



## SUMMARY OF THE STAKEHOLDER DAYS PRIOR TO THE THIRD SESSION OF THE INTERGOVERNMENTAL SCIENCE-POLICY PLATFORM ON BIODIVERSITY AND ECOSYSTEM SERVICES (IPBES-3): 10-11 JANUARY 2015



View of of the Stakeholder Days plenary session

The Stakeholder Days prior to the third session of the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES-3) took place from 10-11 January 2015 in Bonn, Germany. The first Stakeholder Day convened at the Museum Koenig, while the second Stakeholder Day took place at the World Conference Centre in Bonn.

The meeting was convened by the IPBES Secretariat with the support of the UN Environment Programme (UNEP), UN Development Programme (UNDP), UN Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) and the Food and Agriculture Organization of the UN (FAO), and facilitated by the International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN) and the International Council for Science (ICSU) with support from the European Platform for Biodiversity Research Strategy (EPBRS), the German science-policy interface for biodiversity research (NeFo) and the Helmholtz Centre for Environmental Research (UFZ).

Attended by more than 90 participants, the Stakeholder Days opened with presentations by the IPBES Secretariat on progress in the implementation of the IPBES Work Programme and the revised draft stakeholder engagement strategy. Participants then held a series of panel discussions and break out sessions over the two days to discuss key issues for stakeholders. The discussions covered: key messages to IPBES-3 based on initial experience in implementing the Work Programme and an exchange with members of IPBES task forces and the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel (MEP); stakeholder coordination during IPBES-3 building on lessons learned from previous IPBES Plenary sessions; coordination of stakeholder activities during intersessional periods; concrete proposals for stakeholder contributions to the IPBES Work Programme; documents on admission of observers and conflict of interest procedures; and possible stakeholder statements and a process for stakeholder engagement.

During the closing session, participants agreed to continue consultations during IPBES-3 to ensure a high profile for stakeholder issues.

### **A BRIEF HISTORY OF STAKEHOLDER PARTICIPATION IN THE IPBES PROCESS**

**Multi-stakeholder process towards IPBES:** IPBES emerged out of the multi-stakeholder consultative process for an International Mechanism of Scientific Expertise on Biodiversity

(IMoSEB), initiated in November 2007. Since the formal establishment of IPBES in 2011 stakeholder consultations have been organized in advance of Plenary meetings to update a wide range of interested organizations on the IPBES process and informally discuss issues of concern related to the IPBES Work Programme.

#### IN THIS ISSUE

A Brief History of Stakeholder Participation in the IPBES Process. . . . .	1
Report of the Meeting. . . . .	2
Opening Session . . . . .	2
Overview of the Work Programme and Agenda for IPBES-3 . . . . .	2
Information on the Stakeholder Engagement Strategy. . . . .	3
Breakout Group on Potential of the Stakeholder Engagement Strategy . . . . .	3
Panel Discussion on Messages to IPBES-3 Based on Highlights from the work of IPBES . . . . .	4
Panel Discussion on the Work of the IPBES Task Forces . . . . .	5
Question and Answer Session with MEP Members on Stakeholder Engagement. . . . .	6
Panel Discussion on Concrete Examples of Stakeholder Engagement Under Task Forces and IPBES Deliverables. . . . .	5
Breakout Discussions . . . . .	6
Closing Session . . . . .	6
Upcoming Events . . . . .	7
Glossary. . . . .	7

The *IPBES Bulletin* is a publication of the International Institute for Sustainable Development (IISD) <info@iisd.ca>, publishers of the *Earth Negotiations Bulletin* © <enb@iisd.org>. This issue was written by Wangu Mwangi and Beate Antonich and edited by Brett Wertz. The Digital Editor is Francis Dejon. The Editor is Brett Wertz <brett@iisd.org>. The Director of IISD Reporting Services is Langston James "Kimo" Goree VI <kimo@iisd.org>. Funding for coverage of this event has been provided by the Secretariat of the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES). IISD can be contacted at 161 Portage Avenue East, 6th Floor, Winnipeg, Manitoba R3B 0Y4, Canada; tel: +1-204-958-7700; fax: +1-204-958-7710. The opinions expressed in the *Bulletin* are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of IISD. Excerpts from the *Bulletin* may be used in other publications with appropriate academic citation. Electronic versions of the *Bulletin* are sent to e-mail distribution lists (in HTML and PDF format) and can be found on the Linkages WWW-server at <http://www.iisd.ca/>. For information on the *Bulletin*, including requests to provide reporting services, contact the Director of IISD Reporting Services at <kimo@iisd.org>, +1-646-536-7556 or 300 East 56th St., 11D, New York, New York 10022, USA. The ENB team at IPBES-3 can be contacted by e-mail at <Kate@iisd.org>.



**Stakeholder Day prior to IPBES-1:** Held on Sunday, 20 January 2011 in Panama City, Panama, this meeting brought together a group of stakeholders, ranging from scientific communities to civil society organizations. The meeting discussed the inter-sessional process leading to IPBES-1 and called for the IPBES Plenary to consider a strategy on stakeholder participation. In a final decision, IPBES-1 requested IUCN and ICSU to convene a broad consultative process to develop a draft stakeholder engagement strategy.

**Stakeholder Days prior to IPBES-2:** The stakeholder days took place from 7-8 December 2013 in Antalya, Turkey. The meeting discussed the draft stakeholder engagement strategy and an initial implementation plan and participants exchanged views with representatives of the IPBES Bureau and the MEP. Participants agreed to, *inter alia*: urge IPBES to adopt the proposed stakeholder engagement strategy to support implementation of the IPBES work programme; call for a mechanism to facilitate stakeholders' interaction with the Platform; and call for stakeholder participation to be financed through the IPBES budget. Stakeholders also emphasized the need to be recognized as "partners" rather than "stakeholders" and involve them in all relevant work of the Platform. Due to shortage of time, IPBES-2 did not discuss the draft stakeholder engagement strategy and requested the IPBES Secretariat to provide a revised draft at the IPBES-3.

## REPORT OF THE MEETING

### OPENING SESSION

The session was facilitated by Estelle Balian, Belgium Biodiversity Platform.

IPBES Executive Secretary Anne Larigauderie emphasized that the IPBES Bureau was determined to ensure that the stakeholder engagement strategy is considered "by this Plenary" and that a decision is made.

Wolfgang Wägele, Director, Museum Koenig described natural history museums as "the last reservoir" for taxonomy experts involved in the discovery and description of species. He expressed concern about "the path IPBES is taking," noting that a focus on the "market value" of ecosystem services could hamper efforts to combat biodiversity loss at species level.

Thomas Brooks, IUCN, said IPBES has great potential for delivering contributions to biodiversity ecosystem services conservation, and highlighted four "unresolved" issues for IPBES-3 from a stakeholder perspective: adopting

a stakeholder engagement strategy and related rules of procedure; involving stakeholders in each of the four IPBES functions; ensuring an inclusive and broad-based approach to stakeholder engagement; and establishing strategic partnerships to support effective stakeholder engagement. He expressed his organization's preference for the second of two proposed options on stakeholder engagement, which calls for an inclusive, open-ended forum of stakeholders, representing the diversity of stakeholders, working on a virtual basis and in collaboration with the Secretariat.

Cornelia Krug, ICSU, said her organization also supports an open-ended stakeholder engagement mechanism and invited participants to think about and develop roadmaps on how their organizations could support the implementation of the IPBES Work Programme.

Balian provided an overview of the programme and anticipated outcomes for the Stakeholder Days, including: better understanding of stakeholder engagement opportunities; identification of concrete stakeholder contributions for current deliverables; roadmaps for stakeholder engagements in the three task forces; and better collaboration during IPBES-3.

### OVERVIEW OF THE WORK PROGRAMME AND AGENDA FOR IPBES-3

Larigauderie provided an overview of the IPBES-3 agenda, with a focus on achievements made over the past year in the implementation of the four objectives of the IPBES Work Programme (IPBES/3/2). With regard to the first objective on capacity strengthening and knowledge foundations, she highlighted, *inter alia*: the establishment of three task forces and their technical support units (TSUs); identification of capacity-building needs; progress on draft procedures for working with indigenous and local knowledge systems; and the development of a knowledge and data strategy. With regard to the second objective on sub-regional, regional and global assessments, she highlighted progress in developing scoping reports for the five regions as well as an initial scoping document for a global assessment on biodiversity ecosystem services. With regard to the third objective on thematic and methodological assessments, she highlighted ongoing work on pollination and pollinators, land degradation and restoration, invasive alien species and sustainable use of biodiversity, as well as scenario analysis and modeling and conceptualization of multiple values of nature and its benefits. With regard to the fourth objective on communication and evaluation of Platform deliverables, she discussed progress in developing catalogs of relevant assessments and policy tools and methodologies, and strategies for communication and outreach, and stakeholder engagement.

Concluding, Larigauderie outlined four options for the further implementation of the Work Programme, ranging from a scenario in which all the scoping assessments would be carried out simultaneously, a more gradual approach focusing on first completing a limited set of assessments, and integrating some of the assessments at thematic or geographical levels.



Cornelia Krug, International Council for Science (ICSU)



Estelle Balian, Stakeholder Days facilitator, welcomed participants.



IPBES Executive Secretary Anne Larigauderie

During a question and answer session several participants expressed concern that integrating assessments would limit the scope and usefulness of assessments. Responding to whether there is a formal link between IPBES and the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), Larigauderie noted these as two “different mechanisms” but reported that information exchange does take place. In this regard, she noted the CBD as an “important partner,” with IPBES playing a supportive role.

She concurred with a comment from the floor that stakeholder engagement is not just important for engagement’s sake but necessary for the implementation of IPBES outcomes.

### **INFORMATION ON THE STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT STRATEGY**

Irini Roumboglou, IPBES Secretariat, presented the draft stakeholder engagement strategy (IPBES/3/16), focusing on the proposed implementation plan. She reiterated the commitment of both the Bureau and the MEP to see discussion and adoption of the strategy at IPBES-3 and she drew attention to the two proposed oversight options.

Noting the overall goal of the strategy is to support the implementation of the Platform’s Work Programme, she stressed that IPBES will depend on expert contributions to fulfill its assessment functions.

She reported that 500 experts from around the world are already engaged in ongoing assessments and called for regular input from diverse stakeholders to meet the Platform’s knowledge generation, policy support and capacity-building functions, noting she anticipates further guidance on this from IPBES-3.

On the definition of stakeholders, she distinguished between their roles as contributors and end-users.

On the scope of the strategy, she said stakeholder engagement will be essential to advance the four objectives of the platform, including by, *inter alia*: mobilizing contributing stakeholders; and facilitating the use of products by end-users and the participation of observer organizations at plenary meetings.

Among indicators for successful stakeholder engagement, Roumboglou highlighted: commitment; capacity to address challenges; extent of engagement, diversity and evidence of outputs; and impacts and opportunities for two-way communication. She also drew attention to some “risks” of stakeholder engagement, including: conflict of interest or dissent among stakeholders; inability to engage effectively owing to lack of funding; participation fatigue; unmet expectations; and unequal level of engagement among stakeholders.



Irini Roumboglou, IPBES Secretariat, presented the revised draft of the stakeholder engagement strategy.

With regard to the proposed implementation plan she said the Secretariat could contribute to, *inter alia*: identifying stakeholders; conducting needs analyses; developing how-to guides and translating them into different languages; and evaluating progress in engaging hard-to reach stakeholders.

Responding to questions on access for stakeholders to the IPBES Plenaries, Larigauderie noted that there are practical constraints in inviting large numbers of non-parties to intergovernmental sessions and stressed that the focus should be on ensuring inclusive representation of diverse stakeholder interests through effective coordination at regional and national levels during the intersessional periods. She highlighted opportunities for strategic partnerships such as UNU/IUCN initiative on Regional Centres of Expertise (RCE) that are willing to use IPBES information in their activities, noting this can exponentially expand impact.

During discussions, several participants highlighted “sensitivities” at IPBES-2 relating to the role of stakeholders in the process and expressed concern that some governments might be opposed to the strategy. Others highlighted difficulties in reaching agreement on ecosystem-based approaches in the intergovernmental process due to geopolitical and national sovereignty considerations.

Responding to a question on how IPBES products could be distributed to different audiences and networks, Brooks highlighted the two-directional process involving “distributing information from the work outward as well as bringing in expertise into the work.” With regard to strategies for achieving sustainable, common and integrated data and a data analysis strategy he stressed the need to build on and incentivize long-term support of existing data structures and cautioned against building new structures.

Responding to a question on how the Stakeholder Days will contribute to the development of the stakeholder engagement strategy and the implementation plan, Roumboglou expressed hope that stakeholders would share ideas and comments on the implementation plan.

### **BREAKOUT GROUP ON POTENTIAL OF THE STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT STRATEGY**

Introducing the session, Katja Heubach, NeFo, noted the aim is to identify concrete contributions that stakeholders can make to the IPBES Work Programme. Several participants expressed concern that focusing on a matrix of stakeholder inputs could detract from the need for a more general reflection on how to generate knowledge and expertise for bridging the science-policy interface. One speaker asserted, “we don’t just want to be called to generate data but rather to be more structurally involved.” Noting that multidisciplinary approaches are challenging because they take time and are not always sufficiently recognized in mainstream scientific publications, one participant called for exploring ways to incentivize young scientists interested in working on IPBES assessments and other deliverables related to the Work Programme.



L-R: Katja Heubach, NeFo; Douglas Nakashima, UNESCO; Jerry Harrison, UNEP-WCMC; and Haejin Bae, National Institute of Ecology, Republic of Korea

Three breakout groups then convened. In the group focusing on coordination of stakeholders during IPBES-3, participants discussed the meaning of “stakeholder versus observers,” as well as challenges of coordination. A second



Thomas Brooks, IUCN

group focused on how to address the lack of diversity of stakeholders participating in the process, and identified the need to, *inter alia*: create a culture that is more inclusive, sensitive and representative of stakeholders not present and allow for their inclusion in national and regional consultations; build capacity including through regional centers of excellence on traditional knowledge;

clearly formulate and communicate mandated inputs from stakeholders; and take into account multi-disciplinary research work. Participants in a final group focusing on how stakeholders could contribute towards the different deliverables emphasized: the need for mapping data sources and initiatives; identifying best strategic partners to work with the task forces to achieve specific deliverables; and what incentives IPBES could provide to data providers. The group also discussed issues around assessment, including the need for further inputs and harmonization of worldviews regarding diverse conceptualization of values of biodiversity and nature’s benefits to people, including ecosystem services.

#### **PANEL DISCUSSION ON MESSAGES TO IPBES-3 BASED ON HIGHLIGHTS FROM THE WORK OF IPBES**

On Sunday morning, Estelle Balian, Belgium Biodiversity Platform, welcomed delegates to the second Stakeholder Day. Thomas Brooks, IUCN, invited representatives of UN partner agencies to highlight support activities for the IPBES Work Programme.

IPBES Executive Secretary Anne Larigauderie said, “we are here to put some meat around the bones of stakeholder engagement.” She reiterated that stakeholder engagement increases the relevance of IPBES, which is “not purely an intergovernmental mechanism but open to all sectors of civil society.”

Nalini Sharma, UNEP, outlined UNEP’s support to IPBES, highlighting activities relating to: capacity building; policy support tools and methodologies for the conceptualization of values of biodiversity and nature’s benefits to people; and a guide on production and integration of assessments from and across all scales.

Eileen de Ravin, UNDP, lauded work already accomplished and drew attention to UNDP’s report on the Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services Network (BES-Net) strategy in support of the capacity-building activities of IPBES presented to IPBES-3 (IPBES/3/INF/19).

Douglas Nakashima, UNESCO, highlighted joint activities with UNDP through BES-Net to foster mobilization of expertise and capacity building and, with UNEP, to harmonize

observation systems in support of IPBES. He further outlined UNESCO’s support in the areas of: education, natural and social sciences, indigenous and local knowledge systems, and cultural values.

Benjamin Graub, FAO, highlighted the importance of developing a partnership framework for IPBES support, noting it has provided the four UN agencies with the “institutional security” to collaborate on the IPBES Work Programme. Describing FAO’s motivation for becoming involved, he noted agriculture is a useful entry point making the link between environmental and agricultural agencies at all levels and highlighted the proposed scoping study on land degradation as a potential area of interest. Among specific activities supported by FAO, he noted the secondment of two researchers to work on the pollination assessment and collaboration with the indigenous partnership for agrobiodiversity.

During discussions, participants highlighted, *inter alia*, the need for: a broader conceptualization of biodiversity and ecosystem services within the scientific community to include cultural biodiversity; outreach beyond the “usual” networks; acknowledging efforts at the national level to establish structures to further support the implementation of the IPBES Work Programme, and linking such efforts.

Responding to a question on options for engaging more closely with other stakeholders to take forward the IPBES Work Programme, Larigauderie underscored that IPBES was purposely set up to work with scientific and knowledge communities, but more work is needed to expand strategic partnerships with reputable scientific networks in order to tap all available knowledge and data and identify data gaps. De Ravin said the Work Programme outcomes would feed into the SDGs, noting IPBES’ role is informing the process while “the SDGs will take it to implementation.”

Nakashima said UNESCO can help link up members of its scientific networks with ongoing as well as future thematic and methodological assessments and noted that indigenous and local knowledge holders have an opportunity to engage with IPBES process through the three task forces. Sharma noted UNEP would explore how to incorporate the various assessment findings in its next Work Programme. Panelists also highlighted opportunities for building synergies with complementary scientific initiatives, including BES-Net, the Global Soil Partnership and UNEP’s Global Environment Outlook and Emissions Gap Report.

#### **PANEL DISCUSSION ON THE WORK OF THE IPBES TASK FORCES**

This session facilitated by Katya Heubach, NeFo, reviewed the work of the three task forces set up under the first objective of the Work Programme on strengthening the capacity and knowledge foundations of the science-policy interface to implement key functions of the Platform.

Douglas Nakashima, UNESCO presented ongoing work of the task force on indigenous and local knowledge (ILK). Using the example of piloting approaches and procedures in IPBES’s pollination assessment, he reported on steps taken, including: a global call for submissions; dialogue workshops; and building on ILK components. He highlighted several challenges, including: managing ILK data given its oral character and collective ownership; providing appropriate data storage, access,



Eileen de Ravin, UNDP



Douglas Nakashima, UNESCO



Jerry Harrison, UNEP-WCMC

manipulation, and generation of new data; protection of intellectual property rights related to ILK; cooperation among knowledge systems; and capacity-building needs for ILK holders to better understand the functioning of IPBES, and for scientists and decision makers to

develop their understanding of ILK.

Jerry Harrison, UNEP-World Conservation Monitoring Centre, outlined activities of the task force on capacity building, noting technical support is provided by the Norwegian Environment Agency. He said the approach taken by the task force was to first identify and prioritize capacity-building needs based on requests made by IPBES parties. Among proposed capacity-building activities to be tabled at IPBES-3, he highlighted a fellowship, exchange and training programme, a “matchmaking” facility and a capacity-building forum.

Haejin Bae, Technical Support Unit (TSU) on Knowledge and Data in South Korea, presented an overview of activities of the task force on knowledge and data policy making. She highlighted the proposed Data and Information Management Plans and Knowledge Information and Data (KID) Strategy for 2015, including: developing a typology for IPBES KID; identifying and addressing gaps, biases and limits of IPBES KID; developing guidelines on uncertainty and data quality; driving cultural change through collaboration; enabling internal and external partners; and developing key performance indicators.



Haejin Bae, National Institute of Ecology, Republic of Korea

#### **QUESTION AND ANSWER SESSION WITH MEP MEMBERS ON STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT**

Heuback then invited MEP members to present their perspectives on the stakeholder engagement process.

Paul Leadley, University of Paris, noted that while a matrix of concrete contributions to each of the 18 Work Programme deliverables is a useful input, there is need for a broader stakeholder-driven vision. He highlighted an initiative by the Future Earth research platform to mobilize an interdisciplinary scientific network to contribute to IPBES activities, emphasizing that stakeholders will need to mobilize funding themselves for such support.

György Pataki, Corvinus University of Budapest, said Eastern Europe lags behind in stakeholder engagement and looked forward to proposals on how to provide support for needs analysis in the region.

Stressing that business as usual is no longer an option, Moustafa Fouda, Egypt, called for a focus on how to effectively build the capacity of decision makers, and noted that a new “language” is needed for this.

Yoshihisa Shirayama, Japan Agency for Marine Earth Science and Technology, highlighted the need for a global assessment to tackle poor data accessibility, noting that unlike climate change information, biodiversity data is fragmented and restricted to small research communities.

In the ensuing discussions, participants highlighted, *inter alia*, the need for: clarity on how the stakeholder funding initiatives are assessed to ensure they adhere to the IPBES principles; with “parasitic

aggregators” that republish publicly available data for commercial use and block access to platforms providing novel and high quality information; improving the participation of indigenous knowledge holders in IPBES activities; and dealing with intermediary organizations and networks in a “multi-systemic” knowledge approach.

Responding to the issues raised, Shirayama said the knowledge and data task force is addressing the issue of data quality and access and drew attention to the forthcoming launch of the first “market place” for biodiversity data.

Answering a question on the role of the ILK task force in the values scoping study, Nakashima said it has been difficult to manage multiple activities in the IPBES Work Programme and noted that the lack of nominations of indigenous knowledge holders to the assessment team amplified this gap. He said this points to the need to strengthen links between stakeholders and national focal points to ensure more inclusive representation within IPBES structures. An indigenous and local knowledge holder representative underscored the need to: allow sufficient time to engage indigenous communities; invest in mentoring and other inter-generational learning activities; and build synergies with IUCN’s work following up on the outcomes of the recent IUCN World Parks Congress.

#### **PANEL DISCUSSION ON CONCRETE EXAMPLES OF STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT UNDER TASK FORCES AND IPBES DELIVERABLES**

Facilitated by Laurence Perianin, IUCN, this panel focused on concrete examples of stakeholder engagement that have contributed to IPBES deliverables over the past year.

Solène Le Doze-Turvill, BES-Net, discussed links between the biodiversity and ecosystem services network (BES-Net) and IPBES, including, *inter alia*: alignment with IPBES’ thematic assessments; providing capacity building in all IPBES workstreams; and consultations of IPBES stakeholders and the



Yoshihisa Shirayama, Japan Agency for Marine Earth Science and Technology, highlighted data quality and access issues.



Laurence Perianin, IUCN

wider community. She drew attention to: the revised BES-Net strategy (IPBES/3/INF/19); the evolved multi-stakeholder advisory committee; different BES-Net web portal entry points; the IPBES matchmaking facility; and UNEP's face-to-face capacity-building activities. Le Doze-Turvill concluded by outlining as next steps: developing the first online modules, establishing collaboration and agreement and launching BES-Net dialogues.

Claire Brown, UNEP World Conservation Monitoring Centre (UNEP-WCMC), presented the work of the Sub-Global Assessment (SGA) Network, explaining it has been in place since the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment and that it focuses on assessment practitioners working at the regional and subregional level. She explained the Network's aim is to create a common platform to build capacity through: training opportunities; capturing, synthesizing and disseminating examples of best practices and lessons learned; developing e-learning tools; encouraging and supporting exchanges between and amongst SGAs to share experiences; and helping to build links with the scientific community. Brown highlighted activities that contribute to the IPBES process, including a mentoring scheme targeting early career assessment practitioners and ongoing efforts to establish regional hubs. She encouraged stakeholders to get involved in the Network.



Claire Brown, UNEP-WCMC

Kazuhiko Takemoto, UN University Institute for the Advanced Study of Sustainability (UNU-IAS) highlighted the work of the network of Regional Centres of Expertise (RCE) on Education for Sustainable Development. He noted ways in which RCE networks play an active role in capacity building for biodiversity policy implementation, including through mobilizing local networks of multiple stakeholders and local technical resources and the advantage of RCE networks being spread across diverse bio-geographical regions, providing for improved South-South, North-



Kazuhiko Takemoto, UN University (UNU)

South and triangular cooperation. He announced UNU-IAS commitments to: contribute to the IPBES capacity-building forum to be held in the second half of 2015; further develop fellowship, exchange and training programmes proposed by IPBES; and develop a range of education programmes and materials with other organizations.

During the ensuing discussion, participants addressed, *inter alia*: engagement of stakeholder organizations and incorporation existing tools into BES-Net; the need for an institutional mechanism and support for centers of excellence with indigenous and local knowledge holders; the value of face-to-face dialogues exchanging practices and policies, including on inter-generational knowledge transfer; and the need for more focused discussions on an action plan for networking activities, their support and funding.

## BREAKOUT DISCUSSIONS

Participants met in five breakout groups to discuss: the proposed stakeholder engagement strategy; stakeholder coordination at IPBES-3; intersessional work and how to capture the diversity of stakeholders beyond just the meeting; concrete stakeholder contributions to deliverables; and documents on admission of observers and conflict of interest procedures.

The first group, facilitated by Thomas Brooks, IUCN, and Cornelia Krug, ICSU, discussed how stakeholders should coordinate themselves during the IPBES-3 Plenary. The group agreed that the stakeholders' daily coordination meetings during IPBES-3 would be divided between informal coordination in the first half hour and then facilitated discussion on the daily agenda and any interventions from 8:30 a.m. to 9:30 a.m.

The second group, facilitated by Marie Vanderwalle, UFZ Science-Policy Expert Group, Laurence Perianin, IUCN and Kristina Articus-Lepage, Belgian Biodiversity Platform, discussed intersessional work, including how to engage young scientists. The facilitators reported that they would distribute a full report of discussions to a morning coordination meeting during IPBES-3, and reported on major points including the need: to develop an inclusive and respective discussion culture; to include stakeholders that are not physically present; for incentives for stakeholder engagement; and for inclusion of diverse knowledge systems.

The third group, facilitated by Katja Heubach and Malte Timpte, NeFo, discussed how stakeholders could concretely contribute to IPBES deliverables. Heubach reported that the group had developed a matrix of stakeholder contributions and highlighted two aspects of engagement: shaping the political process at IPBES; and helping to implement the Work Programme. She explained the stakeholders would continue discussions to define more concrete activities over the course of IPBES-3.

The fourth group, facilitated by Günter Mitlacher, WWF Germany, and Christine von Weizsäcker, ECOROPA, considered the documents on admission of observers and conflict of interest procedures that will be discussed at IPBES-3. Mitlacher explained that the group had discussed the review process for conflicts of interest, noting concerns raised that two members of industry are involved in the pollination and pollinators assessment. He also reported the group discussed how to work with Member States to introduce changes to the text. With regard to bracketed text relating to procedures for admission of observers at Plenary sessions (IPBES/3/13), the group objected to proposed text that allows for a single IPBES member to object to admission of observers, and favored alternative formulation which requires that admission can only be denied if it is supported by one third of the Plenary.

The fifth group, facilitated by Friedrich Wulf, Pro Natura/Friends of the Earth, Switzerland, discussed the stakeholder engagement strategy for IPBES-3 and began work on a statement to IPBES-3. Wulf reported that the group wanted to convey that it is very supportive of the stakeholder engagement strategy yet underscored the need to stress it is a living document and to highlight the need for a culture of respect for diversity. He introduced prepared text for the statement.

## CLOSING SESSION

Balian thanked the groups for their concrete proposals and noted that, as a first step, volunteers would work in the evening to prepare text for the first stakeholder consultation meeting on Monday morning. She reminded participants to sign up to the IPBES Engagement Forum social media sites, thanked all participants for their active and constructive contribution, and thanked the facilitators for the work they completed.

on a volunteer basis. Brooks expressed thanks to Museum Koenig, host of the first Stakeholder Day on Saturday and all organizations that helped to organize the event.

In closing remarks, Brooks lauded the small group discussions for their constructive feedback and thanked participants and facilitators for their coordination work, noting it will enable improved input from stakeholders to IPBES-3 and beyond. Thanking all participants for their contributions, Balian declared the Stakeholder Days closed at 5.30 p.m.

## UPCOMING MEETINGS

### Intergovernmental Negotiations on Post-2015

**Development Agenda - First Session:** The intergovernmental negotiations on post-2015 development agenda will take place over several sessions starting in January 2015. **dates:** 19-21 January 2015 **venue:** UN Headquarters **location:** New York City, US **contact:** Office of UNGA President **e-mail:** [dowlatshahi@un.org](mailto:dowlatshahi@un.org) **www:** [http://www.un.org/pga/wp-content/uploads/sites/3/2014/11/141114\\_post-2015-agenda.pdf](http://www.un.org/pga/wp-content/uploads/sites/3/2014/11/141114_post-2015-agenda.pdf)

**15th Regular Session of the Commission on Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture:** The 15th Regular Session of the Commission on Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture (CGRFA 15) is expected to convene in 2015. The Commission provides the only permanent forum for governments to discuss and negotiate matters specifically relevant to biological diversity for food and agriculture. The Commission aims to reach international consensus on policies for the sustainable use and conservation of genetic resources for food and agriculture and the fair and equitable sharing of benefits derived from their use. **dates:** 19-23 January 2015 **location:** Rome, Lazio, Italy **contact:** FAO Secretariat **phone:** +39 06 5705 4981 **e-mail:** [cgrfa@fao.org](mailto:cgrfa@fao.org) **www:** <http://www.fao.org/nr/cgrfa/cgrfa-meetings/cgrfa-comm/fifteenth-reg/en/>

**Expert Group Meeting on an Optional Protocol to UNDRIP:** This group will discuss a study of the possibility of an optional protocol to the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP), focusing on land, territories and resource rights, as well as the right to self-determination, self-government and autonomy. The results of the meeting will be reported to the UN Permanent Forum on Indigenous Issues (PFII) at its fourteenth session in May 2015. **dates:** 27-29 January 2015 **venue:** UN Headquarters **location:** New York City, US

**UNCCD 3rd Scientific Conference:** The Scientific Conference aims harness a wide range of scientific, local and traditional knowledge to achieve poverty reduction and sustainable development in areas susceptible to desertification, land degradation and drought. The Conference is being organized by the UNCCD Secretariat and the Scientific

and Traditional Knowledge for Sustainable Development (STK4SD) Consortium. **dates:** 9-12 March 2015 **location:** Cancun, Quintana Roo, Mexico

**Third Global Science Conference on Climate-Smart Agriculture:** The Third Global Scientific Conference on Climate-Smart Agriculture (CSA) is the result of a Netherlands-led initiative aimed at simultaneously addressing the themes of agriculture, food security and climate change. The conference will continue the work of the first and second conferences, held in Wageningen, the Netherlands, in 2011, and Davis, California, US, in 2013. The initiative has structured its work around two parallel processes: one to address the science of CSA and the other to focus on policy. The conference, which will focus on vulnerable countries and populations, filling research gaps and closing the science-policy divide, will be an opportunity for researchers to update knowledge of CSA and make recommendations to policymakers. The Food and Agriculture Organization of the UN (FAO) and the CGIAR Consortium are among the conference organizers. **dates:** 16-18 March 2015 **venue:** Le Corum, Esplanade Charles De Gaulle, 34000 **location:** Montpellier, Languedoc-Roussillon, France

## GLOSSARY

BES-Net	Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services Network
CBD	Convention on Biological Diversity
EPBRS	European Platform for Biodiversity Research Strategy
FAO	UN Food and Agriculture Organization
IPBES	Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services
ICSU	International Council for Science
IUCN	International Union for Conservation of Nature
MEP	Multidisciplinary Expert Panel
NeFo	German science-policy interface for biodiversity research
RCE	Regional Centres of Expertise
SDG	Sustainable Development Goal
UNDP	UN Development Programme
UNEP	UN Environment Programme
WCMC	World Conservation Monitoring Centre
TSU	Technical Support Unit
UFZ	Helmholtz Centre for Environmental Research
UNESCO	Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization



Stakeholder Days team confirm a successful conclusion of the meeting