

*Eingegangene Kommentare zur “IPBES Draft Stakeholder Engagement Strategy for supporting the implementation of the Platform’s work programme” (according revised document: IPBES/2/13)*

---

Die IPBES Stakeholder Engagement Strategy stand im Rahmen der offiziellen Online-Konsultation vom 17.6. bis 28.7.2013 zur Kommentierung zur Verfügung (<http://www.ipbes.net/intersessional-process/current-review-documents-ipbes2.html>). Insgesamt gingen 6 Kommentare von Mitgliedsregierungen (China, Costa Rica, Finnland, Frankreich, Großbritannien, USA) sowie 16 anderen Stakeholdern (Action Group on Erosion, Technology and Concentration (ETC Group), ALTER-NET, Emirates Environmental Group, FAO, Forest Peoples Programme, ICSU, IUCN, NeFo, NERC Biodiversity and Ecosystem Service Sustainability (BESS) Directorate, Pan-European Stakeholder Consultation (PESC), SCB, The Sub-Global Assessment (SGA) network, The Resilience and Development Programme at Stockholm Resilience Centre, Swiss Biodiversity Forum, WWF, East European Stakeholders) ein.

Eine breite Übereinstimmung ergab sich zu folgenden Punkten:

- Stakeholders’ activities should go beyond the support of the implementation of the work programme
- Representativeness
- Ownership
- Clarify incentives and benefits for stakeholders
- IPLCs should be recognized as distinct group of stakeholders
- Tailor-made activities and capacity building
- Use of existing networks and fora, and organisational structures
- Establish institutional mechanisms
- ‘Advisory committee’ should also have coordinating functions
- External review
- Adequate financial support
- Clear lines of responsibilities within the Platform’s components needed (Secretariat, the MEP, the Bureau and encompasses IPBES Members) / also within the national governments
- Integrate stakeholder and communication strategy of IPBES, and strategy on strategic partnerships
- Next step: development of an implementation or action plan by the MEP and the Bureau

Dagegen kontrovers kommentiert wurden:

- Advisory board
  - UK: advisory board not efficient – stakeholder engagement can be managed by the Secretariat, Bureau and Plenary (UK)
  - U.S.: Establishment of an advisory board should be postponed
- China: Full-scale stakeholder engaging actions will add considerable burden to IPBES - no need to establish separate body for stakeholders, Secretariat should identify stakeholders - list of key stakeholders sufficient

Zusätzlich gab es folgende Ideen:

- Offer research opportunities to stakeholders
- Include gender dimensions
- Governments should be provided with success stories
- Identification and involvement of practitioners
- UNEP major Groups, UNEP-live as rationales

Die folgende Zusammenstellung der eingegangenen Einzelkommentare der Mitglieder und anderer Stakeholder enthält ausgewählte Kommentare, die aufgrund der Häufigkeit ihrer Nennung während der Treffen zur Entwicklung der Strategie sowie begleitender Workshops und Konsultationen als besonders wichtig erachtet werden.

Governments	Selected comments
<p><b>China</b></p> <p>Weekly supportive</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Full-scale stakeholder engaging actions will add considerable burden to IPBES, distract limited resources from the priority (which is developing principle rules &amp; regulations, and the work programme)</li> <li>• no need to establish separate body for stakeholders, Secretariat should identify stakeholders which could interact with (assessment) working groups according to their needs</li> <li>• Secretariat should hold and update a list of key stakeholders, enhancing it step-by-step if needed – more feasible and cost-efficient</li> </ul>
<p><b>Costa Rica</b></p> <p>Ministry of Environment and Energy</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Erase “positively and negatively affected” since this could mean everybody</li> </ul>
<p><b>Finland</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The “strategy should include a meta-analysis of studies on arguments used in developing management plans and policy instruments or when using voice in other decision-making processes”; include analysis of land owners, farmers etc.</li> <li>• Analyse the outcome of stakeholder communication and engagement, using robust social sciences methods, in order to i) improve the process, and avoiding frustration of the stakeholders, and ii) understand the underlying issues of discourses</li> </ul>
<p><b>France</b></p> <p>Ministry of Foreign Affairs – Development and Global Public Goods Directorate</p> <p>Very supportive</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The way in which stakeholders may organise themselves to effectively contribute to the implementation of the work programme is not dealt with in this document. Two ways possible: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Internationally organized networks</li> <li>○ Organization on national &amp; regional level</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Next step, to be mandated by IPBES-2: implementation or action plan</li> <li>• Typology of stakeholders needed (scale of work on BES, relationship to BES – use/conserves/impact etc.) to identify appropriate means to engage them</li> <li>• ‘Potential conflicts’ should not only be defined but also ways to cope with it should be discussed/drafted</li> <li>• Representativeness should be added as principle</li> <li>• Link stakeholder board to existing networks</li> </ul>
<p><b>UK</b></p> <p>UK Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (Defra) (on behalf of UK stakeholders)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More focus needed on who stakeholder are and how IPBES tends to engage with them</li> <li>• IPBES should learn from IPCC (strength &amp; weaknesses)</li> <li>• More information needed about the most important stakeholders, what they should do and what IPBES needs from them</li> </ul>

Generally supportive	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What is the message of IPBES to the scientific community?</li> <li>• Advisory board not efficient – stakeholder engagement can be managed by the Secretariat, Bureau and Plenary</li> <li>• ‘activities’ should go beyond the implementation of the work programme, e.g. development of work programme, its implementation and communication of deliverables, participation in Plenary</li> <li>• Is the strategy a thing to be implemented through a work plan? Or is the Strategy something that guides how stakeholders interact with the work programme (in which case it may be better described as ‘guidance’ or ‘policy’)?</li> </ul>
<b>USA</b> United States Department of States	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Social media might be helpful to the engagement process</li> <li>• Establishment of an advisory board should be postponed, and should rather be a virtual one</li> <li>• Clarification needed concerning who will be performing the activities in the action plan</li> <li>• Work programme must be established before establishing the action plan for stakeholder engagement</li> <li>• Who actually will be identifying stakeholders? – this must be made fully transparent</li> <li>• In order not to overload the Secretariat, stakeholders should also be encouraged to independently engage with IPBES</li> <li>• The framework of UNEP-live may be considered for work</li> </ul>
<b>Other stakeholders</b>	<b>Selected comments</b>
<b>Action Group on Erosion, Technology and Concentration (ETC Group)</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Inclusiveness is critical: access, effective participation of diverse stakeholders, adequate representation</li> <li>• Establishment of institutional mechanisms within IPBES to enable and facilitate stakeholder engagement in all its activities</li> <li>• UNEP major Groups could serve as an example; however, developing new sub-global processes for IPBES should not be precluded</li> <li>• Stakeholders should have a role in “deliberations and discussions”</li> </ul>
<b>ALTER-NET</b>  Very supportive	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• include a meta-analysis of studies on arguments used in developing management plans and policy instruments or when using voice in other decision making situations; Include analyses of land owners, farmers etc.</li> <li>• additional point: analysis of the outcomes of stakeholder communication and engagement processes; using social science methodologies; ensure budget</li> </ul>

<p><b>East European Stakeholders</b></p> <p>very supportive</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Regions with minor activity might require specific tools</li> <li>• IPBES might learn from related processes (IPCC, IIASA – attract researchers from the communist block, GISCorps, Balaton Group – Marie Curie)</li> <li>• Expectations to IPBES: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Small and efficient secretariat</li> <li>○ Direct communication of IPBES-related material to national stakeholders – not only to governmental bodies</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Critical issues (no decision amongst the participants of the workshop) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Top-down vs. bottom-up</li> <li>○ Private sector involvement</li> <li>○ <b>Known and unknown stakeholders</b> – how much effort to include the latter is appropriate?</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Different phases of the IPBES processes may need different incentives and tools for engagement accordingly</li> <li>• <b>Funds</b> are needed for ensuring proper engagement</li> <li>• Political, scientific and media celebrities might foster the IPBES process</li> <li>• <b>Governments should be provided with success stories</b> for outreach</li> <li>• Strengthen communication and outreach of IPBES activities and products</li> <li>• <b>Incentives for academia to engage</b>: visibility, being cited; scientific results utilised in policy-making; networking opportunities; revealing new research niches, pioneering in certain subjects; scientific database about researchers involved and available; prestigious institution (IPBES), prestigious researchers involved, prestigious research topics; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>→ However, benefits should not be only for individual researchers but also for their communities</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Definition of key terms needed (biodiversity)</li> <li>• <b>Identification and involvement of practitioners</b> who are not aware that they are impacting on biodiversity</li> </ul>
<p><b>Emirates Environmental Group</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A newsletter could provide stakeholders globally about the latest developments within IPBES</li> <li>• <b>Offer research opportunities to stakeholders</b> in order to build up a rich knowledge basis on various ecological concepts around the world</li> <li>• Annex 2 (online survey): “<b>Incentives for respondent organisations to engage</b>” &amp; “ways and means to ensure effective stakeholder engagement” are particularly noteworthy</li> </ul>
<p><b>FAO</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the term ‘ownership’ remains unclear, suggestion for rephrasing: “ensuring active and effective participation”</li> </ul>

<b>Forest Peoples Programme</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• current document does not define stakeholder groups</li> <li>• IPLCs should be recognized as distinct group of stakeholders</li> <li>• Full and effective participation of IPLCs requires targeted procedures and distinct treatment</li> </ul>
<b>ICSU</b>  very supportive	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Next step: development of an implementation or action plan by the MEP and the Bureau → based on indicative list of first actions (with according budget) to be submitted to IPBES-2 for revision and approval</li> </ul>
<b>IUCN</b>  very supportive	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Next step: development of an implementation or action plan by the MEP and the Bureau → based on section V (implementation) and Annex I, suggestions from the review process and regional/national consultations</li> <li>• Included “human socio-cultural diversity, in particular gender dimensions” (social roles of, and power relations between men and women) → ensure equitable representation</li> <li>• Need to support the underrepresented data holders, especially in developing countries</li> <li>• Clear lines of responsibilities within the Platform’s components needed (Secretariat, the MEP, the Bureau and encompasses IPBES Members); countries themselves would take responsibility for outreach, consultation and other activities that foster the engagement of stakeholders especially at national level.</li> <li>• Related to capacity building: pay specific attention to women empowerment</li> </ul>
<b>NeFo: Stakeholder Workshop Bonn</b>  very supportive	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• participation of stakeholders not only in the implementation of the work programme, but also in other IPBES activities and related processes needed (e.g. participation in working groups, discussions in the plenary etc.); involvement in the shaping of the work programme</li> <li>• underrepresented stakeholders should be particularly addressed</li> <li>• review of the strategy while work programme is progressing is needed, external reviewers</li> <li>• representativeness of stakeholders to be ensured</li> <li>• ownership is very important (while ownership as used here does not affect legal ownership of decision-making in the plenary)</li> <li>• ensure adequate financial support</li> <li>• implementation unclear: establish clear lines of responsibilities; also within the national governments</li> <li>• advisory board versus steering committee</li> <li>• integrate stakeholder and communication strategy of IPBES</li> <li>• capacity building must be concentrated on</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• peer-to-peer interaction to be supported; and sharing of good practices and lessons learnt</li> <li>• include citizen-science</li> </ul>
<p><b>NERC Biodiversity and Ecosystem Service Sustainability (BESS) Directorate</b></p> <p>very supportive</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• IPBES will need to engage a large variety of stakeholders at different scales</li> <li>• <b>Budget should not be underestimated</b>: identify specific targets and means to achieve them – not attempting to engage with all stakeholders;</li> <li>• <b>Objectives should link clearly to the scientific and policy objectives of IPBES</b> helping to identify relevant stakeholders</li> <li>• Indicative list of actions is useful, should be used to develop an implementation plan; define deliverables and ‘success’ in order to <b>evaluate the process afterwards</b> - appropriate metrics need to be developed and integrated in the implementation plan</li> </ul>
<p><b>Pan-European Stakeholder Consultation (PESC)</b></p> <p>very supportive</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• stakeholders should also be allowed, amongst others, to contribute to the <b>further development of the work programme, to participate in working groups and discussions in the plenary, to promote the work of the platform as well as the uptake of the products of the platform</b></li> <li>• special attention should be paid to stakeholders that so far are <b>not well represented in IPBES</b></li> <li>• external independent <b>review</b> needed</li> <li>• <b>engagement of stakeholders</b> for each activity of the work programme should be <b>tailor-made</b> towards the work programme’s aspects and deliverables in all phases of its implementation</li> <li>• <b>ownership</b> is crucial</li> <li>• <b>clarify benefits for stakeholders</b></li> <li>• <b>mechanisms</b> for involvement needed</li> <li>• <b>advisory board should have advising and coordinating function</b>; there’s a <b>strong need for regional and national</b> as well as thematic support structures</li> <li>• <b>clear lines of responsibility within the secretariat, the MEP, the bureau, national focal points and stakeholders</b> needed</li> <li>• <b>next step: development of an indicative list of actions</b> to be presented to IPBES-2</li> </ul>
<p><b>SCB</b></p> <p>very supportive</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Involvement of stakeholders should go beyond (the implementation of) the work programme (add to decisions made by other IPBES bodies) → need to communicate this notion to IPBES-2 in a clear way</b></li> <li>• Integrate terms “knowledge providers” and “knowledge holders”</li> <li>• Voices from <b>underrepresented stakeholders</b> must be strengthened</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Documentation of engaged stakeholders is needed to ensure transparency</li> <li>• Relation between the secretariat, bureau, MEP and the plenary needs to be clarified</li> <li>• 'ownership' of IPBEs is essential</li> <li>• Clear communication of benefits for stakeholders needed</li> <li>• Need for financial support must be taken seriously ('equitable opportunities for participation')</li> <li>• 'advisory committee' should also have coordinating functions</li> <li>• Lines of responsibility should also be established with the other IPBES bodies</li> <li>• Use existing networks and organizational structures; SCB's structures as template: global Board, regional sections and local chapters</li> <li>• Stakeholders should be invited to take part in the review ("procedure of report")</li> <li>• One might list the responses of stakeholders to the survey in order to identify major gaps in communication to important organisations / stakeholders</li> </ul>
<p><b>Swiss Biodiversity Forum</b></p> <p>very supportive</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Transparency is very important</li> </ul>
<p><b>The Sub-Global Assessment (SGA) Network</b></p> <p>generally supportive</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SGA network considers itself as key stakeholder</li> <li>• SGA currently develops a common platform for improved capacity in the uptake and use of ecosystem assessment for practitioners</li> <li>• SGA commits itself to support the identification of stakeholders based on existing networks and fora, encourage sub-global networking activities, the scoping, networking</li> </ul>
<p><b>The Resilience and Development Programme at Stockholm Resilience Centre, Sweden</b></p> <p>very supportive</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No stakeholders are named throughout the whole document</li> <li>• IPLCs should be named explicitly in order to highlight their major role as critical knowledge holders</li> <li>• The suggested actions for implementation of the strategy are supported</li> </ul>
<p><b>WWF</b></p> <p>very supportive</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The SES needs to go beyond the implementation of the work programme: contribute to decisions made by plenary, bureau, MEP, development of work programme, working groups, promote uptake of IPBES deliverables</li> <li>• Stakeholders should be considered strongly as 'users' of IPBES products</li> <li>• Underrepresented stakeholders – representativeness to be ensured</li> </ul>

- |  |   |
|--|---|
|  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• External review of the strategy needed</li><li>• It might not be useful to stick to the UN Major Groups since the broadest participation should be announced</li><li>• Obligation to declare potential conflict is essential</li><li>• Lines of responsibilities should lie within IPBES structures; national focal points,</li><li>• SES should complement the strategy on strategic partnerships</li><li>• Clarify the benefits for stakeholders</li><li>• Advisory board may also have coordinating function</li></ul> |
|--|---|

Impressum:

**Dr. Katja Heubach**

Netzwerk-Forum zur Biodiversitätsforschung Deutschland (NeFo)

Helmholtz Zentrum für Umweltforschung – UFZ

Permoserstr. 15 04318 Leipzig

Tel: 0341 235 – 1650

E-Mail: [katja.heubach@ufz.de](mailto:katja.heubach@ufz.de)

[www.biodiversity.de](http://www.biodiversity.de)