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Item 8 (a) of the provisional agenda[[1]](#footnote-2)\*

Building capacity, strengthening knowledge foundations and supporting policy: work programme deliverables and task force workplans

Information on advanced work on policy instruments, policy support tools and methodologies

Note by the secretariat

1. One of the four functions of the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES) set out in its founding resolution is to support “policy formulation and implementation by identifying policy-relevant tools and methodologies, such as those arising from assessments, to enable decision makers to gain access to those tools and methodologies and, where necessary, to promote and catalyse their further development”.[[2]](#footnote-3)
2. In decision IPBES-7/1, the Plenary adopted the rolling work programme of the Platform for the period up to 2030, which included objective 4 (a), on advanced work on policy instruments, policy support tools and methodologies. This objective focuses on supporting the use of policy instruments, policy support tools and methodologies in the implementation of the programme of work relevant for biodiversity conservation, restoration and sustainable use, as well as the provision of ecosystem functions and services in the conduct of the assessments, and in enabling the uptake of the findings of the assessments in decision-making. Further, the objective focuses on promoting and catalysing the further development of policy instruments and policy support tools to fill gaps identified in assessments and related capacity-building activities.
3. In section V of that decision, the Plenary established a task force on policy tools and methodologies to implement objective 4 (a) of the rolling working programme of the Platform up to 2030, in accordance with the terms of reference set out in annex II to the decision, and requested the Bureau and the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel, through the Platform’s secretariat, to constitute the task force in accordance with those terms of reference. The Plenary decided to review the mandate and terms of reference of the task force at its tenth session.
4. The terms of reference of the task force include:
   1. Overseeing the development of content for the IPBES policy support gateway and support for the use of the gateway by Governments and stakeholders, and ensuring that policy instruments, policy support tools and methodologies identified in IPBES assessments are featured on the gateway and accessible to decision makers;
   2. Catalysing the further development of policy instruments, support tools and good practices to fill gaps identified in IPBES assessments;
   3. Supporting the use of policy instruments, policy support tools and methodologies in the implementation of the work programme relevant to biodiversity conservation, restoration and sustainable use, as well as the provision of ecosystem functions and services in the conduct of the assessments, and in enabling the uptake of the findings of the assessments in decision-making.
5. Also in decision IPBES-7/1, the Plenary requested the task force to develop specific deliverables for each of the priority topics set out in paragraph 8 of the rolling working programme up to 2030, for consideration by the Plenary at its eighth session.
6. The general terms of reference of the task force, set out in annex II to decision IPBES-7/1, stipulate that each task force will, among other activities, provide a regular progress report and, in consultation with the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel and the Bureau, develop and update a workplan that sets out clear milestones and deliverables with regard to the relevant topics and objectives of the rolling work programme up to 2030 for periodic consideration by the Plenary.
7. In decision IPBES-8/1, the Plenary welcomed the progress made in the development of deliverables supporting objective 4 (a) and the three initial priority topics of the work programme of the Platform up to 2030. The Plenary also approved the interim workplan of the task force on policy tools and methodologies for the intersessional period 2021–2022, as set out in annex VI to that decision.
8. Deliverables for objective 4 (a), a workplan for the intersessional period 2022–2023 and a draft workplan for the intersessional period 2023–2024 are presented in annex I to document IPBES/9/10 for consideration by the Plenary. An overview of the activities carried out by the task force since the eighth session of the Plenary is set out in the report of the Executive Secretary on progress in the implementation of the rolling work programme up to 2030 (IPBES/9/4).
9. Further information on the task force on policy tools and methodologies and the activities carried out by the task force in addressing its mandate is provided in the annex to the present note, which has not been formally edited.

Annex[[3]](#footnote-4)\*

Information on work related to policy instruments, policy support tools and methodologies

I. Composition of the task force on policy tools and methodologies

1. At their 13th meetings, the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel and Bureau selected the members of the task force on policy tools and methodologies, in line with the terms of reference set out in annex II to decision IPBES-7/1. The Multidisciplinary Expert Panel and Bureau also selected liaison experts from each assessment as members or alternate members of the task force, to enhance connections between the work of the task force and the on-going assessments.
2. The task force is currently composed of the following members:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| *Name* | *Country* | *Function* |
| Vinod Bihari Mathur | India | Task force co-chair, Bureau member |
| Mersudin Avdibegovic | Bosnia and Herzegovina | Task force co-chair, member of the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel |
| Madhav Karki | Nepal | Member of the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel |
| Luthando Dziba | South Africa | Co-chair of the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel (alternate member) |
| María Elena Zaccagnini | Argentina | Expert |
| Senka Barudanovic | Bosnia and Herzegovina | Expert |
| Xu Jing | China | Expert |
| Juana Mariño | Colombia | Expert |
| Gemedo Dalle Tussie | Ethiopia | Expert |
| Ryo Kohsaka | Japan | Expert |
| Mialy Andriamahefazafy | Madagascar | Expert |
| Trine Setsaas | Norway | Expert |
| Jacob Malcom | United States of America | Expert |
| Marina Kosmus | Austria / Argentina | Liaison expert from the values assessment |
| Mi Sun Park | Republic of Korea | Liaison expert from the sustainable use assessment |
| Melodie McGeoch | Australia / South Africa | Liaison expert from the invasive alien species assessment (alternate member) |

1. A representative of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) participated in the work of the task force as resource person.
2. The United Nations Environment Programme World Conservation Monitoring Centre (UNEP-WCMC), which had provided technical support to the expert group on policy support during the first work programme of IPBES, was selected by the Bureau at its 13th meeting to also provide technical support to the task force under the 2030 rolling work programme until the tenth session of the Plenary.

II. Meetings of the task force on policy tools and methodologies

1. The third meeting of the task force on policy tools and methodologies was held from 27 to 29 September 2021. The full report of the task force meeting is set out in appendix I to this document.
2. The main objective of the meeting was to continue the implementation of objective 4 (a) of the IPBES rolling work programme up to 2030, relating to advancing the work on policy instruments, policy support tools and methodologies. Focus was put on the following deliverables included in the interim workplan of the task force for the intersessional period 2021–2022:
   1. Promoting and supporting the use of findings of IPBES assessments in decision‑making;
   2. Increasing the policy relevance of IPBES assessments; and
   3. Maintaining the policy support gateway as a repository for IPBES products.
3. In particular, the meeting kickstarted and continued the process of implementing the following activities planned for 2021 and early 2022, as specified in the interim work plan of the task force:
4. Convening up to four dialogue workshops with actors at the science-policy interface to promote the use of findings of completed thematic, regional and global IPBES assessments in decision-making, including engagement with existing platforms and networks;
5. Providing support to strengthen the IPBES impact tracking database (TRACK), including by considering the development of case studies, illustrating the use of completed IPBES assessments in decision-making;
6. Developing a strategy to further increase the involvement of practitioners in the assessment process; and
7. Maintaining the policy support gateway as a repository for IPBES products.
8. During the meeting, sessions were held in plenary and two parallel breakout groups. Plenary sessions concentrated on exploring ways of using the results of the “Survey on the use of IPBES assessments in policymaking at (sub)national levels”, conducted between November 2020 and January 2021. Plenary sessions then proceeded to address the development of a roadmap with key aspects to be considered in the planning of future dialogue workshops. Further, these sessions focused on the development of a strategy to increase the involvement of experts with practical policy experience in the assessment process; and on initiating the process of development of the task force’s workplan for the intersessional period 2021–2022. The breakout groups focused on: (i) identifying potential changes that could be considered for TRACK in order to increase the policy relevance of IPBES assessments and understand better their policy impact, and (ii) on how to best document the process of development of the policy support gateway, as a requisite to transition the gateway into a repository.

III. Progress in the implementation of objective 4 (a): Advanced work on policy instruments, policy support tools and methodologies

A. Promoting and supporting the use of findings of IPBES assessments in decision-making

1. Based on the outcomes and lessons learnt from the “Pilot online dialogue on the use of IPBES assessments in policymaking in Africa”, held in March 2021, and the discussions at the third meeting of the task force in September 2021, the task force developed a roadmap to guide the strategic planning of future dialogue workshops. The roadmap outlines the key steps and considerations that should be taken into account in the organization of dialogue workshops in order to ensure that these promote and support the use of IPBES products in decision-making. A draft version of the roadmap was reviewed and approved by the Bureau and MEP at their 18th meetings. The final version of the roadmap is set out in appendix II to this document for information of the Plenary.
2. The task force convened two further online dialogue workshops to promote the use of findings of IPBES products in Asia and the Pacific (on 19 April 2022), and Latin America and the Caribbean (on 3 May 2022). Concept notes for both dialogue workshops, including proposed agendas, were prepared by the task force under the guidance of members of the Bureau and Multidisciplinary Expert Panel from each targeted region and subsequently reviewed and approved by the Bureau and Multidisciplinary Expert Panel at their 18th meetings. The final version of the agendas of both dialogue workshops have been made available at <https://ipbes.net/events/dialogue-workshop-promote-use-ipbes-products-policy-making-asia-and-pacific> and <https://ipbes.net/events/dialogue-workshop-promote-use-ipbes-products-policymaking-latin-america-and-caribbean>. The reports of both meetings will also be made available on each relevant page. In total, both dialogue workshops gathered over 100 participants, including IPBES national focal points, other government officials from various sectors, IPBES experts, and representatives from international and regional organizations.
3. The dialogue workshops provided a space for an informal exchange on the benefits derived from using IPBES products as well as challenges encountered in doing so. Participants had the opportunity to hear concrete examples of how these products are being used in different countries and at the regional level, for example as a key source of information for those responsible for the formulation and implementation of policy measures at national and subnational levels, for the development of thematic and national ecosystem assessments, and to raise awareness on biodiversity and ecosystem services among stakeholders. Furthermore, in some countries institutional mechanisms are being put in place to promote exchanges between governmental agencies and IPBES experts from the country, for example, to share challenges and progress in their work to foster mutual support and advice. Experiences were also shared on the limitations faced in utilizing IPBES products for policy purposes, for example relating to the difficulties of multilevel governance and cross-sectoral cooperation.
4. With a view to fostering collaboration and greater integration among IPBES functions, the technical support units of all task forces and ongoing assessments were invited to the dialogue workshops. During the dialogue workshop for Asia and the Pacific, the technical support unit on capacity building provided a brief overview of the work of the task force on capacity building and ways to engage in it.
5. The task force is in the process of identifying options for strengthening IPBES impact tracking database (TRACK) (<https://ipbes.net/impact-tracking-view>), in collaboration with the communications team at the IPBES secretariat. This work is undertaken to enhance the content of the database as well as the way in which the policy impact generated by IPBES products can be captured in it.
6. Early in its work, the task force identified the need for IPBES to strengthen links with other intergovernmental processes (e.g., biodiversity-related conventions) to inform their work in the field of biodiversity and ecosystem services. At its third meeting, the task force initiated a mapping exercise aimed at identifying international agreements and intergovernmental processes relevant to the nexus and transformative change assessments. The purpose of this activity is two‑fold: (i) to provide assessment experts with relevant information on the mandates of these processes as they relate to the scope of the assessments, and (ii) to start exploring ways for these processes to make further use of IPBES assessments, once approved. The mapping will identify key international agreements and intergovernmental processes of relevance to the scope of the nexus and transformative change assessments, as per the scoping reports approved through decision IPBES-8/1. In relation with the mapping exercise, the task force also provided support to the secretariat in its work to compile existing and ongoing work relevant to the nexus and transformative change assessments with the aim of sharing such information on key intergovernmental processes with assessment experts. In this context, the secretariat contacted the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP), the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), the secretariats of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES), the Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals (CMS), the Ramsar Convention on Wetlands, the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification (UNCCD), the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), the World Health Organization (WHO), United Nations Water (UN Water), the United Nations Department of Economic and Social Affairs (UN DESA), the World Trade Organization (WTO) and the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD).
7. The task force also identified the need to make relevant key findings of IPBES assessments relevant to different sectors. In this regard and drawing upon a process that is being carried out in the context of the contribution of Working Group I to the 6th Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, the task force proposed that factsheets for key sectors addressed in IPBES assessments be developed from these assessments. In this regard, the task force elaborated a draft process for the development of the factsheets, which was reviewed by the Bureau and Multidisciplinary Expert Panel at their 18th meetings. As part of the workplan of the task force for 2022–23 it is suggested to pilot the development by assessment authors of fact sheets from approved IPBES assessments. This would include the preparation of fact sheets based on the assessment reports on the sustainable use of wild species and values, once approved/accepted by the Plenary. The proposed process for the development of factsheets is presented in appendix III to this document.

B. Increasing the policy relevance of IPBES assessments

1. With a view to enhancing the policy relevance of IPBES assessments, as part of the implementation of its workplan agreed by the Plenary, the task force developed a strategy to increase the involvement of experts with practical experience in policy processes in IPBES assessments. The strategy is set out in appendix IV and will be further developed and implemented by the task force in the intersessional period 2022–23.
2. Furthermore, the task force reviewed the scoping report of the business and biodiversity assessment, which was open for external review from 2 November to 13 December 2021. Similarly, the task force reviewed the second order draft of the chapters and the first order draft of the summary for policymakers of the invasive alien species assessment, opened for external review from 15 December 2021 to 15 February 2022. The technical support unit submitted a compilation of comments received from members of the task force as part of the external review of these documents.

C. Providing support to authors of policy chapters in IPBES assessments

1. During the joint introductory meeting for experts of the IPBES nexus and transformative change assessments, held online on 24 February 2022, the technical support unit provided an overview of the work of the task force on policy tools and methodologies of main relevance to the assessments’ teams.

D. Maintaining the policy support gateway as a repository for IPBES products

1. As part of the process for maintaining the policy support gateway as a repository for IPBES products, the task force produced a draft document that describes the background of the development of the policy support gateway, presents an overview of the online platform and provides information of next steps. The draft document seeks to inform users, or any stakeholder interested in the gateway with the details around this tool and the process of its design and development. A preliminary draft version of the document was reviewed by the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel and Bureau at their 18th meetings. The final version of the document will be made available on the IPBES website.[[4]](#footnote-5) In addition, a technical document describing the content of the repository of IPBES products is being developed with the technical support unit on knowledge and data and the secretariat and will be made available to the Bureau and Multidisciplinary Expert Panel at their next meetings.

IV. Overview of possible activities under objective 4 (a) of the rolling work programme up to 2030 and draft interim workplan for the intersessional period 2022-2023

1. In preparation for the ninth session of the Plenary, the task force identified draft deliverables for objective 4 (a) of the rolling work programme up to 2030, and prepared a workplan for the intersessional period 2022–2023. In addition, a draft workplan for the intersessional period 2023–2024, was also developed. The documents are set out in document IPBES/9/10 for consideration by the Plenary.

Appendix I

Report of the IPBES task force on policy tools and methodologies on its third meeting under the 2030 IPBES rolling work programme

Introduction

1. The third meeting of the task force on policy tools and methodologies was organized as an online meeting, due to the ongoing COVID-19 pandemic, and held from 27 to 29 September 2021.

# Opening of the meeting and agenda

1. The co-chairs of the task force, Vinod Bihari Mathur and Mersudin Avdibegović, and the Executive Secretary, Anne Larigauderie, opened the meeting on 27 September 2021.
2. The task force adopted the agenda for the different sessions as presented (see annex I). To maximize participation and inputs, most discussions took place in plenary sessions. Given the limited time available, some of the work took place in two parallel breakout groups. The list of participants is set out in annex II.

# Objectives of the meeting

1. The main objective of the meeting was to continue the implementation of objective 4(a) of the IPBES rolling work programme up to 2030, relating to advancing the work on policy instruments, policy support tools and methodologies. The meeting of the task force focussed on the following deliverables included in the interim work plan of the task force for the intersessional period 2021-2022, approved by the Plenary at its eighth session in June 2021:
   1. Promoting and supporting the use of findings of IPBES assessments in decision‑making;
   2. Increasing the policy relevance of IPBES assessments; and
   3. Maintaining the policy support gateway as a repository for IPBES products.
2. In particular, the meeting aimed to kickstart and continue the process of implementing the following activities planned for 2021 and early 2022, as specified in the interim work plan of the task force:
   1. Convening up to four dialogue workshops with actors at the science-policy interface to promote the use of findings of completed thematic, regional and global IPBES assessments in decision-making, including engagement with existing platforms and networks;
   2. Providing support to strengthen the IPBES impact tracking database (TRACK), including by considering the development of case studies, illustrating the use of completed IPBES assessments in decision-making;
   3. Developing a strategy to further increase the involvement of practitioners in the assessment process; and
   4. Maintaining the policy support gateway as a repository for IPBES products.

# Summary of general discussions and presentations

## Promoting and supporting the use of findings of IPBES assessments in decision-making

Follow-up to the survey on the use of IPBES assessments in policymaking at (sub)national levels

1. The technical support unit presented a summary of the analysis of survey responses. The task force was then invited to a brainstorming exercise to explore ways of using the survey results to strengthen the implementation of IPBES policy support function and work ahead.
2. Several recommendations were made to facilitate the use of findings from IPBES assessments, including the following:
   1. Explore alternative approaches to increase participation and involvement from individuals with practical experience in policy processes in IPBES assessments;
   2. Further improve the presentation of the assessment reports, simplifying the language and providing more case studies relevant for national policymakers. Suggestions included hiring professional writers;
   3. Facilitate cross-sectoral discussions to identify where IPBES can contribute to wider knowledge needs. The nexus and transformative change assessments were identified as opportunities to explore mechanisms to involve sectoral stakeholders at all stages of the assessment process;
   4. Support countries to use the IPBES assessments and to undertake national ecosystem assessments, facilitating access to relevant information, as some policymakers find it difficult to extract what they need from assessments for use at the national level;
   5. Strengthen the cooperation with other intergovernmental processes and international conventions, including the UNFCCC. This could be done through:
      1. Convening dialogue workshops with experts from IPBES assessments and national focal points of the relevant conventions/processes to bring the findings of the IPBES assessments to their attention and explore ways to use them further at the national level;
      2. Identifying mandates and decisions by the governing bodies of relevant multilateral environmental agreements to identify potential entry points of relevance for the work of IPBES;
   6. Consider ways to encourage regional and national stakeholders to, whenever possible, facilitate the translation of summaries for policymakers beyond the 6 official United Nations languages.
3. Beyond the recommendations listed above, it was suggested that the survey should be rolled out on a regular basis (e.g., every 2 years). It was also suggested that the results of the survey be shared with chairs and co-chairs of completed assessments, and that the chairs and co‑chairs be invited to provide ideas on the outcomes to inform potential future activities of the task force.

### Strategic planning of upcoming dialogue workshops

1. The task force was presented with a brief summary of the lessons learnt from the pilot online dialogue workshop for the African region. They were then invited to a brainstorming exercise to develop a roadmap, identifying key aspects that should be considered in the planning of future dialogue workshops to ensure that these workshops are strategic in promoting and supporting the use of findings of IPBES assessments in decision-making. The following issues were presented to the task force for their consideration: focus of future dialogue workshops, geographic scope, audiences to be targeted, strategies to foster discussions, follow-up and evaluation to obtain feedback from participants and ways in which the task force can consider the outcomes derived from the dialogue workshops for the development of its future workplan.
2. Several recommendations were made to strengthen the upcoming online dialogues. The recommendations identified include:
   1. Focus of dialogues: The focus of the dialogues will change over time as new IPBES products become available. A suggestion was made for the current series of dialogues to continue covering not only the regional assessments but also messages from other completed IPBES assessments which are relevant for each region, for example focusing on a sectoral approach;
   2. Geographical scope: It should be considered to go beyond the regions used to define the scope of the IPBES regional assessments and organize dialogues at the sub-regional scale, thus allowing for a more substantive engagement between countries with similar circumstances. This would in turn create a platform for dialogue between stakeholders at the national and sub-regional levels;
   3. Strategies to foster discussions: It was noted that interpretation into the relevant official United Nations languages, depending on the region/subregion being targeted, is critical to foster the dialogues effectively. It was also suggested that to support discussions, the task force could facilitate the development of 1-pagers that summarize key messages from the assessments relevant to specific sectors/audiences, through other organisations, for example BES-Net;
   4. Target audiences: These should be national focal points and other policymakers (including from ministries outside the environmental sector e.g., agriculture, infrastructure, spatial planning) as they are the critical players in reforming and implementing policies. Depending on the scope of the dialogue workshop, other actors at the science-policy interface, including the private sector and non-governmental organizations, could also be considered;
   5. Timing: The appropriate time for the dialogues is critical for effective discussions. The task force suggested that, whenever possible, dialogues be held back-to-back with other relevant meetings that gather some of the same targeted individuals, e.g., meetings under the Convention on Biological Diversity;
   6. Collaborations: A suggestion was made to collaborate with other task forces (in particular capacity-building) whose objectives could be aligned with those of the dialogue workshops;
   7. Follow-up evaluations: It is important to receive feedback on the dialogues and continuously improve the dialogues going forwards.
3. Based on the recommendations, the task force, supported by the technical support unit, will develop an annotated outline of a roadmap for the strategic planning of future dialogue workshops. The annotated outline will be sent to the task force for further comments and the final version will be used as the basis to develop a full version of the roadmap.

### Providing support to strengthen the IPBES impact tracking database (TRACK)

1. On the second day, the task force worked in two breakout groups. One of the groups focused on identifying potential changes in the TRACK database to increase the policy relevance of IPBES assessments and understand better their policy impacts. The group was presented with a brief summary of TRACK. The group was then invited to brainstorm about possible additions to the database’s function in order to measure the potential policy impacts of IPBES assessments. An annotated outline of areas of TRACK where changes could potentially be considered was produced, as a basis for several recommendations to strengthen TRACK and better capture policy impacts. The recommendations identified include:
2. A typology of what is considered a policy impact is needed. The typology should consider scale and time and focus on both private and public policies. The typology could also look at more structural impacts (e.g., at an institutional level) and distinguish between direct or indirect policy impact;
3. The policy impact typology should consider the current settings of the database. Although categories can be added, any suggested changes to TRACK should consider keeping changes to a minimum as it could impact the technical parameters of the database;
4. Once the potential policy impact typology is agreed, a test case could be run on the entries in TRACK to validate the typology.
5. Based on the above recommendations, in consultation with the IPBES communications team, the technical support unit will assist the task force in exploring potential options to strengthen TRACK by preparing a revised version of the annotated outline presented to the breakout group. The revised annotated outline will be sent to the task force for further comments. The final version will be used to develop a full document on the matter.

## Maintaining the policy support gateway as a repository of IPBES products

### Documenting the experience of the policy support gateway

1. The second breakout group worked on how to best document the development of the policy support gateway, as a requisite to transition the gateway into a repository. The breakout group started with a brief recap of the decision of the Plenary (adopted at its eighth session), to not develop the policy support gateway further and instead to maintain the gateway as a repository for IPBES products. The task force was presented with a brief summary of suggested steps to include the gateway as a repository, including a document that explains the process of developing the gateway, its characteristics, and current and future users of the gateway. The task force was then invited to provide recommendations about the development of this document. An annotated outline of the document was made available for their consideration. Several recommendations were made including the following:
2. The document should present the shortcomings found while developing the gateway (e.g., limited promotion and communication) to inform possible future IPBES work;
3. Existing information documents made from previous sessions of the Plenary will inform the development of some sections of the document. Some of the current task force members closely involved in the development of the gateway as part of the former expert group will assist in identifying and compiling such information documents;
4. Minor changes were recommended to improve the annotated outline. The technical support unit will prepare a revised version as a basis to initiate the development of the document.
5. During the discussion, some ideas were proposed regarding the development of the repository. In that regard, further clarification on what is precisely meant by ‘repository’ is recommended, along with suggestions about future settings and functions.
6. Based on the recommendations received, in collaboration with the task force on knowledge and data, the technical support unit will provide support in the development of the document on the gateway. The technical support unit will prepare a revised version of the annotated outline presented to the breakout group, which will be sent out to the task force for further comments.

## Increasing the policy relevance of IPBES assessments

### Developing a strategy to further increase the involvement of experts with practical policy experience in the assessment process to ensure policy relevance

1. The task force was presented with an annotated outline of the strategy to further increase the involvement of experts with practical experience in policy processes in the assessment process, including some suggested content that could be considered under each proposed section. Members were then invited to provide feedback on the development of the strategy. Several recommendations were provided:

*Need to define the strategy’s target audience*

* 1. The task force attempted to agree on a definition for the term “practitioner”. Various interpretations of the term were noted (e.g., conservationists in the field, policy officers of national public agencies, scientists of public research institutions), which initially led to suggestions to identify different categories of practitioners. Ultimately, the discussion pointed out a need to clearly determine the exact stakeholders that the strategy will aim to reach out to;
  2. Due to the various interpretations of the term “practitioner”, many of which pointed out to individuals working out in the field, and the overlaps between potential categories of practitioners (i.e., certain stakeholders pertaining to more than one category), the task force proposed to characterise those stakeholders that would fall under the reach of the strategy (e.g., experts with practical experience in policy processes), considering that the types of expertise required would vary depending on the scope of each one of the future assessments.

*Need to encourage participation*

* 1. The benefits of involving experts with practical experience in policy processes in the development of IPBES assessments should be underlined as it may encourage further involvement from that group of stakeholders, despite certain challenges (e.g., some experts may have a different focus or interests, and they may face difficulties to participate given their work commitments);
  2. Drawing on the experience of completed and ongoing assessments, the involvement of experts with practical experience in policy processes has been mostly limited to the review process. It is important to consider that different experts may be interested in participating in different parts of the assessment process, which might depend on various factors (e.g., their availability);
  3. The focus of involving relevant experts with practical experience in policy processes can be on higher policy and decision-making levels, which in turn can attract increasingly participating practitioners, resulting in more extensive use of IPBES assessments in policymaking. This will trigger other activities including science-based decision-making;
  4. Governments could be further encouraged to consider the nomination of practitioners;
  5. IPBES national focal points could help in the identification and involvement of relevant practitioners. During workshops, relevant experts could be identified to potentially be approached and nominated as authors early on in the assessment process to increase involvement.

*Need to apply a sectorial approach*

* 1. It is important to encourage engagement of experts with experience in policy processes from diverse backgrounds and professions to maximize the variety of knowledge provided;
  2. A sectorial approach was emphasised, which can be useful to attract the relevant sectorial actors and help identify which stakeholders to involve;
  3. For more extensive use in policymaking, those sectors indirectly or directly related to the drivers of biodiversity loss (for instance, forestry, agriculture or mining sectors), could be targeted;
  4. Consideration can be given to involving professional associations or institutions that serve as intermediaries and connect different types of practitioners working at different levels in a particular sector (e.g., public research institutions such as the agricultural research institutes that work with farmers and with policymakers in relevant ministries).

1. Based on the recommendations made, the technical support unit will provide support on the development of the strategy to be sent for further review by the task force members.

## Developing a work plan for the period between IPBES 9 and IPBES 10

1. In preparation for IPBES 9, the task force was invited to brainstorm on ideas for its next workplan for the period between IPBES 9 and IPBES 10. Potential ideas were proposed to be further discussed and developed in the weeks following the meeting of the task force. A draft workplan would be presented to the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel and Bureau in November 2021, ahead of the external review scheduled for December 2021. Based on the feedback received from the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel and Bureau, the workplan would be finalized and made available to the Plenary at its ninth session.
2. Building on the discussions held during the week, on the final day of the meeting, the task force agreed on the list of activities to be implemented by the task force, including in collaboration with other task forces and technical support units, or with external organizations. Given that the task force would continue working remotely, its members worked through the list assigning themselves to different activities.

# Closing session

1. The meeting was closed by the co-chairs of the task force and it was reiterated that the next steps would include a consultation with the task force members for input into the documents discussed.

Annex I to the report of the IPBES task force on policy tools and methodologies on its third meeting under the 2030 IPBES rolling work programme: Agenda

**3rd Meeting of IPBES task force on policy tools and methodologies**

27 to 29 September 2021 – online (via Zoom)

**Agenda**

**Objectives**

The main objective of the meeting is to continue the implementation of objective 4(a) of the IPBES rolling work programme up to 2030, relating to advanced work on policy instruments, policy support tools and methodologies. In particular, key activities identified in the interim work plan of the task force on policy tools and methodologies as approved by the Plenary at its eight session in June 2021.

In the context of the initial phase of implementation of the mentioned work plan, this meeting of the task force will focus, in particular, on the following deliverables:

* Promotion of and support to the use of findings of IPBES assessments in decision-making;
* Increase the policy relevance of IPBES assessments; and
* Maintenance of the policy support gateway as a repository for IPBES products.

This meeting will kickstart or continue the process of implementation of the following activities planned for 2021:

1. Convening up to four dialogue workshops with actors at the science-policy interface to promote the use of findings of completed thematic, regional and global IPBES assessments in decision-making, including engagement with existing platforms and networks;
2. Provision of support to strengthen the IPBES impact tracking database (TRACK), including by considering the development of case studies illustrating the use of completed IPBES assessments in decision-making;
3. Development of a strategy to further increase the involvement of practitioners in the assessment process; and
4. Maintain the policy support gateway as a repository for IPBES products.

***Note****: Given that this meeting will be held online, the finalisation of the activities in the agenda will require that the group further engages remotely following the meeting.*

*In the case that any of the activities require further time for discussion, an additional session will be convened on Thursday 30th September, using the same connection details. Information will be provided during the course of the meeting.*

**Provisional organization of work**

The meeting will take place between **13:00 and 15:20 (CEST)**. To maximise the time available, discussions will take place in **plenary sessions** as well as **breakout groups**. Details of the different sessions are provided in the daily programmes below.

**Connection details**

Please connect to the Zoom meeting via the following link.

**Start time based on the location of the task force members *(same time every day)***: 06:00 AM Bogota / 07:00 AM Washington DC / 08:00 AM Buenos Aires / 12:00 PM London / 13:00 CEST / 16:30 Chennai / 16:45 Kathmandu / 19:00 Beijing / 20:00 Tokyo and Seoul / 21:00 Melbourne

*Please,* ***connect 15 minutes before the start of the meeting*** *to make sure the equipment works (there will an opportunity to test your microphone before the meeting starts).*

***If you encounter any difficulties in the use of Zoom during the meeting, please get in touch with Emma at***[*emma.martin@unep-wcmc.org*](mailto:emma.martin@unep-wcmc.org)

**Monday 27 September 2021**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  |  |
| 12:45 – 13:00  (15 min) | **Join the meeting**: *05:45 AM Bogota / 06:45 AM Washington DC / 07:45 AM Buenos Aires / 11:45 AM London / 16:15 Chennai / 16:30 Kathmandu / 18:45 Beijing / 19:45 Tokyo and Seoul / 20:45 Melbourne* |
| 13:00 - 13:20  (20 min) | **Opening of the meeting**: Vinod Bihari Mathur and Mersudin Avdibegović, Co-chairs of the task force   * Welcome * Opening remarks – Anne Larigauderie, Executive Secretary |
| 13:20 - 13:40  (20 min) | **Plenary**: **Orientation and reflections**   * Overview of feedback provided during IPBES 8 and approved interim work plan for the task force on policy tools and methodologies until IPBES 9 – TSU * Update on the activities carried out during the first half of 2021 – TSU * Objectives of the meeting and proposed organization of work – TSU |
| 13:40 - 14:20  (40 min) | **Plenary**: **Follow up to the survey on the use of IPBES assessments in policymaking at (sub)national levels**   * Presentation of key findings, conclusions and recommendations (~10 min) * Discussion: Identifying ways on how to use the survey results to strengthen the implementation of the policy support function and work ahead (~30 minutes) |
| 14:20 – 14:30  (10 min) | **Break** |
| 14:30 - 15:10  (40 min) | **Plenary**: **Strategic planning of upcoming dialogue workshops**   * Presentation of lessons learnt from the pilot online dialogue workshop to promote the use of findings of IPBES assessments in Africa (~10 min) * Discussion: Developing a roadmap by identifying key aspects of that should be considered in convening future dialogue workshops (~30 minutes) |
| 15:10 – 15:20  (10 min) | Wrap up and details for the next day – TSU and Co-chairs |

**Tuesday 28 September 2021**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | |
| 12:45 - 13:00  (15 min) | **Join the meeting**: *05:45 AM Bogota / 06:45 AM Washington DC / 07:45 AM Buenos Aires/ 11:45 AM London / 16:15 Chennai / 16:30 Kathmandu / 18:45 Beijing / 19:45 Tokyo and Seoul / 20:45 Melbourne* | |
| 13:00 - 13:15  (15 min) | **Plenary**: Recap on previous day and plans for the day | |
| 13:15 - 14:00  (45 min) | **Breakout group 1:** Provision of support to strengthen the IPBES impact tracking database (TRACK)   * Development of a draft document identifying potential changes to TRACK | **Breakout group 2: Documenting the experience of the Policy Support Gateway**   * Development of a draft annotated outline of a document addressing the process of development of the policy support gateway |
| 14:00 – 14:10  (10 min) | Break | |
| 14:10 – 15:10 (60 min) | **Plenary**: **Development of a strategy to further increase the involvement of practitioners in the assessment process**   * Summary of feedback received from IPBES Members and Observers stressing the need to increase the role of practitioners in the assessment process (~10 minutes) * Presentation of a draft annotated outline of a strategy (~10 minutes)   Discussion: Preliminary views and feedback to the draft annotated outline (~40 min) | |
| 15:10 – 15:20  (10 min) | **Plenary**: Wrap up and details for the next day – TSU and Co-chairs | |

**Wednesday 29 September 2021**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  |  |
| 12:45 - 13:00  (15 min) | **Join the meeting**: *05:45 AM Bogota / 06:45 AM Washington DC / 07:45 AM Buenos Aires/ 11:45 AM London / 16:15 Chennai / 16:30 Kathmandu / 18:45 Beijing / 19:45 Tokyo and Seoul / 20:45 Melbourne* |
| 13:00 – 14:00 (60 min) | **Plenary**: Developing a work plan for the period between IPBES 9 and IPBES 10   * Recap on previous days * Discussion of ideas and preparation of a draft work plan post IPBES 9 (deliverables, activities and expected outcomes), including areas of collaboration with other task forces |
| 14:00 – 14:30 (30 min) | **Closing of the meeting:**   * Summary of action points and next steps - TSU * Closure of the meeting - Co-chairs |
| 14:30 – 15:20  (50 min) | **Additional session (to be confirmed)** |

***Note:*** *In the case that any of the activities require further time for discussion, an additional session will be convened on Thursday 30th September, using the same connection details. Information will be provided during the course of the meeting.*
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| **SECRETARIAT** | |
| ***Bonn Secretariat*** | |
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| Simone Schiele | Head of Work Programme |
| Robert Spaull | Head of Communications |
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Appendix II

Road map for the organization of dialogue workshops to promote the use of IPBES products in decision-making

## Background

Objective 4 (a) of the IPBES rolling work programme up to 2030, advanced work on policy instruments, policy support tools and methodologies, includes a focus on enabling the uptake of the findings of IPBES assessments in decision-making. With a view to advancing the implementation of IPBES policy support function, the task force on policy tools and methodologies is convening dialogue workshops with actors at the science-policy interface to promote the use of IPBES products – including completed thematic, regional and global IPBES assessments – in decision-making.

Convening these dialogue workshops is one of the activities included in the task force’s interim workplan for the intersessional period 2021-2022, approved by the Plenary at it eighth session, and the task force proposes that further dialogue workshops be included in its workplan for the intersessional period 2022-2023.

## Purpose of this document

The objective of the present roadmap is to ensure that the dialogue workshops convened by the task force are strategic and effective in promoting and supporting the use of IPBES products, including the key findings of IPBES assessments, in decision-making at various levels.

## Key steps and considerations

To achieve its objective, the roadmap outlines the key steps and considerations that will be considered when convening dialogue workshops. The steps are clustered under two main components that are to be considered: (a) definition of content and scope; and (b) checklist and logistical matters.

## Definition of content and scope

In planning a dialogue workshop, the following steps and considerations should be noted:

|  |
| --- |
| Identify region or subregion to be targeted The **first step** in planning a dialogue workshop is to **identify the geographical region or sub-region** that the event will be focusing on. |

#### Considerations

* *The UN regions, namely, Africa, Asia-Pacific, Eastern Europe, Latin America and the Caribbean and Western Europe and other States, will be the starting point for the identification of the geographical regions and subregions to be targeted through the dialogue.*
* *If the UN regions are considered too large to ensure that experiences relating to the use of IPBES products are shared between participants in countries with similar circumstances, the task force will consider focusing on sub-regions.*

|  |
| --- |
| Develop a draft concept note and a background information document The **second step** is to **develop a draft concept note for the specific dialogue workshop**,that can be used as a starting point for brainstorming and refinement of its scope and agenda. The concept note would be **complemented by a brief background document** containing relevant information to be made available to the management committee and other relevant members of the Bureau and MEP to further support discussions for defining the details of the dialogue workshop (e.g., identification of speakers). |

#### Considerations

* *As a minimum, the concept note will include preliminary proposals for the dialogue workshop’s scope, objectives, modality, targeted audience and ideas for the development of a provisional agenda.*
* *The background information document should include a list of experts of completed IPBES assessments from the (sub)region targeted by the specific dialogue workshop being planned; and examples of the use of IPBES assessments for decision-making at the regional and national levels, relevant to the specific dialogue workshop being planned. Examples could be obtained from internal intelligence and other sources such as the IPBES impact tracking database (TRACK).*

|  |
| --- |
| Decide on the main features of the dialogue workshop With support of members of the task force, IPBES Bureau and MEP members from the identified (sub)region, and based on the draft concept note and the background information document developed, the **third step** consists of: |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. **Refining specific objectives** for dialogue workshop. |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. **Refining the scope** of the dialogue workshops by deciding on the themes and IPBES products to be covered. |

#### Considerations

*When refining the scope of a dialogue workshop, the task force will consider:*

* *All completed IPBES assessments relevant to the (sub)region (either global, regional, thematic, or methodological). Recently released assessments can be prioritised to better understand the aspects of relevance for different (sub)regions and support their increased use in decision-making.*
* *Other IPBES products (e.g., IPBES conceptual framework).*

|  |
| --- |
| 1. **Selecting a modality** for the dialogue workshop. |

#### Considerations

*When choosing a modality for a dialogue workshop, the following aspects are to be considered:*

* *Dialogue workshops can be held in-person or online. Choosing between these two options will depend on factors such as the sanitary situation derived by the COVID-19 pandemic, travel restrictions in place, and the availability of financial resources.*
* *If a dialogue workshop is to be held in-person, whenever possible, it should be convened back-to-back with other IPBES events and other relevant international and regional events.*
* *When a dialogue workshop is planned to be convened online, it is suggested that it lasts no longer than 2.5 hours and - whenever possible – include a break.*
* *The number of sessions should be defined based on the structure and overall aim of the event. The event should be as concise as possible to maintain engagement from the audience.*

|  |
| --- |
| 1. **Refining the agenda** by identifying possible topics for presentations and speakers to deliver these. |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. **Identifying experts from the relevant (sub)region, who participated in completed IPBES assessments,** that could be invited as speakers and support the task force in further tailoring the dialogue workshop to the specific needs of the targeted (sub)region. |

|  |
| --- |
| 1. **Determining the audience** to be invited to the dialogue. |

#### Considerations

*Taking into consideration the intergovernmental nature of IPBES as well as its mandate and the scope of its work, when determining the audience to be invited to a dialogue workshop, the task force would prioritise:*

* *IPBES national focal points (NFP).*
* *NFP to other multilateral environmental agreements.*
* *NFP to other intergovernmental processes as relevant based on the scope of the dialogue workshop.*
* *Government representatives from sectors linked to conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity and ecosystem services, such as ministries or equivalent in charge of agriculture, forestry, fisheries, tourism, infrastructure, energy, mining and commerce.*
* *Representatives from public research institutions.*
* *Representatives of regional organizations with a relevant role in the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity and ecosystem services.*

*(\*) The invitation to a dialogue workshop will be addressed to an IPBES NFP. When a country has no designated IPBES NFP, and depending on the scope of the dialogue workshop, the NFP for other relevant multilateral environmental agreements or intergovernmental processes will receive the invitation and registration form.*

*(\*\*) Depending on the objectives and scope of the specific dialogue workshop, the task force could consider inviting representatives of indigenous peoples and local communities, and/or business and civil society organizations with a relevant role in the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity and ecosystem services.*

|  |
| --- |
| 1. **Determining the best timing** for the dialogue workshops to be held. |

#### Considerations

*When determining the timing of a dialogue workshop, the task force should consider the following aspects:*

* *Identify best timing after the release of new IPBES assessments depending on the intended outcome of the event being organized (e.g., promoting a new IPBES product or understanding how a relatively new IPBES product has been used in decision-making).*
* *Take into account scheduled meetings of other intergovernmental processes related to the scope of IPBES work, so to avoid potential overlaps with meetings that might target the same individuals.*
* *Take advantage of other relevant international and regional events, considering the option of holding the dialogues back-to-back with those, including meetings under relevant intergovernmental processes such as the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD).*
* *If a dialogue workshop is planned to be convened online, it should be scheduled at a time that accommodates the widest range of time zones possible.*

|  |
| --- |
| Call for presentations of national experiences Each dialogue workshop should foster knowledge and experience sharing. Thus, the presentation of national experiences should be at the very core of the agenda. To ensure that the presentations in the dialogue workshop are representative of the situation of the targeted (sub)region, the **fourth step** is to **invite and encourage countries to share their experiences in using IPBES products.** The opportunity to express interest in delivering a presentation will be provided through the invitation and registration form to the dialogue workshop. |

#### Considerations

* *The IPBES NFP (or NFP for other relevant multilateral environmental agreements or intergovernmental processes) will be invited to submit an expression of interest to present their country’s experience as part of their response to the invitation and registration form.*
* *If no expressions of interest are received, the members of the task force, as well as from the Bureau and MEP, with support from the technical support unit, will be invited to brainstorm on potential ideas to be considered.*

|  |
| --- |
| Develop an annotated agenda as guidance for participantsThe fifth step is to develop an annotated agenda including suggested topics/questions to guide the moderated discussion. |

|  |
| --- |
| Develop a report of the dialogue workshop, including lessons learnt After a dialogue workshop has been convened, the **final step** consists in **developing a report that synthesizes the main issues discussed and key outcomes derived**. The report will also include **any lessons learnt** that could inform the organization of future dialogue workshops. |

## Checklist and logistical matters

In taking care of the logistical arrangements related to the dialogue workshops, the task force and its technical support unit should refer to the following **checklist**:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Task | Subtask | Ideal timeline |
| In preparation to a dialogue workshop | | |
| Date | Identify a tentative date for the dialogue workshop |  |
| Planning | Develop draft concept note and brief background document | At least 3.5 months prior to the tentative date for the dialogue workshop |
| Agenda | Send draft concept note and brief background document for review of the task force and the secretariat | At least 3 months prior to the tentative date for the dialogue workshop |
| Send draft concept note and brief background document for review of the members of the MEP/Bureau from the identified (sub)region | At least 2.5 months prior to the tentative date for the dialogue workshop |
| Organise meeting with members of the task force, and the MEP/Bureau from the identified sub(region) | At least 2 months prior to the tentative date for the dialogue workshop |
| Develop a final version of an agenda for the dialogue workshop | At least 2 months prior to the confirmed date for the workshop |
| Team coordination | Liaise with institutions working with IPBES (e.g., national platforms), who might be interested in supporting the organization of the event | At least 2 months prior to the confirmed date for the workshop |
| Participant list | Develop a list of participants | At least 2 months prior to the confirmed date for the workshop |
| Set up meeting platform link | At least 2 months prior to the confirmed date for the workshop |
| Email invitations to participants, including agenda and link | At least 2 months prior to the confirmed date for the workshop |
| Presentations | Email indications to speakers to guide their presentations | At least 1.5 months prior to the confirmed date for the workshop |
| Collect speakers’ presentations (if they have prepared slides) | At least 2 weeks prior to the confirmed date for the workshop |
| Facilitation | Email draft notes to aid chairing of the event to facilitator | At least 2 weeks prior to the confirmed date for the workshop |
| Interpretation | If interpretation is required, gather quotes for interpretation services | At least 1.5 months prior to the confirmed date for the workshop |
| Hire interpretation | At least 1 month prior to the confirmed date for the workshop |
| Send slides, facilitation notes and other information to interpreters | At least 1 week prior to the confirmed date for the workshop |
| Communication of the event | Send reminder to registered participants and unconfirmed invitees | 1-2 weeks prior to the confirmed date for the workshop |
| Platform use | Deliver short trainings on the use of the platform selected to hold the dialogue workshop | 1-2 weeks prior to the confirmed date for the workshop |
| During a dialogue workshop | | |
| Coordination support | Send reminder to participants on day of workshop with link |  |
| Monitor chat for questions |
| Manage timings using the agenda and facilitation notes |
| Technical support | Ask facilitator, speakers and interpreters to test their microphones |  |
| Allow people in from waiting room |
| Mute/unmute people |
| Support anyone with technical difficulties |
| Ensure the workshop is being recorded |
| Pop-in information messages to the chat |
| Other in-meeting support | Share slides (including brief survey), and other tools (e.g., polls and online whiteboards) if deemed necessary |  |
| Take notes |
| After a dialogue workshop | | |
| Communication with participants | Email thank you notes to facilitator and presenters |  |
| Email slides and evaluation survey to participants |
| Workshop report | Draft workshop report |  |
| Send draft workshop report for review by the task force and secretariat |
| Finalise workshop report |  |

## Evaluation of the effectiveness of the dialogue workshop

The task force should make use of available instruments that allow for the effectiveness of the dialogue workshops to be evaluated accurately by their recipients. Evaluations will enable the task force to continuously improve the list of steps and considerations for the task force to account in the process of planning and organizing a dialogue workshop, ensuring that future dialogue workshops better achieve their intended objectives.

In evaluating a dialogue workshop, the following instruments should be considered:

## Prior to the dialogue workshop

At the start of a dialogue workshop, the task force should carry out a **brief survey** to get a sense of the participant’s understanding of the event, and their expectations related to it. This could be displayed using online tools such as Mentimeter or Slido.

## Following the dialogue workshop

After the dialogue workshop, the task force should share an **evaluation survey** to enquire participants for their opinions about the utility of the content and the effectiveness of the logistical organization of the dialogue workshop that they attended. The evaluation survey will also allow participants to submit additional information on how they are using IPBES products in their respective regions.

Appendix III

Proposed process for the development of factsheets for key sectors addressed in IPBES assessments

**Introduction**

Since its establishment in 2019, the task force on policy tools and methodologies considered ways to enhance the policy relevance of IPBES assessments, including by considering the development of a short version of the summaries for policymakers. Furthermore, the task force also considered the importance of identifying and communicating sector-specific key messages to further increase their use in decision-making. Drawing on the experience of a process that is being implemented in the IPCC secretariat, led by the technical support unit for Working Group I[[5]](#footnote-6), a similar process is proposed to be tested in the context of IPBES, possibly for the sustainable use assessment, the values assessment and the assessment on invasive alien species.

**Purpose**

The main purpose of the development of sectoral factsheets is to facilitate access to those key messages from completed IPBES assessments that are of relevance to specific sectors, with a view to increasing the opportunities for the use of assessment findings in decision-making. In this respect, the factsheets would provide an overview of the main messages and related information of fundamental importance for actions in different sectors.

**Proposed process**

The proposed process for the development of sectoral factsheets, as set out below, builds on the procedures for the preparation of Platform deliverables. Factsheets will be developed once the relevant IPBES assessment report has been approved. The responsibility for developing these will lie with a selection of authors from the assessment team, overseen by the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel and the Bureau.

Development of factsheets can be carried out based on the following steps:

* 1. Selection of the drafting team
  2. Brainstorming meeting(s) to define target audience and potential scope and sectors to be targeted
  3. Survey with stakeholders to identify priority key messages that would be covered for each of the relevant sectors
  4. Drafting
  5. Review
  6. Finalisation
  7. Communication and outreach

Some key principles to guide the development of the factsheets:

1. Ensure traceability to the information in the assessment report and use the language of the report. This will be further enhanced by focusing on high confidence messages as much as possible
2. Inclusive and iterative process for drafting and review of the factsheets
3. Regional balance of authors selected

Other elements to be addressed:

* Factsheets will not develop new content but rather be used as guidance toward information included in the assessment reports of key relevance for specific sectors. They can therefore be considered a signposting exercise to facilitate access to material that would be important to inform actions.
* Assessment technical support units will support the development of the factsheets including through organization of meetings, overall coordination of the process for their development and provision of editorial support. The technical support unit for policy support and methodologies will provide support on process, where required.
* The factsheets would not be an IPBES product as they will be produced after approval of the assessment report(s). As such, an adequate disclaimer should be added.

Appendix IV

Draft strategy to further increase involvement of policy practitioners in IPBES assessment process

1. **Introduction**

The IPBES rolling programme of work up to 2030 currently includes two thematic assessments and one methodological assessment, in addition to two thematic assessments and one methodological assessment still under way from the previous work programme. The overall purpose of the Platform and its assessments 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*”. [[6]](#footnote-7),[[7]](#footnote-8)

IPBES aims to support “*policy formulation and implementation by identifying policy-relevant tools and methodologies, such as those arising from assessments, to enable decision makers to gain access to those tools and methodologies and, where necessary, to promote and catalyse their further development*”, and in doing so to “*provide policy-relevant information, but not policy-prescriptive advice*”.[[8]](#footnote-9)

Involving individuals with practical experience in policy processes at all stages in IPBES assessment processes in order to contribute their knowledge and perspectives can support the achievement of this mandate. This involvement is different from the role of IPBES members in the approval of scoping documents and summaries for policymakers, and acceptance of assessment chapters.

1. **Aim of the strategy**

The ***overall aim*** of this strategy is to increase the involvement of individuals with practical experience in policy processes (hereafter, policy practitioners) throughout the IPBES assessment process with a view to enhancing the policy relevance of IPBES assessments and promoting their use.

1. **Scope and definitions**

This strategy is intended to cover the engagement of ***policy practitioners***. For the purposes of this strategy these are identified as individuals who:

1. Fulfil a policy-related role in governmental or non-governmental institutions dealing with policies and/or contributing to policy processes;
2. Work or have worked in policy formulation and/or implementation, in particular at national or sub-national levels;
3. Work or have worked in policy formulation and/or implementation amongst indigenous peoples and local communities;
4. Work or have worked at the science-policy interface, in particular where this has involved practical engagement with policy making processes;
5. Work or have worked in the private sector, academia or civil society, but have participated in and provided substantive inputs to policy processes.

This strategy is intended to ***cover all stages in the IPBES assessment process***. Consistent with the *IPBES Guide on the Production of Assessments* and the IPBES policies and procedures on which this guide is based.[[9]](#footnote-10) For the purposes of the strategy the relevant parts of the IPBES assessment process are understood to include:

1. Scoping process;
2. Expert evaluation of the state of knowledge and associated review processes;
3. Communication and use of the final assessment findings.
4. **Strategic approach**

A number of steps are needed in this strategic approach for increasing the engagement of policy practitioners with the IPBES assessment process, including:

**Step 1**: Focused communication, to strengthen understanding by Governments and stakeholders of the important role that individuals with practical experience in policy processes can play in increasing the relevance, accessibility and use of IPBES assessments; this step would have as a goal to trigger the nomination of such individuals in response to IPBES calls for experts.

**Step 2**: Selection of such individuals in IPBES assessments, in line with IPBES procedures.

**Step 3**: Targeted outreach to directly encourage policy practitioners to become actively engaged in the communication and use of IPBES outputs, following approval of IPBES assessments.

Implementation of this strategy will involve not only the task force on policy support and its technical support unit, but also others including in particular the IPBES secretariat, and the task force on capacity‑building and its technical support unit.

1. **Step 1: Focused communication**

**1.1 Value of IPBES assessments to support policy:** Communication will focus on the relevance of IPBES assessments for supporting policy formulation and implementation, as a way to trigger the interest of policy practitioners to engage in IPBES. *Specific targeted communication of the value of IPBES assessments to support policy formulation and implementation will facilitate this*.

**1.2 Value of policy experts engaging in IPBES assessment processes:** There are potential benefits from increasing understanding of important contributions that can be made in the assessment process by individuals with practical experience in policy processes, and the opportunities for contributing. This will inform both those responsible for nomination and those responsible for selecting individuals engaged in IPBES assessment processes. *Specific targeted communication of the benefits that individuals with practical experience of policy processes will bring to IPBES assessments, and the ways in which they can contribute*.

**1.3 Launch of IPBES assessments:** The launch of new IPBES assessments presents opportunities to highlight the value of IPBES assessments to support policy formulation and implementation, and the value and importance of individuals with practical experience of policy processes in their development. *Consider whether there are opportunities to further increase the focus on this aspect during launch and promotion of IPBES assessment products.*

1. **Step 2: Selection of policy practitioners as experts for IPBES assessments**

The following mechanisms can be considered for increasing the involvement of policy practitioners in IPBES assessments.

**2.1 Nomination and selection:** Individuals with practical experience in policy processes in a position to commit the time required can be formally nominated to act as experts in assessments including in their scoping reports. Those nominated are subject to the selection process implemented by the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel.[[10]](#footnote-11) *Governments and organizations are encouraged to nominate individuals with practical experience in policy processes to serve as experts in an IPBES assessment. The information included in the nomination form as well as the application of the selection process should consider the skills and expertise related to individuals with practical experience in policy processes.*

**2.2 Addressing gaps in knowledge and experience:** It is important to understand what knowledge and experiences are needed in the group of experts preparing an assessment, recognising that this will vary depending on the nature of the assessment. Gaps in the availability of expertise, including appropriate experience of policy formulation and implementation, can be addressed using the procedure for filling gaps in expertise set out in annex I to decision IPBES-4/3. *Approaches in place to identify gaps in knowledge and experience in assessment teams can consider whether there is a gap which individuals with practical experience in policy processes could fill*.

**2.3 Review of assessments:** During the external review periods, there is value in explicitly inviting individuals with practical experience in policy processes to review drafts of the assessments from the perspective of policy relevance. One way of achieving this could be meetings with authors aimed at supporting individuals with practical experience in policy processes in their review. *Further explore the potential of using online dialogue workshops with policy practitioners during the external review as a means of increasing feedback from individuals with practical experience in policy processes.*

1. **Step 3: Targeted outreach**

The smooth implementation of the previous steps assumes the active engagement of qualified individuals. A more proactive approach might however be necessary to complement these two steps, as explained below.

**3.1 Mapping exercise:** In order to increase engagement of individuals with practical experience in policy processes, it will be important to identify them together with the best way of reaching them with both communication materials and invitations to engage. Many such individuals may also be accessed through particular organizations and networks. *Carry out a mapping exercise to identify what experience and skills are needed, where to find such individuals, and how best to reach and involve them. Different assessments may need different mapping exercises, so these exercises could be carried out after or in parallel with scoping exercises.*

**3.2 Follow-up using existing processes:** There are already processes in place for notifying opportunities for engaging with IPBES assessments, through notifications reaching all subscribers to the IPBES mailing list – currently around 18,000 individuals, including IPBES national focal points. Building on the mapping exercise there may be opportunities for encouraging more individuals with practical experience of policy processes to subscribe to the IPBES mailing list, and it may also be useful to engage with national focal points in this regard using communications materials developed above. *Consider options for encouraging more individuals with practical experience of policy processes to register for receiving notifications from IPBES concerning opportunities for engaging, and to make contributions.*

**3.3 Workshops to increase engagement:** Building on the experience of the dialogues already organized for national focal points, there may be value in convening online dialogue workshops with individuals identified during the mapping exercise to further inform on IPBES and gauge potential interest in engaging. Similar workshops could also be useful at the national level. *Consider opportunities for bringing together identified individuals with practical experience of policy processes in order to enhance understanding of IPBES and opportunities to make an impact.*

1. **Tracking and review**

To evaluate the effectiveness of the strategy in achieving its aim, one could keep track of the number or the proportion of nominees with practical experience in policy processes, and of the characteristics of these nominees in terms of region and sector; and of examples of the use of IPBES assessments in policymaking documented, for example, in TRACK.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |  |

1. \* IPBES/9/1. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
2. UNEP/IPBES.MI/2/9, annex I, sect. I, para. 1 (d). [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
3. \* The annex has not been formally edited. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
4. <https://ipbes.net/policy-support> [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
5. For example, see work carried out for the development of regional factsheets: <https://www.ipcc.ch/report/ar6/wg1/#Regional> A different process has been followed for the development of sectoral factsheets, which are not yet publicly available. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
6. IPBES Plenary Decision 7/1 <https://ipbes.net/sites/default/files/decision_ipbes-7_1_en.pdf> [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
7. See <https://ipbes.net/assessing-knowledge> [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
8. Functions, operating principles and institutional arrangements of IPBES <https://ipbes.net/sites/default/files/downloads/functions_operating_principles_and_institutional_arrangements_of_ipbes_2012.pdf> [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
9. <https://ipbes.net/guide-production-assessments> [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
10. In addition, during the assessment author meetings, online sessions with authors could be organized where policy practitioners could serve as resource persons, to provide input and feedback on the practical and policy relevance of the assessments as well as suggestions on how to make the outcomes of the assessment more policy relevant. [↑](#footnote-ref-11)