, but can incorporate a range of views based on the evidence.

7. Government and observer organization focal points

Function:

To prepare and update the list of national experts required to assist in the implementation of the Platform's work programme, and to arrange for the provision of integrated comments on the accuracy and completeness of the scientific, technical and/or socioeconomic content and the overall balance between scientific, technical and/or socioeconomic aspects of the drafts.

Comment:

Government review will typically be carried out among a number of departments and ministries. For administrative convenience, each Government and observer organization should designate one focal point for all Platform activities, providing full contact information for the focal point to the secretariat and notifying the secretariat of any changes in the information. Focal points should liaise with the secretariat regarding the logistics of the review processes.

Appendix II

Procedure on the use of literature in the reports of the Platform

The present appendix is provided to ensure that the Platform's process for the use of literature is open and transparent. In the assessment process, emphasis is to be placed on the assurance of the quality of all cited literature. Priority should be given to peer-reviewed and publicly available scientific, technical and socioeconomic literature, including assessment reports such as those produced for the Platform. The procedure for the recognition and incorporation of indigenous and local knowledge is discussed in appendix III to the procedures for the preparation of Platform deliverables.

It is recognized that, besides this peer-reviewed and publicly available literature, other diverse sources²⁶ provide crucial information for Platform reports. These sources may include reports by Governments, industry and research institutions, international and other organizations, or on conference proceedings. In addition, valuable information will be sourced from the "supporting material" prepared for the consideration of the Platform (annex I, sect. 1.2). The use of such diverse sources, however, brings with it an extra responsibility for the author teams in ensuring the quality and validity of cited sources and information. In general, newspapers and magazines, blogs, social networking sites and broadcast media are not acceptable sources of information for Platform reports. Personal communications providing scientific results are also not acceptable sources.

The following additional procedures are specified:

1. Responsibilities of coordinating, lead and contributing authors

The coordinating lead authors will ensure that all sources are selected and used in accordance with the procedures set out in the present appendix.

The author team is required to critically assess information from any source considered for inclusion in a report. Each author team should review the quality and validity of each source before incorporating information from that source into a Platform report. Authors who wish to include information that is not publicly available are required to send the full reference for and a copy of the information, preferably electronically, to the relevant technical support unit and the Platform secretariat. With regard to materials available in electronic format only, the location where such material may be accessed and a soft copy of such material should be sent to the technical support unit, and to the secretariat for archiving. In the case of a source written in a language other than English, an executive summary or abstract in English facilitated by the relevant technical support unit is required.

These procedures also apply to papers undergoing the publication process in peer-reviewed journals at the time of Government or expert review. Such papers must have been accepted for publication by the journal prior to the final distribution to Governments of the report and the summary for policymakers for which they have been used. If that is not the case, the material and any arguments reliant on it must be withdrawn from the report, as well as from its technical summary and its summary for policymakers.

All sources will be included in the reference section of the relevant Platform report.

²⁶ Historically termed "grey literature".

2. Responsibilities of the review editors

The review editors will provide support and guidance to the author team in ensuring the consistent application of the procedures set out in the present appendix.

3. Responsibilities of the technical support unit

For sources that are not publicly available, the technical support unit responsible for the coordination of the report, in consultation with the report co-chairs, will make these sources available to reviewers who request them during the review process and send the material to the Platform secretariat for archiving.

4. Responsibilities of the Platform secretariat

The Platform secretariat will store sources that are not publicly available. The secretariat should archive the location where material available in electronic format only may be accessed and a soft copy of such material. It should provide access to these materials on request. Storage procedures will comply with protocols and guidelines to be agreed under the Platform's data and information management plan (decision IPBES-3/1, annex II).

[Appendix III

Procedure for the recognition and incorporation of indigenous and local knowledge (to be developed)]

Annex II

Conflict of interest policy and implementation procedures

I. Conflict of interest policy

A. Purpose of the policy

1. The objective of the Platform as stated in paragraph 1 of the "Functions, operating principles and institutional arrangements of the Platform"²⁷ is to strengthen the science-policy interface for biodiversity and ecosystem services for the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity, long-term human well-being and sustainable development. According to the operating principles of the Platform, in carrying out its work the Platform must be scientifically independent and ensure credibility, relevance and legitimacy through peer review of its work and transparency in its decision-making processes and 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, as appropriate.

2. The role of the Platform requires that it pay special attention to issues of independence and bias in order to maintain the integrity of, and public confidence in, its products and processes. It is essential that the work of the Platform not be compromised by any conflict of interest on the part of those who execute it.

3. The overall purpose of this policy is to protect the legitimacy, integrity and credibility of the Platform and its deliverables as well as confidence in its activities and in individuals who are directly involved in the preparation of its reports and other deliverables. The policy is based on principles and does not provide an exhaustive list of criteria for the identification of conflicts of interest. The Platform recognizes the commitment and dedication of those who participate in its activities and the need to maintain a balance between minimizing the reporting burden and ensuring the integrity of the Platform and its deliverables while continuing to build and maintain public trust.

4. The conflict of interest policy is designed to ensure that potential conflicts of interest (see sect. C below) are identified, communicated to the Committee on Conflicts of Interest and managed in order to avoid any adverse impact on the Platform's independence, deliverables and processes, thereby protecting the person or persons concerned, the Platform and the public interest. Any duly reasoned request relating to a potential conflict of interest may be sent to the Bureau²⁸ of the Platform.

²⁷ UNEP/IPBES.MI/2/9, annex I, appendix I.

²⁸ bureau@ipbes.net.

5. It is essential to avoid a situation in which a reasonable person could question, discount or dismiss the work of the Platform owing to the perception of a conflict of interest. It is recognized that the privacy and professional reputation of individuals must be respected. Identifying a potential conflict of interest does not automatically mean that a conflict of interest exists. The policy is intended to enable individuals to provide the information necessary for the evaluation of a given situation.

6. At its first session, held in Bonn, Germany, in January 2013, the Plenary of the Platform requested the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel to develop its own code of practice for the performance of its scientific and technical functions. This code of practice was duly developed and at the first joint meeting of the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel and the Bureau, held in Bergen, Norway, in June 2013, the Bureau reviewed and revised the code of practice with a view to adopting it.

B. Scope of the policy

7. This policy applies to the senior leadership of the Platform, namely, members of the Bureau, the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel and any other subsidiary bodies contributing to the development of deliverables, authors with responsibility for report content (including report co-chairs, coordinating lead authors and lead authors), review editors and the professional staff to be hired to work in a technical support unit established by the Platform.

8. The professional staff members of the secretariat are employees of the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) and are subject to the Programme's disclosure and ethics policies, which include conflicts of interest. Likewise, the professional staff of any technical support unit who are employees of a United Nations entity are subject to the conflict of interest policy of that entity. Technical support units that are not hosted by the United Nations are expected to comply with the Platform's policy.

9. The policy applies to the development of any and all deliverables of the Platform.

10. The application of the conflict of interest policy to persons elected to or selected for positions in the Platform should reflect their specific responsibilities.

C. Definition of "conflict of interest" and "bias"

11. For the purposes of this policy, any circumstances that could lead a reasonable person to question either an individual's objectivity, or whether an unfair advantage has been created, constitute a potential conflict of interest. A "conflict of interest" refers to any current interest of an individual that could:

(a) Significantly impair the individual's objectivity in carrying out his or her duties and responsibilities for the Platform;

(b) Create an unfair advantage for any person or organization.

12. A distinction is made between "conflict of interest" and "bias". "Bias" refers to a point of view or perspective that is strongly held regarding a particular issue or set of issues. In the case of author and review teams, bias can and should be managed through the selection of authors and reviewers with a balance of perspectives. It is expected that the Platform's author teams will include individuals with different perspectives and affiliations. Individuals or teams of individuals involved in selecting authors should strive for an author team composition that reflects a balance of expertise and perspectives to ensure that the Platform's products are comprehensive and objective and remain neutral with respect to policy. In selecting these individuals, care must be taken to ensure that biases can be balanced, where they exist. In contrast, a "conflict of interest" refers to a situation as described in paragraph 11. Holding a view that one believes to be correct, but that one does not stand to gain from personally, does not necessarily constitute a conflict of interest but may be a bias.

13. The conflict of interest requirements in this policy are not designed to include an assessment of an individual's behaviour or character or his or her ability to act objectively despite the conflict of interest.

14. This policy applies only to current conflicts of interest and does not apply to past interests that have expired. Professional and other non-financial interests need only be disclosed on the conflict of interest form if they are significant and relevant. If in doubt about whether an interest should be disclosed, individuals are encouraged to contact the secretariat, which, in turn, will seek advice from the Committee on Conflicts of Interest. Significant and relevant interests may include, but are not limited to, membership of advisory committees associated with private sector organizations and of the boards of non-profit or advocacy groups. Such associations do not necessarily constitute a conflict of interest, however.

15. Financial interests need only be disclosed on the conflict of interest form if they are significant and relevant. Such interests may include, but are not limited to, employment relationships, consulting relationships, financial investments, intellectual property interests, commercial interests and sources of research support. Individuals should also disclose the significant and relevant financial interests of any person with whom the individual has a substantial business or relevant shared interest, such as a close family member. If in doubt about whether an interest should be disclosed, individuals are encouraged to contact the secretariat, which, in turn, will seek advice from the Committee on Conflicts of Interest.

16. In order to prevent situations in which a conflict of interest may arise, individuals directly involved in or leading the preparation of deliverables of the Platform should avoid being in a position in which they are required to approve, adopt or accept on behalf of any Government the text that he or she was directly involved in drafting.

II. Implementation procedures

Rule 1

These implementation procedures are designed to ensure that relevant interests are identified and then disclosed to the Committee on Conflicts of Interest, which will identify potential and real conflicts of interest and manage them in order to avoid any adverse impact on the Platform and its deliverables while protecting the person or persons concerned and the public interest.

Rule 2

1. These implementation procedures apply to all conflicts of interest as defined in section C of the conflict of interest policy and apply to the individuals listed in section B on the scope of the policy.

2. Compliance with the conflict of interest policy and implementation procedures is mandatory. An individual will not be permitted to participate in the work of the Platform if he or she has not complied with the policy and procedures. If a conflict of interest is identified, a person may only proceed to participate in the activities of the Platform if action is taken that resolves the conflict.

Members of the Bureau of the Platform and the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel: review process prior to appointment

Rule 3

1. The conflict of interest disclosure form contained in the appendix to the present procedures will be submitted to the secretariat in respect of each nominee for election to the Bureau of the Platform and the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel.

2. A Committee on Conflicts of Interest (see rule 10) will review the conflict of interest forms and may request additional information and advice as appropriate. If the Committee determines that a nominee for membership on the Bureau or the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel has a conflict of interest that cannot be resolved, the nominee will not be eligible for election to the Bureau or the Panel. The nominee may request a review, however (see rule 8).

3. The process described in this rule will also apply to candidates for election to the Bureau of the Platform who are nominated during the course of the Platform session at which the relevant election is due to be held. In such cases, candidates will be required to complete the form, which will be reviewed by the Committee prior to the election.

Members of the Bureau of the Platform and the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel: review process after appointment

Rule 4

1. All members of the Bureau of the Platform and the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel will inform the secretariat of any changes in the information provided in their previously submitted conflict of interest disclosure forms as they arise.

2. The Committee on Conflicts of Interest will review the updated information and determine whether the relevant individual has a conflict of interest that cannot be resolved, in which case the individual will no longer be eligible to be a member of the Bureau or the Panel.

Task force and expert group members, report co-chairs, coordinating lead authors, lead authors, review editors and technical support units: review process prior to appointment**Rule 5**

Before an individual is appointed as a task force or expert group member, report co-chair, coordinating lead author, lead author or review editor, the secretariat will request the individual to complete a conflict of interest form for submission to the secretariat. The Committee on Conflicts of Interest will then evaluate the form to determine whether the individual may be affected by a potential conflict of interest that cannot be resolved. If the Committee determines that the individual has a conflict of interest that cannot be resolved, the individual will not be eligible to participate in the preparation of the deliverable. The individual may, however, request a review (see rule 8).

Rule 6

Candidates applying for professional posts in any technical support unit established by the Platform in an organization outside the United Nations system should, prior to their appointment, submit a conflict of interest form to the secretariat for evaluation within five working days by the Committee on Conflicts of Interest in accordance with rule 8.

Task force and expert group members, report co-chairs, coordinating lead authors, lead authors, review editors and technical support units: review process after appointment**Rule 7**

All task force and expert group members, report co-chairs, coordinating lead authors, lead authors and review editors will inform the secretariat of any changes in relevant information as they arise. The professional staff of any technical support unit established by the Platform in an organization outside the United Nations system will inform the secretariat of any changes in relevant information as they arise. The Committee on Conflicts of Interest will evaluate the revised information in accordance with the procedure for reviewing conflict of interest issues prior to appointment.

Principles for considering conflict of interest issues**Rule 8**

1. The bodies involved in advising and deciding on conflict of interest issues in respect of individuals under the conflict of interest policy (the Committee on Conflicts of Interest and the Bureau) will consult the individual affected if it has concerns about a potential conflict of interest and/or requires clarification of any matter arising out of a conflict of interest disclosure form. They will ensure that the individual affected and, as appropriate, the Platform member who nominated the individual, are afforded the opportunity to discuss any concerns about a potential conflict of interest.
2. If the Committee on Conflicts of Interest determines that an individual has a conflict of interest that cannot be resolved, the relevant individual may request a review by the Bureau of the Platform of the Committee's determination. The individual concerned will be bound by the determination of the Committee pending the outcome of the review. The Bureau will review the determination at its next meeting and its decision will be binding.
3. When considering whether an individual has a conflict of interest, the relevant body will, in consultation with the individual, explore options for resolving the conflict.²⁹
4. If it is determined that an individual has a conflict of interest that cannot be resolved the individual will no longer be able to participate in the preparation of the Platform deliverable.
5. Members of bodies that are involved in considering conflict of interest issues may not consider cases involving themselves and will recuse themselves in the event that the relevant body considers a potential conflict of interest that concerns them.

²⁹ Individuals might, for example, resolve a conflict of interest by divesting themselves of the particular financial or other interest that gave rise to the potential conflict or by recusing themselves from discussions or decision-making processes in respect of which they have a conflict.

Processing and storage of information

Rule 9

1. All conflict of interest forms will be submitted to the secretariat, which will securely archive such forms, together with any records of the deliberations and/or decisions of the Committee on Conflicts of Interest, and retain them for a period of five years after the end of the individual's participation in the role that required the review, after which such information will be destroyed.
2. Subject to the requirement to notify the existence of a conflict of interest to others under rule 8, the forms referred to in this rule will be considered confidential and will not be disclosed or used for any purpose other than the consideration of conflict of interest issues under these implementation procedures without the express consent of the individual providing the information and a decision of the Bureau.

Committee on Conflicts of Interest

Rule 10

1. A Committee on Conflicts of Interest ("the Committee") will be established for the purpose of implementing these rules and determining conflict of interest cases referred to it by the Bureau of the Platform.
2. The Committee on Conflicts of Interest will meet by teleconference as necessary. If a physical meeting is needed, it will be held before or after regular Bureau meetings.
3. The Committee will comprise three elected members from the Bureau, including one of the Bureau vice-chairs as chair, and five members, one per United Nations region, selected by the Bureau following a call for nominees from member countries of the Platform, together with one additional member with appropriate legal expertise from, and appointed by, the organization hosting the secretariat.
4. The members of the Committee are expected to reach consensus on conflict of interest issues. If consensus cannot be reached, exceptionally, on matters of particular urgency, the chair of the Committee may take a final decision with due regard to the weight of opinion expressed in the Committee. The Committee will decide upon its method of working.
5. The Committee will submit a report on its activities to the Plenary of the Platform at least four weeks prior to each session of the Plenary. Issues of confidentiality will be addressed by the Committee at the earliest opportunity.

Appendix Conflict of interest disclosure form**Confidential****Conflict of interest disclosure**

Please sign and date the last page of this form and return it to the Executive Secretary of the Platform. Kindly retain a copy for your records.

Disclosure of relevant interests form

Note: You have been invited to serve on the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services because of your professional standing and expertise. As outlined in the Platform's conflict of interest policy, the role of the Platform demands that it pay special attention to issues of conflict of interest and bias in order to maintain the integrity of, and public confidence in, its deliverables and processes. It is essential that the work of the Platform not be compromised by any conflict of interest affecting individuals who execute it. Disclosure of certain matters is necessary, therefore, to ensure that the work of the Platform is not compromised by conflicts of interest. We are reliant on your professionalism, common sense and honesty in filling out this form.

The Platform does not require comprehensive lists of activities under each heading set out below. You should disclose interests that are significant and relevant and relate or have the appearance of relating to your duties within the Platform and that could:

- (i) Significantly impair your objectivity in carrying out your duties and responsibilities for the Platform;
- (ii) Create an unfair advantage for you or any person or organization and which could result in you securing a direct and material gain through outcomes in a Platform product.

For the purposes of this policy, circumstances that could lead a reasonable person to question your objectivity, or whether an unfair advantage has been created, constitute a potential conflict of interest and should be disclosed on this form. Disclosure of an interest on this form does not automatically mean that a conflict exists or that you will be unable to perform your designated role in the Platform. If you are in any doubt about whether an interest should be disclosed, you are encouraged to disclose such interest.

NAME: _____

ADDRESS: _____

TELEPHONE: _____ EMAIL ADDRESS: _____

CURRENT EMPLOYER: _____

ROLE IN PLATFORM: _____

- (1) **Are you involved in any significant and relevant professional activities that might be considered as constituting a conflict of interest?**

Yes No (if yes, please give details below).

Please list significant and relevant professional and other non-financial interests that relate or may have the appearance of relating to your duties for the Platform and could be interpreted as:

- (i) Significantly impairing your objectivity in carrying out your duties and responsibilities for the Platform;
- (ii) Creating an unfair advantage for you or any person or organization. This might include, but is not limited to, membership on the boards of advocacy groups.

- (2) **Do you have any significant and relevant financial interests in the subject matter of the work in which you will be involved that might be considered as constituting a conflict of interest?**

Yes No (if yes, please give details below).

Please list significant and relevant financial interests that relate or may have the appearance of relating to your duties for the Platform and could be interpreted as:

- (i) Significantly impairing your objectivity in carrying out your duties and responsibilities for the Platform;
- (ii) Creating an unfair advantage for you or any person or organization. These may include employment relationships, consulting relationships, financial investments, intellectual property interests and commercial interests and sources of private-sector research support.

- (3) **Is there any other interest that could affect your objectivity or independence in the work in which you will be involved?**

Yes No (if yes, please give details below).

I hereby declare to the best of my knowledge that the disclosed information is complete and correct. I undertake to inform the secretariat of the Platform immediately of any change in my circumstances during the course of the work assigned to me.

I understand that information about my interests will be held by the Platform for a period of five years after the end of the activity to which I contributed, after which the information will be destroyed. Subject to the requirement to notify the existence of a conflict of interest to others under rule 8 of the implementation procedures, I understand that these forms will be considered confidential and will be reviewed in accordance with the conflict of interest implementation procedures.

I hereby declare that I will comply with the Platform's conflict of interest policy and implementation procedures.

Signature

Date

Further details (if answered "yes" to any of the questions 1–3 above):

Decision IPBES-3/4: Communications, stakeholder engagement and strategic partnership

The Plenary

1. *Takes note* of the communications and outreach strategy³⁰ set out in annex I to the present decision;
2. *Requests* the secretariat, subject to the availability of funds, to undertake the activities described in the initial implementation plan set out in the appendix to annex I to the present decision, as appropriate;
3. *Welcomes* the revised draft stakeholder engagement strategy for supporting the implementation of the Platform work programme set out in annex II to the present decision;
4. *Requests* the secretariat, under the supervision of the Bureau and the Plenary and in collaboration with an open-ended network of stakeholders, to undertake the activities, as appropriate, set out in the initial implementation plan included in the appendix to annex II to the present decision, subject to the availability of resources;
5. *Encourages* all stakeholders representing, inter alia, their regional, disciplinary and knowledge systems in their diversity, to collaborate with the Platform;
6. *Approves* the guidance on the development of strategic partnerships and other collaborative arrangements set out in annex III to the present decision;
7. *Invites* the secretariats of the multilateral environmental agreements related to biodiversity and ecosystem services, as appropriate, to work with the Bureau to develop strategic partnerships, modelled on the existing strategic partnership arrangement with the secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity, setting out areas for collaboration and cooperation, to be approved by the Plenary at a future session;
8. *Decides* to review steps that have been taken to develop and enter into strategic partnerships and other collaborative arrangements at its fourth session.

Annex I

Communications and outreach strategy (deliverable 4 (d))

I. Introduction

1. The present strategy is based on the principles and guidelines enunciated in the draft communications and outreach strategy presented at the second session of the Plenary (IPBES/2/12), which was designed to provide a framework for the communications of the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services and serve as the founding document for all communications strategies to come.
2. Following an initial discussion at its second session, the Plenary, in its decision IPBES-2/9, requested the secretariat, under the supervision of the Bureau and in cooperation with the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel, to prepare a draft communications and outreach strategy for consideration by the Plenary at its third session. The present strategy was prepared in response to that request. In decision IPBES-2/9 the Plenary further requested the secretariat, in consultation with the Bureau, to develop and implement a policy for the use of the Platform logo (see IPBES/3/INF/9).

II. Context

3. The purpose of all communications activities will be to ensure that the Platform is recognized as a credible, relevant, independent and legitimate platform that produces policy-relevant – but not policy-prescriptive – knowledge products and builds capacity for the use of biodiversity and ecosystem services knowledge in decision-making.
4. More specifically, communications activities will be aimed at promoting the work of the Platform among key audiences and coordinating outreach for the Platform's assessment findings. The aim of the Platform's communications approach and activities shall be to ensure that timely and

³⁰ IPBES/3/15.

appropriate information enters the public domain – both proactively to communicate reports and reactively in response to questions or criticism.

5. While the communications strategy will need to focus on promoting the work of the Platform among key audiences, the stakeholder engagement strategy should focus on encouraging the participation of stakeholders in the Platform’s work. The latter is presented in annex II to decision IPBES-3/4. The present communications and outreach strategy focuses on two key areas: day-to-day communications; and the launch of assessment reports.

6. In developing the strategy, certain factors that could hinder communication efforts among audiences, such as different languages and culture-specific communication styles, were taken into consideration. To address these challenges, communications materials will be provided in all six official United Nations languages, where practical. In its communications and outreach activities, the Platform will also pay attention to the specific context of different countries. This reflects an understanding that the needs of developing countries may differ from those of developed countries and may require tailor-made outreach activities.

7. To ensure coordination and coherence of the Platform’s communications, the secretariat will work with all parts of the Platform – the Bureau, the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel, the technical support units, the coordinating lead authors and others – as appropriate. The secretariat should also evaluate the Platform’s communications and report to the Plenary, including on the type and extent of outreach and media coverage. Evaluation reports should also be presented to the Bureau and the Panel at regular intervals.

8. The communications strategy comprises the following elements: goals and objectives, audience analysis, messages, areas of activity and evaluation. For the sake of brevity, the communications and outreach strategy focuses on key points and does not include an exhaustive list of all messages, tools, audiences and outreach activities that will be used to implement communications and outreach work.

III. Goals and objectives

9. The Platform’s primary objective is to strengthen the science-policy interface for biodiversity and ecosystem services for the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity, long-term human well-being and sustainable development. Communications efforts will be based on the principle that the Platform shall be policy relevant but not policy prescriptive. The Platform will not engage in advocacy and will not provide policy recommendations.

10. Setting specific objectives from a communications perspective can provide a process for evaluation from the outset. Such objectives should be achieved in the context of each Platform activity and are:

(a) To reaffirm the Platform’s reputation as a credible, transparent, independent and authoritative intergovernmental body that strengthens the policymaking and knowledge interface on biodiversity and ecosystem services;

(b) To communicate assessment findings and provide clear and balanced information on biodiversity and ecosystem services, including on risks and scientific uncertainties, without compromising accuracy;

(c) To raise awareness about all the Platform’s functions, which go beyond assessments and support knowledge generation, capacity-building and the identification of policy-relevant tools and methodologies;

(d) To explain the way in which the Platform works, selects its authors and reviewers and produces its reports so as to promote an understanding of its work;

(e) To position the Platform as one that adds value to the work already undertaken in the field of biodiversity and ecosystem services to support policymaking;

(f) To foster two-way communication between the Platform and its audiences so as to improve the Platform’s products and messages.

IV. Audience analysis

11. The audience for the communications strategy needs to be well defined in order for the strategy to be well focused. The Platform has a mandate to provide scientific and technical information on biodiversity and ecosystem services to policymakers who need scientifically credible and

independent information to enable them to adopt local, national and international policies that could address the challenges of biodiversity loss and decline in ecosystem services. Accordingly, the communications and outreach strategy is directed towards the intended beneficiaries of the Platform work programme: governments and policymakers at all levels, including the States members of the Platform and multilateral environmental agreements.

12. While the stakeholder engagement strategy needs to find ways of boosting the participation of stakeholders in the Platform's work programme and deliverables, the communications and outreach strategy is designed with the intended beneficiaries in mind. By focusing on the intended beneficiaries of the Platform's work, it is easier to make a distinction between primary and broader audiences.

13. Some primary and broader target audiences for the Platform's outputs are listed below. In the interests of brevity, the list is not exhaustive:

- (a) Primary target audiences:
 - (i) Policymakers in the field of biodiversity and ecosystem services at all levels: Platform member States, ministries of environment, energy, industry, planning, finance and agriculture, local authorities and the scientific advisers of policymakers need to be informed about the Platform so that they can use it as a source of independent knowledge;
 - (ii) United Nations programmes and multilateral environmental agreements: some United Nations programmes and multilateral environmental agreements are key clients for the Platform's reports. The Platform will work with them, including during outreach and dissemination activities;
- (b) Broader audiences:
 - (i) Scientific community: the Platform depends on the scientific community for the production of its reports and should therefore target this community to increase its engagement. International associations of scientists could be targeted as part of outreach activities;
 - (ii) Indigenous and local knowledge holders: the Platform has identified the indigenous and local knowledge community as an important target audience;
 - (iii) Business and industry: it is anticipated that the Platform's reports will be considered by businesses and industries interested in the Platform to help them find sustainable ways of avoiding, minimizing and offsetting their impacts on ecosystems;
 - (iv) Practitioners or implementers: a multitude of organizations and individuals involved in the implementation of biodiversity and ecosystem services working on the ground will be interested in learning about the products of the Platform, such as policy support tools, and how they can use them;
 - (v) Community-based organizations: certain communities will be greatly affected by biodiversity loss and will therefore need to be aware of the findings of the Platform's assessments and policy support tools. The Platform secretariat could work with relevant networks to disseminate communications materials to these communities;
 - (vi) Intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations: these may be able to support the Platform's objectives by providing outreach to their constituencies, including policymakers or the private sector;
 - (vii) The media: the Platform secretariat would not be in a position to reach all audiences directly and would therefore rely on good media relations to reach broader audiences;
 - (viii) Communities and the public at large.

14. While the Platform secretariat itself might not be in a position to produce derivative products aimed at specific audiences, it may engage with organizations that take elements of the Platform's assessments and communicate them in more audience-specific formats.

V. Messages

15. Messaging will need to be coordinated, in particular during the launch of assessment reports, when there will be heightened interest in the work of the Platform. Prior to the launch of assessment reports, the secretariat should work with report co-chairs, coordinating lead authors and review editors to ensure the consistency of messages to policymakers, their scientific advisers and the media. Messaging will need to respect the bounds set for the Platform's reports, namely, that they should be policy relevant but not policy prescriptive. It is therefore an essential quality of the Platform's work that messaging and reports should remain policy neutral and maintain scientific balance.

16. In addition, a number of overarching key messages explaining what the Platform is actually doing need to be agreed upon and be used in all materials for the media or events attended by different audiences. The focus of these messages should be to explain the process and its legitimacy, shedding light on such notions as "global consensus", "peer review", "highest-quality science" and others.

17. Although by no means exhaustive, the list below presents overarching messages that can be used to illustrate the Platform's added value and role among all audiences that are not familiar with its operations:

(a) The Platform is the authoritative body which provides state-of-the-art and up-to-date reports on key aspects of biodiversity and ecosystem services, in response to requests from policymakers;

(b) The Platform does not duplicate existing work but adds value to the wide range of organizations already working in this field by filling gaps and building upon their work;

(c) The Platform is unique in that it aims to strengthen capacity for the effective use of science in decision-making at all levels;

(d) The Platform is scientifically independent and ensures credibility, relevance and legitimacy through peer review of its work and transparency in its decision-making processes for the exchange, sharing and use of data, information and technologies from all relevant sources;

(e) The Platform recognizes and respects the contribution of indigenous and local knowledge to the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity and ecosystems;

(f) The Platform recognizes the unique biodiversity and scientific knowledge of different regions and the need for the full and effective participation of developing countries and balanced regional representation and participation in its structure and work;

(g) The Platform takes an interdisciplinary and multidisciplinary approach that incorporates all relevant disciplines, including social and natural sciences.

VI. Areas of activity

A. Day-to-day communications

18. The Platform secretariat will provide information and regular updates about its deliverables, events and activities through its website, social media accounts, presentations and so forth. A list of all suggested activities that could be undertaken by the secretariat as of 2015 and a timeline are set out in the appendix to the present strategy.

B. Launch of assessment reports

19. Two assessments reports will be launched at the fourth session of the Plenary: first, the thematic assessment of pollination and pollinators associated with food production and, second, the methodological assessment of scenarios and modelling of biodiversity and ecosystem services. More assessment reports will follow. There will be a short period, probably lasting three months, of sustained and concentrated interest in each of the reports all over the world. It is essential that the Platform be well prepared for this.

20. The launch of assessment reports will spark a period of heightened interest in the Platform's work from the media, policymakers and other stakeholders. The Platform's key strategic objectives at these periods of heightened activity are, first, to maintain vigorous, accurate and sustained press coverage, second, to coordinate and control messaging that is kept strictly within the bounds set for the Platform's reports, namely, that they should be policy relevant, not policy prescriptive, and, third, to meet the requests made by end users – in particular policymakers and scientific and technical experts in government and the private sector – for the conduct of seminars, briefings and meetings.

21. To promote the findings of the assessment reports it will be important to develop an outreach strategy and mount a media relations campaign, including press releases, the use of social media and website announcements, press conferences, messaging, speeches, speaking notes and other approaches.
22. To be effective and to have the required impact, it is recommended that the Platform appoint a communications consulting firm a few months prior to the launch of assessment reports to handle the increased volume of activities and products that will need to be developed and disseminated. This recommendation is in line with similar practices adopted by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, which has enlisted the help of communications consulting firms during peak periods. Such an appointment could be covered by the communications budget allocated for each assessment and would only take effect during the peak periods before, during and after the launch of assessment reports. Consulting firms will work under the supervision of the Bureau and the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel and in collaboration with the communications officer of the secretariat.
23. Communicating the results of the Platform's assessments will be a challenging task because of the range and complexity of scientific issues and the increasing need to reach audiences beyond scientists and Governments. With the help of a communications consulting firm, clear messages can be crafted for different audiences. Furthermore, trained science writers can translate technical language into text suitable for mass communication or design web pages that explain scientific concepts to lay audiences without misconstruing or distorting the evidence underpinning those concepts.
24. In order to promote understanding, acceptance and practical use of assessment reports, it is critical that, subject to the availability of resources, the secretariat and communications firm work together with the task force on capacity-building to develop and implement training programmes for decision makers at various levels, when needed, and to provide guidance to member States, regional hubs and networks.
25. As the assessment on pollination and pollinators will be one of the first two reports to be launched, it could be used as a model for the activities and products needed prior to, during and after the launch of each assessment report. A timeline of suggested activities is set out in the appendix to the present strategy.

VII. Evaluation

26. The evaluation process will comprise three stages, as appropriate and depending on the availability of funding:
- (a) *Perception surveys.* One survey targeting primary and broader audiences will be conducted as necessary to gauge perceptions about the Platform and its work;
 - (b) *Focus group discussions.* To measure the effectiveness of the communications and outreach strategy, focus group discussions will be held at key stages of the campaign as it progresses. These discussions will be held during major events or targeted at specific audiences, such as policymakers;
 - (c) *Media content monitoring.* Press coverage in websites, newspapers, magazines and scientific publications will be continually monitored.

Appendix

Implementation plan

1. The present implementation plan provides further details about the activities that could be implemented under the two key areas of communications: first, day-to-day communications and, second, the launch of assessment reports.

A. Day-to-day communications

2. As of 2015, the secretariat will develop the following products and undertake the following activities:

(a) *Needs analysis*. This will be conducted as part of the stakeholder engagement strategy (decision IPBES-3/4, annex II). The findings of this analysis will be valuable for communications planning purposes;

(b) *Website revamp*. A large-scale project to be undertaken by the secretariat will be the revamping of the Platform's website on the basis of an open consultation process on areas to be improved. The aim will be to create a user-friendly and intuitive website with a contemporary and fresh look and feel;

(c) *Information and communications technology tools*. The secretariat will use information and communications technology tools, which will provide an opportunity for dialogue and communication to the Platform's bodies (Bureau and Multidisciplinary Expert Panel), task forces and expert groups. Such information and communications technology tools will facilitate file sharing and collaboration online, along with videoconferencing services;

(d) *Visual identity*. With the help of professional graphic designers, a consistent corporate visual identity for all communications products and activities of the Platform, including its website, presentations, fact sheets, publications and other outputs, will be developed;

(e) *Presentations*. Once the visual style guide has been developed, professional and visually appealing presentations promoting the work of the Platform will also be developed;

(f) *Fact sheets*. One-page fact sheets presenting the Platform's work will be created using the same visual style guide. Where practicable, these fact sheets will be made available in all six official languages of the United Nations;

(g) *Social media*. A social media strategy will also be developed to promote opportunities for participation in the Platform's work. Accounts for the Platform will be created on Facebook, Twitter and YouTube providing updates about the Platform's work;

(h) *FAQ web page*. This will be created on the revamped website providing key messages to explain why the Platform has been set up, how it adds value to the current array of initiatives and how it operates and under what principles;

(i) *Events and outreach*. An interactive calendar with Platform events will be included in the revamped website;

(j) *Translations*. Where practicable, translations of key communications products will be made available in all six official United Nations languages;

(k) *Wikipedia*. The Platform's webpage on Wikipedia will be updated after major events, such as sessions of the Plenary and the launching of assessment reports;

(l) *Annual survey*. A survey to gauge stakeholder perceptions will be conducted each year.

Table 1
Timeline of communications activities

<i>Activities</i>	<i>Timeline</i>
Needs analysis	Completion by April 2015
Website revamp	January–April 2015
Information and communications technology tools	Procurement by April 2015
Visual identity	Completion by June 2015
Presentations	Completion by July 2015
Fact sheets	Completion by August 2015
Social media	Throughout the year
FAQ web page	Completion by June 2015
Events and outreach	Throughout the year
Translations	Completion by November 2015
Wikipedia	Updated regularly
Annual survey	Completed in October each year

B. Launch of assessment reports

3. As the thematic assessment of pollination and pollinators will be one of the first two reports to be launched, it will be used as a model for the activities and products needed prior to, during and after the launch of each assessment report. A timeline of possible activities could be used as a model for the launch of the assessment reports that will follow.

Table 2
Timeline of possible launch-related activities

<i>Activities prior to, during and after the launch of the thematic assessment of pollination and pollinators</i>	<i>October 2015</i>	<i>November 2015</i>	<i>December 2015</i>	<i>January 2016</i>	<i>February 2016</i>	<i>March 2016</i>
Publications						
Supporting materials						
Derivative products						
Dedicated conference						
Special events, briefings, side events						
Speaker opportunities						
Online Q and A sessions with experts						
Rapid response plan						
Spokespersons						
Media training						
List of influential media						
Media monitoring						
Marketing						
Mailing lists						
Press conferences						
Interviews						

Annex II

Stakeholder engagement strategy (deliverable 4 (d))

I. Introduction

1. In decision IPBES/1/2, the Plenary of the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services invited the International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN) and the International Council for Science (ICSU) to work with relevant stakeholders, including indigenous and local communities and the private sector, and with the secretariat, to prepare, in consultation with the Bureau and the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel, a draft stakeholder engagement strategy for supporting the implementation of the work programme. After a broad consultative process that included a call for input, an in-person workshop and an online review, all comments and suggestions were incorporated in a draft stakeholder engagement strategy that was submitted to the Plenary for consideration at its second session (IPBES/2/13).

2. At the second session of the Plenary, representatives expressed general support for the draft strategy and, following the discussion, the Chair proposed that the secretariat develop a revised version for consideration by the Plenary at its third session (IPBES/2/17, sect. VII.B). In addition, at the third Bureau meeting, in March 2014, the Chair asked the secretariat to develop an initial implementation plan, to be presented together with the draft strategy to the Plenary at its third session.

3. In response to that request, the secretariat, working with Bureau members and in consultation with Panel members, prepared a revised version of the draft stakeholder engagement strategy and a draft implementation plan and invited comments from stakeholders. In total, the secretariat received 364 comments from stakeholders and took them into consideration in the preparation of the revised draft strategy. In addition, the secretariat took into consideration suggestions from stakeholders that were discussed by the Platform's Pan-European Stakeholder Consultation at its second meeting, held in Basel, Switzerland, in September 2014. The revised version of the draft strategy and the initial implementation plan, as set out below, were welcomed by the Plenary at its third session.

II. Context

4. Stakeholder engagement has been identified as an important element for the relevance, effectiveness, credibility and overall success of the Platform. The stakeholder engagement strategy differs from the communications strategy in the following respects: while the stakeholder engagement strategy needs to focus on encouraging the participation of scientists and other knowledge holders in the Platform's work and on facilitating the use of the Platform's products, such as its policy support tools, the communications strategy needs to focus on promoting the work of the Platform among key audiences via publications, media relations, special events and other measures.

III. Oversight

5. The stakeholder engagement strategy will be implemented and operationalized by the secretariat, subject to the availability of resources, working under the supervision of the Bureau and the Plenary and in collaboration with the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel. The Platform encourages the self-organization of an inclusive, open-ended network of stakeholders representing their diversity, working primarily on a virtual basis. Collaboration between the Platform and the network will be guided by the stakeholder engagement strategy. A strategic partnership between the Platform and the network will specify the arrangements for this collaboration and will be subject to the approval of the Plenary.

IV. Purpose and objectives

6. The purpose of the Platform is to strengthen the science-policy interface on issues related to biodiversity and ecosystem services through its four functions (assessments, knowledge generation, policy support and capacity-building). The overall purpose of stakeholder engagement is to support the implementation of the Platform's work programme and its specific deliverables for the period 2014–2018 in a participatory, inclusive and transparent manner. The Platform will depend on expert individual contributions for its assessments. In addition, the other three functions of the Platform also require input from and participation by a diverse mix of stakeholders. Accordingly, the strategy for engaging with stakeholders is a key element of the efforts to mobilize support for the implementation of the Platform's work programme for the period 2014–2018.

7. Setting clear objectives that are aligned with the purpose of stakeholder engagement will help the strategy to maintain its focus. Key objectives of the Platform's stakeholder engagement include:

- (a) Reaching out to a diversity of potential users and providers of information to increase the relevance and use of the Platform;
- (b) Bringing diverse perspectives together to facilitate creativity and innovation;
- (c) Attracting scientists, such as assessment experts, and other knowledge holders from citizen science initiatives and indigenous peoples and local communities to contribute to the Platform's deliverables;
- (d) Strengthening support for the Platform's deliverables from different regions and scientific disciplines;
- (e) Endeavouring to reach balance in the contribution of knowledge across regions, sectors, genders and knowledge types;
- (f) Delivering high-quality products in the context of science and knowledge to decision makers who are the end users of the Platform's deliverables;
- (g) Mobilizing resources for capacity-building in order to contribute to the development of assessments and policy support tools and facilitate the use of policy support tools;
- (h) Mobilizing in-kind support from stakeholders to promote the implementation and use of the Platform.

V. Definitions of stakeholders

8. In the context of the work programme, stakeholders will act as both contributors to and end users of the Platform and will be individual scientists and knowledge holders as well as institutions, organizations and groups working in the field of biodiversity and ecosystems services that can:

- (a) Contribute to the activities of the work programme through their experience, expertise, knowledge, data, information and capacity-building experience;
- (b) Use or benefit from the outcomes of the work programme;
- (c) Encourage and support the participation of scientists and knowledge holders in the work of the Platform.

9. The Platform aims to strengthen the interface between science and policymaking on issues related to biodiversity and ecosystem services. Two categories of stakeholders have been identified: contributors (scientists, knowledge holders, practitioners and others) and end users (policymakers and others).

10. Stakeholders are not entitled to observer status unless they are admitted as such according to the rules of procedure.

VI. Scope

11. Stakeholder engagement is essential to efforts to advance the four functions of the Platform (assessment, knowledge generation, policy support and capacity-building). One aspect of the Platform's stakeholder engagement is the need to mobilize stakeholders who can act as contributors to its four functions, while another aspect is efforts to facilitate use of the Platform's products, such as the catalogue of relevant assessments or the catalogue of policy support tools, by end users. A third aspect is an endeavour to facilitate the participation of observer organizations at sessions of the Plenary and to invite comments from stakeholders on documents to be submitted to the Plenary.

12. Operationalization of the stakeholder engagement strategy will be facilitated through the secretariat, which will provide clear information regarding opportunities for stakeholder engagement and seek feedback from stakeholders with a view to making suggestions to improve the process and foster two-way communication.

13. In some cases, the Plenary has already clearly defined rules and processes for stakeholder engagement. For example, under its first function (assessments), the nomination and selection process of experts, including opportunities for peer review, are clearly outlined in decision IPBES-2/3. Stakeholder engagement in these areas has already begun.

14. There are, however, other areas of the work programme that might offer opportunities for stakeholder engagement and for which no rules or processes of engagement have yet been considered.

The three task forces might offer opportunities for stakeholder engagement, as their work will heavily rely on collaboration with various partners in the fields of capacity-building, indigenous and local knowledge and knowledge and data. The secretariat will accordingly work with the task forces to develop options for stakeholder engagement in the work of the task forces.

VII. Incentives and disincentives

15. In implementing the stakeholder engagement strategy, it will be useful for the Platform to be aware of potential incentives and disincentives to engagement. Some useful insights can be drawn from the preliminary review of the motivation for participating in Platform assessments. The United Nations Environment Programme World Conservation Monitoring Centre (UNEP-WCMC) prepared a paper reviewing the motivation for the participation of experts in Platform assessments (see IPBES/1/INF/15).

16. Possible incentives for experts to participate in the work of the Platform, identified in the paper by WCMC, include: prestige and opportunities to engage in a project of scientific excellence; making a difference; relevance to their research interests; networking opportunities; working on something that they consider important; being part of an influential organization; and recognition for grants, scholarships and fellowships. Possible disincentives include: engaging in a process with regard to which they have not been involved in developing the questions; heavy time commitments; lack of clarity on how to participate; uncertainty as to how funding incentives are to be established; and lack of recognition by institutions for the contributions made by their scientists.

17. Another survey conducted by ICSU and IUCN identified the following factors as potential incentives for organizations to engage as stakeholders in the work of the Platform: the alignment of their priorities with those of the Platform; the opportunity to influence the Platform's work; the opportunity to contribute to useful outcomes; the potential to develop partnerships; the opportunity to gain recognition; and the potential to be compensated for their time.

18. Although the results do not represent the views of all future stakeholders of the Platform, they provide some insights into what needs to be done to enhance stakeholder engagement.

VIII. Risks

19. As part of the Platform's stakeholder engagement planning, it is important to identify and prepare for risks associated with engagement and ways of confronting them. The following are among the most common risks of stakeholder engagement: first, conflict of interest or dissent among stakeholders; second, inability to engage owing to lack of funding; third, participation fatigue; fourth, unmet expectations; and, fifth, unequal levels of engagement among stakeholders. In order to address potential risks, the secretariat will seek feedback from stakeholders during special events and draft a policy for identifying and addressing risks, under the guidance of the Bureau and the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel.

IX. Evaluation

20. For high-quality stakeholder engagement, evaluation needs to be planned from the outset through the setting of objectives and indicators of performance to enable the Platform to measure and evaluate progress towards achieving high-quality stakeholder engagement and identify areas for improvement. The following draft indicators are classified in groups depending on the nature of the information that they provide:

<i>Indicators for successful stakeholder engagement</i>	<i>Description</i>
Commitment to stakeholder engagement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development of a strategy and an implementation plan • Evidence of consultations with stakeholders • Evidence of clear and accurate policies and processes explaining how stakeholders can get involved and in which areas
Capacity to address challenges	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • References to obstacles to stakeholder engagement and the steps planned to surmount them (e.g., hard-to-reach stakeholders, language or cultural barriers, diverse agendas or interests, etc.)
Extent of engagement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Metrics assessing engagement (e.g., number of nominations, peer review comments, participants, fellowships, etc.)
Diversity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Metrics assessing representation of stakeholders from different countries, regions, disciplines, etc.
Evidence of outputs and impacts	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of the relation between the purpose of engagement and its expected outcomes • Evidence of achieved impacts
Opportunities for two-way communication	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Calls for input on issues related to stakeholder engagement • Surveys to provide feedback on the engagement • Evidence of stakeholder issues and concerns being addressed

21. One tool for evaluation could be the use of annual surveys, which would provide opportunities for feedback on the process and outcomes of engagement. As mentioned earlier, the secretariat could undertake an annual survey to gauge stakeholder views and perceptions. Monitoring will be conducted continually, by taking into account the comments and feedback during various stakeholder events.

22. In addition, as decided by the Plenary, the effectiveness of stakeholder engagement should be independently reviewed and evaluated as part of the Platform's efficiency and effectiveness (deliverable 4 (e)).

X. Initial implementation plan

23. The initial implementation plan for this stakeholder engagement strategy set out in the appendix includes actions that could be taken by the secretariat to ensure that stakeholders receive sufficient and clear information on how to engage with the Platform. The secretariat will also seek input from stakeholders with a view to improving stakeholder engagement and fostering two-way communication. In 2015, the secretariat, in collaboration with the open-ended network, will undertake the following activities, as appropriate, together with stakeholders, subject to the availability of resources:

- (a) Identification of stakeholders;
- (b) Needs analysis;
- (c) Preparation of how-to guides and translations;
- (d) Preparation of fact sheets and translations regarding information, data sources, knowledge generation and capacity-building;
- (e) Collaboration with task forces to engage with hard-to-reach stakeholders;
- (f) Collaboration with existing networks and hubs;
- (g) Facilitation and establishment of new networks and hubs;
- (h) Use of social media and electronic mailing lists;
- (i) Use of information and communications technology tools;
- (j) Stakeholder events;
- (k) Annual surveys.

24. Details regarding the above-mentioned activities, together with a timeline and an indicative budget, are presented in the initial implementation plan.

25. From 2016 onwards, additional activities could be undertaken by the secretariat to enhance stakeholder engagement. Products related to media relations, outreach, dissemination and promotion of the Platform's products will be covered by the budget allocated to communications as part of the Plenary-approved budget for the work programme.

Appendix

Initial implementation plan

1. In 2015, the secretariat will undertake the following activities, as appropriate, together with stakeholders, subject to the availability of resources.

Identification and mobilization of stakeholders

2. Identification and mobilization of the Platform's potential stakeholders is a complex task, as a great diversity of individuals, institutions, organizations and groups working across and within different sectors and scales (local, national, subregional, regional and global) need to be considered. Other parameters include the different disciplines (natural, social and economic sciences), types of knowledge (traditional, local and indigenous, citizen science) and sectors (industry, health, food, energy) that must be taken into account. Cultural differences, language barriers, differing stakeholder interests and different mandates and governance arrangements represent additional factors that must be taken into consideration.

3. The secretariat, in collaboration with the network of stakeholders, will develop a method for systematically identifying and mobilizing stakeholder groups, taking into account regional and gender balance and diverse knowledge systems. As a starting point, all observer organizations that have already been admitted to sessions of the Plenary will be included. The secretariat will further seek guidance from the Bureau and the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel and then publish an open registry of stakeholders. Platform national focal points will, upon request, be informed of relevant information about the identification and the engagement of stakeholders in their countries and regions so as to maximize synergies at the national and regional levels. The secretariat will maintain a database of stakeholders with their contact details and preferred methods of communication.

4. The stakeholder network, under advice from the secretariat, may develop proposals as necessary, regarding ways in which they can support the work of the Platform. The proposals will be shared with the Platform national focal points and will be considered by the Bureau and the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel.

5. A detailed categorization of potential stakeholders is provided in the note by the secretariat on additional information on the stakeholder engagement strategy (IPBES/3/INF/10). This categorization was originally initiated by the interim Platform secretariat (provided by the United Nations Environment Programme) in the gap analysis that it conducted to facilitate the discussions on how to improve and strengthen the science-policy interface on biodiversity and ecosystem services (see UNEP/IPBES/2/INF/1). This categorization has been updated and new organizations have been included following suggestions and comments by stakeholders on the revised draft communications strategy.

Needs analysis

6. Apart from the identification exercise, the secretariat will also conduct a needs analysis of stakeholder groups (both contributors and end users) to identify willingness to participate, incentives and disincentives for participating, interest in specific outputs of the Platform, preferred methods of engagement and issues of concern. This analysis will be conducted using a quantitative survey that can be translated into different languages. Existing networks will be asked to forward the survey to their members. This type of survey provides comparable and quantifiable results and can reach a broad spectrum of stakeholders.

7. The needs analysis will help the Platform identify stakeholder expectations and better understand the nature and degree of engagement envisaged by contributors and end users and the engagement methods (e.g., website, direct interaction, hubs, print materials, audiovisual materials, collaborative projects or any combination of the above) best suited to different groups of stakeholders. The results of this survey could help the secretariat improve its approaches to reaching stakeholders as of 2016. A possible questionnaire for stakeholders is included in the note by the secretariat on additional information on the stakeholder engagement strategy (IPBES/3/INF/10).

Engagement with stakeholders

8. *How-to guides.* The Plenary has adopted clear rules for the Platform's assessments, explaining at which stages the participation and input of stakeholders are to be sought. The policy and procedure for the admission of observers' organizations to sessions of the Plenary are also being developed. The secretariat will prepare simple and clear how-to guides explaining these processes. These how-to

guides could be translated into all the official languages of the United Nations and posted on the Platform's website, while fact sheets could be created for wider distribution to existing networks.

9. *Task-forces.* Another aspect of stakeholder engagement is identifying how to strengthen collaboration with stakeholders regarding specific activities of the Platform's work programme, such as the need to fill gaps in knowledge or data, conduct or receive training and participate in the matchmaking facility. The task force on capacity-building recently held a meeting in Brazil, at which it discussed how to communicate and engage with various stakeholders in the context of the proposed Platform matchmaking facility. The secretariat should work closely with this and other task forces to provide clear information about how stakeholders can participate in these areas.

10. *Outreach.* One of the challenges faced by the Platform in pursuing stakeholder engagement is how to give a voice to developing countries, indigenous peoples and local communities and traditional and local knowledge holders, citizen science organizations, and community-based conservation organizations, given the possible language barriers and other constraints such as limited funding or internet access. The secretariat will work closely with the Platform's focal points, the task forces and others, as appropriate, to address these gaps.

11. *Networks and hubs.* Existing networks and regional or local hubs could help by mobilizing their stakeholders, tailoring messages, participating in outreach efforts and potentially translating key documents. Apart from existing networks on biodiversity and natural resources management, some countries have developed their own Platform coordination units to mobilize their scientific communities. These hubs and coordination units could perhaps help set up similar units in other countries and encourage Platform member States to establish their own networks on national and subnational scales.

12. *Social media.* The use of social media will allow the secretariat rapidly to inform diverse groups of stakeholders. Via Facebook and Twitter, the secretariat will disseminate calls for input and recent developments and receive feedback, harnessing a two-way communication model.

13. *Information and communications technology.* The secretariat has procured information and communications technology tools to enable its expert groups, task forces and authors to share files, collaborate online and conduct video conferences. The videoconferencing tools use cutting-edge technology that provides a stable connection even in regions where there are connectivity problems.

14. *Stakeholder events.* The secretariat will organize each year, before each Plenary session, stakeholder days to encourage stakeholders to interact. In addition, several awareness-raising events or targeted expert workshops are expected to be initiated by groups of stakeholders and regional networks that might consider including slots for the Platform's consultations. The secretariat will support these events by assigning a staff member to them, to inform stakeholders about progress in the Platform's deliverables and to listen to their suggestions. Such participation shall of course be subject to the secretariat's budget and workload.

15. *Annual survey.* The secretariat will conduct a stakeholder needs analysis to better assess the needs of stakeholders. This annual survey will aim to gauge perceptions and views of stakeholders so as to improve stakeholder engagement.

<i>Actions</i>	<i>Timeline</i>	<i>Indicative budget</i>
Identification of stakeholders	March–May 2015	N/A
Needs analysis	June–July 2015	N/A
How-to guides and translations	March–June 2015	\$35,000 for 2015
Fact sheets and translations regarding knowledge generation and capacity-building	May–July 2015	\$70,000 for 2015
Hard-to-reach stakeholders	Ongoing	Part of the budget for deliverable 1 (c)
Networks and hubs	Ongoing	N/A
Social media	Ongoing	N/A
Information and communications technology tools (online file sharing and video conferencing tools)	Jan 2015–Dec 2018	Online file sharing and video conferencing for 500 users: \$130,000 for four years
Stakeholder events	One or two days prior to each Plenary	Estimated cost of venue per day: \$38,000
Annual surveys	November each year	N/A

Annex III

Guidance on the development of strategic partnerships and other collaborative arrangements

I. Purpose of strategic partnerships in supporting the work programme of the Platform

1. The primary purpose of any strategic partnership will be to support implementation of the work programme of the Platform through one or more of the following means, recognizing that they might be applied differently depending on the area of work or the Platform's functions:

(a) *Increasing alignment of activities.* Coordinating with existing institutions may help to align the different activities that are currently being undertaken relevant to the delivery of the work programme, thereby filling gaps and building upon their work while avoiding duplication of effort. This might include, for example, coordination of relevant capacity-building activities. In working alongside those institutions already undertaking activities in areas related to the work programme, the Platform is much more likely to add value and avoid duplicating existing work;

(b) *Providing direct support.* There is a range of activities that the Platform could agree to provide or commission other organizations to provide as part of the institutional arrangements for supporting the delivery of the work programme. These activities might include, for example, providing a technical support function, contributing specific knowledge and experience, coordinating areas of work in which an organization has particular expertise, providing administrative support, engaging in outreach and communication functions, increasing access to data and analytical methods and promoting and catalysing capacity-building;

(c) *Building and managing relationships.* Ensuring effective sharing of knowledge and building of mutual understanding may be important in developing good working relationships between the Platform and other intergovernmental processes and, in particular, with multilateral environmental agreements related to biodiversity and ecosystem services;

(d) *Facilitating stakeholder engagement.* It is widely recognized that the Platform will need to engage with a broad range of stakeholders, and this is addressed in the stakeholder engagement strategy. Engagement with scientists and other knowledge holders is particularly relevant to the implementation of the work programme. Strategic partnerships with organizations that can assist with facilitating and promoting stakeholder engagement may be helpful.

2. Such strategic partnerships may be relevant at the global level, but they may also serve a useful purpose in supporting delivery of the work programme within particular regions in order to increase cooperation and to increase access to data, information and knowledge. In this regard, needs may vary from one region to another.

3. It is important to recognize that strategic partnerships are not necessary for every action that the Platform may undertake with other organizations and individuals. In particular, the following actions might be sufficient, and in most instances could be undertaken, without entering into more formal partnership arrangements:

(a) *Liaising and communicating.* Given the breadth of organizations involved in biodiversity and ecosystem services, it is essential for the Platform to effectively communicate what it is doing (through a range of mechanisms, including national focal points), to indicate potential opportunities for involvement and to liaise with relevant organizations known to have particularly relevant interests;

(b) *Recognizing what others produce or do as contributions to the Platform.* Some organizations are already carrying out activities directly relevant to the Platform that could be readily used by the Platform. Consideration will be given to ways of identifying and appropriately recognizing these activities and products. This will need to be handled through an open and transparent process and to be addressed in the rules of procedure;

(c) *Promoting cooperation and coordination.* The Platform will provide the necessary impetus for increased cooperation and collaboration among organizations working on similar issues, so that they can together deliver more effectively a product or service to meet the needs of the Platform;

(d) *Informing and potentially influencing the priorities of others.* Priorities identified by the Platform are likely to be taken into account in the planning and prioritization processes of many organizations, networks, programmes and processes relevant to the Platform;

(e) *Informing and potentially influencing working practices.* Promoting the use of standard methodologies, frameworks and tools and access to information on lessons learned would support the working practices of a range of organizations. Each of these has the potential to increase harmonization in approaches so that organizations doing things in similar ways can more easily share the resulting data, information and experience.

II. Key considerations to be taken into account in establishing strategic partnerships

4. Careful consideration on a case-by-case basis is required as to whether a strategic partnership is appropriate and necessary. Given that the Platform is a new and evolving entity there are many organizations that might wish to form partnerships with it in order to try to secure their own roles in its future. In such a situation the partnership arrangements of the Platform should be purpose-driven and centred around the need for effective implementation of its functions and work programme. The Platform must therefore be prudent in its approach to the development of partnerships and give very careful consideration to the value and implications of such partnerships.

5. Taking account of the previous paragraphs, criteria to be used in identifying whether a strategic partnership is appropriate and necessary include:

(a) Necessity of using a formal partnership approach rather than other available mechanisms such as those identified in paragraph 3;

(b) Relevance of the potential partnership to delivery of the work programme agreed upon by the Plenary, including consideration of any priorities agreed upon by the Plenary;

(c) Opportunity to perform work programme activities more effectively, efficiently, economically and ethically;

(d) Experience and capacity of the potential strategic partner in fields relevant to the Platform and its willingness to collaborate in delivering the work programme;

(e) Achievement of a more appropriate regional or thematic balance in the delivery of the work programme.

6. Assuming that a strategic partnership is deemed both necessary and appropriate, consideration must be given to the potential roles and responsibilities of the different partners, any specific deliverables and terms of reference and the necessary time frames. In this regard, a partnership might cover a narrow range of activities or be quite broad, and it might be time-bound or open-ended (noting the need for regular review highlighted in paragraph 10).

7. Any partnership arrangements entered into shall be established within the existing partnership rules and policy of the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), as the institution administering the Platform secretariat, which will ensure that appropriate generic legal, ethical and financial issues are fully addressed.

8. In establishing strategic partnerships, consideration will need to be given to the issues that are normally addressed in contracts between organizations, a number of which may already be included in the policies and procedures of the Platform. Most of these issues will need to be considered whether or not there is a contractual arrangement and whether or not there is a written agreement. These include:

- (a) Purpose and objective;
- (b) Commitments of each party;
- (c) Conflict of interest;
- (d) Liability;
- (e) Intellectual property rights;
- (f) Confidentiality;
- (g) Representation and use of logos;
- (h) Amendment;
- (i) Entry into force;

- (j) Termination;
- (k) Settlement of disputes.

9. Finally, consideration will need to be given to ensuring that the procedures and operating principles of the Platform are fully taken into account when developing strategic partnerships, and in particular to ensure that those operating principles are applied in an appropriate manner both in choosing partnerships and in the manner in which those partnerships are implemented. Specifically, there must be:

- (a) Transparency and accountability in deciding on and entering into partnerships, so that the reasons for doing so are obvious and it is clear what each party will gain;
- (b) Application of all relevant Platform procedures and operating principles by partners so that partnerships do not become a mechanism for circumventing agreed approaches;
- (c) Clear and understood quality control and quality assurance of processes and outputs through implementation and monitoring using appropriate mechanisms;
- (d) Access to collaboration with the Platform across regions, Platform functions or among a variety of stakeholders;
- (e) Steps taken to ensure that the development of a strategic partnership with one organization does not lead to reduced involvement of other organizations or stakeholders.

10. In order to ensure and maintain public confidence, partnerships shall be the subject of regular review by the secretariat, the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel, the Bureau and the Plenary to ensure that they continue to serve the purpose for which they were intended and to check that they remain relevant to delivery of the work programme. Any partnership arrangements, including terms of reference, should allow for such periodic review and adjustment.

III. Form of strategic partnerships

11. The form that strategic partnerships assume may vary considerably. For example, intent to collaborate may be established through an exchange of letters or a memorandum of understanding that can be used for defining strategic alliances and for declaring agreement on intent, on areas of common interest, on cooperation in terms of project and programme implementation and on the sharing of responsibilities for joint programming – recognizing that there are potential costs and benefits to both parties. They are essentially frameworks through which the parties to an agreement confirm that they share a common understanding.

12. In order to operationalize partnerships, consideration might be given to drawing up a project document of some form or a jointly agreed programme of work, which would spell out how the intent to collaborate would be realized. Such documents would provide more detailed definitions of activities, timetables and deliverables and would be likely to include implementation plans and potentially also budgets. These more detailed documents may cover the whole period of the partnership or may be periodically updated.

13. While in some cases partnerships may involve the transfer of funds to support a particular set of tasks, this is not necessarily always the case. Partnerships could also be established with no implied exchange of funds. In some cases it would be assumed that the legal entities involved would provide the necessary resources for their own activities (which may well be activities that they intended to carry out anyway). The agreements might be used, however, as a vehicle to help find additional funding from elsewhere, and this should be considered when they are drawn up.

14. There may also be cases where a legal agreement in the form of a contract is necessary in order to ensure timely delivery of a product or service necessary for the efficient implementation of the work programme. The form that the contract takes may well vary depending on the type of organization and the institutional relationship between the Platform or UNEP and the organization concerned.

IV. Categories of strategic partnership and processes for their identification

Bodies identified in the functions, operating principles and institutional arrangements of the Platform

15. The following two categories of institutions are already recognized as being a part of the Platform and are explicitly referred to in the resolution establishing the Platform³¹ and in Plenary decisions. Establishment by way of a Plenary decision of some form of strategic partnerships with institutions in these two categories will help promote and support delivery of the work programme through improved collaboration and cooperation:

(a) *United Nations system.* Through decision IPBES-2/8, the Platform has already established a collaborative partnership with UNEP, the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, the United Nations Development Programme and the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization;

(b) *Multilateral environmental agreements.* It is in the interests of both the Platform and the multilateral environmental agreements related to biodiversity and ecosystem services that the agreements work closely together and with the Platform. The Bureau will therefore work with the appropriate governance body (or bodies) for each of the multilateral environmental agreements to develop strategic partnership arrangements between each multilateral environmental agreement and the Platform for approval by the Plenary. It is expected that these partnerships will be modelled on the existing memorandum of cooperation between the Platform and the Convention on Biological Diversity.³²

Technical support for implementation of the work programme

16. Some arrangements, whether they are known as strategic partnerships or not, will be necessary to provide technical and administrative support for implementation of the work programme. These arrangements essentially provide additional support to the secretariat in a time-bound manner relating to one or more defined deliverables. By decision IPBES-2/5 (sect. X, para. 3), the Plenary mandated the Bureau and the secretariat to establish the institutional arrangements necessary to operationalize technical support for the implementation of the work programme. This will continue as necessary throughout the duration of the work programme. It should be recognized that, while such arrangements may reduce the overall workload, the work of formalizing and managing such partnerships will in itself require the time and attention of the secretariat.

17. The following approaches aim to help ensure the alignment of strategic partnerships and other collaborative arrangements with the delivery of the work programme, placing the responsibility for identifying potential strategic partnerships and other collaboration arrangements with those most directly involved with each deliverable:

(a) *Supporting the work of task forces.* The terms of reference of the three task forces (decision IPBES-2/5, annexes II–IV) explicitly ask each task force to advise on strategic partnerships that would help to deliver support in the area for which the task force is responsible, namely, key capacity-building initiatives, engagement with scientific and observing communities and indigenous and local knowledge communities. In carrying out this function the task forces shall identify both strategic partnerships and other collaborative arrangements that are necessary for delivery of their responsibilities and review their proposals with the Bureau. A range of different types of relationships will be proposed and, based on the guidance provided in paragraph 18, the Bureau will approve, deny or refer to the Plenary for decision the proposed partnership;

(b) *Supporting thematic and global, regional and subregional assessments.* The expert group appointed to scope each assessment shall advise on strategic partnerships and other arrangements that would be valuable in helping with the conduct of the assessments. The suggestions of the group will then form part of the scoping document or its accompanying documentation, which will be reviewed and adopted by the Plenary. In addition, however, it may be necessary to establish strategic partnerships or other appropriate arrangements with other assessment processes or bodies responsible for those assessment processes, in particular in thematic areas specific to certain regions. In this case the Bureau, working with the secretariat, shall define the type of relationship required. A range of different types of relationship will be proposed and, based on the guidance provided in

³¹ UNEP/IPBES.MI/2/9, annex I.

³² A memorandum of cooperation was signed in October 2014 between the Platform secretariat and the secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity.

paragraph 18, the Bureau will approve, deny or refer to the Plenary for decision the proposed partnership;

(c) *Policy support, including that related to methodological assessments.* Two types of advice will come from the expert groups working on methodological assessments. Any expert group scoping a methodological assessment shall make recommendations to the Plenary regarding strategic partnerships or other arrangements that would be valuable in carrying out the assessment as part of the scoping document or other associated documentation. In addition, when the assessment – or guide – is presented to the Plenary, the expert group carrying out the assessment shall advise on any strategic partnerships or other arrangements that would be valuable in the future development and implementation of policy support tools arising from the assessment;

(d) *Communications, outreach and stakeholder engagement.* The Bureau, working with the secretariat, will identify strategic partnerships and other arrangements that would be valuable in helping to carry out communication, outreach and stakeholder engagement activities. A range of different types of relationship may be considered and, based on the guidance provided in paragraph 18, the Bureau will approve, deny or refer to the Plenary for decision the proposed partnership.

18. In deciding whether or not it is appropriate to consult the Plenary before entering into any form of partnership arrangement, the Bureau will keep in mind the following considerations:

(a) High-level partnerships with bodies identified in the functions, operating principles and institutional arrangements of the Platform will be approved by the Plenary;

(b) Partnerships with institutions providing technical support for implementation of the work programme may be approved by the Bureau following any generic or specific guidance provided by the Plenary;

(c) The Bureau will consult the Plenary prior to entering into a partnership agreement where for any reason further guidance is required.