Strengthening the Role of Science in the Implementation of the IUCN Programme 2013-2016

4-7 December 2012

Bellagio Center, Italy

Contents

Executive Summary

Through generous support from MAVA and the Rockefeller Foundation, this workshop gathered together some 20 experts from IUCN and beyond. Three objectives were achieved: key scientific issues within the IUCN Programme 2013-2016 and six of the IUCN flagship Knowledge Products were identified; the impact goals of the Programme were reflected on; and potential partnerships were recognised. Participants validated ideas regarding the implementation of the IUCN Programme 2013-2016 and the development of Knowledge Products and suggested a number of new perspectives to improve and strengthen the work as it progresses. Particular areas where the IUCN Science Advisory Board could have a significant role were identified, including collaborations with regard to IPBES.

Significant outcomes from the meeting include:

- In order to address a number of scientific challenges within the 3 programme areas of the new IUCN Programme 2013-2016, IUCN could and should collaborate further with other organisations to better leverage the best available scientific expertise necessary for its work;
- There are noteworthy issues beyond those with which the Knowledge Products deal;
- The role of social science is crucial and could be better highlighted in several aspects of the IUCN Programme 2013-2016 and the Knowledge Products. Social science can also help with solutions to some of the issues highlighted by the workshop;
- The Knowledge Products must be accompanied by adequate guidance for decision-makers on how to interpret and use them;
- The role of IUCN in the new social science-related Knowledge Products (e.g. Natural Resource Governance Framework, Index of Human Dependency on Nature) under development must be carefully considered as it will be significantly different from its role in the more spatial-oriented Knowledge Products (e.g. Red Lists; World Database of Protected Areas; and, Key Biodiversity Areas);
- Several potential partnership opportunities with institutions and networks such as UNESCO, ICSU, SCOPE and TWAS were identified;
- Three mapping exercises need to be undertaken: 'Who is doing what where' so that we avoid duplication; potential partners to reach out to for better synergies and collaboration; and, which other target audiences inside and outside the conservation community we should keep in mind;
- The scientific community still has some work to do to both communicate clearly enough and to instil a sense of urgency regarding issues related to nature conservation;
- We (human species) must think of ourselves as part of nature rather than separate and communicate that solutions for nature are actually solutions for ourselves.

Introduction

This workshop brought together representatives from each of the principal science resources of IUCN – the Commissions, the Secretariat and the IUCN Science Advisory Board – as well as external scientists, to reflect on how science (both biophysical and social sciences) can enhance the implementation of the new IUCN Programme 2013-2016 and the development of six flagship Knowledge Products and how IUCN can expand its links to organisations and individuals across a variety of conservation-relevant disciplines.

Objectives

1. To identify the key scientific issues within the three Programme Areas of the new IUCN Programme 2013-2016 and six IUCN flagship Knowledge Products.

2. To reflect on whether the impact goals of the Programme 2013-2016 are realistic, achievable and measurable from a scientific point of view.

3. To identify partnerships which could be developed with organizations who are interested in the work of IUCN especially as regards the use of IUCN Knowledge Products to advance conservation and sustainable development.

I.   Programme Areas

Participants were asked to reflect on the key scientific issues of the three Programme Areas, following short presentations of the main aspects of each.

Programme Area 1: Valuing and conserving nature

Preliminary remarks proposed that IUCN could leverage its work with other organisations better and more effectively. Advice pinpointed the fact that the international scientific community is changing fast, with examples including the rise of citizen science and the increase in data-intensive science and spatially structured databases.

There are several scientific issues beyond the Knowledge Products of IUCN that also need to be considered. Throughout the discussion, a list of these was proposed and added to by several participants.

1. Emerging infectious diseases
2. Climate change adaptation
3. Adaptation to ocean acidification
4. Ecosystem restoration, connectivity and species reintroduction
5. Invasive species control
6. Integrated pest management
7. Research on conservation effectiveness
8. Migration (migratory species and migratory systems)
9. Sustainability and livelihoods (what works in conservation?)
10. Arctic and Antarctic challenges

11. New ecosystems (e.g. dams) and urban ecosystems
12. Conflicts over land and water use
13. Population growth
14. Pollution (Aichi Target 8) and ecological impacts of mixed pollutants

Comments on this list focused on the need to prioritise areas and to ensure that all the areas are covered by one organisation or another, flagging the need for a mapping exercise to understand the current position among the conservation and wider scientific community. With a map in place, we could better know who to go to in order to work on specific topics.

Several participants highlighted that we are not winning the race against current challenges, for example, global warming. This inherently leads to questions as to how we measure the effect international scientific organisations are having and why we are failing. Organisations must collaborate or risk losing further on the race against biodiversity loss and other environmental challenges. Leading on from these questions about why we are failing, participants addressed the issue of why we have also failed to instil a sense of urgency. Contributors suggested that there are various failings in the way that we are communicating the issues both within and beyond the scientific community. Currently, the conservation and ecology community is perceived as specialist by outside groups and therefore left alone, and this situation has somehow become acceptable to the scientists working inside these fields. Nature must be redefined as the life support of the planet and made relevant to all. This could be achieved by better communication and collaboration. As well as increased communication among scientists and better sharing of research, communication to non-scientific communities must also be improved. Questions about how IUCN reaches its target audience were raised and the psychology of decision making is one area that was suggested could help with this. It is important to ensure that the right messages are being communicated in the right way to the right audiences. IUCN must improve on simplifying concepts and providing clear signposts and guidance in order to share these with non-conservationists.

The role of social science in Programme Area 1 and beyond was widely discussed and contributors suggested that IUCN should not just strengthen the science, but also be more explicit about the role of social science. This is integral and it cannot just be assumed that it is in the Programme – it must be highlighted. It was pointed out that social science is what connects the two elements of the IUCN vision – ***a just world that values and conserves nature***. Propositions to operationalize the '<u>just</u>' dimension are not explicit in the Programme. Social science can particularly help to shed light on not only why we have so far failed to translate awareness into action, but also who is making the decisions that have led to this. At present, IUCN focuses much of its attention on governments (sometime forgetting the fact that governments change all the time and that decisions made by one government can be undone by the next one), but in order to succeed, communities must also be involved. Hand in hand with this aspect, participants also suggested that IUCN should not limit its resources to 'western' science, but also integrate and increase the emphasis on traditional and local knowledge, especially from a resilience point of view in the context of climate change.

Tools for scaling up successful experiences were also mentioned, including the role of technology (as an opportunity to link up to industry). We also need to address the negative image attached to the concept of "valuation" in some communities which interpret or perceive this approach as an attempt to "commoditize/merchandise" nature, but rather

recognize and communicate better that valuation is a tool that can provide incentives to do good things for nature conservation.

Participants went on to discuss how to prioritise what IUCN can do. It was recognized that relative to its mission, IUCN is 'cash poor' but 'knowledge rich' and therefore we cannot possibly tackle all the issues listed above at once. It was suggested that a refinement of the concept of biodiversity is needed as not all biodiversity can be preserved and some is more important and more urgent to preserve from irreversible loss. One way of prioritizing might be to identify which areas are important for conservation for both nature and people. Collaboration with other organisations especially around the IPBES could help in achieving this.

Programme Area 2: Effective and Equitable Governance of Nature's Use

Preliminary discussion points were proposed as follows:
1. How policy decisions about nature's use are made and implemented
2. How IUCN Congress resolutions related to governance and equity are followed up and implemented and how scientists and global scientific institutions can assist in implementation
3. Governance of nature's use as a crosscutting theme and the work of the IUCN Commission on Environmental Law in this regard
4. How to strengthen the work on indigenous peoples' rights issues
5. How to identify good practices and success stories on benefits of good governance for local communities
6. How to strengthen relationship between this programme area and CBD and IPBES
7. Linkages with e.g. IPBES, ICSU, International Council for Social Sciences

This Programme Area instigated also discussions on who the audiences are and how to get them involved. In particular, it was identified as important to define who the major stakeholders and decision-makers are. It was also suggested that the scientific community should help set the goals for conservation and should be there to provide the methodology behind decisions. Participants also called for IUCN to help bridge the gap between social and natural sciences, in particular to help break the barriers that are established due to the use of jargon. It was also pointed out that 'governance' is an elusive concept – which can be normative or prescriptive - and it will be important to unpack this term and the various interpretations given to it in the course of implementing this Programme Area.

Participants called for highlighting good practice and publicising success stories regarding governance. Elinor Ostrom's work (2008 Economics Nobel Prize winner) was highlighted as relevant, in particular her eight design principles for stable local common pool resource management. Participants recommended IUCN conducts more community-centric research to inspire hope in this arena. It was agreed that 'bottom up' processes are necessary, as the closer you get to the ground, the more likely it is to get tangible outcomes. In implementing this Programme Area, it will be important to focus on decisions rather than on institutions that make them and address the question of how to create 'movements' around effective and equitable governance of nature's use. An increase in engagement with local governments and communities was called for, particularly as governments are often led by society. Networks such as ICLEI would be important audiences to influence in this regard. It was

noted also that there is limited political will for nature conservation (linked to the short-termism approach that characterizes many governments decision-making) and this calls for different influencing approaches to encompass also 'infiltrating' the spheres of decision-making at several levels – local, national, regional. There is also the dimension of legislation and there were calls for the Commission on Environmental Law to conduct more research and lobby parliaments. Adequate regulatory frameworks are needed to create the right incentives for effective and equitable governance of nature's use.

It was noted also that the conservation community is based on short-term projects of 3-5 years. There is growing evidence that longer-term projects are more effective within the community, government and NGOs. Suggestions arose that research into this aspect would be beneficial, as would consultation with the donor community, with emphasis on projects that are built around the Ecosystem Approach principles (which include social justice and equity considerations).

Participants also suggested that IUCN could have a significant role in conflict management and with the private sector, as well as the political sphere. Within the private sector, it was suggested that rewards and recognition have significant impacts and could be used more widely. Contributors also flagged that scientific organisations which work on some of these natural resource topics (e.g. water, forests, etc) have their own governance structures and we must learn to work better with each other and mobilise communities.

Programme Area 3: Deploying Nature-Based Solutions to Global Challenges in Climate, Food, Development

Participants pointed the distinction between conserving biodiversity for its own sake compared with conserving biodiversity in order to provide nature-based solutions to some global challenges (i.a. food security, climate change, development). It was suggested that the latter is the core of this Programme Area and needs to be communicated well (the former being the subject of Programme Area 1): to sell nature conservation as one approach in a suite of possible solutions to global challenges, while recognizing that these challenges are also threats to biodiversity. Science needs to provide answers for the long term justification of why we need to conserve nature and provide evidence that this kind of approach (nature-based solutions) is working, from an ecological point of view as well as for bringing benefits to people. In this sense the three Programme Areas of the IUCN programme 2013-2016 complement each other very well.

It was proposed that working together with local communities is key, as is working with the government to provide solutions and incentivise local people, and we will need to take an integrated approach when promoting nature-based solutions.

Suggestions for additional challenges for nature-based solutions were mentioned and included water, energy, health and poverty. Other challenges and emerging issues (such as deep sea mining, transport routes in the Artic) were also flagged and a suggestion was made that there are topics which IUCN Commissions could identify and put on the agenda.

Participants suggested using conservation approaches for global challenges. Proposals were made to research whether conservation issues could be fixed on the way to fixing

global challenges, e.g. whether by addressing food security issues we can restore Key Biodiversity Areas.

Regarding how the knowledge generated in this programme area will be made accessible to benefit the world, it was highlighted that as a provider of "credible and trusted knowledge", IUCN has to be careful not to "oversell" its work and has a responsibility to nurture the trust built up over the many years of working with communities and other partners. It was suggested that there should always be an adherence to the principle of doing more than is publicised.

II.   Knowledge Products

The Knowledge Products were presented to the group in pairs in short presentations, followed by discussions on the scientific issues that the participants felt were key to the products.

Red List of Threatened Species and World Database on Protected Areas

Participants applauded the effort to integrate datasets but raised questions about the longer term strategy for sustaining the IT platform that supports the datasets. Computer science is an important issue in relation to the Red List of Threatened Species. It was agreed that the website system can only be as good as the investment in it in this respect. Although partnerships have been developed and this has benefits, the group encouraged more linkages to be built, particularly with research institutes and the computer science interdisciplinary initiatives. Contributors agreed that there is a need to assess but this will be challenging as there is an acute shortage of taxonomists in many parts of the world. Another challenge identified by participants is that of prioritising which groups of species need to be assessed. This was agreed by the group as one significant challenge that is already being undertaken on the basis of ecologically representation and usefulness, for example. Using keystone species as a way of prioritising was also suggested. There was also mention of negative examples of how the Red List is perceived in some countries. Real-time monitoring was also acknowledged as another significant challenge. It was suggested that developing an App would be useful for fieldwork.

The social aspects of both the Red List of Threatened Species and the World Database on Protected Areas were discussed. It was highlighted that both databases were started when IUCN was not yet engaged in equity and community rights and the information was sometimes gathered without the criteria needed now to access information at local levels. It was highlighted that there are still communities who disagree with some Protected Areas, and although over time many have now been legitimised, there is still work to be done in this arena. It was suggested that some of these issues may also be tackled by the other new Knowledge Products to be discussed.

Key Biodiversity Areas and the Red List of Ecosystems

The definition proposed for Key Biodiversity Areas as "***sites that contribute significantly to the global persistence of biodiversity***" was found useful by participants. However, one participant suggested that we may need to find a name that resonates better in multiple

languages and make the concept easier to understand by the non-conservation community (for example, KBAs might be confusing for a Minister of Finance…).

The general reaction to these two Knowledge Products was one of overall support for the initiative, but a query as to whether it is too ambitious. There was a feeling of urgency from some participants, a suggestion of collaboration with UNESCO (through the MAB programme) and confirmation that these products would be very useful to institutions such as the World Bank and its clients. The Key Biodiversity Areas were highlighted as particularly crucial for developing policies on social development.

It was suggested that it is of utmost importance to facilitate participation from decision-makers right from the very beginning of these processes as this will make them more sustainable in the long term. Investment in local decision-making capacity was also highlighted. It was proposed that different presentations of the data will be needed for different users and an end user analysis will be needed.

There was discussion around the processes of both these Knowledge Products. General guidance included making sure that the Key Biodiversity Areas are not prescriptive, but instead should support decision-making. There were also calls for guidance to accompany the products. Support was given for a bottom-up approach, although the standards will be developed at a global level, they will be applied at a regional one, which is also a good entry point. It was recommended that the role of IUCN in assisting member countries in classifying Key Biodiversity Areas must be clarified.

It was mentioned that the motivation behind the Red List of Ecosystems was requests from governments (originating from an IUCN Resolution at the Barcelona Congress of 2008). It was recommended that case studies in these countries should be developed as soon as possible to encourage others.

Challenges such as natural ecosystems within cities and urban ecosystems will need to be addressed. It was also noted that climate change is not well reflected in the Red Lists criteria while it can lead species to extinctions and ecosystems to collapse.

Noting that the development plan of these products will stretch over several years up to 2015, participants suggested that 2020 is a crucial year (the end point of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and the UN Decade for Biodiversity) and it is important to have at least something out before then.

Natural Resource Governance Framework (NRGF) and Index of Human Dependency on Nature (HDN)

The overriding perspective of the group was that this is very important work that IUCN is proposing to take on. However, there were also concerns that this is opening a 'Pandora's Box' and that IUCN must have a very different role in this than in other Knowledge Products which are more spatial-oriented and whose link to conservation is more obvious and more straightforward.

Participants acknowledged that it is a welcome development that IUCN is now looking also at the vulnerability of communities, in addition to and as part of ecological vulnerability. Again, IUCN should take this opportunity to build on Elinor Ostrom's legacy,

and the work done by CEESP over the years. IUCN must aim at rigorous information to close the policy gaps – and especially to empower communities to make better choices for the sustainability of their own livelihoods. The development of these Knowledge Products requires rigorous peer review.

It was proposed that the HDN builds upon a critically important message for IUCN – the direct dependence of the poor on wild resources. It must also contain a risk assessment, especially related to natural disasters. IUCN needs to clarify the relationship between human dependency on nature and human wellbeing. The question of how the HDN will actually measure this was highlighted. Participants highlighted that it is not only the poor, but also the rich who make use of natural resources. To maintain a focus on the poor, food security issues should be emphasised. Some national development plans have already started to recognise subsistence practices and the consumption of non-monetised natural resources.

It was suggested that the NRGF focus on *decisions* is very good but IUCN must look at decisions in all sectors and across all stakeholders. However, can IUCN also get *nature's rights* into the analysis as good decisions should be for all (both nature and people)?

The HDN focus on food security and livelihood must also incorporate the livelihood importance of species. It has the potential to deliver what IUCN has so far not delivered compellingly (the connection between species and livelihoods). However, IUCN needs to ascertain what the "spine" of the HDN is and participants queried whether it is household income. IUCN needs to be precise about the difference between use and dependency in this case.

While it is great that IUCN is finally branding itself as caring also for people, there were some concerns about being careful that humans are not talked about in the same context as species and the Knowledge Products must be sensitive to this.

It was suggested that "natural resources" is an outdated concept and there should instead be a focus on landscape/seascape, ecosystems or biodiversity.

Participants thought that while IUCN can develop the framework for these two knowledge products, it is important to consider who will take the responsibility – and accountability – for data collection.

It was also mentioned that the NRGF should not be neutral. Instead, it should be rights-based, e.g. incorporating Free Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC). It is also worth noting that these Knowledge Products are not starting from scratch, but instead building on previous tools.

It was suggested that IUCN should have a very different role with these two Knowledge Products – as a knowledge broker, not a knowledge producer. It is a crowded territory and IUCN must find its niche, based on biophysical resources / ecosystems. On the NRGF, IUCN needs to unravel: Who (stakeholder analysis / decision focus); What (what kind of decisions); and How (institutions, practices and customs). On the HDN, IUCN should push for inclusion of HDN into the array of household surveys being undertaken by the World Bank and many others. IUCN should not try to do free-standing HDN analyses.

Participants recommended that initially, the NRGF should focus on the landscape level. In the longer run, it may also assist in monitoring the implementation of the Multilateral Environmental Agreements (MEAs).

As the NRGF is portrayed to be also used as an indicator of good governance of nature's use, IUCN will need to consider the question of whether these indicators should be outcome based or process based. It was noted that outcome indicators tend to be "lagging" in time, whereas process indicators can lead the process. On the HDN knowledge product, it was mentioned that the objective of the initiative as currently stands does not provide a specific niche for IUCN because any organisation could carry out the work. The view was also expressed that in doing the HDN, IUCN should recognise dependency and not necessarily aim to reduce it. The target audiences need to be clarified as this will determine the messages that will be developed

The NRGF underlies all the other knowledge products. It is also an opportunity to bring social and natural scientists together, to find the IUCN niche. For HDN, the vulnerability index should also include access to decision-making. Natural resource governance usually has a sectoral starting-point, but the NRGF must be cross-sectoral.

Participants queried whether IUCN needs to talk of a Knowledge *Product*. Instead, it was suggested that it is knowledge for action / transformation. It was suggested that IUCN needs an operational definition of Knowledge Products and a participant mentioned that the International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI) has a useful definition. Other suggestions included using the Maori term of 'basket'. It was proposed that Knowledge *Product* refers to something complete rather than ongoing or dynamic.

IUCN was also advised to be careful not to view nature as something external to be studied, controlled and used for human needs. Rather, humankind and nature are one and nature conservation is not separate from human development.

The HDN is an IUCN message, aimed at enhancing the choice of poor households. The HDN and the NRGF relate to the four biophysical flagship knowledge products in different ways, but they will be integrated with a starting-point at the landscape / seascape level.

Other recommendations included: Knowledge Products should focus on nature-based solutions for decision-makers; Outcome indicators risk leading to short-term decision-making; The NRGF should be linked up with other inputs to IPBES; The NRGF must be based on evidence and case-studies of integrated governance.

III.   Impact goals of the IUCN Programme 2013-2016

Participants were requested to reflect on whether the impact goals of the Programme are realistic, achievable and measurable from a scientific point of view.

Programme Area 1: Valuing and conserving nature

Comments on the four indicators proposed in the IUCN Programme 2013-2016 document:

1. Agreed with this indicator

2. The word 'proportion' is not helpful wording – 'extent' or 'number' would be preferable as an indication of progress made
3. Agreed with this indicator
4. Agreed with this indicator

Propose two other indicators:

1. How far along are we in achieving the Red List of Biodiversity – the Barometer of Life
2. Change in status of ecosystems which can be observed by satellite or remote imagery

Programme Area 2: Effective and Equitable Governance of Nature's Use

- Noble goal but hard to measure
- Should be able to measure if bottom-up approach
- 'Natural resources' is too broad a term
- Good governance needs good coordination and communication
- High level indicator not attributable to IUCN specifically
- All indicators depend on NRGF and this is risky to commit when it has not yet been finalised
- There are parallels between the structure of the Programme and the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 – targets could be pulled across

Programme Area 3: Deploying Nature-Based Solutions to Global Challenges in Climate, Food, Development

- Initial timeframe of four years is short
- Must set realistic targets
- Need to make explicit statement for outcome we are looking to achieve and what has been IUCN's contribution
- Need to ensure indicators contribute to communications needs
- Capture specific and compelling stories
- Challenges:
  - No specific Knowledge Product to support Monitoring and Evaluation
  - Baseline
  - Value of different approaches

Comments on the indicators:

1. Replace 'incorporated' with 'considered'
2. Mostly accounted for by the Red List of Ecosystems. Target for four years – Red List of Ecosystems established for terrestrial systems in South America
3. Extractions in Protected Areas, economic benefits discussion

IV.   The Way Forward: Partnerships

It was noted that ICSU seeks to forge stronger ties with governments and other decision-makers, while its broad mandate aims at strengthening international science for the benefit of society. Programmes of relevance to IUCN include DIVERSITAS, International Geosphere-Biosphere Programme (IGBP), International Human Dimensions Programme (IHDP), World Climate Research Programme (WCRP), Earth System Science Partnership (ESSP) and the Future Earth initiative. IUCN could become involved in future research funding calls of the Belmont Forum. The collaboration between IUCN and ICSU will intensify on the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES) and the Group on Earth Observations Biodiversity Observation Network (GEO BON) in relation to identification of standards and indicators for conservation planning, building effective ecosystem institutions and governance and addressing together food security and biodiversity issues. As ICSU has regional chapters, IUCN regional officers could establish contacts their ICSU counterparts.

It was proposed that the École Polytechnique Fédérale de Lausanne (EPFL) and IUCN could form closer ties in addressing questions particularly on issues such as nitrogen emissions from peatlands.

UNESCO already works closely with IUCN, but further strengthening of the collaboration with World Heritage was proposed. There is also room for collaboration within the educational activities of the Man and Biosphere (MAB) Programme. IPBES and Future Earth initiative are both high priorities for UNESCO and are opportunities for collaboration. It was suggested that IUCN and UNESCO should explore potential collaborations on an integrated approach to databases of Knowledge Products. A short term staff exchange programme was also proposed. IUCN should reach out to UNESCO's national offices to strengthen ties.

Potential closer ties could be developed with The World Academy of Sciences - for strengthening science in developing countries (TWAS) in regard to nature-based solutions, global change and sustainable development. It was suggested that IUCN could draw from the TWAS database in identifying experts for its field projects and that regional and national IUCN staff should know about the TWAS fellows in their area.

Scientific Committee on Problems of the Environment (SCOPE) suggested that of particular interest to IUCN would be discussions on valuation methodology and invasive species, as well as the UNESCO-SCOPE-UNEP Policy Briefs and the SCOPE Young Scientists Forum.

Private sector partnerships with Holcim and the World Bank are already strong. They provide access to sectors of society that business communicates with that IUCN might not. There is room for partnership with the World Bank especially on the social science-oriented Knowledge Products.

It was recommended that IUCN hosts a young scientists meeting at the next IUCN World Conservation Congress. IUCN Commission Chairs also welcomed the chance to partner with members of the scientific community on future research, the opportunity to join together for more advocacy on scientific work and any assistance in thinking about end users, communication of the Knowledge Products and the prospect of extending collaborations to communications units within institutions.

V.   The Way Forward: Objectives and agenda for the IUCN Science Advisory Board

It was suggested that IPBES provides a strong context for a more cohesive collaboration of the many institutions and networks interested in it given the recognized operational principle calling on IPBES to build on relevant existing initiatives and processes. The IUCN Science Advisory Board could provide recommendations on how this collaboration could be optimized as it was recognised that the scientific community would be more strategic if it works together. For example, a mapping exercise of the membership of TWAS and the IUCN Commissions would be a useful initiative to monitor the overlap particularly with regard to experts who will be nominated to serve on the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel (MEP) of IPBES.

It was proposed that the Science Advisory Board should also help IUCN in improving its communication messages and its outreach impact through members serving in both their individual and their organisational capacities. This could include disseminating information it receives from IUCN and gaining more international recognition for IUCN within decision-making bodies and the general public. It was suggested that the Science Advisory Board members should receive the newsletters of the IUCN Commissions to help support this. An intraweb system would also be useful to support the Science Advisory Board.