

IPBES template for the submission of requests, inputs and suggestions on short-term priorities and longer term strategic needs that require attention and action by IPBES as part of its future work programme.

Name and contact details of individual submitting requests/inputs/suggestions: [André Mader](#).

Email: mader@iges.or.jp.

Date of submission: [29 September 2018](#)

Submission from: IPBES member: _____

Observer allowed enhanced participation in line with decision IPBES-5/4:

MEA(s): _____

United Nations body: _____

Expert on, and holder of, indigenous and local knowledge: _____

Other Stakeholder(s): [Institute for Global Environmental Strategies](#)

Please provide the following information for any request and, where relevant, for any inputs and suggestions (additional attachments can also be submitted):

Request/input/suggestion: [Minimise overlap between IPBES assessments.](#) The IPBES regional assessments provide an extremely valuable knowledge foundation. Their subject matter, however, overlaps with that of the thematic and global assessments. The regional assessments, furthermore, risk insulating information within regions, whose boundaries do not correspond well with national priorities. Though variable across the globe, national priorities are roughly as likely to apply across regions as they are within them. Thematic assessments cover topics in greater depth, even though they are conducted at the global level, and they explicitly consider the planet as a whole. Decision-makers are, furthermore, more likely to seek information by theme than by region. This suggestion is, therefore, to focus scarce financial and human resources on thematic and global assessments, rather than repeating regional assessments in future work programmes.

Information to accompany requests submitted to the Platform (see also Decision IPBES-1/3 Procedure for receiving and prioritizing requests put to the Platform):	
1.	Relevance to the objective, functions and work programme of IPBES: As assessments are at the core of IPBES' utility, efficiency and quality of their design is relevant to IPBES at many levels
2.	Urgency of action by IPBES in the light of the imminence of the risks caused by the issues to be addressed by such action: Dependent on the timing to determine follow-up assessments and scheduling of future assessments

3.	Relevance of the requested action in addressing specific policies or processes: Relevant to the IPBES assessment design process
4.	Geographic scope of the requested action, as well as issues to be covered by such action: Global
5.	Anticipated level of complexity of the issues to be addressed by the requested action: Simple, although evidence of the existing overlap, as well as the expense (financial and otherwise) would have to clearly demonstrated for member States to agree
6.	Previous work and existing initiatives of a similar nature and evidence of remaining gaps, such as the absence or limited availability of information and tools to address the issues, and reasons why IPBES is best suited to take action: Some assessment processes (e.g. IPCC, MEA, World Ocean Assessment) have taken the route of overlapping thematic and regional assessments. Others, however, focus on global-level only reporting, encouraging or even undertaking matching assessment at the <i>national</i>-level. These include UNISDR's Global Assessment Report on disaster risk and risk management, the CBD's Global Biodiversity Outlook, and FAO's Global Forest Resources Assessments (which switched from regional to global in the 1970s)
7.	Availability of scientific literature and expertise for IPBES to undertake the requested action: Not applicable but please see answer to question 6
8.	Scale of the potential impacts, and potential beneficiaries of the requested action: Global
9.	Requirements for financial and human resources, and potential duration of the requested action: Additional resources not applicable - likely to result in reduced costs. Suggested duration: ongoing/continuous
10.	An identification of priorities within multiple requests submitted: Medium
11.	Any other relevant information (including a list of any attachments provided):

IPBES template for the submission of requests, inputs and suggestions on short-term priorities and longer term strategic needs that require attention and action by IPBES as part of its future work programme.

Name and contact details of individual submitting requests/inputs/suggestions: [André Mader](#).

Email: mader@iges.or.jp.

Date of submission: [29 September 2018](#)

Submission from: IPBES member: _____

Observer allowed enhanced participation in line with decision IPBES-5/4:

MEA(s): _____

United Nations body: _____

Expert on, and holder of, indigenous and local knowledge: _____

Other Stakeholder(s): [Institute for Global Environmental Strategies](#)

Please provide the following information for any request and, where relevant, for any inputs and suggestions (additional attachments can also be submitted):

Request/input/suggestion: [Schedule follow-ups of completed assessments](#). It is suggested that a schedule of follow-up assessments be clarified and built into future work programmes. For example, the second work programme will end more than five years after the pollination assessment was completed, and five years might be a reasonable interval between assessments to assess progress or lack thereof.

Information to accompany requests submitted to the Platform (see also Decision IPBES-1/3 Procedure for receiving and prioritizing requests put to the Platform):	
1.	Relevance to the objective, functions and work programme of IPBES: Relevant to the extent that assessments are relevant to IPBES (i.e. very relevant)
2.	Urgency of action by IPBES in the light of the imminence of the risks caused by the issues to be addressed by such action: Low. However, for those assessments that were completed first, a follow-up during the second work programme might be considered appropriate
3.	Relevance of the requested action in addressing specific policies or processes: Relevant to the extent that assessments are relevant to IPBES (i.e. very relevant)
4.	Geographic scope of the requested action, as well as issues to be covered by such action: Global .
5.	Anticipated level of complexity of the issues to be addressed by the requested action: Simple .
6.	Previous work and existing initiatives of a similar nature and evidence of remaining gaps, such as the absence or limited availability of information and tools to address the issues, and

	reasons why IPBES is best suited to take action: Various other assessment reports such as IPCC reports, GBO, GEO, etc, have follow-ups, the frequencies of which could be considered in informing the frequency of IPBES assessment follow-ups
7.	Availability of scientific literature and expertise for IPBES to undertake the requested action: Not applicable
8.	Scale of the potential impacts, and potential beneficiaries of the requested action: Global
9.	Requirements for financial and human resources, and potential duration of the requested action: Resources dependent on member States' prioritisation/balance between new assessment sand follow-up assessments. Suggested duration ongong/continuous
10.	An identification of priorities within multiple requests submitted: Medium
11.	Any other relevant information (including a list of any attachments provided):

IPBES template for the submission of requests, inputs and suggestions on short-term priorities and longer term strategic needs that require attention and action by IPBES as part of its future work programme.

Name and contact details of individual submitting requests/inputs/suggestions: [Yasuo Takahashi](#). Email: yasuo.takahashi@iges.or.jp

Date of submission: [29 September 2018](#)

Submission from: IPBES member: _____

Observer allowed enhanced participation in line with decision IPBES-5/4:

MEA(s): _____

United Nations body: _____

Expert on, and holder of, indigenous and local knowledge: _____

Other Stakeholder(s): [Institute for Global Environmental Strategies](#)

Please provide the following information for any request and, where relevant, for any inputs and suggestions (additional attachments can also be submitted):

Request/input/suggestion: [Set up a robust mechanism to encourage cross-scale integration in IPBES assessments particularly from smaller to larger scales](#). The IPBES secretariat's efforts to articulate some ideas for the second work programme in document IPBES/6/11, "Initial draft elements for a second work programme" is highly appreciated. In paragraph 21 "*a single assessment that integrates the regional and global components*" is suggested. This could be a rational approach to address the challenges faced by the regional and global assessments and the efforts for their integration encountered for the first work programme. There may, however, be the possibility of an overly top-down approach to scaled integration in the proposed integrated global and regional assessments, e.g. heavy reliance on global indicators and on downscaling global scenarios and models that do not necessary represent national and local realities. With this in mind, we would suggest to IPBES to set up a robust mechanism to encourage bottom-up approach to scale integration, e.g. through setting up an expert group on landscape approach and regional/sub-regional nodes that collaborate with the TSU for the global assessment for the delivery of its works.

Information to accompany requests submitted to the Platform (see also Decision IPBES-1/3 Procedure for receiving and prioritizing requests put to the Platform):	
1.	Relevance to the objective, functions and work programme of IPBES: The suggestion is to strengthen IPBES's global assessment in line with what it envisages in the conceptual framework, i.e. cross-scale knowledge integration

2.	Urgency of action by IPBES in the light of the imminence of the risks caused by the issues to be addressed by such action: The request is to strengthen an integrated global/regional assessment proposed for its second work programme. The request would be quite urgent, not to lose cross-scale point of view in the assessments to be delivered in the IPBES second work programme.
3.	Relevance of the requested action in addressing specific policies or processes: The request is particularly important to make the IPBES's assessments relevant to national, sub-national and local policies for biodiversity conservation and mainstreaming.
4.	Geographic scope of the requested action, as well as issues to be covered by such action: The request assumes global scope, while the resolution of the unit of analysis (e.g. landscapes, seascapes at municipality or sub-national level) can be determined in due course. The scope of the experts can be narrowed down to the areas that have not been effectively represented by global indicators or other expert groups, e.g. production landscapes and seascapes.
5.	Anticipated level of complexity of the issues to be addressed by the requested action: Relatively high level of complexity is expected: e.g. particularly in conducting a meta-analysis of local- or subnational-scale human-nature interactions, that are highly variable and inherently context dependent, to draw globally relevant implications.
6.	Previous work and existing initiatives of a similar nature and evidence of remaining gaps, such as the absence or limited availability of information and tools to address the issues, and reasons why IPBES is best suited to take action: IPBES' first work programme invested significant efforts in knowledge and cross-scale integration in its deliverables, but findings from local and sub-national scales largely ended up in boxes in the Chapter text, with very limited representation in their SPMs. On the other hand, global scale scenarios and modelling were downscaled to regional and sub-regional scales with very limited relevance to the real-world policy making. Such gaps can be closed by ensuring a robust mechanism for encouraging bottom-up approach to cross-scale integration. Satoyama Initiative, established at CBD/COP-10 under the auspices of CBD and led by the Japanese Government, has developed a community of practitioners that would be capable of supporting such activities.
7.	Availability of scientific literature and expertise for IPBES to undertake the requested action: Increasing number of academic journal articles on socio-ecological systems in past one decade. A large number of landscape/seascape-level case studies are available, in forms usable for a scientific meta-analysis.
8.	Scale of the potential impacts, and potential beneficiaries of the requested action: Increased credibility, relevance and legitimacy of the findings provided in the IPBES assessment reports, particularly for national, sub-national and local governments.
9.	Requirements for financial and human resources, and potential duration of the requested action: Desirable throughout the entire period of the second work programme, but can be limited to the most important stage of the production of the global/regional integrated assessment upon resource availability. One taskforce of experts, supported by a small TSU, can be desirable.
10.	An identification of priorities within multiple requests submitted: Medium
11.	Any other relevant information (including a list of any attachments provided):

IPBES template for the submission of requests, inputs and suggestions on short-term priorities and longer term strategic needs that require attention and action by IPBES as part of its future work programme.

Name and contact details of individual submitting requests/inputs/suggestions: [Henry Scheyvens](#). Email: scheyvens@iges.or.jp.

Date of submission: [29 September 2018](#)

Submission from: IPBES member: _____

Observer allowed enhanced participation in line with decision IPBES-5/4:

MEA(s): _____

United Nations body: _____

Expert on, and holder of, indigenous and local knowledge: _____

Other Stakeholder(s): [Institute for Global Environmental Strategies](#)

Please provide the following information for any request and, where relevant, for any inputs and suggestions (additional attachments can also be submitted):

Request/input/suggestion: [Strengthen processes to incorporate indigenous and local knowledge \(ILK\) into assessments by means of thorough assessment of first work programme.](#) The incorporation of ILK into assessments is a distinguishing feature of IPBES. Bringing ILK and scientific knowledge together in assessments is not an easy task. Much can be learnt by reviewing how IPBES engaged with ILK in its first work programme. A review of these processes reflecting on the methods of engagement with ILK knowledge holders, incorporation of ILK into assessments, and follow-up/feedback with the knowledge holders is likely to yield important ideas for strengthening processes in future work programmes.

Information to accompany requests submitted to the Platform (see also Decision IPBES-1/3 Procedure for receiving and prioritizing requests put to the Platform):	
1.	Relevance to the objective, functions and work programme of IPBES: In IPBES document IPBES/MEP-Bureau/11/12 “Development of a second work programme” Annex II Guiding questions sent to receive input on the draft strategic framework include 2.4 Indigenous and local knowledge (ILK). How could the work with ILK be further improved to implement the approach?
2.	Urgency of action by IPBES in the light of the imminence of the risks caused by the issues to be addressed by such action: Not highly urgent but should be conducted in an early phase of the work programme to inform later work

3.	Relevance of the requested action in addressing specific policies or processes: Aimed at strengthening the second work programme. Will also yield important ideas for how any process can engage successfully with ILK in assessments.
4.	Geographic scope of the requested action, as well as issues to be covered by such action: Regional and global
5.	Anticipated level of complexity of the issues to be addressed by the requested action: Medium level of complexity. Review process can be led by ILK Task Force.
6.	Previous work and existing initiatives of a similar nature and evidence of remaining gaps, such as the absence or limited availability of information and tools to address the issues, and reasons why IPBES is best suited to take action: No review conducted of IPBES processes to engage with ILK and ILK knowledge holders under the first work programme.
7.	Availability of scientific literature and expertise for IPBES to undertake the requested action: Review of approach and experiences during the first work programme, so scientific literature not so relevant to this exercise. Relevant expertise exists in ILK task force and can be tapped from IPBES network of ILK experts.
8.	Scale of the potential impacts, and potential beneficiaries of the requested action: The direct beneficiary is IPBES itself, i.e. anticipated outcome is more effective engagement with ILK and ILK knowledge holders under the second work programme.
9.	Requirements for financial and human resources, and potential duration of the requested action: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Desirable to have several ILK experts – women and men from different regions. Anticipate voluntary time contribution by IPBES ILK experts. - Several meetings of review team would be required over several months. Costs could be reduced by having these timed with other IPBES events. - Review methodology: Costs could be reduced by conducting online surveys and interviews, rather than face-to-face meetings with ILK knowledge holders who participated in the first work programme (and other ILK knowledge holders who maybe should have participated).
10.	An identification of priorities within multiple requests submitted: Medium
11.	Any other relevant information (including a list of any attachments provided):

IPBES template for the submission of requests, inputs and suggestions on short-term priorities and longer term strategic needs that require attention and action by IPBES as part of its future work programme.

Name and contact details of individual submitting requests/inputs/suggestions: [André Mader](#).

Email: mader@iges.or.jp.

Date of submission: [29 September 2018](#)

Submission from: IPBES member: _____

Observer allowed enhanced participation in line with decision IPBES-5/4:

MEA(s): _____

United Nations body: _____

Expert on, and holder of, indigenous and local knowledge: _____

Other Stakeholder(s): [Institute for Global Environmental Strategies](#)

Please provide the following information for any request and, where relevant, for any inputs and suggestions (additional attachments can also be submitted):

Request/input/suggestion: [Adjust IPBES assessment report authorship status be partially dependent on authors' contributions.](#) In completed assessment reports some contributing authors noted having contributed considerably more than some lead authors. If there is some flexibility to change an author's status (particularly between lead author and contributing author) dependent on their contribution after the assessment report has been completed, strong contributions (and therefore a better product) would be incentivised. It is acknowledged that there are procedural challenges to such a change, but equally acknowledged that the quality of the assessment is paramount.

Information to accompany requests submitted to the Platform (see also Decision IPBES-1/3 Procedure for receiving and prioritizing requests put to the Platform):	
1.	Relevance to the objective, functions and work programme of IPBES: Improvement of the quality of the IPBES assessment process and outcomes
2.	Urgency of action by IPBES in the light of the imminence of the risks caused by the issues to be addressed by such action: Low urgency
3.	Relevance of the requested action in addressing specific policies or processes: Relevant only within the assessment process. No direct bearing on policy
4.	Geographic scope of the requested action, as well as issues to be covered by such action: Global and restricted only by the scope of the assessments themselves

5.	Anticipated level of complexity of the issues to be addressed by the requested action: Medium. It is quite conceivable that authors who are not benefitted, and their nominators, may protest. Furthermore, contributing authors would have to be retroactively nominated at a late stage in order to become lead authors
6.	Previous work and existing initiatives of a similar nature and evidence of remaining gaps, such as the absence or limited availability of information and tools to address the issues, and reasons why IPBES is best suited to take action: Unknown
7.	Availability of scientific literature and expertise for IPBES to undertake the requested action: Not applicable
8.	Scale of the potential impacts, and potential beneficiaries of the requested action: Global and restricted only by the scope of the assessments themselves
9.	Requirements for financial and human resources, and potential duration of the requested action: None. Purely a procedural adjustment, which would require noting in the relevant IPBES decision on review of the Platform. Duration would be ongoing
10.	An identification of priorities within multiple requests submitted: Low
11.	Any other relevant information (including a list of any attachments provided):

IPBES template for the submission of requests, inputs and suggestions on short-term priorities and longer term strategic needs that require attention and action by IPBES as part of its future work programme.

Name and contact details of individual submitting requests/inputs/suggestions: [André Mader](#).

Email: mader@iges.or.jp.

Date of submission: [29 September 2018](#)

Submission from: IPBES member: _____

Observer allowed enhanced participation in line with decision IPBES-5/4:

MEA(s): _____

United Nations body: _____

Expert on, and holder of, indigenous and local knowledge: _____

Other Stakeholder(s): [Institute for Global Environmental Strategies](#)

Please provide the following information for any request and, where relevant, for any inputs and suggestions (additional attachments can also be submitted):

Request/input/suggestion: [Allow more time at sessions of the Plenary, and more time between sessions of the Plenary.](#) Despite excellent organization by the secretariat, IPBES Plenaries have frequently struggled to finish on time, requiring delegations – especially small ones - to work unpleasantly and unproductively long hours, potentially affecting the quality of negotiations. The timely availability of documentation (both pre-session and in-session) has, furthermore, been expressed as a concern. Slightly longer sessions of the Plenary and a longer interval between Plenaries (18 to 24 months), therefore, seems worthy of consideration.

Information to accompany requests submitted to the Platform (see also Decision IPBES-1/3 Procedure for receiving and prioritizing requests put to the Platform):	
1.	Relevance to the objective, functions and work programme of IPBES: Underlies all objectives, functions and the work programme of IPBES as it may have a bearing on the quality of decisions that shape all of these elements
2.	Urgency of action by IPBES in the light of the imminence of the risks caused by the issues to be addressed by such action: Medium, if such changes can be decided upon at IPBES-7
3.	Relevance of the requested action in addressing specific policies or processes: Underlies all policies or processes, as it may have a bearing on the quality of IPBES decisions
4.	Geographic scope of the requested action, as well as issues to be covered by such action: Global, as it may have a bearing on the quality of IPBES decisions

5.	Anticipated level of complexity of the issues to be addressed by the requested action: Simple, but requiring agreement by all member States
6.	Previous work and existing initiatives of a similar nature and evidence of remaining gaps, such as the absence or limited availability of information and tools to address the issues, and reasons why IPBES is best suited to take action: The proposal tends towards the style adopted by meetings of the Conference of the Parties to the CBD and other multilateral environmental agreements
7.	Availability of scientific literature and expertise for IPBES to undertake the requested action: The proposal tends towards the style adopted by meetings of the Conference of the Parties to the CBD and other multilateral environmental agreements
8.	Scale of the potential impacts, and potential beneficiaries of the requested action: Global, as it may have a bearing on the quality of IPBES decisions
9.	Requirements for financial and human resources, and potential duration of the requested action: None. It is likely to reduce the need for these resources. Duration would be potentially ongoing
10.	An identification of priorities within multiple requests submitted: High
11.	Any other relevant information (including a list of any attachments provided):

IPBES template for the submission of requests, inputs and suggestions on short-term priorities and longer term strategic needs that require attention and action by IPBES as part of its future work programme.

Name and contact details of individual submitting requests/inputs/suggestions: [André Mader](#).

Email: mader@iges.or.jp.

Date of submission: [29 September 2018](#)

Submission from: IPBES member: _____

Observer allowed enhanced participation in line with decision IPBES-5/4:

MEA(s): _____

United Nations body: _____

Expert on, and holder of, indigenous and local knowledge: _____

Other Stakeholder(s): [Institute for Global Environmental Strategies](#)

Please provide the following information for any request and, where relevant, for any inputs and suggestions (additional attachments can also be submitted):

Request/input/suggestion: [Incorporate uptake of assessment findings more explicitly and formally into assessment design.](#) It is suggested to investigate ways to formalise the process of decision-maker consultations and focus on involving various sectors within, and beyond, national government.

Information to accompany requests submitted to the Platform (see also Decision IPBES-1/3 Procedure for receiving and prioritizing requests put to the Platform):	
1.	Relevance to the objective, functions and work programme of IPBES: Direct relevance
2.	Urgency of action by IPBES in the light of the imminence of the risks caused by the issues to be addressed by such action: Medium urgency
3.	Relevance of the requested action in addressing specific policies or processes: Relevant at the broad scale of informing policymakers, preferably cross sectors
4.	Geographic scope of the requested action, as well as issues to be covered by such action: Global
5.	Anticipated level of complexity of the issues to be addressed by the requested action: Simple but not easy, especially with regard to getting the required decision-makers to the table
6.	Previous work and existing initiatives of a similar nature and evidence of remaining gaps, such as the absence or limited availability of information and tools to address the issues, and reasons why IPBES is best suited to take action: Not studied

7.	Availability of scientific literature and expertise for IPBES to undertake the requested action: None that I am aware of, but this may not be necessary and there is, of course, much literature on the science/policy interface and its importance
8.	Scale of the potential impacts, and potential beneficiaries of the requested action: Global
9.	Requirements for financial and human resources, and potential duration of the requested action: Quite substantial financial and human resource requirements, justified by the fact that the assessment reports are useful only if used, and more useful if used across sectors
10.	An identification of priorities within multiple requests submitted: High priority
11.	Any other relevant information (including a list of any attachments provided):