



Distr.: General
27 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

Outcome of the Eastern Europe regional consultation meeting

Note by the secretariat

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

Annex

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

Review sheet for IPBES intersessional documentation

see www.ipbes.net/plenary/intersessional for further details

Document name: IPBESDraftWorkProgramme2014–2018

Reviewer name: OutcomeoftheEasternEuropeanStakeholderConsultationonIPBES,31July–2 August,2013,BudapestandTihany,Hungary

Government/Institution: EasternEuropeanstakeholders,seelistofparticipants

Country: EasternEuropeanstakeholders

Email address: contactpersonsDr.AndrásBáldi(andrasbaldi@gmail.com) andDr.GyörgyPataki (gyorgy.pataki@uni-corvinus.hu),IPBESMEPmembersforEasternEurope

Page number	Line/Paragraph/Rule number	Comment
<i>General Comments</i>		
		The IPBES work programme should be based on a clear, preferably simple, conceptual framework (CF). The CF should inform directly the science-policy interface IPBES focuses upon. Furthermore, the CF should clearly reflect the difference between value and economic value since the value of biodiversity cannot be reduced only to economically measurable (monetary) values. Economic valuation of biodiversity is inevitably anthropocentric. Values do not represent an 'objective' reality and indication of values can be performed qualitatively, quantitatively, or both. Moreover, the science-policy interface character of IPBES requires recognition of values within the political systems, that is, to develop effective policy frames on valuing biodiversity both for conservation of biodiversity and human well-being. Busan Outcome Article 6 suggests that the role of IPBES involves not only informing biodiversity conservation policy but also economic and social policy. IPBES can assist all stakeholders concerned with biodiversity and ecosystem services by increasing the political feasibility of nature conservation using environmental, social and economical tools.
		Without an approved budget and transparent budgetary procedures, IPBES limits planning and participation by the EE region due to its high uncertainty of management and needs.

Page number	Line/Paragraph/Rule number	Comment
2	16-18	<p>What is the definition and substance of an assessment? What is it supposed to include? Is habitat mapping, for example, included? Will thematic assessments include assessments of related, or relevant, policies? Eastern Europe (EE) suggests all the assessments to include the policy contexts since assessments will connect biodiversity and ecosystem services with human well-being. Another related issue here is policy effectiveness. Will all assessments include current knowledge and information on lessons learnt from applying different policy tools in different policy contexts and their effectiveness? IPBES should inform policy choices by exploring current knowledge on implications of different policy options.</p>
5 and 7 and 12	21-28 and Objective 1 and Deliverable 2(a)	<p>There are large differences and disparities with regard to capacities (incl. access to data, human resources, commitment by stakeholders, etc.) to engage with IPBES within the EE region itself. This might require IPBES to pay attention to the particular capacity-building needs of individual countries. Generally, in EE there is low state and civil society capacity for engaging with IPBES. There are many parallel and overlapping biodiversity initiatives and networks with incompatible work programmes in the EE region. How can we draw out synergies and bring these together? IPBES should seek ways to support the emergence of a synergistic and cooperative knowledge network in the region. There could be potential in supporting the establishment of an online resource hub (see also page 5, lines 21-28).</p>
12	Deliverable 2(a) 2-44	<p>Assessment methodologies should be comparable and, if possible, standardised.</p>
12 and 18-24	Deliverable 2(a), as well as Deliverable 3(c), 3(d), 3(e), and 3(f), as well as Objective 4 and Deliverable 4(a)	<p>To unpack global environmental change processes, due attention needs to be made to, on the one hand, regional drivers, such as economic transition processes putting specific pressures on biodiversity and ecosystem services in the EE region. On the other hand, attention should also be paid to local dynamics and local drivers of change. In order to assess environmental values and use in a holistic way that incorporates local users and bottom-up processes, studies on valuation need to pay attention to the specific ways local communities value nature. To reflect this, the assessment on value/valuation requires close attention to the relationship between people and their local environment.</p>

Page number	Line/Paragraph/Rule number	Comment
13	Deliverable 2(b) 1-25	Alongside 'Indigenous knowledge' systems there exist traditional and local knowledge forms that are particularly important in the EE region (see SES). IPBES should seek ways to involve holders of local and traditional knowledge in the EE region and catalyse the generation of new knowledge and research avenues into its widespread use and existence, particularly as related to farming and agriculture. Local and traditional knowledge has an economic value that is currently not recognised. This needs to be investigated and promoted. There is a dilemma here however that IPBES might want to inform: How to meaningfully integrate alternative knowledge systems and practices when, for example, we are living in a world where traditional ways of life are not (economically, socially) viable? Furthermore, one could reasonably ask IPBES to inform policy on what are the successful ways for integrating different knowledge systems into decision- making?
13-14	Deliverable 2(c)	Comprehensive habitat inventories are required before comprehensive ecosystem services assessments may be completed; there are distinct gaps in knowledge and mapping around particular habitat types/ecosystems. The current lack of national ecosystems services valuations in the EE region constitutes a knowledge gap.
15	Objective 3 18-36	There is a knowledge gap related to biodiversity and ecosystem services studies on what factors influence human behaviour and what information and knowledge is required to make politicians or the general public take biodiversity loss seriously? IPBES should prioritise the behavioural and communication issues as a cross-cutting thematic/methodological topic by assessing current knowledge on behavioural drivers and effective communication approaches and tools.
15	Objective 3 18-36	Attention needs to be paid to exploited, degraded, transformed ecosystems, for example brown fields and urban ecosystems, for their rehabilitation. Urban ecosystem services evaluation is a particularly uncharted field of ESs research and it is especially relevant due to its role in forming citizens' cultural identity.
15	Objective 3 18-36	Is there a business case for biodiversity and ESs? This relationship seems to be neglected so far, thus IPBES should pay due attention to the promotion of biodiversity and ecosystem services among private businesses by involving them (see SES) and assessing current knowledge on "business and biodiversity and ecosystem services" and the relevant policy frames.
16	Deliverable 3(a) 1-22	Deliverable 3(a) requires clarification as it is currently ambiguous and not at all clear what will be included under this assessment. This assessment is of high relevance to the EE region since agriculture-related biodiversity and ecosystem services issues are of primary significance.

Page number	Line/Paragraph/Rule number	Comment
17	19-50	Pollination (particularly insect pollination) is endorsed as an important thematic field for assessment but it needs to be complemented by an evaluation of other essential ecosystem services in need of restoration, particularly related to agriculture, forests and water bodies.
23-24	Deliverable 4(a)	IPBES should take into account the compulsory country-level assessments of Aichi Targets in order to avoid duplication of work.
25	Deliverable 5(a) 1-23	IPBES needs to check the assessment work conducted under the FAO in order to build on it as well as avoid duplication of work.
25	Deliverable 5(a) 1-23	IPBES needs to check the assessment of the impacts of climate change on biodiversity by IPCC and critically review and build on it, avoiding unnecessary overlaps and duplication of work.
25	Deliverable 5(a) 1-23	There are a few local biodiversity and ESs assessments IPBES can acknowledge and build upon.

Note:

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

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

Review sheet for IPBES intersessional documentation

see www.ipbes.net/plenary/intersessional for further details

Document name: IPBESDraftStakeholderEngagementStrategyforsupportingimplementationofthe IPBESworkprogramme

Reviewer name: OutcomeoftheEasternEuropeanStakeholderConsultationonIPBES,31July–2 August,2013,BudapestandTihany,Hungary

Government/Institution: EasternEuropeanstakeholders,seelistofparticipants

Country: EasternEuropeanstakeholders

Email address: contactpersonsDr.AndrásBáldi(andrasbaldi@gmail.com) andDr.GyörgyPataki (gyorgy.pataki@uni-corvinus.hu),IPBESMEPmembersforEasternEurope

Page number	Line/Paragraph/Rule number	Comment
<i>General Comments</i>		
		One of the primary incentives for stakeholders to engage with the IPBES process will be the tangible results and outcomes produced by IPBES and considered useful by stakeholders.
		Regions and stakeholder groups showing relatively minor activity and less engagement might require specific tools and incentives in order to contribute to as well as benefit from IPBES.
		<p>IPBES may learn and apply the experience of other international institutions, such as, for example:</p> <p>IPCC:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Try to inherit its and multilateral environmental agreements' prestige ("legitimacy spillover") - There may be no biodiversity skepticism now, but IPBES needs to think about and prepare to handle challenges if skepticism occurs <p>IIASA: a research center set up in a way to be able to attract researchers from the communist block – an exciting example of generating cooperation and their added values</p> <p>GISCorps: common actions, exchanges of stakeholders in order to learn about, work with and be inspired by each other</p> <p>Balaton Group, Marie Curie Fellowship: both have working</p>
		mechanisms to leverage individual benefits of researchers to communities, thus attempting to overcome the risk that the involvement of scientists will have positive outcomes only for individual researchers

Page number	Line/Paragraph/Rule number	Comment
		<p>Expectations toward IPBES are:</p> <p>To have a full time and professional but small secretariat</p> <p>That communication of activities shall go beyond letters to national governmental bodies; this would demonstrate all possible problems of formal one-way communication, and a direct approach to even national stakeholders is highly preferable</p> <p>To improve and accelerate outreach activities and awareness raising</p> <p>To actively and effectively build the prestige of IPBES in order to attract new members; stakeholders to engage substantively in its process and activities</p>
Topics where different, even opposing approaches have been detected, disputed		
		<p>Top-down or bottom-up engagement</p> <p>Whether governments should be the major initiators of national participation, awareness raising, nomination of experts, etc.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>or</i></p> <p>participation and engagement shall come from (and learned/practised by) other segments of local societies, stakeholder groups</p>
		<p>Private sector involvement</p> <p>(+) can provide efficient encouragement for governments to act</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>BUT</i></p> <p>(-) how to avoid their domination of processes and prevent the question of profits and profitability from becoming a major driving force behind IPBES?</p>
		<p>How far to go to find and involve stakeholders?</p> <p>Have relevant stakeholders in the process – that should be a central, emphasised rule</p> <p>Thus existing networks, already visible stakeholders shall be targeted</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>BUT</i></p> <p>It is important not to leave out those who are “usually” unheard, we need to look beyond the existing networks in order to identify other relevant stakeholders</p>
2	Objective 2	SES should be designed to facilitate effective and long-term engagement in a way that pays attention to the fact that different phases (entering, contributing, etc.) of the IPBES process may require different incentives and tools for the substantive engagement of stakeholders.
2	Guiding principles	IPBES should demonstrate professional independence and political impartiality.

Page number	Line/Paragraph/Rule number	Comment
3	Implementation	Funds generated, resources provided to stakeholders (e.g. academia) via governments
		Political, scientific or media celebrities to be involved in order to reach out to the public at large
5-6	Annex I: Indicative elements of an action plan	Provide governments with IPBES-related success stories that governments are able to publicise locally, e.g. regional cooperation, international economic or research projects attributed directly or indirectly to IPBES
5-6	Annex I: Indicative elements of an action plan Communication	<p>Gap in communication is identified (in some cases national offices at UN do not react to and pass information on to governments or relevant bodies)</p> <p>Tools:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Publish an annual report + potential research questions for the coming period Dedicated working groups for specific scientific issues, help communication within the scientific community Fellowships, workshops, summer schools (esp. for young scientists) Letter/e-mail from the Secretariat before plenary meetings to major local stakeholders <p>Topics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identify common issues and concerns of the various stakeholder groups Show the relevance of biodiversity issues in different disciplines of science and to different knowledge-holders <ul style="list-style-type: none"> understanding biodiversity how does it effect their field (+/-) potential importance and benefits
5-6	Annex I: Indicative elements of an action plan Communication	<p>Incentives for academia to participate in IPBES processes at the individual level:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> visibility, being cited scientific results utilised in policy-making networking opportunities revealing new research niches, pioneering in certain subjects

Page number	Line/Paragraph/Rule number	Comment
		<p>scientific database about researchers involved and available</p> <p>prestigious institution (IPBES), prestigious researchers involved, prestigious research topics</p> <p><i>BUT</i></p> <p>there is a need to overcome the risk of having benefits only for the individuals and not for their communities</p> <p>“Translation” of the term biodiversity and other key notions to be understood by even the scientific community is still required as the understanding of key terms and their relevance cannot be taken for granted.</p>
	Annex I: Indicative elements of an action plan Scoping	Identify and involve practitioners, knowledge- holders who are not aware of the fact that their work is related to biodiversity issues and actually are natural resource managers. This will serve to establish some “sectoral” balance, thus also enriching academic knowledge.

Note:

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

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