



Stakeholder Engagement: Feedback from the breakout group

PESC-4

**Vácrátót, Hungary
12-14 June 2017**

Facilitated by:

Rob Spaul – IPBES Head of Communications

Laurence Perianin, IUCN Technical Support Officer for IPBES



www.ipbes.net



**Food and Agriculture
Organization of the
United Nations**



empowered lives.
Resilient nations.

According to you, what would be the best « non financial » way to encourage stakeholders from ECA to engage/engage more with IPBES?

QUESTION - 1

Question – 1: feedback on “non financial” incentives

PR; social media; advertisement; producing excellent assessments; Networking; understanding the needs of stakeholder; reputation; Translating ~~key~~ document and info, assessments, SPMs etc. into all of the ECA languages; national platforms + meetings;

- DIALOG SPACE ↗
- RELEVANCE for DAILY WORK
- VISIBILITY of GROUPS of SHs


OFFERING GREATER → agreed.

- GIVING INFO/KNOWLEDGE GAPS TO SCIENTISTS FOR THEIR FUTURE RESEARCH (TO MAKE IT MORE RELEVANT)
- SOCIAL INNOVATION for e.g. BUSINESS (CAPITALISATION, ADDED VALUE → SOCIAL RESPONSIBILITY, ETC)
- producing material directed to specific stakeholder groups
SPM → 'summary for business sector'

- PR
- Social media
- Advertisement
- producing excellent assessments
- Networking
- Understanding the needs of stakeholders
- reputation
- Translating key documents and information, assessments SPMs etc in all of the ECA languages
- National platforms, dialog spaces and meetings
- Relevance for daily work
- Offering greater visibility to groups of Stakeholders
- Giving info/knowledge gaps to scientists for their future research (to make it more relevant)
- Social innovation for e.g. business (capitalisation, added values → social responsibility, etc)
- Producing material directed to specific stakeholder groups
- SPM → summary for business sector

Question – 1: feedback on “non financial” incentives


- Stakeholders publication demonstrating impact + acknowledging contributions , list of contributors and authors
- “open” database of knowledge and methodologies stakeholders can use in their work
- Development of software = translation in relevant languages
- Motivation for different groups
- Coordinated and linked stakeholders at global level = influence on global stakeholder strategy on biodiversity actions and policies
- Legislative regulation of the process of IPBES



According to your experience, which specific parts of IPBES stakeholder engagement, as currently implemented, work best and worst – and why?

QUESTION – 2


Question – 2: feedback on what works...



- Engaging natural scientists and NGOs for assess
- Nice visuals
- Spreading the word about IPBES work via social media
- IPBES-5 stakeholder day with live stream
- BSPIN event before IPBES-5
- Networking
- Exchange of experience
- YouTube videos explaining the process
- Brings together all relevant EU conventions + directives
- Tracking the after process
- Interaction with CBD / uptake of results
- Topic of pollination for the 1st assessment (works with agricultural vector)

Question – 2: ...and what don't

- Spreading the word about the existence of IPBES to new SHs
- Engaging social scientists and private sector and ILK holders
- Overcoming the language barrier (everything is in English)
- Lack of interest (country dependent)
- Spreading the word about IPBES to the wide public
- Youth engagement
- Influence on IPBES work pros ??
- Stakeholder expert nomination should be improved
- Monitoring of effectiveness of engagement -> what is done with it afterwards?
- NGO that participate to plenaries and are active have focus on charismatic biodiversity locations but not inclusive globally
- Clarity of process and how to take part.
- Engaging practitioners (planning, urban development, agriculture, forestry, ...) because of implementation gaps



In ECA (EE in the IPBES Survey) the **private sector**, **science networks** and **ILK groups** have been identified as priority gaps in the IPBES stakeholder registry – please suggest three or more organizations/groups from your network of contacts that you believe would be good prospects to recruit as IPBES stakeholders.

QUESTION - 3

Question – 3: feedback on Private sector

PRIVATE SECTOR

EU Business@Biodiversity Platform

E-WOVA

World Business Council for Sustainable Development

Biodiversity in good Company

Association for Ecological Farming

Natural Capital Coalition.


Commonland

CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

- EU Business at Biodiversity platform
- E-WOVA
- WBCSD
- Biodiversity in good company
- Association for ecological farming
- Natural capital coalition
- Common land
- Chamber of commerce


Question – 3: feedback on Science Networks

- IFSA eV and YPARD
- Centre for ecology and natural resources
faculty of science UNSA
- Backan nature net (BNH)
- Scientific centre of zoology and hydro-
ecology of national academy of science of
Armenia
- FARA
- GLF
- MEDCOAST foundation
- LYNET (finland)
- FPWC – Armenia (comm linked to
conservation)
- ESP
- Slovak academy of science
- PEDRR
- Center for bio ressources of Belarus
- Association “Fauna” (Ukraine)
- NGO EKAPRAEKT (Belarus)



Question – 3: feedback on ILK groups

- COIAB
- IIPFCC
- Sami parliament
- Wehea Dayak community Indonesia
- IFOAM international forum for organic agriculture
- LAG's Local action groups
- AMAN indigenous peoples alliance ? Archipelago
- Indigenous peoples' partnership on climate change, forest and sustainable development
- Indigenous peoples pact
- IITC international Indian Treaty Council



Question – 3: feedback on public sector

Category added by participants

- SWG
- Communities for Biodiversity (Germany)
- ICLEI
- Regional environmental centre for the Caucasus (RECC) Georgia
- NGO Bright
- RCC-RWGE; BD task force; BIMR platform (ORF BD GIZ)
- WESSA (WESSA.org.za)
- Foundation for environmental education (fee global)

