Summary of recommendations:

There remains great potential for synergy between IUCN and IPBES, given that while our two institutions have very similar functions, the wholly intergovernmental governance of IPBES is neatly complementary with the half-government-half-NGO governance of IUCN. IUCN’s Members recognised the importance of this synergy as early as 2012, mandating “A significant role for IUCN in IPBES”, and we are delighted that this collaboration was formalized in April 2016 through a broad-based Memorandum of Understanding between IUCN and IPBES. A first Supplemental Agreement under this Memorandum of Understanding specifies $75,000 of annual in-kind support from IUCN to IPBES through dedication of a half-time position to implementation of the IPBES stakeholder engagement strategy. Against this backdrop, IUCN makes the following recommendations:

Regarding item 5 (Report of the Executive Secretary on the implementation of the first work programme for the period 2014–2018), IUCN is grateful for the acknowledgement of our in-kind contribution of technical support for the implementation of the stakeholder engagement strategy (para 11(c) of IPBES/6/2 and para 13 of IPBES/6/INF/19). As the first IPBES work programme draws to a close, we look forward to working with the platform to develop a follow-up arrangement for the second work programme.

- IUCN would like to make three suggestions regarding the IPBES assessment process, based on experience with similar processes in IUCN:
  - Drafts for review (and templates for reviewer comments) should be placed online, marked “not for citation”, to solicit as broad a review as possible, rather than establishing password protection that limits the quality, transparency, and breadth of engagement of the review;
  - Responses to reviewer comments should be made available after each round of review, to respect the huge contributions of volunteer reviewers; and
  - Strict cut-off dates for inclusion of literature should be established and published in the assessments.

- IUCN urges that the 65 as-yet-unsubmitted conflict-of-interest forms from IPBES experts (Final para of Appendix of IPBES/6/INF/22) be completed and reviewed as soon as possible.

Regarding item 6 (Regional and subregional assessments of biodiversity and ecosystem services) and item 7 (Thematic assessment of land degradation and restoration), IUCN appreciates the enormous volume of work undertaken in the delivery of the final draft of these IPBES assessments, and congratulates all involved.

- For Africa (IPBES/6/4), IUCN urges the inclusion of Figure 3.2 (main text page 185) on extinction risk across Africa, into SPM Key Message B1 (page 12).

- For the Americas (IPBES/6/5), IUCN urges the inclusion of:
  - Figure 3.29 (main text page 255) on extinction risk across the Americas, into SPM Key Message B5 (page 15);
  - Figure 3.30 (main text page 256) on the Red List Index, into SPM Key Message B5 (page 15); and
  - Figure 3.33 (main text page 260) on protected area coverage of key biodiversity areas, into SPM Key Message E4 (page 23).
For Asia-Pacific (IPBES/6/6), IUCN urges the inclusion of:
  o Figure 3.15 (main text page 270) on the Red List Index, into SPM Key Message B2 (pages 13–14); and
  o Figure 3.11 (main text page 266) on protected area coverage of key biodiversity areas, into SPM Key Message B4 (pages 15–16).

For Europe & Central Asia (IPBES/6/7), IUCN urges the inclusion of Figure 4.26 (main text page 590) on protected area coverage of key biodiversity areas, into SPM Key Message C1 (pages 14–15).

For Land Degradation & Restoration (IPBES/6/3), IUCN supports the compromise definition of land degradation reached in development of the assessment (SDM Box.1, page 8).

Regarding item 8 (Pending assessments: thematic assessment of the sustainable use of wild species; methodological assessment regarding the diverse conceptualization of multiple values of nature and its benefits; and thematic assessment of invasive alien species) and item 9 (Financial and budgetary arrangements for the Platform: (a) Budget and expenditure for the period 2014–2019; (b) Fundraising), IUCN is grateful for acknowledgement of our Support for stakeholder engagement (deliverable 4 (d)) (Table 3.2, Page 10 of IPBES/6/9).

IUCN reiterates our support for the urgency of the three pending assessments (IPBES/6/8), and recommend that they be initiated, as a priority, within the current IPBES work programme.

IUCN recalls that sustainable use and invasive species experts were enlisted to the regional assessment teams in the anticipation that their roles in these would be cross-cutting with the sustainable use and invasive species assessments themselves; the call for nominations for these two assessments (if approved) should therefore take these existing commitments into account.

IUCN intends to reiterate and update our offer of staff support for the assessment on invasive alien species (see IPBES/2/17 pages 50 & 76), should this assessment be approved to proceed.

Regarding agenda item 10 (Review of the Platform):

IUCN concurs with the finding of the internal review (Annex, Summary Section III, IPBES/6/INF/32, page 5) that the synergies and allocation of budget among IPBES’ four functions is an area in need of improvement; we very much look forward to seeing this redressed in the development of the second work programme.

IUCN agrees that finding that the task force on knowledge and data is an area in need of improvement, with more than half of the survey’s respondents disagreeing that the task force provided the necessary inputs into IPBES’ assessment processes. We have heard numerous concerns from assessment authors about imposition of poorly-conceived indicators from this taskforce, and about failure of the taskforce to coordinate with the international organisations responsible for the provision of such indicators.

IUCN recommends that the application of the IPBES conflict of interest policy be added as an explicit third criterion for selection of candidates to conduct the external review (para 3, IPBES/6/INF/33, page 1).

Regarding item 11 (Development of a second work programme):

IUCN remains concerned by the mismatch in timing between the external review, which is to be delivered to the seventh plenary (para 5, IPBES/6/10, page 2) and of “approving a second work programme of the Platform at that session” (para 3(b)(vii), IPBES/6/11, page 2). This would mean that there is no mechanism through which the external review can influence the design of the second work programme, which would violate all good practice of institutional review and adaptive management. To resolve this mismatch, we therefore suggest that the draft second work programme be considered for possible adoption by the eighth session of the IPBES plenary.

IUCN strongly agrees that “That the second work programme should reflect the implementation of the four functions of the Platform” (para 1d, IPBES/6/11, page 1). To this end, the proposed “call for requests, inputs and suggestions” should explicitly address all four of the platform’s functions.

IUCN suggests deletion of the text claiming that IPBES “has delivered on all its objectives to date” (Annex, para 1, IPBES/6/11, page 3), given that three important deliverables of the first work programme (3(b)(ii), 3(b)(iii), and 3(d)) have not even been started.

IUCN is not supportive of the proposal that the second work programme “second work programme would cover the period 2020–2030” (Annex, section I, para 8, IPBES/6/11, page 3). Even with a rolling structure, a ten-year work programme would necessarily lock in many elements, therefore leaving the platform with minimal flexibility either to learn lessons from its own implementation, or to respond to emerging issues.
Initial considerations

IUCN has for 70 years served as a science-policy interface for biodiversity and ecosystem services, with its scientific excellence delivered by its independent expert Commissions, and its policy demand delivered from its Membership of states and government agencies (responsible for half the weight of IUCN's governance) and of national and international NGOs and indigenous peoples' organisations (responsible for the other half). This governance structure of the Union is neatly complementary with that of IPBES, as a wholly intergovernmental mechanism. Given that the functions of the two institutions are so similar, IUCN's Members passed Resolution 118 at the 2012 IUCN World Conservation Congress in Jeju, Republic of Korea, mandating "A significant role for IUCN in IPBES".

Building from this basis, IUCN made an official offer of in-kind support to IPBES on 19 November 2013. This was formalized into a broad-based Memorandum of Understanding signed between the two organisations on 6 April 2016 (posted on the IPBES and IUCN websites). The Memorandum of Understanding is structured such as to allow the development of Supplemental Agreements to advance specific areas of collaboration. The first of these, signed alongside the overall Memorandum of Understanding, dedicated a half-time position from IUCN to IPBES to support implementation of the IPBES stakeholder engagement strategy. Other Supplemental Agreements are in discussion regarding Knowledge & Data, Invasive Alien Species, Capacity-building, and other issues.

Over 2017, numerous elements of the Supplemental Agreement on stakeholder engagement between IPBES and IUCN were advanced, as summarized in para 11(c) of IPBES/6/2 and detailed in para 13 of IPBES/6/INF/19. These included compilation and delivery of a summary of lessons learned from stakeholder engagement at IPBES-5, support to the IPBES Secretariat in organising the IPBES-6 stakeholder day (agenda, project team, interpreters, etc), design and launch of TRACK (the IPBES impact tracking database), support to IPBES outreach activities (ECA, social media, etc), and promotion of released assessments. Further, IUCN has continued to support the operations of open-ended inclusive stakeholder networks to IPBES, including through contributions to support the stakeholder day preceding IPBES-5, facilitate communications, and develop the community web space on IPBES portal).

Our IUCN position paper into IPBES-6 plenary is offered in the light of the context above. We are deeply grateful to the Government of France and the Gordon & Betty Moore Foundation for their support to IUCN's engagement with IPBES.

IUCN's position on item 5 of the provisional agenda - Report of the Executive Secretary on the implementation of the first work programme for the period 2014–2018 (IPBES/6/2 proposed for plenary; Sunday 18 March morning)

IUCN thanks all involved with IPBES for their hard work over the last year to deliver the progress summarised in the report of the Executive Secretary.

IUCN is grateful for the acknowledgement of our in-kind contribution of technical support for the implementation of the stakeholder engagement strategy (para 11(c) of IPBES/6/2 and para 13 of IPBES/6/INF/19). As the first IPBES work programme draws to a close, we look forward to working with the platform to develop a follow-up arrangement for the second work programme.

IUCN would like to repeat three suggestions made previously regarding mechanisms to facilitate delivery of the IPBES work programme, in all three cases drawn from IUCN experience with similar processes:

First, peer review of draft IPBES materials remains only possible through a cumbersome registration process, which risks compromising the quality of IPBES' outputs. For subsequent peer review processes, we recommend that IPBES place drafts for review (and templates for reviewer comments) online, marked "not for citation", to solicit as broad a review as possible, rather than establishing password protection that limits the quality, transparency, and breadth of engagement of the review process.
Second, the current IPBES practice is that responses to peer review comments are only made available after the completion of each deliverable. IUCN recommends modifying this practice to make responses to reviewer comments available after each round of review, to respect the huge contributions of volunteer reviewers. Again, IUCN utilises this approach in its own review processes.

Third, IPBES should establish strict cut-off dates for inclusion of literature in assessments, and publish these cut-off dates along with the description of literature search protocols used, within the text of the assessment in question. Such procedures were not used for IPBES deliverables 3(a) or 3(c), leaving it impossible for readers to determine the explanation for why various key literature sources were omitted from these assessments.

IUCN urges that the 65 as-yet-unsubmitted conflict-of-interest forms from IPBES experts (Final para of Appendix of IPBES/6/INF/22) be completed and reviewed as soon as possible, to reduce the risk of any compromise to IPBES’ integrity.

IUCN’s position on item 6 of the provisional agenda - Regional and subregional assessments of biodiversity and ecosystem services:

a) Regional and subregional assessment for Africa (IPBES/6/4 & IPBES/6/INF/3 proposed for contact group; Sunday 18 – Tuesday 20 March)

IUCN appreciates the enormous volume of work undertaken in the delivery of the final draft of the IPBES regional assessment for Africa, and warmly congratulates all involved.

Several Contributing Authors are missing from the authorship list for Chapter 3 (page 177). We will follow up directly with the relevant CLAs to ensure that this is rectified as soon as possible.

We were surprised not to see the issue of sustainable vs unsustainable harvest of wild species emerge more strongly in the SPM (further to e.g. main text Section 4.2.2.4), given recent attention to the issue e.g. in “An IUCN situation analysis of terrestrial and freshwater fauna in West and Central Africa”. This could be strengthened.

IUCN is pleased that data and knowledge mobilised against IUCN standards (2016 Nature Scientific Data) was useful in delivering the assessment. Further to this, we have three specific recommendations for strengthening the final text.

First, it would be very useful to include into the SPM, associated with Key Message B1 (page 12), a figure documenting the prevalence of extinction risk across different taxonomic groups in Africa. This figure is included in the main text as Figure 3.2 (page 185). Equivalent figures are included in the SPMs of other IPBES regional assessments (e.g. Asia-Pacific Figure SPM.4, page 14; Europe & Central Asia Figure SPM.5 upper graph, page 11).

Second, IUCN is pleased to see the inclusion of Figure SPM.5 (page 13), showing changes in numbers of threatened species in the African subregions between 2004 and 2017. However, we would suggest that this might be more powerfully portrayed as a graph of the Red List Index, with lines for each subregion documenting the associated uncertainty. IUCN has provided this graph to the Africa assessment Chairs and CLAs, and the equivalent figure is used in the SPMs of the other IPBES regional assessments (e.g. Europe and Central Asia Figure SPM.5 lower graph, page 12). This latter format is the standard structure used for presentation of Red List Indices, for example in the Global Biodiversity Outlook 4 (Figure 12.1B, page 88), the Sustainable Development Goals Report 2017 (page 49), the relevant scientific literature (e.g. 2007 PLoS ONE), and the IUCN Red List website.

Third, IUCN is also pleased to see the inclusion of Figure SPM6 (page 16), showing changes in protected area coverage of key biodiversity areas since 1970 against a map of the African subregions. However, we would suggest that this might be more powerfully portrayed as a single graph, with lines for protected area coverage of the two subsets of key biodiversity areas, documenting the associated uncertainty. IUCN has provided this graph to the Africa assessment Chairs and CLAs, and the equivalent figure is used in the other IPBES regional assessments (e.g. Americas Figure 3.33B, page 260; Asia-Pacific Figure 3.11, page 266; Europe & Central Asia Figure 4.26, page 590). This latter
format is the standard structure used for presentation of protected area coverage of key biodiversity areas, for example in the Global Biodiversity Outlook 4 (Figure 12.1D & E, page 88), the relevant scientific literature (e.g. 2012 PLoS ONE).

b) Regional and subregional assessment for the Americas (IPBES/6/5 & IPBES/6/INF/4 proposed for contact group; Sunday 18 – Tuesday 20 March)

IUCN appreciates the enormous volume of work undertaken in the delivery of the final draft of the IPBES regional assessment for the Americas, and warmly congratulates all involved.

IUCN is pleased that data and knowledge mobilised against IUCN standards (2016 Nature Scientific Data) was useful in delivering the assessment. Further to this, we have three specific recommendations for strengthening the final text.

First, it would be very useful to include into the SPM, associated with Key Message B5 (page 15), a figure documenting the prevalence of extinction risk across different taxonomic groups in the Americas. This figure is included in the main text as Figure 3.29 (page 255). Equivalent figures are included in the SPMs of other IPBES regional assessments (e.g. Asia-Pacific Figure SPM.4, page 14; Europe & Central Asia Figure SPM.5 upper graph, page 11).

Second, it would be very useful to include into the SPM, again associated with Key Message B5 (page 15), a graph of the Red List Index, with lines for each subregion documenting the associated uncertainty. This figure is included in the main text as Figure 3.30 (page 256), and the equivalent figure is used in the SPMs of the other IPBES regional assessments (e.g. Europe and Central Asia Figure SPM.5 lower graph, page 12). This is very important for consistency with presentation of Red List Indices elsewhere, for example in the Global Biodiversity Outlook 4 (Figure 12.1B, page 88), the Sustainable Development Goals Report 2017 (page 49), the relevant scientific literature (e.g. 2007 PLoS ONE), and the IUCN Red List website.

Third, it would also be very useful to include a graph into the SPM, associated with Key Message E4 (page 23), with lines for protected area coverage of the two subsets of key biodiversity areas, documenting the associated uncertainty. This figure is included in the main text as Figure 3.33 (page 260), and the equivalent figure is used in the other IPBES regional assessments (e.g. Asia-Pacific Figure 3.11, page 266; Europe & Central Asia Figure 4.26, page 590). This is very important for consistency with presentation of the indicator of protected area coverage of key biodiversity areas elsewhere, for example in the Global Biodiversity Outlook 4 (Figure 12.1D & E, page 88), and the relevant scientific literature (e.g. 2012 PLoS ONE).

c) Regional and subregional assessment for Asia and the Pacific (IPBES/6/6 & IPBES/6/INF/5 (proposed for contact group; Sunday 18 – Tuesday 20 March)

IUCN appreciates the enormous volume of work undertaken in the delivery of the final draft of the IPBES regional assessment for the Asia-Pacific region, and warmly congratulates all involved.

We were surprised not to see the importance of the Asia-Pacific region for the conservation of coral reef species and ecosystems emerge more strongly in the SPM. This could be strengthened.

IUCN is pleased that data and knowledge mobilised against IUCN standards (2016 Nature Scientific Data) was useful in delivering the assessment. Further to this, we have three specific recommendations for strengthening the final text.

First, IUCN is very pleased to see the inclusion of Figure SPM.4, documenting the prevalence of extinction risk across different taxonomic groups in the Asia-Pacific subregions; this figure should be retained here in the SPM. The figure is included in the main text as Figure 3.14 (page 269). Equivalent figures are included in the SPMs of other IPBES regional assessments (e.g. Europe & Central Asia Figure SPM5 upper graph, page 11).

Second, it would be very useful to include into the SPM a graph, associated with Key Message B2 (pages 13–14), of the Red List Index, with lines for each subregion documenting the associated
uncertainty. This figure is included in the main text as Figure 3.15 (page 270), and an equivalent figure is used in the SPMs of the other IPBES regional assessments (e.g. Europe and Central Asia Figure SPM5 lower graph, page 12). This is very important for consistency with presentation of Red List Indices elsewhere, for example in the Global Biodiversity Outlook 4 (Figure 12.1B, page 88), the Sustainable Development Goals Report 2017 (page 49), the relevant scientific literature (e.g. 2007 PLoS ONE), and the IUCN Red List website.

Third, it would also be very useful to include a graph, associated with Key Message B4 (pages 15–16), with lines for protected area coverage of the two subsets of key biodiversity areas, documenting the associated uncertainty. This figure is included in the main text as Figure 3.11 (page 266), and the equivalent figure is used in the other IPBES regional assessments (e.g. Europe & Central Asia Figure 4.26, page 590). This is very important for consistency with presentation of the indicator of protected area coverage of key biodiversity areas elsewhere, for example in the Global Biodiversity Outlook 4 (Figure 12.1D & E, page 88), and the relevant scientific literature (e.g. 2012 PLoS ONE).

d) Regional and subregional assessment for Europe and Central Asia (IPBES/6/7 & IPBES/6/INF/6 (proposed for contact group; Sunday 18 – Tuesday 20 March)

IUCN appreciates the enormous volume of work undertaken in the delivery of the final draft of the IPBES regional assessment for the Europe and Central Asia region, and warmly congratulates all involved.

IUCN is pleased that data and knowledge mobilised against IUCN standards (2016 Nature Scientific Data) was useful in delivering the assessment. Further to this, we have two specific recommendations for strengthening the final text.

First, IUCN is very pleased to see the inclusion of Figure SPM.5, documenting the prevalence of extinction risk across different taxonomic groups (upper graph, page 11) and Red List Indices (lower graph, page 12) in the Europe and Central Asia subregions; this figure should be retained here in the SPM. The figure is included in the main text as Figures 3.44 (page 371) and 3.45 (page 372). Equivalent figures are also included in the SPMs of other IPBES regional assessments (e.g. Asia-Pacific Figure SPM.4, page 14).

Second, it would also be very useful to include in the SPM a graph, associated with Key Message C1 (pages 14–15), with lines showing protected area coverage of the two subsets of key biodiversity areas, and documenting the associated uncertainty. This figure is included in the main text as Figure 4.26 (page 590), and the equivalent figure is used in the other IPBES regional assessments (e.g. Americas Figure 3.33B, page 260; Asia-Pacific Figure 3.11, page 266). This is very important for consistency with presentation of the indicator of protected area coverage of key biodiversity areas elsewhere, for example in the Global Biodiversity Outlook 4 (Figure 12.1D & E, page 88), and the relevant scientific literature (e.g. 2012 PLoS ONE).

IUCN's position on item 7 of the provisional agenda - Thematic assessment of land degradation and restoration

IUCN appreciates the enormous volume of work undertaken in the delivery of the final draft of the IPBES thematic assessment of land degradation and restoration, and warmly congratulates all involved.

IUCN is pleased that data and knowledge mobilised against IUCN standards was useful in delivering the assessment. We note, for example, that the important Figure SPM.11 is derived from combining data from IUCN Red List of Threatened Species with economic and trade data; this figure should be retained here in the SPM.

IUCN supports the compromise definition of land degradation reached in development of the assessment (SDM Box.1, page 8); this definition should be retained here in the SPM.

IUCN's position on item 8 of the provisional agenda - Pending assessments: thematic assessment of the sustainable use of wild species; methodological
assessment regarding the diverse conceptualization of multiple values of nature and its benefits; and thematic assessment of invasive alien species; and on item 9 of the provisional agenda - Financial and budgetary arrangements for the Platform: (a) Budget and expenditure for the period 2014–2019; (b) Fundraising (IPBES/6/8 and IPBES/6/9) proposed for contact group lunchtime Monday 19 & Tuesday 20, afternoon Wednesday 21, morning Thursday 22, and all day Friday 23 March)

IUCN reiterates our support for the urgency of the three pending assessments, and recommend that they be initiated, as a priority, within the current IPBES work programme.

We also recall that numerous sustainable use and invasive species experts were enlisted to the regional assessment teams in the anticipation that their roles in these would be cross-cutting with the sustainable use and invasive species assessments themselves; the process for call for nominations for these two assessments (if approved) should therefore take these existing commitments into account.

On 19 November 2013, IUCN made a formal offer of in-kind support to “Staff support to assessments or work of the task forces”, specifying that “This will represent assignment of IUCN staff of 0.5 Full Time Equivalent per year. This contribution will last for the whole period 2014-18. In 2014 and 2015, IUCN will assign half the time of a professional staff for supporting the assessment on invasive alien species.” This offer was welcomed by IPBES Decision 2/5 X (see IPBES/2/17 page 50) and documented in Annex VII to this Decision (IPBES/2/17 page 76). IUCN intends to reiterate and update this offer, within the context of the IUCN-IPBES Memorandum of Understanding, if the sixth plenary approves development of the full thematic assessment on invasive alien species.

IUCN is grateful for acknowledgement of our Support for stakeholder engagement (deliverable 4 (d)) (Table 3.2, Page 10 of IPBES/6/9).

**IUCN’s position on item 10 of the provisional agenda - Review of the Platform** (IPBES/6/10, IPBES/6/INF/32, and IPBES/6/INF/33 proposed for contact group morning Wednesday 21, evening Thursday 22, and all day Friday 23 March)

IUCN sees the external review as being of crucial importance to the future of IPBES. Looking forward towards this, IUCN recommends that the application of the IPBES conflict of interest policy be added as an explicit third criterion for selection of candidates to conduct the external review (para 3, IPBES/6/INF/33, page 1).

IUCN largely agrees with the findings of the internal review (IPBES/6/10 and IPBES/6/INF/32). We would like to emphasise two key points raised by the internal review.

First, the internal review highlights that “Synergies between the four functions of IPBES are considered to be an area in need of improvement. The allocation of the budget among the various deliverables of IPBES was considered “fair”. Synergies and balance between the four functions are an important consideration for the development of the second work programme.” (Annex, Summary Section III, IPBES/6/INF/32, page 5).

This is an issue about which IUCN has raised concern throughout the first work programme (2014 Trends in Ecology & Evolution), and we very much look forward to seeing it fully addressed in the development of the second IPBES work programme.

Second, the internal review found that “The question regarding the work of the task force on knowledge and data received the lowest rating among the various aspects of the work on knowledge and data, with 51% of 51 respondents answering that they disagree or strongly disagree with the proposition that the task force provided, in time, the necessary inputs to assessments. Processes used to manage the data and information used in assessments were rated “fair” (mean rating of 3.0). The question to what degree IPBES has established appropriate links with other international initiatives and identified and used existing data sets held by partner organizations received a mean rating of 3.4, with 47% of 64
respondents rating it “good” or “very good”.” (Annex, Detailed Section ID, para 39, IPBES/6/INF/32, pages 8–9).

We heard numerous concerns from assessment authors about imposition of poorly-conceived indicators from the taskforce on knowledge and data (and in particular its taskgroup on indicators), and failure of the taskforce to coordinate with the international organisations responsible for the provision of such indicators. The list of ‘IPBES core indicators’ served little purpose, because it was not developed in consultation with assessment authors and did not consider the specific needs of individual assessments or their chapters. The graphics produced were not informed by or adapted to user-needs, and the attempts to stifle assessment author teams’ ability to present and adapt these indicators as needed were wholly inappropriate. It would have been much more useful had the taskforce and taskgroup focused on guidance and advice, and facilitation of connections between authors and indicator providers.

IUCN’s position on item 11 of the provisional agenda – Development of a second work programme (IPBES/6/11 proposed for contact group morning Wednesday 21, evening Thursday 22, and all day Friday 23 March)

IUCN remains concerned by the mismatch in timing between the external review, which is to be delivered to the seventh plenary (para 5, IPBES/6/10, page 2) and of “approving a second work programme of the Platform at that session” (para 3(b)(vii), IPBES/6/11, page 2). It is clearly essential that “the final review will inform the development of the work programme for the next period” (Annex I, Section II, Objective 4(e) of IPBES/2/17; page 60). If both documents are to be delivered to the seventh plenary, then there will be no mechanism through which the external review can influence the design of the second work programme, in violation of all good practice of institutional review and adaptive management.

To resolve this mismatch, we therefore suggest that the draft second work programme be considered for possible adoption by the eighth session of the IPBES plenary. This would give sufficient time to ensure that the results of the external review were fully and appropriately incorporated into the development of the draft second work programme. It would also allow time for initiation of the three pending assessments before the closure of the first work programme.

IUCN strongly agrees that “That the second work programme should reflect the implementation of the four functions of the Platform” (para 1d, IPBES/6/11, page 1), a point that we have echoed throughout the first IPBES work programme (Brooks et al. 2014 TREE). To this end, the proposed “call for requests, inputs and suggestions” should explicitly address all four of the platform’s functions. Indeed, the development of the second work programme could even look towards a focus on capacity building, policy support, or knowledge generation, to redress the skewed emphasis on assessments from the first work programme.

IUCN suggests deletion of the text claiming that IPBES “has delivered on all its objectives to date” (Annex, para 1, IPBES/6/11, page 3), given that three important deliverables of the first work programme (3(b)(ii), 3(b)(iii), and 3(d)) have not even been started.

IUCN is not supportive of the proposal that the second work programme “second work programme would cover the period 2020–2030” (Annex, section I, para 8, IPBES/6/11, page 3). Even with a rolling structure, a ten-year work programme would necessarily lock in many elements, therefore leaving the platform with minimal flexibility either to learn lessons from its own implementation, or to respond to changing drivers of change in biodiversity and ecosystem services, or to the broader political and economic context. We recommend that IPBES work programmes be retained on five year cycles, such that the third IPBES work programme, in due course, inform “efforts to implement the follow-up to the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011–2020, the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, including the Sustainable Development Goals, and the Paris Agreement on Climate Change”.