



Biodiversity Science-Policy-Interfaces Network for Early Career Scientists



1. International Network Meeting

January 9th 2015, UN Campus Bonn

Supported by the Network-Forum for Biodiversity Research Germany (NeFo), funded by the German Federal Ministry of Education and Research (BMBF)

MEETING REPORT

Impressum

Local organisation: Katja Heubach & Malte Timpte, Network-Forum for Biodiversity Research Germany (NeFo), Yves Zinngrebe & Georg Barth, PhD Program Biodiversity and Society, University of Göttingen, Germany; Irimi Rouboglou, IPBES Secretariat

Resource persons (experts involved in IPBES): Anne Larigauderie & Thomas Koetz, IPBES Secretariat; Nicola Breier, BMUB (Head of German Delegation to IPBES)

Report: Katja Heubach & Malte Timpte, Network-Forum for Biodiversity Research Germany (NeFo); Michael Cormann, Helmholtz Center for Environmental Research – UFZ, Germany; Yves Zinngrebe & Georg Barth, PhD Program Biodiversity and Society, University of Göttingen, Germany;

Support: Network-Forum for Biodiversity Research Germany (NeFo), German Federal Ministry of Education and Research (BMBF), German Ministry of the Environment (BMUB), IPBES Secretariat



SPONSORED BY THE



BSPIN 2015

www.facebook.com/biodivspis
contact.bspin@gmail.com

Content

Summary 4

Programme..... 5

- 1. Introduction to BSPIN..... 6
- 2. Opening addresses 6
- 3. Introduction of participants 7
- 4. Knowledge gaps & research needs 12
- 5. BSPIN Possible activities 13
- 6. People and organizations involved in IPBES..... 16
- 7. BSPIN organization of work during IPBES-3 17

Annex: participant list 18

BSPIN in brief..... 19

Summary

The **Biodiversity Science-Policy Interfaces Network for Early Career Scientists (BSPIN)** is an initiative of a group of young scientists dealing with issues of biodiversity-related science-policy interfaces (SPIs), such as IPBES and CBD. BSPIN's objective is to bring them together to jointly discuss and broaden their research topics, to identify how they can most effectively contribute to SPIs, and which capacities are necessary to build in order to do so.

Following up on previous smaller meetings held at IPBES-2 (Antalya 2013), at CBD-COP-12 (Pyeongchang 2014) and on several occasions on national level, BSPIN now called for its first international network meeting to be held prior to IPBES-3 in Bonn.

The meeting's objectives were to

- Inform about the network, its latest and planned future activities;
- Discuss the role of early career scientists in international biodiversity-related science-policy interfaces, particularly IPBES;
- Discuss the issue of knowledge gaps and research needs in global biodiversity governance;
- Inform about and discuss the current involvement of stakeholders and experts in IPBES;
- Organise the network's activities and work during IPBES-3;

Of currently around 60 members, 21 joined the meeting at the UN Campus, spanning 7 countries (Germany, Belgium, Brazil, USA, UK, France and Italy) and 2 continents (Europe and the Americas).

During the meeting three working groups were formed discussing i) whether to adapt one's own research to research gaps as identified by politics on international and national level, ii) institutional aspects of IPBES, and iii) the future activities of the network. Prominent ideas of the latter break-out group were to **organise a summerschool on SPIs for early career scientists in 2016**, establish a **mentoring programme**, and get involved into the **development of the IPBES fellowship programme** as planned by the IPBES task force on capacity building.

Programme

9.00	Arrival and welcome	Katja Heubach
9.15	Introduction to BSPIN <ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Scope, mission, objectives & general activities▪ Retrospect previous activities▪ Organisation▪ Communication channels	Georg Barth
9.40	Opening address by IPBES Secretariat Opening address by BMUB	Anne Larigauderie & Thomas Koetz, IPBES Secretariat Nicola Breier, BMUB
10.00	Round of introductions of participants <ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Participant inventory▪ Individual rounds of introduction	Katja Heubach
11.00	<i>Coffee break</i>	
11.30	Presentation & discussion: knowledge gaps & research needs <ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ BSPIN Side Event at CBD-COP-12 & survey▪ Research needs as identified through CBD process▪ Discussion presented issues	Yves Zinngrebe
12.30	<i>Lunch break</i>	
13.30	BSPIN – possible activities of the network <ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Formal engagement in IPBES process▪ Participant interrogation: previous involvement in IPBES▪ Possible network activities & organisational structures	Katja Heubach
15.00	<i>Coffee break</i>	
15.20	BSPIN – conclusions on activities for 2015/2016 <ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Summary of agreed activities in 2015/2016▪ Constitution of working groups incl. responsibilities	Katja Heubach
15.50	People & organisations involved in IPBES <ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Stakeholders & experts in IPBES▪ Representation and balance (gender, stakeholders, young scientists)	Malte Timpte
16.10	BSPIN – organisation of the network’s work during IPBES-3 <ul style="list-style-type: none">▪ Experiences in intergovernmental processes▪ Organisation of work: ‘collaborative observation’	Daniel Suarez Malte Timpte
16.50	Closing	Katja Heubach
20.00	<i>Get-together at restaurant</i>	

1. Introduction to BSPIN

Georg Barth, PhD Program Biodiversity and Society, University of Göttingen, Germany, gave a short overview about the background, objectives and vision of BSPIN, as well as the current status regarding involved individuals, current and past activities and such envisioned for the future.



BSPIN is a network for international early career scientists (ECS), initiated in January 2013 during the IPBES-2 plenary in Antalya, Turkey. The idea of the network derived from the question how ECS could effectively contribute to science-policy interfaces (SPIs) in the biodiversity arena, in particular IPBES and CBD/SBSTTA. The main objectives of BSPIN are i) linking ECS among each other and to other stakeholders in SPI processes, ii) improve capacities of ECS to engage in global biodiversity-related SPIs, iii) foster inter- and transdisciplinary research, iv) communicate the potential of ECS regarding IPBES (and related SPIs), and v) encourage practical involvement of ECS in these SPIs.

BSPIN currently has around 60 members comprising scientists/knowledgeholders (PhD candidates, postdocs, masters) that deal with thematic issues relevant for the work programmes of the SPIs, and/or analyze the structures, functionality and effectiveness of the SPIs. So far, the members were very active in promoting the network through personal and established networks (e.g. the IPBES Stakeholder Engagement Network), established a mailing list (BSPIN@googlegroups.com), mail address (contact.bspin@gmail.com) and facebook page (www.facebook.com/biodivspis). Also aside event at CBD-COP-12 in Pyeongchang, Korea was organized by the network in Oct 2014 (with a thematic focus on knowledge gaps and science-policy communication).

One focus of BSPIN is to build capacities of ECS for involvement and contribution to SPIs, for example, such capacities asknowledge about SPI processes, to learn how to comment on SPI strategies and documents, and how to feed relevant knowledge in the process.

Future envisioned activities of the network are to organise an international summer school in 2016 in Malaysia (as invited by IPBES Chair Prof. Zakri) and workshops on particular SPI issues, to establish a proper network structure and governance (e.g. setting up regional groups), and identify common research questions and establish according working/research groups.

2. Opening addresses



Mrs Nicola Breier, German Ministry of the Environment (BMUB), emphasized the strong support for BSPIN by the BMUB which already was involved in the organisation of the BSPIN side event at CBD-COP-12 in Korea. Mrs. Breier is very positive regarding the IPBES process and strongly hopes for governmental implementation. Reiterating the key role of stakeholders for the overall success of IPBES, she looks forward

for according progress to be made during IPBES-3, particularly the adoption of the IPBES stakeholder engagement strategy which Germany is highly supportive of. Mrs Breier concluded with her being very interested in further collaboration with BSPIN and the support of ECS's involvement in science-policy processes.



Anne Larigauderie, IPBES Executive Secretary, stressed the importance to involve diverse stakeholders in IPBES, with a strong emphasis on ECS as they are not yet appropriately represented in the process. IPBES is very much supportive of BSPIN and the work done by young scientists, looking forward to the research that will be conducted. She informed about the process and asked students to not get scared of the process, but get involved and start to own the process, for instance alike the

two PhD candidates who currently work as interns in the IPBES secretariat. Mrs Larigauderie ended with summarizing the agenda of IPBES-3: There are 7 scoping reports for regional/subregional and thematic assessments to be decided on. There will be a discussion on whether to couple the current assessments of the IPBES work programme to lower work loads for the authors and chairs. Finally, it will be discussed how to further strengthen the science-policy interface, and how to increase the availability of knowledge for the assessments.

Thomas Koetz, IPBES Secretariat, stated that critical constructive views from ECS on IPBES are highly welcomed, and encourages the meeting's participant to consider doing an internship with IPBES. Drawing on a quotation of Churchill that "nobody wants to know how policies are made" - but the end product is nice (like sausages), Mr Koetz emphasized the importance to get involved into these science-policy processes.



One way could be to take part in (and help shaping) the Fellowship programme which is foreseen as a component of the capacity building undertaken in IPBES, and will be discussed by IPBES-3. Within that programme there will be trainings for appropriately taking part in the implementation of the work programme, e.g. as experts in specific assessments, in the technical support units, or the IPBES Secretariat. There will be a diverse set of opportunities coming up. Particularly the task force on capacity building will need feedback for stakeholders and knowledge holder, involving ECS. Subsequently, Thomas Koetz introduced to the actual IPBES work programme 2014-2018.

3. Introduction of participants

The participants of this first international BSPIN meeting were asked to introduce themselves by writing information related to nine categories (name, institution, country, education/disciplines, areas of research/work, main research questions, link to SPI arena, and topics for the network). The information given on notes is given below (Table 1).

Table 1: Participants' information as result of the introduction round

Last Name	First Name	Institution	Country	Education / Disciplines	Area of research/work	Main research questions	Link to SPI arena	Topics for the network
Articus	Kristina	Belgian Biodiversity Platform	German, working in Belgium	PhD in Botany (Plant Systematics)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SPI networking, facilitating research 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lichen evolution (PhD) conservation horizon scanning (now) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> National SPI from Belgium 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How and where can I involve Belgian ECS?
Barth	Georg	University of Göttingen	Germany	Conservation biology, Environmental economics	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Protected areas planning Global conservation priority areas Protected areas costs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What are the most important areas/countries/regions for expanding protected areas? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Interest in how my research topic relates to policy /decision making 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Protected areas planning Cooperations with governmental agencies to design research projects
Borges	Rebecca	ZMT-Bremen	Brazil	Biology, applied Ecology	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Marine spacial planning 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Link ecosystem-based, interactive MSP with governance 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Indigenous and local knowledge applied to MSP 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ES spacial planning Interactive governance assessment
Collaro	Carolina	University of Bayreuth	Italy studying in Germany	Global Change Ecology, PhD candidate at Nova Gorica University at Venice	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Ecosystem services (ES, regulatory, cultural) Ecological climatology, climate change Adaptation planning Global change ecology 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ES and sustainable human development Global ecological change How to plan and adapt to global change (social, ecological) considering the natural capital Integration of ES in decision making 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Socio-ecological systems No market evaluation of ES ES mapping also with remote sensing 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Accounting and mapping of ES, planning with ES, best practices, internships and fellowships and summerschools
Cormann	Michael	UFZ Leipzig University of Bayreuth	Germany	Geoecology	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Structures/problems /needs of SPIs in Africa 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Science-Policy Interaction concerning food security / sustainable agriculture 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> None yet; first experiences here at IPBES-3 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Communication/SPI trainings internationalisation meet people interested in terrestrial land use / sustainable agriculture (policy)

Last Name	First Name	Institution	Country	Education / Disciplines	Area of research/work	Main research questions	Link to SPI arena	Topics for the network
Förster	Johannes	UFZ Leipzig	Germany	Ecology, Economics, Nature Conservation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ecosystem Services + Climate Change • Mitigation & Adaptation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How can ES info enhance ecosystem management e.g. REDD+ 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Role of ES in land use policies: -> REDD+ / Adaptation -> TEEB / Capacity Building ->UNFCCC + CBD ->IUCN 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (LEARNING) • Opportunities for collaboration and exchange on IPBES / ES / Climate Change
Futhaza	Guillaume	OT-Med Ceric IMBE	France	International environmental law	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • International law • International relations • Sociology of science 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How does law shape science and vice versa • IPBES opportunities for the mediterranean region 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IPBES is the object of my PhD • Strong interest in IPBES and other SPIs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Relation between scientists and decision makers perceptions • Influence of law in this topic (obstacles? incentives?)
Gaillard	Camille	Senckenberg BiK-F	France, working in Germany	Biology, Anthropology, Environmental Management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ecological modelling 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Biodiversity mechanisms 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Science to be directly delivered to stakeholders 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • OPEN
Geffert	(Jan) Laurens	Cambridge University UNEP-WCMC	DE/UK	Biogeography	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fisheries 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Where are all the fish? Why? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • BfN, UNEP-WCMC, LUSPE 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Representativeness
Heubach	Katja	Helmholtz Centre for Environmental Research – UFZ NeFo (Network-Forum for Biodiversity Research Germany)	Germany	Biologist, PhD in Socio-Economics in West Africa, Development Cooperation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stakeholder engagement in SPIs • SPIs in Africa • Synergies in global biodiversity governance (CBD + IPBES) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inclusion of stakeholders and different knowledge systems in IPBES • Performance of biodiversity-related SPIs on national level in Africa • How to enhance mutual benefits for IPBES and MEAs, e.g. CBD? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • NeFo • IPBES: stakeholder engagement strategy & capacity building • CBD/SBSTTA 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concrete Contribution of ECS to SPIs (review, authorships, shaping of fellowship programme etc.) • Critical reflection on IPBES related to the inclusion of stakeholders and knowledge systems

Last Name	First Name	Institution	Country	Education / Disciplines	Area of research/work	Main research questions	Link to SPI arena	Topics for the network
Korting	Janina	GIZ	Germany	Tropical Marine Biology	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Marine & coastal biodiversity in the context of sust. Development 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How can we support our partners in achieving international targets? How can we support stakeholders in sharing knowledge & learning from other's experiences? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> CBD SOI (CBD Sustainable Oceans Initiative) CBD SBSSTA, COP 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Marine & coastal issues Biodiv. And sust. Developmen Communication / capacity development
Müller	Verena	UFZ Leipzig	Germany	Biology/Ecology & Journalism	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Science communication & scientific journalism 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Facilitating the involvement of the biodiversity community in IPBES Science communication in the field of biodiversity 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Working within NeFo which itself is a SPI 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Communication of biodiversity science: How can it be used to raise awareness of the values of biodiversity (in politics & science)?
Reuter	Katrin	MfN Berlin NeFo	Germany	Philosophy (PhD)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Biodiversity and society 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Working for NeFo 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Transdisciplinary issues IPBES
Sakiyama	Melina	Diversitas/FutureEarth, GYBN	Brazil	Biology, Env. Management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Biodiversity SPIs Evolutionary biology 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Impact of academic biodiversity conservation research in policy making 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Science communicatio SPIs 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What we want to achieve as a group Representation
Schwarzer	Christian	Forum Environment and Development, GYBN	Germany	Political Science	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Environmental Governance 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Success factors of MEAs Synergies between MEAs Mechanisms of Stakeholder Engagement 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Through work with UNFCCC / CBD 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Capacity building for young scientists

Last Name	First Name	Institution	Country	Education / Disciplines	Area of research/work	Main research questions	Link to SPI arena	Topics for the network
Suarez	Dan	UC Berkeley	Canada/USA	PhD Environmental Politics	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Politics & Institutionalisation of "Ecosystem Services" 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Policy support tools (models and scenarios) Valuation Communication & dissemination 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> PBES Natcop Policy process in Canada 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What explains the spread and uptake of "ES" in environmental governance?
Timpte	Malte	MfN Berlin	Germany	M.Sc. Environmental Planning + Politics	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Stakeholder Engagement and IPBES;NeFo 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How are stakeholders involved in the shaping of SPIs? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> National IPBES Platform International network 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Own statement/position of BSPIN at IPBES-3?
Vandewalle	Marie	UFZ Leipzig	France, working in Germany	PhD in Plant Ecology	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> SPI Stakeholder engagement Biodiversity knowledge flow improvement Biodiversity conservation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How to better improve the biodiversity knowledge flow and its uptake in the decision-making process? 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Biodiversity Knowledge IPBES (Stakeholder Engagement) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Future of IPBES (Vision) Stakeholder Engagement Biodiversity
Zinngrebe	Yves	University of Göttingen	Germany Research Peru	Dipl.Ing Biotechnology M.Sc. Environmental Policy PhD Biodiv. And Society	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Effectiveness of conservation policies (focus Peru) as PhD project 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Peru in CBD+IPBES Importance of science in policy evaluation and agenda setting Policy relevance of my research 		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> NBSAP objectives & evaluation, governance & implementation Biodiversity discourses narratives Science in Policy + Biodiv project implementation

4. Knowledge gaps & research needs



Yves Zinngrebe, PhD Program Biodiversity and Society, University of Göttingen, Germany, gave a presentation on the relationship between scientists interested in science policy interphases and the knowledge gaps and research needs identified by political processes on different political levels. Input on four different aspects was presented to stimulate a discussion among seminar participants:

i) Who defines knowledge gaps and research needs?

In a first part, the relation between the different stakeholders in science-policy processes has to be highlighted. On one hand, science is meant to be “objective”, which requires a high level on independence in selecting research topics and discussing results. On the other hand, science depends on funds that are predominantly allocated by (often drastically changing) policy processes. The open question remains, to what extent a researcher should or is required to direct her/his research towards a topic of political interest.

ii) How do political processes (related to biodiversity) articulate research needs?

Several examples from CBD, SBSTTA, Global Biodiversity Outlook (GBO), Peruvian NBSAP, German scientific framework plan (BMUB und Ressortforschungsplan – UFO-Plan) indicated that research needs are indeed directly articulated by political processes. Public funds are accordingly allocated towards those topics to incentivise research directed to fill those articulated knowledge gaps. By showing examples like EU Horizon or citizen science however, it was demonstrated that science is also given the opportunity to engage in agenda setting and convince policy processes of the importance of specific research areas.

iii) How do young scientists perceive their potentials and restrictions?

Based on a survey conducted among BSPIN members, we presented perspectives of young scientists on selected topics related to SPIs. Regarding the research needs deriving the Strategic Plan 2020 of the CBD and its Aichi Targets, survey participants called for more research exploring policy options for different actor groups, evaluating sustainability of land-use management techniques, generating knowledge on incentive structures in a wider picture; and engaging in communication of knowledge systems, just to name a few examples. The survey revealed four main roles for young scientists to engage in SPI processes. Firstly, young scientists shall prepare for later senior engagement. Secondly, they can bring in new interdisciplinary perspectives and thirdly, knowledge regarding specific methodologies or case studies. Lastly, they can lend add to the working force needed to confront the wide range of sciencitic challenges revealed by the biodiversity policy process.

iv) *What are the lessons learnt from the BSPIN side event at CBD COP 12?*

In October 2014, BSPIN hosted a side event on CBD COP 12 in Pyeongchang, Korea. In a fishbowl discussion we discussed how science should contribute to the biodiversity policy process and what role young scientists can play. Several experts participating in that discussion highlighted the importance of integrating new scientific fields, knowledge systems and interdisciplinary perspectives into the biodiversity SPI processes. It became apparent that young scientists can play an important role in this transformation by bringing in new perspectives and facilitating the communication of knowledge and research needs. Several participants highlighted the need for a conscious confrontation of the question what knowledge is needed and how much knowledge is sufficient to take political decisions. Experts pointed to the importance of terminology developed and agreed upon by the political process that significantly helps framing research needs and political relevance of scientific results. As an open issue the participants called for an adaptation of the reward system for the work in the science policy interphase.

After this input, we the participants of the meeting split in three groups to discuss the relevance of political processes for our work as young scientists. For example, it became aware that especially in developing countries, scientists strongly depend on political interest when looking for research funds. By sharing our diverse range of experiences in the field, we discussed the raised issues in order to get to a more differentiated perspective on the topic.

5. BSPIN Possible activities



Katja Heubach, Network Forum for Biodiversity Research Germany (NeFo), Helmholtz Center for Environmental Research, Germany, introduced to the diverse opportunities to engage in the IPBES process and gave some ideas how BSPIN could get active. Her presentation was meant to stir a subsequent discussion on future activities of BSPIN, identifying topics, structures and responsibilities.

The formal possibilities for engagement in IPBES comprise i) membership in IPBES bodies (MEP, Bureau, expert group, task force), ii) nomination of experts (with the upcoming opportunity being the regional assessments to start in early 2015), iii) observer to the IPBES plenaries, iv) participation in the IPBES Stakeholder Days prior to the plenaries, v) submission of requests on scientific and technical matters to the IPBES Plenary (closed for the work programme 2014-18), vi) submission of comments on draft IPBES documents available for public review (with the upcoming opportunity being the first order drafts for the pollination assessment and the assessment of policy support tools for modelling and scenario analysis). Furthermore, there are several non-IPBES activities organised by stakeholders on the regional and national level, e.g. the Pan-European Stakeholder Consultation on IPBES (PESC), and the national biodiversity platforms which consult on IPBES in Belgium, Germany, France, Switzerland, and others.

In the subsequent discussion on future BSPIN activities, the participants sampled around three break-out groups, also taking into account the results of the working session on 'knowledge gaps and research needs' (see above). In the following, the results of the discussions are collected.

Group 1: Should we adapt our research to research gaps as identified by politics on international and national level?

- Necessary in order to get funding?
- Balance: basic research versus applied research
- "How much can we extend it? Because it depends on funding."
- "Who made the political priorities?" → we need to know that in order to better react to it
- Research needs identified on global level might not reflect local needs!
- Lack of time & contact to (local) people lead to adaption to 'official' policy requests (e.g. GB04)
- In what form results have to be provided in order to fit policy maker's needs?
- Think about a possible collaboration of BSPIN with the German Agency for Nature Conservation (BfN)?
- Not easy to adapt research because individual scientists depend on existing institutions, research fields ...
- Capacity building is needed
- Invite experts on policy relevant research gap who knows ways how to adopt to policy needs (e.g. German Institute for Biodiversity - ibn)
- Approach EPBRS?
- List (?) of political agencies which fund research -> their research priorities
- More workshops with policy makers

Group 2: Analysing institutional aspects of IPBES (notes by **Guillaume Futhazare, IMBE, France**)

As a network of young scientists, BSPIN will often attend international fora where it will seek to address conservation issues by interacting with the different actors of global governance of biodiversity and ecosystems services. The prerequisite for an efficient "lobbying" for the members of this network is an acute knowledge of the institutional and political interests at play in the different *fora*. In the case of IPBES, two main areas of research have been identified during the discussions held during the meeting on the 9th of January.

- Firstly, the inter-institutional situation of IPBES

As a new body in the already complex institutional landscape of global governance of biodiversity and ecosystems, IPBES has to establish its place in relation to other existing initiatives. This led to numerous questions such as its relation to the CBD or the other Multilateral Environmental Agreements relying on their own scientific bodies in their decision making process. Or even how will IPBES avoid duplication when so many different assessments exist or are ongoing in numerous different fields? What will be the shape of partnerships between IPBES and other institutions and what will be the concrete result of these partnerships?

Knowing the answers to these questions allows to anticipate the possible direction of negotiations. This knowledge could then be of use to the members of the BSPIN network. By understanding the inter-institutional dynamics at play in the themes they are focusing on, they will be able to adapt their discourse so as to make their actions within the platform as efficient as possible.

- Secondly, the intra-institutional situation of IPBES

But IPBES is also a complex subject on its own. Knowing the power dynamics within the platform is itself challenging. However this knowledge is crucial for the member of the BSPIN network in order to identify the most relevant interlocutors on specific themes. For instance, identifying the different expectations of States and Regions is a determining factor for the BSPIN network in order to contact the most relevant delegates when dealing with a specific issue. Moreover, IPBES is a platform where individuals can have a very strong influence in shaping the negotiations. Determining who these individuals are and how to interact with them is also crucial. Finally, understanding the procedures established for the platform is necessary in order to emphasize the strength and weaknesses of the Platform. For instance, on this specific issue, members of the BSPIN network highlighted that the assessment on pollination is being conducted while no policy of conflict of interests has been formally endorsed by the plenary. As the deliverable on pollination is expected to be one of the first broadly mediated production of the Platform, the existence of conflicts of interests could be a serious threat to the legitimacy of IPBES.

As discussions on the subject went on, the members of the network realised how numerous the different research focus can be. They decided that informal evening meetings could be a useful tool to understand what was going on during the upcoming plenary. Also, relying on the inputs of experienced participants to the IPBES process could be beneficial for young scientists as they may sometimes lack the experience in this complex field.

Group 3: BSPIN – future activities of the network

- How could ECS lobby towards IPBES?
- Whether and how to get involved in the design of the IPBES Fellowship Programme (contents, formulate a programme, way of influencing and shaping it) → participants proposed to identify first what BSPIN would aim to get out of it
- Establish a mentoring programme for ECS? → senior scientists mentor ECS in Assessments, in all different aspects of IPBES (inside+outside); theoretical (mentoring) vs. practical activities (visiting experimental sites); looking also at obstacles of the SPI process as identified in the BSPIN survey (Oct 2014)
- Conduct a summer school? → address more broadly (than fellowships); include a level for beginners; look for funding sources; identify relevant topics (integrated into the IPBES context, e.g. work on actual documents) and educational needs
- Further develop the BSPIN network: increase membership, communication, and networking with other networks
- Enhancing outreach → identify and reach out to other audiences

- Enhancing communication → as part of all tasks
- Development of the content of BSPIN → leave BSPIN open to be filled with the contents identified by its members; current members should define the form of the network and manage expectations by clearly setting out what the network can provide and what not
- Strengthen collaboration with the IPBES Secretariat → whether and how to formalize
- Conduct a workshops tackling relevant topics
- International Academy for Nature Conservation on the German Island of Vilm – discuss a collaboration with regard to their young scientists meeting (“Expertentreffen Biologische Vielfalt”)
- Interaction with political institutions and networks: how do we find each other?
- Organizing/developing governance – Decisions?
- Thematic groups framework: i) Marine coastal biodiv, ii) Effectiveness of policy, iii) Implementation/organisation
- Information for policy, e.g. policy briefs
- (Broad) Conception of biodiversity knowledge – discuss with task force on indigenous and local knowledge
- Shared language development + understanding
- Training for BSPIN members

6. People and organizations involved in IPBES



Malte Timpte, Network Forum for Biodiversity Research Germany (NeFo), Public Engagement with Science Department, Museum für Naturkunde Berlin (MfN) Germany, presented some facts and figures on how the participation of states, observer countries and observer organisations to the IPBES process has evolved since the first meeting on the founding of a science-policy interface on

biodiversity in Malaysia 2008. He also talked about representation and balance of the selected experts for the first IPBES working groups and task forces.

While already quite a large number of state delegations participated in the early consultation meetings between 2008 and the first IPBES plenary in Bonn 2013 (77 in 2008 / 113 in 2013) only a small group of observer organisations followed the process from the start. When the third IPBES plenary took place in Bonn again in 2015, 109 member state delegations and 22 observer states were registered for the meeting. This time, almost 200 organisations signed up to observe the negotiations by the national states. Mr. Timpte explained, that the group of non-governmental observer organisations to IPBES-3(excluding UN and IGOs) was dominated by organisations from the WEOG region (Western Europe and Other States), About 60% of these organisation and network delegations are based in WEOG states, while only 17% came from the Asia-Pacific and 15% from the African region. About half of the non-governmental observer organisations to work within the field of education and research, 36% could be considered as NGOs and only 4% are from the business sector.

It is important to distinguish between observer organisations and those organisations that are stakeholders to the process and that propose experts for the IPBES working groups. However, one could ask if not more efforts should be made to have a more diverse group of observers following the negotiations on the IPBES programme of work.

The experts in the IPBES “...task force(s) or expert group(s) should reflect a range of scientific and technical expertise; appropriate geographical representation; diversity of knowledge systems; and gender balance...”¹ A more diverse group of observers could help to mobilize experts from all regions and with different backgrounds.

Analysing the list of selected experts after the first IPBES call in spring 2014, Mr. Timpte said that there is still room for improvement. Even if regional balance in the expert groups has been considered, some sub-regions are still underrepresented and some countries provided more than 10 experts why nominations from other countries were not considered at all. Gender balance has not been reached and based on the information available the diversity of disciplines is another challenge. Data is lacking on the age of all selected experts, but at least 22 experts out of 330 are in the age group of 25 to 35 (85 experts/age group 36-45), showing that there is an opportunity for early career scientists to get involved.

7. BSPIN organization of work during IPBES-3



Daniel Suarez, PhD candidate at the Environmental Science, Policy, and Management Department, University of California at Berkeley, United States, introduced the approach of ‘collaborative observation’ and talked about event ethnography as a method to observe and document negotiations at international environmental conferences and negotiations. In the discussion afterwards, the participants shared their experience and difficulties with the observation of negotiations.

Malte Timpte presented the agenda and the schedule of the IPBES-3 plenary and the participants discussed how to join forces to follow and document the meeting. The participants indicated which agenda items they planned to focus on during the negotiations and it was decided to have evening meetings from Tuesday to Friday to share and discuss the outcomes of the day. If possible, experts and negotiators should be invited to the meetings to serve as resource persons.

¹ Additional guidance for nominated and selected experts - IPBES.net 10.2.2014

Annex: participant list

Name	Vorname	Email	Institution	Country
Articus	Kristina	k.articus@biodiversity.be	Belgian Biodiversity Platform	Belgium
Barth	Georg	gbarth@gwdg.de	University of Göttingen	Germany
Borges	Rebecca	becca.rbs@gmail.com	ZMT Bremen	Germany
Bozzi	Pierluigi	p.bozzi@yahoo.it	International University Network on Culture and Biological Diversity (SPES)	Italy
Collaro	Carolina	carolina.collaro@gmail.com	University of Bayreuth	Germany
Cormann	Michael	michael.cormann@ufz.de	Helmholtz Centre for Environmental Research - UFZ	Germany
Förster	Johannes	johannes.foerster@ufz.de	Helmholtz Centre for Environmental Research - UFZ	Germany
Futhazar	Guillaume	futhguillaume@gmail.com	IMBE	France
Gaillard	Camille	Camille.Gaillard@senckenberg.de	Biodiversity and Climate Research Centre (LOEWE BiK-F)	Germany
Geffert	Laurens	laurensgeffert@gmail.com	University of Cambridge	UK
Heubach	Katja	katja.heubach@ufz.de	Helmholtz Centre for Environmental Research - UFZ	Germany
Korting	Janina	janina.korting@giz.de	GIZ Germany	Germany
Montana	Jasper	jasper.montana@gmail.com	University of Cambridge	UK
Müller	Verena	verena.mueller@ufz.de	Helmholtz Centre for Environmental Research - UFZ	Germany
Reuter	Katrin	Katrin.Reuter@mfn-berlin.de	Museum für Naturkunde Berlin (MfN)	Germany
Sakiyama	Melina	melina@diversitas-international.org	DIVERSITAS International Sao Paulo // GYBN	Brazil
Schwarzer	Christian	christian.schwarzer@gmail.com	University of Marburg, GYBN	Germany
Suarez	Daniel	dsuarez@berkeley.edu	University of Berkeley	USA
Timpte	Malte	malte.timpte@mfn-berlin.de	Museum für Naturkunde Berlin (MfN)	Germany
Vandewalle	Marie	marie.vanderwalle@ufz.de	Helmholtz Centre for Environmental Research - UFZ	Germany
Zinngrebe	Yves	yzinngr@gwdg.de	University of Göttingen	Germany

BSPIN in brief

Scope

We are an international and interdisciplinary network of early career scientists interested and engaged in science-policy interfaces (SPIs*) related to global biodiversity policy. We focus on institutions such as the Intergovernmental Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES), the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), and the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC). We warmly welcome other early career scientists (ECS) interested in those topics to join the network.

Mission

Our mission is to link young scholars interested in science-policy interface processes within the field of global biodiversity policy and to improve their capacities to actively engage in them, as well as in transdisciplinary research being the foundation of such processes.

Objectives

Advancing research of ECS

- Towards SPIs' work programmes (i.e. generating knowledge directly relevant for SPI assessments or other SPI activities)
- On SPIs (i.e. generating knowledge about relevant processes, design options, etc.)

Advancing engagement of ECS in SPIs in global biodiversity policy

- By building capacities of network members and other interested ECS
- By communicating the potential of ECS and encouraging their involvement

Activities

Linking

- ECS interested in SPI-processes to exchange information, knowledge and ideas, as well as to institutionalize a network that represents the interest of young knowledge holders at SPIs
- ECS to other stakeholders in SPI processes

Communicating

- relevance and needs of SPIs to ECS
- relevance of ECS for SPIs to other stakeholders

Building capacity


- of ECS to create knowledge for and understanding of SPI processes
- of ECS to actively participate in SPI processes

Engaging

- in SPI-processes by commenting on SPI strategies and/or activities, and related documents (e.g. via online consultations, workshops, side events or publications)
- in SPI-processes by feeding relevant knowledge into assessment processes and scientific-technical activities related to the work programmes of SPIs

Contact

www.facebook.com/biodivspis
contact.bspin@gmail.com



The participants of the first international BSPIN Network Meeting in Bonn, Jan 9th 2015

