IPBES-5/1: Implementation of the first work programme of the Platform

The Plenary,

Welcoming the report of the Executive Secretary on the implementation of the first work programme of the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services,[1] which includes challenges faced and lessons learned during the third year of implementation of the work programme,

Acknowledging the outstanding contributions made by all experts to date in the implementation of the work programme and thanking them for their unwavering commitment,

Encouraging Governments and organizations to participate actively in the implementation of the work programme, in particular through the nomination of experts and the review of draft deliverables,

I

Implementation of the first work programme of the Platform

Decides to proceed with the implementation of the first work programme of the Platform in accordance with the present decision and the approved budget set out in decision IPBES-5/6;

II

Capacity-building

1.   *Welcomes* the Platform's capacity-building rolling plan,[2] including its executive summary set out in annex I to the present decision, noting that the rolling plan is a living document intended to guide the work of the Platform and collaboration among partners aimed at the implementation of deliverables 1 (a) and 1 (b) of the Platform's first work programme;

2.   *Requests* the task force on capacity-building to implement the capacity-building rolling plan, subject to the availability of financial resources, and to report on progress to the Plenary at its sixth session;

3.   *Encourages* members and observers of the Platform to take advantage of the regional consultation meetings planned under the capacity-building rolling plan for 2017 to enhance members' and observers' contributions to the finalization of the regional assessments;

4.   *Welcomes* the initial efforts of partner organizations in support of capacity-building initiatives under the rolling plan and invites other organizations to join those efforts by offering technical and financial contributions that further match identified capacity-building needs;

5.   *Requests* the task force on capacity-building to further enhance collaboration transparently with other organizations in the implementation of the rolling plan;

6.   *Requests* the Bureau, in collaboration with the task force on capacity-building, to consider what would be the most effective way of leveraging additional support for capacity-building, to consider whether a third meeting of the capacity-building forum is needed, and to report on its work to the Plenary at its sixth session;

III

Knowledge foundations

1.   *Approves* the approach to recognizing and working with indigenous and local knowledge set out in annex II to the present decision and requests the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel, supported by the task force on indigenous and local knowledge, to implement it;

2.   *Invites* indigenous peoples and local communities and their representatives, as well as experts on indigenous and local knowledge, to engage in the activities described in the approach, in particular through the participatory mechanism;

---

[1] IPBES/5/2.

[2] IPBES/5/INF/3.

3. *Invites* Governments, stakeholders, strategic partners and others to support activities that mobilize indigenous and local knowledge where such knowledge is needed but not available in readily available formats and that increase the capacity of indigenous peoples and local communities to engage in and benefit from the Platform;

4. *Requests* the Executive Secretary to make the arrangements necessary to implement the approach, including arrangements for the establishment of the participatory mechanism, subject to the availability of resources;

5. *Takes note* of the outline workplan for the task force on knowledge and data for 2017 and 2018 set out in annex III to the present decision;

6. *Requests* the task force on knowledge and data, subject to the availability of resources, to further develop the outline workplan with clear deliverables and milestones for 2017 and 2018, taking into account the comments received during the fifth session of the Plenary, in consultation with relevant multilateral environmental agreements, international processes and organizations, to provide further updates during the intersessional periods through the Platform website and to report on progress to the Plenary at its sixth and seventh sessions;

7. *Encourages* the task force on knowledge and data to develop terms of reference to specify the modalities of its collaboration on specific tasks with partner organizations;

8. *Takes note* of the outcome of the expert group mandated to take into account the evolution of thinking on ecosystem services and of the transition from ecosystem services to nature's contributions to people to be in line with the inclusive approach of the IPBES conceptual framework.

9. *Notes* that the concept of nature's contributions to people will be used in the Platform's current and future assessments;

IV

Global, regional and subregional assessments

Welcomes the progress made in the undertaking of the global assessment of biodiversity and ecosystem services[3] and the regional and subregional assessments of biodiversity and ecosystem services;[4]

V

Thematic assessments

7. *Welcomes* the activities undertaken to disseminate and communicate[5] the summary for policymakers of the assessment report on pollinators, pollination and food production[6] and the individual chapters of the assessment report and their executive summaries,[7] and the consideration by all relevant bodies of the findings in the summary;

8. *Also welcomes* the progress made in the undertaking of the assessment of land degradation and restoration;[8]

9. *Approves* the scoping report for a thematic assessment of sustainable use of wild species set out in annex IV to the present decision;

10. *Requests* the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel, in consultation with the Bureau, to evaluate the need for any changes to already approved scoping documents based on major scientific findings of other Platform assessments and to report to the Plenary if any significant modifications are needed;

---

[3] IPBES/5/INF/8.

[4] IPBES/5/INF/7.

[5] IPBES/5/INF/1.

[6] Decision IPBES-4/1, annex II

[7] IPBES/4/INF/1/Rev.1.

[8] IPBES/5/INF/9.

VI

Methodological assessments

11.   *Welcomes* the activities undertaken to disseminate and communicate[9] the summary for policymakers of the assessment report on scenarios and models of biodiversity and ecosystem services[10] and the individual chapters of the assessment report and their executive summaries;[11]

12.   *Welcomes* the progress made and next steps planned in the implementation of the work plan for the second phase of IPBES work on scenarios and models;[12]

13.   *Requests* the expert group on scenarios and models established in accordance with paragraph 2 of section V of decision IPBES-4/1 to continue its work in accordance with the terms of reference set out in annex V to decision IPBES-4/1 and to report on progress at the sixth and seventh sessions of the Plenary;

14.   *Welcomes* the progress made and next steps planned in the work of the expert group on values established in accordance with paragraph 5 of section V of decision IPBES-4/1 to ensure that values and valuation are incorporated appropriately into all Platform assessments;[13]

15.   *Extends* the mandate of the expert group on values until the seventh session of the Plenary and requests the expert group to report on progress at the sixth and seventh sessions of the Plenary;

VII

Catalogue of policy tools and methodologies

1.   *Welcomes* the progress made and next steps planned in the work of the expert group on policy support tools and methodologies;[14]

2.   *Takes note* of the development of the online catalogue of policy support tools and methodologies and the support provided for ongoing Platform assessments;[15]

3.   *Requests* the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel, in consultation with the Bureau and supported by a reconstituted task-specific expert group on policy support tools and methodologies and the secretariat, to continue, subject to the availability of resources, to address the requests made in decision IPBES-4/1 and, in addition:

(a)   To submit the prototype online catalogue of policy support tools and methodologies for review by members, observers and stakeholders;

(b)   To further develop the catalogue in cooperation with relevant international processes and interested partners;

(c)   To work with the task force on capacity-building to explore ways to more effectively promote and facilitate the future use of policy support tools and methodologies at appropriate scales that meet the needs of policymakers;

(d)   To undertake an evaluation of the use and effectiveness of the online prototype of the catalogue in the context of the review of the Platform (deliverable 4 (e)) and to report to the Plenary at its sixth session;

VIII

Technical support for the work programme

1.   *Welcomes* the offers of in-kind contributions to support the implementation of the work programme received as at 10 March 2017, as listed in table 1 of the annex to decision IPBES-5/6, and invites the submission by 30 April 2017 of additional offers of in-kind contributions to support the implementation of the work programme and offers to host the seventh session of the Plenary;

---

[9] IPBES/5/INF/2.

[10] Decision IPBES-4/1, annex IV

[11] IPBES/4/INF/3/Rev.1.

[12] IPBES/5/INF/2.

[13] IPBES/5/INF/13.

[14] IPBES/5/8 and IPBES/5/INF/14.

[15] Ibid.

2.   *Requests* the secretariat, in consultation with the Bureau and in accordance with the approved budget set out in the annex to decision IPBES-5/6, to establish the institutional arrangements necessary to operationalize the technical support required for the work programme.

Annex I to decision IPBES-5/1

IPBES rolling plan for capacity-building

Executive summary

A.   Rationale and objectives

1.   The Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES) promotes knowledge concerning the diversity of life on earth (biodiversity) and its contributions to humanity (ecosystem services). This concern is reflected in the United Nations 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development and its Sustainable Development Goals, together with other key aspirations of society, many of which are also causing human impacts on biodiversity and ecosystem services. Efforts to conserve and sustainably use biodiversity involve balancing the interests of different sectors, and this could benefit from an effective science policy interface. Established in 2012, essentially as an independent body on the lines of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), IPBES aims at strengthening this interface. It does so by undertaking international assessments and promoting national ones; by catalysing knowledge; by promoting the development of policy-support tools*;* and by undertaking and facilitating capacity-building.

2.   IPBES identifies and prioritizes capacity-building needs for improving the science-policy interface at appropriate levels and provides, calls for and facilitates access to the necessary resources for addressing the highest priority needs directly relating to its activities. The role of capacity-building in IPBES is embedded in both the agreed functions of the Platform and in its operating principles. The capacity-building role of IPBES is operationalized through the following two deliverables in the work programme for the period 2014-2018:[16] deliverable 1 (a): "priority capacity-building needs to implement the Platform's work programme matched with resources through catalysing financial and in-kind support"; and deliverable 1 (b): "capacities needed to implement the Platform's work programme developed".

3.   The objective of the capacity-building rolling plan is to identify the principles, strategic directions, modalities and actions for building and further developing the capacities of individuals and institutions based on the priority needs[17] established by the IPBES Plenary. The approach involves outlining aims to achieve the capacity-building deliverables under the first IPBES work programme and is financed through the IPBES trust fund, with in-kind support from partners and the task force on capacity-building[18] and its technical support unit, as well as support from other sources including through the capacity-building forum with conventional and potential sources of funding. The intention is that over time the activities described will also leverage additional financial and technical resources through matchmaking in cooperation with partners.

4.   The plan is envisaged as a living document and sets out the principles, strategic directions and modalities for building and further developing individual and institutional capacities based on the priority needs established by the IPBES Plenary. In addition, the plan will contain a regularly updated list of activities that IPBES plans to undertake alone and in collaboration with partners. In addressing agreed priority capacity-building needs, the plan is based on the principles of identifying needs; building for the future; leveraging impacts; working collaboratively with others; using resources efficiently; learning lessons; and ensuring quality.

---

[16] The work programme was adopted by the IPBES Plenary through decision IPBES-2/5 and is set out in annex I to that decision.

[17] See decision IPBES-3/1, by which the IPBES Plenary adopted priority capacity-building needs based on advice from its task force on capacity-building.

[18] The terms of reference of the task force on capacity-building were agreed in decision IPBES-2/5 and are set out in annex II to that decision.

B.   Strategies

1.   Strategy 1: Learning and engagement

5.   The primary focus of learning and engagement is on support for implementation of the work programme itself and for learning associated with that implementation. The strategy will contribute to the investment in IPBES deliverables, which are credible and relevant to all regions of the world. It focuses on building and developing capacity across disciplines and knowledge systems through:

(a)   *The IPBES fellowship programme*, which allows junior research officers and other professionals to engage with IPBES activities, working alongside more experienced colleagues. The programme is administered by the technical support unit with additional support from task force members. Activities are mainly supported by the capacity-building component of the IPBES budget under the trust fund, together with some in-kind support. Further contributions from partners may also be solicited. The fellows are selected by the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel with support from the management committees for the assessments based on nominations. Fellows are linked to specific chapters, assigned mentors and invited to attend authors' meetings and training sessions, for which fellows from eligible developing countries receive travel support. This is a non-sponsored fellowship scheme, and selected fellows are expected to work pro bono (as do other experts) but will be duly acknowledged in the final reports;

(b)   *The IPBES training and familiarization programme*, which is tailored to IPBES needs and will enhance individual and institutional capacities for supporting the development and use of IPBES deliverables. It is based on existing guidance material produced by IPBES, in particular the guide on assessments – work programme deliverable 2 (a). It will be delivered through training workshops; hands on capacity-building integrated into workshops and consultations for the production of IPBES deliverables; and webinars, e-learning tools and other online approaches made available on the IPBES website. The programme is administered by the technical support unit with support from task force members, IPBES experts and partners. Activities are mainly funded from the capacity-building component of the IPBES budget under the trust fund and include support for travel to workshops and the development of training material. Activities also benefit from in-kind contributions, and further support may be solicited from partners. Partners may also contribute technically to IPBES training activities and material or offer to host and run such activities. Those trained will be encouraged to pass on their experience to others, so as to broaden the potential impact of training activities;

(c)   *Promoting secondments and internships* by encouraging, advertising and, where appropriate, supporting secondments and internships within the secretariat and technical support units to foster shared knowledge and understanding and build experience while contributing to the work of the secretariat.[19] This will involve individuals working in or remotely supporting the secretariat, including technical support units, for a certain period. The process will be overseen by the technical support unit with support from task force members, while being administered by the receiving or providing institutions. Efforts entail working with the secretariat and interested organizations to develop terms of reference and legal agreements for secondments and internships, including approaches to mentoring and ways of promoting the transfer of knowledge and experience to the home institutions of seconded staff members and interns. It is anticipated that activities will mainly be undertaken through contributions by partners. Opportunities for collaboration include seconding staff to the IPBES secretariat, including technical support units, or to other organizations supporting IPBES; and hosting seconded staff members and interns working on IPBES-related activities and supporting their learning;

(d)   *Promoting exchange visits and study tours* by encouraging and, where appropriate, supporting exchange visits and study tours among individuals and institutions relevant to the work of IPBES, which will promote peer-based learning and, at the same time, strengthen cooperation among institutions working on IPBES-related activities.[20] While the initiative is promoted and overseen by

---

[19] The secretariat has benefited from the secondment of three staff members, one from UNEP, one from the Government of China and one member of the IPBES Asia-Pacific technical support unit, and also from the contribution of interns. A seconded staff member from the capacity-building task force and the University of Montreal is currently supporting the technical support unit of the Africa regional assessment on biodiversity and ecosystem services. These secondments and internships have to date been achieved without the need for significant advertising.

[20] One of the officers of the technical support unit for the task force on knowledge and data worked at the secretariat in Bonn for a period, and the full team of the technical support unit visited the UNEP World Conservation Monitoring Centre in Cambridge. Further visits have been associated with meetings and workshops.

the technical support unit with support from task force members, it would be administered by the receiving or providing institutions or both. It is anticipated that activities will mainly be undertaken through contributions by partners. Opportunities for collaboration include hosting and participating in study tours and exchange visits so as to increase the understanding and experience of those working on IPBES-related activities and providing financial support to assist those undertaking study tours and exchange visits.

2.   **Strategy 2: Facilitating access to expertise and information**

6.   Efforts to facilitate access to expertise and information aim to support the implementation of the IPBES work programme and increase the reach and impact of work programme deliverables. These efforts will be assisted by other capacity-building activities, the work of the other IPBES deliverables and the focus on the uptake and implementation of IPBES guidance and deliverables through the following initiatives:

(a)   *Building and supporting communities of practice* among experts, policymakers and practitioners based on IPBES work programme deliverables.[21] This initiative will promote the increased use of IPBES products and the further development and sharing of associated information and experience by individuals and institutions taking part in communities of practice. It will contribute to expanding stakeholder involvement in efforts to strengthen the science-policy interface. Under this initiative, partners will be invited to help develop communities of practice based on IPBES deliverables such as the guidance on scenarios and models, the guidance on the conceptualization of values, the catalogue of policy-support tools and completed assessments. It is expected that activities will mainly be undertaken through contributions by partners;

(b)   *Facilitating the consideration of indigenous and local knowledge* through capacity-building for the effective use of indigenous and local knowledge in assessments and other relevant deliverables and for dialogue among different knowledge systems. This would be carried out in support of the work of the task force on indigenous and local knowledge systems, responding directly to priority needs identified by the Plenary, when acknowledging the special capacity-building needs related to the development and strengthening of indigenous and local knowledge approaches and procedures. It will contribute to the more effective use of indigenous and local knowledge systems in developing IPBES deliverables, and at the same time to the increased recognition of the potential value of such knowledge systems to national decision-making processes relating to biodiversity and ecosystem services. The initiative will be developed jointly by the task force on capacity-building and the task force on indigenous and local knowledge systems, supported by their respective technical support units, with responsibilities for implementation that have been mutually agreed. It is anticipated that activities will mainly be undertaken through contributions by partners;

(c)   *Facilitating access to data, information and knowledge* through developing the necessary capacities of those involved in working on IPBES deliverables, as set out in the strategies of the IPBES data and information management pan,[22] and in decision-making processes relating to biodiversity and ecosystem services. The initiative would be developed jointly by the task force on capacity-building and by the task force on knowledge and data, supported by their respective technical support units, with responsibilities for implementation that have been mutually agreed. It is expected that activities will mainly be undertaken through contributions by partners.

3.   **Strategy 3: Strengthening national and regional capacities**

7.   Efforts to strengthen national and regional capacities will draw heavily on the experience of partner organizations and will be implemented with their substantive support. Support will mainly be achieved through partnerships and matchmaking activities on the part of IPBES aimed at addressing the approved priority capacity-building needs, and in particular the second priority area on enhancing the capacity to undertake, use and improve national assessments of biodiversity and ecosystem services, through the following initiatives:

(a)   *Promoting and facilitating national capacity self assessment*, including in respect of capacities for locating and mobilizing financial and technical resources in the science-policy interface

---

[21] The UNDP Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services Network initiative has indicated an interest in promoting what it refers to as "trialogues" (bringing together knowledge holders, policymakers and practitioners) on the use of IPBES products. In addition, the task force is working with the Sub-Global Assessment Network, which is an existing community of practice among ecosystem assessment practitioners.

[22] The IPBES data and information management plan was agreed on in decision IPBES-3/1 and is set out in annex II to that decision.

as it relates to biodiversity and ecosystem services. Efforts aim to contribute to the increased identification at the national level of priority capacity-building needs relevant to IPBES and of the manner in which they can be addressed, at the same time providing evidence to potential supporters of nationally recognized needs. The task force members will develop an approach to self-assessment working with appropriate organizations, which will then be available for use by the appropriate national authorities with the support, where necessary, of interested partner institutions. Where necessary, support could be sought through matchmaking. It is anticipated that activities will mainly be undertaken through contributions by partners;

(b)   *Promoting and facilitating national and sub-global assessments of biodiversity and ecosystem services* by relevant national and subregional authorities, in order to encourage responses to the priority capacity-building needs identified by the Plenary. Efforts aim to contribute to improved capacity at the national and, where relevant, subregional levels to undertake national and subregional assessments of biodiversity and ecosystem services and to use their findings effectively. This will necessarily include the engagement of all relevant stakeholders and relevant sectors. The task force will consider ways to promote and facilitate national and subregional assessments, in particular through the capacity-building forum and the matchmaking functions. It is expected that activities will mainly be undertaken through contributions by partners;

(c)   *Promoting and facilitating national and regional platforms and networks* on biodiversity and ecosystem services, drawing on existing experience, networks and platforms. These platforms would support engagement in IPBES and its work programme and support the development, implementation and use of national and subregional assessments. They would facilitate increased cooperation and collaboration among scientists and other knowledge holders, policymakers and decision makers, practitioners and other stakeholders, leading to the more effective generation and use of knowledge in decision-making. The task force will consider ways to promote and facilitate the development of national and regional platforms, in particular through the forum and the matchmaking functions. It is expected that activities will mainly be undertaken through contributions by partners.

C.   Priorities and criteria for implementing the strategies

8.   The task force has developed a set of criteria based on the agreed priority capacity-building needs to be used for reviewing proposed activities and offers of technical and financial support prior to their acceptance as IPBES-relevant activities. These criteria are not intended as a reinterpretation of the priorities set by the Plenary, but as an operationalization of those priorities in a pragmatic manner for each of the three strategies described above and operationalized through the rolling plan.

1.   Strategy 1: Learning and engagement

9.   The primary focus should be on those activities supporting implementation of the work programme itself, and on learning associated with that implementation. In order, as mandated by decision IPBES-3/1, to focus on the ability to participate in Platform deliverables, primarily addressed through the proposed fellowship, exchange and training programme, with the priority placed on Platform regional assessments, criterion 1 should apply, along with at least two of the other criteria:

(a)   *Criterion 1*: Proposed activities should be consistent with strategy 1 of the capacity-building rolling plan and with one or more of its programmes and initiatives;

(b)   *Criterion 2*: Proposed activities should directly support capacity needs relating to achieving implementation of the IPBES work programme, and in particular the regional assessments on biodiversity and ecosystem services;

(c)   *Criterion 3*: Proposed activities should be consistent with and complement the work of IPBES subsidiary bodies, expert groups and task forces and the secretariat, including the technical support units;

(d)   *Criterion 4*: Proposed activities should arise directly from the work of the IPBES task force on capacity-building, helping to pilot, demonstrate and further communicate the work that it is undertaking.

2.   Strategy 2: Facilitating access to expertise and information

10.   Activities should primarily aim to draw on other IPBES deliverables, and in particular the work of task forces and expert groups, in order to increase access to expertise and information for supporting the implementation of the IPBES work programme and to increase the reach and impact of work programme deliverables. In order, as mandated by decision IPBES-3/1, to focus on the development and implementation of pilot or demonstration activities addressing other categories of needs, one or more of the following criteria should apply:

(a) *Criterion 5*: Proposed activities should promote multi-stakeholder engagement and networking in implementation of the work programme, including for facilitating the use of IPBES deliverables;

(b) *Criterion 6:* Proposed activities should build and support communities of practice arising directly from the work of one of the following IPBES deliverables, helping to pilot and demonstrate application of the guidance arising from these deliverables:

– IPBES regional and global assessments

– IPBES thematic assessments

– IPBES work on scenario analysis and modelling

– IPBES work on conceptualization of values

– IPBES work on policy support tools and methodologies

(c) *Criterion 7*: Proposed activities should facilitate the consideration of indigenous and local knowledge, drawing on the work of the IPBES task force on indigenous and local knowledge systems and helping to pilot, demonstrate and further communicate its work, thereby addressing, as mandated by decision IPBES-3/1, the specific capacity-building needs related to the development and the strengthening of the participatory mechanism and indigenous and local knowledge approaches and procedures;

(d) *Criterion 8:* Proposed activities should facilitate access to data, information and knowledge, drawing on the work of the IPBES task force on knowledge and data, and helping to pilot, demonstrate and further communicate the work that it is undertaking.

3. **Strategy 3: Strengthening national and regional capacities**

11.   Activities will mainly be carried out and facilitated through partnerships and matchmaking activities. In order, as mandated by decision IPBES-3/1, to focus on enhancing the capacity to undertake, use and improve national assessments of biodiversity and ecosystem services, criteria 9 and 10 should apply, along with either criterion 11 or criterion 12. Those criteria are as follows:

(a) *Criterion 9*: Activities should demonstrate how all relevant IPBES guidance, processes and procedures would be taken into account in planning and implementation;

(b) *Criterion 10*: Activities in support of national efforts should demonstrate a national need and, where appropriate, be undertaken in consultation with the relevant IPBES national focal points;

(c) *Criterion 11*: Activities should address the undertaking and use of national and subregional assessments of biodiversity and ecosystem services or similar approaches (including the promotion of national and regional platforms and networks) that have the following characteristics:

– They cover all ecosystems within a country or other geopolitical unit or are clearly defined as thematic or methodological assessments at the appropriate level

– They demonstrate the involvement of all relevant stakeholders during all stages

– They demonstrate how indigenous and local knowledge will be considered

(d) *Criterion 12:* Activities should address the national capacity self-assessments, including in respect of capacities for locating and mobilizing financial and technical resources.

D.   **Approach to building collaboration and engagement**

12.   A wide range of institutions are involved in capacity-building activities that relate directly to the IPBES work programme and to the priority capacity-building needs approved by the IPBES Plenary:

(a) *The IPBES task force on capacity-building,* with the support of a technical support unit established at the Norwegian Environment Agency, oversees the development and implementation of the rolling plan. In doing so it works closely with resource persons and partner organizations that can contribute to its effective implementation;

(b) *The IPBES capacity-building forum* is a key vehicle for increasing engagement and facilitating cooperation among partners for the implementation and further development of the rolling plan. When planning and holding meetings of the capacity-building forum, the task force will work

closely with the Bureau of the IPBES Plenary to regularly invite organizations that fund, undertake or otherwise support relevant capacity-building activities; to develop the list of invitees and an engagement strategy for promoting their involvement in the forum well in advance of each meeting of the forum; to invite contributions from forum participants to the development and pilot implementation of the rolling plan as supported by matchmaking activities; to develop and implement appropriate communication and follow-up to the meetings of the forum to further strengthen engagement in IPBES-related capacity-building initiatives; and to regularly review the effectiveness and modalities of work in the context of the forum together with partners.;

(c)   *IPBES matchmaking*: The strategies, programmes and initiatives described in the present executive summary, and the activities described in the IPBES capacity-building rolling plan, will help frame cooperation among partners on how to match identified priority needs with financial and technical resources. The focus on matchmaking has seen a gradual shift from an attempt to develop a prototype facility to an incremental development of the matchmaking functions and their web-based support structures. While there are currently no plans to issue further open calls for project submissions, as was done in the trial call during the initial work on the matchmaking facility, specific calls under the rolling plan may be conducted in collaboration with strategic partners representing both implementers and conventional and potential sources of funding.

E.   Options for organizations wishing to contribute

13.   Institutions may choose to fund, undertake or otherwise support relevant capacity-building activities in order to help support implementation of the IPBES capacity-building rolling plan. Collaborative arrangements can take a number of forms, based on the parties' degree of involvement. The IPBES guidance on the development of strategic partnerships and other collaborative arrangements[23] sets out a number of the key considerations, and also the types of collaboration that may be necessary for supporting IPBES implementation. Contributions may be made directly or indirectly through one or more of the following approaches:

(a)   *Contributions to the IPBES trust fund through the budget agreed by the Plenary*, which already supports parts of the work described in the rolling plan. Contributions to the rolling plan can therefore be made through contributions to the IPBES trust fund itself or by direct funding through earmarked contributions to the IPBES trust fund.[24] Any institution wishing to provide direct funding through earmarked contributions to the IPBES trust fund should contact the IPBES secretariat. Acknowledgement of contributions to the trust fund is primarily conveyed through the report of the Executive Secretary to the Plenary on the trust fund;

(b)   *In-kind contributions to the capacity-building work of IPBES* through various degrees of involvement where institutions may wish:

(i)   To provide partial or complete support to capacity-building activities under the rolling plan that are being administered by the technical support unit or otherwise organized by IPBES. Examples of such support might include instances where the capacity-building activity is led by IPBES but carried out with the technical or financial support of one or more partner institutions or, conversely, led by a partner institution with support from the IPBES secretariat;

(ii)   To offer to administer or undertake activities themselves, working in collaboration with IPBES. This might include instances where institutions already have or would like to plan activities in order to support delivery of the IPBES capacity-building rolling plan and wish to seek acknowledgement or endorsement from IPBES for so doing. An endorsement or acknowledgement will require a review of the proposed activity to ensure that it is aligned with IPBES priority capacity-building needs, operating principles, relevant procedures and criteria;

---

[23] IPBES guidance on the development of strategic partnerships and other collaborative arrangements was agreed on in decision IPBES-3/4, and is set out in annex III to that decision.

[24] The financial procedures for IPBES state that "…additional contributions for specific activities approved by the Plenary may be accepted. Single contributions in excess of 300,000 United States dollars per contributor per activity require approval by the Plenary. Single contributions not exceeding 300,000 United States dollars per contributor per activity require approval by the Bureau" (IPBES Financial Procedures, Rule 10).

(c)	Providing direct technical or financial support to other institutions (for example to organizations in other countries) to enable them to address in a more effective manner priority capacity-building needs. The activities may be explicitly identified in the rolling plan and may include types of training or support for fellows or be inferred from the descriptions of the capacity-building approaches described above, for example support for national ecosystem assessments;

(d)	Alignment of capacity-building activities, whereby institutions may wish to consider how their capacity-building activities can take more account of the objectives, deliverables and ongoing work of IPBES. Alignment of interests may be facilitated through, for instance, supporting the uptake and use of any IPBES guides, methodological assessments or other deliverables. The IPBES capacity-building forum also provides an opportunity for further exploring modalities for achieving the alignment of activities.

Annex II to decision IPBES-5/1

Approach to recognizing and working with indigenous and local knowledge in the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services

I. Overall framework

1.   The present approach to working with indigenous and local knowledge in the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES) is multifaceted; applies across the four functions of IPBES; considers various scales, from local to global; and involves activities to be undertaken or catalysed by IPBES (see section II below).

2.   The present approach will be undertaken in line with the approved rules and procedures of IPBES and in accordance with internationally recognized rights of indigenous peoples and relevant commitments related to local communities.

3.   Indigenous and local knowledge experts selected by IPBES for the preparation of IPBES deliverables will engage in the approach, which will, in addition, involve a wide community of stakeholders via the participatory mechanism for working with indigenous, local and diverse knowledge systems set out in section III below.

4.   The approach is based on a number of overall considerations, understanding of terms and the identification of challenges as described in the following paragraphs.

5.   In terms of **overall considerations** regarding the mandate, functions, means and operating principles of IPBES, the approach will:

     (a)   Rely on activities undertaken by IPBES at the global, regional and, where appropriate, subregional levels, using available knowledge, which will be gathered, synthesized, reviewed and evaluated, and rely on the promotion and catalysis of activities by appropriate partners such as the mobilization of knowledge that is not readily available, the generation of new knowledge or capacity-building activities;

     (b)   Besides funding that may be available from the trust fund, rely on in-kind support from, and collaborative activities with, strategic partners;

     (c)   Involve collaboration with relevant initiatives and build on appropriate work, guidelines and best practices that have been developed and agreed on by relevant multilateral agreements and/or other entities;

     (d)   Use clear, transparent and credible processes for the exchange, sharing and use of data, knowledge, information and technologies from all relevant sources.

6.   The approach is based on the following **understandings** of key terms, concepts and categories:

     (a)   Indigenous and local knowledge systems are in general understood to be dynamic bodies of integrated, holistic, social and ecological knowledge, practices and beliefs pertaining to the relationship of living beings, including people, with one another and with their environments. Indigenous and local knowledge is grounded in territory, is highly diverse and is continuously evolving through the interaction of experiences, innovations and various types of knowledge (written, oral, visual, tacit, gendered, practical and scientific). Such knowledge can provide information, methods, theory and practice for sustainable ecosystem management. Many indigenous and local knowledge systems are empirically tested, applied, contested and validated through different means in different contexts;

     (b)   Maintained and produced in individual and collective ways, indigenous and local knowledge is at the interface between biological and cultural diversity. Manifestations of indigenous and local knowledge are evident in many social and ecological systems. In this context, the approach understands "biocultural diversity" as biological and cultural diversity and the links between them;

     (c)   The approach does not intend to create or develop new definitions of what constitutes "indigenous and local knowledge" or "indigenous peoples and local communities", as these definitions are often context specific and vary within and across regions;

(d)   *Indigenous and local knowledge holders* are understood to be persons situated in the collective knowledge systems of indigenous peoples and local communities with knowledge from their own indigenous peoples and local communities; *indigenous and local knowledge experts* are understood to be persons from indigenous peoples and local communities who have knowledge about indigenous and local knowledge and associated issues (they may also be indigenous and local knowledge holders); and *experts on indigenous and local knowledge* are understood to be persons who have knowledge about indigenous and local knowledge and associated issues, not necessarily from indigenous peoples and local communities.[25]

7.   Engaging indigenous and local knowledge in a dialogue with other knowledge systems can bring important new perspectives to IPBES. This dialogue will need to respect the following **best practices**:

(a)   An effective dialogue will require the building of mutual trust and confidence between indigenous and local knowledge holders and natural and social scientists through cultural respect and sensitivity;

(b)   The approach will need to provide opportunities for dialogue with indigenous peoples and local communities focusing on topics relevant to IPBES, through the development of initiatives by and/or in collaboration with IPBES members and existing networks of indigenous peoples and local communities and of experts on indigenous and local knowledge;

(c)   The approach should acknowledge the time needed for decision-making by customary and traditional institutions through dialogues at various levels (for example, extended family groups, women, elders and youth and indigenous peoples who may hold different rights with respect to knowledge) with relevant institutions in order to identify common goals in the development of IPBES deliverables;

(d)   The approach should work in culturally appropriate environments, respecting diverse and interactive styles of engagement, using effective tools and strategies to allow effective dialogue across diverse knowledge systems;

(e)   The approach should promote a participatory and empowering dialogue based on non-discrimination, inclusiveness and the recognition of social, cultural, economic and political plurality in the world;

(f)   The approach should recognize, strengthen and promote the conservation of the *in situ* knowledge systems of indigenous peoples and local communities where knowledge is gathered, used, applied, renewed, enhanced, tested, validated, transmitted, shared and governed, as well as the dialogue between knowledge systems as an iterative two-way process. It should deliver policy-relevant knowledge and policy options to indigenous peoples and local communities in meaningful and useful forms.

8.   The approach seeks to address a broad range of **general challenges**, including the following:

(a)   *Scale.* Scale matters in the definition, collation, compilation and aggregation of knowledge both horizontally (e.g., across local communities) and vertically (scaling knowledge up and down). While most indigenous and local knowledge is inherently local and contextual, IPBES operates at the regional and global levels and critically evaluates policy-relevant knowledge. Mobilizing relevant indigenous and local knowledge, and ensuring validation through the indigenous and local knowledge system from which it comes, while avoiding the loss of legitimacy, represents a major challenge. Related challenges include representation and participation (addressed in subparagraph (b) below) and analytical challenges, as the type and level of complementarity across knowledge systems will vary according to the context, the issue addressed and the desired outcomes;

(b)   *Participation and representation.* Meaningful participation and engagement of indigenous peoples and local communities play an important role in working with indigenous and local knowledge. The challenge is to find ways and means that allow for meaningful participation and adequate representation, including regional and gender balance, within the existing mandate, rules and procedures and available resources of IPBES;

---

[25] In the "Procedures for working with indigenous and local knowledge systems" (Decision IPBES-4/3, annex), the terms "indigenous and local knowledge experts" refer both to "indigenous and local knowledge experts" and to "experts on indigenous and local knowledge" according to the understanding of those terms set out in the present paragraph.

(c)   *Formats.* Indigenous and local knowledge exists in many languages, often in written formats other than peer-reviewed literature, such as grey literature, or in other forms, such as ritual, ceremonial, oral, dance, song and visual manifestations, including symbols, documentaries and artwork. Sometimes knowledge holders have not recorded their knowledge in any form, or their knowledge has been transmitted in a non-tangible form. The variety of formats and the difficulty of accessing them pose a major challenge;

(d)   *Methods and tools.* Many of the methods and specific tools needed for this work, such as guidance and methods for addressing the variety of available indigenous and local knowledge formats, do not yet exist and may need to be developed by IPBES, to the extent that doing so falls within its mandate and within available resources, or by appropriate partners, taking into account all of the above.

9.   This approach, which is breaking new ground, should be understood as a first step in an iterative process in which indigenous peoples and local communities are key partners. The approach should be evaluated as part of the review of the Platform.

II.   Overall approach to recognizing and working with indigenous and local knowledge

10.   The approach described in the present section, which applies across the four functions of IPBES, sets out activities for each of the four functions.

11.   Within the approach, free prior informed consent will be sought, as appropriate, for accessing indigenous and local knowledge, and the activities should not occur where they would prejudice the internationally recognized rights of indigenous peoples and interests of local communities as affirmed in paragraph 2. Best practices and ethical guidelines, as appropriate, should be consulted to make decisions regarding the use of indigenous and local knowledge.

A.   Assessments

12.   Assessing available knowledge forms the backbone of this approach. It includes four phases:

13.   The **first phase**, the collaborative definition of problems and goals, is to be realized during the scoping of an assessment and should result in the development of key questions specific to the assessment. In general, it is suggested that the following broad groups of questions may be considered and adapted as necessary to the specific subject of the assessment:

(a)   What are the contributions of indigenous peoples and local communities in terms of their knowledge, practices and world views to the management and conservation of nature, the delivery of nature's contributions to people and ensuring a good quality of life at the regional and global scales?

(b)   What are the most important pressures and factors undermining these contributions, as well as affecting the quality of life of present and future generations of indigenous peoples and local communities?

(c)   What policy responses, measures and processes exist for strengthening and improving the governance of nature and nature's contributions to people with regard to indigenous peoples and local communities and their knowledge and practices?

14.   The **second phase,** occurring once the undertaking of an assessment has been approved, is about synthesizing, and incorporating into the assessment, a wide array of evidence and data from multiple sources of indigenous and local knowledge related to the assessment itself, including, as appropriate:

(a)   Literature reviews, synthesis reports, geospatial data and sources of indigenous and local knowledge documented in accessible written form;

(b)   Recorded, referenceable and accessible indigenous and local knowledge manifested in forms such as ritual, ceremonial, oral, dance, song and visual manifestations, including symbols, documentaries and artwork;

(c)   Compilations of literature, data and cases from other IPBES assessments and related reports;

(d)   Reports, including meta-analysis and data from international research centres and institutions and relevant regional centres;

(e)   Spatially explicit data and geospatial data sources.

15.   The **third phase** focuses on appropriately engaging indigenous peoples and local communities in the review of the various drafts of a specific assessment.

16.   The **fourth phase** aims at sharing knowledge and insights gained through an assessment with indigenous peoples and local communities once the assessment is concluded.

17.   Important procedural components and activities of these **four phases** include:

(a)   Appropriate representation of indigenous and local knowledge experts and experts on indigenous and local knowledge in the expert groups scoping and performing an assessment in line with the procedures for working with indigenous and local knowledge and the principles presented above;

(b)   A series of broad web-based consultations via the participatory mechanism during the first, second and third phases to ensure broad participation by indigenous peoples and local communities, and reflection of their perspectives and of indigenous and local knowledge, in the scoping exercise (first phase); the fine-tuning of questions to be addressed by an assessment and the identification, mobilization and gathering of relevant indigenous and local knowledge where such knowledge exists in recorded, shareable and referenceable form (second phase); and the review of the successive drafts of the assessment (third phase);

(c)   Dialogue workshops, to allow for direct exchanges on the scope and the content of drafts. These workshops would bring together the indigenous and local knowledge experts of the scoping expert group (first phase) or of the indigenous and local knowledge liaison group (third phase) with a representative selection of experts on indigenous and local knowledge and representatives of indigenous peoples and local communities. The format (in person or virtual), number and timing of the dialogue workshops should take into account financial considerations;

(d)   The synthesis, during the second phase, of the indigenous and local knowledge gathered in accordance with the procedures for the preparation of the Platform's deliverables, using established methods such as the reflection of confidence levels as defined in the guide for assessments (IPBES/5/INF/6), seeking to balance large-scale synthesis and spatial upscaling of literature and geospatial data sources with a rich illustration of cases from different parts of the world portraying the practices, world views, voices and faces of indigenous peoples and local communities. This synthesis would include the description of different understandings resulting from different epistemologies and/or ontologies;

(e)   The promotion and catalysis of activities to be undertaken by appropriate partners, such as local dialogue workshops to fill knowledge gaps when relevant knowledge does not exist in readily available formats (first and second phase), or the building of the capacity of indigenous peoples and local communities to engage in and benefit from IPBES (throughout all four phases). These efforts are part of the knowledge mobilization and capacity-building approach to indigenous and local knowledge (further described in paragraphs 18 and 20 below).

B.   Knowledge and data

18.   In line with its mandate regarding knowledge and data, IPBES will within the present approach:

(a)   Identify, in coordination with indigenous and local knowledge holders, indigenous and local knowledge experts and experts on indigenous and local knowledge, a set of practices to help manage evidence and data that will be collected in the assessments;

(b)   Facilitate, as appropriate, via the IPBES web-based infrastructure, the accessing and management of available sources of indigenous and local knowledge, both for internal use in developing assessments and for decision makers and scholars drawing on the work of IPBES to support their own work, in line with relevant standards and conventions;

(c)   Promote and catalyse the mobilization of indigenous and local knowledge, as appropriate, where such knowledge does not exist in readily available formats in ways that reflect the concepts of parallel validation or co-production processes, with the support of appropriate partners, focusing on gaps that emerge during each phase of an assessment; and

(d)   Take into account appropriately those aspects relevant to indigenous and local knowledge and indigenous peoples and local communities in the list of indicators, classifications of units of analysis and classification of nature's contributions to people,[26] including ecosystem services and nature's gifts.

C.   Policy support tools and methodologies

19.   In line with its mandate regarding policy support tools and methodologies, IPBES will within the present approach:

(a)   Identify, describe and facilitate the use of relevant tools and methods for implementing the four phases of the proposed approach. Where such tools and methods still need to be developed, IPBES will promote and catalyse their development with appropriate partners;

(b)   Ensure that policy responses, decision-making instruments and processes relevant to indigenous and local knowledge and indigenous peoples and local communities are reflected in IPBES assessments.

D.   Capacity-building

20.   In line with its mandate regarding capacity-building, IPBES will, within the present approach:

(a)   Identify, prioritize and build capacity critical to its implementation, within the means available, through, for example, training workshops and webinars on the approaches to and procedures for recognizing and working with indigenous and local knowledge in assessments or participation in the fellowship programme; and

(b)   Promote and catalyse the undertaking of capacity-building activities in support of broader capacity-building needs involving, among other mechanisms, strategic partnerships where such needs go beyond the means of IPBES. In this context, the participatory mechanism could strengthen the ability of indigenous peoples and local communities to take part in, contribute to and benefit from IPBES deliverables.

III.   Institutional arrangements and the participatory mechanism supporting the implementation of the approach

21.   In order to implement the approach outlined in section II, IPBES will draw on relevant existing arrangements, which will need to be complemented by the participatory mechanism.

A.   Existing arrangements relevant to the implementation of the approach

22.   The **Multidisciplinary Expert Panel** will oversee the implementation of the approach and any further developments under it.

23.   **Indigenous and local knowledge liaison groups** will be established for each assessment. Such groups will comprise the indigenous and local knowledge experts and experts on indigenous and local knowledge selected for the various chapters of each individual assessment. The groups will be responsible for developing the key questions and topics pertaining to indigenous peoples and local communities to be covered in each assessment, for synthesizing all relevant knowledge and for ensuring that each assessment adequately reflects the perspectives resulting from different knowledge systems in accordance with the procedures for the preparation of the Platform's deliverables.

24.   **Other task forces and expert groups** will also provide support for the implementation of the approach.

25.   The **secretariat, including its technical support units,** will provide support for the implementation of the approach.

B.   Participatory mechanism for working with indigenous and local knowledge systems

26.   The objective of the participatory mechanism for working with indigenous and local knowledge systems is to facilitate the effective and meaningful engagement of indigenous and local knowledge holders, indigenous and local knowledge experts and their organizations or networks in order to strengthen their ability to contribute to and benefit from IPBES at all scales.

---

[26] Referred to in the guide for assessments (IPBES/5/INF/6).

27. In line with the rules and procedures of IPBES, the participatory mechanism is to achieve this objective by inter alia:

(a) Providing a *web-based platform* to facilitate the effective and meaningful engagement of existing networks of indigenous peoples and local communities and relevant experts and allowing new, perhaps self-organizing, networks to develop;

(b) Promoting, through *consultations*, a dialogue with various networks, relevant experts and policymakers to mobilize inputs and disseminate results during all four phases of the assessment process, including both web-based consultations and dialogue workshops;

(c) Creating opportunities for shared learning and exchange through dedicated *discussion forums* on the web-based platform or in the context of the contribution to and use of the catalogue of policy support tools and methodologies; and

(d) Supporting IPBES, by means of *strategic partnerships*, in promoting and catalysing activities by appropriate partners that build the capacity of indigenous peoples and local communities to engage effectively and meaningfully in IPBES and that mobilize indigenous and local knowledge in formats accessible to IPBES when such knowledge is missing.

28. The central component of the participatory mechanism will be a **web-based platform**, managed by the secretariat and hosted on the IPBES website http://www.ipbes.net/ilk-participatory-mechanism, comprising the following elements:

(a) A *registry* linked to the IPBES stakeholder registry, inclusion in which is mandatory for all actors wishing to participate, including individuals, social organizations, institutions and networks;

(b) A *roster* including all registered individuals or entities as well as, with their consent, all indigenous and local knowledge experts currently or formerly involved in IPBES. This roster will be searchable according to a variety of criteria and will be publicly available;

(c) A *repository of relevant resources of indigenous and local knowledge* displaying a broad range of relevant sources of information, knowledge and data sets related to indigenous and local knowledge, or links to such information, knowledge and data sets, and thus forming an institutional database to facilitate the mobilization of data and knowledge relevant for gap-filling and dialogue. This repository and these links must comply with the conditions set out in paragraph 11;

(d) A *display of ongoing activities* pertaining to indigenous and local knowledge, including those described in section II above, such as web-based consultations, dialogue workshops, capacity-building activities and activities mobilizing accessible indigenous and local knowledge;

(e) A *discussion forum* creating opportunities for shared learning and exchanges between indigenous and local knowledge systems and other knowledge systems;

(f) A *place to self-organize* for registered individuals or entities, including for subgroups that members may seek to establish, such as dedicated groups providing support for specific IPBES assessments.

29. The participatory mechanism will support the dedicated **consultations** foreseen as part of the four phases.

30. Through the participatory mechanism, IPBES will engage in **strategic partnerships** to:

(a) Promote the broad reach of and engagement in the online consultation and dialogue workshops;

(b) Promote and catalyse the mobilization of indigenous and local knowledge in accessible formats to address gaps identified by appropriate partners;

(c) Promote and catalyse the undertaking of capacity-building activities that strengthen the ability of indigenous peoples and local communities to take part in, contribute to and benefit from IPBES deliverables;

31. Raise awareness and understanding of indigenous and local knowledge systems and the application of the IPBES approach to recognizing and working with indigenous and local knowledge.

Annex III to decision IPBES-5/1

Outline workplan for 2017 and 2018

Activity	2nd quarter 2017	3rd quarter 2017	4th quarter 2017	1st quarter 2018	2nd quarter 2018	3rd quarter 2018	4th quarter 2018	1st quarter 2019
Support to experts working on assessments regarding the selection and use of indicators, metrics and related data	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Survey regarding the utility of the web-based infrastructure and its further refinement	x	x	x					
Update of the web-based infrastructure with finalized IPBES products	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Development of the web-based infrastructure into a repository of key resources pertaining to IPBES deliverables		x	x	x	x	x	x	x
Identification of research gaps emerging in the context of ongoing and completed assessments	x				x			
Consultations on suggested priority areas for knowledge generation	x	x				x		
Engagement with potential research funding organizations on priority areas for knowledge generation			x	x			x	x
Other activities related to knowledge and data in support of IPBES assessment experts	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x

Annex IV to decision IPBES-5/1

Scoping report for a thematic assessment on the sustainable use of wild species: deliverable 3 (b) (iii)

I. Scope, coverage, rationale, utility and methodological approach

A. Scope

16.   The objective of the proposed thematic assessment is to consider various approaches to the enhancement of the sustainability of the use of wild species of all organisms within the ecosystems that they inhabit and to strengthen related practices, measures, capacities and tools for their conservation through such use. The assessment will focus on the sustainability of the use of wild species, and will recognize the inherent interdependencies between the use of wild species and its wider socio-ecological contexts. The assessment will be solution-oriented, with the overall aim of identifying challenges and opportunities to establish or further strengthen measures and conditions that ensure and promote the sustainable use of wild species and the halting of their unsustainable use. Relevant dimensions of the sustainable use of wild species will be analysed, and the status of and trends in the sustainable use of wild species will be assessed along with direct and indirect drivers of change and the contributions that they provide. The assessment will further explore future scenarios for the use of wild species and the consequences for wild species and their evolutionary fate and will examine the range of challenges to and opportunities and policy options for the further enhancement of ensuring that the use of wild species is sustainable. The time frame of analyses will cover current status, trends up to 2020 (going back as far as 50 years) and plausible future projections, with a focus on various periods between 2030 and 2050.

17.   The assessment will result in the elaboration of a common understanding of the term "wild species" that is consistent with the assessment's overall approach and the IPBES conceptual framework and takes into account existing definitions used under the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES), the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), the Convention on Biological Diversity and other relevant international bodies, as well as various knowledge systems recognizing that, depending on the context, there is often a continuum between what is considered wild and what is considered domestic or captive. As a starting point, the term refers to non-domesticated species and wild populations of domesticated species. The assessment will therefore not address, for example, the management of crops or livestock on farms or of populations in aquaculture facilities or in artificial plantations except insofar as they may provide alternatives to the use of wild populations.

18.   The assessment will recognize the inseparable unity of nature and humanity, including ecosystem functions and nature's contributions to people and a good quality of life, as outlined in the IPBES conceptual framework. It will therefore take into account not only the positive and negative ecological and social effects of the use of wild species but also the effects of various approaches, practices and technologies in a range of sociopolitical contexts and their relationship to various knowledge systems, including indigenous and local knowledge and practices.

19.   The assessment will focus on the consumptive and non-consumptive uses of a number of wild species across a representative group of taxa and uses. The assessment will take into account a wide range of aspects of the actual use of wild species, including spatial and temporal scales; subsistence, commercial and recreational purposes; and customary, legal and illegal contexts. To reflect the breadth and complexity of the uses of wild species, the assessment will cover a range of the IPBES terrestrial and aquatic units of analysis, including marine ones, and their contiguity and connectedness. The assessment will not replicate the work of other assessments, but will review existing work in the context of the mandate of IPBES and the present scoping report.

20.   Building on internationally recognized definitions and principles of sustainable use, such as the definition and recommendations for the sustainable use of biodiversity under article 2 of the Convention on Biological Diversity, the Addis Ababa Principles and Guidelines for the Sustainable Use of Biodiversity, adopted by its Conference of the Parties (decision VII/12), and the concept of "non-detriment findings" under CITES, and on the guidance developed for their formulation in accordance with the various species characteristics, the assessment will include the elaboration of what could reasonably be included under the sustainable use of wild species in the context of international targets such as the Aichi Biodiversity Targets and the Sustainable Development Goals.

21.   The assessment will identify opportunities and challenges in respect of the establishment or further strengthening of the conditions and measures conducive to promoting the sustainability of the use of wild species within the ecosystems that they inhabit. The assessment will be based on the understanding of sustainable use of wild species that are important elements in the present and future functioning of ecosystems and their contributions to people. Where the assessment finds that the use of wild species is not sustainable, it should explore possible policy options as to what level of use (if any) could be sustainable and when all use should be curtailed in order for species to recover, taking into account the ecological conditions for such recovery. Drawing on lessons learned from a wide range of perspectives and knowledge systems, the assessment will analyse the strengths and weaknesses of relevant governance systems, legislative and trade regimes, methodologies and practices.

22.   The assessment will address the following questions of relevance to decision makers dealing with the sustainable use of wild species:

        (a)   How can the sustainable use of wild species be appropriately conceptualized and operationalized (chapter 2)?

        (b)   What methods and tools exist for assessing, measuring and managing the sustainable use of wild species (chapter 2)?

        (c)   What are the positive and negative impacts of various uses of wild species and other direct drivers on nature and nature's contributions to people (chapter 3)?

        (d)   Who is likely to be the main beneficiaries of the sustainable use of wild species (chapter 3)?

        (e)   What are the indirect drivers that affect the sustainability of the use of wild species, including systemic obstacles and perverse incentives preventing sustainable use (chapter 4)?

        (f)   What are the different scenarios related to the sustainable use of wild species (chapter 5)?

        (g)   What policy options and governance pathways relating to various scenarios of the use of wild species, including socioeconomic and ecological considerations, can lead to the achievement of sustainability of the use of wild species in the ecosystems they inhabit (chapter 5)?

        (h)   What policy responses and methods and tools for assessing, measuring and managing sustainable use of wild species have proved to be appropriate and effective, in which contexts and over what time frames? To what extent can they be replicated in other contexts (chapter 6)?

        (i)   What gaps in data and knowledge regarding status, drivers, impacts, policy responses and policy support tools and methods need to be addressed in order to better understand and implement the variety of options and opportunities for enhancing conservation through the sustainable use of wild species (chapter 6)?

        (j)   What opportunities does the sustainable use of wild species offer with regard to alternative land uses (for example, replacing less sustainable land use activities) (chapter 6)?

B.   Geographic coverage of the assessment

23.   The coverage of the assessment will be global, including terrestrial and aquatic (including marine) socio-ecological systems at a range of spatial scales, from local to global.

C.   Rationale

24.   There is a need for a comprehensive assessment of the status of and trends in the use of wild species, and of possible future scenarios of such use, in terms of the sustainability of current use in its socio-ecological context as well as the status of and trends in the direct and indirect drivers that affect that sustainability. The assessment will take into account the multiple worldviews, knowledge systems, cultural traditions and values that operate within different socio-ecological contexts.

25.   The use of wild species is of critical importance to all communities, particularly those that live in biodiversity-rich countries or regions earmarked for global conservation efforts. The assessment provides an opportunity to address good quality of life, including the needs of indigenous peoples and local communities. For many countries the very essence of the cultures and livelihoods of their people is based on the natural resources to which they have access and the ecosystems of which they form a part. Many species are also used by populations outside the countries where they are located – for example, through international trade and tourism.

26. There is a general desire to protect wild species from extinction and decline, especially in the case of the most visible mammal and bird species. The use of these species is regarded, and publicly criticized, as a major cause of their decline. If improperly managed the use of wild species can lead to extinction, yet the sustainable use of wild species can also be a driver for long-term conservation. The sustainable use of wild species, rather than non-use, is an important aspect of sustainable and socioeconomically just development and policy that conserves the biodiversity on which people depend.

27. The assessment will yield options for policy scenarios and governance pathways that could promote the conservation of biodiversity and the maintenance of socio-ecological functions such as nature´s contributions to people. The assessment will contribute to the development of a strengthened knowledge base relating to both the concept of sustainable use of wild species and the direct and indirect drivers of unsustainable practices and ways of countering those practices. It will focus both on existing policy instruments and policy support tools and on their effectiveness and will catalyse the development of additional policy support tools and methodologies.

D. Utility

28. The assessment will provide users and the general public, including Governments, multilateral organizations, the private sector and civil society, including indigenous peoples and local communities, and non-governmental organizations, with a relevant, credible, legitimate, authoritative, evidence-based and comprehensive analysis of the sustainable use of wild species based on the current state of knowledge stemming from scientific and other knowledge systems, including indigenous and local knowledge.

29. The assessment will contribute to the second objective of the Convention on Biological Diversity, which focuses on the sustainable use of biodiversity. It will also support the implementation of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011–2020 and Aichi Biodiversity Targets 6 (on sustainable consumptive use of fish and invertebrate stocks and aquatic plants) and 12 (on conservation of threatened species) and elements of targets 3 (on incentives), 4 (on sustainable consumption and production), 7 (on sustainable management in particular of forests), 16 (on the Nagoya Protocol) and 18 (on customary use of biological resources). The assessment will also support the implementation of a number of decisions adopted by the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity, including on the Addis Ababa Principles and Guidelines for the Sustainable Use of Biodiversity and on the differentiation of subsistence uses, legal and illegal hunting, overharvesting and domestic and international trade in specimens of wild species and products.

30. The assessment will contribute to attainment of the goal of CITES, which is to ensure that international trade in endangered wild animals and plants does not threaten their survival in the wild. The assessment will contribute by providing information to CITES parties that they may use in the issuance of permits. It will also provide information as to whether international trade will be detrimental or beneficial to the survival of species and will demonstrate the importance and value of sustainable practices for species conservation. The assessment will take into account the knowledge needs of national scientific and management authorities to foster the use of applied science for the implementation of CITES, including the making of non-detriment and legal acquisition findings and related trade decisions. It will also contribute to the exploration of the conditions that contribute to the sustainable use of wild species and the identification of methods and tools for assessing, measuring and managing the sustainable use of wild species.

31. Countries could make use of the assessment while working to achieve the Sustainable Development Goals, specifically goals 2 (on ending hunger), 12 (on sustainable production and consumption), 13 (on combating climate change), 14 (on conservation and sustainable use of oceans, seas and marine resources), 15 (on sustainable use of terrestrial ecosystems) and 17 (on revitalizing the Global Partnership for Sustainable Development). In addition, the assessment aims to contribute to efforts to counter the unsustainable and illegal use of wild species, which undermines the achievement of broader societal goals and targets. It will also contribute to goals 1 (on ending poverty), 3 (on ensuring healthy lives and well-being), 5 (on achieving gender equality), 6 (on sustainable water and sanitation), 7 (on sustainable energy) and 16 (on peaceful and inclusive societies).

E. Methodological approach

32. The assessment will be based on existing scientific literature, national assessments and sources from other knowledge systems, including indigenous and local knowledge, and will draw on the work of existing institutions and networks (see section IV below, on relevant stakeholders and initiatives). It will consider relevant work such as CITES advances on the context of non-detriment findings and the definition of sustainable use and trade of wildlife. It will also take into account the IPBES regional and

global assessments of biodiversity and ecosystem services, as well as its assessment of land degradation and restoration, which cover many aspects of sustainable use. The assessment should also take into account the preliminary guide on the conceptualizations of values of biodiversity and nature's contributions to people (IPBES/4/INF/13). Materials collected during the scoping process, including references to published and grey literature, will be available to the assessment expert group. The preparation of the assessment will follow agreed procedures. Confidence terms, as outlined in the IPBES guide for assessments, will be assigned to all key findings in the executive summaries of the technical chapters in the assessment report and to the key messages in the summary for policymakers.

33.   The assessment expert group should ensure disciplinary, regional and gender balance, should represent a diversity of worldviews and will comprise 2 co-chairs, 12 coordinating lead authors, 36 lead authors and 12 review editors, who will be selected in accordance with the procedures for the preparation of the Platform's deliverables following a call for nominations after approval of the scoping report by the Plenary.

34.   Technical support for the assessment will be provided by a technical support unit working as part of the secretariat.

35.   The assessment will be prepared over three years. The preparation process and timetable are outlined in section VI below.

II.   Chapter outline

36.   The thematic assessment will consist of a set of six chapters and their executive summaries and a summary for policymakers drawing key messages from those chapters. The assessment will also include a glossary with all relevant terms and definitions.

Chapter 1. Setting the scene

37.   Chapter 1 will set the scene for the assessment by outlining how the sustainable use of wild species and their contributions will be addressed in the context of the IPBES conceptual framework. Chapter 1 will define what is meant by "wild species", taking into consideration definitions used under CITES, FAO, the Convention on Biological Diversity and other relevant international bodies, as well as various knowledge systems, and their sustainable use, taking into account biological, ecological and evolutionary aspects.

38.   This chapter will provide a road map and overarching rationale for the sequence of chapters in the assessment, as well as for the focus on consumptive and non-consumptive uses of a number of wild species across a representative group of taxa and uses. The assessment will take into account a wide range of aspects of the actual use of wild species, including spatial and temporal scales; subsistence, commercial or recreational purposes; and customary, legal and illegal contexts. The chapter will explain the integrative socio-ecological approach taken, recognizing the inseparable unity of nature and humanity, including ecosystem functions and nature's contributions to people and a good quality of life. The chapter will outline how the assessment will strengthen related practices, measures, capacities and tools and help to achieve relevant internationally agreed targets and goals such as the CITES goals, the Aichi Biodiversity Targets and the Sustainable Development Goals.

Chapter 2. Conceptualizing the sustainable use of wild species

39.   Chapter 2 will elaborate on the conditions that are necessary for the sustainable use of wild species and on the criteria and elements that are essential to ensure that the impacts of wild species use are socially sound and within ecological limits. The chapter will provide a critical assessment of sustainable use principles, including recognized standards for the sustainable use of wild species.

40.   Building on internationally recognized definitions, principles and concepts of sustainable use, the chapter will elaborate on what sustainable use of wild species means in the context of international targets such as the Aichi Biodiversity Targets and the Sustainable Development Goals and its implications for conventions such as CITES. It will reflect on the methods and tools needed to assess, measure and manage the use of wild species sustainably, as well as the contributions that they provide, taking into account a wide range of aspects of their actual use, including spatial, temporal and quantitative scales, subsistence commercial or recreational purposes, sustainable customary use, legal or illegal contexts, how they are perceived and classified by local people and other considerations. It will also consider the non-anthropocentric value of sustainable use of species, particularly for maintaining the evolutionary perspectives of ecosystems and species. The chapter will draw on the preliminary guide on the conceptualizations of values of biodiversity and nature's contributions to people.

Chapter 3. Status of and trends in the use of wild species and its implications for wild species, the environment and people

41.   Chapter 3 will assess the use of wild species and its effect on their conservation status and trends and the positive and negative environmental aspects of the various categories of consumptive and non-consumptive uses introduced in chapter 1 with regard to a selection of wild species covering a range of taxa, and relevant terrestrial and aquatic units of analysis, including marine ones. This will be done in relation to the Aichi Biodiversity Targets and the Sustainable Development Goals. Thus it will undertake an analysis of the sustainable use of wild species covering all of the IPBES regions, taking a balanced approach to the treatment of taxa and of species in each taxon and building on relevant work such as CITES non-detriment findings. Criteria for the selection of wild species could entail risk of extinction, importance to communities, examples of best practices, and division into consumptive and non-consumptive use.

42.   The chapter will assess knowledge on what levels of use (if any) could be sustainable and/or when management is required in order for species to recover, taking into account ecological conditions for such recovery. Looking at various management practices, in particular those promoted in the context of CITES, the Convention on Biological Diversity, the Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals and other relevant conventions, as well as assessments carried out by FAO and regional fisheries management organizations, the chapter will assess the impact of the use of selected wild species on nature, including its effects on the ecology, dynamics and genetic diversity of species populations or on corresponding ecosystem functioning. In assessing the environmental context of the use of wild species, the chapter will also take into account relevant direct drivers such as degradation, land-use change, habitat conversion, urban development, pollution, acidification, eutrophication, invasive alien species and climate change.

43.   Chapter 3 will also assess the implications of the use of wild species with regard to nature's contributions to people and to a good quality of life, taking into account the conditions, criteria and elements of the sustainability of their use elaborated in chapter 2. The chapter will draw on the preliminary guide on the conceptualization of values of biodiversity and nature's contributions to people.

Chapter 4. Indirect drivers of the sustainable use of wild species

44.   Chapter 4 will assess the positive and negative indirect drivers of the sustainable use of wild species, exploring institutional arrangements, governance regimes and the sociopolitical, economic, legal, cultural and technological context of the use of wild species across scales. It will assess conditions such as tenure systems, urban management, land-management practices and relevant environmental legislation and schemes of illegal use. The indirect drivers considered will include demography, income levels, consumption patterns, value systems and others. Consideration will be given to how institutional and governance arrangements contribute positively and negatively to changes in the use of wild species, interactions among drivers and environmental outcomes.

Chapter 5. Future scenarios of the sustainable use of wild species

45.   Chapter 5 will present possible future scenarios for sustainable use and its effects on the conservation of wild species in their wider socio-ecological context. In assessing trends in and scenarios for the use of wild species, the chapter will take into consideration the conditions, criteria and elements fundamental to the sustainability of such use elaborated in chapter 2 and the analysis of the direct and indirect drivers as assessed in chapters 3 and 4. In considering the scenarios, the chapter will also draw on the IPBES methodological assessment of scenarios and models of biodiversity and ecosystem services (decision IPBES-4/1, section V, paragraph 1 and annex IV), the preliminary guide to the conceptualizations of values of biodiversity and nature's contributions to people and the assessment of the effectiveness of policy responses provided in chapter 6. It will make use of exploratory scenarios for plausible futures for wild species and the contributions they provide, subject to levels of use, and will also examine policy-screening scenarios and governance pathways that could lead to more sustainable futures. The possible futures and scenarios for the sustainable use of wild species will take into account regional specificities, including those of small island States.

Chapter 6. Policy options and responses

46.   Chapter 6 will assess knowledge on the effectiveness of policy responses with regard to the sustainable use of wild species and will outline possible options for and impediments faced by decision makers regarding the policy-relevant issues discussed in the preceding chapters. Options explored will include various policy instruments, including legal and regulatory instruments, and best practices. Options explored should also include communication measures that promote sustainable use through awareness-raising, networking and capacity-building. In addition, the combining of policy

instruments and their integration with other environmental policy and governance pathways will be emphasized as policy strategies for promoting the sustainable use of wild species and their habitats.

47. The chapter will explore options at various hierarchical, spatial and temporal scales, looking at a range of governance systems and considering knowledge about who would gain from them or bear the costs and benefits of their implementation. It will look at knowledge on both statutory and traditional tenure systems and at the role of informal institutions and will also identify existing data, the enabling environments and limitations for policy uptake and lessons learned, including solutions and methods for ensuring success and capacity-building needs in diverse contexts.

III. Indicators, metrics and data sets

48. With support from the IPBES task force on knowledge and data, and taking into account the core and highlighted indicators selected for the regional and global assessments of biodiversity and ecosystem services and the assessment of land degradation and restoration, the assessment will review the use and effectiveness of existing indicators for assessing sustainable use, such as those developed by the Biodiversity Indicators Partnership, and will explore other possible indicators and data sets that could be used.

49. The assessment will survey the extent to which data are available and current and will determine data and knowledge gaps. Data selected for use in the assessment should allow for disaggregation according to relevant variables such as biotope, taxa and level of income. Attention will be given, in accordance with the data and information management plan of IPBES, to ensuring access to metadata and, whenever possible, to the corresponding underlying data, through an interoperable process to ensure comparability between assessments. In addition, the task force on data and knowledge will develop recommendations and procedures to ensure that data and information used in the assessment is widely available for future IPBES assessments and other uses.

50. The assessment will also identify and seek access to any other relevant data and information sources that may exist or emerge. Such sources include global, regional and national institutions and organizations, as well as literature by scientific and indigenous and local communities. The requirements of the assessment process will be communicated widely in order to identify and encourage the sharing of relevant data and information.

51. The task force on indigenous and local knowledge systems, together with relevant indigenous and local knowledge-holders and experts, will guide the procedures for the analysis and use of indigenous and local knowledge. The collective ability to perform these tasks will be strengthened through capacity-building, knowledge-sharing and international collaboration.

IV. Relevant stakeholders and initiatives

52. Under the operating principles of IPBES, partnerships are important in order to avoid duplication and promote synergies with ongoing activities. Strategic partnerships are a critical subset of the many possible forms of partnership with IPBES. In the context of the assessment on the sustainable use of wild species, strategic partnerships are those that promote, for example, relationships with multiple relevant bodies under a single global umbrella. Strategic partners for the assessment process should be identified in accordance with the IPBES guidance on the development of strategic partnerships and other collaborative arrangements (decision IPBES-3/4, annex III). Other interested organizations are invited to engage with the assessment process.

53. Indigenous and local people generally possess significant knowledge on the wild species that surround them, including knowledge about their habitat, seasonal availability, species ethology in the case of animal species and other matters, and they often use them for subsistence and other purposes. Consequently, indigenous and local people are major stakeholders and key partners for national Governments and international agencies seeking to safeguard biodiversity through conservation measures or regulatory interventions. The livelihoods of indigenous and local people are often strongly intertwined with the use of wild species. Incentives for the sustainable use of wild species can be used by local populations as tools for the sustainability of the use of wild species.

V. Capacity-building

54. A key objective of the assessment is to support the development and improvement of approaches to ensure that the use of wild species is sustainable and to strengthen related practices, measures, techniques, capacities and tools. The assessment will aim to strengthen the scientific underpinnings of informed decision-making on this issue. It will provide the basis for

capacity-building activities to improve human, institutional and technical capacities to foster the implementation of its key messages. This includes building capacities to provide the science-based data necessary to determine the sustainability of wild species use. Capacity-building will aim in the long term at the development and use of policy support tools and methodologies and improving access to the necessary data, information and knowledge and to indigenous and local knowledge systems.

55.   In addition, capacity-building activities will be designed to enable the effective participation of experts from developing countries in the assessment. The assessment will be supported by the task force on capacity-building, in particular through the implementation of the IPBES capacity-building rolling plan. In line with the plan, capacity-building will also include strengthening the effectiveness of the contributions of indigenous and local knowledge systems to assessments.

VI.   Process and timetable

56.   The proposed process and timetable for preparing the assessment report, including actions, milestones and institutional arrangements, are set out below.

Date	Actions and institutional arrangements
Year 1	
First quarter	The Plenary approves the conduct of the thematic assessment of sustainable use of wild species, asks for offers of in-kind technical support for the assessment and requests the secretariat, advised by the Bureau, to establish the necessary institutional arrangements to put technical support in place
	The Chair, through the secretariat, requests nominations of experts from Governments and other stakeholders
Second quarter	The Secretariat compiles lists of nominations
	The Multidisciplinary Expert Panel selects the assessment co-chairs, coordinating lead authors, lead authors and review editors using the approved selection criteria
	Meeting of the Management Committee (co-chairs, head of the technical support unit and Multidisciplinary Expert Panel and Bureau members) to plan first author meeting
	Selected nominees contacted, gaps filled and the list of co-chairs, authors and review editors finalized
Second and early third quarters	First author meeting with 56 participants: 2 co-chairs, 12 coordinating lead authors, 36 lead authors, 6 Panel and Bureau members
Fourth quarter	Zero-order drafts of chapters prepared and sent to the secretariat (technical support unit)
Year 2	
First quarter	First-order drafts of chapters prepared and sent to the secretariat (technical support unit)
	Compilation of chapters into first-order draft (6 weeks)
Second quarter	First-order draft sent for external expert peer review (6 weeks, June and July)
	Review comments collated by technical support unit and sent to authors (2 weeks)
Early third quarter	Second author meeting with 68 participants: 2 co-chairs, 12 coordinating lead authors, 36 lead authors, 12 review editors and 6 Panel and Bureau members
Third quarter	Second-order drafts of chapters and first-order draft of summary for policymakers prepared (5–6 months)
Year 3	
First quarter	Second-order draft of the assessment and first-order draft of the summary for policymakers sent for review by Governments and experts (2 months)
First quarter	Review comments collated by technical support unit and sent to authors (2 weeks)
Second and early third quarters	Third author meeting with 68 participants: 2 co-chairs, 12 coordinating lead authors, 36 lead authors, 12 review editors and 6 Panel and Bureau members
Third and fourth quarters	Final revisions of assessment and summary for policymakers (6 months)

Date	Actions and institutional arrangements
Year 4	
First quarter	Translation of the summary for policymakers into the 6 official languages of the United Nations
First quarter	Submission of the assessment, including the translated summary for policymakers, to Governments for final review prior to the Plenary session (6 weeks)
First quarter	Final government comments on the summary for policymakers considered by authors prior to the Plenary session
May (to be confirmed)	Plenary approves the summary for policymakers and accepts the chapters and their executive summaries
Second and third quarters	Communication activities in relation to the assessment

VII. Cost estimate

57. The table below shows the estimated cost of conducting the assessment and preparing the assessment report. The cost includes three author meetings, all involving the lead authors. The total estimated cost is $997,000.

Year	Cost item	Assumptions	Estimated costs (United States dollars)
Year 1	Management meeting on assessment (with co-chairs and members of the secretariat, technical support unit, Multidisciplinary Expert Panel and Bureau)	Cost of venue (1/2 week, 6 participants, in Bonn)	0
		Travel and daily subsistence allowance (4 × $3,750)	15 000
	First author meeting (participants: 2 co-chairs, 12 coordinating lead authors, 36 lead authors and 6 Multidisciplinary Expert Panel and Bureau members)	Cost of venue (corresponding to 75 per cent, to be complemented with 25 per cent in kind); 56 participants (42 supported)	18 750
		Travel and DSA (42 × $3,750)	157 500
	Technical support unit	Corresponding to half the costs of one full-time equivalent professional position, including travel and overhead (to be matched by an in-kind offer of an equivalent value)	75 000
	Total year 1		**266 250**
Year 2	Second author meeting (participants: 2 co-chairs, 12 coordinating lead authors, 36 lead authors, 12 review editors and 6 Multidisciplinary Expert Panel and Bureau members)	Cost of venue (corresponding to 75 per cent, to be complemented with 25 per cent in kind); 68 participants (51 supported)	20 000
		Travel and daily subsistence allowance (51 × $3,750)	191 250
	Technical support unit	Corresponding to half the costs of one full-time equivalent professional position, including travel and overhead (to be matched by an in-kind offer of an equivalent value)	75 000
	Total year 2		**286 250**

Year	Cost item	Assumptions	Estimated costs (United States dollars)
Year 3	Third author meeting (participants: 2 co-chairs, 12 coordinating lead authors, 36 lead authors, 12 review editors and 6 Multidisciplinary Expert Panel and Bureau members)	Cost of venue (corresponding to 75 per cent, to be complemented with 25 per cent in kind); 68 participants (51 supported)	20 000
		Travel and daily subsistence allowance (51 × $3,750)	191 250
	Technical support unit	Corresponding to half the costs of one full-time equivalent professional position, including travel and overhead (to be matched by an in-kind offer of an equivalent value)	75 000
	Dissemination and outreach		50 000
	Total year 3		**336 250**
Year 4 (assessment launch and post-launch activities)	Participation of 8 experts, including 2 co-chairs and 6 coordinating lead authors or lead authors, in the Plenary session	Travel and daily subsistence allowance 8 participants (6 supported) (6 × $3,750)	22 500
	Technical support (for 3 months after launch of the assessment report at the Plenary session)	Corresponding to half the costs of one full-time equivalent professional position, including travel and overhead (to be matched by an in-kind offer of an equivalent value)	18 750
	Dissemination and outreach		67 000
	Total year 4		**108 250**
			997 000