

**Intergovernmental Science-Policy  
Platform on Biodiversity and  
Ecosystem Services**Distr.: General  
23 January 2019

Original: English

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

Paris, 29 April–4 May 2019

Item 9 of the provisional agenda\*

**Next work programme of the Platform****Report on the prioritization of requests, inputs and suggestions  
on short-term priorities and longer-term strategic needs for the  
next work programme of the Platform****Note by the secretariat**

In paragraph (g) of decision IPBES-6/2, the Plenary of the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services requested the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel and the Bureau, supported by the secretariat, to compile the requests, inputs and suggestions on short-term priorities and longer-term strategic needs received in response to a formal call issued by the Executive Secretary (EM/2018/14 of 11 July 2018) and prepare a report containing a synthesized and prioritized list for consideration by the Plenary at its seventh session. The report prepared in response to that request is set out in the annex to the present note.

---

\* IPBES/7/1.

## Annex

# Report on prioritization of requests, inputs and suggestions on short-term priorities and longer-term strategic needs for the next work programme of IPBES

## I. Introduction

1. In its decision IPBES-6/2, the Plenary of the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES) requested the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel and the Bureau, supported by the secretariat, to launch a formal call for requests, inputs and suggestions on short-term priorities and longer-term strategic needs, with a deadline of 30 September 2018, following the procedure for receiving and prioritizing requests as set out in decision IPBES-1/3, and (i) to invite members, observers that are allowed enhanced participation in accordance with decision IPBES-5/4, and multilateral environmental agreements related to biodiversity and ecosystem services as determined by the respective governing bodies of those agreements, to submit requests; (ii) 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; and (iii) to invite experts on, and holders of, indigenous and local knowledge to provide their inputs and suggestions through the participatory mechanism of IPBES.

2. In response to that decision, the Executive Secretary issued a formal call for requests, inputs and suggestions on short-term priorities and longer-term strategic needs on 11 July 2018 (EM/2018/14). The secretariat received submissions containing requests from 13 Governments, 1 observer with enhanced participation,<sup>1</sup> and 5 multilateral environmental agreements. In addition, 22 submissions with inputs and suggestions were received from United Nations bodies related to biodiversity and ecosystem services and relevant stakeholders; and 2 from experts on and holders of indigenous and local knowledge. As requested by the Plenary, the secretariat has made those requests, inputs and suggestions available on the IPBES website in the form in which they were received.<sup>2</sup> An overview of all the requests, inputs and suggestions received is set out in annex I to document IPBES/7/INF/21.

3. In its decision IPBES-6/2, the Plenary also requested the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel and the Bureau, supported by the secretariat, to compile the requests, inputs and suggestions received and prepare a report containing a synthesized and prioritized list for consideration by the Plenary at its seventh session. In response to that decision, the Panel and the Bureau prioritized the requests, inputs and suggestions received in accordance with the procedure for receiving and prioritizing requests put to the Platform as set out in decision IPBES-1/3. In paragraph 12 of that decision, the Plenary specified that the Panel and the Bureau would prepare a report containing a prioritized list of requests, with an analysis of the scientific and policy relevance of the requests as referred to in paragraph 7 of the decision, including the possible need for additional scoping and the implications of the requests for the work programme and resource requirements.

4. The methodology used by the Panel and the Bureau for the prioritization of requests, inputs and suggestions is outlined in section II; the organization of requests, inputs and suggestions into topics and their relationship to the draft next work programme of the Platform (IPBES/7/6) are set out in section III (supplemented by document IPBES/7/INF/21), and the prioritization of requests by the Panel and the Bureau is explained in section IV.

## II. Methodological approach to prioritization

5. The methodological approach used to prioritize the requests, inputs and suggestions received was based on the approach followed to prepare the draft work programme for the period 2014–2018, set out in document IPBES/2/3. Requests were analysed by the Panel and the Bureau during the joint part of their twelfth meetings, held in Bonn, Germany, from 22 to 26 October 2018.

---

<sup>1</sup> In accordance with decision IPBES-5/4.

<sup>2</sup> Available at [www.ipbes.net/requests-received-ipbes-work-programme](http://www.ipbes.net/requests-received-ipbes-work-programme).

6. The Panel and the Bureau noted that many of the individual requests, inputs and suggestions covered similar or related broad topics and worked to identify groups of submissions that addressed similar topics. The outcome of that work led to the grouping of all submissions into five broad topics, which are described in section III.

7. The Panel and the Bureau then proceeded to prioritize those five topics in accordance with the 10 criteria which are set out in paragraph 7 of decision IPBES-1/3 and reproduced below:

- (a) Relevance to the objective, functions and work programme of the Platform;
- (b) Urgency of action by the Platform in the light of the imminence of the risks caused by the issues to be addressed by such action;
- (c) Relevance of the requested action in addressing specific policies or processes;
- (d) Geographic scope of the requested action, as well as issues to be covered by such action;
- (e) Anticipated level of complexity of the issues to be addressed by the requested action;
- (f) Previous work and existing initiatives of a similar nature and evidence of remaining gaps, such as the absence or limited availability of information and tools to address the issues, and reasons why the Platform is best suited to take action;
- (g) Availability of scientific literature and expertise for the Platform to undertake the requested action;
- (h) Scale of the potential impacts, and potential beneficiaries of the requested action;
- (i) Requirements for financial and human resources, and potential duration of the requested action;
- (j) An identification of priorities within multiple requests submitted.

8. Special attention was paid to the urgency of action requested from the Platform (item (b)) and to relevance to specific policies or processes (item (c)) and, in particular, in line with decision IPBES-5/3, the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, including the Sustainable Development Goals, the biodiversity-related conventions and other biodiversity and ecosystem services processes.

9. To ensure balance in the prioritization of requests, the Panel and the Bureau also paid particular attention to requests made under multilateral environmental agreements, given the fact that many Governments had not submitted requests. Some Governments made requests similar to those made under multilateral environmental agreements, and others expressed support for submissions from some of those agreements.

10. The Bureau and the Panel agreed that the work programme for the period from 2019 to 2030, like the first work programme, should have a limited set of objectives that would be achieved through specific deliverables, addressing a small number of priority topics.<sup>3</sup> In order to ensure a balanced implementation of the four functions of IPBES under the work programme to 2030, the Panel and the Bureau agreed to structure the work programme into six objectives, with one objective related to each of the four functions of IPBES, one related to communication and engagement, and one to reviewing the effectiveness of the Platform, as other important elements of its work. In greater detail, those objectives are as follows:

- **Objective 1: assessing knowledge.** This objective includes deliverables which produce assessments of knowledge and implements the second function of IPBES. Assessments may be thematic, methodological, at the regional or global level, and may be performed following a standard or fast-track approach. This objective may also include deliverables producing technical papers.<sup>4</sup>
- **Objective 2: building capacity.** This objective includes deliverables related to capacity-building and implements the fourth function of IPBES. Activities relate to the three priority topics set out in paragraph 28 of the present document and, in addition, to the work started during the first work programme in the context of the implementation of the rolling plan for capacity-building.<sup>5</sup>

<sup>3</sup> For a figure illustrating the structure of the draft work programme for the period from 2019 to 2030, see document IPBES/7/6.

<sup>4</sup> See procedures for the preparation of Platform deliverables as set out in annex I to decision IPBES-3/3.

<sup>5</sup> The capacity-building rolling plan was welcomed by the Plenary in decision IPBES-5/1, section II.

- **Objective 3: strengthening the knowledge foundation.** This objective includes deliverables dedicated to advancing work on data and knowledge, and to recognizing and working with indigenous and local knowledge systems. It implements the first function of IPBES and its guiding principle to engage with different knowledge systems, including indigenous and local knowledge. Activities relate to the three priority topics and, in addition, to the work started during the first work programme in the context of the implementation of the approach to recognizing and working with indigenous and local knowledge.
- **Objective 4: supporting policy.** This objective includes deliverables dedicated to supporting policy formulation and implementation, including by advancing work on policy tools and methodologies on scenarios and models of biodiversity and ecosystem services, and on values. It implements the third function of IPBES. Activities relate to the three priority topics and, in addition, to the work started during the first work programme.
- **Objective 5: communicating and engaging.** This objective aims to strengthen the visibility of IPBES, the use of its products, the involvement of its members and stakeholders, and increase its membership and outreach.
- **Objective 6: reviewing effectiveness.** This objective aims to ensure that the outcome of the review of the first work programme informs the implementation of the work programme for the period to 2030, and that a procedure is developed for both a midterm and a final review of the work programme to 2030.

### III. Grouping requests, inputs and suggestions

11. A compilation of the requests, inputs and suggestions received, and details of the way in which they were addressed, is set out in document IPBES/7/INF/21.

12. The Multidisciplinary Expert Panel and the Bureau were able to group most of the requests, inputs and suggestions into five broad topics (as set out in part A). There were, in addition, other requests, inputs and suggestions, proposing activities in support of the work programme, which the Panel and the Bureau grouped according to the objectives of the work programme to 2030 (as set out in part B).

#### A. Grouping requests into topics

##### 1. Topic 1: Promoting biodiversity to achieve the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development

13. IPBES received several requests, inputs and suggestions that concerned the nexus between biodiversity and a number of thematic areas that are highly relevant to the 2030 Agenda and the Sustainable Development Goals. They included the following:

##### (a) Related to objective 1 on assessing knowledge

(a) A request submitted by the Convention on Biological Diversity to assess issues at the nexus of biodiversity, food and water, agriculture and health, nutrition and food security, forestry and fisheries, considering trade-offs between those areas and related policy options regarding sustainable production and consumption, pollution and urbanization, including implications for energy and climate, taking into account the role of biodiversity and ecosystem services in addressing the Sustainable Development Goals, with a view to enabling decisions that support the coherent policy and transformational change necessary to achieve the 2050 Vision for Biodiversity;

(b) Similar requests were submitted by the European Union, the United Nations Educational Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) and the Norwegian Institute for Nature Research (NINA);

(c) Other related requests, inputs and suggestions, some of which focused on only one Sustainable Development Goal or several Goals, including the following:

- (i) Scientific evidence of the multiple benefits of ecosystem-based approaches, which aim to tackle climate change and conserve biodiversity, while delivering benefits related to water, disaster risk reduction, air quality and human health, as well as economic and social challenges (submitted by the European Union; a similar request by the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) and the Global Oil and Gas Industry Association for Environmental and Social Issues (IPIECA));

- (ii) Themes concerning biodiversity and poverty reduction, alleviation and prevention (related to Sustainable Development Goal 1 on poverty; submitted by China);
  - (iii) Themes concerning biodiversity and food systems (related to Sustainable Development Goal 1 on poverty and Goal 2 on hunger; submitted by France, Norway, Bioversity International, a research centre of the Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research (CGIAR) and EAT Foundation (also related to health) and the International Union of Nutritional Sciences); also including themes concerning the impact of rhizosphere macrobiodiversity and microbiobiodiversity loss on the productivity and resilience of agrifood systems (European Union) and the role of sustainable agriculture in biodiversity conservation (World Wide Fund for Nature);
  - (iv) Themes concerning biodiversity and health (related to Sustainable Development Goal 3; submitted by Belgium, Finland, France and the Network for Evaluation of One Health); and wildlife diseases and their control (South Africa);
  - (v) Themes concerning biodiversity and urbanization (related to Sustainable Development Goal 11 on sustainable cities; submitted by Finland, European Union, European Land-use Institute and ICLEI - Local Governments for Sustainability);
  - (vi) Themes concerning biodiversity and climate change (related to Sustainable Development Goal 13; submitted by Brazil, China, France, Norway, UNEP, UNESCO, NINA, IPIECA and World Wide Fund for Nature); also including both positive and negative ecosystem feedbacks and tipping points in the climate system (European Union); blue carbon in coastal and marine ecosystems (Finland); the impact of oceanographic changes caused by climate change on marine biodiversity; the impact of the increased use of biomass and of methods of carbon capture and storage on biodiversity and ecosystems (Norway); ocean acidification (UNESCO); and an assessment of the biodiversity implications of the special report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) on the impact of global warming of 1.5 degrees Celsius (UNEP). Several requests, inputs and submissions highlighted the need for enhanced cooperation between IPBES and IPCC, including potential joint assessment activities (Convention on Biological Diversity, France, Norway, United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and World Wildlife Fund for Nature);
  - (vii) Addressing the “triple jeopardy” of providing food for a growing global population, keeping global warming below 1.5 degrees Celsius and restoring nature (World Wide Fund for Nature);
- (b) Related to objective 2 on building capacity**
- (a) Enable scientists and policymakers to use IPBES products related to nature-based solutions (European Union and a similar request submitted by UNEP);
  - (b) Develop training materials on biodiversity and food systems (France);
- (c) Related to objective 3 on strengthening the knowledge foundation**
- Facilitate knowledge and science agendas related to ecosystem-based approaches, based on IPBES products (European Union);
- (d) Related to objective 4 on supporting policy**
- Identification, promotion and further development of the following:
- (a) Tools for assessing the effectiveness of policies concerning food security and biodiversity linkage (China);
  - (b) Tools to reconcile food transition and biodiversity, and to assess the impact of trade on biodiversity, included in the catalogue for policy support tools (France);
  - (c) Policy support tools and mechanisms for climate change adaptation and mitigation (New Zealand);

(d) Tools for designing and implementing ecosystem-based approaches (European Union and a similar request submitted by UNEP).

**2. Topic 2: Understanding the underlying causes of biodiversity loss and determinants of transformative change to achieve the 2050 Vision for Biodiversity**

14. IPBES received several requests, inputs and suggestions that concerned the underlying causes and indirect drivers of biodiversity loss and matters related to institutions and governance. Those included the following:

**(a) Related to objective 1 on assessing knowledge**

(a) A request to understand and assess [the biodiversity component of] the behavioural, social, economic, institutional, technical and technological determinants of transformational change and how they may be deployed to achieve (i) the 2050 Vision for Biodiversity (submitted by the Convention on Biological Diversity, supported by Norway and the European Union); and (ii) the 2030 Agenda (UNESCO);

(b) A theme on developing a multidisciplinary approach to understanding the interactions between the direct and indirect drivers of biodiversity loss (Convention on Biological Diversity; Norway), for transformational change and key societal challenges (European Union);

(c) An assessment of community biodiversity protocols (Brazil);

(d) A methodological, integrated assessment on criteria, metrics and indicators to measure transformational change; and a methodological assessment on criteria, metrics and indicators suitable for the implementation of measures to achieve transformational change (European Union);

(e) A theme on biodiversity and international trade (France);

(f) A theme on exploring options for developing the evidence base to support transformational change in the way society values, uses and restores ecosystems and natural resources, and manages trade-offs between different demands on the environment, including the nexus of biodiversity, food, energy and health (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland);

(g) A suggested focus on the box “Institutions and governance and other indirect drivers impacting biodiversity and ecosystem services” of the IPBES conceptual framework (UNEP);

**(b) Related to objective 2 on building capacity**

(a) Building capacity regarding biodiversity and international trade (France);

(b) Building capacity in communicating the values of biodiversity and ecosystem services (UNEP);

**(c) Related to objective 4 on supporting policy**

A number of requests, inputs and suggestions concerning assessments of the effectiveness of policy instruments, including methodological assessments on the effectiveness of various policy instruments and policy and planning support tools for understanding how to achieve transformational change, and to characterize and quantify successful approaches and cases of the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity and their impact (Convention on Biological Diversity, China; European Union, Japan, Norway, UNEP, UNESCO and NINA), some of which were submitted with the aim of understanding how to achieve transformational change.

**3. Topic 3: Measuring business impact and dependency on biodiversity and nature’s contributions to people**

15. IPBES received several requests, inputs and suggestions that specifically concerned the relationship between biodiversity, ecosystem services and productive sectors. All the themes concerned related to both objective 1 on assessing knowledge and objective 4 on supporting policy, as follows:

(a) To assess the potential positive and negative impact of productive sectors and undertake a methodological assessment of the criteria, metrics and indicators of the impact of productive sectors on biodiversity and ecosystem services, as well as the benefits derived from biodiversity and ecosystem services, with a view to enabling businesses to reduce negative impact and promote consistency in assessment and reporting, taking into account both direct and indirect pressures on biodiversity, as well as the connections between them (Convention on Biological Diversity, supported by Japan, Norway and the European Union);

- (b) The establishment of a task force on biodiversity mainstreaming and synergies (Mexico);
- (c) To assess the dependency of specific sectors on biodiversity and ecosystem services (UNEP).

#### 4. **Topic 4: Connectivity**

16. IPBES received several requests, inputs and suggestions that concerned the theme of connectivity, all pertaining to objective 1 on assessing knowledge, including for an assessment focusing on connectivity conservation (submitted by the Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals and the Agreements thereto and the Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage) and for an assessment on the broader ecological concept of connectivity (United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification in Those Countries Experiencing Serious Drought and/or Desertification, Particularly in Africa). Related themes included biotic interactions (Colombia), fragmentation as a major driver of biodiversity loss (France) and a specific suggestion concerning a transcontinental ecological corridor linking protected areas in Asia and Europe (Institute of Geography, Russian Academy of Sciences).

#### 5. **Topic 5: Pressures, status and trends concerning biodiversity and ecosystem services**

17. IPBES received several requests, inputs and suggestions that concerned a second global assessment of biodiversity and ecosystem services and the integration of regional and global components within such an assessment (submitted by the Convention on Biological Diversity, Japan, Norway, the United Kingdom, European Union and UNEP), pertaining to objective 1 on assessing knowledge. In addition, a number of requests, inputs and suggestions concerning thematic issues focusing on specific species, ecosystems, direct pressures on biodiversity and ecosystem services or specific interactions were received. Those could be addressed through individual thematic assessments, or as components of a global assessment of biodiversity and ecosystem services, and include the following themes:

##### (a) **Related to objective 1 on assessing knowledge**

- (a) Knowledge about the conservation status of species listed under the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora that are traded internationally, particularly in biodiversity-rich developing States, on a species-specific and range State-specific level, in addition to information and guidance to maintain the use of species at biologically sustainable levels (submitted by the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora);
- (b) Peatlands (Convention on Wetlands of International Importance especially as Waterfowl Habitat);
- (c) Freshwater ecosystems (Brazil, South Africa and United States of America);
- (d) Marine ecosystems (France, Norway, European Union and Institute for Sustainable Development and Research, India);
- (e) Relationship between biodiversity and ecosystem services (Finland and Mexico);
- (f) Impact of pollution on biodiversity and ecosystem services (Mexico);
- (g) Evaluation of methods for monitoring biodiversity in restoration projects (Brazil);
- (h) Evaluation of methods for prioritizing areas for the conservation of biodiversity and ecosystem services (Brazil);
- (i) Selection and application of indicators of ecosystem collapse for risk assessments (Colombia);
- (j) Situation of indigenous and local populations who depend directly on biodiversity and ecosystem services (France);
- (k) Assessment of vegetation and its monitoring (South Africa);
- (l) Assessment of the implementation of the Nagoya Protocol on Access to Genetic Resources and the Fair and Equitable Sharing of Benefits Arising from their Utilization to the Convention on Biological Diversity (South Africa);
- (m) Assessment of conservation and sustainable use of cultural heritage (South Africa);

- (n) Evaluation of methods to guide national accountability efforts for the conservation of biodiversity and ecosystem services and impact assessments, including the definition of indicators (Brazil);
- (o) Methodological assessment of indigenous and local knowledge in biodiversity research, monitoring and assessment (UNESCO);
- (p) Soil biodiversity (Global Soil Biodiversity Initiative; African Model Forest Network);
- (q) Scavengers and scavenging (suggestion for the creation of an expert panel; International Union for Conservation of Nature Vulture Specialist Group);
- (r) Abiotic components of nature (European Association for the Conservation of the Geological Heritage);
- (s) The role of protected areas in achieving global conservation goals (IPIECA);
- (t) Matters related to intangible cultural heritage (two indigenous and local knowledge experts);

**(b) Related to objective 2 on building capacity**

- (a) Training in biodiversity and ecosystem monitoring and assessment, including standards and best practice in observations, data management and scientific analysis, modelling and output visualizations (UNESCO);
- (b) Assessments of biodiversity and ecosystem services at the national level for the countries of Central, North and West Africa (African Model Forest Network);
- (c) Regional conservation of forest trees and shrubs in Africa (National Centre for Genetic Resources and Biotechnology of Nigeria);
- (d) Governing the use of nature and sharing its benefits equitably, in the context of protected areas (SNDT Women's University, India).

**B. Grouping other requests in support of the entire work programme**

18. In addition to the above submissions, which focused on a specific topic for the various objectives, IPBES also received requests, inputs and suggestions of a more general nature to support the work programme in its entirety.

19. In relation to objective 1 on assessing knowledge, IPBES received requests, inputs and suggestions that concerned the process and general matters related to IPBES assessments, including concerning the development of technical papers and syntheses, including for specific audiences with a view to increasing the impact and uptake of existing assessments (Norway; UNEP and UNESCO); enhancing the processes for nomination of experts, balance in the composition of assessment expert groups, clarity of the language of summaries for policymakers and dialogue between assessment experts and policymakers (Mexico); ensuring a more coherent approach to assessments undertaken under multilateral environmental agreements and by United Nations agencies, IPCC and IPBES (United Kingdom); increasing the duration of assessments (UNESCO); developing follow-up mechanisms to completed IPBES assessments (Institute for Global Environmental Strategies); continuing the focus of assessments on developing multidisciplinary approaches and on policy-relevant options for Governments (NINA); enhancing the clarity of scoping documents (NINA); and strengthening administrative and editorial support by the secretariat to assessment authors (NINA).

20. In relation to objective 2 on building capacity, IPBES received requests, inputs and suggestions that concerned the general importance of the work of IPBES on capacity-building (International Union for Conservation of Nature) and the continued implementation of the rolling plan for capacity-building (China). Additional requests on capacity-building included building capacity for promoting uptake of completed IPBES assessments, including to ensure continuity from the first work programme (China; Mexico and UNESCO) and including engagement of actors beyond the environment sector (Institute for Global Environmental Strategies); building capacity for the development of local or national assessments (Mexico); linking capacity-building efforts to the identification of knowledge gaps (NINA); and establishing a more formal mechanism for engaging with organizations on the capacity-building rolling plan (UNDP).

21. In relation to objective 3 on strengthening the knowledge foundations, IPBES received requests, inputs and suggestions that concerned the general importance of activities under that function (International Union for the Conservation of Nature) and the need to address the knowledge and data gaps emerging from the deliverables of the first work programme (Convention on Biological



Diversity; Mexico; NINA), as well as a request to promote platforms for access to information from various sources (Mexico).

22. In relation to objective 4 on supporting policy, IPBES received requests, inputs and suggestions that concerned the importance of the function in general terms and the need to provide practical support to policymakers (International Union for Conservation of Nature); the catalogue of policy support tools and methodologies (Japan; Mexico and UNESCO); assessments of groups of specific policy support tools through methodological assessments or technical papers (Norway and UNEP); and the development of a conceptual framework and indicators for measuring “good quality of life” (Mexico).

23. IPBES also received requests, inputs and suggestions concerning further work on scenarios and models, building on efforts undertaken as part of the first work programme, including regarding scenarios and models to assess pathways towards the transformational change required for a sustainable future (Convention on Biological Diversity, supported by the European Union and UNESCO); the catalysis of the production of a new generation of scenarios to be used by both the IPCC and IPBES (France); the development of a new set of “nature’s futures” scenarios, improving integrated assessments to better represent the ecological processes and biodiversity indicators needed to identify plausible pathways to achieve goals (European Union); and modelling the global socioeconomic impact of future changes in biodiversity and ecosystem services (World Wide Fund for Nature).

24. In relation to objective 5 on communicating and engaging, IPBES received requests, inputs and suggestions that concerned the following specific themes, among others:

(a) Importance of communication with organizations and initiatives, including the Global Reporting Initiative, International Integrated Reporting Council, International Resource Panel, Natural Capital Coalition and its biodiversity working group, One Health, the One Planet network, United Nations Global Compact, United Nations Statistics Division and the World Economic Forum (Convention on Biological Diversity);

(b) Increasing engagement with stakeholders, the promotion of consultation mechanisms at the national level and addressing sectors other than the environment to ensure mainstreaming of biodiversity (Mexico);

(c) Increasing collaboration on the themes of soil biodiversity and biodiversity for food and agriculture (Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO));

(d) Increasing collaboration, including the identification of concrete areas for collaboration and increasing the visibility of collaboration, with the four United Nations partners of IPBES (FAO);

(e) Elaborating on the ways in which different areas of the work of IPBES will contribute to realizing different Sustainable Development Goals and targets to support the identification of key partners and the enhancement of coordination with ongoing initiatives (UNDP);

(f) Enhancing coordination and synergy with the work of the multilateral environmental agreements throughout all IPBES functions (UNDP);

(g) Developing a new narrative about biodiversity, designing biodiversity communication strategies that address a variety of age groups and communities, and securing the engagement of all relevant actors (UNESCO);

25. In relation to objective 6 on reviewing effectiveness, IPBES received requests, inputs and suggestions that concerned the following specific themes, among others:

(a) Taking into account the results of the review of IPBES at the end of its first work programme (Mexico);

(b) Thoroughly evaluating the impact and uptake of the results of the first work programme, including the global assessment of biodiversity and ecosystem services and the review of IPBES (United Kingdom);

(c) Reviewing deliverables of the first work programme to draw lessons from it for future work (UNESCO);

(d) Continuously evaluating the impact of the work of IPBES (UNEP).

## IV. Prioritization of requests, inputs and suggestions

### A. Prioritization of topics

26. The Multidisciplinary Expert Panel and the Bureau reviewed the five broad topics presented in section III A and the activities proposed in support of the work programme to 2030 in its entirety, set out in section III B. In order to prioritize the topics and activities, they recalled decision IPBES-5/3, in which the Plenary cited the time frame for the second work programme in the context of a 10-year horizon, the 2030 Agenda, including the Sustainable Development Goals, the biodiversity-related conventions and other biodiversity and ecosystem service processes. They also analysed the responses given to each of the ten criteria set out in paragraph 7 above, and the number of requests received for each topic.

27. In order to keep the work programme to 2030 flexible, the Panel and the Bureau agreed to select three of the five topics, with the option of addressing further topics following additional calls for requests, inputs and suggestions in the course of the work programme for the period to 2030.

28. The three following topics were selected for prioritization, as they fulfilled all the considerations cited above:

- **Priority topic 1: Promoting biodiversity to achieve the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development.** This topic fulfils the key criteria cited above, having been requested under a multilateral environmental agreement, Governments and stakeholders. It is seen by the Panel and the Bureau as addressing an urgent priority, namely to understand how biodiversity can enable the simultaneous achievement of several Sustainable Development Goals. The topic would allow policymakers to better understand the ways in which biodiversity relates to key sectors, such as agriculture and food, health, water, and climate and energy, and would thus inform the consideration of biodiversity across multiple sectors.
- **Priority topic 2: Understanding the underlying causes of biodiversity loss and determinants of transformative change to achieve the 2050 Vision for Biodiversity.** The Panel and the Bureau noted that IPBES, during its first work programme, had not placed sufficient emphasis on the “Institutions and governance” box of its conceptual framework and that increased efforts were required to achieve objective A of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011–2020, which addresses the underlying causes of biodiversity loss, including behavioural, social, economic, institutional, technical and technological determinants of change. The need to support Governments and stakeholders in evaluating the effectiveness of policy instruments, methods and tools also appeared to be particularly urgent, forming part of the institutional context of the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity, to support them in the effective implementation of policy options resulting from completed assessments, including ways in which to enhance institutions and leverage change at the individual and collective levels.
- **Priority topic 3: Measuring business impact and dependency on biodiversity and nature’s contributions to people.** The Panel and the Bureau also considered topic 3 to be of great importance. Within the topic, they accorded highest priority to a methodological assessment measuring the impact and dependence of productive sectors on biodiversity and nature’s contributions to people. Since earlier assessments (and deliverable 1 (a), as proposed) provide global assessments of the role of biodiversity and ecosystem services in productive sectors and recognize the need for practical guidance on the specific matter of measuring impact and dependency at a range of scales, including by businesses, the Panel and the Bureau prioritized a methodological approach.

29. In addition, the Panel and the Bureau accorded high priority to topic 4 on connectivity, in particular in the light of its relevance to three multilateral environmental agreements and a number of requests by Governments. Therefore, the Panel and the Bureau suggest considering an assessment on connectivity for inclusion as part of the work programme at the tenth session of the Plenary, following a second call for requests, inputs and suggestions.

30. With reference to topic 5, the Panel and the Bureau noted that the first global assessment of biodiversity and ecosystem services would be finalized at the seventh session of the Plenary, with the regional assessments of biodiversity and ecosystems approved at the sixth session of the Plenary. The Panel and the Bureau also noted the suggestions and comments made for greater integration of different scales into assessments of biodiversity and ecosystem services. The need for a second global assessment to support the post-2030 process and related timelines, including a delivery of that assessment by early to mid-2029, was also noted. Therefore, the Panel and the Bureau decided to

accord a high priority to a future assessment of biodiversity and ecosystem services, but to suggest it for consideration by the Plenary at its tenth session, in the context of the second call for requests, inputs and suggestions. At that time, the Plenary may also wish to decide on any thematic focus of the assessment.

## B. Prioritization of activities: deliverables of the work programme

31. The Panel and the Bureau recommended that the work programme of IPBES to 2030 should place a major emphasis on promoting collaboration between science, policy and practice; between scientific disciplines; between different types of knowledge; and between the four functions of the Platform. The six objectives would therefore be addressed in an integrated manner and in a way that would be mutually supportive.

### 1. Objective 1: assessing knowledge

32. In order to formulate the deliverables under this objective, the Panel and the Bureau examined the activities proposed for each topic under each objective. They recalled the recommendation of the internal review and the comments received on the draft strategic framework to perform no more than three assessments in parallel, and for the Plenary to consider for acceptance and approval no more than two assessments at any single session. They also considered the timeline of the assessments on values, of the sustainable use of wild species and of invasive alien species.

33. Based on those considerations, the Panel and the Bureau decided to propose the following deliverables,<sup>6</sup> noting that the scoping report for each assessment would identify issues related to building capacity, strengthening the knowledge foundation and supporting policy:

- **Deliverable 1 (a):** A four-year thematic assessment of the interlinkages among biodiversity, water, food and health, for which a scoping report would be prepared for consideration by the Plenary at its eighth session, and which would be completed for consideration by the Plenary at its twelfth session.
- **Deliverable 1 (b):** Responding to the many requests for collaboration with the IPCC and in view of the need to make efficient use of the work already undertaken by IPCC and IPBES, the Panel and the Bureau suggested a technical paper on assessing interlinkage between biodiversity and climate change, co-produced with the IPCC, to be produced within one and a half years.
- **Deliverable 1 (c):** A three-year thematic assessment of the underlying causes of biodiversity loss and the determinants of transformative change, for which a scoping report would be prepared for consideration by the Plenary at its ninth session, but which would only be initiated following the tenth session of the Plenary, in order to limit the number of assessments conducted in parallel, and which would be completed for consideration by the Plenary at its thirteenth session.
- **Deliverable 1 (d):** A two-year fast-track methodological assessment of the impact and dependence of business on biodiversity and nature's contributions to people, for which a scoping report would be prepared for consideration by the Plenary at its eighth session, which would be initiated following the ninth session of the Plenary (in 2021) and completed for consideration by the Plenary at its eleventh session.

### 2. Objective 2: building capacity

34. The Panel and the Bureau considered the requests, inputs and suggestions received concerning this objective and recognized the work undertaken on capacity-building during the first work programme, in particular the development of the capacity-building rolling plan, which had as its objective 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 established by the Plenary in its decision IPBES-3/1. The Panel and the Bureau designated all components of the rolling plan as being of the highest priority and decided that the following deliverables should be established under objective 2:

- **Deliverable 2 (a):** Enhanced learning and engagement
- **Deliverable 2 (b):** Facilitated access to expertise and information
- **Deliverable 2 (c):** Strengthened national and regional capacities

<sup>6</sup> An initial scoping is set out in document IPBES/7/6.

### 3. Objective 3: strengthening the knowledge foundations

35. The Panel and the Bureau considered the requests, inputs and suggestions received concerning this objective and recognized the work undertaken on strengthening the knowledge foundation during the first work programme, including on knowledge and data and the development of the approach to recognizing and working with indigenous and local knowledge.<sup>7</sup> The Panel and the Bureau designated all elements of this work as being of the highest priority and proposed including the following two deliverables under this objective:

- **Deliverable 3 (a):** Advanced work on knowledge and data
- **Deliverable 3 (b):** Enhanced recognition of and work with indigenous and local knowledge systems

### 4. Objective 4: supporting policy

36. The Panel and the Bureau considered the requests, inputs and suggestions received concerning this objective and recognized the work undertaken concerning supporting policy during the first work programme, including the development of a policy support portal and related procedures, work on scenarios and models, and on values and valuation. The Panel and the Bureau designated all elements of this work as being of the highest priority and proposed including the following three deliverables under this objective, in addition to deliverable 1 (c), which would address the effectiveness of policy instruments and tools, and deliverable 1 (d), which would concern specific indicators and metrics:

- **Deliverable 4 (a):** Advanced work on policy tools and methodologies
- **Deliverable 4 (b):** Advanced work on scenarios and models of biodiversity and ecosystem services
- **Deliverable 4 (c):** Advanced work on multiple conceptualizations of values

### 5. Objective 5: communicating and engaging

37. The Panel and the Bureau considered the requests, inputs and suggestions received concerning this objective (see paragraph 24). They recognized the work undertaken in communicating, engaging and reviewing effectiveness during the first work programme, including the adoption and implementation of a communications and outreach strategy<sup>8</sup> and a stakeholder engagement strategy for the Platform,<sup>9</sup> as well as the conclusions of the review of IPBES undertaken at the end of its first work programme.<sup>10</sup> The Panel and the Bureau designated all three elements as being of the highest priority and suggested including the following two deliverables under this objective:

- **Deliverable 5 (a):** Strengthened communication
- **Deliverable 5 (b):** Strengthened engagement of Governments and stakeholders

### 6. Objective 6: reviewing effectiveness

38. The Panel and the Bureau considered the requests, inputs and suggestions received concerning this objective (see paragraph 25) and suggested including the following deliverable under this objective:

- **Deliverable 6:** Reviewed effectiveness

## V. Considerations regarding future calls

39. During the 10-year period between 2020 and 2030, the Panel and the Bureau suggest that IPBES could conduct between 10 and 12 assessments on the following proposed timeline:<sup>11</sup>

(a) Two assessments which would be ongoing until the ninth session of the Plenary (an assessment on values and an assessment of the sustainable use of wild species) and a third assessment which would be ongoing until the tenth session of the Plenary (an assessment of invasive alien species);

<sup>7</sup> Decision IPBES-5/1, annex II.

<sup>8</sup> Decision IPBES-3/4, annex I.

<sup>9</sup> Decision IPBES-3/4, annex II.

<sup>10</sup> The recommendations of the review are set out in document IPBES/7/5.

<sup>11</sup> For a figure illustrating the timeline of assessments for the draft work programme for the period to 2030, see document IPBES/7/6.

---

(b) Three assessment themes would be approved for scoping by the Plenary at its seventh session as part of the framework of the work programme to 2030, for consideration by the Plenary at its eleventh, twelfth and thirteenth sessions respectively;

(c) Three assessment themes would be decided by the Plenary at its tenth session, taking into account the requests, inputs and suggestions received in response to a second call that could be launched following the ninth session of the Plenary (in 2021);

(d) Two final assessment themes would be decided by the Plenary at the midpoint of the work programme, taking into account the requests, inputs and suggestions received in response to a third call.

---

ADVANCE