



IPBES-10

Tenth meeting of the Plenary of the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services, Bonn, Germany, 28 August – 2 September 2023

Key messages:

IUCN congratulates and thanks all involved with IPBES for their hard work over 2022–2023, and is grateful for the acknowledgement of our in-kind contributions. A summary of IUCN's views is presented below, focusing on the Assessment of Invasive Alien Species (IAS), and expanded with more detailed comments on this and other agenda items alongside editorial suggestions in the following pages.

Assessment of Invasive Alien Species - Summary for Policy-Makers (SPM)

IUCN views the current focus on the achievability of IAS response, in contrast to the transformative change necessary to tackle some other drivers, as an overarching and crucial key message of the SPM.

IUCN emphasises the importance of consistency with the existing definition of IAS.

- IUCN and numerous other organisations (eg the Bern Convention, CBD, ICES, IMO, IPPC, OIE, UNEP-WCMC, WTO) define “invasive alien species” in ways consistent with their definition as “alien species whose

Initial considerations

IUCN has for 75 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 and of national and international NGOs and indigenous peoples' organisations. The 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 adopted [Resolution 118](#) at the 2012 IUCN World Conservation Congress, mandating "A significant role for IUCN in IPBES". Since 2016, IUCN and IPBES have operationalized this collaboration through a strategic partnership including substantial in-kind support to stakeholder engagement (see Table 3.2 in IPBES/10/5), including in facilitating the Open-Ended Network of IPBES Stakeholders (ONet) and providing in-kind and financial support to the organization of the Stakeholder Days preceding the IPBES plenary. In this context, IUCN welcomes recognition of this support in the IPBES10 Report of the Executive Secretary on Progress in the implementation of the rolling work programme up to 2030 (IPBES/10/4), Section E.3, paragraph 44. IUCN is also very grateful to the Government of France for their continue for their

A4. The next sentence (ie the current second sentence) gives the impression that such IAS have benefits only. Modify to read “Although some invasive alien species have been intentionally introduced for their anticipated benefits to people without consideration of their negative impacts,...”.

A7. Current sentence on invasive pigs does not sufficiently balance negative impacts with benefits. Change “but are considered key species in driving and maintaining the spread of invasive alien plants that are having a negative impact on the Hawaiian rainforest” to read “despite the fact that they cause a severe negative impact by driving and maintaining the spread of invasive alien plants in Hawaiian rainforest”.

A8. Begin the second sentence “As documented by SDG indicator 15.8.1,...”. It is very important to recognise that data mobilisation on IAS responses is mandated under the official UN SDG indicator.

IUCN questions Topic (d), a proposed fast-track assessment of biodiversity and climate change given it is unclear how this would relate to the ongoing process of engagement with the IPCC (Item 7b of the provisional agenda), especially in the light of the existing scientific outcome and workshop report on the same topic.

IUCN is provisionally supportive of Topic (e), a proposed fast-track assessment of biodiversity and pollution, a theme which has received rather little attention to date, although it needs further contextualisation. Its relationship with current discussions on development of a dedicated science-policy interface on pollution, to the existing agreements dedicated to the topic – notably the Basel, Rotterdam, Stockholm, and Minamata Conventions – as well as to the ongoing negotiations on a new legally-binding plastic pollution treaty, would need to be clear.