



DANISH PRESIDENCY OF THE COUNCIL OF THE EUROPEAN UNION 2012



## EPBRS

### The thematic content of the first IPBES work programme

University of Copenhagen, 16.-18. January 2012

## WORKSHOP REPORT

**Venue:** University of Copenhagen, Bispetorvet 1-3. 1167 Copenhagen K., Denmark

**Hosted by:** Danish Ministry of Environment  
University of Copenhagen

**Organisers:** Martin Schneekloth (Ministry of Environment)  
Carsten Rahbek (University of Copenhagen)  
Neil Burgess (University of Copenhagen)  
Carsten Neßhöver (EPBRS Secretariat)

**Supported by:** European Environmental Agency and GBIF

# Content

<b>INTRODUCTION .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>PROGRAMME OF THE WORKSHOP .....</b>	<b>4</b>
<b>CHAIR'S SUMMARY .....</b>	<b>7</b>
<b>REPORTS FROM BREAKOUT GROUPS.....</b>	<b>10</b>
BREAKOUT GROUP 1, DAY 1 .....	10
BREAKOUT GROUP 2, DAY 1 .....	13
BREAKOUT GROUP 3, DAY 1 .....	16
BREAKOUT GROUP 1, DAY 2 .....	17
BREAKOUT GROUP 2, DAY 2 .....	19
BREAKOUT GROUP 3, DAY 2 .....	22
<b>KEYNOTE PRESENTATIONS.....</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>LIST OF PARTICIPANTS.....</b>	<b>25</b>

## Introduction

The Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES) has been under formation since 2005. In October 2011, the first session of the Plenary was held in Nairobi, Kenya. Due to various constraints mainly of a political character, an agreement to formally establish the platform was not reached at the meeting. The second session will be held in Panama City, Panama in April 2012.

For the first session of the IPBES Plenary, UNEP had prepared a working document and four information documents to outline the possible elements of the first IPBES work programme. Based on discussions and suggestions in the first Plenary, an intersessional process was established to develop a more consolidated outline of the first work programme.

The EPBRS meeting held at the University of Copenhagen 16. – 18. January 2012 under the auspices of the Danish EU Presidency, the University of Copenhagen and the EPBRS was a part of this process. Scientists from social as well as political and natural sciences, policy makers, and government officials considered various subjects related to possible themes, methodologies and approaches for the first work programme. Key note speakers representing a wide range of scientific, political, and organisational experiences provided their inputs, which were then discussed further in smaller breakout groups and on the last day collated in a Chair's Summary. A round of comments from the floor from the participants was conducted and the comments were taken into consideration by the chair in its summary.

Presentations and discussions mostly revolved around the assessment function of IPBES, but other topics such as Rules of Procedure, tools and methodologies for integration into policy-making processes and options for review processes were also touched upon.

This report contains presentations from key note speakers, a Chair's summary, and reports from the breakout groups.

The Danish EU Presidency, the University of Copenhagen and the EPBRS wish to thank all participants for their valuable inputs, the spirit of cooperation and mutual respect, and the highly qualified and thought-provoking presentations.

# Programme of the Workshop

**Monday, 16<sup>th</sup>. January 2012**

---

## Opening:

09:00 – 09:30

Welcome by organisers:

*Martin Schneekloth, IPBES HoD, Danish Ministry of Environment.*

*Thomas Bjørnholm, Vice-rector of the University of Copenhagen.*

*Horst Korn, Chairman of EPBRS.*

## Setting the stage:

09:30 – 10:00

Briefing on the current stage of the IPBES process and other intersessional workshops.

*Jerry Harrison, UNEP/UNEP-WCMC, Cambridge, United Kingdom.*

## Session 1

Challenges and thematic approaches to assessments in relation to policy usefulness

10:15 – 10:30

**Key Note speaker 1:** IPBES as a policy tool for addressing global sustainability challenges.

*Ida Auken, Danish Minister of the Environment.*

10:30 – 11:15

**Key note speaker 2:** Status and trends in biodiversity and their relevance to global environmental sustainability – what do we know and what do we need to know?

*Neil Burgess, Centre for Macro ecology, Evolution and Climate, Faculty of Science, University of Copenhagen, Denmark.*

11:15 – 12:00

**Key note speaker 3:** Lessons learned from other assessments and processes.

*Robert Watson, Chief Scientific Advisor, Department of Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (DEFRA), United Kingdom.*

13:15 – 14:00

**Key Note speaker 4:** Status and trends in ecosystem services and their relevance to global environmental sustainability – what do we know, what do we need to know, and how to move forward on what we need to know?

*Megan Tierney, UNEP-WCMC, United Kingdom*

14:00 – 14:45

**Key note speaker 5:** Lessons learned from the Regular Marine Process on choosing thematic approaches for assessments, and how to bring in the social sciences and traditional knowledge

*Jake Rice, Senior National Advisor, Ecosystem Science for the Department of Fisheries and Oceans, Canada.*

## Breakout groups

14:45 – 17:30

Three groups to further debate the different issues addressed in the key note presentations.

*Facilitators: Jake Rice (group 1), Neil Burgess (group 2) and Ivar Baste (group 3)*

1. Which major global negotiations and events does IPBES need to provide input to in order to be relevant to policy makers?
2. Which key products should the platform deliver in relation to what events or processes?

3. How should the scoping process be organised in order to frame the questions that policy makers want answers for?
4. Which partners would be the most important ones for IPBES to engage with?
5. What could the modalities of such partnerships be?

18:00 Departure by bus to European Environment Agency (EEA) ([www.eea.eu.int](http://www.eea.eu.int)).

18:30 **Key note speaker:** Interface between global assessments and sub-global assessments – EEA as an example.  
*Jacqueline McGlade, Executive Director, EEA.*

## **Tuesday, 17<sup>th</sup>. January 2012**

---

Session 2 Perspectives on tools and methodologies for assessments:

09:00 – 10:00 Reports for the breakout-groups from the previous day.

10:15 – 10:45 **Key note speaker 1:** Input from the policy makers.  
*Steen Gade. Member of the Danish Parliament (Socialist Party).*

10:45 – 11:15 **Key note speaker 2:** Input from the natural sciences.  
*Kathy Willis, Oxford University, United Kingdom.*

11:15 – 11:45 **Key note speaker 3:** Input from the social sciences.  
*Ørnulf Seippel, Professor of Sociology and Political Science, Institute for Social and Political Science, Norwegian University of Science and Technology, Trondheim.*

11:45 – 12:15 **Key note speaker 4:** Input from the environmental economic sciences.  
*Patrick ten Brink, Senior Fellow and Head of Brussels Office, Institute for European Environmental Policy (IEEP).*

Breakout groups

13:15 – 16:30 Breakout groups on the issues covered by keynote speakers.  
*Facilitators: Jake Rice (group 1), Neil Burgess (group 2) and Ivar Baste (group 3).*

Suggested questions:

1. How and by use of which tools can assessments be more useful for policy?
2. How can assessments be used to evaluate and identify existing and missing policy tools to address the challenges and questions that policy makers will need answers for without being policy prescriptive?
3. Which assessment tools and methodologies seem to be relevant for all groups, and which can be used at a global scale across regions?
4. How can an inter-disciplinary approach be ensured in the assessments?

16:45 Departure by bus to the Zoological Museum (GBIF).

17:15 -19:00 Tour of the exhibitions and visit to GBIF ([www.gbif.org](http://www.gbif.org)).

19:00 – 21:30 Reception at Zoological Museum with guest talk by *Prof. Carsten Rahbek, for Macroecology, Evolution and Climate, University of Copenhagen.*

## **Wednesday, 18<sup>th</sup>. January 2012**

---

- Session 3                      Periodicity and interrelationship of assessments (global and others)  
Sequencing of assessments to ensure policy relevance, and use of thematic assessments complementing global assessments.
- 09:00 – 10:00                      Reports from breakout-groups from previous day.
- 10:15 – 10:45                      **Key note speaker 1:** Linking global assessments with major negotiations processes and with sub-global and regional, in the context of IPBES.  
*Ivar Baste, Consultant, Norwegian Directorate for Nature Management, Norway.*
- 10:45 – 11:15                      **Key note speaker 2:** IPBES as a newcomer. How can IPBES be useful in an already crowded assessment landscape?  
*Jake Rice, Senior National Advisor, Ecosystem Science for the Department of Fisheries and Oceans, Canada.*
- 11:15 – 11:45                      **Key note speaker 3:** Linking IPBES with regional assessments – the case of Europe.  
*Carsten Neßhöver, Coordinator, KNEU project.*
- Plenary discussion  
12:45 – 15:15                      Discussion on possible conclusions from the meeting in relation to the thematic scope, content and approach of the IPBES assessments for the initial work programme.  
*Facilitators: Neil Burgess and Martin Schneekloth*
- 15:15 – 15:30                      Closing remarks  
*Martin Schneekloth, Danish Ministry of Environment, Nature Agency.*

# Chair's Summary

## General comments in relation to assessments and the IPBES work programme

The EPBRS workshop participants recommend that all four functions of IPBES should be integrated in relevant aspects of the first work programme.

Assessments of knowledge on biodiversity and ecosystem services should in general be designed in such a way that they can also help to identify and prioritize key scientific information needed for policymakers at appropriate scales, catalyze efforts to generate new knowledge, support policy formulation and implementation and prioritize key capacity-building needs to improve the science policy interface.

Assessments will in many cases probably depend on an approach that integrates information from a variety of disciplines relevant to biodiversity and ecosystem services, including evidence-based knowledge disciplines, as well as local or traditional knowledge.

Assessments should wherever possible be designed in such a way as to make up-scaling and down-scaling possible. Assessments should also be carefully selected and designed in order to avoid overlaps and duplication of work.

Participants at the workshop emphasized that Europe with its broad landscape of knowledge holders on biodiversity and ecosystem services is particularly ready to contribute actively to the first work programme with experience, resources and assessments.

## Current situation in relation to assessments and the work programme

1. While there are many known gaps, there are already significant existing data, information and knowledge that can provide the basis for assessment(s) on a wide range of critical issues.
2. There is experience from other assessment processes of what has worked well and what has not worked well, which can be used to inform development and implementation of IPBES work programme.
3. There are already more suggestions for assessments at multiple scales that IPBES could carry out than it would be reasonable to consider even in the medium term, so prioritised choices will need to be made.
4. As IPBES governance structure and implementation processes have yet to be agreed, and there is no agreed work programme or budget, timescale and modalities for assessments are not clear.
5. Working on the basis that we want IPBES to be up and running as soon as possible, we need to identify those steps that can be taken in 2012 to help IPBES move towards implementation of its work programme.

## Issues relating to the work programme

6. IPBES could aim to do (periodic) global and regional assessments, drawing on sub-global assessments, designed in collaboration with scientists and other stakeholders, and based on a common conceptual framework. Duplication of effort with existing initiatives should be avoided.
7. IPBES may also carry out thematic assessments focused on specific questions and issues, and potentially develop products targeted at specific audiences.

8. Assessments and associated tools could identify risks and consequences of different options for policy and action (including maintaining the status quo) and present these in a non-policy prescriptive manner, thus also supporting the policy support function of IPBES.
9. Details of the initial scoping process as the first step in assessment processes need to be defined and operationalised in 2012, based on decisions made at the second session of the IPBES plenary meeting in Panama City in April 2012. Otherwise it can prove difficult for IPBES to be able to address major relevant negotiation processes, as appropriate, in a timely manner later in the decade.
10. Thematic assessments might include those already discussed in IPBES meetings, issues raised by other MEAs/processes, and other issues raised at this meeting (included as footnote).<sup>1</sup>
11. Expert meeting(s) could be convened to review potential issues that Governments and other participants suggest to the IPBES Plenary as priorities for assessments, in order to help prioritize the issues being discussed.
12. Intersessional processes and work related to the work programme between the IPBES meeting in Panama in April 2012 and the following IPBES plenary meeting should be activity-focused..
13. Potential relationships with other assessment processes (TEEB, GRAME and others) and possible consequences of this for the IPBES work programme should be explored, as IPBES becomes more clearly defined and as the other processes continue to evolve.

#### **Issues relating to processes for establishing assessments**

14. A careful definition and timescale for the initial scoping process for assessments is vital, in particular recognising required interaction with plenary or subsidiary bodies in clarifying and agreeing expected outputs and elements in the work programme. The Rules of Procedure should explain how such an initial scoping process should be carried out.
15. The process for identifying lead authors is critical, including guidance for Governments making nominations, whether other stakeholders can also nominate, how lead authors are chosen from the nominations, how the lead authors choose author teams, and what to do if there are gaps. These processes should be included in the rules of procedure for the operations of IPBES. It was mentioned by participants that this process is long and that it would be useful to have the process started already by decisions at the 2. IPBES meeting in Panama in April 2012.
16. Mechanisms need to be put in place in order to help ensure that the relevant experts and stakeholders (governments across sectors, natural and social scientists, business and local communities) are encouraged to participate from the beginning of each activity implemented by IPBES.

---

<sup>1</sup> These might include: Aichi targets (individually and/or as a body); carbon ecosystem services assessment; pollination; ecosystem based adaptation for climate change; REDD+, coral reef health; ecosystem-based water supply; fish stocks; land use changes; land degradation issues; emerging diseases; resource-related conflict; forest communities – dependence and benefits; invasive alien species; scenarios for changes in human behaviour and outcomes on biodiversity and ecosystem services. Especially assessments in relation to the Aichi targets were highlighted, even though it was mentioned that overlapping with other assessments on the same issue should be avoided and that the request to do assessments on the Aichi targets should probably come via a decision of a CBD CoP, and not IPBES itself.

### **Issues relating to engagement of scientists and other knowledge holders in the assessment work**

17. It is important to incorporate capacity building initiatives in the assessments as early as possible in the scoping phase. This could be done through, for example, via scholarships for young scientists, exchange programmes, or requirements for gender balance.
18. A thorough review of the potential incentives and disincentives for scientists and other knowledge holders to engage in different regions could be conducted, and actions that could be taken to improve engagement identified.
19. The meeting proposes the use of mechanisms to facilitate participation of those involved in assessments, through for example funding, academic credits, or replacement capacity from PhD or post doc grants.
20. Procedures for establishing partnerships that help to ensure access to and strengthening networks providing data, information and knowledge relevant to carrying out assessments and following up on assessment outcomes should be established early on. The procedures should take the potentially mutually support values of partnerships into account, as well as the potential for reputational risks.
21. Procedures for inclusion of traditional knowledge in assessments should be developed, taking into account best practices for quality assurance of such information. These procedures should draw from earlier experiences made for example in the MA, IPCC and IAASTD. It should be noted that the MA developed specific procedures which dealt with traditional knowledge.
22. Areas where improvements to assessment tools are urgently needed could be identified, such as development and use of scenarios in the context of IPBES, and the measurement of ecosystem services other than provisioning services as measurement of ecosystem services has focused on these so far.
23. Structured ways to input IPBES needs into national and regional research strategies and funding plans should be identified, especially for work on the gaps in science identified for assessment processes.
24. Scientists and others selected to participate in assessments should participate in their personal capacity and not as representatives of certain organisations or institutions. Efforts should also be made to ensure that these people can participate in their own language.

### **Issues relating to communication and outreach**

25. Effective communication is absolutely critical in reaching the target audiences, including policy makers and the general public, and this includes ensuring effective targeting and packaging of products.<sup>2</sup>
26. IPBES products should combine evidence from science and other knowledge holders and ideally address, and if possible combine, elements of moral, ethical and economic considerations, as appropriate, to specific target audiences.

---

<sup>2</sup> This might include: key message summaries; big storylines; appropriate metaphors; case studies; clear language; short messages; good maps and/or graphics; country and sector-relevant examples

# Reports from Breakout Groups

## **Breakout Group 1, day 1**

Facilitated by Jake Rice.

### **Breakout Group 1 - General**

- What is context for our discussions and conclusion

- European or Global? Workshop is European IPBES, but think global first and if there are components of answers that are uniquely European, report them and label them as such.

- What role of past work? Useful answers will be linked to the four potential functions of IPBES. No one activity or partnership needs to serve ALL functions, but useful answers will contribute to at least one function and possibly more.

- Vehicle and Destination of product? Chair's report to Danish Presidency and Presidency to Panama City

**Which major global negotiations and events does IPBES need to provide key inputs to in order to be relevant to policy makers?**

Points of Agreement:

- The list from the Pusan Agreement is complete at its level, just need specific examples of the classes.

- Key Priority is process to evaluate progress towards CBD Aichi Biodiversity targets. Reasons:

- Timing: realistic to have major product by ~ 2018.

- Priority: Key biodiversity policy commitment by States.

- Scope: global & addresses many biodiversity issues

- Opportunity: commitment to evaluate progress but process to do so not yet completely established

- Receptivity: CBD COP X endorsed IPBES

### **Other Key negotiations**

- Rio+30.

- More speculative but another summit in 2022 is quite possible

- Nature of what comes after Rio+20 will be clearer after June 2012, so can start planning quickly after Panama City is done.

- If there will be another summit in 2022, then biodiversity will be key. Lots of lead time to integrate IPBES in preparations, and have a second major product as focus for global efforts after products for evaluation of Aichi Targets are completed.

### **Other Opportunities to explore, with more mixed support**

- Next Global Biodiversity Outlook: Pros are mandate relevance and scope. Cons – their processes already pretty established and concern about possibly having to adopt identity of another groups' process

- OECD initiative on valuation of ecosystem services. Pros – available partner with expertise we need but find in short supply. Cons – very rich-country oriented
- Periodic or opportunistic Assessments of other IGOs [ex.- bycatch by FAO and RFMOs]. Pros – relevant to our mandate and need our expertise. Cons – we haven't been invited and have no mandate to invite ourselves.
- IPCC AR6 – too early to plan but open dialogue when AR5 is released. If biodiversity is in follow-up, explore opportunities to engage

**Which key products should the platform deliver in relation to what events or processes?**

First of all, think beyond just assessments

- Structured ways to input to research strategies and priority setting, especially for work on science needed for decision-making
- Recurrent opportunities for engagement with decision-makers; mutual education why they need us and what we can do of most relevance to them
- Serious exploration of what “policy support platforms” really means, and if/how it varies with governance context.
- Process for identifying or organizing approaches to capacity building needs

But we do include assessments

- Need some big ones (global or near-global scale), but can't do many (more than one?) and can't do quickly.

–First one may be linked to Aichi evaluation

–First one may be global consolidation of information and trend evaluations on Drivers, Pressures and Responses that affect biodiversity status

- Proactive scans for new issues? No agreement on feasibility or desirability.

Dynamic tension of smaller, more local products vs larger ones

- Argument for exclusive focus on large: Can't do everything for everyone and IPBES' unique niche is larger scales

- Argument for also doing smaller: Many States will not make expertise and information available if they are not getting help on problems that are often national or lower

– (Especially if it is evaluating effectiveness of existing policies, which are likely to differ among governance bodies.)

Conclusion: High risk of losing support if IPBES ignores smaller scale assessments. However essential to have process for engagement that manages workload and protects IPBES identity and reputation.

Challenge to engagement in smaller scale needs

- What makes a biodiversity assessment carry the IPBES label?

–Needed to protect reputation for quality and objectivity, but intrusive and burdensome to have top-heavy approval process.

–Produce standards and guidelines for best practices, and tools for enabling more focused policy-relevant biodiversity assessments

–Relatively fast time-line so IPBES can earn reputation for added value, policy relevance, and quality of products as early as possible

–NEEDS REVIEW OF CASE HISTORIES & PRACTICES TO SEE WHAT WORKS WELL

Where to engage first in smaller-scale assessments

•Many ideas, decided we should strive for several to run in parallel

–Some replication of projects for each of the four functions

–Make sure balance between developed and less-developed countries.

–Perhaps take a topic like “invasive species” that is relevant everywhere, needs local treatment to be perceived as relevant, and try as many ways of going at developing the science in support of policy as the teams develop. Evaluate practices after several are done and see if “best practices” emerge.

## **Breakout Group 2, day 1**

Facilitated by Neil Burgess

### **How should the scoping process be organised in order to frame the questions that policy makers want answers for?**

- Scoping could be defined as the *identification of how questions asked by Plenary can be addressed*, in particular in terms of what information and knowledge is available, what the potential products are and who will use them, who the key players are, how addressing this question relates to the other IPBES functions, and so on. This activity is key in terms of preparing for implementation of assessments, and is therefore an early or initial activity.
- Implementation would probably be through a *workshop* or series of workshops, potentially with preparatory work to inform them. All key stakeholders would need to be involved in elaborating the questions and identifying and reviewing the proposed response, including policymakers, scientists and other knowledge holders.
- However it is important to recognise that *scoping would be assessment-specific*, done at the level at which the assessment was being carried out, so participation would depend on region, theme being addressed, and so on.
- Following the scoping process it would be *necessary to get agreement from the Plenary* or appropriate subsidiary body that the outcome of the scoping processes is appropriate and agreeable. This may be an iterative process in order to refine the questions and products further.
- If the identified *knowledge is not available* there will be a need to engage the scientific community and other knowledge holders in seeking that knowledge, or finding ways to access it if it exists but is not currently available.
- Note that there are also processes to be developed for *scientists to inform IPBES Plenary of key needs* to be addressed (new or emerging issues), although this would not be scoped in more detail until Plenary had agreed that these were priority issues.
- Any government or other stakeholder *submitting a potential issue for being addressed by IPBES* could be using a specific template describing the topic and addressing some of the preliminary scoping issues. A call for comment on such submissions could be established to refine questions/issues further ahead of review by the Plenary.
- Clear *processes* need to be set out and adopted by the IPBES Plenary for addressing all of these issues, including identifying who should be participating in the processes, and it is possible that IPBES may want to review the scoping processes of other assessments, and ways in which these sorts of issues have already been addressed at the national level in some countries (e.g. the UK approach, and possibly Portugal and Spain and others).

### **Which partners would be the most important ones for IPBES to engage with?**

- Involved *UN agencies* (UNEP, FAO, UNDP, UNESCO), so as to ensure their programmatic engagement as well as their involvement in administering IPBES.
- *Biodiversity-related conventions* and the other Rio Conventions, so as to help ensure integration and identify opportunities and synergies, while recognising that there are also important regional conventions that are relevant in particular regions.

- **Assessment processes**, so as to share lessons learnt and collaborate in preparation and delivery with respect to areas of common interest. Including in particular the Regular Process, IPCC, GEO, GIWA and FRA, and possibly also TEEB.
- Partnership **based on specific work programme activities** and deliverables. These might include, for example: key data providers (including, for example, GBIF and GEO BON, and other major databases and data management organizations); and key networks (including, for example the SGA Network which brings together practitioners of assessments at national and sub-regional levels).
- **Business and industry**, potentially through organizations such as WBCSD, ICMC and IPIECA, with respect to both outreach and engagement. This is particularly relevant to ethical funding, and for those companies which are pro natural capital or reliant upon it.
- **Development assistance agencies**, including both bilateral and multilateral agencies (including regional ones), who will hopefully be interested in supporting relevant activities, and encourage greater attention being paid to IPBES-relevant activities in developing projects.
- **GLOBE International** for informing parliamentarians.

#### **What could the modalities of such partnerships be?**

- All **partnerships must be based on work programme needs**, and not be driven by other considerations, so that they are directly relevant to what IPBES is trying to achieve.
- The need for **partnerships will depend on the issue being addressed**, and will vary between one regional and another, and with different themes and issues (for example ecosystem services need to be mapped onto users at different scales).
- Partners are likely to be organizations or other initiatives in a position to **help IPBES in implementing its work programme** through direct or indirect support. This might include:
  - support for preparatory and scoping discussions
  - review of reports and other outputs
  - coordination of IPBES-related activities
  - communication and outreach to specific groups
- Partners are **not likely to draft assessment reports** themselves, which would be drafted by individuals in their personal capacity.
- **Risks of IPBES entering partnerships** must be well understood in order to ensure IPBES maintains its independence, and does not lose any credibility.

#### **Which major global negotiations and events does IPBES need to provide input to in order to be relevant to policy makers?**

- Implementation of the CBD and its **Strategy for Biodiversity 2011-2020**, which is also relevant to all the other biodiversity-related conventions which are engaging with the strategy and its implementation.
- Implementation of **other Rio Conventions**, UNFCCC because of REDD and ecosystem-based adaptation, and UNCCD because of the critical importance of biodiversity and ecosystem services in addressing desertification and other land issues.
- Implementation of the **Green Economy post Rio+20**, including relevant discussions in the context of the World Economic Forum and the World Trade Organization.

- Supporting FAO and others in ensuring that the processes addressing *world food security* are provided with appropriate information and knowledge on the relevance of biodiversity and ecosystem services to sustainable food production.
- Note that we need to also consider regional processes and agreements, and identify how IPBES might be able to engage and contribute.

#### **Which key products should the platform deliver in relation to what events or processes?**

- In all cases input should provide knowledge, options and assessment of the implications of policy alternatives to *help address key issues on the agendas of relevant intergovernmental meetings* and other processes which the IPBES Plenary would like to see informed.
- For example, *key meetings and associated processes* might be:
  - the 2015 mid-term evaluation of the Strategic Plan on Biodiversity 2011-2020, noting that outputs would need to be ready a year earlier
  - completion of the period covered by the Strategic Plan in 2020, noting that this could tie in well with completion of a global assessment in 2018 or 2019
  - review of the MDGS and potential adoption of SDGs, noting that the former is likely to take place in the lead up to 2015, but the timing of the latter has yet to be agreed.
- In general terms it was felt that there was *merit in starting thematic and regional/sub-regional assessments first*, then initiating a global assessment later which would build on the information and experience arising from the thematic and regional/sub-regional assessments, and the sub-global assessments that IPBES would also have helped to promote.
- It was noted also that there was *potential value in working on smaller products first*, testing out approaches in preparation for future major products. For example, consideration could be given to working on an assessment related to one or more of the Aichi targets in the near term.
- It was also suggested that *specific ecosystem services might be the focus of earlier assessments*, including, for example: carbon ecosystem services assessment; pollination and pollinators; Ecosystem based adaptation for climate change; coral reef health; ecosystem-based water supply; and fish stocks.
- *Other issues raised in discussion as possible candidates for assessment* included: land use changes; emerging diseases; resource related conflict; forest communities – dependence and benefits; invasive alien species; and scenarios for future sourcing and behavioural change.

## **Breakout Group 3, day 1**

Facilitated by Ivar Baste

### **Which partners would be the most important ones for IPBES to engage with?**

- Starting point is the GAP analysis – not spent too much time on identifying new partners
- However we recognise that there are key strategic partners which have a role to plan supporting IPBES' multiple functions
- Make sure the partners are geographical and multidisciplinary representative
- Partnership approach and modalities will vary between partners, functions and levels
  - Assessment: ensure incorporation with a wide range of expertise (individuals and/or organisations), partner with other global assessments, link to sub global assessments, and governments, partnerships shouldn't solely limit the
  - Knowledge generation: - partner with knowledge generators (research and academia) and knowledge holders and those who can facilitate access to information and who are often already networked with regional and national hubs and nodes (GBIF, Eye on Earth, GEOSS, intergovernmental organisations, NGO's and governments)
  - Policy support: - ensure the interface with the different sectors such as intergovernmental processes, policy sectors and engage private sector.
  - Capacity building: use existing bilateral and intergovernmental institutions, especially those with capacity building as their core mandate.

### **What could the modalities of such partnerships be?**

- Risks and opportunities related to partnerships which need to be addressed through modalities/rules of procedures – examine the implications.
- Procedures and guidelines including for scoping is an opportunity to identify partnerships and modalities.
- Partnerships can also be structured through network of networks, node functions, MOU's
- Mindful of the potential categories of partners (formal, informal etc) such for as for policies, outreach, capacity building, knowledge generation etc)
- How to make IPBES attractive for the scientific community

### **Which major global negotiations and events does IPBES need to provide input to in order to be relevant to policy makers? Which key products should the platform deliver in relation to what events or processes?**

- Provide inputs to RIO +20, and Aichi targets review, MDG and other major productive sectors
- Not only major assessments, but a flexible system to address emerging and possible controversial issues
- Targeted summaries such as for the private sector

## **Breakout Group 1, day 2**

Facilitated by Jake Rice.

### **How and by use of which tools can assessments be more useful for policy?**

#### **Overarching messages**

- Need more than good *assessment* process and products. All four components of work package have to work together
- Even among assessments one type of process and product will not be best for all needs.
- which is not to say every case is unique and needs custom-made approach

#### **Policy user needs are tiered**

- Policy maker has clear question and needs answer from advisors.
- Desired answer usually technical but can be on ecological, social, and/or economic issue.
- Policy maker has general question that science can't answer but can help formulate (and answer) better ones that move forward
- "Science" sees an issue policy makers need to know about but aren't asking for advice on.

#### **Type 1 – clear question to IPBES**

- Usually comes with resources to support developing an answer
- Technical quality of answer important.
- Nature of product(s) desired usually clear from dialogue when question posed
- Interaction with stakeholders has to be sensitive to other policy processes likely already underway

#### **Type 2 – Vague question to IPBES**

- Huge resources usually needed to develop answer to a vague question
- Equal footing of Experts and Policy-makers in IPBES Plenary should be basis for process of dialogue to develop work plan to address tractable and meaningful pieces of the question, then iteration of dialogue to plan next step(s)
- Early steps likely to need knowledge generation and be opportunity for capacity building
- First steps probably need modest price tag until clear what "best case" answer would be (and resources required to provide answers)
- Transparency and inclusiveness important but need to manage expectations.
- In iterative process, policy maker may decide price too high for an answer of desired quality, and needs to feel it is possible to walk away at an early stage.
- LACK of inclusiveness in early steps may build distrust with excluded parts for rest of process
- Nature of products and outcomes likely to be refined as steps proceed. Expectations need to be made explicit at each review of progress and planning of next steps.

#### **Type 3 – Scientists need to get policy makers to ask new questions**

- Equal status in plenary is opportunity to educate
- Easy – when first steps can be knowledge generation and capacity building
- Hard – when quick action on new threat may be needed in face of uncertainty
- Same points about inclusiveness as for 2.
- All Bob Watson's advice valid & important
- Do NOT make process too rigid or policy makers will be reluctant to accept new (uncosted) issues

#### **All cases – Produce OPTIONS**

- Not a single "recommended" action
- For each choice present likely risks & possible consequences on ALL THREE dimensions

- Also important to clarify both magnitude of costs and benefits of options AND how they are distributed among society in non-judgemental language (social science engagement vital)
- Option of continuing status-quo should always be included and treated same as other options

#### **Related points that were important but unresolved**

- Actual value of interactive models – all agree they are great tools, but do decisions-makers use them in REAL decision-making?
- Are stakeholders brought in differently in processes under request types 1, 2, 3? Expectations may differ but should that mean they should be treated differently?
- Can likely distribution of costs and benefits influence nature of stakeholder engagement? If so how to manage to keep treatment equitable but protect integrity / credibility of process?

#### **Roles of things other than assessments**

- Peer review can be effective way to get inclusiveness when issues technical or process may have trouble managing expectations once started.
- Knowledge generation and capacity building key as described earlier
- ALL assessments present chances for capacity building AND inclusiveness so participants being trained contribute knowledge that helps (NOT ensures) later buy-in and legitimacy.
- Teaching decision-makers how to use products is part of capacity-building

#### **How can assessments be used to evaluate and identify existing and missing policy tools to answer the challenges and questions that policy makers will need answers for, without being policy prescriptive**

##### **For “without being prescriptive”**

- What we said about options applies here
- Include consequences on all dimensions
- Use neutral language about consequences but do not hide bad news
- Role of media is complex.
- Essential for conveying outcomes to all sectors of society, but many impose their own values on products as soon as they have them

##### **Lots of discussion – more scoping problems than finding solutions**

- Policy evaluation usually needs multiple scenarios
- To do a good job evaluating effectiveness of policy options, may have to consider role of other policies as drivers of trends. What is proper strategy when political system not willing to consider review of the “external” policy (e.g. subsidies, trade)

## **Breakout Group 2, day 2**

Facilitated by Neil Burgess.

### **How could IPBES be made more attractive to the engagement of scientists and other knowledge holders?**

#### **Incentives to participate**

- *Prestige* and opportunities to engage with peers in a project of scientific excellence
- Participating in something that can be seen to be having an impact and *making a difference*
- Ability to work on *something they consider important*, independently and without constraints
- Addressing questions of interest to them personally, and *relevant to their research interests*
- Contribution of their components to a *bigger picture*
- *Networking* opportunities
- *Grants*, scholarships and fellowships linked to IPBES, and potentially prizes

#### **Disincentives to participation**

- For senior scientists there is perhaps a disincentive to engage in a process where they have *not been engaged in developing the questions* that the process is addressing
- Meetings and discussion can take a *huge amount of time*, and intergovernmental processes can appear slow, unintelligible and uninviting to scientists and other knowledge holders
- Opportunities to engage can be *restricted if it is entirely voluntary*, so funding behind it is important - if not this can bring its own biases where only those able to afford to will participate
- Potential *lack of recognition for the contributions* that individual scientists make by institutions that employ them, where the value of doing so is unclear and the institution supports the cost
- It may be possible for incentives to be set up by research funding agencies, but at present *how incentives might be established is unclear*
- *Lack of clarity on how to participate*

#### **Participation in the plenary**

- Representation of scientists and other knowledge holders in *Government delegations* is for those governments to decide, although the IPBES Plenary could certainly provide guidance
- *Other stakeholder organizations* would be part of the plenary, including scientific bodies (such as ICSU, DIVERSITAS, SCB and others), and organizations with significant scientific activities, and other knowledge holders.

#### **Engagement in assessments**

- Scientists and other knowledge holders participating in assessments as *lead authors* would be identified through processes yet to be decided, but is likely to be through nomination by Governments based on CVs, taking account of discipline, regional origin, gender and other issues to ensure balance.

- Each Government may develop its own approach to **identifying potential nominees**, but with guidance from the IPBES Plenary. For scientists, key issues may be publication authorship and research grant record, and relevance for the topic being addressed.
- Other expertise would be needed for specific issues and activities, so it may be necessary to find ways to assess **whether nominations include all of the key expertise** that is needed from the nomination process, and to identify where that expertise can be found.
- Depending on the type of assessment it may be appropriate for **other IPBES stakeholders to make recommendations** on lead authors, but this is a political issue not yet decided.
- It is anticipated that lead authors would then draw in a significant number of **other scientists and knowledge holders**, although again the process has yet to be defined.
- It is not clear how the process of selecting authors would relate to the **scoping process** – perhaps selection of lead authors would be on a ‘best guess’ basis for the scoping process, and then confirmed (or otherwise) once this process is completed.

#### **Checklist of necessary rules of procedure implied by the above**

- Seek **observer status for scientific organizations** which are in a position to represent scientists in the IPBES Plenary, and similarly for other key knowledge groups
- Consider how scientists and other knowledge holders would be represented and act in **subsidiary bodies**, recognising the importance of their contribution
- Develop a **process for nomination of lead authors** for each assessment, and for their review and selection (including identification of selection criteria)
- Develop a process for involving scientists and other knowledge holders in **identifying issues** and reviewing/commenting on questions and/or issues for consideration by the plenary

#### **Preparation**

- EU **expert review of potential key issues** for Governments to suggest to the IPBES Plenary, in order to help prioritize the issues being discussed. This meeting would:
  - review those issues already suggested in IPBES-related discussions
  - identify any additional issues
  - consider the added value that IPBES could bring to each topic discussed
- Some Governments have explored working with **national stakeholder groups** to increased understanding and participation, and there is obvious potential to develop this further
- Investigate ways for increasing **science-policy dialogues** on specific issues at the national level, and potentially also regionally and globally
- Consider potential **options for speeding up the process** after establishment of IPBES in Panama, so that potential delays in implementation are avoided. This might include:
  - Preparing for substantive discussion on the information document that is expected to be prepared based on the Norwegian indicative timetable;
  - Preparing recommendations for an intersessional process on the work programme to be put in place between the second session of the plenary and the first IPBES Plenary.

### **How and by use of which tools can assessments be more useful for policy?**

- Engage policy maker in dialogues to identify and clearly understand what they need and ensure that this is a part of the response at the end of the process
- Effectively use valuation in making assessments more relevant to developing and implementing policy, particularly in other sectors
- Ensure effective means of communication of assessment outcomes, including for example:
  - key message summaries
  - big storylines
  - appropriate metaphors
  - case studies
  - clear language
  - short messages
  - good maps and/or graphics
  - country and sector-relevant examples
- Cannot underestimate the importance of ensuring the credibility and legitimacy of IPBES and the relevance of their products in order to increase uptake of IPBES products
- Meeting places for delivering outcomes

### **Which assessment tools and methodologies seem to be relevant for all groups, and which can be used at a global scale across regions?**

- Remember other knowledge systems
- Must ensure that results of IPBES are actually useful at different scales, which may require different tools at different scales

### **How can an inter-disciplinary approach be ensured in the assessments?**

- Involve social scientists (including economists) from the start

## **Breakout Group 3, day 2**

Facilitated by Ivar Baste

### **Which assessments tools and methodologies seem to be relevant for all groups and which can be used at a global scale across regions?**

- IPBES should focus on policy support and implementation by advancing policy tools including those embedded in the assessment processes such as scenarios, indicators, advanced ICT, remote sensing and social media.
- Tools and methodologies available through online guidelines, manuals, resource kits, tool boxes and work with partner in development and customising of tools.
- The link between sub/regional and global assessment and including advanced interoperability of data.
- Strengthening capacities and responding to requests.
- Contextualise tools, methodologies and findings while keeping in mind multi-scale interactions such as potential impacts in a region of global trends and processes.

### **How can an inter-disciplinary approach be ensured in the assessments?**

- Recognition of the need for processes including scoping processes, procedures, conceptual frameworks and venues which allows for inter-disciplinary dialogue within the science-policy interface and acknowledge the risks and opportunities involved.
- Acknowledge and be able to deal with conflicting interests and policies, concerns and goals across scales.
- Ensure procedures that safeguard the credibility and the transparency of the process including by quantifying to the extent possible the level of confidence and agreement in the state of knowledge.
- Communicate the limitations and level of uncertainties involved the assessments findings so as to ensure legitimacy and credibility of the assessments in the wider public.
- There is a need for a balanced engagement of scientific disciplines that can support the adaptive management needed to cope with multiple and interacting change processes focused on options for strengthening the effectiveness of policies for halting the loss of biodiversity.

### **How do we ensure the engagement of scientists and other knowledge holders**

- Create the incentives for participation
- Including by remuneration especially for developing countries experts and grants fellowships
- Recognition such as by ensuring a high level of scientific credibility and reputation in the IPBES assessments.
  - Se your own research in the bigger picture,
  - extending scientific network links with other disciplines and research areas,
  - new ideas for societal beneficial research knowledge and research gap
  - IPCC exp – moved away from gaps in order to avoid being self serving – removing an incentive
- Strengthen the network of institutions able to support the participation of scientific experts.
- Engage governments, academies of sciences and other scientific and knowledge-holder institutions in providing in-kind and financial support to the IPBES processes.

## Keynote presentations

- Annex 1: Briefing on the current stage of the IPBES process and other intersessional workshops.  
*Jerry Harrison, UNEP/UNEP-WCMC, Cambridge, United Kingdom.*
- Annex 2: Status and trends in biodiversity and their relevance to global environmental sustainability – what do we know and what do we need to know?  
*Neil Burgess, Centre for Macro ecology, Evolution and Climate, Faculty of Science, University of Copenhagen, Denmark*
- Annex 3: Lessons learned from other assessments and processes.  
*Robert Watson, Chief Scientific Advisor, Department of Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (DEFRA), United Kingdom.*
- Annex 4: Status and trends in ecosystem services and their relevance to global environmental sustainability – what do we know, what do we need to know, and how to move forward on what we need to know?  
*Megan Tierney, UNEP-WCMC, United Kingdom*
- Annex 5: Lessons learned from the Regular Marine Process on choosing thematic approaches for assessments, and how to bring in the social sciences and traditional knowledge.  
*Jake Rice, Senior National Advisor, Ecosystem Science for the Department of Fisheries and Oceans, Canada.*
- Annex 6: Interface between global assessments and sub-global assessments – EEA as an example.  
*Jacqueline McGlade, Executive Director, EEA.*
- Annex 7: Input from the natural sciences.  
*Kathy Willis, Oxford University, United Kingdom.*
- Annex 8: Input from the social sciences.  
*Ørnulf Seippel, Professor of Sociology and Political Science, Institute for Social and Political Science, Norwegian University of Science and Technology, Trondheim.*
- Annex 9: Input from the environmental economic sciences.  
*Patrick ten Brink, Senior Fellow and Head of Brussels Office, Institute for European Environmental Policy (IEEP).*
- Annex 10: A short introduction to the global Biodiversity Information Facility (GBIF). *Hugo von Linstow, Deputy Director/Acting Director and Tim Hirsch, Senior Programme Officer for Engagement.*
- Annex 11: Linking global assessments with major negotiations processes and with sub-global and regional, in the context of IPBES.

*Ivar Baste, Consultant, Norwegian Directorate for Nature Management, Norway.*

Annex 12: IPBES as a newcomer. How can IPBES be useful in an already crowded assessment landscape?

*Jake Rice, Senior National Advisor, Ecosystem Science for the Department of Fisheries and Oceans, Canada.*

Annex 13: Linking IPBES with regional assessments – the case of Europe.

*Carsten Neßhöver, Coordinator, KNEU project*

## List of Participants

Lastname	Firstname	Organisation	Country	E-mail
Auken	Ida	Danish Minister of the Environment	DK	
Baadsvik	Karl	Norwegian Biodiversity Information Centre (NBIC)	NO	karl@baadsvik.no
Backe-Hansen	Per	The Research Council of Norway	NO	pbh@rcn.no
Balian	Estelle	Belgian Biodiversity Platform- RBINS	BE	estelle.balian@naturalsciences.be
Balslev	Henrik	Aarhus University - Biosciences	DK	henrik.balslev@biology.au.dk
Baste	Ivar	Norwegian Directorate for Nature Management	NO	ivar.baste@gmail.com
Bennun	Leon	BirdLife International	UK	leon.bennun@birdlife.org
Biala	Katarzyna	EEA		<a href="mailto:Katarzyna.Biala@eea.europa.eu">Katarzyna.Biala@eea.europa.eu</a>
Björk	Lars	Swedis Scientific Board on Biodiversity	SE	lars.bjork@ebc.uu.se
Blanc	Cécile	French Foundation for Research on Biodiversity	FR	cecile.blanc@fondationbiodiversite.fr
Breier	Nicola	Federal Ministry for the Environment	DE	nicola.breier@bmu.bund.de
Burgess	Neil	Center for Macroecology, Evolution and Clima,- University of Copenhagen	DK	ndburgess@bio.ku.dk
Carbonnière	Aurélien	Fondation for research on Biodiversity	FR	aurelien.carbonniere@fondationbiodiversite.fr
Commenville	Pierre	IUCN		pierre.commenville@iucn.org
Damsgaard	Mette Gervin	Ministry of environment	DK	megda@nst.dk
Degeorges	Patrick	MEDDTL	FR	patrick.degeorges@developpement-durable.gouv.fr
Freund	Wolfram	Federal Ministry for the Environment	DE	wolfram.freund@bmu.bund.de
Frostholm	Ann Berit	The Danish Society for Nature Conservation	DE	abf@dn.dk

Geldmann	Jonas	Center for Macroecology, Evolution and Clima. University of Copenhagen	DK	jgeldmann@bio.ku.dk
Grima Connell	Matthew	MEPA	MT	matthew.grimaconnell@mepa.org.mt
Haczek	Bozena	Ministry of the Enviroment	PL	bozena.haczek@mos.gov.pl
Håkansson	Bo	The Danish Society for Nature Conservation	DK	<a href="mailto:boh@dn.dk">boh@dn.dk</a>
Harrison	Jerry	UNEP-WCMC	UK	jerry.harrison@unep-wcmc.org
Häuser	Christoph	Museum für Naturkunde	DK	christoph.haeuser@mfn-berlin.de
Hedlund	Katarina	Lund university	SE	katarina.hedlund@biol.lu.se
HERMAN	Rudy	Economy, Science & Innovation dept.	BE	rudy.herman@ewi.vlaanderen.be
Hirsch	Tim	The Global Biodiversity Information Facility - Zoological Museum	DK	thirsch@gbif.org
Jensen	Hanne Stadsgaard	Ministry of Environment, Nature Agency	DK	hsj@nst.dk
Jongman	Robert	Wageningen UR, Alterra	NL	rob.jongman@wur.nl
Jørgensen	Kristian	Verdens Skove / Forests of the World / Bosques del Mundo	DK	kj@verdenskove.org
Klovaite	Kristina	Ministry of Environment	LT	k.klovaite@am.lt
Koetz	Thomas	European Commission	BE	thomas.koetz@ec.europa.eu
Korn	Horst	German Federal Agency for Nature Conservation	DE	horst.korn@bfm-vilm.de
Kvist	Kristian	Danish Ministry of the Environment	DK	krkvi@nst.dk
Laporte	Valérie	EEA	DK	valerie.laporte@eea.europa.eu
Larigauderie	Anne	DIVERSITAS		anne@diversitas-international.org
Le Duc	Jean-Patrick	Muséum national d'Histoire naturelle	FR	leduc@mnhn.fr
Lund	Martin	Center for Macroecology, Evolution and Clima,- University of Copenhagen	DK	mlund@bio.ku.dk

Martinez	Sylvia	Swiss Biodiversity Forum	CH	sylvia.martinez@unibas.ch
McGlade	Jacqueline	EEA		jacqueline.mcglade@eea.europa.eu
Mulvad Jessen	Uiloq	Greenland Government	GL	irum@nanoq.gl
Muriele	MILLOT	MEDDTL	FR	muriele.millot@developpement-durable.gouv.fr
Müssner	Rainer	Federal Research Ministry	DE	rainer.muessner@bmbf.bund.de
Myklebust	Ivar	Norwegian Biodiversity Information Centre	NO	ivar.myklebust@artsdatabanken.no
Nabe-Nielsen	Louise Imer	Danish Ministry of the Environment	DK	loina@nst.dk
Nesshoever	Carsten	Helmholtz-Centre von Environmental Research - UFZ	DE	carsten.nesshoever@ufz.de
Neßhöver	Carsten	Helmholtz Centre for Environmental Research - UFZ	DE	carsten.nesshoever@ufz.de
Olech-Piasecka	Wanda	Warsaw University of Life Sciences	PL	wanda_olech@sggw.pl
Rahbek	Carsten	Center for Macroecology, Evolution and Clima - University of Copenhagen	DK	crahbek@bio.ku.dk
Rasmussen	Birgitte Ingrid	University of Copenhagen	DK	bir@bio.ku.dk
Rice	Jake	Fisheries and Oceans Canada	CA	jake.rice@dfo-mpo.gc.ca
Rode	Julian	Helmholtz Centre for Environmental Research (UFZ)	DE	julian.rode@ufz.de
Santamaria	Luis	IMEDEA (CSIC-UIB)	ES	lsantamaria@imedea.uib-csic.es
Sarkki	Simo	Thule Institute, Univ of Oulu	FI	simo.sarkki@oulu.fi
Scally	Louise	BEC Consultants	IE	lscally@biodiversityresearch.ie
Schneekloth	Martin	Danish MoE	DK	masch@nst.dk
Segers	Hendrik	Belgian Biodiversity Platform	BE	hendrik.segers@naturalsciences.be
Seippel	Ørnulf	NTNU / NOVA	NO	ornulf.seippel@gmail.com
Sharman	Martin	European Commission		martin.sharman@ec.europa.eu
Siegismund	Hans R.	Department of Biology, University of Copenhagen	DK	HSiegismund@BIO.KU.Dk

Skov	Flemming	Aarhus University	DK	fs@dmu.dk
Slaweta	Roman	Ministry of Science and Higher Education	PL	roman.slaweta@nauka.gov.pl
Sousa Pinto	Isabel	CIMAR	PT	<a href="mailto:ispinto@ciimar.up.pt">ispinto@ciimar.up.pt</a>
Spyropoulou	Rania	EEA		rania.spyropoulou@eea.europa.eu
Stott	Andrew	Defra	UK	andrew.stott@defra.gsi.gov.uk
Sugden	Andrew	Science magazine	UK	asugden@science-int.co.uk
Svenning	Jens-Christian	Aarhus University	DK	jcsvenning@gmail.com
Tack	Jurgen	Research Institute for Nature and Forest INBO	BE	jurgen.tack@inbo.be
ten Brink	Patrick	Institute for European Environmental Policy - IEEP	BE	ptenbrink@ieep.eu
Thauloq	Inge	Government of Greenland, Ministry of Domestic Affairs, Nature and Environment	DK	inth@ghsdk.dk
Tierney	Megan	UNEP World Conservation Monitoring Centre	UK	megan.tierney@unep-wcmc.org
Tillier	Simon	Ministère de l'Enseignement Supérieur et de la Recherche	FR	simon.tillier@recherche.gouv.fr
Török	Katalin	Centre for Ecological Research, Inst. Ecology and Botany of HAS	FR	kati@botanika.hu
Vallejo Pedregal	Noelia	Spanish Ministry on Agriculture, Food and Environment	ES	nvallejo@marm.es
van Baalen	Jieles	Ministry of Economic Affairs, Agriculture and Innovation, Department of Nature and Biodiversity	NL	j.vanbaalen@mineleni.nl
van den Hove	Sybille	Median	ES	sybille@median-web.eu
Vandewalle	Marie	UFZ Leipzig	DE	marie.vandewalle@ufz.de
Vihervaara	Petteri	Finnish Environment Institute (SYKE)	FI	petteri.vihervaara@ymparisto.fi

Vik	Nina	Norwegian Directorate for Nature Management	NO	nina.vik@dirnat.no
von Linstow	Hugo	The Global Biodiversity Information Facility - Zoological Museum	DK	hvlinstow@gbif.org
von Weissenberg	Marina	Ministry of the Environment	FI	marina.weissenberg@ymparisto.fi
Watson	Robert	Defra Chief Scientific Advisor	UK	robert.watson@defra.gsi.gov.uk
Watt	Allan	Centre for Ecology and Hydrology	UK	adw@ceh.ac.uk
Weibull	Anki	Swedish Scientific Council on Biological Diversity	SE	anki.weibull@naturvardsverket.se
Willis	Kathy	University of Oxford	UK	kathy.willis@zoo.ox.ac.uk
Wulffeld	Elisabeth	Center for Macroecology, Evolution and Clima. University of Copenhagen	DK	ewulffeld@bio.ku.dk