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Outcome of the Eastern Europe regional consultation meeting

 Note by the secretariat

The annex to the present note sets out the outcome of the Eastern Europe regional consultation meeting, at which participants considered the draft programme of work 2014–2018, the draft stakeholder engagement strategy and the draft conceptual framework of the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services. The meeting, which was organized by the Centre for Ecological Research, Hungarian Academy of Sciences, with support from the Ministry of Rural Development, Hungary, and the Platform’s interim secretariat, was held in Budapest and Tihany, Hungary, from 31 July to 2 August 2013. The annex is presented as received from the meeting organizers and has not been formally edited.

Annex

Outcome of the Eastern Europe regional consultation meeting, held in Budapest and Tihany, Hungary, from 31 July to 2 August 2013

Review sheet for IPBES intersessional documentation

see [www.ipbes.net/plenary/intersessional](http://www.ipbes.net/plenary/intersessional) for further details

**Document name: IPBES Draft Work Programme 2014–2018**

**Reviewer name: Outcome of the Eastern European Stakeholder Consultation on IPBES, 31 July – 2**

**August, 2013, Budapest and Tihany, Hungary**

**Government/Institution: Eastern European stakeholders, see list of participants**

**Country: Eastern European stakeholders**

**Email address: contact persons Dr. András Báldi** **(andrasbaldi@gmail.com****) and Dr. György Pataki**

**(gyorgy****.pataki@uni-corvinus.hu****), IPBES MEP members for Eastern Europe**

| **Page number** | **Line/Paragraph/Rule number** | **Comment** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| *General Comments* |
|  |  | The IPBES work programme should be based on a clear, preferably simple, conceptual framework (CF). The CF should inform directly the science-policy interface IPBES focuses upon. Furthermore, the CF should clearly reflect the difference between value and economic value since the value of biodiversity cannot be reduced only to economically measurable (monetary) values. Economic valuation of biodiversity is inevitably anthropocentric. Values do not represent an ‘objective’ reality and indication of values can be performed qualitatively, quantitatively, or both. Moreover, the science- policy interface character of IPBES requires recognition of values within the political systems, that is, to develop effective policy frames on valuing biodiversity both for conservation of biodiversity and human well-being. Busan Outcome Article 6 suggests that the role of IPBES involves not only informing biodiversity conservation policy but also economic and social policy. IPBES can assist all stakeholders concerned with biodiversity and ecosystem services by increasing the political feasibility of nature conservation using environmental, social and economical tools. |
|  |  | Without an approved budget and transparent budgetary procedures, IPBES limits planning and participation by the EE region due to its high uncertainty of management and needs. |
| 2 | 16-18 | What is the definition and substance of an assessment? What is it supposed to include? Is habitat mapping, for example, included? Will thematic assessments include assessments of related, or relevant, policies? Eastern Europe (EE) suggests all the assessments to include the policy contexts since assessments will connect biodiversity and ecosystem services with human well-being. Another related issue here is policy effectiveness. Will all assessments include current knowledge and information on lessons learnt from applying different policy tools in different policy contexts and their effectiveness? IPBES should inform policy choices by exploring current knowledge on implications of different policy options. |
| 5 and7 and12 | 21-28 and Objective 1 andDeliverable 2(a) | There are large differences and disparities with regard to capacities (incl. access to data, human resources, commitment by stakeholders, etc.) to engage with IPBES within the EE region itself. This might require IPBES to pay attention to the particular capacity-building needs of individual countries. Generally, in EE there is low state and civil society capacity for engaging with IPBES. There are many parallel and overlapping biodiversity initiatives and networks with incompatible work programmes in the EE region. How can we draw out synergies and bring these together? IPBES should seek ways to support the emergence of a synergistic and cooperative knowledge network in the region. There could be potential in supporting the establishment of an online resource hub (see also page 5, lines 21-28). |
| 12 | Deliverable 2(a)2-44 | Assessment methodologies should be comparable and, if possible, standardised. |
| 12 and18-24 | Deliverable 2(a), as well asDeliverable 3(c), 3(d),3(e), and 3(f), as well as Objective 4 andDeliverable 4(a) | To unpack global environmental change processes, due attention needs to be made to, on the one hand, regional drivers, such as economic transition processes putting specific pressures on biodiversity and ecosystem services in the EE region. On the other hand, attention should also be paid to local dynamics and local drivers of change. In order to assess environmental values and use in a holistic way that incorporates local users and bottom-up processes, studies on valuation need to pay attention to the specific ways local communities value nature. To reflect this, the assessment on value/valuation requires close attention to the relationship between people and their local environment. |
| 13 | Deliverable 2(b)1-25 | Alongside ‘Indigenous knowledge’ systems there exist traditional and local knowledge forms that are particularly important in the EE region (see SES). IPBES should seek ways to involve holders of local and traditional knowledge in the EE region and catalyse the generation of new knowledge and research avenues into its widespread use and existence, particularly as related to farming and agriculture. Local and traditional knowledge has an economic value that is currently not recognised. This needs to be investigated and promoted. There is a dilemma here however that IPBES might want to inform: How to meaningfully integrate alternative knowledge systems and practices when, for example, we are living in a world where traditional ways of life are not (economically, socially) viable? Furthermore, one could reasonably ask IPBES to inform policy on what are the successful ways for integrating different knowledge systems into decision- making? |
| 13-14 | Deliverable 2(c) | Comprehensive habitat inventories are required before comprehensive ecosystem services assessments may be completed; there are distinct gaps in knowledge and mapping around particular habitat types/ecosystems. The current lack of national ecosystems services valuations in the EE region constitutes a knowledge gap. |
| 15 | Objective 318-36 | There is a knowledge gap related to biodiversity and ecosystem services studies on what factors influence human behaviour and what information and knowledge is required to make politicians or the general public take biodiversity loss seriously? IPBES should prioritise the behavioural and communication issues as a cross‑cutting thematic/methodological topic by assessing current knowledge on behavioural drivers and effective communication approaches and tools. |
| 15 | Objective 318-36 | Attention needs to be paid to exploited, degraded, transformed ecosystems, for example brown fields and urban ecosystems, for their rehabilitation. Urban ecosystem services evaluation is a particularly uncharted field of ESs research and it is especially relevant due to its role in forming citizens’ cultural identity. |
| 15 | Objective 318-36 | Is there a business case for biodiversity and ESs? This relationship seems to be neglected so far, thus IPBES should pay due attention to the promotion of biodiversity and ecosystem services among private businesses by involving them (see SES) and assessing current knowledge on “business and biodiversity and ecosystem services” and the relevant policy frames. |
| 16 | Deliverable 3(a)1-22 | Deliverable 3(a) requires clarification as it is currently ambiguous and not at all clear what will be included under this assessment. This assessment is of high relevance to the EE region since agriculture-related biodiversity and ecosystem services issues are of primary significance. |
| 17 | 19-50 | Pollination (particularly insect pollination) is endorsed as an important thematic field for assessment but it needs to be complemented by an evaluation of other essential ecosystem services in need of restoration, particularly related to agriculture, forests and water bodies. |
| 23-24 | Deliverable 4(a) | IPBES should take into account the compulsory country-level assessments of Aichi Targets in order to avoid duplication of work. |
| 25 | Deliverable 5(a)1-23 | IPBES needs to check the assessment work conducted under the FAO in order to build on it as well as avoid duplication of work. |
| 25 | Deliverable 5(a)1-23 | IPBES needs to check the assessment of the impacts of climate change on biodiversity by IPCC and critically review and build on it, avoiding unnecessary overlaps and duplication of work. |
| 25 | Deliverable 5(a)1-23 | There are a few local biodiversity and ESs assessments IPBES can acknowledge and build upon. |

**Note:**

Upon the proposal by the IPBES Interim Secretariat, the Centre for Ecological Research, Hungarian Academy of Sciences, the Ministry of Rural Development, Hungary and the Environmental Social Science Research Group (ESSRG), organised and hosted an Eastern European Stakeholder Consultation on IPBES from July 31 till August 2, 2013 in Budapest and Tihany, Hungary.

Twenty-three participants from 11 countries attended, including experts from state administrative bodies, environmental non-governmental organisations, as well as scientific organisations. At the meeting the draft work programme and the stakeholder engagement strategy were introduced by Mr. Jerry Harrison on behalf of the IPBES Interim Secretariat and the draft conceptual framework by Mr. Adem Bilgin, IPBES Bureau member. These were discussed in plenary and breakout group sessions. The resulting draft review sheet was then sent to the participants for comments and finalised after their feedback.

**Review sheet for IPBES intersessional documentation**

see [www.ipbes.net/plenary/intersessional](http://www.ipbes.net/plenary/intersessional) for further details

**Document name: IPBES Draft Stakeholder Engagement Strategy for supporting implementation of the**

**IPBES work programme**

**Reviewer name: Outcome of the Eastern European Stakeholder Consultation on IPBES, 31 July – 2**

**August, 2013, Budapest and Tihany, Hungary**

**Government/Institution: Eastern European stakeholders, see list of participants**

**Country: Eastern European stakeholders**

**Email address: contact persons Dr. András Báldi** **(andrasbaldi@gmail.com****) and Dr. György Pataki**

**(gyorgy****.pataki@uni-corvinus.hu****), IPBES MEP members for Eastern Europe**

| **Page number** | **Line/Paragraph/Rule number** | **Comment** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| *General Comments* |
|  |  | One of the primary incentives for stakeholders to engage with the IPBES process will be the tangible results and outcomes produced by IPBES and considered useful by stakeholders. |
|  |  | Regions and stakeholder groups showing relatively minor activity and less engagement might require specific tools and incentives in order to contribute to as well as benefit from IPBES. |
|  |  | IPBES may learn and apply the experience of other international institutions, such as, for example:IPCC:- Try to inherit its and multilateral environmental agreements’ prestige (“legitimacy spillover”)- There may be no biodiversity skepticism now, but IPBES needs to think about and prepare to handle challenges if skepticism occursIIASA: a research center set up in a way to be able to attract researchers from the communist block – an exciting example of generating cooperation and their added valuesGISCorps: common actions, exchanges of stakeholders in order to learn about, work with and be inspired by each otherBalaton Group, Marie Curie Fellowship: both have working |
|  |  | mechanisms to leverage individual benefits of researchers to communities, thus attempting to overcome the risk that the involvement of scientists will have positive outcomes only for individual researchers |
|  |  | Expectations toward IPBES are:To have a full time and professional but small secretariatThat communication of activities shall go beyond letters to national governmental bodies; this would demonstrate all possible problems of formal one-way communication, and a direct approach to even national stakeholders is highly preferableTo improve and accelerate outreach activities and awareness raisingTo actively and effectively build the prestige of IPBES in order to attract new members; stakeholders to engage substantively in its process and activities |
| Topics where different, even opposing approaches have been detected, disputed |
|  |  | Top-down or bottom-up engagementWhether governments should be the major initiators of national participation, awareness raising, nomination of experts, etc.*or*participation and engagement shall come from (and learned/practised by) other segments of local societies, stakeholder groups |
|  |  | Private sector involvement(+) can provide efficient encouragement for governments to act*BUT*(-) how to avoid their domination of processes and prevent the question of profits and profitability from becoming a major driving force behind IPBES? |
|  |  | How far to go to find and involve stakeholders?Have relevant stakeholders in the process – that should be a central, emphasised ruleThus existing networks, already visible stakeholders shall be targeted*BUT*It is important not to leave out those who are “usually” unheard, we need to look beyond the existing networks in order toidentify other relevant stakeholders |
| 2 | Objective 2 | SES should be designed to facilitate effective and long-term engagement in a way that pays attention to the fact that different phases (entering, contributing, etc.) of the IPBES process may require different incentives and tools for the substantive engagement of stakeholders. |
| 2 | Guiding principles | IPBES should demonstrate professional independence and political impartiality. |
| 3 | Implementation | Funds generated, resources provided to stakeholders (e.g. academia) via governments |
|  |  | Political, scientific or media celebrities to be involved in order to reach out to the public at large |
| 5-6 | Annex I: Indicative elements of an action plan | Provide governments with IPBES-related success stories that governments are able to publicise locally, e.g. regional cooperation, international economic or research projects attributed directly or indirectly to IPBES |
| 5-6 | Annex I: Indicative elements of an action planCommunication | Gap in communication is identified (in some cases national offices at UN do not react to and pass information on to governments or relevant bodies)Tools:Publish an annual report + potential research questions for the coming periodDedicated working groups for specific scientific issues, help communication within the scientific communityFellowships, workshops, summer schools (esp. for young scientists)Letter/e-mail from the Secretariat before plenary meetings to major local stakeholdersTopics:Identify common issues and concerns of the various stakeholder groupsShow the relevance of biodiversity issues in different disciplines of science and to different knowledge- holdersunderstanding biodiversityhow does it effect their field (+/-)potential importance and benefits |
| 5-6 | Annex I: Indicative elements of an action planCommunication | Incentives for academia to participate in IPBES processes at the individual level:visibility, being citedscientific results utilised in policy-making networking opportunitiesrevealing new research niches, pioneering in certainsubjects |
|  |  | scientific database about researchers involved and availableprestigious institution (IPBES), prestigious researchers involved, prestigious research topics*BUT*there is a need to overcome the risk of having benefits only for the individuals and not for their communities“Translation” of the term biodiversity and other key notions to be understood by even the scientific community is still required as the understanding of key terms and their relevance cannot be taken for granted. |
|  | Annex I: Indicative elements of an action planScoping | Identify and involve practitioners, knowledge- holders who are not aware of the fact that their work is related to biodiversity issues and actually are natural resource managers. This will serve to establish some “sectoral” balance, thus also enriching academic knowledge. |

**Note:**

Upon proposal by the IPBES Interim Secretariat, the Centre for Ecological Research, Hungarian Academy of Sciences, the Ministry of Rural Development, Hungary and the Environmental Social Science Research Group (ESSRG), organised and hosted an Eastern European Stakeholder Consultation on IPBES from July 31 till August 2, 2013 in Budapest and Tihany, Hungary.

Twenty-three participants from 11 countries attended, including experts from state administrative bodies, environmental non-governmental organisations, as well as scientific organisations. At the meeting the draft work programme and the stakeholder engagement strategy were introduced by Mr. Jerry Harrison on behalf of the IPBES Interim Secretariat and the draft conceptual framework by Mr. Adem Bilgin, IPBES Bureau member. These were then discussed in plenary and breakout group sessions. The resulting draft review sheet was then sent to the participants for comments and finalised after their feedback.
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