

**Intergovernmental Science-Policy  
Platform on Biodiversity and  
Ecosystem Services**Distr.: General  
11 December 2017

Original: English

**Plenary of the Intergovernmental Science-Policy  
Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services****Sixth session**

Medellin, Colombia, 18–24 March 2018

Item 11 of the provisional agenda\*

**Development of a second work programme****Development of a second work programme****Note by the secretariat****Introduction**

1. In its decision IPBES-5/3, the Plenary of the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES) requested the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel and the Bureau, with support from the secretariat, to develop, for consideration by the Plenary at its sixth session, initial draft elements of a framework for a rolling work programme, including a potential structure, guidance on a call for requests, a process for receiving and prioritizing requests, and preliminary estimates of costs and human resource needs, considering in particular:

(a) The time frame for the second work programme in the context of a 10-year horizon, the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, including the Sustainable Development Goals, the biodiversity-related conventions and other biodiversity and ecosystem service processes;

(b) Any opportunities that might arise through strategic partnerships;

(c) Options for the number and timing of methodological and thematic assessments, and for assessments at various spatial scales, with the provision that flexibility by the Plenary is required to address needs that may arise during the period of the work programme;

(d) That the second work programme should reflect the implementation of the four functions of the Platform, based on the results of the review of the Platform (deliverable 4 (e)) and the recommendations stemming therefrom;

(e) The modalities for the implementation of the second work programme, building on any early outcomes of the review of the Platform with regard to the modalities for the implementation of the first work programme of the Platform, in particular the structure of technical support, task forces and expert groups and the composition of the secretariat.

2. In response to that decision, the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel and the Bureau have prepared initial draft elements of a framework for a second work programme, presented in the annex to this document, for the consideration of the Plenary.

---

\* IPBES/6/1.

## Suggested action

3. The Plenary may wish:
- (a) *To take note* of the initial draft elements of a framework for a second work programme set out in the annex to document IPBES/6/11;
  - (b) *To request* the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel and the Bureau, supported by the secretariat:
    - (i) To revise the initial draft elements of the framework for a second work programme,<sup>1</sup> taking into account the views expressed by the Plenary at its sixth session;
    - (ii) To hold a series of regional consultations early in the process, to seek relevant inputs from Governments and stakeholders on the revised draft framework for a second work programme;
    - (iii) To launch a call for requests, inputs and suggestions, with a deadline of 30 September 2018, following the agreed procedure and guidance set out in the annex to decision IPBES-1/3 on the procedure for receiving and prioritizing requests put to the Platform, and:
      - a. To invite members to submit requests, including those conveyed by the multilateral environmental agreements related to biodiversity and ecosystem services as determined by their respective governing bodies;
      - b. To invite United Nations bodies related to biodiversity and ecosystem services and relevant stakeholders, such as other intergovernmental organizations, international and regional scientific organizations environment-related trust funds, non-governmental organizations, indigenous peoples and local communities and the private sector to submit inputs and suggestions;
      - c. To invite experts on, and holders of, indigenous and local knowledge to provide their input and suggestions through the participatory mechanism of the Platform;
    - (iv) To compile the requests, inputs and suggestions submitted and prepare a report containing a prioritized list of requests, inputs and suggestions for consideration by the Plenary at its seventh session;
    - (v) To further revise the draft framework for a second work programme, taking into account the comments received in the context of the regional consultations, as well as the report containing the prioritized list referred to in paragraph (iv), above;
    - (vi) To send the further revised draft framework for a second work programme to Governments and stakeholders for further comments;
    - (vii) To finalize a draft of the second work programme, taking into account comments received during the review referred to in paragraph (vi), for consideration by the Plenary at its seventh session, together with the report containing the prioritized list referred to in paragraph (iv), with a view to approving a second work programme of the Platform at that session.

---

<sup>1</sup> IPBES/6/11.

## Annex

### Initial draft elements for a second work programme

#### Preamble

1. The Multidisciplinary Expert Panel and the Bureau consider that the first work programme of the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES), which will come to an end in May 2019, has delivered on all its objectives to date and, after four years, has made good progress in establishing IPBES as the science-policy platform on biodiversity and ecosystem services. IPBES has successfully delivered its first set of credible assessment reports; driven the elaboration of new concepts, such as multiple values of nature and its benefits, and new approaches, such as working with indigenous and local knowledge; and catalysed new scientific work, such as on scenarios and models. New procedures have been established, new rules tested and, as a result, many lessons have been learned by all involved. The Multidisciplinary Expert Panel and the Bureau are confident that the community at large, having now benefited from this large-scale collective experience, is in a good position to design a compelling second work programme that will make a difference in terms of the importance given to biodiversity and ecosystem services for achieving the Sustainable Development Goals.

#### Introduction

2. The present document reflects the results of the internal review of IPBES (IPBES/6/INF/32) and the lessons learned from the implementation of the first work programme. The Plenary may wish to focus some of its exchanges at its sixth session on providing further guidance on the possible options indicated in bold text.

3. The second work programme of IPBES would be expected to continue to implement the four functions of IPBES, guided by the operating principles set out in the resolution establishing the Platform (UNEP/IPBES.MI/2/9, annex I, appendix I).

4. One option to allow for the requested flexibility, or “rolling” nature, of the second work programme **could be to determine some elements of the work programme, such as the themes of possible assessments, at various times during the course of the programme, through a succession of calls for requests, inputs and suggestions, rather than at the beginning.**

5. One option to allow for more synergies across the four functions, as recommended by the internal review, could be to **structure the second work programme in a more integrated manner.** For example, any theme selected by IPBES could include not only an assessment component but also well-defined capacity-building, policy support and knowledge generation components.

6. The three pending assessments under the first work programme are not mentioned in the present document.

#### I. Scope

7. The second work programme would be guided by the objective of IPBES to “strengthen the science-policy interface for biodiversity and ecosystem services for the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity, long-term human well-being and sustainable development”.

8. The second work programme would cover the period 2020–2030, when the science-policy interface for biodiversity and ecosystem services will be dominated by efforts to implement the follow-up to the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011–2020, the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, including the Sustainable Development Goals, and the Paris Agreement on Climate Change.

9. The objectives of those three instruments reflect the central elements of what the IPBES conceptual framework describes as “good quality of life”, that is a fulfilled human life, which can be understood to include access to food, water and shelter; health, education and good social relationships; physical, energy and livelihood security; equity, cultural identity, material prosperity and spiritual satisfaction; freedom of choice and action; and participation in society.

10. Through the sense of perspective provided by the IPBES conceptual framework, the second work programme could further contribute to understanding the relationships between people and nature, in particular the contributions of nature to a good quality of life, focusing on aspects relevant to the follow-up to the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011–2020, the Sustainable Development Goals and the Paris Agreement on climate change.

## II. Process for receiving and prioritizing requests

11. IPBES would be expected to respond to requests from Governments, including those conveyed by the multilateral environmental agreements related to biodiversity and ecosystem services, as determined by their respective governing bodies; to welcome inputs and suggestions from, and the participation of, the United Nations bodies related to biodiversity and ecosystem services, as determined by their respective governing bodies; and to encourage and take into account, as appropriate, the inputs and suggestions made by relevant stakeholders, such as other intergovernmental organizations, international and regional scientific organizations, environmental trust funds, non-governmental organizations, indigenous peoples and local communities and the private sector.

12. The internal review of IPBES has indicated that IPBES should find ways to strengthen interaction with Governments in its work (IPBES/6/INF/32). **One option to facilitate this could be to hold informal consultations at various times during the period of the second work programme with IPBES national focal points and the representatives of other relevant stakeholders for an exchange of views on, in particular, potential future areas of work to be addressed by IPBES.** The consultations could take place at the regional level or at one or two-day meetings held back to back with a session of the Plenary.

13. **The process to further develop the framework for a second work programme after the sixth session of the Plenary could include the following steps:**

(a) **Revision of the initial draft elements of the framework for a second work programme, taking into account the views expressed by the Plenary at its sixth session;**

(b) **Convening of regional consultations to seek relevant strategic inputs from Governments and stakeholders on the revised draft framework for a second work programme;**

(c) **Issuance of a call for requests, inputs and suggestions to Governments and other stakeholders;**

(d) **Compilation and prioritization by the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel and the Bureau of the requests, inputs and suggestions received in response to the call;**

(e) **Further revision by the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel and the Bureau of the draft framework, taking into account the comments received in the context of the regional consultations and the outcome of the prioritization exercise;**

(f) **Submission of the further revised draft framework to Governments and stakeholders for comments;**

(g) **Finalization of the draft second work programme for consideration by the Plenary at its seventh session.**

14. As mentioned in the introduction, and in order to allow for the requested flexibility of the work programme, **several calls for requests, inputs and suggestions could be issued at various times during the period of the second work programme.** The regional consultations mentioned above could be held in conjunction with each of the calls in order to engage Governments and other stakeholders more strongly.

### III. Functions

15. It is expected that the elements of the second work programme would foster a synergetic integration of the four functions of IPBES.

#### A. Assessing knowledge

16. IPBES would be expected to continue to perform regular and timely assessments of knowledge on biodiversity and ecosystem services and their interlinkages – at a global, regional and, as necessary, subregional scale – and of thematic and methodological issues, in line with the procedures for the preparation of Platform deliverables set out in Annex I to decision IPBES-3/3.

17. IPBES would be expected, in that context, to continue to apply the approach to recognizing and working with indigenous and local knowledge, as approved by the Plenary in decision IPBES-5/1 (part II), by collaboratively identifying problems and goals and developing a set of key questions specific to each assessment; to synthesize and incorporate evidence and data from multiple sources of indigenous and local knowledge; to appropriately engage indigenous peoples and local communities in the review of the various assessment drafts; and to share with the indigenous peoples and local communities the knowledge and insights gained during the process, once the assessment has been concluded.

18. Based on the lessons learned, and in the light of the heavy workload for all involved in the first work programme, **the Plenary may wish to discuss whether it would be useful to limit the number of assessments performed in parallel to three, for example, and the number of assessments considered at a single Plenary session to two, for example.** This would spread the workload for Governments, the scientific community, the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel, the Bureau and the secretariat.

19. **Given the goal of placing the second work programme in the context of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, one option could be to focus on the role of marine and terrestrial biodiversity and nature’s contributions to people in regard to nexus issues, such as food and water; food, water and health/nutrition; and food, water, health and energy.** A focus on such themes could serve to address the contributions underlying sustainable food production, including the quantity and quality of freshwater resources; improved nutrition and sustainable agriculture; sustainable, modern energy services; and efforts to ensure good health for all. It could also help to consider the role of those issues in achieving a good quality of life, as well as the trade-offs between them and related policy options. The assessment of the themes would provide a scientific basis to support appropriate consideration of biodiversity and nature’s contributions to people in relevant decisions and policies related to several of the Sustainable Development Goals. Other themes could be suggested, scoped and agreed upon at a later stage.

20. The Plenary, at its seventh session, may wish to start by approving as part of the second work programme the undertaking of a scoping process for at least one theme.

21. One question to consider is whether there would be any need to repeat the regional and global assessments and whether any modifications in regard to their preparation should be proposed. Integrating the work across four separate regional assessments, and between those assessments and the global assessment, has proved challenging for all involved in the first work programme, as it has been difficult for five different groups working separately on different reports to integrate their work. **One option for fostering more integration between the regional assessments, and between the regional assessments and the global assessment could be to have a larger group of experts produce a single assessment that integrates the regional and global components.** In terms of timing, **one option could be to release it in 2028 or 2029, for example, in accordance with the request from the Plenary to support the development of any follow-up to the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011–2020 and the Sustainable Development Goals beyond 2030.** That would correspond to a release date about 10 years after that of the global assessment, which is scheduled for May 2019.

#### B. Supporting policy formulation and implementation

22. IPBES would be expected to continue and expand its work of identifying policy-relevant tools and methodologies to enable decision makers to gain access to them and, where necessary, to promote their further development.

23. Comments from the internal review have highlighted the need to ensure that the work related to policy support is more strongly integrated with other IPBES deliverables, the assessments in particular, and that the links are strengthened with communities of practice and capacity-building opportunities.
24. Efforts under the first work programme have resulted in, among other things, the production in 2016 of the first IPBES methodological assessment on scenarios and models, followed by the work of the IPBES expert group on scenarios and models to catalyse the production of new models and scenarios (IPBES/6/INF/15), which will provide options for decision-making as part of the IPBES global assessment and in the future work of IPBES. It is expected that that work would continue. **One option for the second work programme could be to undertake methodological assessments focusing on the effectiveness of various policy instruments and policy support tools, either as stand-alone reports, such as on governance and institutions, or as part of an assessment with a broader theme, and to catalyse their further development in a manner comparable to that of the expert group on scenarios and models.**
25. Other efforts under the first work programme have included the identification in IPBES assessments of relevant methods and tools, together with information on their effectiveness and use, according to the guidance provided by the expert group on policy support tools and methodologies. A catalogue of policy support tools, as an interactive website, was initiated to feature the identified tools and information on their use to allow Governments and others to have access to the tools and to reflect on their experience with them and with other tools.
26. The agreed approach to indigenous and local knowledge for this function will serve to identify, describe and facilitate relevant tools and methodologies for implementing the four phases of the approach in assessments and to ensure that the policy responses, decision-making instruments and processes relevant to indigenous peoples and local communities are reflected in the assessments.
27. **That work is expected to continue, with stronger guidance to assessment expert groups and informed by strengthened interactions with Governments and other users.**

### C. Catalysing efforts to generate new knowledge

28. IPBES would be expected to continue **to identify and prioritize key scientific information needed for policymakers at an appropriate scale**; to continue to **catalyse efforts to generate new knowledge** by engaging in dialogue with key scientific organizations, policymakers and funding organizations on the identified priorities; and **to further implement the approach to recognizing and working with indigenous and local knowledge** in that context.
29. Under the first work programme a process has been developed, and is being piloted, to identify the knowledge gaps in completed assessments; to consult on those gaps with the scientific community and other knowledge holders to formulate priorities for scientific research and other forms of knowledge generation; and to engage on those priorities with potential research funding institutions and other funding organizations.
30. Under the first work programme processes have been developed to mobilize data, information and knowledge, including indicators, in support of IPBES assessments. The work on indicators and how they are framed in the assessments would be expected to continue, with the list of indicators being further developed to better include socioeconomic aspects and aspects relevant to indigenous peoples and local communities, and to further strengthen and expand the necessary partnerships in that regard.
31. Regarding indigenous and local knowledge, an approach has been defined under the first work programme to identify practices to help to manage the evidence and data collected in assessments; to facilitate access to, and the management of, available sources of indigenous and local knowledge; and to promote and catalyse the mobilization of indigenous and local knowledge where such knowledge does not exist in readily available formats.
32. **It is expected that that work would continue and that the processes would be applied to the assessments carried out under the second work programme, with continuous learning and improvement.**

### D. Building capacity

33. IPBES would be expected to continue to prioritize key capacity-building needs to improve the science-policy interface at the appropriate levels, and to provide and call for financial and other support for the highest priority needs related directly to its activities, as decided by the Plenary. It would further be

expected to host a forum to catalyse conventional and potential new sources of funding for such capacity-building activities.

34. Regarding the work related to indigenous and local knowledge, IPBES would continue to identify, prioritize and build the capacity critical to the implementation of the indigenous and local knowledge approach; to promote and catalyse the undertaking of capacity-building activities in support of the needs of indigenous peoples and local communities in regard to their engagement with IPBES; and to establish and fully develop the participatory mechanism as a way to improve the participation of indigenous and local communities in the four functions of IPBES.

35. Comments from the internal review have highlighted the need to increase opportunities for partners to engage with and build capacity for IPBES and to further integrate capacity-building activities into other components of any future work programme (IPBES/6/INF/32).

36. The Plenary, at its fifth session, welcomed the rolling plan for capacity-building set out in Annex I to decision IPBES-5/1, which outlines three strategies: enhancing learning and engagement, facilitating access to expertise and information, and strengthening national and regional capacities.

37. As part of the second work programme, **capacity-building could continue to be undertaken according to the rolling plan welcomed by the Plenary in decision IPBES-5/1. The plan could be reviewed and potentially revised on a regular basis in keeping with its “rolling” nature.**

## IV. Institutional arrangements

### A. Sessions of the Plenary

38. The Plenary would be expected to continue to meet annually, although it may wish to consider other arrangements.

39. As mentioned above, one option for strengthening interaction with Governments and other stakeholders could be to hold informal consultations at various times during the period of the second work programme. The informal meetings could involve Governments and other policymakers, practitioners and other stakeholders, the scientific community and partner organizations. They could, for example, allow for technical discussions and exchanges on the selection of requests to the Plenary; the development of scoping documents; a dialogue on draft assessments to strengthen the submission of comments; or the provision of input on other aspects of the work programme, such as the web-based policy support tool. **The consultations could take place at the regional level, at one or two-day meetings held back-to-back with a session of the Plenary or, if deemed feasible, in place of an annual session of the Plenary.**

### B. Expert groups and task forces

40. It is expected that **expert groups and task forces would continue to be established to respectively perform assessments and implement other deliverables of the second work programme.**

41. Among the comments from the internal review it has been noted that the composition of expert groups and task forces could be reconsidered. Possible options include:

(a) Selecting experts from assessment expert groups to fully align the work of a task force, such as on indicators or indigenous and local knowledge, with the needs of the assessments;

(b) Engaging as resource persons the representatives of partner organizations contributing to the work, such as on knowledge generation catalysis, for example.

42. It is suggested that the consultations for the second work programme could:

(a) Reflect on the possibility of better integrating the work of IPBES across various themes and functions by establishing fewer expert groups and task forces;

(b) **Seek advice as to whether adjustments are necessary in regard to the focus and modus operandi of the three task forces** established as part of the first work programme – on knowledge and data, capacity-building and indigenous and local knowledge – in the light of the outcomes of the internal review;

(c) **Explore whether there is a need to establish additional task forces on the following topics** covered under the first work programme by expert groups or as part of the mandate of a task force:

- (i) **Indicators:** a separate task force to provide focused support to the work on indicators in IPBES assessments;
- (ii) **Conceptualization of multiple values:** to continue to support the diverse conceptualization of multiple values of nature and its benefits in IPBES assessments and to catalyse the development and use of relevant tools and methodologies;
- (iii) **Scenarios and models:** to continue to support the integration of scenarios and models into IPBES assessments and to catalyse the development of new scenarios and models;
- (iv) **Policy support tools and methodologies:** to continue to support the identification and assessment of relevant tools and methodologies to be featured on the web-based policy support portal and to catalyse their further development.

### C. Secretariat, including technical support units

43. The outcomes of the internal review indicate that the current size of the secretariat supported by the IPBES trust fund is considered the minimum size to provide support to an intergovernmental process such as that of IPBES. The size of the entire secretariat would need to be consistent with the ambition of the second work programme.

44. It is expected that time-bound and task-specific technical support units would complement and report to the secretariat.

### D. Engagement with partners

45. The internal review comments have highlighted the important role of partner organizations in regard to the successful and effective implementation of the IPBES work programme.

46. To more effectively organize engagement with the many potential partners and wider communities of practice and to continue to implement the stakeholder engagement strategy, it is suggested that **IPBES could consider adopting for its second work programme an additional approach that complements the strategic partnerships and allows IPBES to engage, in a more informal manner, with more partners.**

47. Efforts would be undertaken to more appropriately recognize and visualize the contributions made by the various partners according to their level of engagement, including through adequate recognition on the website.

48. There should be dedicated efforts, especially on the part of the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel, to enhance the engagement of the scientific community in IPBES, as pointed out in the internal review report (IPBES/6/INF/32).

### E. Communications and outreach

49. With the adoption by the Plenary of decision IPBES-3/4 on communications, stakeholder engagement and strategic partnerships, it has been recognized that the ability of IPBES to strengthen the science-policy interface depends, to a considerable degree, on its communications activities, which poses considerable challenges in view of the complexity of IPBES itself and the scientific and policy issues that it addresses, as well as the need to create and build a dialogue on those issues with multiple stakeholders at multiple scales. This continues to define the key communication and outreach challenges and opportunities for IPBES.

50. IPBES communication activities under the second work programme could focus on:

- (a) Presenting compelling narratives to a wide range of decision makers in support of the vision that better choices in regard to biodiversity and nature's contributions to people require the best available evidence and policy options, from a broad spectrum of knowledge systems, which are provided by IPBES;
- (b) Building on and adding value to efforts to ensure that biodiversity and nature's contributions to people are recognized as key to human well-being and sustainable development;
- (c) Ensuring that IPBES is increasingly recognized as a credible, relevant, independent and legitimate collaborative platform that produces policy-relevant, but non-prescriptive, knowledge to inform decision-making;



(d) Facilitating increased engagement with IPBES for a wider range of members, observers, partners and relevant, more broadly representative, stakeholders to contribute to the work and impact of IPBES;

(e) Supporting the operation of IPBES as a whole, as well as the activities of – and coordination between – its various bodies and organs.

## V. Preliminary estimates of costs and human resource needs

### A. Types and amounts of funding to be mobilized

51. It is expected that the second work programme would continue to rely on four distinct categories of resources: cash contributions to the IPBES trust fund; in-kind contributions covering elements otherwise charged to the trust fund; time provided pro bono by selected experts; and the catalysing of activities that contribute to the IPBES objectives.

52. The IPBES trust fund, over the period 2013–2017, received an average of \$5.7 million per year thanks to a single major donation in 2013. The trust fund, over the past three years, from 2015 to 2017, has received an average of \$3.6 million per year. While it is very difficult to foresee the amount of resources that would be available to the trust fund for the second work programme, **a conservative estimate is that IPBES could expect a regular annual income of around \$5 million per year**, if one takes into account the indications of a future pledge from the European Union amounting to \$1.5 million per year, starting in 2018 (IPBES/6/9).

53. IPBES has also received in-kind contributions of between \$5 million and \$6 million per year on average, covering costs that would otherwise have had to be supported by the trust fund, such as for the provision of technical support units or support to meetings.

54. IPBES has further received in-kind contributions from all the experts involved in IPBES, contributing on average between 10 and 20 per cent of their time on a pro bono basis, which amounts to an estimated additional in-kind contribution of \$4.7 million to \$9.4 million per year.<sup>2</sup>

55. Lastly, an increasing number of activities contributing to the IPBES objectives but not forming part of the approved work programme and budget have been catalysed, such as capacity-building with funds from the German International Climate Initiative of \$10 million over the period 2016–2017, or a recent call for research on scenarios and models for biodiversity and ecosystem services launched by the European Union-funded BiodivERsA network and the Belmont Forum, with a budget of some \$23.5 million, to address the research priorities highlighted in the IPBES assessment on scenarios and models.

### B. Preliminary estimate of costs to the trust fund

56. This section provides an estimate of the cost for some of the key elements of a second work programme.

57. The annual costs of the IPBES bodies and the secretariat, respectively, would amount to \$1.77 million and \$2.2 million, as detailed below, based on similar costs incurred during the first work programme. Together, those costs amount to \$3.97 million per year, or close to \$4.3 million after allowing for the 8 per cent programme support costs. **An income of \$5 million per year would therefore leave only \$0.7 million for the work programme, which is clearly inadequate.** The annual costs of the IPBES bodies and of the secretariat would therefore be expected to be as follows:

- (a) Meetings of IPBES bodies:
  - (i) Plenary: \$1.5 million per session;

<sup>2</sup> Those estimates, based on a total of 1,172 experts for 2016, 984 for 2015 and 559 for 2014, were calculated according to an annual academic salary of \$52,000, based on the mean salary at purchasing power parity provided for 28 countries that are representative of the geographic diversity of IPBES member countries. The mean salaries at purchasing power parity for the 28 countries concerned may be found in: Philip G. Altbach and others, eds., *Paying the Professoriate: A global comparison of compensation and contract* (London and New York, Routledge, 2012).

- (ii) Multidisciplinary Expert Panel and Bureau: \$250,000 per year for two annual meetings of the Panel and the Bureau;
  - (iii) Travel costs of the Chair: \$20,000 per year;
- (b) Secretariat: \$2.2 million per year, based on the approved budget for 2017 and the secretariat's current composition and operational costs (document IPBES/6/9).
58. Estimates for some of the items of the work programme, including technical support, would be as follows:
- (a) One integrated global/regional assessment as described in paragraph 21 of the present note: \$4 million to \$5 million over three to four years;
  - (b) One nexus assessment as described in paragraph 19: \$1.5 million to \$2.5 million over three to four years, depending on the complexity and scope of the assessment;
  - (c) One standard thematic or methodological assessment: \$1.5 million over three years;
  - (d) One thematic or methodological fast-track assessment: \$700,000 to \$1 million over two years;
  - (e) One meeting of one task force, for an average of three days with 20 participants: \$40,000;
  - (f) Capacity-building activities: \$350,000 per year;
  - (g) General communications and outreach: \$250,000 per year;
  - (h) Programme support costs of 8 per cent would continue to be applied to all expenses incurred.
59. It is assumed that in-kind contributions would continue to be received for:
- (a) The time contributed by experts pro bono to IPBES;
  - (b) Full or partial technical support to specific deliverables;
  - (c) Some meetings, to cover venue costs and/or the travel costs of participants.
60. It is assumed that the following work programme elements would continue to be covered through leveraged activities promoted and catalysed by IPBES:
- (a) Capacity-building activities to support the implementation of IPBES;
  - (b) Knowledge generation activities to address the gaps identified by IPBES;
  - (c) Other activities undertaken by partner organizations, such as activities supporting IPBES efforts in the area of communications and outreach.
-