



---

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

Paris, 29 April–4 May 2019

Item 8 of the provisional agenda\*

**Review of the Platform at the conclusion  
of its first work programme****Response by the Executive Secretary to the report on the review  
of the Platform at the end of its first work programme****Note by the secretariat**

1. As part of the first work programme of the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES), the Plenary, in its decision IPBES-2/5, requested the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel, in consultation with the Bureau, to develop a procedure for the review of the effectiveness of the administrative and scientific functions of IPBES.
2. In its decision IPBES-5/2, the Plenary approved the terms of reference for the review, including an internal and an external element. In the same decision, it requested the Executive Secretary to call for the nomination of candidates for the review panel and to conduct a competitive bidding process for an external professional organization to coordinate the review. The Plenary also requested the review panel, in accordance with the terms of reference, to provide a final report on the review, including recommendations on the implementation of the second work programme of IPBES, to the Plenary at its seventh session.
3. The report of the review panel on the review of the Platform at the end of its first work programme is set out in document IPBES/7/INF/18. The executive summary and recommendations of that report are set out in the annex to document IPBES/7/5. Activities already undertaken to implement recommendations arising from the internal report are described in document IPBES/7/INF/17.
4. The annex to the present note, which is presented without formal editing, sets out the Executive Secretary's response to the review. The response to the review by the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel and the Bureau is set out in document IPBES/7/INF/19.

---

\* IPBES/7/1/Rev.1.

## Annex

### Response by the Executive Secretary to the report on the review of the Platform at the end of its first work programme

1. The table below contains in column 3, the response by the Executive Secretary to selected findings (column 1) and recommendations (column 2) of the review of IPBES at the end of its first work programme.

2. The responses focus on those findings and recommendations that either called for a clarification, a correction, the provision of additional information or that addressed directly the work of the secretariat.

Findings of the review panel	Corresponding recommendations of the review panel	Responses by the Executive Secretary
<b>ORIGINS, CONCEPTUALISATION AND POSITIONING OF IPBES</b>		
<p><b>Finding 6</b> IPBES has prioritized building its scientific and technical credibility over policy application and subsequent implementation in its first years. While that is both understandable and in some ways desirable, IPBES is operating largely as a science-based organization that has yet to fully engage with and effectively navigate the interface between data, science, policy and practice, and thereby bridge the gap between knowledge and policy. Such navigation requires time, resources and engagement from all members, partners and other stakeholders of the Platform to yield results. Finally, there is a tacit expectation that knowledge will have influence just by “being”. This is not a valid assumption.</p>		<p>The secretariat has taken a proactive approach to ensure that IPBES assessments are visible and used, including by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Working with the secretariats of multilateral environmental agreements, including of the CBD<sup>1</sup>, but also CITES, CMS, the Ramsar Convention and UNCCD, and also with IPCC. Further information is set out in IPBES/7/INF/15;</li> <li>▪ Actively seeking, and, in some cases, initiating uptake events for assessments, and playing a role in coordinating their organization and facilitating their engagement with IPBES experts and IPBES outreach material;</li> <li>▪ Establishing and maintaining data bases to track these uptake events as well as the impact of IPBES assessments and other work programme outputs, to the extent that this has been feasible.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Finding 7</b> The issue of partnership is crucial for the positioning and acceptance of IPBES. The stakeholder mapping shows a very complex landscape of organizations and stakeholder groups that could be or are already interacting and collaborating with IPBES as partners. While IPBES has formalized a number of partnership agreements in the course of the first work programme, their effective implementation has been hampered by the single formal status of observers available to all non-members and non-State actors (partners or otherwise), which has prevented their full strategic engagement. In addition, the current</p>	<p><b>Recommendation 3</b> A clear strategy should be developed for enhanced and more synergetic collaboration and engagement with key strategic stakeholders as strategic partners, allowing for differentiation of status (beyond observer status) to enhance mutual benefits.</p>	<p>The status of observers relates to the rules of the Plenary and not to the issue of partnership as stated in recommendation 3: observer status relates to the right of non-member countries of IPBES to participate in Plenary without the right to take part in its decision-making. Other observers include the secretariats of the multilateral environmental agreements, members of the United Nations System, other inter-governmental bodies and civil society. Such participation is governed by the rules of procedure. However, the question of partnership is far broader and relates in general to how IPBES collaborates with all entities, including outside the context of intergovernmental meetings. Such partnerships are usually addressed through an agreement such as a memorandum of</p>

<sup>1</sup> The Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), the Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals (CMS), the Convention on Wetlands of International Importance Especially as Waterfowl Habitat (Ramsar), the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES) and the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification in Those Countries Experiencing Serious Drought and/or Desertification, Particularly in Africa (UNCCD), the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change.

<p>IPBES stakeholder strategy has not enabled the degree of synergetic collaboration and engagement with the range of stakeholders envisaged at its establishment.</p>		<p>understanding or a memorandum of cooperation.</p> <p>IPBES, as pointed in the external review report, and further explained in IPBES/7/INF/15 has:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ A collaborative partnership arrangement with the four UN partners;</li> <li>▪ Memoranda of cooperation between the secretariat of IPBES and the secretariats of multilateral environmental agreements related to biodiversity and ecosystem services (CBD, Ramsar Convention, CMS, CITES, and UNCCD);</li> <li>▪ Memoranda of understanding between the IPBES secretariat and strategic partners.</li> </ul> <p>In addition, the Bureau, in consultation with the MEP, established at their 12<sup>th</sup> meeting (October 2018), the category of “collaborative supporters” in order to address the recommendation from both internal and external reviews (recommendation 3) to engage with and recognize a larger number of partners. Collaborative supporters are endorsed by the Bureau, in consultation with the MEP, based on proposals from the task forces, in particular, and recognized on the IPBES web site for their support to the implementation of the work programme of IPBES.</p> <p>The secretariat will add material on its web site to clarify these different levels of engagement.</p>
<p><b>Finding 8</b> Despite much activity early on in shepherding the process of the Platform’s formation, even at one stage by proposing to jointly provide the secretariat, the potential value of the four United Nations organizations (FAO, UNDP, UNEP and UNESCO) is significantly under-utilized, or even poorly understood, by all parties.</p>		<p>The four UN organizations have been informing each session of the Plenary session on how they support IPBES in the implementation of its work programme in dedicated documents (IPBES/3/INF/14; IPBES/4/INF/19; IPBES/5/INF/18; IPBES/6/24*; IPBES/7/INF/12).</p> <p>The document on financial and budgetary arrangements for IPBES submitted to each Plenary session includes a table of in-kind contributions in which the in-kind contributions from the four UN partners are listed.</p> <p>Contrary to what is indicated in the review report, no offer from GEF to collaborate with IPBES was declined (finding 7), and all four UN partners have provided over the years in-kind contributions, set out in the documents mentioned above (finding 8).</p> <p>The secretariat will add material on its web site to make the role of each one of the four UN partners more visible and better understood.</p>
<p><b>Finding 9</b> While interactions with the secretariat of and the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity have been</p>		<p>Progress on this matter is set out in IPBES/7/INF/15. Finding 9 underlines the positive interactions with CBD. These positive interactions, which have been built over the years through in-depth work, will</p>

<p>positive and mutually supportive, there is room for stronger collaboration and alignment between IPBES and the other biodiversity-related multilateral environmental agreements at both formal (Conference of the Parties) and informal (secretariat) levels.</p>		<p>culminate with the publication of the global assessment of biodiversity and ecosystem services. This assessment will be drawn upon by the Global Biodiversity Outlook 5, to assess the achievement of the Aichi Targets and discuss the post-2020 global biodiversity framework (decision UNEP/CBD/COP/14/34). In addition to this decision, the work of IPBES is mentioned in several other CBD COP 14 decisions including decision 14/2 on scenarios for the 2050 vision for biodiversity and decision 14/6 on the conservation and sustainable use of pollinators, which both illustrate the impact that these two assessments are having.</p> <p>One important criterion for a successful collaboration with multilateral environmental agreements is whether IPBES can respond favorably to a request made by a multilateral environmental agreement. This was the case for CBD and the global assessment, for UNCCD and the land degradation and restoration assessment, and is currently the case with the assessment of the sustainable use of wild species and CITES. CBD, CITES, CMS, the Ramsar Convention, UNCCD and the World Heritage Committee have submitted requests for the work programme up to 2030.</p>
<p><b>Finding 10</b> IPBES identified early on the importance of stakeholder engagement in its work and should be commended for that. At the same time, early implementation has been tentative.</p>	<p><b>Recommendation 4</b> The stakeholder engagement processes within IPBES needs to be reviewed and strengthened to better deliver for the Platform and the stakeholders. In particular, stakeholder engagement should occur throughout the assessment process to implement the true co-production of assessments. This will critically rely on appropriate nominations by the Platform members, partners and other stakeholders, in particular of practitioners, biodiversity managers, policymakers and policy experts, and rely on the capacity to generate mutual benefits and to communicate and coordinate at different scales (interest, capacities and coordination should be developed at the national scale, then be leveraged by IPBES at regional and global scales).</p>	<p>Stakeholders are invited to participate in assessments at various stages in the process, and many have done so. In order to reach out to a greater diversity of stakeholders, the Executive Secretary has in her letters calling for nominations explicitly addressed practitioners and policy makers, particularly at the scoping stage to help define policy relevant questions to be addressed by assessments. However, this has not worked well, and additional measures will need to be taken. The challenge is to extend the reach of the calls to these communities.</p> <p>Stakeholder Days have been organized before each Plenary. The project team, in charge of developing the agenda, has been led by the self-organized stakeholder networks, with the secretariat present as a resource.</p> <p>The process leading to that day has been undertaken over a period of more than three months, entailing extensive consultations and co-design of the agenda and content for Stakeholder Day. The co-designed agenda at IPBES-6, for example, provided space to discuss the implementation of the ILK approach.</p> <p>A report from Stakeholder Day(s) is made available by stakeholders on the stakeholder's pages of the IPBES website". Stakeholders at IPBES-6 elected to not produce such a report.</p> <p>The Stakeholder Day project team co-design process is described in a small guide describing the process of design and capturing the lessons learned from past experiences, produced by stakeholders. It is made available to members of the project</p>

		team to assist with preparation of each Plenary and is available upon request.
<b>GOVERNANCE, STRUCTURE AND PROCED</b>		
<p><b>Finding 11</b> There is confusion regarding the legal status of IPBES among IPBES stakeholders and even national focal points. IPBES is often perceived as a United Nations body rather than an intergovernmental platform. While the IPBES secretariat is hosted and administered by UNEP, the Platform is an independent body with its own governance structure.</p>	<p><b>Recommendation 5</b> The exact legal status of IPBES should be clarified and effectively communicated, as this has wide-ranging implications, including in terms of partnership development, fundraising and communications.</p>	<p>The mandate and status of IPBES is defined by States who see it as having a separate legal status. IPBES is an independent intergovernmental body. It was established in Panama City, on 21 April 2012 by 94 Governments. The Plenary of IPBES is the decision-making body of IPBES. IPBES is not a United Nations body and not under the United Nations Environment Programme, nor hosted by UNEP. However, at the request of the IPBES Plenary and with the authorization of the UNEP Governing Council in 2013, UNEP provides secretariat services to IPBES. In this capacity, i.e. for the acts performed as the secretariat of IPBES, UNEP assumes liability. As per decision IPBES-1/4, paragraph 3, the secretariat is solely accountable to the IPBES Plenary on policy and programmatic matters.</p> <p>A simplified version of this text will be posted on the web site, as per recommendation 5.</p>
<p><b>Finding 13</b> For participation in all bodies of the platform, the principle of geographical balance among the five United Nations regions as well as overall gender balance has often resulted in slates of nominations that are balanced geographically and, to some extent, in terms of gender, but are not well-rounded in terms of disciplines and relevant skills. In the longer term, this risks undermining the credibility of IPBES.</p> <p><b>Finding 14</b> IPBES still appears to have difficulty in engaging expertise beyond experts in the fields of biodiversity and ecosystem services. There are well-identified gaps in expertise, notably in the social sciences, that can potentially compromise its capacity to meet its overall mandate and influence policy.</p>	<p><b>Recommendation 8</b> IPBES needs to diversify and be more explicit about the different kinds of expertise needed for different activities, and the criteria applied for expert selection, to strengthen the policy dimension within IPBES. In addition to the existing criteria for regional, gender and disciplinary diversity/scientific credentials, criteria aiming to strengthen the capacity of IPBES to operate at the interface between data, science, policy and practice should be included.</p> <p><b>Recommendation 9</b> There is a need to improve the reach of the process for nominating individuals to take part in the Platform's activities, and to improve the quality of the experts nominated to IPBES. This is a key responsibility of members of the Platform. One approach could be to establish national IPBES committees, chaired by the national focal points, that can assist the nomination processes.</p>	<p>Efforts have been made to rectify the imbalance in the nominations received from Governments and stakeholders regarding disciplines, gender and geography. The procedure for filling gaps in the availability of experts approved by decision IPBES-4/3 has been instrumental in that regard.</p> <p>Specific efforts from the secretariat include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The Executive Secretary has indicated in letters calling for nominations, the disciplines needed for each assessment in the calls for nominations for assessments;</li> <li>▪ In these same letters, the Executive Secretary has also placed an emphasis on the need to nominate more social scientists and more women;</li> <li>▪ The secretariat has reached out to networks and associations of social scientists, such as learned societies, to inform them about the open calls and explain how to submit nominations;</li> <li>▪ The Executive Secretary co-authored an article<sup>2</sup> with Prof. Marie Stenseke, co-chair of MEP and social scientist, to draw the attention of the social science community to this issue.</li> </ul> <p>The situation is improving regarding social scientists and gender balance as follows:</p>

<sup>2</sup> Stenseke M & Larigauderie A (2018): The role, importance and challenges of social sciences and humanities in the work of the Intergovernmental science-policy platform on biodiversity and ecosystem services (IPBES). *Innovation: The European Journal of Social Science Research*. 31:sup1, S10-S14, DOI: 10.1080/13511610.2017.1398076.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Global assessment: social scientists 33%; interdisciplinary scientists<sup>3</sup>: 9%; natural scientists: 58%; 46% women;</li> <li>▪ Assessment on values: social sciences: 80%, natural sciences: 10%; 52% women;</li> <li>▪ Assessment of the sustainable use of wild species: social scientists: 30%; interdisciplinary scientists: 13%; natural scientists: 57%; 44% women.</li> </ul> <p>Additional efforts will be made by the secretariat to continue to improve on these balances.</p>
<p><b>Finding 15</b> In this initial implementation phase of IPBES, significant efforts have been made to elaborate, refine and adopt a set of rules of procedure governing all aspects of IPBES work. But it is worth noting that they are difficult to access as they are distributed across a range of decisions and other information resources on the IPBES website.</p>	<p><b>Recommendation 11</b> The current rules of procedure need to be checked for relevance, updated as necessary and made accessible in a more user-friendly way.</p>	<p>All available policies and procedures are available from the IPBES home page under the tab “policies and procedures”: <a href="https://www.ipbes.net/document-library-categories/policies-and-procedures">https://www.ipbes.net/document-library-categories/policies-and-procedures</a></p> <p>All decisions are available from the IPBES home page under the tab “decisions”: <a href="https://www.ipbes.net/document-library-categories/decisions">https://www.ipbes.net/document-library-categories/decisions</a></p> <p>The secretariat will make additional efforts to make the rules of procedure more accessible on the IPBES web site (finding 15 and recommendation 11).</p> <p>Regarding the need for the rules to be checked for relevance and updated as necessary (recommendation 11): the rules will be reviewed to reflect the current work of IPBES as well as the current rules and practices of other UN inter-governmental bodies.</p>
<p><b>Finding 18</b> The performance of the IPBES secretariat, the competence of its staff, and its strong commitment to the mission of IPBES is widely commended. The work of the secretariat is perceived to be a strength of IPBES, and the technical support units (as part of the secretariat) are also perceived positively. However, the chronic work overload of the secretariat and the lack of visibility and recognition of the work of the technical support units are issues of concern.</p>	<p><b>Recommendation 12</b> There are opportunities for strengthening the impact of the secretariat, including through matching expectations with the resources available, administrative processes and reporting lines with the host agency and the development of an information management strategy.</p> <p><b>Recommendation 13</b> Greater recognition of the critical role of the technical support units within IPBES, e.g. in operationalizing the roll-out of assessments, is required and needs to be formalized and better supported to ensure more consistent engagement of the technical support units in the work of IPBES.</p>	<p>Additional positions are requested from the Plenary (IPBES/7/4) in order to match secretariat capacity with the needs of the work programme up to 2030 as proposed.</p> <p>Reporting line between IPBES and UNEP as the provider of the secretariat, are clear, with the Executive Secretary reporting to the head of the Science Division of UNEP (first reporting officer) and to the Deputy Executive Director of UNEP (second reporting officer).</p> <p>The members of the technical support units work under the oversight of the secretariat. The secretariat has opportunities to meet in its entirety, with staff members from all technical support units, at MEP and Bureau meetings and at Plenaries, and in various subsets throughout the year. The head of each TSU producing an assessment is entitled to be part of the citation of that assessment, which is a major form of recognition and visibility, which other members of the secretariat are not entitled to.</p> <p>The Plenary is informed at each session both orally as part of the Executive Secretary oral report, and in writing (e.g. IPBES/7/INF/5) on the institutions providing TSUs. The</p>

<sup>3</sup> Experts in the category “interdisciplinary scientists” have an academic background in social sciences and strong professional experience in natural sciences, or vice versa.

		<p>secretariat will more prominently acknowledge these institutions on its web site.</p> <p>There is no information management strategy, but the Plenary approved a data, information and knowledge management plan (Annex II of decision IPBES-3/1). The secretariat is using this plan and implementing UN standards and administrative instructions on record-keeping; information labelling, filing and clean-up; and use of information and communication technology, resources and data. The secretariat has deployed SharePoint and Microsoft Teams for its internal document/record management. This software together with file classification management schemes adapted from standard UN procedures have allowed the secretariat to make maximum use of the latest technology to increase effectiveness by allowing on-site and remote access, co-development, versioning, removal of duplicates, and access control.</p>
	<p>Recommendation 14 IPBES should develop comprehensive guidance on national focal point roles and good practice (while allowing for countries to define their own modalities) and develop dedicated channels for communications between IPBES and national focal points and for interaction among the national focal points themselves.</p>	<p>The capacity-building technical support unity has developed an overview document for NFPs on the different ways in which Governments have organized their process to review drafts of the chapters and summary for policymakers of IPBES assessments, that can serve as a basis for inspiration and mutual learning (IPBES/6/INF/12). This document was developed following the meetings of national focal points held in the four regions in 2017 in order to strengthen the submission of comments by Governments for the regional assessments. A similar meeting of all NFPs was held in Bonn in 2018, to achieve the same purpose for the global assessment. In addition, a series of webinars targeted at the NFPs was held ahead of the review period of the summary for policymakers for the land degradation, and the regional assessments to present the documents for review and provide general information about the review process.</p> <p>As part of deliverable 2 (c) of the new work programme, strengthened national and regional capacities, this effort can be extended to other roles of NFPs, as per recommendation 14.</p>
<p>Finding 19 The IPBES website is not fit for purpose, although it has seen some improvements. It is unwieldy, not user-friendly and often lacks the information that is most often sought.</p>		<p>The secretariat acknowledges that it must improve user satisfaction and ease of use of the IPBES web site. Efforts are currently underway to hire a contractor to improve mobile compatibility/ responsiveness, information architecture, navigation, formatting, browser consistency, and forms. The IPBES website receives 16,000, 4,300 and 727 active users per month, week and day respectively. 75% of traffic is from new visitors.</p> <p>The secretariat has made efforts to improve page loading time, accuracy of information, downtime prevention, URL stability, and</p>

		<p>security and to reduce errors. The website serves multiple purposes such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Meeting registration</li> <li>● Conflict of interest declaration</li> <li>● Expert nomination</li> <li>● Meeting documents</li> <li>● Database: previous/current experts, membership, accredited organizations,</li> <li>● Communities/Forums: Open Ended Network of Stakeholders, Land Degradation and Restoration</li> <li>● E-learning</li> <li>● Glossary</li> </ul> <p>The secretariat has deployed the website as a tool and this has helped to improve standardization, meeting planning, distributed workload between the secretariat and website users, and improved the reliability and stability of documents.</p>
<p><b>Finding 20</b> The establishment of supporting bodies (e.g. expert groups and taskforces) to the Plenary is a grey area in terms of structures, defining objectives, accountability, status, utility of outputs and sunset clauses.</p>		<p>Every expert group and task force within IPBES has been established within a mandate, a budget, and terms of reference approved by Plenary, and information on progress with their work and on the established institutional arrangements has been reported to Plenary on an annual basis. Sunset clauses are included in the mandate received from the Plenary. For example, groups of experts tasked with the production of an assessment have sunset clause specified as part of the timeline included in the approved scoping report for that assessment; task forces appointed by the Plenary, as per decision IPBES-2/5, were all time-bound, and established for the period 2014-2018.</p>
<p><b>IMPLEMENTATION OF THE FIRST WORK PROGRAMME</b></p>		
<p><b>Finding 22</b> While it may be premature to assess the policy impact of the assessments produced by IPBES to date, there are several factors that limit the policy relevance of the assessment process and the reports, and therefore their likely influence on policies and decisions in the long run. They include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. IPBES tends to see assessments as end products rather than as part of a wider, more complex and longer-term process to influence policy;</li> <li>b. Members of the assessment scoping teams have been largely dominated by natural scientists (working on biodiversity issues), and an analysis of the scoping documents found little reference to either the co-production of assessments as a core approach or to communications or capacity-building activities that would occur in conjunction with the assessments. The regional</li> </ol>		<p>As pointed out in the response to finding 6, the secretariat has taken a number of initiatives to facilitate the use of these products. There has, however, not been any dedicated funding in the budget for these efforts, and more focus on the uptake of IPBES products could lead to greater impact.</p> <p>In order to address point b of finding 22, it is proposed, as part of the new work programme, to invite national focal points to contribute to the definition of questions of future assessments, at annual workshops, to provide another opportunity to co-design the questions to be addressed.</p> <p>Capacity-building activities by partners, such as national assessments (UNEP-WCMC), or BES-Net dialogues with scientists, policymakers and practitioners (UNDP) strengthen the impact of IPBES assessments by bringing their findings at scales which are relevant to many users.</p>

<p>assessments included more capacity-building efforts as part of their activities;</p> <p>c. With the exception of the pollination and pollinators assessment, their scope is often seen as occurring over scales that are larger than that by which biodiversity management typically operates;</p> <p>d. IPBES assessments have not sufficiently incorporated reviews of the effectiveness of existing policies.</p> <p>IPBES tends to see assessments as the ultimate products to influence policy.</p>		
<p>Finding 25 During its first programme of work, IPBES had noteworthy successes in catalysing the generation of new knowledge. Regarding data management, there has been insufficient attention to developing an infrastructure, standards and guidance for systematically recording the data used in assessments, which is an important consideration to ensure that the work of IPBES is cumulative.</p>		<p>The global assessment has established a repository for long term availability of the spatial data used in the global assessment. Information on how this system is structured and on how other types of data will be accessible is provided in document IPBES/7/INF/2. Experts of other assessments and of the new task force on knowledge and data will be able to build on this pilot work and develop if further for all future work of IPBES.</p>
<p>Finding 26 The policy support mechanism of IPBES has been implemented primarily through the development of an extensive online catalogue of policy support tools. However, a range of sources suggest that the policy support function remains the least successfully pursued of its functions.</p>	<p>Recommendation 18 IPBES needs to review its policy support function and the modalities for delivering on it.</p>	<p>The first prototype of the online policy support catalogue was presented at the fifth session of the IPBES Plenary. Further improvements were requested at the sixth session of the IPBES Plenary and a meeting of the expert group took place in Cambridge, UK, in August 2018 to determine how to make the catalogue policy-supportive (IPBES/7/INF/13). The secretariat is about to engage a contractor who will implement the recommendations of this expert group meeting. It would be premature to examine the effectiveness of the online catalogue before the recommendations are considered and before the revised catalogue is promoted and made available to external users.</p>
<p>Finding 27 The capacity-building function was a key element of the Busan outcome (UNEP/IPBES/3/3, annex). Capacity-building was recognized as being necessary to lift the level of global scientific expertise in biodiversity and ecosystem services and to provide capacity for new data acquisition, especially in the global South. The Platform has had important success in that regard, especially with the fellows programme. However, broader capacity-building efforts are still lagging in other areas of IPBES work. As the task is enormous, it is expected that a clearer partnership and stakeholder engagement</p>	<p>Recommendation 20 The capacity-building function should be continued and enhanced to support the sustainability and long-term impact of IPBES. It should be tailored to its target audiences (e.g. policymakers and practitioners) and be a component of all IPBES functions.</p>	<p>The following elements would start to address recommendation 20:</p> <p>The capacity-building efforts have started to target individuals other than IPBES experts, with the organization of capacity-building events for IPBES national focal points, for example, to increase the submission of comments to assessment and thus increase their policy relevance.</p> <p>Capacity-building efforts led by partners are also contributing to increase impact. One example is the work performed by the BES-Net project of UNDP, which organized dialogues around IPBES assessments between scientists, decision makers and practitioners in different regions of the world.</p>

<p>strategy will help over time to improve this situation.</p>		<p>In addition, it is proposed, as part of the new work programme up to 2030, to have annual workshops with national focal points, either to collect views that could contribute to ongoing scoping processes of assessments, or on completed IPBES products, to contribute to their long-term impact.</p>
<p>Finding 31 Engagement with indigenous peoples and local communities seems to have generated important advances but also significant frustrations during the first years of IPBES.</p> <p>Finding 32 Participation in IPBES, especially by indigenous knowledge holders, has been impeded by the lack of an operational participatory mechanism.</p>	<p>Recommendation 21 IPBES should continue to strive to bring indigenous and local knowledge and other knowledge systems into all its work.</p> <p>Recommendation 22 The task force on indigenous and local knowledge in its present form should be urgently reviewed.</p>	<p>The participatory mechanism is currently being implemented by the TSU on ILK, under the guidance of the task force, and by the TSUs in charge of coordinating the production of assessments. Progress, reported in document IPBES/7/INF/2, on the global assessment of biodiversity and ecosystem services includes activities to collaboratively define problems (phase 1), synthesize and incorporate evidence and data from multiple sources of ILK (phase 2), and appropriately engaging indigenous people and local communities (IPLCs) in the review of the various drafts by convening a series of dialogues (phase 3). Activities are planned for phase 4 to share knowledge and insights gained through the global assessment with IPLCs once the assessment will be concluded.</p> <p>The consultation of indigenous people on the participatory mechanism held in September 2018 by the task force on ILK stressed the importance of dialogues and face-to-face interactions as part of the participatory mechanism compared to online tools or web portals, to implement the approach.</p> <p>The task force has developed a draft methodological guidance for recognizing and working with indigenous and local knowledge in IPBES assessments (IPBES/7/INF/8), which includes a detailed plan for the engagement of IPLCs at all phases of the cycle of an assessment including through dialogues. The draft budget for the work programme up to 2030 takes this proposal into account.</p> <p>Revised terms of reference are being proposed for all task forces (document IPBES/7/6, appendix I), including the task force on ILK, based on lessons learnt.</p>
<p><b>BUDGET AND FINANCIAL ARRANGEMENTS</b></p>		
<p>Finding 35 The Platform relies heavily on in-kind contributions from the scientific community, partners and nation States, from the self-funded participation of experts from developed countries in the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel to their participation in assessments and other activities.</p>	<p>Recommendation 29 The risk of fatigue in the science community, especially of experienced assessment practitioners who receive little or no reward or recognition, needs to be addressed in some manner. IPBES should track in-kind contributions (secondments, scientists donating their time) and catalysed funding and report on them as part of the budget.</p>	<p>The secretariat has been informing the Plenary at each session regarding the in-kind contributions, which are known to the secretariat, and providing an estimate of their value. In-kind contributions in support of the work programme, including support of approved and costed activities, are set out in table 3 of document IPBES/7/4 and estimated at \$3.4 million for 2018.</p> <p>The document further lists (section I.B., in-kind contributions), the in-kind contribution collectively contributed to IPBES by all scientists and other knowledge holders estimated by the secretariat at between \$24 and \$47 million since IPBES started in 2014.</p>

<p>Finding 36 Currently, IPBES spends about half its resources on the implementation of the work programme and half on the operation of the Platform and management functions. Most of the funding has been spent on the important regional and global assessments.</p>		<p>The budget allocated to assessments includes funds for related activities such as communication or work on ILK. For example, a significant part of the budget allocated to the implementation of the ILK approach is included in the budgets for assessments. In the 2019 budget, a three-year assessment includes as part of its budget \$150,000 dedicated to ILK dialogues (one per year), and \$220,000 for dissemination and outreach.</p>
<p>Finding 39 The financial measures clearly reflect the turbulent and rapid start that IPBES made on its new journey. It is important that net assets be well managed in the future, and the net operating ratio must soon be stabilized above zero. The operating reserve ratio is still positive, but the trend is concerning. No information was available to conduct a liquidity assessment, but this should routinely be conducted into the future.</p>	<p>Recommendation 24 IPBES should set a target for the reserves that should be maintained.</p> <p>Recommendation 27 IPBES should incorporate a series of key financial health indicators (e.g. net assets, net operating ratio, operating reserve ratio and programme efficiency ratio) into its annual financial reporting systems and a liquidity assessment into its annual financial reviews in order to foster a culture of pursuing financial sustainability. Appropriate targets should be specified for each.</p>	<p>The secretariat has provided information on its projected biennial liquidity at each Plenary session in the budget document, by estimating the “cash balances as of 1 January of the current year”.</p> <p>IPBES currently maintains a reserve of \$0.9 million as per rule 20 of its financial procedures, which sets a target for the reserve IPBES should maintain. Rule 20 requests that “the Trust Fund maintain a working capital reserve of 10 per cent of the average annual budget of the biennium, to be adjusted as necessary by the Plenary. The purpose of the working capital reserve will be to ensure continuity of operations in the event of short-term liquidity problems, pending receipt of contributions”.</p> <p>An analysis by the secretariat of other trust funds held by UNEP indicates that reserves oscillate between 10 and 25%.</p> <p>The secretariat could start reporting on the financial indicators suggested by the review panel starting with the 2019 budget.</p>
<p>Finding 40 The review panel is aware of the current fund-raising strategy being developed for IPBES to boost the income of the Platform. This is to be encouraged. However, the somewhat restricted attempts to engage the private sector in providing financial support for assessments in exchange for visibility are unlikely to yield significant results for sustainable financing.</p>	<p>Recommendation 30 There is clearly a need to diversify the funding streams of IPBES, e.g. through increased engagement with foundations, pension funds and the private sector. However, the review panel has found that the ongoing engagements between IPBES and the private/corporate sector are still too underdeveloped and would encourage IPBES to refocus on this issue to enhance its fundraising potential. This is a critical area of work for the Executive Secretary, with support from the Head of Development and Chair of the Platform.</p>	<p>The secretariat started to implement the fund-raising strategy about one year ago, with the arrival of the head of development, thanks to an in-kind contribution from France. The work has already produced encouraging concrete results as noted in document IPBES/7/4 considering that securing new donors takes time. The Bureau has proposed to establish a position at the secretariat to continue implementing the fund-raising strategy when the in-kind offer will expire.</p>
<b>TOWARDS GREATER IMPACT</b>		
<p>Finding 41 IPBES communications have seen steady improvement over the course of the first work programme. IPBES has had significant success in reaching global policymakers and, to some extent, national policymakers and members of the scientific community who are not directly linked to IPBES. It is perceived as being much less successful in reaching practitioners (i.e. the implementers of</p>	<p>Recommendation 31 Further improvements in communications could be achieved through more coverage on television and in other digital media, more placement of opinion pieces and more diversity among IPBES spokespersons. In future communications exercises resulting from assessments and other IPBES products, the key “faces” should be the experts in the subject, who often are best able to discuss results and to consider potential policy and</p>	<p>Efforts made by the secretariat in the context of the fund-raising strategy have also aimed at increasing engagement of the private sector in IPBES. IPBES assessments are, for example, cited as the basis for the act4Nature initiative by 65 major companies, including many global companies, which launched a biodiversity charter, including specific commitments to biodiversity.</p> <p>Media campaigns in the context of the release of assessments have been very successful (IPBES/7/INF/14). The land degradation and</p>

<p>conservation and development projects). And it appears and to have largely failed to reach local policymakers, the private sector or citizens to date.</p>	<p>biodiversity management implications, and, for the regional assessments, would have “local presence”.</p> <p>Recommendation 32 IPBES needs to target its communication towards the primary goal of the Platform, which is to bring evidence to bear in decision-making and to ensure transformative change.</p>	<p>regional assessments had media uptake significantly greater than that of the pollination assessment (in the order of ten times greater in some mediums), which had already seen very successful media outreach. Reaching out to citizens more extensively will require greater levels of human and financial resources for IPBES communications – especially if the general public is to be a priority audience (which it has not been thus far). Similarly, gaining more coverage on any medium, including television, will require greater human and financial resources.</p> <p>Based on the Media Impact Study it seems that recommendation 31 refers only to outlets such as BuzzFeed, Huffington Post, and not to traditional media portals and outlets, with which IPBES has had much success. With the understanding of that reading of the term, the secretariat agrees that this is a priority area, and will endeavor to improve this situation.</p> <p>The secretariat will improve its work on the placement of opinion pieces.</p> <p>Past and current spokespersons for assessments were and are being trained by media professionals, and include co-chairs, selected CLAs and limited numbers of LAs from all regions, that is, recognized experts for each assessment. In addition, IPBES spokespersons, typically the Chair and/or the Executive Secretary, have also received specific requests from media, especially about cross-assessment and wider global issues.</p> <p>The secretariat considers that recommendation 32 has been and remains at the core of the IPBES communications efforts and will continue its efforts to reach this goal.</p>
<p><b>Finding 44</b> No definitive statements can yet be made about policy impact, as there is significant time lag between the production of global reports and their translation and appropriation by national actors, and multiple sources of information are considered in the policymaking process. However, there are a number of influencing factors within the IPBES sphere of control that should be considered to enhance the potential for impact. They include a range of appropriate partnerships beyond Governments that are imperative in order for IPBES to have an impact on policymaking and decision-making.</p>		<p>The secretariat has developed its own in-house web-based impact tracking data base for communications purposes called TRACK (<a href="http://www.ipbes.net/impact-tracking-view">www.ipbes.net/impact-tracking-view</a>). This data base is filled by Governments and stakeholders on a voluntary basis and is thus not exhaustive. It features many examples of promising impact including national legislation triggered or changed by IPBES assessments and other work programme outputs.</p> <p>While mainstream media attention has waned soon after the release of the regional and land degradation and restoration assessments, sustained interest by potential users remains strong as evidenced by the more than one-hundred uptake events that have taken place and will take place in the near future following the release of the regional and land degradation assessment reports, at which findings of the IPBES assessments are analyzed in various contexts.</p>

	<p>Recommendation 34 The Platform, in partnership with FAO, UNDP, UNEP and UNESCO, should attempt to reach universal membership.</p>	<p>The secretariat is working on this, with a few new members being secured each year, but does not have enough resources to fully invest in securing new members.</p>
	<p>Recommendation 35 IPBES should put in place regular reviews and self-evaluations of its structures, processes and products.</p>	<p>The work programme up to 2030 includes objective 6 dedicated to reviewing the effectiveness of IPBES.</p>