

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:

Date of submission: October 08, 2018

Submission from: IPBES member: Mexico

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): _____

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

GENERAL COMMENTS

The construction of a second work programme needs to take into consideration the vision of IPBES for the following years and particularly, how the members visualize IPBES in the short, medium and long term.

It will also be crucial to assess the impacts of the four functions (in terms their correct operation, and improvements along the road), as well as to consider the experience and lessons learned from the design and implementation of the first programme of work.

Some specific recommendations and identified needs for the development of the second work programme, based on relevant experiences within the first programme of work and the current international context and needs, include:

FUNCTIONS

Function 1: Assessments

- Ensure scientific independence.
- Improve and make more streamline the process to nominate experts.
- Improve the balance and effective participation of experts from all regions, including improving the mechanisms for communication among team participants, and the inclusion of relevant information in a regionally balanced manner.
- Improve the internal decision making processes (streamline relations between CCs, CLAs, LAs and conciliation of diverse positions, ensure more fluid and constant interactions)
- Use factual language in SPMs to convey a clear message that invites to take action.

- Strengthen the dialogue between experts and delegates for a better understanding of scientific findings for the adoption of text of SPMs.
- Connect with a broader public and promote the use of IPBES deliverables beyond policy and decision makers, emphasizing facts, trends and options.
- Promote applicability of IPBES deliverables at the local level and review their usefulness.

Function 2: New Knowledge

- Promote the establishment and use of diverse platforms to gather and access new information from various sources.
- Identify information gaps and needs to produce knowledge to address specific priorities (eg. top problems faced by Ministers).
- Consider the value of grey literature.
- Invest in generation of knowledge to address particular identified needs of knowledge.
- Cover gaps of knowledge identified in previously approved IPBES assessments.
- Identify new information needed to address causes of biodiversity loss, particularly uncovered issues such as pollution.
- Develop a conceptual and operational framework and indicators to measure “good quality of life”.

Function 3: Policy tools

- Identify who uses existing tools and usefulness.
- Identify opportunities for improvement.
- Identify needs for new tools.
- Feed the catalogue with best practices.

Function 4: Capacity Building

- Identify specific capacity needs and address them, to support the development of national/local assessments with the IPBES scope.
- Based on identified tools and assessments, design capacity building programmes to cover gaps.
- Develop activities to share IPBES deliverables at different scales and in different formats, for stakeholders to use them and make them “their own”.

MAINSTREAMING

- Promote and strengthen the collaboration with other sectors and stakeholders to ensure biodiversity mainstreaming (beyond the environmental sector) in IPBES deliverables, contributing to the development of cross-sectoral policy-making with a holistic approach.
- Disseminate IPBES deliverables suited to different audiences beyond the environmental sector and promote their use by policy makers and practitioners in other sectors.

REVIEW OF THE PLATFORM

The second work programme must take into account the results of the Review of the Platform, particularly:

- Internal review:
 - Financial resource management and administration efficiency.
- External review:
 - Global and local impact and usefulness of IPBES deliverables.
 - Monitor efficiency of public awareness policy.
 - Emphasize lessons learned and opportunities.
 - Identify needs for new structures or interphases to downscale implementation of IPBES deliverables at regional or national levels.

STAKEHOLDERS

- Promote consultation models and mechanisms for early participation of IPLC, academy and other relevant stakeholders at national level in IPBES processes (such as topic selection for assessments and other deliverables) and inclusion of their knowledge and perspective in IPBES deliverables at multiple stages of the process.
- Respect multiple participation and views, and recognize their relevance, while taking into account the diverse contexts between countries and regions.

TASK FORCES

- Analyse the convenience to renew and amend mandates of the existing task forces and to define their temporality.
- Consider the creation of new task forces to address relevant needs identified by the new programme of work.

ROLLING PROGRAMME

- Develop the work agreed under the second programme of work, while remaining flexible to discuss and analyse the convenience to include new and emerging issues.
- Develop a process and clear criteria to determine and consider new and emerging issues.

INTERNATIONAL CONTEXT

- Alignment to Agenda 2030 and its SDGs.
- Alignment to the Post-2020 Biodiversity Framework and NBSAPs.
- Alignment to the Paris Agreement and NDCs.
- Collaboration with international organizations (such as FAO, WTO, WHO, UNEA, etc.) to promote biodiversity mainstreaming in other sectors as a permanent process (agriculture, forestry, fisheries, tourism, water, health, education, energy, etc.).
- Consideration and inclusion of needs and priorities of developing and megadiverse countries.

PROPOSED TOPICS TO BE INCLUDED IN THE 2ND WORK PROGRAMME

1. Assessment on pollution impacts on biodiversity, ecosystem services and well-being.
2. Task force on biodiversity mainstreaming and synergies to ensure a cross-sectoral/holistic approach in IPBES functions and deliverables.
3. Task force on monitoring systems and generation of timely, consistent and relevant data on biodiversity and its relation, linkages and interdependence with ecosystem services.

Request/input/suggestion: ASSESSMENT ON POLLUTION IMPACTS ON BIODIVERSITY, ECOSYSTEM SERVICES AND WELL-BEING

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: Pollution is globally recognized as one of the 5 main causes of biodiversity loss. Then it is urgent to assess the major impacts of pollution on biodiversity and ecosystem services while connecting the available information and existing efforts on pollution to biodiversity and ecosystem services (<i>IPBES function 2: new knowledge</i>), in order to provide policy-relevant knowledge foundations and options to halt and/or reduce its negative impacts while fostering biodiversity's conservation and sustainable use and maintaining or restoring ecosystem services essential for well-being (<i>IPBES objective</i>). Since pollution is impacting a wide range

	<p>of ecosystems (air, land, inland waters, coastal and marine), IPBES should decide which one to assess first based on priorities and enabling conditions to mainstream existing initiatives on pollution and biodiversity under a cause-effect-policy fashion to provide practical deliverables. In the first program of work, IPBES included thematic assessments (<i>IPBES function 1: assessments</i>) to partially address 3 of the 5 main causes of biodiversity loss: land degradation assessment (as part of habitat loss), invasive species assessment and overexploitation (through sustainable use assessment). It is therefore crucial for IPBES to address Pollution as the 4th global driver for a more comprehensive approach using indicators (<i>IPBES function 3: policy tools</i>) to measure positive trends on biodiversity, ecosystem services and well-being.</p>
2.	<p>Urgency of action by IPBES in the light of the imminence of the risks caused by the issues to be addressed by such action:</p> <p>There are many examples of negative impacts of pollution on species and ecosystems. However data available on pollution is extremely scarce and there is a lack of connection on cause-effect-policy, from productive sectors and biodiversity interactions including measures to address it on a practical fashion. The only good data series at national level for most countries are greenhouse gas emissions and Particulate Matter. Yet, the emission of toxic chemicals into the atmosphere, dissolved into water bodies and into the soil as well as dumping of soils, is not being monitored at most scales in most countries.</p> <p>Ecosystems and species are extremely vulnerable to pollution, even from natural sources, such as nitrogen and phosphorous used as nutrients for crop growth, and causing eutrophication in water systems, which according to the World Water Assessment Program (WWAP) of UNESCO, is the most prevalent water quality problem globally. The WWAP also states that despite improvements in some regions, water pollution is on the rise globally.</p> <p>According to the Global Biodiversity Outlook 4 (GBO4), nutrient pollution has stabilized in parts of Europe and North America but is projected to increase beyond 2020 in other regions (particularly Asia, South and Central America, and Sub-Saharan Africa) and remains a significant threat to aquatic and terrestrial biodiversity. GBO4 also states that other forms of pollution such as from chemicals, pesticides and plastics are increasing (Aichi Target 8). GBO4 highlights that even if some toxic contaminants of wildlife are declining in part due to successful international action, some other existing and newly-developed contaminants are still widely used. For example, other pollutants of continuing or growing concern include plastics, in particular their impacts on marine ecosystems, heavy metals, endocrine disrupters, pesticides, and pollution from pipelines. More than 60% of the national reports analysed for GBO4 indicate that countries are making progress towards achieving Aichi Target 8, with measures including reduction in the use of pesticides (Belgium), phasing out some harmful products (Mongolia) and putting pollution monitoring systems in place (Myanmar). However, trends are moving us further away from the target of bringing excess nutrients to levels not detrimental to ecosystem function and biodiversity. However, it is important to stress, that due to limited information, GBO4 could not evaluate overall trends regarding other forms of pollutants.</p> <p>According to FAO (Soil pollution: A Hidden Reality) oil pollution affects the food we eat, the water we drink, the air we breathe, the water we drink and the health of our ecosystems. FAO also acknowledges that agricultural intensification, industrial output and urbanisation continue at a rapid pace, and no systematic assessment of the status of soil pollution at global level has ever been undertaken. Regarding ocean pollution, we are facing a serious problem of plastic debris of over 8 million tons every year, which according to UN-Environment, will lead us to have more plastic bags than fish in the ocean by 2050 if we do not take action.</p>
3.	<p>Relevance of the requested action in addressing specific policies or processes:</p> <p>Pollution has been addressed in silos, whether by ecosystem (air, land, coastal and marine, etc.) or by type of pollutant (CO₂, plastic, coal, oil, heavy metals, pesticides, sewage waters, acid rain, etc.), and the topic needs to be addressed from a holistic approach in terms of global impacts on biodiversity and providing multidisciplinary and cross-cutting options.</p>
4.	<p>Geographic scope of the requested action, as well as issues to be covered by such action:</p>

	Global, regional, national and subnational scope. Issues to be covered: data availability, data gaps, legal and technical limitations to access to data and quality of the data, indirect drivers that lead to pollution, status and trends of land pollution, inland water pollution and ocean pollution; impacts on biodiversity; impacts on human-well being; cross-cutting issues; options.
5.	Anticipated level of complexity of the issues to be addressed by the requested action: Considering that this would be the first global assessment to address this issue from a broader perspective and that there are important information gaps, there are several articles, papers and publications on these types of pollution and their impacts that can be integrated into the assessment. The complexity of the assessment will depend on the scoping proposed by the experts and approved by the Plenary.
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 issue of pollution has been addressed by the academia, organisations, among others. However, the issue has been addressed by ecosystem or pollutant, rather than from a broader and holistic scope in terms of the impacts on biodiversity, and no global assessments have been developed. Thus, IPBES can conduct this assessment to cover pollution in land, inland water and oceans, from the perspective of impacts on biodiversity and guidance for policy-making.
7.	Availability of scientific literature and expertise for IPBES to undertake the requested action: Several scientific, academic, scholar and policy papers.
8.	Scale of the potential impacts, and potential beneficiaries of the requested action: Pollution is directly related to biodiversity conservation, water security, air quality, food production, infrastructure, and poverty eradication, among other issues addressed by the 2030 Agenda and its SDGs, as well as by other MEAs and international organisations such as the CBD, FAO, WHO, etc. This assessment would benefit policy makers, practitioners and entrepreneurs, in different sectors.
9.	Requirements for financial and human resources, and potential duration of the requested action: Similar financial and human requirements as other thematic assessments, based on the number of experts and time of duration of thematic assessment as agreed on the budget on IPBES-6.
10.	An identification of priorities within multiple requests submitted: 1
11.	Any other relevant information (including a list of any attachments provided):

Request/input/suggestion: TASK FORCE ON BIODIVERSITY MAINSTREAMING AND SYNERGIES

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 active involvement of productive sectors is crucial to achieve conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity. This implies that a multidisciplinary approach within the Platform should not be limited to the participation of experts in IPBES assessments, but a broader holistic scope of deliverables and reaching all relevant stakeholders beyond the environmental sector is crucial. The 2030 Agenda and its SDGs are a clear example of the importance of the involvement of several stakeholders from different sectors in the achievement of sustainable development, and these stakeholders need available tools (<i>IPBES function 3: policy tools</i>) and transparent

	<p>access to information to help them build proper strategies, policies and programs, such as a toolkit of good practices that can be adapted to specific activities, or a catalogue of case studies, or successful examples on how to achieve an effective inter-sectoral dialogue. Also, capacity building (<i>IPBES function 4: capacity building</i>) is still needed to successfully involve relevant policy makers from other sectors to cooperate with the environmental sector on joint policy making towards sustainable development. Including biodiversity mainstreaming as part of the general view of IPBES assessments (<i>IPBES function 1: assessments</i>), would certainly contribute to foster other sectors participation, particularly when cooperating with relevant MEAs and organisations (such as CBD and FAO) who are actively working on mainstreaming biodiversity in productive sectors (particularly in agriculture, forestry, fisheries and tourism).</p> <p>Within the framework of CBD and FAO, the development of workshops and papers is being conducted to generate new knowledge (<i>IPBES function 2: new knowledge</i>) on how to effectively incorporate biodiversity conservation and sustainable use in the plans, actions, programmes and policies of other sectors. IPBES could contribute to this process, while leveraging from the work developed by other MEAs and organisations, while providing elements to help MEAs and organisations to support their Parties to develop national and local diagnoses to design biodiversity mainstreaming policies and programs to implement their integration into the different sectors. Also, the progress made at the international level and at the national level (eg. Mexico’s Sectoral Strategies on Biodiversity Mainstreaming) can be included in IPBES catalogue as case studies, to support the work of IPBES and the work in other countries.</p>
2.	<p>Urgency of action by IPBES in the light of the imminence of the risks caused by the issues to be addressed by such action:</p> <p>Economic production and the dependence of people in productive sectors for their livelihoods, is intricately connected to the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity, as biodiversity has a crucial role for human well-being. As acknowledged by IPBES, nowadays, biodiversity and nature’s benefits to people are being depleted and degraded faster than at any other point in human history. Human demand for products, has resulted in economic activities causing serious negative impacts on biodiversity, and the internalization of externalities in development models to improve environmental quality and productivity in the long-term needs to be addressed. Many MEAs and international organisations (such as FAO, WHO, UNEA, WTO, etc.) have recognized the need to address biodiversity mainstreaming and provide options for policy-making in productive sectors integrating considerations of biodiversity conservation and sustainable use to ensure the proper use of biodiversity impacts not only for economic growth, but also for food security and social equity. Also, the 2030 Agenda has a cross-cutting nature, understanding, for example, that poverty reduction is not only dependent on socio-economic factors, but also on sustainable management of natural resources. For this aim, an interdisciplinary approach (social, economic and hard sciences) is essential to provide recommendations and to generate momentum from market and consumer pressure. Thus, biodiversity mainstreaming provides a framework to successfully achieve the collaboration of diverse sectors and stakeholders to halt biodiversity loss and to ensure the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity and the ecosystem services it provides for human well-being.</p>
3.	<p>Relevance of the requested action in addressing specific policies or processes:</p> <p>The Second Work Programme needs a transversal and holistic approach that promotes quality of life in many dimensions. Biodiversity mainstreaming aims to promote and strengthen the collaboration with other sectors and stakeholders (beyond the usual stakeholders), ensuring human well-being. A key element of IPBES Conceptual Framework is the “good quality of life”, which includes food, water, health, education and energy, among others, so promoting biodiversity mainstreaming as a permanent process, contributes to achieve “good quality of life” as presented in IPBES Conceptual Framework. It is also important to keep in mind that for IPBES deliverables to be used in policy making at the national and subnational level, they have to reach different audiences and sectors beyond</p>

	the environmental sector, so promoting biodiversity mainstreaming within IPBES would contribute to this purpose.
4.	<p>Geographic scope of the requested action, as well as issues to be covered by such action: Global, national and subnational scope.</p> <p>Issues to be covered: Concept and criteria on biodiversity mainstreaming; development of adequate, simple, economic and “smart” (specific, measurable, realistic, reachable and temporarily defined) biodiversity indicators for each sector as the main tool for the assessment of sectoral policies and programs on biodiversity mainstreaming; strategies for capacity building for stakeholders for indicators monitoring; incorporation of biodiversity conservation and sustainable use criteria in other sectors practices, plans and policies; cross-sectoral cooperation and policy-making; involvement and participation of other stakeholders (civil society, academia, entrepreneurs, legislators, IPLCs, youth organisations, etc.); success stories on biodiversity mainstreaming into productive sectors; implications of mainstreaming for nature and NCPs, and for good quality of life; direct and indirect drivers that enable or obstacle biodiversity mainstreaming; options for sectors and stakeholders.</p>
5.	<p>Anticipated level of complexity of the issues to be addressed by the requested action: The level of complexity may be high considering that in order to achieve biodiversity mainstreaming, cross-sectoral coordination is required and that the concept needs to be brought from the international discussions down to the subnational level for effective internalization. However, biodiversity mainstreaming is being addressed in several international forums beyond the environmental sector, such as UNIDO, FAO, UNEA, and WHO, among others, which would probably facilitate the work of IPBES to include the topic as part of its deliverables. For example, as a result of the outcome of the CBD COP13 being brought to the attention of the 40th Session of FAO Conference, FAO created the Biodiversity Mainstreaming Platform to facilitate the integration in a structured and coherent manner of the conservation, sustainable use, management and restoration of biodiversity across agricultural sectors at national, regional and international level.</p>
6.	<p>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: Biodiversity mainstreaming is being addressed within, CBD, FAO, WTO, WHO, UNEA, among other MEAs and international organisations. However, there is still a need to have a document from IPBES that provides punctual options for policy makers in different sectors, to cooperate in the formulation of joint policies to address the main causes of loss of biodiversity, as well as other threats.</p>
7.	<p>Availability of scientific literature and expertise for IPBES to undertake the requested action: Even if there are academic papers on biodiversity mainstreaming, other valuable materials, such as official publications or case studies on mainstreaming processes documented (or being documented) by countries may be included. For example, between 2004 and 2016 the GEF supported a total of 427 biodiversity mainstreaming programmes and projects, totalling US\$2.7 billion and leveraging an additional US\$16.8 billion in co-financing.</p>
8.	<p>Scale of the potential impacts, and potential beneficiaries of the requested action: Biodiversity mainstreaming is linked to cross-sectoral policies and the internalisation of externalities in productive chains, so including the topic in IPBES deliverables would benefit policy makers, practitioners and entrepreneurs, in different sectors.</p>
9.	<p>Requirements for financial and human resources, and potential duration of the requested action: Similar financial and human annual requirements as other task forces, for the duration of the entire second work programme, to be assessed at the end of the programme for possible continuity.</p>
10.	<p>An identification of priorities within multiple requests submitted: 2</p>
11.	<p>Any other relevant information (including a list of any attachments provided):</p>

Request/input/suggestion: TASK FORCE ON MONITORING SYSTEMS AND GENERATION OF DATA ON BIODIVERSITY AND ECOSYSTEM SERVICES

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.	<p>Relevance to the objective, functions and work programme of IPBES:</p> <p>Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services can only be assessed and made policy relevant when data can be reviewed and synthesized. In most parts, the relation between biodiversity and ecosystem services is conceptually clear but no or not sufficient data is available on their interdependence and how biodiversity actually generates ecosystem services. A task force on the relation, linkages and interdependence of biodiversity and ecosystem services should be established.</p> <p>Additionally, it is necessary to support the implementation of operational monitoring systems in the long run, as the generation of timely, consistent and relevant data on biodiversity, ecosystem services and their interlinkage needs to be developed. Mexico has been pioneering the promotion, design and implementation of national scale biodiversity monitoring systems, even under very difficult conditions in several aspects, such as security, accessibility, lack of network coverage, etc. The data retrieved and collected so far have by no means been fully exploited. Mexico's CONABIO is currently mainly developing data management, analysis and access services in order to satisfy the needs of policy-makers and academics who constitute the main users of the system. The development of indicators and standards within these monitoring systems constitute a great opportunity as they will provide guidelines for other countries considering the implementation of national monitoring, potentially saving also considerable funds by the provision of lessons learnt in setting up the systems, running them and improving them. Mexico focuses in its monitoring concept on the retrieval of data on ecological functions and less on species. The data shall provide insights in the effects of degradation on key services/functions such as pollination, seed dispersal, predation, etc.</p>
2.	<p>Urgency of action by IPBES in the light of the imminence of the risks caused by the issues to be addressed by such action:</p> <p>If biodiversity and ecosystem services should be considered in decision making, it is of high urgency to assist the ongoing initiatives that try to support this, as for example the inclusion of ecosystem accounting in the national accounts (SEEA-EEA: https://unstats.un.org/unsd/envaccounting/eea_project/default.asp).</p>
3.	<p>Relevance of the requested action in addressing specific policies or processes:</p> <p>If information on biodiversity and ecosystem services cannot be included in relevant accounting systems, the goals to reduce biodiversity loss of the CBD cannot be achieved. This aspect would also help in the context of most SDGs. This problem of lack of data on the relation of biodiversity and ecosystem services has been becoming an obstacle to the advancement of the SEEA-EEA (UNSD).</p>
4.	<p>Geographic scope of the requested action, as well as issues to be covered by such action:</p> <p>Global, regional. Mexico is currently engaged in a trilateral cooperation with Colombia's Humboldt Institute and South Africa's SANBI. The main goal is to develop and implement mutual standards, tools and processes for data management and analysis that include the relationship between biodiversity and ecosystem services, based on available cloud services. In the medium term, the 3 consider a shared cloud-based data access platform to facilitate scientific cooperation among the 3 but also with other parties. Australia CSIRO is supporting this cooperation technically with its data cube concept.</p>

5.	<p>Anticipated level of complexity of the issues to be addressed by the requested action:</p> <p>Establishing a task force should be easy, however, filling the gap with information is difficult and will need time.</p>
6.	<p>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:</p> <p>There exist a lot of conceptual work and some (semi)quantitative inferences but not too much on the actual functional relation of biodiversity and ecosystem services that is usable for policy relevant applications. The problem of lack of data has been identified as one major obstacle for generating ecosystem accounts in the context of the SEEA-EEA initiative of the UNSD. IPBES has been identified in the SEEA-EEA community as the agency with most relevance to the topic.</p>
7.	<p>Availability of scientific literature and expertise for IPBES to undertake the requested action:</p> <p>Meta-analysis, expert group, monitoring projects.</p>
8.	<p>Scale of the potential impacts, and potential beneficiaries of the requested action:</p> <p>Enabling the design of nature-relevant policies based on NCP/GQL. As this is being promoted in the context of SEEA-EEA, this can have potentially a huge impact globally. Potential beneficiaries are all people.</p>
9.	<p>Requirements for financial and human resources, and potential duration of the requested action:</p> <p>Meta-analysis, expert group, monitoring projects. 1-5 years potentially.</p>
10.	<p>An identification of priorities within multiple requests submitted:</p> <p>3</p> <p>First priority is to establish the expert group. Second priority is to support the implementation of monitoring projects.</p>
11.	<p>Any other relevant information (including a list of any attachments provided):</p>