



Distr.: General
16 September 2013

English only



**United Nations
Environment
Programme**

**Plenary of the Intergovernmental Science-Policy
Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services
Second session**
Antalya, Turkey, 9–14 December 2013

**Report of the Latin American and Caribbean Regional
Consultation meeting on the Intergovernmental Science-Policy
Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services**

Note by the secretariat

The annex to the present note sets out the final report of the Latin American and Caribbean regional consultation meeting on the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services, convened in São Paulo, Brazil, from 11 to 13 July 2013 by the Biota-FAPESP Programme of the São Paulo Research Foundation and the United Nations Environment Programme. The report is presented as received from the meeting organizers and has not been formally edited.

Annex

Intergovernmental Panel on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES) Regional Consultation Meeting for Latin America and the Caribbean 11–13 July 2013, São Paulo, Brazil Draft Report

1. Introduction

The IPBES Regional Consultation Meeting for Latin America and the Caribbean was jointly organized by the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) and the BIOTA/FAPESP Programme of the São Paulo Research Foundation from 11-13 July 2013 in São Paulo, Brazil. Representatives of 18 of the 23 IPBES members in the region, as well as a number of non-governmental organizations, attended the meeting. The list of participants is attached as Annex 1.

The objectives of the meeting were as follows:

1. Strengthen and focus regional inputs to the IPBES Work Programme 2014-2018, with an emphasis on a strong programme of capacity building in the region.
2. Strengthen regional participation in the IPBES intersessional process on other issues.
3. Develop an active network of institutions contributing to IPBES work and related capacity building in Latin America and the Caribbean
4. Identify possible partnerships between institutions and/or governments to strengthen sub-regional and regional biodiversity and ecosystem services assessments, as well as knowledge generation, within the IPBES framework.

Presentations made at the meeting have been made available at the following web site:

<http://www.fapesp.br/7937>

2. Opening remarks and update on the IPBES process

The meeting was opened by Professor Celso Lafer, President of FAPESP, who presented the BIOTA/FAPESP programme, which aimed to characterize and map the biodiversity of the State of São Paulo, gathering and making information relevant to biodiversity conservation and sustainable use available to decision makers, with over 20 legal instruments in the State of São Paulo published as a result of the programme. Professor Zakri Abdul Hamid, founding Chair of IPBES, made brief remarks, noting the importance of the Regional Consultations and their input to the IPBES Intersessional Process. This was followed by brief remarks by Professor Carlos Joly, Co-Chair of the IPBES Multi-Disciplinary Expert Panel (MEP); Larissa Lima, Division of Environment, Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Brazil; Daniela Oliveira, Ministry of Environment of Brazil; and David Oren, Ministry of Science, Technology and Innovation, which among other things emphasized the importance of regional capacity building in the IPBES Work Programme, the purpose of the present meeting to ensure this was well reflected, Brazil's commitment in taking forward the work of IPBES, and the relation of IPBES with the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) and other conventions related to biodiversity.

Professor Zakri Abdul Hamid made a keynote speech on “The role of IPBES on the science-policy interface of biodiversity and ecosystem services”, which is attached as Annex 2 of this report.¹ This was followed by a public question and answer session touching on issues such as payment for ecosystem services (PES), the need for greater balance in the IPBES Work Programme, the importance of countries providing active input on their priorities on capacity building and other aspects of the Work Programme, the importance of outreach in the Work Programme and the need to dedicate adequate resources for this,

¹ Comments on the keynote were also published as a full page by Valor Economico, a leading Brazilian newspaper targeted at the private sector and decision makers. All presentations of the Opening Ceremony were also published online by Agencia FAPESP, a leading online publication on Science related subjects in Brazil.

and the need to study and consider adopting lessons learned from other assessment processes such as the Global Environment Outlook. Professor Zakri mentioned to participants that the documents to be discussed in this Regional Consultation were only drafts that had not been agreed yet by the IPBES members, therefore, all contributions were welcomed. Bolivia, however, expressed its concerns that the documents disseminated did not take into account all divergent and alternative proposals from countries, in order to have a more balanced debate; with the documents only incorporating one position, and eliminating alternative positions.

UNEP also provided introductory remarks on the purpose of the Regional Consultations, as well as a presentation on the IPBES process so far, with a focus on the Intersessional Process leading the second session of the IPBES Plenary, to be held from 9 to 14 December 2013, Antalya, Turkey.

3. Knowledge systems and knowledge generation

Professor Manuela Carneiro da Cunha presented some outcomes of the recent IPBES Workshop on Indigenous and Local Knowledge Systems, held 9-11 June 2013, Tokyo, Japan. The following points were raised in her presentation and in the subsequent question and answer session:

- Knowledge of the natural environment continues to be a foundation for indigenous and local community livelihoods and cultures.
- Traditional knowledge does not just consist of data, it also consists of different models, with one example being how the source-drain approach complementing a numbers-quota approach to sustainable hunting.
- Despite concerted efforts in recent decades to build linkages between natural and social sciences, many aspects remain difficult to resolve including differences in approaches, terminology, scale, and views of what constitutes scientific method, data and evidence. On the other hand, similar challenges are encountered building links between different scientific disciplines such as physics and chemistry.
- Language and linguistic diversity add additional levels of complexity. This is not just a matter of communication and interpretation, but can reflect fundamentally different views about taxonomies, observations, evidence and proof.
- Access to knowledge may be governed by culturally specific rules and procedures.
- Procedures and approaches need to apply across an enormous diversity of ecological and cultural systems worldwide, and to roles such as farmers, fishers, pastoralists, and hunter gatherers (nomadic or sedentary), many of which are the fruit of long-term and intimate interactions between human and biological systems.
- The spatial extent of some sets of indigenous knowledge coincides with the subregional or regional aspects of IPBES (and some is confined to very small areas), but long-distance migratory species may raise other methodological considerations.
- Much of the experience integrating science and traditional knowledge has been at the local level, but there is also experience at wider scales, in particular in river basins (e.g., Xingu River and Rio Negro) as well as the Arctic Council.
- National legislation to implement Article 8(j) of the Convention on Biological Diversity is limited to a few countries, and is sometimes “defensive” (e.g., focused on limiting access to indigenous areas) rather than encouraging joint work and capacity building on an equal footing.
- In practice, it will be important that IPBES assessments are not limited to a synthesis of peer-reviewed literature in English, but can incorporate knowledge in national and local languages as well as knowledge from oral traditions in its work, perhaps based on national diagnostics.

Representatives from the Humboldt Institute, Colombia, Honduras, Mexico and Bolivia made presentations on knowledge generation, addressing the following questions:

- What are the main priorities to address with respect to data and knowledge on biodiversity and ecosystem services in the region?
- What would be clear and transparent processes for sharing and incorporating relevant data?
- How can IPBES contribute to monitoring of progress in meeting the Aichi Biodiversity Targets and other biodiversity-related goals in the region?

The representative of the Humboldt Institution, Colombia, made a presentation on participation of interested parties and the science-policy-society interface in integrated biodiversity management in Colombia. Among other things, she highlighted the National Policy for the Integrated Management of Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (PNGIBSE), and a long and diverse experience of assessment and reflection on the interface between science and policy in Colombia. It was important not to preach to the converted, but also involve decision makers and other stakeholders (defined broadly to include those contributing to, using, supporting, or affected positively or negatively) in the assessment process, adapt assessment cycles so they contribute to policy processes and timescales, and consider capacity building not as an external factor but one integral and necessary for all assessment functions.

The representative of Honduras made a presentation on biodiversity and ecosystem services in Honduras that presented advances through national institutions and policies such as the Technical Unit for Payment for Ecosystem Services, the National Committee for Environmental Goods and Services of Honduras (CONABISAH), the National Strategy for Environmental Goods and Services, and a National System being developed to regulate compensation mechanisms at the local, municipal, regional and national levels, with a focus on river basins and ecosystems. She highlighted experiences with open access web pages and databases as a transparent way to share information, and approaches used by Ramsar rapid assessments as well as monitoring protocols and standard indicators as a way to increase the comparability between assessments in different areas and at different scales.

The representative of Mexico made a presentation focusing on Mexico's National Biodiversity Information System, coordinated by the National Commission for Knowledge and Use of Biodiversity (CONABIO) and incorporating taxonomic references (based on International Codes of Nomenclature), specimen data repatriation, procedures manuals and a variety of monitoring programmes (invasive alien species, forest fires, vegetation change and mangroves as examples), remote sensing and spatial data, citizen science (e.g., AverAves), bioinformatics and gap analysis of priority conservation areas, valuation studies, and technical support to other countries in the region such as Costa Rica, Panama and Trinidad and Tobago. He stressed points such as the relevance of standards, baselines and sustainable finance to maintain time series of key data, the need for institutions aimed at building capacity for biodiversity knowledge in the region, and the importance for regional countries to participate actively in the IPBES process to ensure the development of a balanced Work Programme responding to regional needs.

The representative of Bolivia stressed the need for IPBES to include and develop different visions, approaches and models, including integral, comprehensive and holistic visions such as that of Living-well in balance and harmony with Mother Earth. Such visions had been affirmed by the Rio+20 Outcome Document (paras. 39-41 and 56) and the Governing Council/Global Ministerial Environment Forum at its first universal session (UNEP, February 2013, Nairobi). IPBES should also promote a similar hierarchy between Western science and indigenous and local science to advance intercultural dialogue, and establish decentralized and polycentric institutional arrangements with similar participation of academic scientists and of indigenous and local peoples, including ecoregional networks. In this regard, he highlighted visions and perspectives of non-Western society, indigenous peoples and local communities that included the importance not only of individual but also collective property, community decisions based on consensus, the planet as a living system and continuous biosphere with humans an intrinsic part of Mother Earth.

A representative of Brazil also made reference to a national system of biodiversity information being constructed, financed partly with Global Environmental Facility (GEF) resources, continuing to June 2015 and thereafter with Brazilian resources. It would start by bringing together information from biological collections (with currently only 10% contained in databases) but would later expand to other areas of work including a strong programme of translating information for decision makers.

4. IPBES Assessments in the Latin America and Caribbean Region

The representative of Trinidad and Tobago made a presentation on management of biodiversity in the country, focusing on a number of new policies adopted to strengthen flexibility, multi-disciplinary capacity, human resources and independent access to funding. Policies included: the National Tourism Policy—2010; the New National Forest Policy—2011; the National Protected Areas Policy—2011; the National Climate Change Policy—2011; and a new Protected Areas, Wildlife Conservation and Forestry Bill 2012 and Wildlife Policy in progress. Efforts were being made to address challenges such as a lack of biodiversity baseline data, lack of systematic monitoring and measurements, insufficient dialogue among researchers, and a weak science-policy interface, being addressed through development of a National Biodiversity Information System with technical assistance from CONABIO.

The representative of Saint Lucia presented the country's assessment experience and capacities—including a well developed forest department and some expertise in wildlife and fisheries management—as well as a number of capacity constraints that IPBES would be timely to address. These included a lack of research institutions and universities and limited skill set in non-government organizations and civil society, dependence on external agencies for biodiversity assessment, peer review and DNA analysis. Within the context of the current difficult economic times, there was a challenge to replace retired staff, and a rather cautious approach was being adopted to invest in areas not providing immediate employment. Approaches to scaling up national assessments included revision of the National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (NBSAP), and working with regional and international forums and agencies involved in biodiversity monitoring such as the Society for the Conservation and Study of Caribbean Birds (SCSCB) and the Caribbean Foresters' Conference.

The representative of Argentina presented two initiatives—ECOSER and Vulnerability, Ecosystem Services and Rural Territorial Planning (VESPLAN)—aimed at increasing the influence of ecosystem service approaches in the region. The presentation studied factors that limited the influence and effectiveness of ecosystem service approaches, such as the limited number of studies responding to concrete needs expressed by decision makers, and considered the characteristics of a platform (ECOSER) aimed at overcoming these limitations and increasing aspects such as ownership, comparability and accessibility of ecosystem service analysis for decision making in the region.

During the discussion, a number of participants highlighted the importance of a common set of tools, methods and indicators to increase the comparability of assessments conducted at different scales. A fundamental decision for national governments was to carry out national land use planning, which could incorporate mapping of ecosystem services; at present, ecosystem service mapping is based on a number of different methods making it difficult to convince decision makers of the value of these maps. Recent efforts had also been made (e.g., a recent paper in *Science*) to identify minimum variables for biodiversity studies, similar to efforts of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) in 1994 to establish basic measurements for climate change. These efforts were a good first step, although some of the variables (e.g., genetic diversity as measured by gene sequencing) would not be feasible for many developing countries.

Some participants highlighted the importance of the upcoming International Congress on Ecosystem Services in the Neotropics, Medellin, Colombia, 7-11 October 2013, to advance technical cooperation on ecosystem service assessments in the region.

Some participants stressed the importance of increased awareness and understanding of decision makers being complemented by increased education and awareness of the general public, the latter providing the impetus for decision makers to act. The possibility to incorporate climate change in ecosystem service models (in addition to rapid changes such as deforestation and agriculture) as well as the value of local knowledge and links with local demand were also raised.

5. IPBES Work Programme 2014-18 and Capacity Building

The Secretariat presented the IPBES Draft Work Programme 2014-2018. MEP members and the secretariat emphasized that this was still a draft, nothing was set in stone, and it was essential for countries in the region to provide their inputs to the draft as part of the online review process. Participants at the Regional Consultation meeting felt that the draft currently lacked balance, especially with regard to national and regional assessments, knowledge generation and capacity building, and put forward a number of proposals in this regard as outcomes of the Regional Consultations, as reflected in Annex 3.

Bolivia expressed concern with the Work Programme being unbalanced and oriented to move forward the vision of the green economy, without taking into account different and alternative proposals, such as the Living-well in balance and harmony with Mother Earth. The Work Programme was contingent upon a conceptual framework that had not been approved yet as an official framework, including only one potential institutional arrangement for the MEP and phasing out alternative proposals. Bolivia expressed its concerns that all Bolivian suggestions submitted to the Secretariat had not been considered in this document. Bolivia had expected the Regional Consultations to include a serious discussion on the Work Programme, but it felt the Work Programme had been delivered to countries as a finished document. Bolivia abandoned the salon because of its view that the Chairs of the Work Programme limited the Bolivian participation and contribution to the Work Programme; later, the representative of Bolivia returned to the consultation, mentioning that it kept the right to pursue its views about the Work Programme at the second IPBES session.

Some additional, general comments on the work programme included: to make an effort to keep the language simple and non-technical wherever possible; to include up front in the document the four functions of the IPBES platform; to explain in the text how the five objectives of the IPBES Work Programme 2014-2018 related to each other.

The MEP members emphasized the importance of capacity building in the IPBES Work Programme, which should address capacities at the individual, institutional and systemic levels.

In this regard, a number of countries shared information on their legal and policy frameworks for biodiversity, ecosystem services, and recognition of the rights of Mother Earth. The variety of different experiences and models in the region would be a valuable resource for countries looking to strengthen their legal and policy frameworks, and something the IPBES Work Programme on capacity building could build on, ensuring that any work was policy relevant but not policy prescriptive, and ensuring that it recognized and applied different perspectives and value systems.

Some participants stressed the importance for countries to go beyond stand-alone laws on biodiversity and the environment, and also ensure these issues were taken into account in a range of different sectors with a holistic view. Similarly, it was important that national legal frameworks addressed the root causes of biodiversity loss, not only the symptoms. In this regard, some countries made reference to provisions for protection of biodiversity and ecosystem services in their national Constitutions.

Some participants stressed the importance of national territorial planning, and related IPBES capacity building on this issue, in ensuring that biodiversity and ecosystem services were given priority “on the ground” (and below it when appropriate), and as a way to address potential conflicts and inconsistencies between laws covering themes such as the environment, private property, and extractive industries.

Some participants noted that while many countries had laws on paper, implementation and enforcement was a significant capacity gap, especially when these responsibilities were decentralized to the sub-national level. Hence, capacity building on developing realistic implementation plans, and different aspects of law enforcement, should be a priority.

In addition, capacity building on national programmes for public information were emphasized as a priority, since this public awareness would be necessary in convincing decision makers to take action.

During the discussion on capacity building, two questionnaires on capacity building were presented (one global and another region-specific), to be completed by participants. These questionnaires are attached as Annex 4.

6. IPBES Stakeholder Engagement Strategy and Strategic Partnerships

The Secretariat presented the draft IPBES stakeholder engagement strategy, as well as guidance on the development of strategic partnerships. Countries were encouraged to submit their comments on both these documents officially by 28 July 2013 as part of the online review process.

Comments by individual participants mostly focused on the stakeholder engagement strategy, and included the following:

- It was important for IPBES to institutionalize participation of different stakeholders, and develop a clear mandate on what is expected from them.

- Many non-government organizations could make a strong contribution to the platform, since many had good skills to translate technical language into language that was understandable by the general public.
- It was also important to have a broad view of the stakeholders that could contribute to IPBES, not only non-government organizations, but also multilateral organizations supporting policy development, donors, the private sector, as well as the main actors (both inside and outside the region) influencing changes in land use in Latin America and the Caribbean. IPBES should adopt a broad view and leave the door open for a wide range of stakeholders to participate.
- The importance of regional hubs and networks was stressed as a way to engage different stakeholders, including the regional scientific and technical community, and bring together different sources of data. Some participants stressed that IPBES should build on the regional Sub-Global Assessment network.
- IPBES should avoid building new bureaucratic structures, and build on and empower stakeholder networks that already existed, including subregional spaces with a bio-ecoregional view established for the Chaco, Amazon and Andes.
- The Stakeholder Engagement Document was a good start, but still quite generic. Among other things, the contribution of stakeholders at the global, regional and local levels should be linked more closely with specific activities under the IPBES Work Programme.

7. Latin America and Caribbean Network on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services—South-South Cooperation

A long tradition and rich landscape of existing networks, technical, government and academic institutions in the Latin America and Caribbean region was presented at the meeting, many of which could contribute to the objectives of IPBES. These included the Latin American Plant Science Network (RLB), presented by its former Presidents Mary Kalin-Arroyo and Mónica Moraes Ramírez, the regional sub-global assessment network of the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment, the Working Group on Indicators of the Latin America and Caribbean Initiative for Sustainable Development (GTIA), networks on marine and terrestrial protected areas, invasive alien species and other issues, and technical institutions from the region that were represented at the meeting (see Annex 1, List of Participants). As discussed in a report on Biodiversity Research produced by the International Council for Science—Latin America and the Caribbean (ICSU-LAC) in 2009,² these networks and institutions were already supporting South-South and regional cooperation, promoting greater comparability between assessment and knowledge generation work in different countries, and cooperation should be scaled up through IPBES to support an active regional programme of capacity building.

Some participants stressed that establishment of new networks could require substantial time, human and financial resources. While many networks in the region remained active, others had become inactive, and long-term stability and sustainability would need to be carefully considered before establishing new IPBES structures.

Some participants raised the issue of national clearing house mechanisms, aimed at coordinating biodiversity information and addressing problems with information generated by many institutions being difficult to access. Some national mechanisms had previously been established in universities and then moved to government ministries, making them more robust institutions linked with official data. Others had become inactive, and reactivating them would be a priority.

Some participants stressed the importance of networks being accessible and inclusive, both in terms of participation, and also in terms of their coverage of the four IPBES functions – not just taxonomy and natural sciences but also geographic information, social sciences, indigenous and local knowledge, environmental accounting, education and public information, among other themes.

² Kalin-Arroyo, M.T., Dirzo, R., Joly, C.A., Castilla, J.C., Rodrigues, F.C., Biodiversity knowledge, scope of research and priority areas: an assessment of Latin America and the Caribbea, 1. ed. Rio de Janeiro: ICSU-LAC, 2009, v.1., 136p.

The meeting agreed that the MEP would coordinate a “fast track” assessment of existing regional networks and institutions that could contribute to the IPBES Work Programme in the Region. The assessment would identify, within the region, institutions and countries that would have the capacity and willingness to provide support and capacity building to other countries in Latin America and the Caribbean (whether in terms of training personnel, developing, sharing and integrating biodiversity databases, or a range of other capacity building activities). This regional “matchmaking” would ensure the region used the opportunity of the IPBES Work Programme to increase its capacity and contribute at a level commensurate with its importance as home to approximately one third of the world’s biodiversity.

8. IPBES Conceptual Framework

Regional members of the MEP presented the draft IPBES conceptual framework document, and the process that had been used to develop it, and stressed its importance as a long-term conceptual document to capture the work of IPBES, beyond the 2014-2018 Programme of Work currently being developed. Preparing the conceptual framework involved considerable challenges such as how to tie the IPBES philosophy with practical aspects of the Work Programme in order increase comparability of assessments at different scales, and how to ensure the framework was something all IPBES members could identify with, incorporating different knowledge systems and worldviews.

Some participants expressed concerns with the procedure of reviewing a draft of the conceptual framework document, which was not publicly available, in a short session at the Regional Consultations. In response, the MEP members coordinating the conceptual framework session stressed that the session was aimed partly to familiarize participants with the document, since not all had the opportunity to attend the series of workshops dedicated to developing it, and partly to conduct a brief review (but not a full negotiation) with a view to identifying regional points of view. The draft was a work in progress, which had not yet fully incorporated the formal suggestions made by countries and stakeholders, and had not yet been approved by the MEP. Countries were encouraged to submit their own formal comments as part of the review process for the conceptual framework. The regional MEP members coordinating the conceptual framework session also requested the Secretariat to email the current draft of the document to participants in the Regional Consultation. One participant recommended holding an additional workshop to develop regional input to the IPBES conceptual framework.

The representative of Bolivia expressed concern that the current draft had a heavy focus on natural capital, based on a Eurocentric worldview and approach. The representative of Bolivia mentioned that the country had submitted a serious proposal in order to enrich the conceptual framework, taking into consideration the Living-well in balance and harmony with Mother Earth, which had not been included in the draft proposal structurally. Only the concept of Living-well had been included but nothing else; the conceptual framework as a whole responded to the green economy framework. In the document, it appeared as if there were no alternative proposals to the issue of the green economy. Therefore, it felt that the contributions of developing countries were not considered seriously in IPBES, and the document should have included all alternative proposals sent to the IPBES secretariat. The Plurinational State of Bolivia had recently changed its name to reflect the visions and approaches of all indigenous peoples that lived in Bolivia, something they would like to apply to ensure the IPBES conceptual framework also had a multi-centric not a monolithic vision. He requested that the document recover the idea of the “institutional economy” to strengthen analysis of the effects of different governance systems on ecosystem services, and stressed that in dealing with ecosystem “goods and services” it was important to differentiate public, private and—importantly—community goods and services. At least in Bolivia, private companies and governments were not the driving forces for conservation, rather, the collective action of indigenous people were. Finally, he objected to the procedure of using of a placeholder (for the UK National Ecosystem Assessment) in the draft, when other countries had submitted formal comments that had not been reflected at all. Bolivia requested again to incorporate structurally into the conceptual framework the Living-well in balance and harmony with Mother Earth.

The representative of Nicaragua added that models used so far had failed to prevent biodiversity loss, and the conceptual framework should give visibility to models that protected nature such as rights and their restitution, gender-sensitive approaches, equity, and protection of Mother Earth.

Some participants expressed the view that the conceptual framework should focus on points of agreement, and steer away from points of controversy, with a view to integrating a diversity of visions in the document. Diagrams or schemes that excluded particular viewpoints should be avoided. The introduction

of natural capital in the document should also be avoided since it led to controversy, as some countries interpreted it as a capitalist concept leading to the mercantilization of nature. The platform should respect different approaches, but should not make judgements about one world vision having more value than another. It could be complemented by additional documents specific to different visions and themes.

Other comments made by participants included the following:

- Well being needed to be more clearly defined in the conceptual framework, since there were many visions of well being, and the concept went beyond the work of IPBES itself;
- “Goods and services” should be more clearly defined, and how these related to “ecosystem services” in the title of IPBES;
- “Drivers” (which could imply intention) should be replaced by a more neutral word (e.g., “agents” or “changes”);
- The conceptual framework should at some point recognize a distinction between local benefits and global benefits—changes that were positive at the global level might not always be positive at the local level, and vice versa;
- The application of scenarios should be discussed in the IPBES conceptual framework as well as specific deliverables;
- The current flows of ecosystem goods and services was, on its own, not a good basis for decision making, since it did not take into account factors like the dependence of different communities on these services, exposure or susceptibility to their loss, or changing scenarios. These related more closely to the concept of social and environmental “vulnerability”, which should be included in the document;
- Section 2.1 of the document should not be prescriptive with a focus on capital assets, but should encompass different viewpoints;
- The framework should describe the importance of rights (including of Earth and indigenous peoples) including a box focusing on this issue, and should also capture the concept of “living well”;
- The strength and importance of governance, institutions and collective action should also be included, and there should be a broader approach to how knowledge generation was treated;
- Common but differentiated responsibilities should also be included as a central topic in the conceptual framework;
- Biodiversity should be considered as heritage rather than a resource, to address the break between humans and nature that considered people only as citizens or consumers, rather than part of the natural world;
- The conceptual framework needed to strengthen its description of how IPBES can promote multi-disciplinary dialogue and restore links between different bodies of knowledge such as natural sciences, economics and social sciences.

9. Next steps

- The meeting agreed that the MEP would coordinate a quick assessment of available biodiversity-related institutions and networks in the region, including previous experiences such as the Inter-American Biodiversity Information Network (IABIN), and combine this information with that from the Questionnaires (Annex 4), to produce a matrix of capacities and needs in the region. The matrix would form the baseline for “matchmaking” efforts to be coordinated by the Latin America and Caribbean MEP members, ensuring the region would use the opportunity of the IPBES Work Programme to increase its capacity and contribute at a level commensurate with its importance as home to approximately one third of the world’s biodiversity.

- The Secretariat was requested to email the current draft of the Conceptual Framework to participants.
- Participants were requested to complete both (global and region-specific) capacity building questionnaires and return them to the IPBES Secretariat by **Friday, 19 July 2013**.
- The draft meeting report would be circulated in the **week of 22-26 July 2013** in English only, and finalized in time for the next meeting of the MEP in mid August. The final report would be available in English and Spanish.
- Countries were urged to provide their official comments to IPBES documents (including the draft Work Programme, stakeholder engagement strategy and guidelines on strategic partnerships) by **28 July 2013**, as part of the online review process.
- Governments that had not done so already were requested to appoint their official focal point to the IPBES platform as soon as possible.
- Governments in the region were also requested to identify participants for the second session of the IPBES Plenary, Antalya, Turkey, 9-14 December 2013, to ensure a strong regional presence at that meeting.

Annex 1

List of Participants

Government nominees to the Regional Consultations

Argentina

Pedro Laterra
Profesor Titular/Investigador Independiente
Facultad de Ciencias Agrarias
Universidad Nacional Mar del Plata
CC 276 (7620) Balcarce, Argentina
Tel: +54 2266 439100
Email: platterra@balcarce.inta.gov.ar

Bolivia

Diego Pacheco Balanza
Experto en Temas Ambientales
Ministerio de Relaciones Exteriores
Man Cesped No. 500 (Prolongación)
La Paz, Bolivia
Tel: +591 670 05265
Email: jallpa@yahoo.com

Fernando Cisneros Arza
Funcionario
Ministerio de Relaciones Exteriores
Av. 6 de Agosto No. 1471
La Paz, Bolivia
Tel: +591 772 81887
Email: ferarza@gmail.com

Brazil

Daniela América Suarez de Oliveira
Directora, Departamento de Conservação da Biodiversidade
Secretaria de Biodiversidade e Florestas
Ministério do Meio Ambiente
SEPN 505, Bloco B
Ed. Marie Prendi Cruz, 4º Andar—Sala 416
Asa Norte—Brasilia DF 70.730-542, Brasil
Tel: +61 2028-2028
Email: daniela.oliveira@mma.gov.br

Larissa Maria Lima Costa
Ministry of External Relations
Esplanada dos Ministerios, Bloco H, Anexo I
Brasilia 70170-900, Brazil
Email: larissa.costa@itamaraty.gov.br

David Oren
Coordenador de Biodiversidade
Ministério da Ciência, Tecnologia e Inovação (MCTI)
Esplanada dos Ministérios, Bloco E, 2º Andar - Sala 242
70.067-900 Brasilia, DF, Brasil
Tel: +55 61 2033 8500
Email: doren@mct.gov.br

Chile

Charif Tala González
Profesional de la División de Recursos Naturales, Residuos y Evaluación de Riesgo
Ministerio del Medio Ambiente
Teatinos 254, Cod. Postal 8340434
Santiago, Chile
Tel: +562 2241 1827
Email: ctala@mma.gob.cl

Colombia

Paula Andrea Rojas Gutierrez
Dirección de Bosques, Biodiversidad y Servicios de los Ecosistemas
Ministerio de Ambiente y Desarrollo Sostenible
Calle 37 No. 8-40
Bogota, Colombia
Tel: +57 300 876 7174
Email: projas@minambiente.gov.co

Costa Rica

Jenny Asch Corrales
Ministro de Ambiente y Energía (MINAE)
Tel: +506 8885 2594
Email: jenny.asch@sinac.go.cr

Cuba

Lourdes Coya de la Fuente
Funcionaria
Ministerio de Ciencia, Tecnología y Medio Ambiente
Calle 20 esq. 18ª, CP: 11300
Playa, La Habana, Cuba
Tel: +537 204 9460
Email: lourdes@citma.cu

Dominican Republic

José Rafael Almonte
Asesor Técnico del Viceministerio de Áreas Protegidas y Biodiversidad
Ministerio de Medio Ambiente y Recursos Naturales
Ave. Cayetano Germosen, Esquina Avenida Luperon
Distrito Nacional, Edif. del Ministerio de Medio Ambiente, 3ra planta
Santo Domingo, República Dominicana
Tel: +809 501 2148
Email: Jose.Almonte@ambiente.gob.do

El Salvador

Nestor Herrera
Gerente de Vida Silvestre, Dirección de Biodiversidad y Patrimonio Natural
Ministerio de Medio Ambiente y Recursos Naturales
Kilómetro 5½ Carretera a Santa Tecla, Calle y Colonia Las Mercedes
Edificio MARN (Instalaciones ISTA)
San Salvador, El Salvador
Tel: +503 2132 9381
Email: nherrera@marn.gob.sv

Guatemala

Helmer Ayala Vargas
Asesor—Gestión de Proyectos
Consejo Nacional de Áreas Protegidas (CONAP)
6 av. 6-03 zona 1
Ciudad de Guatemala, Guatemala
Tel: +502 5830 4771
Email: hayala@conap.gob.gt

Honduras

Ivette Velásquez
Directora de Modernización
Secretaría de Recursos Naturales y Ambiente (SERNA)
100 metros al sur del Estadio Nacional
Tegucigalpa M.D.C., Honduras
Tel: +504 2239 4272
Email: ivetteyolandav@hotmail.com

Mexico

Hesiquio Benítez Díaz
Director General de Cooperación Internacional e Implementación
Comisión Nacional para el Conocimiento y Uso de la Biodiversidad (CONABIO)
Liga Periferico—Insurgentes, Sur, No. 4903
Col. Parques del Pedregal, Tlalpan 14010
México DF, México
Tel: +52 55 5004 5025
Email: hbenitez@conabio.gob.mx

Nicaragua

Edilberto Duarte
Director General de Patrimonio Natural
Ministerio del Ambiente y los Recursos Naturales (MARENA)
Km 12.5 Carretera Norte, P.O. Box 5123
Managua, Nicaragua
Tel: +505 8912 6230 / +505 2263 1994
Email: eduarte@marena.gob.ni

Panama

Darío Luque
Áreas Protegidas, Autoridad Nacional del Ambiente (ANAM)
Edificio 804, Allbrook, Apartado postal C-0843-00793
Balboa, Ancón, Ciudad de Panamá, Panamá
Tel: +507 500 0878
Email: dluque@anam.gob.pa

Peru

Roxana Virginia Solís Ortíz
Especialista—Gestión de la Biodiversidad
Ministerio del Ambiente
Ave. Villareal de los Infantes 225
Urb. Las Lomas de la Molina, Cond. Los Portales
La Molina, Lima, Perú
Tel: +511 611 6000, ext. 1030
Email: rsolis@minam.gob.pe

Saint Lucia

Alwin Dornelly
Assistant Chief Forest Officer
Department of Forestry
Ministry of Sustainable Development, Energy, Science and Technology
Gabriel Charles Forestry Complex, Union, Castries, Saint Lucia
Tel: +758 468 5644 / +758 717 3919
Email: dornelly_al@yahoo.com

Trinidad and Tobago

Carlton Roberts
Director, Forest Resource Inventory and Management
Ministry of Environment and Water Resources
#33, Long Circular Rd., St James
Port of Spain, Trinidad and Tobago
Tel: +868 622 5858
Email: edric45@hotmail.com

Uruguay

Luis Mario Batalles
Jefe de Gestión del Sistema Nacional de Áreas Protegidas
Ministerio de Vivienda, Ordenamiento Territorial y Medio Ambiente
Galicia 1133, Montevideo 11000, Uruguay
Tel: +598 9 961 8925
Email: mario.batalles@mvtoma.gub.uy

IPBES Bureau and Multidisciplinary Expert Panel Members

Zakri Abdul Hamid
Science Advisor to the Prime Minister of Malaysia
Chairman of the National Professors Council, Malaysia
IPBES Chair

Lilian Ferrufino

Professor
National Autonomous University of Honduras
Alternate to IPBES Bureau Member for Latin America and the Caribbean

Sandra Myrna Díaz

Professor of Community and Ecosystems Ecology
Department of Biological Diversity and Ecology
Universidad Nacional de Córdoba, Argentina
Director of Núcleo Diversus on Biodiversity and Sustainability
Email: sdiaz@efn.uncor.edu

Edgar Selvin Pérez

Director, Technical Biodiversity Office (OTECBIO)
National Council for Protected Areas
5a. Ave. 6-06 Zona 1 Edif. IPM, 7º nivel
Guatemala, Guatemala
Tel: +502 2422-6700, ext. 3007 / +502 4151-8336
Email: chijunil@hotmail.com

Carlos Alfredo Joly
Professor, Plant Ecology
Plant Biology Dept.
Biology Institute – PO Box 6109
State University of Campinas (UNICAMP)
13083-970 - Campinas/SP
Brazil
Tel: +55 19 3521 6166
Email: cjoly@unicamp.br

Floyd Homer
Biodiversity Specialist, Multilateral Environmental Agreements
Ministry of the Environment and Water Resources
Level 26, Tower D
Waterfront Complex, Wrightson Road
Port of Spain, Trinidad and Tobago
Tel: +868 623 3158, ext. 221
Email: floyd.homer@gov.tt

Intergovernmental organizations

Latin American Development Bank (CAF)

Sintia Yañez
Ejecutiva Principal de Medio Ambiente/Representação no Brasil
Banco de Desenvolvimento da América Latina (CAF)
Tel: +55 61 2198622 / +55 61 33250633
Email: syanez@caf.com

United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) (Secretariat)

Charles Davies
Regional Coordinator, Division of Early Warning and Assessment
Regional Office for Latin America and the Caribbean, UNEP
Clayton, City of Knowledge, Morse Avenue, Building 103
P.O. Box 0843-03590, Balboa—Panama City, Panamá
Tel: +507 305 3150
Email: Charles.Davies@unep.org

Nalini Sharma
IPBES Programme Officer—Biodiversity Unit
Division of Environmental Policy Implementation, UNEP
United Nations Avenue, Gigiri
PO Box 30552, 00100 Nairobi, Kenya
Tel: +254 762 3757
Email: nalini.sharma@unep.org

Pedro Luiz Simpson
Project Officer, UNEP Brazil Office
Setor de Ebaixadas Norte, Brasilia, Brasil
Tel: +55 61 3038 9232
Email: gefbio@pnuma.org

Technical institutions, civil society organizations and experts³

Biodiversitas Foundation

Gláucia Moreira Drummond
Superintendente Geral
Fundação Biodiversitas
Pça. Governador Israel Pinheiro, 277 (Praça do Papa) – Mangabeiras
Belo Horizonte, Minas Gerais, CEP 30210.060, Brazil
Tel: +55 31 3653 7794/5
Email: glauucia@biodiversitas.org.br

Bolivian National Herbarium

Mónica Moraes Ramírez
Herbario Nacional de Bolivia
Instituto de Ecología
Universidad Mayor de San Andrés
Casilla 10077 – Correo Central
La Paz, Bolivia
Tel: +591 2 279 2416 / +591 2 279 2582
Email: monicamoraes45@gmail.com

Conservation International

Helena Pavese
SAUS—Quadra 3, Lote 2, Bloco C, Ed. Business Point, 7º andar, Salas 715-720
70070-934 Brasília DF, Brasil
Email: hpavese@conservation.org

The Cropper Foundation

Keisha Garcia
Senior Associate
The Cropper Foundation
Building #7
Fernandes Industrial Centre, Laventille
Port of Spain, Trinidad and Tobago
Tel: +868 353 7339
Email: kgarcia@thecropperfoundation.org

Fundação Florestal de São Paulo

Rodrigo Victor
Assessor Executiva
Rua do Horte, 931
São Paulo, Brasil 02377-000
Tel: +55 11 999 462 415
Email: rabmvictor@yahoo.com.br

Global Youth Biodiversity Network

Melina Sakiyama
Focal Point, Global Youth Biodiversity Network
Av. Jabaquara, 1469, apto. 92-B
São Paulo, Brasil
Tel: +55 11 55940583
Email: Melina.sakiyama@gmail.com

³ An open session was organized on the morning of 11 July 2013; not all participants are listed.

Humboldt Institute, Colombia

Juana Mariño Drews
 Coordinadora, Programa de Política, Legislación y Apoyo a la Toma de Decisiones
 Instituto Alejandro Von Humboldt
 Calle 28A #15-09
 PBX: 3202767
 Bogotá D.C., Colombia
 Tel: +578 732 0791
 Email: jmarino@humboldt.org.co

Instituto de Ecología y Biodiversidad (IEB), Chile

Mary T. Kalin Arroyo
 Directora, IEB
 Facultad de Ciencias
 Universidad de Chile
 Casilla 653, Santiago, Chile
 Tel: +56 2 9787345 / +56 2 2715464
 Email: southern@uchile.cl, ieb@uchile.cl

Institute for Ecological Research (IPE)

Claudio Padua
Administrador de Empresas e Biólogo
 Instituto de Pesquisas Ecológicas
 SHIN QI 13 Conj. 8 Casa 5 - Brasília - DF, Brazil
 Tel: +55 11 999 007 739
 Email: cpadua@ipe.org.br

Instituto Nacional de Biodiversidad (INBio), Costa Rica

Natalia Zamora Bregstein
 Institutional Affairs Director
 Apdo. Postal 22-3100
 Santo Domingo de Heredia, Costa Rica
 Tel: +506 2507-8123
 Email: nazamora@inbio.ac.cr

International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN)

Luiz Merico
 Coordinador Nacional
 UICN Oficina Brasilia
 CLN 210 bloco C sala 207, Asa Norte
 Brasilia—DF, Brasil
 Tel: +55 61 3547 2588
 Email: luiz.merico@iucn.org

São Paulo Research Foundation (FAPESP) BIOTA Programme

Tiago Duque Estrada
 Programme Officer
 Rua Pio XI, 1500 - Alto da Lapa
 CEP 05468-901, São Paulo, Brasil
 Tel: (+55) 11 3838-4362
 Email: tiago.duqueestrada@gmail.com

Manuela Carneiro Cunha
 Professor, Department of Anthropology
 University of Chicago
 1126 E 59th Street
 60637 Chicago, United States of America
 Email: mcarneir@uchicago.edu

Annex 2

Keynote Address on “The role of IPBES on the science-policy interface of biodiversity and ecosystem services

Zakri Abdul Hamid

Chair, Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES);

Science Advisor to the Prime Minister of Malaysia

Mr Chairman, Ministers, Science Director, distinguished delegates, ladies and gentlemen,

First, let me thank you for the pleasure and honour to have your attention and to thank the hosts for this opportunity.

Today I have been asked to describe the role of IPBES on the science-policy interface of biodiversity and ecosystem.

Let me begin by saying that I believe the loss of biodiversity is the most important global threat we face today.

The evidence that defines this crisis is documented in an ever-expanding body of work published by leading authorities, all warning that we are hurtling towards irreversible environmental tipping points. The melting Greenland ice sheet, shifts in the Atlantic Gulf Stream, creeping increases in ocean acidification and temperature, and the incremental loss of Amazon rainforest are changes that may seem small with shortsighted perspective but which eventually accumulate to cause a larger, more important change.

And almost every day alarming new data appear. On 10 May, scientists announced that a monitoring station in the Pacific had recorded atmospheric CO₂ levels topping 400 parts per million, with predictions of that level as the global average next year. In 1958, the level was 315 ppm and the rising rate of increase is said to be placing the planet on track for a catastrophic 3 to 5 degree increase in average surface temperature by the end of the century.

The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change is preparing its fifth global assessment for publication in 2014. The current draft highlights trends documented in previous assessments now increasing in severity and speed, and it strengthens previous conclusions about the impacts of climate change on physical, biological and human systems.

It highlights that continued climate change, combined with land use change and fires could cause much of the Amazon forest to transform abruptly to more open, dry-adapted ecosystems, threatening the region's enormous biodiversity and priceless services.

The danger of abrupt transformations in the ecology of the northern boreal forest and the loss of the reflective albedo effect service provided by Arctic ice are also highlighted in the current draft, as are the problems of coral reef destruction and invasive species due to rising sea-surface temperatures and acidification.

Some scientists have termed this the “sixth great extinction episode” in Earth's history, and the loss of biodiversity is happening faster and everywhere, even among farm animals, according to the UN Food and Agriculture Organization.

Last fall, the FAO reported the rate of decline is dropping but 22% of domesticated breeds are at risk of extinction. The reason? Their characteristics either don't suit contemporary demand or because differences in their qualities have not been recognized. When a breed population falls to about 1,000 animals, it is considered rare and endangered.

The genetic erosion in domestic animals reflects our general lack of appreciation of the value of indigenous breeds and their importance in niche adaptation. It is a consequence of ill-considered incentives promoting more uniform breeds and product-focused selection.

Among crops, meanwhile, about 75 per cent of genetic diversity was lost in the last century as farmers worldwide switched to genetically uniform, high-yielding varieties and abandoned multiple local varieties.

There are 30,000 edible plant species but only 30 crops account for 95% of human food energy, the bulk of which (60%) comes down to rice, wheat, maize, millet and sorghum.

The decline in the diversity of crop plants and animals is occurring in tandem with the need to sharply increase world food production and as a changing environment makes it more important than ever to have a large genetic pool to enable organisms to withstand and adapt to new conditions.

Ladies and gentlemen

Even though the science of what is happening to our biodiversity and our climate is getting clearer, and the means to mitigate these problems in various sectors are being developed, the political challenges surrounding global change are far from being resolved.

Thankfully, there are some important successes to celebrate and others emerging. Tropical deforestation is finally beginning to slow at the global level. Global pollution problems such as Ozone Depleting Substances (ODS) and organic pollutants are being successfully tackled. The global Protected Area estate has grown to 13% in 2010. Concern about biodiversity loss is rising up the political agenda. Climate change has matured from an environmental problem into a genuine developmental issue. The knowledge and role of local and indigenous communities are increasingly being recognized.

These successes encourage development of additional measures and infrastructures adequate to ensure that ecosystems continue to provide services essential to human well-being.

Role of IPBES on the science-policy interface

Ladies and gentlemen,

Sound policy requires sound science.

The international success in protecting the ozone layer and the influence the IPCC has on the climate change regime have on the biodiversity regime demonstrate that science can motivate change.

It has been clear for some time that a credible, permanent IPCC-like science policy platform for biodiversity and ecosystem services is an important but missing element in the international response to the biodiversity crisis.

Responding to this need, the 65th Session of the UN General Assembly in September 2010 marked the occasion that passed the resolution for the creation of an Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES). However, the idea of an IPBES has a much longer history.

Since the late 90's, there have been efforts to bring an independent science assessment into the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) and biodiversity-related issues generally.

Parallel to the efforts within the CBD, there were a number of events and discussions outside of the CBD towards a new approach to assessments. It was increasingly being recognized that an IPCC-like mechanism was required for biodiversity and ecosystem services that would serve not only the CBD but also biodiversity issues embedded in other biodiversity-related conventions such as (CCD), migratory (CMS), wetlands (Ramsar), forest issues as well as climate change (UNFCCC).

To this end, ICSU, the Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research (CGIAR), World Bank, World Resources Institute and the World Business Council for Sustainable Development and the International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN) called for the creation of the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment in 1999. With time, the relevant multilateral agreements accepted that the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment could meet some of their assessment needs.

The Millennium Ecosystem Assessment brought an innovative approach to biodiversity assessments. It went beyond natural sciences and included social sciences, focusing not only on the status of biodiversity but also on their products and functions, or in other words, the benefits received by society thanks to the functioning of ecosystems.

The landmark Millennium Ecosystem Assessment published in 2005 was hailed as a success and demonstrated that such an intergovernmental platform can create a clear, valuable policy-relevant

consensus from a wide range of information sources about the state, trends and outlooks of human-environment interactions, with focus on the impacts of ecosystem change on human well-being. It showed that such a platform can support decision-makers in the translation of knowledge into policy.

The Millennium Ecosystem Assessment provides our baseline. IPBES will tell us how much we have achieved, where we are on track, where we are not, why, and options for moving forward. It will help to build public support and identify priorities.

In parallel to these efforts, following on from a consultative process on an International Mechanism of Scientific Expertise on Biodiversity (IMoSEB) in November 2007, it was decided that an intergovernmental and multi-stakeholder meeting was to be convened to consider the establishment of an intergovernmental mechanism for biodiversity and ecosystem services. It was also agreed that any follow up process to IMoSEB should merge with the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment follow up process. The merging of these two processes has led to the present process for IPBES.

In June 2010, governments decided that an IPBES should be established as part of the Busan Outcome. This was subsequently considered at the 65th Session of UNGA, where we have finally come full circle to the passing of the resolution for IPBES.

In April 2012, IPBES was finally established in Panama City with its modalities of operation and institutional arrangements agreed.

The first meeting of the Platform's Plenary which is also known as IPBES-1 was held in Bonn, Germany in January 2013 and marked the operationalization stage of IPBES. This brings us to where we are today.

Towards the Operationalization of IPBES

Ladies and Gentlemen,

As you can see the process of establishing IPBES was a long, and at times, challenging process. While IPBES has been successfully established, we are now at the beginning of the operationalization stage, where further challenges lie ahead of us.

I would like to take this opportunity to remind ourselves of the four functions of IPBES: -

Firstly, to identify and prioritize key scientific information needed for policymakers at appropriate scales and catalyze efforts to generate new knowledge;

Secondly, to perform regular and timely assessments of knowledge on biodiversity and ecosystem services and their inter-linkages, which should include comprehensive global, regional and, as necessary, sub-regional assessments and thematic issues;

Thirdly, 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

Last but not least, to prioritize key capacity-building needs to improve the science-policy interface at appropriate levels as well as integrate capacity-building into all relevant aspects of its work

It is important to keep these four functions in mind at all times when undertaking work related to IPBES. This will ensure that IPBES maintains its credibility and legitimacy.

IPBES will respond to requests for scientific information related to biodiversity and ecosystem services from Governments, relevant multilateral environmental agreements and United Nations bodies, as well as other relevant stakeholders. While there are other organisations and initiatives that contribute to the science-policy interface on biodiversity and ecosystem services, IPBES is unique in that it serves as a global mechanism that is recognised by both the scientific and policy communities.

The structure of IPBES mirrors the IPCC but our aims go further, and the inclusion of capacity building will help bridge different knowledge systems. Capacity building has been recognized as being vital to the success of IPBES, and this has been reflected throughout the discussions leading up to its establishment.

It is essential, particularly in developing countries, to build capacities and ensure full participation in the assessments and science-policy dialogues. This will ensure that the assessments that are undertaken have relevance, continuity, and ultimately, effectiveness at all levels and scales.

IPBES will reduce the gulf between the wealth of scientific knowledge on declining natural world conditions, and knowledge about effective action to reverse these damaging trends.

Among IPBES' many activities, a key priority of mine as founding chair is ensuring the usefulness to policy makers of our first comprehensive assessment, to be published in 2018.

While numerous institutions and processes are helping to use science effectively, further efforts are required to integrate multiple disciplines and knowledge systems to produce relevant knowledge effectively and translate knowledge into policy action.

The time has come for scientists within the biodiversity and ecosystems services field to promote evidence based policymaking by providing scientific evidence that is useful to policymakers.

I believe that IPBES will go a long way in increasing the awareness amongst the scientific community to develop policy tools and hence become more policy relevant. This will raise the credibility and legitimacy of biodiversity science and empower decision makers to act towards reversing the damaging trends we are seeing in the world today.

The Outcome of Recent IPBES Activities

Ladies and Gentlemen

I am happy to highlight that there have already been a number of activities that contribute towards meeting the functions of IPBES.

The first meeting between the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel, experts that carry out the scientific and technical functions of the Platform, and the Bureau members, who oversee the administrative functions of IPBES, was held in Bergen in the first week of June this year. The meeting was convened to respond to plenary decisions and requests to the Bureau and MEP for the operationalization of IPBES. A range of documents were discussed, with the main documents being the work programme and the conceptual framework.

It was agreed that the objectives of the work programme is to be structured taking into consideration different scope and scales. Out of the five objectives, three objectives were allocated to assessments at various scales with capacity building and communication making up the other objectives.

In the context of this Regional Consultation Meeting, the emphasis on structuring it this way puts an emphasis on regional and sub-regional assessments. The work programme recognizes the unique biodiversity and scientific knowledge thereof within and among regions.

In line with the functions of IPBES, capacity building is an important component in the work programme that cuts across all the objectives. When IPBES was established it was agreed that the Platform would: prioritize key capacity-building needs to improve the science-policy interface at appropriate levels; provide and call for financial and other support for the highest priority needs related directly to its activities; and catalyse financing for such capacity-building activities by providing a forum with conventional and potential sources of funding.

To date how exactly this will be achieved has not been decided.

Catalyzing funding will be one of the major tasks of IPBES with respect to capacity building. While funding for the highest priority needs should be secured by the Platform, we need to go beyond that and catalyze funding for all priority capacity building needs by matchmaking those who have resources, with those who need them.

The priorities for capacity building is still open to discussion and a Capacity Building workshop is planned to be held in Kuala Lumpur in November this year with the aim to to build further understanding and hopefully a convergence of views on how capacity building could and should be addressed in the context of IPBES.

Another pertinent issue is the importance in communicating IPBES activities to the various stakeholders. Communication was recognized as a vital component in achieving the IPBES functions and this was reflected in the work programme. Mainstreaming biodiversity will hinge on a good communication strategy and building a good network between users and producers of knowledge.

An updated work programme is currently available for online review and I encourage and highly value your input into this process.

In developing a Conceptual framework, delivering one that is both pragmatic and inclusive of different knowledge and value systems will be a major challenge.

Input from an expert workshop on conceptual frameworks that will be held in South Africa at the end of August will be incorporated into a document that will be tabled at the next plenary session. A sub-working group is currently undertaking this challenging task of finding a convergence of views that will suitably encapsulate the overall concept of IPBES.

The contentious issue of regional composition was also discussed in the meeting. In responding to a request by the plenary to review the regional structure and composition, it was agreed to recommend that the UN regional structure, consisting of five UN regions, is maintained for the selection of the future MEP, while considering the working arrangements allow for ensuring intellectually and biogeographically coherent regional activities.

The implementation of the work programme deliverables will require working across regional boundaries however they may be constructed and there is no universally accepted biogeographic regional distribution and no common understanding or agreement on the subject matter. Regional consultations such as this provide an important testament towards this workable solution.

While the Bergen Meeting resulted in the progress on the various documents requested by the plenary, it is worth noting that it was the first meeting between the MEP and Bureau members. The meeting allowed for the Bureau and MEP to discuss the interrelationship between their roles.

The success of IPBES hinges on its people and as an ice-breaker, I think for those who were present in Bergen, we can all agree that it was a successful week where a good working relationship was formed between and amongst the Bureau and MEP members. I trust that we will continue to carry the momentum forward and form a formidable group that will be able to contribute significantly towards a successful IPBES.

There are also many other activities that contribute towards the functions of IPBES.

As an input to the conceptual framework, an International Expert and Stakeholder Workshop on The Contribution of Indigenous & Local Knowledge Systems to IPBES was held in Tokyo in June 2013. International experts nominated by governments and selected by a working group were invited to provide input on incorporating traditional knowledge into the IPBES generally and into the conceptual framework specifically.

The meeting, jointly organized by UNESCO, United Nations University and IPBES, was conducted in response to the first Plenary meeting requesting a workshop to provide input on “the recognition of indigenous and local knowledge and the building of synergies with science”. The workshop provided a set of recommendations for the consideration of inclusion into the conceptual framework. The recommendations surrounded the challenge of bridging different knowledge systems with scientific knowledge.

Activities such as these, including this Regional Consultation meeting, contribute significantly to the success of IPBES and I look forward to many more beneficial activities both formally through the IPBES intersessional process, as well as other informal side events.

The Importance of Regional Structures for IPBES

Ladies and Gentlemen,

The Indigenous & Local Knowledge Systems workshop provided a telling reminder of the importance of ensuring that IPBES is relevant “on the ground”. I mentioned that IPBES mirrors the IPCC model, but one glaring difference is the importance of managing biodiversity and ecosystem services at more local scales compared to the climate.

As a region rich in both biodiversity and cultural diversity, GRULAC can play a major role in shaping the way forward for IPBES. To develop solutions that are relevant at local scales, different knowledge systems will have to be considered and the region and the communities within it can serve as a microcosm in bridging different knowledge systems.

The work programme’s emphasis on regional and sub-regional assessments also provides impetus on having regional consultations and further collaboration. It is recognized within the work programme that

in order for assessments to be relevant, a bottom-up approach is essential and I trust that activities such as these can lead to a strong regional network on biodiversity and ecosystem services.

Building strong networks and exchange of information will also serve to contribute to capacity building. With respected organisations in the region such as CONABIO, Von Humboldt Institute, FAPESP and others, activities in GRULAC can both increase the capacity within the region as well as serve as a model to the rest of the world. These centres of excellence can play a prominent role in supporting IPBES implementation within the region.

Finally, I would also like to highlight the important issue of values. As with the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment, IPBES needs to go beyond biodiversity and the natural sciences to address the social science component of biodiversity and ecosystem services. The issue of valuation of biodiversity and ecosystem services issue was further discussed in Tokyo, and was a major issue in the Trondheim Conference on Biodiversity. The conceptual framework will provide a focus on values in relation to biodiversity and ecosystem services and finding a convergence of views will be a challenge.

How do we value the seemingly invaluable? Can there be a universal agreement on the value of biodiversity and ecosystem services? Can we put a price on nature? While I agree that many of the services the environment provides, like clean water and air, are irreplaceable necessities, however, the undoubted value of these natural treasures should be reflected in their price, which should rise steeply as they become scarcer. In practice, natural assets are often hard to price well, if at all. These are some of the challenging questions that I hope will be discussed in the following days that can contribute towards the conceptual framework in particular and to our understanding of the relationship between biodiversity and human well-being in general.

And so the task at hand is as important as it is complex, and I would like to take this opportunity to extend my sincere gratitude to our host country and organizers for their generosity and for making this regional consultation possible. The work in IPBES is now beginning, and as its Founding Chair, and on behalf of the Platform, I wish to thank you all for your contributions to this extremely important consultation, and wish you fruitful and productive discussions and a pleasant stay here in Sao Paulo.

Thank you for your kind attention.

Annex 3

Inputs of the Latin American and Caribbean Regional Consultation to the IPBES Work Programme 2014-2018

Participants at the Regional Consultation Meeting agreed on the inputs below (in bold, italic, underlined) as an outcome of the Meeting, and presented them as inputs to the IPBES Work Programme 2014-2018. They would not be considered as the official position of the Group of Latin American and Caribbean States (GRULAC), in part because not all GRULAC member States were present at the Regional Consultation meeting. In addition, the inputs of the Regional Consultations were without prejudice to the right of governments to submit their individual comments on the Work Programme directly to the Secretariat as part of the open online review process.

Objective 1

Enhance the enabling environment for the knowledge-policy interface in order to implement key functions of IPBES

- prioritizing, catalyzing and building capacity to engage with IPBES and science-policy interface in general
- promoting the generation of knowledge needed
- activating networks of already existing initiatives, expertise and structures to support implementation of IPBES

Objective 1 - Deliverables

1(a) Regularly updated set of priority capacity building needs matched with resources (***financial, human, institutional***)

1 (b) Fellowship programme facilitating and promoting the engagement of scientists, policymakers and other stakeholders in IPBES-related activities

1 (c) Series of dialogue/workshops addressing priority knowledge needs, ***including cultural and scientific dialogues between different visions and approaches***

1 (d) Approach to networking for capacity building and supporting work under IPBES

– ***For clarity, the Work Programme should elaborate on the nature of these networks***

Add new deliverables under Objective 1:

1. ***Regularly updated set of relevant knowledge generation needs matched with resources***
2. ***A series of capacity building activities, where appropriate, in each of the five United Nations regions, including training courses on tools and methodologies, specifically targeted methodological workshops on issues including indicators and inventory of all data already available but published in native languages or based on indigenous and traditional knowledge, and strengthening regional networking***

Objective 2

Strengthen the knowledge-policy interface on biodiversity and ecosystem services on regional and sub-regional levels

- helping to ensure the full use of national, sub-regional and regional assessments and knowledge ensuring a bottom-up approach
- further elaborating ways and means how to work with different knowledge systems, visions and approaches particularly important at regional and sub-regional level
- rolling out a set of regional and sub-regional assessments

Objective 2 - Deliverables

2(a) Guide for the development and endorsement of regional and sub-regional deliverables, assessments and capacity building to undertake and use the findings of these assessments

2(b) Guide on working with different knowledge systems, visions and approaches

2(c) Set of regional and/or sub-regional assessments and the institutional capacity developed to deliver them

Add new deliverables under Objective 2:

1. Improve capacities within the regions for information management, including sharing of lessons learned and training
2. A series of capacity building activities, where appropriate, in each of the five United Nations regions, including training courses on tools and methodologies, specifically targeted methodological workshops on issues including indicators and inventory of all data already available but published in native languages or based on indigenous and traditional knowledge, and strengthening regional networking

Objective 3

Strengthen the knowledge-policy interface with regards to thematic and methodological issues

- Supporting policy formulation and implementation by providing assessments on relevant thematic issues
- Supporting policy formulation and implementation by promoting and further developing policy relevant tools and methodologies

Objective 3 - Deliverables

3(a) Thematic assessment of degradation and restoration of land and freshwater systems and/or biodiversity and agriculture by March 2016

Replace 3(a) with: “Thematic assessment of life systems including the role of environmental functions and their interactions with the social, economic and cultural dimensions”

3(b) Thematic fast-track assessment on pollination and its impact on food security by March 2015

Replace 3(b) with: “Thematic fast-track assessment on the contribution of biodiversity to food security”

3(c) Methodological fast-track assessment on scenarios and models further elaborated and/or developed.

Add under deliverable 3(c): In addition, a series of capacity building activities in each of the five United Nations regions, including training courses on tools and methodologies, specifically targeted methodological workshops on issues including indicators and inventory of all data already available but published in native languages or based on indigenous and traditional knowledge, and strengthening regional networking

3(d) Methodological fast-track assessment on values of biodiversity and ecosystem services by March 2015

3(e) Policy support tools on value, valuation and accounting further elaborate and/or developed

Add under deliverable 3(e): A series of capacity building activities in each of the five United Nations regions, including training courses on tools and methodologies, specifically targeted methodological workshops on issues including indicators and inventory of all data already available but published in native languages or based on indigenous and traditional knowledge, and strengthening regional networking

Add the following deliverables under Objective 3:

1. Methodological fast-track assessment of direct and underlying causes of biodiversity loss at different scales;

2. *Development of policy support tools on holistic, comprehensive and sustainable management of biodiversity and life systems, including strengthening the collective action of indigenous peoples and local populations;*
3. *Study on the relationship between biodiversity loss and poverty;*
4. *Identification and capacity building in the use of social and natural science methodologies;*
5. *Assessment of the links between flows of ecosystem services and human well-being under different socio-economic conditions;*
6. *Develop strategies to support governments in building awareness and capacity on the science-policy interface;*
7. *A series of capacity building activities, where appropriate, in each of the five United Nations regions, including training courses on tools and methodologies, specifically targeted methodological workshops on issues including indicators and inventory of all data already available but published in native languages or based on indigenous and traditional knowledge, and strengthening regional networking.*

Objective 4

Strengthen the knowledge-policy interface on global dimensions of changes in biodiversity and ecosystem services

- rolling out a global assessment on biodiversity and ecosystem services

Deliverables

4(a) A global biodiversity and ecosystem services assessment on drivers and pressures; status and trends; impacts on human well-being; and the effectiveness of responses, including of the Aichi targets

Add the following deliverable under Objective 4:

A series of capacity building activities, where appropriate, in each of the five United Nations regions, including training courses on tools and methodologies, specifically targeted methodological workshops on issues including indicators and inventory of all data already available but published in native languages or based on indigenous and traditional knowledge, and strengthening regional networking

Objective 5

Communicate and evaluate IPBES activities

- reaching out to users of IPBES deliverables and evaluating the usefulness and relevance to a range of stakeholders

Objective 5 - Deliverables

5(a) Catalogue of relevant assessments - existing

5(b) Catalogue of accessible policy support tools - new

5(c) A set of communication, outreach and engagement products and processes, including a dynamic IPBES website, on IPBES activities, deliverables and findings

5(d) Reviews of the effectiveness of guidance, procedures, methods and approaches by 2018 in order to inform the future development of the Platform

Add the following deliverables under Objective 5:

1. *A new deliverable specifically on outreach and communication;*
2. *An assessment of biodiversity awareness in all regions;*
3. *Development of indicators to monitor the impact of IPBES, in particular with respect to how outputs of the platform are being used by stakeholders;*
4. *A series of capacity building activities, where appropriate, in each of the five United Nations regions, including training courses on tools and methodologies, specifically targeted methodological workshops on issues including indicators and inventory of all data already available but published in native languages or based on indigenous and traditional knowledge, and strengthening regional networking*

Annex 4

Capacity Building Questionnaires



NORWEGIAN DIRECTORATE
FOR NATURE MANAGEMENT

IPBES and capacity building

An informal exploration of capacity building needs and options

UNDP, the UNEP World Conservation Monitoring Centre and the Norwegian Directorate for Nature Management are working together to support discussion on IPBES and capacity building. This is not a formal part of the IPBES process, but part of a collaborative effort by three interested organizations to building understanding of related capacity building needs and the support tools that will be needed to address them.

The *aim of this questionnaire* is to further explore key capacity building needs for improving the science-policy interface with respect to biodiversity and ecosystem services, building on what has already been learnt from submissions made by Governments and other stakeholders.

In responding to the questions below *we do not expect substantial detail*, but rather ‘bullet point’ indications of barriers, needs and responses. If more detail is needed in order to understand your comments, we will contact you, and this is the only reason we need your contact details. Any report that we write up on the results of this questionnaire will reflect trends in the answers and will not attribute comments to countries, individuals or organizations.

Finally, please complete this questionnaire based on *your own experience* or that of your organization. We are trying to move away from generic statements and ‘wish lists’ to practical needs and responses based on the experience of individuals working in this area.

Name and country of the person completing questionnaire:	
Type of organization that you work within:	
Contact information in case we need further detail:	
1. What factors are limiting the effective use of science and other forms of knowledge in decision making?	
Capacity: In what areas does your own capacity or that of your institution need to be developed so as to better support decision making?	

<p><u>Process</u>: Are there related improvements that could be made in the ways that activities are carried out by your institution or others?</p>	
<p><u>Knowledge</u>: Are key knowledge or information gaps a major issue, or your ability to access existing information and knowledge?</p>	
<p>2. If these limiting factors are already known, why do you think that they have not yet been fully addressed?</p>	
<p><u>Capacity</u>: If current capacity is insufficient, are there any underlying reasons why this is the case?</p>	
<p><u>Process</u>: If existing processes and procedures are not effective, why have these have not been addressed?</p>	
<p><u>Knowledge</u>: If there are known information and knowledge gaps and barriers, are there reasons why these have not been addressed?</p>	
<p>3. What types of external support do you need in order to in order to improve the use of science and other forms of knowledge in decision making, whether for policy development or implementation on the ground?</p>	
<p>4. Which other organizations are you working with in order to improve the use of science and other forms of knowledge in decision making and implementation, both those from your country and from elsewhere?</p>	
<p>5. What experience do you have that you could share with others in order to improve the use of science and other forms of knowledge in decision making and implementation?</p>	

Additional questions added by GRULAC MEP members to reflect particularities of our region**6. Country's biodiversity knowledge.**

6.1 - Estimate the percentage of the country's biodiversity that is known/described

- < 25% 25-50% 50-75% 75 – 100%

6.2 - Which is/are the country's biome/ecoregion most endangered?

6.3 What is/are the main pressure on biodiversity and ecosystem services loss?

6.4 Does the country have an Official List of Species? YES No

6.5 Does the country have an Official List of Endangered Species? YES No

6.6 Does the country have a List of Invasive Species? YES No

7. Please prioritize from 1 to 5 the list below, having as number 1 the main problem/bottleneck to increase the biodiversity knowledge.

- Number of trained taxonomists
- Infrastructure of Biological Collections
- Biodiversity Bioinformatics Infrastructure
- Biodiversity Bioinformatics Personnel
- Difficult access to specialized literature (books & journals)

8) Biodiversity protection

8.1 - What is the percentage of each of the country's biome/ecoregion within Protected Areas?

8.2 - What is the percentage of the country's Marine Protected Areas?

8.3 - What are the country's categories of Protected Areas

8.4 - The country has specific Action Plans for protecting Endangered Species?

**Capacity Building and IPBES
Latin America and Caribbean Regional IPBES Consultation Meeting
São Paulo, Brazil 11 to 13 July 2013**

Background

(Adapted from: *National Capacity Self Assessments-a resource kit; UNDP 2004*)

The functions to be performed in order to meet the requirements for the management of biodiversity and ecosystem services can be grouped as follows:

- organizing and formulating policies, legislations, strategies and programmes;
- implementing and enforcing policies, legislations and strategies, often through projects, notably by mobilising and managing all required resources;
- building consensus and partnerships among all stakeholders;
- mobilizing information and knowledge;
- monitoring, evaluating, reporting and learning.

Countries require capacity to be able to perform the above functions; it requires a complex composition of effective individuals, effective institutions and an appropriate enabling environment. In other words, if the country has the appropriate individuals, working effectively in the appropriate institutions, within the appropriate system, then it will be able to perform all the necessary functions to manage biodiversity and ecosystem services.

Capacity development is a process of change through which the system, institutions and individuals are strengthened in order to better perform the capacity functions. Capacity development in this context is defined as the process by which individuals, institutions and social systems increase their capacities and performance in relation to meeting each of the requirements for management of biodiversity and ecosystem services. Capacity development directly increases ability to meet requirements under the IPBES.

- At the individual level, capacity development refers to the process of changing attitudes and behaviours, most frequently through imparting knowledge and developing skills through training. However it also involves learning by doing, participation, ownership, and processes associated with increasing performance through changes in management, motivation, morale, and levels of accountability and responsibility;
- Capacity development at the institutional level focuses on the overall performance and functioning capabilities of an institution. This includes developing the mandates, the tools, the guidelines and the information management systems for the institution. It aims to develop its constituent individuals and groups, as well as its relationship to the outside. Institutions can be governmental or non-governmental, local or national, and formal or informal;
- At the systemic level, capacity development is concerned with the creation of “enabling environments”, i.e. the overall policy, economic, regulatory, and accountability frameworks within which institutions and individuals operate. Relationships and processes between institutions, both formal and informal, are also important.

Questionnaire on Capacity Building

(Adapted from: *National Capacity Self Assessments-a resource kit; UNDP 2004*)

The *aim of this questionnaire* is to further explore key capacity building needs for improving the science-policy interface with respect to biodiversity and ecosystem services, building on what has already been learnt from submissions made by Governments and other stakeholders. In responding to the questions below *we do not expect substantial detail*, but rather ‘bullet point’ indications of barriers, needs and responses. Please complete this questionnaire based on *your own experience* or that of your organization. We are trying to move away from generic statements and ‘wish lists’ to practical needs and responses based on the experience of individuals working in this area.

Name and country of the person completing questionnaire:	
Type of organization that you work within:	
Contact information in case we need further detail:	
Assessing Capacity Constraints at the Systemic Level - Capacity building at the systemic level emphasises the overall policy framework in which individuals and organisations operate and interact with the external environment, as well as the formal and informal relationships of institutions.	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Policy framework:</i> Is the country’s overall policy environment supportive of biodiversity and ecosystem services? Is the value of biodiversity and ecosystem services fully recognised by all sectors of the economy? If no, what is needed? 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Legal and regulatory framework:</i> Is the appropriate legislation in place and are these laws effectively enforced? (These may be both formal and informal, such as cultural practices). If no, what is needed? 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Management accountability framework:</i> Are institutional responsibilities clearly defined and are responsible institutions held publicly accountable? If no, what is needed? 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Economic framework:</i> Has current economic challenges reduced the allocation of resources to your institution for biodiversity and ecosystem services management? 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Systems level resources:</i> Are the required human, financial and information resources available? (These may be in any or all of national and local government, private sector, and civil society – including NGO’s). If no, what is needed? 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Processes and relationships:</i> Do the different institutions and processes interact and work together effectively? (Including national and local government, private sector, and civil society). If no, what is needed? 	
Assessing Capacity Constraints at the Institutional Level - Capacity building at the <i>institutional</i> level focuses on the overall organisational performance and functioning capabilities, as well as the ability of an organisation to adapt to change. It aims to develop the institution as a total system, including individuals, groups and the organisation itself.	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Mission/strategic management</i>: Do the institutions have clearly defined and understood missions and mandates? If no, what is needed? 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Culture/structure/competencies</i>: Are the institutions effectively structured and managed? If no, what is needed? 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Processes</i>: Do institutional processes such as planning, quality management, monitoring and evaluation, work effectively? If no, what is needed? 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Human resources</i>: Are the human resources adequate, sufficiently skilled, and appropriately deployed? If no, what is needed? 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Financial resources</i>: Are financial resources managed effectively and allocated appropriately to enable effective operation? If no, what is needed? 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Information resources</i>: Is required information available, easily accessed, managed and effectively distributed? Is the biodiversity bioinformatics system in place and utilised? Is traditional knowledge utilised in decision making? If no, what is needed? 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Infrastructure</i>: Are material requirements such as buildings, offices, vehicles, computers, allocated appropriately and managed effectively? If no, what is needed? 	
<p>Assessing Capacity Constraints at the Individual Level - Capacity building at the <i>individual</i> level refers to the process of changing attitudes and behaviours - imparting knowledge and developing skills while maximising the benefits of participation, knowledge exchange and ownership.</p>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Job requirements and skill levels</i>: Are jobs correctly defined; are the required skills available at your institution? If no, what is needed? 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Training/retraining</i>: Is the current level of trained staff appropriate? Are opportunities for retraining/further training utilised? If no, what is needed? 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Accountability/ethics</i>: Is responsibility effectively delegated and are individuals held accountable? If no, what is needed? 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Access to information</i>: Is there adequate and timely access to needed information? If no, what is needed? 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Personal/professional networking</i>: Are individuals in contact and exchanging knowledge and experiences with appropriate peers? If no, what is needed? 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Performance/conduct</i>: Is performance effectively measured or evaluated? Are there active attempts to guide and improve performance of staff? If no, what is needed? 	

Biodiversity/Ecosystem Specific Questions**1. Country's biodiversity knowledge:**

1.1 - Estimate the percentage of the country's biodiversity that is known/described

- < 25% 25-50% 50-75% 75 – 100%

a. - Which is/are the country's most endangered ecosystems?

b. What is/are the main pressure on biodiversity and ecosystem services loss?

c. Has your country an Official List of Species? YES No

d. Has your country an Official List of Endangered Species? YES No

e. Has your country a List of Invasive Species? YES No

2. Please prioritize from 1 to 5 the list below, having as number 1 the main problem/bottleneck to increase biodiversity knowledge:

- Number of trained taxonomists
- Infrastructure for Biological Collections
- Biodiversity Bioinformatics Infrastructure
- Biodiversity Bioinformatics Personnel
- Difficult access to specialized literature (books & journals)

3. Biodiversity protection

3.1 - What is the percentage of each of your country's ecosystem within Protected Areas?

3.2 - What is the percentage of the country's Marine Protected Areas?

3.3 - What are the country's categories of Protected Areas?

3.4 – Has your country specific Action Plans for protecting Endangered/Threatened Species?