



Council of the
European Union

**Brussels, 5 August 2022
(OR. en)**

11759/22

**ENV 800
CLIMA 401**

INFORMATION NOTE

From: General Secretariat of the Council
To: Delegations

Subject: Ninth Session of the Plenary of the Intergovernmental Science-Policy
Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services
(IPBES-9) (Bonn, Germany, 3–9 July 2022)
- Statements by the EU and its Member States

Delegations will find in the [Annex](#), for information, a compilation of statements/speaking points delivered on behalf of the European Union and its Member States at the abovementioned meeting.

Ninth Session of the Plenary of the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES-9) (Bonn, Germany, 3–9 July 2022)

- Compilation of EU and its Member States Statements and Speaking Points -

Agenda item 1: Opening of the session

Opening Statement

“Madam Chair,
Madam Executive Secretary,
Your Excellences,
Distinguished Delegates,
Ladies and Gentlemen,

The Czech Republic speaks on behalf of the European Union and its Member States that are members of IPBES.

We are very pleased that the Ninth Plenary of the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services meets in person, after two years of online virtual meetings caused by the COVID-19 pandemic. While IPBES has shown that it can take decisions in a virtual format at last year’s Plenary, we are very happy to engage in a face-to-face exchange again. We would like to express our sincere gratitude to the Executive Secretary, her team, and all others who have worked so hard and tirelessly in preparing this Ninth Session here in the beautiful city of Bonn.

We would also like to thank the Bureau, the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel, the Secretariat and the Technical Support Units for their tremendous efforts in implementing the IPBES work programme in a reasonable and effective manner under the unusual circumstances we have been facing in the last years.

Since its approval in 2019, the IPBES Global Assessment Report on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services has become a widely accepted and highly regarded source of information on the worrying state, changes and trends of biological diversity. Unfortunately, despite this wake-up call and despite efforts and actions undertaken, the decline and loss of nature continues at a massive scale. The world is subject to constant change and the future, just to quote the famous French poet and philosopher Paul Valéry, is not what it used to be.

In this context, let us express the EU and its MS’ full solidarity with Ukraine and the Ukrainian people. Russia is waging an unjustifiable, unprovoked and illegal war of aggression against Ukraine, violating the UN Charter and other fundamental principles of international law. We call on Russia to put an end to the war it started and to end the tragic suffering and loss of life it continues to cause. We also express our deep concern with regard to the profound damaging impacts of the military action by Russian Federation on the nature in Ukraine.

The outstanding relevance of IPBES and its deliverables has never been so crucial for people and nature. The documents we will discuss and agree upon this week will provide the necessary, useful and recognized knowledge base for the effective conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity, contributing to human well-being and sustainable development. They will be of the utmost importance for the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, to be adopted at the CBD COP 15 in Montreal in December under the Presidency of China.

We, the IPBES Member States, have concluded that transformative change is urgently needed, meaning a fundamental, system-wide reorganization across technological, economic and social factors, including paradigms, goals and values. In this regard, IPBES plays a key role due to its engagement with both science and policy and, in particular, their interfaces. It serves therefore as an important bridge between the two spheres.

At this Plenary, we will consider important IPBES deliverables: the assessments of the sustainable use of wild species and of the diverse values and valuation of nature. We will also agree upon the scoping report for the business and biodiversity assessment and discuss the task force work plans for the coming years.

The European Union and its Member States that are members of IPBES invite all to work on options for strengthening the collaboration between IPBES and, the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, recognizing the interdependence of the nature and climate crises.

The European Union and its Member States that are members of IPBES will do their best to ensure a successful outcome of this Ninth Session of the Plenary.

We wish all participants a fruitful and successful meeting and look forward to constructive discussions that lead to an ambitious result in the seven days ahead.

Thank you, Madam Chair".

Agenda item 2: Organizational matters

(a) Adoption of the agenda and organization of work

The EU Member States that are members of IPBES and the EU in its capacity of an enhanced observer support the proposed agenda and organisation of work.

(b) Status of the membership of the Platform

The EU Member States that are members of IPBES and the EU in its capacity of an enhanced observer welcome the Republic of Suriname that has formally joined IPBES as its 138th member and the Republic of North Macedonia as its 139th member. The EU and its Member States also express the wish for more new members to join the Platform and their willingness to contribute to this effort.

(c) Election of officers

In the election of the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel members, the EU and its Member States will follow guidelines adopted for the IPBES 6 meeting:

1. Evaluate the candidates against the following criteria: continuity of the MEP, familiarity with IPBES, experience at the science-policy interface, interdisciplinary expertise, and scientific excellence. Evaluation can result in scoring with “0”, “1”, “2” and “3”, to reflect that the candidate does not meet the criterion, meets it to a little, to a medium, or to a large extent, respectively.

In addition, the nominated experts should be able to demonstrate that they have secured the necessary financial support to participate in MEP activities.

2. Select the five highest ranked candidates, taking into account, if necessary, the gender, disciplinary and geographic (EU/non-EU) balance.

The EU and its Member States will additionally participate in the agreed process at their respective regional level (WEOG/CEE) for the selection of candidates to be nominated by their region.

Agenda item 3: Admission of observers

The EU and its Member States agree to apply the interim procedure for the admission of Observers to sessions of the Plenary, as described in paragraph 22¹ of the report of IPBES-1 and applied for all subsequent sessions of the Plenary *mutatis mutandis*, at the ninth session of the Plenary.

Alternatively, if the issue is addressed by another IPBES Member, the EU and its Member States will suggest the following changes. The entire annex and Paragraphs 14 and 16 in the Draft policy and procedures for the admission of observers remain entirely bracketed in document IPBES/9/3.

The main issues concern paragraph 14 and to lesser degree paragraph 16. The strongly preferred position of the EU and its Member States remains that issues related to the Observers (admission, their status, suspension) should be regarded in a strict and fully transparent manner, considering the variety of subjects eligible for this status. Therefore, the right to approve the admission of Observers, as well as suspending the status should be given to the Plenary and not to the Bureau (paragraph 16 of the Draft policy and procedures as in document IPBES/9/3). In order to ensure that no Member has the right to preclude a subject of becoming Observer on unreasonable grounds, objections to the admission of the Observers should be expressed by at least one third of the Members present (paragraph 14 of the Draft policy and procedures as in document IPBES/9/3).

Paragraph 13 still mentions a list of applicants “not approved” by the Bureau, whereas the bracketed paragraph 14 mentions “accepted” by the Bureau. The wording should be edited to get a coherent text, bearing in mind that the Bureau can only make recommendations.

¹ IPBES/1/12 Paragraph 22: “The Plenary agreed that the following procedure would be applied to the admission of observers to its second session: (a) The observers represented at the first session of the Plenary will be admitted and do not need to resubmit their requests for admission; (b) With regard to new observers, the following procedure will be applied solely for the second session of the Plenary: (i) Any body or organization, which is qualified in matters covered by the Platform, should inform the secretariat of the Platform of its wish to be represented at the second session of the Plenary; (ii) The Bureau will review the list of those who expressed their wish to be represented at the second session of the Plenary as observers, upon submission of such list by the secretariat; (iii) The Bureau will make recommendations on the admission of new observers to the second session of the Plenary and communicate those recommendations to members of the Platform at least eight weeks before the opening of the second session of the Plenary; (iv) Any member of the Platform may communicate its view on the recommendations of the Bureau, which should be received by the Bureau at least two weeks before the opening of the second session of the Plenary; (v) If there are concerns among some members of the Platform regarding the request by a body or organization for its admission to be observer of the Plenary, the Bureau will inform the body or organization of such concerns; (vi) At the second session of the Plenary, a member of the Platform may reject the admission of a body or an organization to be an observer of the Plenary, and such rejection will stand unless overruled by two-thirds majority of the members of the Platform present and voting.”

Suggestions for amendments to document (IPBES/9/3):

14. The Plenary of the Platform will decide **[on the admittance of Observers recommended on the list]** on the admission and participation of all Observers in accordance with its rules of procedure, and Observers **accepted recommended for approval** by the Bureau as detailed in paragraph 13 may be admitted to a meeting of the Plenary and participate in it **[as long as no Member of the Platform objects]** **[unless at least one third of the Members present at the meeting object.]**

16. If Observer status has to be withdrawn for any reason, the chair may suspend the Observer status of that observer subject to ratification by the **[Bureau]** **[Plenary]**.

“Madam Chair,

I am speaking on behalf of the EU Member States that are members of IPBES and the EU in its capacity of an enhanced observer. We agree to apply the interim procedure for the admission of Observers to sessions of the Plenary, as described in paragraph 22 of the report of IPBES-1 and applied for all subsequent sessions of the Plenary mutatis mutandis, at the ninth session of the Plenary.

Regarding the draft policy and procedures for the admission of observers, namely paragraphs 14 and 16, we are of the position that issues related to the Observers (admission, their status, suspension) should be regarded in a strict and fully transparent manner, considering the variety of subjects eligible for this status. Therefore, the right to approve the admission of Observers, as well as suspending the status should be given to the Plenary and not to the Bureau (paragraph 16 of the Draft policy and procedures as in document IPBES/9/3).

In order to ensure that no Member has the right to preclude a subject of becoming Observer on unreasonable grounds, objections to the admission of the Observers should be expressed by at least one third of the Members present (paragraph 14 of the Draft policy and procedures as in document IPBES/9/3). Paragraph 13 still mentions a list of applicants “not approved” by the Bureau, whereas the bracketed paragraph 14 mentions “accepted” by the Bureau. The wording should be edited to get a coherent text.

Thank you, Madam Chair.

Agenda item 4: Credentials of representatives

No specific actions were required on behalf of the EU and its Member States that are members of IPBES under this agenda item.

Agenda item 5: Report of the Executive Secretary on progress in the implementation of the rolling work programme up to 2030

The EU and its Member States:

1. Welcome the report of the Executive Secretary on the progress in the implementation of the rolling work programme;
 2. Express their appreciation to the IPBES secretariat for the continuous professional work in the implementation of the rolling work programme up to 2030 and acknowledge the commitment and enthusiasm of IPBES members, experts and stakeholders that have enabled to meet the requests of the Plenary, despite the ongoing pandemic;
 3. Appreciate the high quality and timeliness of IPBES deliverables and their contribution to the improvement of the knowledge base on biodiversity and ecosystem services for long-term human well-being and sustainable development;
 4. Welcome the progress achieved in the development of the three assessments that started under the first work programme of IPBES (Assessment of the sustainable use of wild species, Values assessment, Assessment of invasive alien species) and the assessments included under objective 1 (Assessing knowledge) of the rolling work programme (nexus assessment, transformative change assessment, business and biodiversity assessment) and takes note of the schedule suggested for assessments up to 2030;
 5. Also welcome the progress achieved in building capacity, strengthening knowledge foundations and supporting policy;
 6. Congratulate IPBES for the outstanding progress achieved in strengthening communication and continuous growth of audience across traditional and social media, including of the Nature Insight podcast;
 7. Take note of the update on the recruitment of staff members to the secretariat in 2021 and 2022.
-

Agenda item 6: Financial and budgetary arrangements for the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services

The EU and its Member States thank the secretariat for preparing a note on financial and budgetary arrangements for the Platform on the status of cash and in-kind contributions to the Platform and on expenditures for the period 2021, further revised budgets for 2022, 2023 and a budget proposal for 2024.

We ask the Executive Secretary to explore on how the number of voluntary contributions from members could be broadened. Even small contributions from parties not contributing yet would strengthen the mandate of IPBES (currently, all pledges/contributions in 2022 but one to IPBES come from WEOG members). Sending letters to the NFP is not sufficient.

Agenda item 7: Assessing knowledge:

(a) Thematic assessment of the sustainable use of wild species

The EU and its Member States (EU+MS) welcome the summary for policymakers (SPM) of the IPBES assessment on the sustainable use of wild species, the quality, clarity and accessibility of the messages and the case studies chosen.

In order to improve the communication to a large audience around the main messages of this assessment, and to be consistent with the structure of the SPM of the Values assessment, the EU+MS could ask to add a specific “key messages” section at the beginning. Furthermore, statements given in the key messages could be emphasized (“can” instead of “might”) when the statement’s information is “well established”.

Main issues:

The following themes and issues could be given greater prominence and consistency in the SPM:

- To reinforce the link between sustainable use and poverty eradication.
- Protected areas and their management in relation to the use of wild species and a greater emphasis on “sustainable use” as a tool to support conservation.
- Illegal trade as a key factor of unsustainable use of wild species (as recognized under B.2.10) should be a prominent part of the key messages.
- The links between the use of wild species, especially when coupled with the degradation and unsustainable use of ecosystems and poorly managed wildlife trade, and the emergence of zoonotic diseases. This could also include for example, ecosystem degradation (e.g. deforestation with associated increase in bushmeat use), illegal trade of wild species, or wild species observation, whether for recreational or scientific purposes, as this also provides opportunities for interspecies exchange of pathogens.
- Social and ecological threats related to the valuation of wild species through trade or other activities.

- Regulating ecosystem services (or nature's contributions to people) to complement the valuable discussion of provisioning ecosystem services. The link between wild species use and regulating ecosystem services, including, pollinators and pollination function, nitrogen retention, soil protection, crop pest and disease regulation and carbon storage.
- The role of sustainable use of wild species (trees) for climate, i.e. the role of unsustainable use of wild species (trees) for deforestation. ('*and climate*' should be added at the end of key message A – in line with Figure SPM 2).
- Urbanisation as a major driver of change in wild species use. Humans are increasingly living in urban landscapes, leading to a complete change in the process of using wild species, and in its intensity. In this regard, the messages in para B.2.8 (lines 438–446) do not seem very accurate, as it seems to suggest that urbanization often has positive impacts on sustainable use of wild species, when, in reality, such changes do not seem to be a direct effect of urbanization, but rather due to other factors (i.e.: changes in lifestyles).
- Customary and statutory rights, norms and concepts both for their positive and negative effects for the sustainable use of wild species. This need to be further balanced, as section B.2.11, for instance, only elaborates on their potential positive effects on sustainable uses.
- The proposed solutions need to be context specific.
- It would be valuable to strengthen the SPM on the importance of land tenure {4.2.2.6}, gender equity {4.2.3.6}, and education {4.2.6.4} for sustainable use.

The EU+MS point out that the use of the term "critical" in the SPM's headlines has a strong communicative impact, but can sometimes lead to a loss of clarity. For example, in the title of Part A, it is not clear whether the term 'critical' should mean 'essential', 'necessary', 'vital', etc.

The EU+MS emphasise that the exploitation of wild species takes place in a variety of governance, rights systems, management, ecological and socio-cultural contexts, which influence sustainable use outcomes and that these aspects will need to be better reflected in the SPM.

Of the practices analysed in this report in relation to the use of wild species, agriculture (as well as aquaculture) is not considered. The EU+MS identify the possibility of considering the relationship between agricultural practices and the use of wild species within the Key Message of the C.2.2 part on sectoral policies. The term "agriculture" itself is only mentioned twice in the SPM, which may be a very important gap in our understanding of wild species use. "Nature's contributions to people and human well-being" including regulating ecosystem services in agriculture (and beyond) are only mentioned as a knowledge gap in Table SPM A.2 in Appendix III. The reason why agricultural issues are not addressed in relation to wild species uses should at least be explained somewhere in the document. It could have been considered as a non-extractive practice that affects and benefits from wild species use, especially if we consider wild species that provide services to agriculture (weeds, pollinators, soil fauna, micro-organisms that support nutrient cycling, carbon storage, pest and disease regulation, etc.). However, "the sustainable intensification of agricultural production" is mentioned, which should be rephrased in order not to allow too much space for interpretation and de facto unsustainable use. Agroecology may provide suitable perspectives on the close interdependence and co-evolution of wild species/habitats and their human use. This also applies to aquaculture and marine wild species; a greater emphasis should be made on unsustainable activities destroying the sea floor plus illegal/over fishing exploitation catches and pollution.

The EU and its Member States are wondering about the added value of figure SPM7. There is a misalignment between the content of the figure, supposed to represent the process leading to "co-produced knowledge" as mentioned in its lower part and the legend which does not refer to knowledge production processes but to governance issues. Therefore, Figure SPM.7 is unclear, both in terms of what is represented and how it is represented. It could be more useful to have a figure that shows the overlap of the different knowledge systems with details of what these overlaps entail. The term "sustainable use" is not used in a consistent way. Sometimes it means simply "use", whether sustainable or not, and sometimes it means "degree of sustainability". This introduces ambiguity and misinterpretation of the messages. For example, if a sentence says that sustainable use should increase, does that mean that the amount of use should increase, or that the sustainability of any use should increase, or both? These two meanings may be incompatible, as the short-term use of wild species resources may have to be limited, to secure the long-term survival of the resource.

The EU and its Member States feel that questions raised in the scoping report have not been fully addressed in the SPM, at least not for the ecological aspects of sustainable use (para22): How can the sustainable use of wild species be appropriately conceptualized and operationalized? What methods and tools exist for assessing, measuring and managing the sustainable use of wild species? Para 39 asked for an analysis of the conditions that are necessary for the sustainable use of wild species and of the criteria and elements that are essential to ensure that the impacts of wild species use are socially sound and within ecological limits. It further asked for a critical assessment of sustainable use principles, including recognized standards for the sustainable use of wild species. Para 42 asked for an assessment of the levels of use that could be sustainable and/or when management is required in order for species to recover, taking into account ecological conditions. If the full chapters contain a more comprehensive treatment of this, we would welcome a summary in the SPM.

About the SPM figures

The SPM figures are rather dry; addition of a few data-driven figures from the main text (e.g. insert Fig 3.9 from {3.2.2} into key message A.3.2; insert Fig 3.52 from {3.3.4.1} into key message B.1.7) would really strengthen the SPM. In addition, the SPM is weak on the importance of land tenure {4.2.2.6}, gender equity {4.2.3.6}, and education {4.2.6.4} for sustainable use – it would be valuable to strengthen these themes.

Definition of wild species:

The EU and its Member States welcome the experts' effort to define the topic and emphasise the need to clarify that the use of wild species does not necessarily imply the absence of strong selection pressures from an evolutionary point of view in so-called wild species. Wild species can live in anthropised or natural environments without human intervention. Furthermore, the EU+MS would like to stress the adequacy of this definition with regards to IPLCs. Indeed, the definition of wild species is scientifically operational, but does not always correspond to the IPLCs' conception on the distinction between what is wild and what is domestic. The EU and its Member States call for corrections to confusions between the use of the terms "biodiversity" and "wild" and for harmonisation of the text in this regard (For example in key message A.1.1).

The EU and its Member States also emphasize that the status of wild resources is multiple and not just a matter of common "property". Indeed, wildlife can be privately, economically or individually owned and is not always considered as common property as described in the SPM.

Definition of types of use:

The EU and its Member States would like to clarify the definition of sustainable use, proposed in page 3 of the SPM, by using for instance the definition used in the Convention on Biological Diversity ("Sustainable use" means the use of components of biological diversity in a way and at a rate that does not lead to the long-term decline of biological diversity, thereby maintaining its potential to meet the needs and aspirations of present and future generations."). In line 44, it could be added "This is considered functionally equivalent to the long-established CBD definition of sustainable use", to avoid policy confusion. The definition in the SPM seems rather unclear and aspirational, while we need to have a concrete understanding of what do we mean by "sustainable" when it comes to usages. The use of criteria could support this idea. The definition suggested in the SPM fails in several respects:

1. It does not build on the CBD definition, as it misses the key elements of that definition, and it does not address wild species being used.
2. It does not specify the desired outcome (no long-term decline), only an aim to maintain biodiversity.
3. It offers an observation that wild species "change over time and space", in a dynamic process, which gives the impression that a long-term decline in wild species being used is natural and acceptable, instead of specifying the change in abundance and distribution that would not be acceptable, e.g. a long-term decline.
4. It offers no criteria for judging what is sustainable, and what is not.

Sustainable use of wild species has social and economic dimensions, but that does not mean that the ecological sustainability can be neglected. Without sustainability with regard to biodiversity itself, i.e. the ecological aspects of sustainable use, there can be no long-term social or economic sustainability. Having a functional definition of "sustainable use" is extremely important, otherwise the addition of the term "sustainable" to the term "use" will be meaningless, and phrases such as "enhance sustainable use" (as in A.1.7) may in effect only mean "enhance use".

The EU and its Member States emphasize the need to refine the diversity of uses behind the term "sustainable use" that sometimes refers only to "use" and "trade", drawing for example on the vocabulary used in Article 6 of the Bern Convention on the Conservation of European Wild species in the Wild and CITES for the vocabulary on trade. More consistent wording such as "hunting", "gathering" and "harvesting" could be used.

The EU and its Member States would find useful to add a short definition of social-ecological systems in order to inform readers which are less familiar with this concept.

It would also be relevant to specify what the purposes of trade are: e.g. forestry, environmental conservation, agriculture, energy, infrastructure, use of wild animals (e.g. pangolins, rhinoceros), pets, medicinal use, recreational use etc.

The EU and its Member States could also stress the need to take into account the governance factor, in relation to global trade that takes place in a given context in terms of governance and rules. If the rules change, the impacts of global trade on biodiversity and the use of wild species may also change.

The focus of some parts on particular uses (e.g. part A1: focus on timber collection, gathering and tourism) requires further clarification and explanation.

Logging:

The EU and its Member States stress that logging is an essential aspect of forest management, but logging is also practiced illegally and can, under certain and regional circumstances, threaten the integrity of ecosystems as well as peoples' livelihoods and their territories.

The term "primary forest" implies virginity, which only applies to a minor share of all forests on Earth. The established FAO definitions of naturally regenerating forests and planted forests allow a better consideration of the human and sustainable occupation of forest ecosystems and do not consider them as pristine spaces.

It should further be clarified whether the assessment has considered logging of indigenous species, but of foreign provenance in planted forests. According to the definition of wild species on page 3, "introduced populations" are not regarded as wild species, but many planted forests consist of foreign genetic stock.

In the definition of logging (appendix, page 28) the reason for the exception from logging from plantations remains unclear.

Fishing:

The EU and its Member States recall that it would be useful and striking to mention that the overexploitation of species is the main factor in the decline of biodiversity in marine ecosystems as clearly stated in the IPBES 2019 global assessment on biodiversity and ecosystems.

Hunting:

The EU and its Member States request that the key messages on recreational hunting and selective hunting be made more explicit. It is not clear what changes can be observed as a result of a change in practices to recreational hunting. It is not clear whether selective hunting includes recreational hunting and whether the ecosystem impact, only detailed for selective hunting in the SPM, applies to both types of hunting.

Hunting is a threat to many more than 301 mammal species. The IUCN Red List database lists 1341 mammal species as globally threatened by hunting and trapping, with 1156 of them being hunted for consumption. At the national level, many more, nationally threatened species are also being threatened by hunting.

Non-extractive uses:

The EU and its Member States emphasize that non-extractive uses should not be limited to observations and that observations should also include knowledge production (scientific and non-scientific). Generally, there is a need for balancing across the SPM between extractive and non-extractive usage.

Therefore, the EU and its Member States would welcome if additional non-extractive practices could be added to the SPM.

Human and social science issues:

The EU and its Member States point out that the cognitive aspects of resources and the link to ecology are not listed as such. Yet these elements are central - to the notion of belonging to a certain environment, - to the identification of indicators and - to scientific and lay knowledge.

The EU and its Member States ask that the term "belief" be replaced by the wording "system of thoughts" which is less restrictive in its definition.

The EU and its Member States emphasize that individual practices, even if they have specificities, are part of a given socio-cultural context. It should be more emphasized in the SPM that many of these activities are based on collectively developed norms. Moreover, the contingency of cultural understandings of nature and its dependency on the symbolic, political and epistemological context do not allow for generalisation. The cultural and symbolic meaning of a given species is extremely tied up to cultural variation.

Principles to enhance the sustainable use of wild species:

The EU and its Member States support the proposal of the 7 principles but would like to see them illustrated by some concrete examples as well as expanded on. In this regard, while the SPM briefly addresses some examples of actions needed to assure future sustainability of practices linked to wild species use (page 23, lines 718–729), these messages should be far more prominent in the SPM, and ideally should be completed with specific suggested actions also for other practices that are not addressed in this paragraph (for instance, as regards recreational hunting, and other practices).

However, ecological aspects including indicators on the ecological components of sustainable use are not taken into account in the 7 principles. It is also notable and surprising that nowhere in the text is the precautionary principle and its role in sustainable use mentioned. In a document aimed at policy makers it would be important to highlight e.g. the often-large uncertainties in the estimation of the available resource and its productivity, and why it is important to take that into account and how it can be done.

In the SPM 1 table, the choice of assigning a category of agreement to a single principle and a single use is difficult to understand and would require further explanation and clarification, or even a change in the graphic choice, if the representation of colours does not represent all possible cases. It would be useful if Table SPM1 could be further elaborated, developing the “policy options” into more detailed and complete examples of possible actions and pathways to foster sustainable use, ideally disaggregated for each of the different practices which are addressed.

Indigenous peoples and local communities (IPLCs):

The EU and its Member States call for strengthening the aspects dealing with partnership, involvement and empowerment of IPLCs through the use of wild species. The recurrent use of the term subsistence/survival and others refers to a precariousness that exists but emphasizes dependency relationships, whereas these relationships are now built around partnership and autonomy. The use of wild species is central to identities, cultural expressions, training, knowledge transmission, and livelihoods.

The culture and values of IPLCs seem implicitly represented as constant over time, while they are rapidly changing: disappearing, hybridizing with other cultures. Paragraphs B.2.11 and B.2.12 justify changes in these cultures and values mainly because of the impact of biodiversity degradation or use, while there are a variety of other factors that can cause cultures and values to co-evolve. The EU and its Member States call for these aspects to be addressed and explicitly mentioned, as the ability of these values and cultures to manage biodiversity could be jeopardized by changes.

Technological advances that can radically change the relationship of local communities with the ecosystem on which they rely on for their sustainable use are not only technologies linked to sectors focused on wild species. For example, water access technologies, diesel pumps for irrigation in North Africa, have greatly disrupted much of the common resource institutions of oasis communities around water, thus affecting both cultivated and non-cultivated species in these ecosystems. The EU and its Member States call for such potential major disruptions to be made explicit, as they could be a key factor that jeopardizes sustainable use. Furthermore, the diffusion of these technologies remains uneven and may exacerbate existing inequalities in access to wild species and markets for them.

With regard to methods co-developed with indigenous peoples and local communities, the six points indicated are part of an interventionist perspective (co-development, knowledge production, co-capacitation, co-governance, revitalization, etc.) that is not very open to decision-making and autonomous management of wild species by IPLCs.

(b) Methodological assessment regarding the diverse conceptualization of multiple values of nature and its benefits, including biodiversity and ecosystem functions and services

The EU and its Member States welcome the draft summary for policymakers (SPM).

The Assessment of the diverse values and valuation of nature is a key source of expert evidence for action to conserve and sustainably use biodiversity and ecosystem services. The assessment provides policy makers and decision makers with guidance to understand, account for and leverage the different ways in which people value nature as well as different ways in which these values can be measured. It provides the basis to undertake well-informed, evidence-based and effective decisions leading to just and sustainable outcomes for nature and human well-being. Table SPM3 illustrating the potential of environmental policy instruments for transformative change and Table SPM6 with value-centred action points relevant to different actors provide particularly useful guidance for different types of actors, decision- and policy-makers.

Proposals for improvement:

The EU and its Member States:

Appreciate the conciseness and clarity of the Key Messages of the SPM as well as the reintroduction of the full title of the assessment as agreed upon in the scoping document (see decision ipbes-4) and suggest coherency in using this title consistently.

Encourage to highlight the concept of ecosystem services equally to other value concepts in the SPM and to strengthen the alignment between the value frameworks included in the SPM (particularly the framework of “living from/in/with/as nature”) with the Nature Futures Framework.

Recommend to further emphasise the role of Indigenous and Local Knowledge-based valuation tools and systems in the SPM, to better reflect intergenerational concerns, to clarify the distinction between “value” as a measure and “value” as a normative judgement and to clarify the role of bottom-up and top-down processes in shifting individuals’ and societal perspective on values for nature, and clarify the role of institutions.

Further recommend to better focus on valuation as a leverage for conservation, and the need for mainstreaming in sectors such as development cooperation, environment & finance ministries to move away from single indicators such as classical GDP and promote societal transformation. Note that while the SPM assumes that uptake of valuation methods is only depending on political will of decision making, the capacity/state of development of countries is also important. The outcomes therefore need to be made more relevant for developing countries and capacity building gaps should be tackled as well.

The dedicated section on knowledge gaps and research needs should also be synthesised in a table format similar to all IPBES assessments.

Further note that language should be improved to be more balanced and aligned with different worldviews, since at several cases, it is too prescriptive (as if some values are correct and others are wrong).

Comments on figures:

- See substantial improvements made to all the figures; however, there are still some further needs for improvements (ensuring that all elements and symbols used in a figure are well explained in the legend, ensuring consistency in the use of scales (e.g. the use/size of “dots”).
- Welcome the Figure SPM 1 – however, it might be better placed in the background messages section. Furthermore, some categories and prioritization in this figure is not completely clear.
- Figure SPM.6: While we do understand the idea behind this figure is to show that there exist multiple pathways to reach the overall goal of (more?) sustainable and just futures, we fear that it might be easily misinterpreted in a way that all pathways somehow automatically lead to just and sustainable futures. We suggest to improve this figure and at least include a “business as usual” pathway which does not achieve this goal.

- Figure SPM.7 (“institutions embrace the diverse values of nature“). The word "embrace" seems to refer to institutions as organizations. However, institutions were defined as “Institutions represent the social conventions, norms, and legal rules that govern people’s lives“ (p. 12, p. 354). Therefore, we would suggest to replace “embrace” for instance with “adopt”.

Regarding specific key messages

- KM2: This key message is highly relevant and important. We suggest to modify this key message as follows: “most ways of policy-making” instead of "policy-making". Furthermore, we would recommend to exchange "privileged", e.g. with "focused on". As a matter of consistency, we suggest changing the term "privileged" in A9 accordingly.
- KM7: “greater transparency about which values are embedded in institutions” – this statement may be misleading as it may unintentionally imply referencing the values embedded in governmental organizations and state authorities. Suggestion: “greater transparency about which values are embedded in social conventions, norms, legal rules and other formal and informal institutions”. Institutions, understood and defined as "Social conventions, norms and legal rules..." (l. 156) cannot be easily "designed". We think that the wording "...can be supported by facilitating institutional transformation to better represent..." (l. 154) might be more precise.
- KM9: “promoting institutional change” – this statement may confuse formal institutions (e.g. governmental organizations and state authorities) and informal institutions (e.g. social conventions and norms). Suggestion: “promoting formal and informal institutional change”.
- KM9: “...embedding such values into policymaking, changing institutions to support sustainability aligned values, and shifting societal norms and goals”: Institutions, understood and defined as "Social conventions, norms and legal rules..." (l. 156) cannot be easily "changed" or "shifted". This wording raises questions regarding who changes or who shifts? Furthermore, it implies a top-down thinking. We suggest the following wording for this key message: “...embedding such values into policymaking, creating spaces for changing institutions and shifting societal norms and goals to support sustainability-aligned values”.
- A1: the term “other-than-humans” may require clarification.

(c) Scoping report for a methodological assessment of the impact and dependence of business on biodiversity and nature’s contributions to people

On IPBES/9/8 Section 1:

The EU and its Member States welcome the “proposals for streamlining future scoping processes under IPBES” as set out in IPBES/9/8 section I for shorter documents, with indicative limits of the length of the summary for policymakers and the chapters. This would allow more flexibility for authors and more efficient use of the time in Plenary when approving the scoping reports. We suggest to include a new paragraph to the IPBES 9 draft decisions to reflect the recommendations along the following lines in section IV (Improving the effectiveness of the Platform) (see possible new draft decision below).

On IPBES/9/8 Section 2:

The EU and its Member States welcome the revised version of the scoping report of the business and biodiversity assessment as set out in IPBES/9/8 section II and recognize the improvements it has undergone since the first draft version of November 2021.

The business and biodiversity assessment is expected to serve as a key source of expert evidence for viable policy and business options to support achieving the 2050 Vision for Biodiversity, the Sustainable Development Goals and other relevant multilateral objectives.

We commend the quality of the scoping document with its clear structure as well as its brief and concise character. It is much appreciated that the document already includes clear guidance regarding the length of assessment chapters and foremost the SPM.

The EU and its Member States would like to suggest the following improvements and seek clarification on the following issues in the scoping report prior to its approval:

Line numbering:

The EU and its Member States suggest to include line numbers in the document in order to facilitate negotiations.] [*might not be needed anymore as soon as revised final documents are released*]

Definition and typology of “business(es)”:

Definition(s) of business(es) should be given right at the beginning. The EU and its Member States also propose to make sure different kinds of businesses (in structure, sector, size, formal/informal, etc.) are covered already in the typology of chapter 1, e.g. business size and business structure but also the position in the market with regard to specific businesses or sectors are not mentioned so far. Their existing or potential links with nature-based solutions could be explored further. In addition, the list of sectors on page 4, paragraph 10, seem to be non-exhaustive. We suggest to delete the examples so that the authors can take into account every sector they find appropriate. Alternatively, we suggest to include at least the two important sectors, aquaculture and transport. On page 5, paragraph 26, Chapter 3 could also consider pollution by the different sectors.

Nature of the methodological assessment:

Based on the available knowledge, the assessment should provide best estimates, examples and typologies for impacts and dependencies. The “scope” section states that it “should assess criteria and indicators for measuring such dependencies and impacts”. It would be important that it also assesses methodologies/approaches for developing such assessments.

However, it should refrain from conducting a full assessment of business’ impacts and dependencies on biodiversity and nature’s contribution to people in order to be in line with Decision [IPBES-2/3](#): Procedures for the preparation of the Platform’s deliverables and the [IPBES Guide on the Production Of Assessments](#) (IPBES, 2018: 3) which states that “methodological assessments are set to assess the availability and use of methods in relation with a specific topic (e.g. values, scenarios and models) so that these methods can then be used in IPBES assessments and other activities” (p. 3). Nevertheless, the assessment might and should reflect a revision and compilation of information on already existing estimates and conclusions on business impacts and dependencies on biodiversity which are already available.

Regional differences/ developing country perspectives in the assessment:

The assessment should be of a global nature. Regional differences or specific challenges for developing countries could be included via case studies, for example.

The financial sector in the assessment:

The authors propose to include options for the financial sector in the outline for chapter 6 (paras 35 – 38), alongside options for governments and civil society. However, the financial sector also operates in a regulated space and impacts biodiversity indirectly through investment decisions and allocation of financial means. The EU+MS are of the opinion that the financial sector could also be included in chapter 5 (business options) or as a separate category.

The role of gender/ women and youth in the assessment:

The EU and its Member States support the inclusion of specific evidence regarding the role of gender/ women and youth in the assessment.

Benefit-sharing/ ABS in the assessment:

The EU and its Member States can accept that the assessment includes consideration on the role of benefit-sharing / ABS in the business practices, and on how ABS compliance by business relates with their dependencies and impacts on biodiversity.

The main target audience of the assessment:

Section D. Methodological Approach, para. 7 only refers to the target group “public and private sector decision-makers”. This wording seems to exclude some other important target groups, such as civil society, unions and international organizations.

Conflicting goals and trade-offs in the assessment:

While potential trade-offs are examined in chapter 2 on dependencies, this issue should also be considered when looking at the impact-side of businesses in chapter 3. As e.g. carbon offsetting schemes are increasingly becoming a part of many companies’ business models, trade-offs between climate action and biodiversity conservation will also become more prominent in the impacts of businesses.

Outreach to and inclusion of the business sector

The inclusion of business seems to be a key aspect for the upcoming assessment process. However, the outreach strategy remains unclear in the scoping document. In addition, the timeline reflects a standard approach for the production of the assessment while it could be suggested to also consider e.g. business or sector-workshops (comparable to the ILK-workshops) for this assessment.

Sufficiency as (part of) sustainability strategies in the assessment

We welcome the discussion of sustainability approaches and approaches that are effective in achieving transformative change under chapter 5. Additionally, para. 33 should also mention sufficiency as (part of) sustainability strategies.

Timeline of the assessment:

The EU and its Member States note with regret that the adoption date for the business and biodiversity assessments was shifted one year compared to the originally foreseen adoption at IPBES-11 (see decision IPBES-7/1, p.11). However, taking into consideration the workload of the rolling work programme, the EU+MS can agree on avoiding to approve three assessments at the same moment at IPBES-11 (Nexus, Transformative Change as well as business and biodiversity). With that in mind, still, the Executive Secretary could explore means whether the adoption date of the Business and Biodiversity Assessment could be reasonably brought forward.

At the same time, the proposed timeline already seems unnecessarily narrow in some parts:

- The gap between end of fourth quarter 2022 and second quarter 2023 could be reduced, i.e. the meeting of the management committee could already take place before IPBES 10, so that the first author meeting could take place directly after IPBES 10.
- In the second quarter of 2024, a review of chapters AND SPM is foreseen. However, it might make more sense to have first a review of the chapters and then, an external review of the SPM (and maybe again, chapters).

If the management committee marks the official start of an assessment, the draft decision could be changed to read “... ~~following~~ **starting before** the tenth session of the Plenary and for consideration by the Plenary at its twelfth session;”

If the first author meeting marks the official start of an assessment, then the draft decision could remain as it is, as this would happen immediately after IPBES-10.

Proposed draft decision (IPBES/9/1/Add.2) and possible amendments (not coordinated):

II
Assessing knowledge

1. *Further approves* the undertaking of a methodological assessment of the impact and dependence of business on biodiversity and nature's contributions to people in accordance with the procedures for the preparation of Platform deliverables² and as outlined in the scoping report for the assessment set out in annex [--]³ to the present decision, ~~following~~**starting before** the tenth session of the Plenary and for consideration by the Plenary **at the latest** at its twelfth session;

Possible new draft decision:

VI
Improving the effectiveness of the Platform

6bis. Welcomes the recommendations for streamlining future scoping processes under IPBES undertaken by the IPBES Bureau and MEP as set out in IPBES/9/8 section I and encourages their application for future scoping processes.

² See decision IPBES-3/3, annex I.

³ The draft text of the scoping report is set out in IPBES/9/8.

d) Engagement with the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change

The EU and its Member States strongly support the synergies between climate and biodiversity, and to design and adopt policies that are encompassing this holistic approach. The EU and its Member States note with concern the limited progress on the discussion between IPCC and IPBES, however recognising the efforts made by the IPBES secretariat to advance on the issue. Several formats are proposed by the Secretariat but the modalities, need for adapting procedures in both bodies are not always clear (especially for the liaison group). Having more details on these elements, and also taking into consideration other proposals provided by the members of the Platform or other relevant stakeholders, could help reflect on the practicalities and perhaps overcome some barriers. Therefore, the Plenary should identify ways which consider the mandates, work programme, timelines, and procedural matters governing both bodies to support the development of feasible options for collaboration that would benefit the work of both bodies.

The proposal made by the secretariat to advance discussions between IPCC-IPBES NFP should be welcomed and encouraged. The WEOG region is already organising such dialogues.

Regarding the document IPBES/9/INF/26 on suggestions for thematic or methodological issues related to biodiversity and climate change which would benefit from collaboration between IPCC and IPBES, the EU and its Member States could support the proposal made by Germany for a temporary IPBES–IPCC ad-hoc group, pending additional details on the composition, objectives, budget implications etc. The WG could be tasked with exploring procedural options for collaboration, and to conduct an initial scientific and technical review of the compilation of thematic & methodological issues, with a concept note provided for discussion at IPBES-10.

Proposed draft decision (IPBES/9/1/Add.2) and possible amendments:

II Assessing knowledge

(...)

4. ~~Takes note of~~ **Welcomes** the report on progress set out in the note by the secretariat on engagement with the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change and the compilation of suggestions for thematic or methodological issues related to biodiversity and climate change that would benefit from collaboration between the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change and the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services **provided in document IPBES/9/INF/26**;

4 bis. Note with regret that due to organisational challenges, including caused by the COVID19 pandemic, limited progresses could be made in advancing the discussion on potential future joint work between the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services and the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change;

5. *Invites* the national focal points of the ~~Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change and the national focal points of the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services~~ to **engage with the national focal points of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change in order to identify opportunities to jointly explore a process for potential future forms of collaboration** activities between the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change and the Platform, including as part of the seventh assessment cycle of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, taking into account the options outlined in section II of the note by the secretariat on the work on biodiversity and climate change, **and other proposals provided by the members of the Platform and other relevant stakeholders and submit these to the IPBES secretariat**;

6. *Invites* the Bureau of the Platform and its Executive Secretary to continue to explore with the **relevant bodies of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change** approaches for future joint **forms of collaboration** activities between the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change and the Platform, including as part of the seventh assessment cycle of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, taking into account the options outlined in section II of the note by the secretariat on the work on biodiversity and climate change, **and also taking into consideration other proposals provided by the members of the Platform or other relevant stakeholders, to inform potential future** stakeholders and the need for transparency of any joint activity, in conformity with ~~the~~ decisions of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change and of the Platform and their respective policies and procedures, and requests the Executive Secretary to report to the Plenary at its tenth session on progress in that regard;

***6bis. Encourages* the members of the Platform, relevant stakeholders, scientific bodies and research organisations to explore ways to consider these suggestions provided in document IPBES/9/INF/26 in order to stimulate research and peer reviewed publications on biodiversity and climate change in support of future work of the IPCC and IPBES.**

Agenda item 8: Building capacity, strengthening knowledge foundations and supporting policy

(a) Work programme deliverables and task force workplans

The EU and its Member States acknowledge the fundamental relevance of the work of the task forces for implementing the rolling work programme of IPBES.

The EU+MS welcome the progress made in the task forces and specifically recognize the advances made regarding the integration of the activities delivered on capacity building, on knowledge and data, on indigenous and local knowledge systems, on policy tools and methodologies and on scenarios and models.

Prior to the approval of the respective work plans, the EU and its Member States seek more clarification and/or suggest improvement regarding the following aspects:

Capacity Building:

- Given the fundamental importance of strengthening youth involvement at national levels, we welcome the activities aimed at youth involvement and request to further strengthen these.
- The EU and its Member States appreciate the activities to encourage communities of practice to facilitate access to expertise and information relevant to IPBES, specifically around the values and sustainable use assessments.
- Furthermore, the EU and its Member States are supportive towards pragmatic approaches for strengthening national and regional capacities. The development of relevant science-policy platforms, networks and assessments should optimally consider a critical review of existing national and (sub)regional structures which could provide effective and efficient entry points, and prevent duplication of efforts.

Knowledge and Data:

- The EU and its Member States appreciate the planned dialogues to actively address ways to reduce knowledge gaps identified in the completed or ongoing assessments.
- The activities to provide support relating to the data and knowledge management policy and the generation, management, handling and delivery of IPBES products should not be restricted to the internal IPBES community but also serve other processes.

Indigenous and local knowledge systems

- The EU and its Member States appreciate the broad review of the inclusion of indigenous and local knowledge in IPBES functions and deliverables, including proposals to strengthen ILK in IPBES. This seems to be a major task, and we would welcome some more information regarding the expected workload/scope/outcome or ways in which the results will be presented to the plenary, e.g. in a footnote.

Policy tools and methodologies:

- The planned dialogue workshops would ideally need to go beyond the ‘usual suspects’ of policy makers in the environment field but also include representatives from other sectoral ministries as well as different sectors or the IPCC community in order to enhance the uptake of IPBES assessments outside the IPBES community.
- In order to actively address other user and stakeholder groups as well as government sectors, the piloting of the development of fact sheets is much welcomed since they could potentially add to the SPM. Some additional information on style and scope would be helpful, co-development with the communications team would be recommended.

Scenario and models:

- The EU and its Member States appreciate the planned activities, both regarding the support on scenarios and models in ongoing IPBES assessments and the catalysation of further development of scenarios and models for future IPBES assessments, including the NFF.
- Regarding the latter, the envisioned cooperation with the other task forces seems to be well-balanced and useful. Also, the EU and its Member States are supportive towards the further development of methodological guidance on the use of the NFF, including future adjustments on the foundations, if appropriate and meaningful.

b) Nature futures framework prepared by the task force on scenarios and models

The EU and its Member States welcome the progress made by the task force on scenarios and models and the foundations of the nature futures framework and are supportive in further catalysing the nature futures framework.

The EU and its Member States support the proposed invitation to the scientific community and other relevant actors to accelerate the further development of scenarios and models for biodiversity and ecosystem services and recognize that such acceleration is enhanced by welcoming the progress that has been made regarding the foundations of the nature futures framework (NFF) at IPBES-9.

The EU and its Member States acknowledge the efforts and the improvements that have been made after the review and in engaging with the scientific community, indigenous and local knowledge holders and other potential user groups. Still, enough opportunity and time need to be given to the scientific community to critically discuss e.g. purpose, use and impact of the NFF. Moreover, the foundations remain rather abstract, are not easy to access outside of the scientific community and leave space for questions and potentially the need for further adjustments/improvements in the future.

At the same time, it provides a basis for stakeholders to share different views and value sets towards nature and allows for positive envisaged narratives through different pathways. Thereby we understand it is not exclusive, but open to other existing and potentially future scenario applications/models. We also recognize the efforts and planned activities to involve governments and stakeholders outside of the scientific community, to better understand and further develop the NFF and the opportunities it might bring along. Also, the increased application and testing of the NFF in case studies is very useful to unfold and understand the merits the NFF might offer.

Regarding the NFF however it is vital to provide clarity on the relationship between its three values perspectives and the four life frames used in the Values assessment. At present, this relationship is explained in Annex 2.13 of the Values assessment. Moreover, such explanation should also be included in the foundations as well as in the further methodological guidance.

Furthermore, it is important that a coherence with the IPBES Values Assessment is ensured, particularly in avoiding claims such as that the NFF incorporates “all” or a “complete set of” possible values that people hold for nature, which may oversimplify and be contrary to the message given by the IPBES Values Assessment.

Also, the EU and its Member States would like to gain clarity on how the invitation by the Plenary to the scientific community and other relevant actors could actually be operationalised. Any indications, on how the scientific community could be invited and how other "relevant actors" are defined would be useful to ensure the IPBES' integrative approach. Also, the invitation to those in a position to support such efforts should be clarified. Taking all this into account, the wording of the proposed work programme related to the NFF should be adapted.

The EU and its Member States support the addition of a subtitle to the NFF to enhance a better understanding of its purpose, also with the aim of promoting the use of the framework beyond the IPBES deliverables (e.g. as part of shared work among IPBES and IPCC). In particular, it is key to clearly capture that the NFF has been developed as a framework to design target-seeking scenarios (so called “positive” futures), not all types of scenarios in general (e.g. exploratory scenarios). The subtitle could read: “A tool to develop scenarios of desirable futures for nature and people”, but EU+MS remain open for other suggestions.

Proposed draft decision (IPBES/9/1/Add.2) and possible amendments:

V Supporting policy

(...)

4. *Welcomes* the progress made by the task force on scenarios and models of biodiversity and ecosystem services in the implementation of objective 4 (b) of the work programme of the Platform up to 2030, including the foundations of the nature futures framework, as set out in annex [--] to the present decision;

(...)

7. *Invites* the scientific community and any other relevant actors to accelerate the development of scenarios and models for biodiversity and ecosystem services for use in assessments by the Platform, addressing the gaps identified in the Methodological Assessment Report on Scenarios and Models of Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services and using **and critically discussing**, as appropriate, the nature futures framework described in annex [--] to the present decision to ensure the comparability of scenarios and models; and invites those in a position to do so to support such efforts;

Agenda item 9: Improving the effectiveness of the Platform

Periodic review of effectiveness

The EU Member States that are members of IPBES and the EU in its capacity of an enhanced observer welcome the note on improving the effectiveness of the Platform (IPBES/9/11).

The EU and its Member States request the Bureau, the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel and the Executive Secretary, in accordance with their respective mandates, to continue to take the recommendations made by the review panel into account in the implementation of the rolling work programme of the Platform up to 2030 and report on progress to the Plenary at its tenth session, and if necessary at later Plenaries, including on further solutions and/or issues identified.

The EU and its Member States note that the draft ToR for the midterm review of the 2030 rolling work programme are not presented to IPBES-9 for a full discussion. This is at variance with decision IPBES/7 section VI §4 which “*requested* the Bureau and the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel to prepare draft terms of reference for a midterm review of the Platform, for consideration by the Plenary at its ninth session”. Clarification should be asked, including on why this is not referenced in section B of the present note.

The EU and its Member States look forward to discuss the draft terms of reference for the midterm review of the 2030 rolling work programme at IPBES-10 and generally agree with the suggested approach for an internal review between IPBES-10 and IPBES-11 and an external review between IPBES-11 and IPBES-12.

The EU and its Member States may request clarification regarding the coordination of the external review panel as described in section II-B of the draft terms of reference. While the external review of IPBES first work programme was coordinated by an external professional organization (the International Science Council) which responded to a call for expressions of interest, there is no detail on the coordination of the external review for the upcoming midterm review. Considering the need for an independent review, the EU and its Member States may request that the review is coordinated by an external professional organization.

Review of the use and impact of the IPBES conceptual framework

The EU and its Member States could welcome the note by the Bureau and the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel on the use and impact of the conceptual framework of the Platform, noting that the main issues identified following IPBES-8 plenary (submitted in writing) were addressed. Those issues were mainly related to a positive bias in the analysis of the results of the survey on the use and impact of the IPBES conceptual framework. This was addressed in the executive summary and to some extent in the conclusion parts of the document.

The EU and its Member States note that the formulation of the survey questions was such that it would have been surprising to get anything other than very positive feedback. A closer reading shows rather a pragmatism of the experts who use the conceptual framework to obtain credits (projectwriting) and publications, but do not necessarily seem to use it. Stakeholders and Governments seem to find it useful for communication, but the conceptual framework remains too complex.

However, the interest of a conceptual framework is to provide a common frame of reference for interpretation, in this case that of society/nature relations. The IPBES conceptual framework does this satisfactorily.

Improving the effectiveness of the assessment process and review of lessons learned from online meetings and other working practices

The EU and its Member States welcome progress made in relation to the:

- review of the expert nomination and selection process, as requested by IPBES-8 Plenary;
- review of lessons learned from online meetings and other online working practices, as requested by IPBES-8 Plenary;
- but regret that documents IPBES/9/INF/21 and IPBES/9/INF/22 have only recently been published, thereby impeding our appreciation of the outcome of this assessment process and review of lessons learned.

The EU and its Member States also appreciate the report on the successful piloting of an additional review by governments of the summary for policymakers (SPM) of the assessment on values, and encourage the consideration of similar additional reviews for the future summaries for policymakers.

The EU and its Member States suggest that the recommendations for streamlining future scoping processes under IPBES presented in the scoping report for a methodological assessment of the impact and dependence of business on biodiversity (IPBES/9/8) should be considered as part of the work on improving the assessment process of the Platform.

The EU and its Member States invite the MEP and the Bureau to further support the application of the conceptual framework, including through the further clarification concerning the individual components of the framework and what they entail and the interrelations of the components.

Proposed amendments to the draft decision (IPBES/9/1/Add.2):

VI

Improving the effectiveness of the Platform

1. ~~*Welcomes*~~ ***Takes note of*** the note on improving the effectiveness of the Platform;
2. *Requests* the Bureau, the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel and the Executive Secretary, in accordance with their respective mandates, to continue to take into account the recommendations set out in the report on the review of the Platform at the end of its first work programme in the implementation of the rolling work programme of the Platform up to 2030 and report on further progress to the Plenary at its tenth session, including on further solutions and issues;
3. *Welcomes* the note by the Bureau and the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel on the use and impact of the conceptual framework of the Platform;
4. *Invites* the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel and the Bureau to take into account the conclusions presented in the note referred to in paragraph 3 above when guiding and supporting the application of the conceptual framework by Platform experts and others;

5. *Invites* Governments from all regions to increase the number of their nominations for experts, nominate experts from all relevant fields of expertise and strengthen gender balance in their nominations;

6. *Welcomes Notes* the progress made by the Bureau and the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel in developing terms of reference for a midterm review of the 2030 rolling work programme of the Platform, which will be conducted between the tenth and twelfth sessions of the Plenary, and invites members, observers [and other stakeholders to provide their comments on the draft terms of reference to the secretariat by 31 August 2022].

6bis. Welcomes the recommendations for streamlining future scoping processes under IPBES undertaken by the IPBES Bureau and MEP as set out in IPBES/9/8 section I and encourages their application for future scoping processes.

“Madam Chair,

I am speaking on behalf of the EU Member States that are members of IPBES and the EU in its capacity of an enhanced observer.

First and foremost, we wish to thank you for the document in front of us.

On Item I, we can inform that we welcome the note on improving the effectiveness of the Platform.

We would request the Bureau, the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel and the Executive Secretary, in accordance with their respective mandates, to continue to take the recommendations made by the review panel into account in the implementation of the rolling work programme of the Platform up to 2030 and report on progress to the Plenary at its tenth session, and if necessary at later Plenaries, including on further solutions and/or issues identified.

However, we note that the draft ToR for the midterm review of the 2030 rolling work programme are not presented to IPBES-9 for a full discussion. This is at variance with decision IPBES/7 section VI §4 which, and I quote, “requested the Bureau and the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel to prepare draft terms of reference for a midterm review of the Platform, for consideration by the Plenary at its ninth session”. We look forward to hearing your clarification on why this Plenary decision has not been implemented, and also why this Decision is not referenced in section B of the present note.

We look forward to discussing the draft terms of reference for the midterm review of the 2030 rolling work programme at IPBES-10 and generally agree with the suggested approach for an internal review between IPBES-10 and IPBES-11 and an external review between IPBES-11 and IPBES-12.

Regarding the coordination of the external review panel as described in section II-B of the draft terms of reference, we note that the external review of IPBES first work programme was coordinated by an external professional organization (the International Science Council) which responded to a call for expressions of interest. While we recognize that this may have budgetary consequences, we prefer this option over the review being supported by the IPBES secretariat.

On the review of the use and impact of the IPBES conceptual framework, the EU MS that are members of IPBES, and of the EU in its capacity of enhanced observer welcome the note by the Bureau and the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel on the use and impact of the conceptual framework of the Platform, noting that the main issues identified following IPBES-8 plenary were addressed.

We note that both stakeholders and Governments find the conceptual framework useful for communication, but that its complexity may impede its use. However, we think that the IPBES conceptual framework satisfactorily provides a common frame of reference for interpretation of society/nature relations.

The EU Member States that are members of IPBES, and the EU in its capacity of enhanced observer, welcome progress made in relation to the review of the expert nomination and selection process and of lessons learned from online meetings and other online working practices, but regret that documents IPBES/9/INF/21 and IPBES/9/INF/22 have only recently been published, thereby impeding our appreciation of the outcome of this review process.

We appreciate the report on the successful piloting of an additional review by governments of the summary for policymakers (SPM) of the assessment on values and encourage the consideration of similar additional reviews for future summaries for policymakers.

We suggest that the recommendations for streamlining future scoping processes under IPBES presented in section I of the scoping report for a methodological assessment of the impact and dependence of business on biodiversity (IPBES/9/8) should be considered as part of the work on improving the assessment process of the Platform. This would allow more flexibility for authors and more efficient use of the time in Plenary and working groups when approving the scoping reports.

We invite the MEP and the Bureau to further support the application of the conceptual framework, including through the further clarification concerning the individual components of the framework and what they entail, and the interrelations of the components.

Thank you, Madam Chair.

Agenda item 10: Requests, input and suggestions for additional elements of the rolling work programme of the Platform up to 2030

Regarding the postponement of this discussion until IPBES-10 (April/May 2023)

The EU and its Member States understand the constraints expressed by the secretariat of IPBES, included in the document IPBES/9/12, and the approach proposed by the secretariat to take into account the inputs that will be coming from the COP15 of the Convention of Biological Diversity. However, the EU and its Member States could still invite the secretariat to look for solutions that would allow the decision on the assessments on connectivity and the second global assessment on biodiversity and ecosystem services already at IPBES-9, as it was agreed in decision IPBES-7/1.

Regarding additional potential fast track assessments

The EU and its Member States welcome the proposal for the secretariat to potentially conduct a maximum of three additional fast track assessments. The EU and its Member States could emphasize that some of these fast track assessments could serve the implementation of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework, including but not limited to an assessment supporting the monitoring framework. The EU and its Member States are open to discuss relevant topics where IPBES could help the concrete implementation of the post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework in addition to the assessment on ecological connectivity.

Regarding the proposal to have a second global assessment on biodiversity and ecosystem services and an assessment on ecological connectivity

The EU and its Member States see potential in an assessment on ecological connectivity, both for the work of the IPBES, but also the post-2020 GBF of the CBD and the CMS work (as well as for other multilateral agreements). EU and its Member States+MS may also see the potential benefits of such an assessment after having reviewed the FOD of the Nexus assessment in particular the chapter 11 (starting in January 2023).

EU and its Member States are aware of the recent CMS notification 2022/008 IPBES-9 “Assessment on connectivity”, which contains a proposal for alternative action at IPBES-9, with the possibility of considering the assessment on connectivity as a fast track assessment, with only one review period and be based on an initial scoping report prepared by the MEP rather than a full scoping process assisted by additional scoping experts, foreseeing that the work on the scoping report could be started between IPBES-9 and 10 (i.e. 2022–2023). In addition, the EU and its Member States take note of the document IPBES/9/INF/27 (Item 10), “External communication: proposed assessment on connectivity”, prepared by the Secretariats of the Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals (CMS) and of the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification (UNCCD) and the UNESCO World Heritage Centre (WHC).

The EU and its Member states could therefore reflect on the possibility to decide upon the start at IPBES-9 plenary. However, the EU and its Member States are being mindful on the limitations indicated by the secretariat and the fact that one assessment cannot be prioritized over the second global assessment nor impact on the quality of any ongoing assessment. The EU and its Member States could support a “step-by-step approach” including, at IPBES-9, both the consideration of the assessment on connectivity and the second global assessment to the IPBES rolling work programme with different timelines. If feasible, the EU and its Member States could support to start the work on the scoping for the evaluation on connectivity after IPBES-9, and to start the scoping on the second global assessment after IPBES-10.

However, the EU and its Member States should be flexible in their approach, mindful that proposing the decision upon the start of any assessment at IPBES-9 might open a discussion on other potential assessments to be included in the work programme. If that would be the case, the proposals with more support could be highlighted in the IPBES decision, to be addressed at IPBES-10 (as it was done at IPBES-7 regarding a second global assessment on biodiversity and ecosystem services and an assessment on ecological connectivity). Should this put at risk the second global assessment, the connectivity assessment or any other useful demands arising from the COP-15, the EU and its Member States will refrain from insisting on deciding upon any new assessments at IPBES-9.

Agenda item 11: Organization of the Plenary; dates and venues of future sessions of the Plenary

The EU Member States that are members of IPBES and the EU in its capacity of an enhanced observer take note of the note by the secretariat on the organization of work of the Plenary and dates and venues of future sessions of the Plenary.

The EU Member States that are members of IPBES and the EU in its capacity of an enhanced observer may thank a Party for offering to host the eleventh session of the Plenary, if such an offer is announced.

The eleventh session of the Plenary should be foreseen for the second half of 2024, with particular regard to a possible CBD COP 16 date in 2024.

Proposed amendments to the draft decision (IPBES/9/1/Add.2):

The Plenary

1. **Decides** that the eleventh session of the Plenary will be held in ~~October~~ **the second half of 2024 taking into account the calendar of relevant intergovernmental meetings;**

2alt. Invites members in a position to do so to consider hosting the eleventh session of the Plenary;

3alt. Requests the Executive Secretary, under the guidance of the Bureau, to consult members of the Platform that may offer to host the eleventh session of the Plenary;

2. *Requests* the Bureau to decide on the specific dates of the eleventh session of the Plenary, taking into account the calendar of relevant intergovernmental meetings;

3. *Also requests* the Bureau to decide on the venue for the eleventh session of the Plenary, taking into account any offers from Members to host the session , which should be subject to the successful conclusion of a host country agreement;

4. *Requests* the Executive Secretary, in the event that the Bureau decides to accept the offer of a specific Government to host the eleventh session of the Plenary, to conclude and sign a host country agreement for the eleventh session of the Plenary with that Government as soon as possible, in conformity with General Assembly resolution 40/243 of 18 December 1985 and in compliance with the provisions of United Nations administrative instruction ST/AI/342;

5. *Takes note* of the draft provisional agendas for the tenth and eleventh sessions of the Plenary, which are set out in the annex to the present decision;⁴

6. *Requests* the Executive Secretary to invite members and observers that are allowed enhanced participation in accordance with decision IPBES-5/4 to provide written comments on the proposed organization of work of the tenth session of the Plenary;

7. *Also requests* the Executive Secretary to finalize the proposed organization of work for the tenth session of the Plenary in line with comments received at the ninth session of the Plenary and written comments received in response to the invitation referred to in paragraph 5 of the present decision. Annex, section II:

7 (c) bis. Scoping report for the assessment on ecological connectivity.

“Madam Chair,

I am speaking on behalf of the EU Member States that are members of IPBES and the EU in its capacity of an enhanced observer. We take note of the note by the secretariat on the organization of work of the Plenary and dates and venues of future sessions of the Plenary.

We express our appreciation to the United States for hosting the tenth session of the plenary in Wisconsin.

Concerning the draft decision, we propose an amendment to paragraph 1 to reflect that the planning of the eleventh session of the Plenary should consider possible CBD COP 16 dates in 2024. We therefore suggest to replace “October 2024” by “the second half of 2024”.

⁴ The draft provisional agendas for the tenth and eleventh sessions of the Plenary are set out in annexes I and III to document IPBES/9/13.

Next, since the venue for a session of the Plenary should be decided in accordance with the Rule 3, we believe that we it might not be necessary to add paragraphs 2, 3 and 4. We would, on the other side, like to include additional paragraph 2 to invite members to consider hosting of the eleventh session. We suggest to amend the wording of the respective paragraphs to reflect this.

Finally, we have an edition to Annex, section II, to include also the Scoping report for the assessment on ecological connectivity.

Thank you, Madam Chair.

Agenda Item 12: Institutional arrangements: United Nations collaborative partnership arrangement for the work of the Platform and its secretariat

EU Member States that are members of IPBES and the EU in its capacity of an enhanced observer take note of the report and welcome the continuous collaboration with UNEP, UNESCO, FAO and UNDP, and would like to encourage the cooperation with further multilateral environmental agreements and other international organizations.

Agenda item 13: Adoption of the decisions and report of the session

No specific actions are foreseen at this stage. Such might become necessary as a result of the discussions held during the Plenary.

Agenda item 14: Closure of the session

Closing Statement

“Madam Chair,
Madam Executive Secretary,
Your Excellencies,
Distinguished Delegates,
Ladies and Gentlemen,

The Czech Republic is speaking on behalf of the European Union and its Member States that are members of IPBES.

The Nobel Prize winner and civil rights activist Martin Luther King Jr. once said that our lives begin to end the day we become silent about things that matter. Biodiversity matters indeed, not only for our well-being and livelihoods but also for all life on Earth. This is why we welcome the important outcomes of the Ninth Plenary of the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services, in particular the approval of the summaries for policymakers of the assessments on the sustainable use of wild species and on the diverse values and valuation of nature, as they give a strong message for biodiversity conservation and sustainable use to policymakers to make well-informed and evidence-based decisions.

During our opening statement we highlighted that IPBES plays a key role due to its engagement with both science and policy. Although the negotiations here in Bonn were not always easy, we have furthermore did reach a common understanding on several key issues for the future work of IPBES, including on the business and biodiversity assessment, engagement with the IPCC or the rolling work programme.

We would like to express our sincere gratitude to all who have made this meeting possible. Firstly, to all experts contributing to the work of IPBES. We also commend the outstanding work and tireless dedication of the Chair, the Bureau, the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel and the Co-Chairs of the Working Groups. We thank the interpreters for their marvellous job of helping delegates understand the words spoken. As usual, the IPBES Secretariat, managed by the Executive Secretary, supported the delegates in a highly professional way. Once again, the first-class media coverage by IPBES helped to ensure our work is known by millions. Finally, we are very grateful to the Government of Germany for hosting the meeting.

Dear distinguished delegates, last but not least many thanks to all of you for your active engagement and stimulating discussions. We wish you a safe journey back to your homes and we are looking forward to our continued collaboration and to meeting you in 2023 in the United States of America.

Thank you, Madam Chair.”