

REPORT OF THE THIRD MEETING OF THE SCIENCE-POLICY INTERFACE (SPI) 17 OCTOBER 2015 IN ANKARA, TURKEY

Date: Saturday, 17 October 2015

Venue: Congressium Ankara - ATO International Convention & Exhibition Centre

Working language: English

Working hours: 9:00 – 13:00
14:00 – 18:00

- REPORT -

I. Opening of the meeting and welcoming the new CST Bureau members

The co-chairs of the SPI welcomed all participants to the 3rd SPI meeting which was held back-to-back with the COP 12. The co-chairs welcomed the newly elected CST vice chairs as well as the new representatives from CSOs and UNEP. The meeting was attended by 21 SPI members as listed in Annex I to this report.

II. Lessons learnt from the first biennium of work

Lessons learnt from the first biennium of work were discussed during the closed SPI meeting on 13. October 2015.

III. CST recommendations for COP decisions and their implications for the SPI

The SPI briefly discussed the CST recommendations CST L2 “Improving the efficiency of the Committee on Science and Technology” and CST L4 “Work programme of the Science-Policy Interface” (not yet adopted at the time of the SPI meeting) with regard to their implications for the future work of the SPI. An issue of concern was the provision of CST L2 to task the COP Bureau with reviewing scientific outputs prior to publication. The SPI agreed that the exact meaning of this provision will need to be clarified as this may interfere with the scientific integrity of the SPI.

IV. Work programme 2016-2017

Contrary to the expected course of action at the 12th session of the CST, the work programme of the SPI for the biennium 2016-2017 (CST L4) was not yet adopted at the time, the SPI meeting took place. Nonetheless, and assuming that final amendments to CST L4 would be

minimal, the SPI started to discuss the modalities for implementing the work programme 2016-2017. In order to clarify the expected output, thematic scope and other basic aspects “pre-scoping fact sheets” were developed for all work programme objectives and coordination activities (see Annex III and IV for the preliminary “pre-scoping fact sheets” as of 17.10.2015).

With the aim of building small working teams, SPI members were asked to identify the work programme objective(s) and coordination activity(ies) in which they want to be involved (see preliminary list in Annex V). It was further decided, that each work programme objective should be led by two SPI members.

V. Other matters

It was decided that the SPI deliverables and outputs from the first work programme (2014-2015) will be made available to SPI members in an online archive. The secretariat will make the necessary technical arrangements

Given that science-policy briefs will be a major output format under the new SPI work programme, the possibility for additional science-policy briefs was discussed. Potential topics for additional briefs include, inter alia, forestry (possibly jointly with IUFRO), environmental migration, traditional and local knowledge, food security.

Co-chair Mariam Akhtar-Schuster thanked the out-going SPI co-chair/CST chair Uriel Safriel and the outgoing CST vice chairs for their work and commitment to the SPI. At the same time, Uriel Safriel thanked Mariam Akhtar-Schuster, Victor Castillo and the KMST team, and Barron Orr for their support.

Information on the next SPI meeting was not yet available.

List of Annexes:

ANNEX I – List of participants

ANNEX II – Agenda

ANNEX III – SPI work programme 2016/2017. Tentative pre-scoping “fact sheet”. Objectives.

ANNEX IV – SPI work programme 2016/2017. Tentative pre-scoping “fact sheet”. Coordination activities.

ANNEX V - Commitment of SPI members to objectives of the 2016-2017 SPI work programme

ANNEX I

| List of participants, 3rd Meeting of the SPI | |
|---|---|
| <p>Elena Maria Abraham Argentine Institute for Research on Arid Lands. National Council for Scientific and Technical Research (IADIZA-CONICET) Mendoza, Argentina Tel: +54 2615244100/02614393591 Email: abraham@mendoza-conicet.gob.ar</p> | <p>Nicole Edel Laure Bernex Centro de Investigación en Geografía Aplicada Instituto de Investigación en Ciencias de la Naturaleza, el Territorio y Energías Renovables (INTE) Lima, Peru Tel: +511 6262408 Email: nbernex@pucp.edu.pe</p> |
| <p>Mariam Akhtar-Schuster German Aerospace Center (DLR PT) Project Management Agency Berlin, Germany Tel: +49 30670557911 Email: Mariam.akhtar-schuster@dlr.de</p> | <p>Jean-Luc Chotte Institut de Recherche pour le Développement – IRD UMR Eco&Sols - Functional Ecology & Biogeochemistry of Soils & Agro-ecosystems Montpellier, France Tel : + 33 04.99.61.21.17. + 33 (0)4.99.61.21.01 Email : jean-luc.chotte@ird.fr</p> |
| <p>Martial Michel Yoric Bernoux Joint Research Unit Eco&Sols (Functional Ecology & Biogeochemistry of Soils & Agro-ecosystems) Institut de Recherche pour le Développement - IRD Montpellier, France Tel: +33 499 61 21 08 Email: martial.bernoux@ird.fr</p> | <p>Hamid Čustović Department Faculty of Agriculture and Food Science Institute of Soil Science University of Sarajevo Sarajevo, Bosnia and Herzegovina Tel: +387 33225727/61775211 Email: custovic.hamid@gmail.com</p> |
| <p>Annette Cowie NSW Department of Primary Industries Australia Tel: +61 403071044 Email: Annette.cowie@dpi.nsw.gov.au</p> | <p>Mihail Daradur State Hydrometeorological Service Chisinau, Republic of Moldova Tel: +373 022 77 36 22 Email: m.i.daradur@gmail.com</p> |
| <p>Joris De Vente Soil Erosion and Conservation Research Group Centro de Edafología y Biología Aplicada del Segura (CEBAS) Murcia, Spain Tel: +34 968396349 Email: joris@cebas.csic.es</p> | <p>Klaus Kellner School of Biological Sciences North-West University Potchefstroom, South Africa Tel: +27 18 299 2510 Email: Klaus.kellner@nwu.ac.za</p> |
| <p>Karma Dema Dorji National Soil Services Centre (NSSC) Ministry of Agriculture and Forests Thimphu, Bhutan Tel: +975 2 351182 Email: kddorji@gmail.com</p> | <p>German Kust Department of Soil Erosion and Conservation Moscow State University Moscow, Russia Tel: +7 926 6206640/ +7 495 9392289 Email: gkust@yandex.com, gskust@gmail.com</p> |

| | |
|---|---|
| <p>Jorge Luis Garcia Rodriguez National Forestry commission (CONAFOR) Ministry of Environment and Natural Resources (SEMARNAT) Zapopan, Jalisco, Mexico Tel: +52 33 3777 7000 Ext. 1001 Email: jlgarcia@conafor.gob.mx, unccd@conafor.gob.mx</p> | <p>Barron J. Orr Arizona Remote Sensing Center Office of Arid Lands Studies School of Natural Resources and the Environment University of Arizona Tucson, United States of America Tel: +1 520 626 8063 Email: barron.orr@gmail.com</p> |
| <p>Uriel Safriel Centre for Environmental Conventions Ben-Gurion University of the Negev The Jacob Blaustein Institutes for Desert Research Midreshet Ben-Gurion, Israel Mobile: +972 54 725 3646 E-mail: uriel36@gmail.com</p> | <p>Rajendra Prasad Pandey National Institute of Hydrology Roorkee, Uttarakhand India Tel: +91 1332 249216 Email: rppandey@Gmail.com</p> |
| <p>Vanina Pietragalla Secretaría de Ambiente y Desarrollo Sustentable Dirección de Conservación del Suelo y Lucha contra la Desertificación Buenos Aires, Argentina Tel: +54 11 4348 8564 Email: pietraga@agro.uba.ar; vpietragalla@ambiente.gob.ar;</p> | <p>Tao Wang Key Lab. of Desert and Desertification Chinese Academy of Sciences (CAS) Cold and Arid Regions Environmental & Engineering Research Institute, CAS Lanzhou, China Tel: +86 931 2198877 Email: wangtao@lzb.ac.cn</p> |
| OBSERVERS | |
| <p>Asociación para la Investigación y Desarrollo Integral (AIDER) Marioldy Sanchez Santivanez Lima Peru Email: monitoreo@aider.com.pe</p> | |
| <p>International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN) Jonathan Mark Davies Coordinator, Global Drylands Initiative Tel: +254 20 2493570/65/61, +254 20 890 606/7/8 Email : Jonathan.Davies@iucn.org</p> | |
| <p>United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) Adamou Bouhari Task Manager Biodiversity/Land Degradation West and Central Africa Focal Point GEF Biodiversity/Land Degradation/Biosafety Unit & Portfolio Manager DEPI-GEF Division of Environmental Policy Implementation (DEPI) Nairobi, Kenya Tel: +254 20 7624294 Email: Adamou.Bouhari@unep.org</p> | |

| UNCCD | |
|--|--|
| <p>Victor Castillo UNCCD Secretariat</p> | <p>Officer in Charge, Knowledge Management, Science and Technology Unit UNCCD Bonn, Germany Tel: +49 (228) 815 2865 Email: vcastillo@unccd.int</p> |
| <p>Alexander Erlewein UNCCD Secretariat</p> | <p>Associate Programme Officer, Knowledge Management, Science and Technology Unit. UNCCD Bonn, Germany Tel: +49 (228) 815 2850 Email: aerlewein@unccd.int</p> |

ANNEX 2

Science-Policy Interface (SPI) meeting

Date: Saturday, 17 October 2015

Venue: Congressium Ankara - ATO International Convention & Exhibition Centre
MET-15
Ankara, Turkey

Working language: English

Working hours: 9:00 – 13:00
14:00 – 18:00

- DRAFT AGENDA –

- I. Opening of the meeting and welcoming the new CST Bureau members
- II. Lessons learnt from the first biennium of work
- III. CST recommendations for COP decisions and their implications for the SPI

CST recommendations on the agenda items “Improving the CST” and “SPI: progress report and work programme 2016-2017” will be discussed in view of their implications for the future work of the SPI.

- IV. Work programme 2016-2017

The SPI is expected to discuss and agree on the modalities of work for implementing the work programme 2016-2017 in line with the reformed procedures for the provision of scientific advice to the UNCCD. This may include, inter alia, clarifying the expected output under each objective, setting up small teams of SPI members for each objective/coordination activity, selecting “mechanisms” for implementation, setting tentative timeframes for implementation, identifying milestones.

- V. Other matters

ANNEX III

SPI work programme 2016/2017

Tentative pre-scoping “fact sheet” (as of 17.10.2015)

(It was agreed at the teleconference on 04.11.2015 between the co-chairs of the SPI and the UNCCD secretariat that the tentative pre-scoping for the operationalization of the objectives and coordination activities of the SPI work programme (2016-2017) would be adjusted at a later stage in consultation with the identified co-leaders of each work item and under full consideration of the final decisions taken at COP.12 and the associated financial implications)

Objective 1

| | |
|---|--|
| Objective | Provide guidance to operationalize the LDN target |
| Deliverable 1: “Product” (developed by commissioned experts) | A user guide for implementing LDN at the country level based on a review of proposed conceptual and methodological frameworks that would scientifically underpin the implementation of LDN |
| Deliverable 2: “Policy brief with policy proposals” (developed by SPI) | Policy brief containing policy proposals |
| Target audience and intervention level (local/national) | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Decision makers including NFPs 2) Scientific advisors to the Parties including STCs (action to be taken at country level) 3) Scientists |
| Thematic scope (key thematic elements) | The sustainable development goal (SDG) related to land degradation was adopted by the UN General Assembly in September 2015. It includes a target on LDN (15.3), and since the SDGs will be embedded in the post-2015 development agenda, operationalizing LDN requires a review of proposed conceptual and methodological |

| | |
|---|--|
| | frameworks that would scientifically underpin the implementation of LDN. |
| Expected use of the product in the UNCCD process | Implementing the SDG target 15.3 through guidance to implement voluntary LDN national target |
| Overlap/contact points with other initiatives within and outside the UNCCD process | Secr. will provide SPI information on all relevant ongoing initiatives on LDN (e.g. Soil Leadership Academy, the LDN fund, LDN pilot and other actions). |
| “Mechanism” for product elaboration (commissioning) | <p><i>Proposed work stages:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Mapping the entities and relevant literature currently addressing LDN (e.g. Soil Leadership Academy, the LDN fund, LDN pilot, and other actions). 2. Developing pathways to interact with leaders of these entities to avoid duplication of efforts and generate synergies including periodic interaction with the LDN pilot to ensure empirical responsiveness. 3. Elaborating on LDN-relevant conceptual framework for scientifically underpinning LDN and directing the work of preparing the User Guide, building on the UNCCD monitoring and evaluation framework (adopted decision 22 COP11), the existing SPI work elaborated in ICC/COP(12)/CST 3 (includes progress indicators, RAPTA), and other relevant resilience based indicator frameworks. 4. Review methodological frameworks that would scientifically underpin the implementation of LDN. 5. Compiling the user guide, facilitated by a “write-shop” process. 6. Review of the draft user guide should be undertaken by stakeholders including potential users. 7. Subjecting the User Guide to be reviewed by the SPI. 8. Submitting the user guide to the CST bureau. <p><i>The table of contents of the user guide may have the following structure: (to be discussed further):</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Conceptual framework for LDN conceptualization. 2. Scoping: spatial and temporal scale, geographic and thematic domain of the LDN project 3. Setting indicators for characterizing the state of used lands (with respect to |

UN Campus, Platz der Vereinten Nationen 1 , 53113 Bonn, Germany
 Postal Address: PO Box 260129, 53153 Bonn, Germany
 Tel. +49 (0) 228 815 2800 Fax: +49 (0) 228 815 2898/99
 E-mail: secretariat@unccd.int Web-site: www.unccd.int

| | |
|--|--|
| | <p>land’s “health” and productivity) within the project’s domain</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 4. Assessing the degree of degradation of degraded lands 5. Classifying and mapping the domain’s lands as: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Under non-degrading use (benchmark) b. Under degrading use (requiring degradation mitigation) c. Already degraded (requiring rehabilitation/ restoration /reclamation). 6. Options for sustainable management practices for each of the diagnosed land classes 7. Proposals of indicators and monitoring for reporting on ongoing activities and responses 8. Identifying options to developing an enabling environment for appropriate project support at the country level <p>For assessing the rapidly accumulating literature and reports on LDN and to provide a credible and salient science-based and policy-relevant information functional and on-the-ground implementation, a multidisciplinary and experienced team is required to carry out such an assessment. Hence, an assessment team comprising of ca. 5-8 experts (e.g. wide range of knowledge of in agriculture and soil sciences, pasture and rangeland management, biophysical and socio-economic sciences, remote sensing, economics, social and political sciences and a policy expert and specialist in RAPTA), needs to be recruited. For facilitating the initialization of the writing-up of the user guide (stage 4 to 8, see above), a short write-shop will be required. A team of the SPI will be charged with leading, guiding, following-up and managing the process. Inaugural meetings of the assessment team, at the start of the work will be needed. Technical and administrative support to this assessment will be provided by UNCCD secretariat. The timeframe for this deliverable is one year.</p> |
| <p>Scientific institutions/expert groups to be considered for the “mechanism”</p> | <p>To be identified jointly</p> |
| <p>SPI team responsible for the objective (team leader + limited number of SPI members)</p> | <p>tbd</p> |

| | |
|--|---|
| <p>Depending on the chosen “mechanism” what will be the tasks of the SPI team (incl. timeline)?</p> | <p>The SPI team will oversee Objective 1 and will internally and externally review the assessment report provided by commissioned expert group and develop associated policy brief(s), including a set of policy-relevant recommendations on a way forward.</p> <p>The SPI team will have two coordinators leading a small team of SPI members, who will jointly ensure implementation of the following steps:</p> <p>17.10.2015: Agree on mechanism to identify experts. xx.xx.2015: Identification of experts. xx.xx.2015: Selection of experts. xx.xx.2015: Outline agreed between SPI and commissioned experts xx.xx.2016: 5 days write-shop for the commissioned expert groups. xx.xx.2016 (after 8 months): Finalization of a first draft of the assessment report. xx.xx.2016 (one month): Internal review of draft assessment by SPI ALL. xx.xx.2016 (ca. 1 month): Expert group addresses SPI comments. xx.xx.2016 (ca. 6 weeks): International independent review process. xx.xx.2016 (ca. 1 month): Revision according to external review (template for review to be prepared by SPI, following international standards). xx.xx.2016 (ca. 3 months): for drafting of 1st version of associated policy brief(s) by the SPI. xx.xx.2016 (ca. 1 month): Review of the policy brief(s) by SPI ALL. xx.xx.2016 (ca. 1 month): Finalization of the policy brief(s). xx.xx.2016 (ca. 1month): Submission of policy brief(s) to secretariat for final lay outing and printing (submit to COP bureau for review). xx.xx.2016: Translation needs will be assessed and decision subject to budget and identifying alternative strategies</p> |
| <p>Preliminary deadline for product delivery</p> | <p>xx.xx.2017</p> |
| <p>Cost estimate</p> | <p>145,000 Euros (needs to be confirmed)</p> |

Objective 2

| | |
|--|--|
| Objective | Highlight the science-based synergistic potential of sustainable land management (SLM) practices to address land degradation, climate change mitigation and adaptation |
| Deliverable | A report that will include the following three sections |
| Section 1: Objective 2a: Foster and facilitate the adoption of SLM practices which reduce land degradation while mitigating climate change “Product” (developed by commissioned experts) | Section 1 (2a) of the report will: (a) Explore the potential of SLM practices to contribute to both climate change mitigation and management of land degradation; (b) Review incentives and disincentives for the adoption of sustainable land use practices at different scales; and (c) Provide options for enhancing climate change mitigation (increasing carbon sequestration and/or reducing emissions) and managing land degradation through SLM practices. |
| Section 2: Objective 2b: Foster and facilitate the adoption of SLM practices which reduce land degradation while enhancing climate change adaptation “Product” (developed by commissioned experts) | Section 2 (2b) of the report will: present state-of-the-art knowledge on experience of land management practices that can qualify as land-based climate change adaptation practices. The report will also summarize land users’ responses to drought in the drylands over several millennia, as well as information on responses to emerging occurrences of droughts in non-dryland areas. Based on this information the report will: (a) Provide guidance for SLM practices that could increase adaptability to climate change projections in drylands and non-dryland areas; (b) Provide relevant information for supporting informed policy-making and provide information to policy-makers, research funding bodies and the scientific community on existing knowledge gaps in terms of achieving land-based climate |

| | |
|---|---|
| | <p>change adaptation; and</p> <p>(c) Identify existing knowledge gaps in terms of achieving land-based climate change adaptation.</p> <p>(d) Review incentives and disincentives for the adoption of sustainable land use practices at different scales;</p> |
| <p>Section 3: Objective 2c: Critically evaluate the conclusions of 2a and 2b to ensure clear understanding of synergies and trade-offs between climate change mitigation and adaptation, and SLM practices which reduce land degradation</p> <p>“Product” (developed by commissioned experts who prepared sections 1 and 2)</p> | <p>Section 3 (2c) of the report will:</p> <p>(a) Provide a critical analysis of the potential synergies and trade-offs between climate change mitigation and adaptation, and SLM practices which reduce land degradation, and in different biomes and regions</p> |
| <p>Deliverable 2: “Policy briefs with policy proposals” (developed by SPI)</p> | <p>Associated policy briefs containing policy proposals</p> |
| <p>Target audience and intervention level (local/national)</p> | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Decision makers including NFPs 2) Scientific advisors to the Parties including STCs(action to be taken at country level) 3) Scientists 4) Other multilateral environmental agreements 5) CSOs |
| <p>Thematic scope (key thematic elements)</p> | <p>Land management practices can contribute significantly to climate change mitigation, through carbon sequestration and /or a reduction in land-generated emissions of CO₂, CH₄ or N₂O (2a text from CST 6).</p> <p>However, some land-based climate change mitigation and adaptation strategies may</p> |

| | |
|--|--|
| | <p>be inconsistent with SLM practices. It is therefore necessary to consider synergies and trade-offs by identifying SLM practices that contribute to land degradation as well as to climate change mitigation and adaptation (2c text from CST 6).</p> <p>Measures to adapt to the current and the projected impacts of climate change, and especially to the increasing frequency, intensity and spatial extent of droughts are mandatory. Current SLM practices are expected to increase resilience to these impacts, and science-based policy options for supporting these practices and addition practices which qualify as land-based climate change adaptations are required. Given the inherent exposure of drylands to persistent drought, it is useful to revisit traditional and local land use knowledge and experiences responding to dryland droughts, and assess their potential for climate change adaptation in drylands and other areas. (2b text from CST.6).</p> |
| <p>Expected use of the product in the UNCCD process</p> | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) the Parties and in order to enhance synergies between the three Rio conventions, exchange with other science-policy interfaces. 2) Organisations on the ground 3) CSOs 4) Media |
| <p>Overlap/contact points with other initiatives within and outside the UNCCD process</p> | <p>Secr. and commissioned consortium of experts or institute will provide SPI information on all relevant ongoing initiatives.</p> |
| <p>“Mechanism” for product elaboration (commissioning)</p> | <p><i>Proposed resources based on discussions in Berlin:</i> <i>Proposed work stages for sections:</i></p> <p>2a: Foster and facilitate the adoption of SLM practices which reduce land degradation while mitigating climate change</p> <p>2b: Foster and facilitate the adoption of SLM practices which reduce land degradation while enhancing climate change adaptation</p> |

| | |
|--|--|
| | <p>2c Critically evaluate the conclusions of 2a and 2b to ensure clear understanding of synergies and trade-offs between climate change mitigation and adaptation, and SLM practices which reduce land degradation</p> <p>Proposed resources: An assessment process is needed that extracts and evaluates knowledge on land-based carbon sequestration. For addressing carbon sequestration in e.g. cultivated, pasture and forest ecosystems, and addressing emissions resulting from cultivation practices and from rangeland management, a small SPI team with two coordinators will oversee two small groups of experts / consortia / institute commissioned to undertake the assessment on mitigation (2a) and on adaptation (2b) respectively.</p> <p>Both commissioned expert groups/ consortia / institute will jointly evaluate the conclusions of 2a and 2b to ensure clear understanding of synergies and trade-offs between climate change mitigation and adaptation, and SLM practices which reduce land degradation.</p> |
| <p>Scientific institutions/expert groups to be considered for the “mechanism”</p> | <p>To be identified jointly</p> |
| <p>SPI team responsible for the objective (team leader + limited number of SPI members)</p> | <p>tbd</p> |
| <p>Depending on the chosen “mechanism” what will be the tasks of the SPI team (incl. timeline)?</p> | <p>The SPI team will oversee Objective 2 (a,b,c) and will internally and externally review the assessment report sections provided by the commissioned expert groups / consortia / institute and develop associated policy brief(s), including a set of policy-relevant recommendations on a way forward.</p> <p>The SPI team will have two coordinators leading a small team of SPI members, who will jointly ensure implementation of the following steps:</p> <p>17.10.2015: Agree on mechanism to identify experts.</p> |

| | |
|--|---|
| | <p>xx.xx.2015: Identification of experts/ consortia / institute. xx.xx.2015: Selection of experts. xx.xx.2015: Outline agreed between SPI and commissioned experts xx.xx.2016: 5 days parallel write-shops (scoping process) for the two commissioned expert groups (2a, 2b). xx.xx.2016 (after 6 months): Finalization of a first draft of the assessment report sections 2a and 2b. xx.xx.2016 (one month): Internal review of draft assessment by SPI ALL. xx.xx.2016 (ca. 1 month): Expert group addresses SPI comments on 2a and 2b. xx.xx.2016: 3 days joint write-shop to evaluate 2a and 2b and design 2c. xx.xx.2016 (ca. 3 months): Finalization of a first draft of the assessment report sections 2c. xx.xx.2016 (one month): Internal review of draft assessment of 2c by SPI ALL. xx.xx.2016 (ca. 1 month): Expert group addresses SPI comments on 2c.</p> <p>xx.xx.2016 (ca. 8 weeks): External review process on 2a, 2b and 2c. xx.xx.2016 (ca. 1 month): Revision according to external review on 2a, 2b and 2c (template for review to be prepared by SPI, following international standards). xx.xx.2016 (parallel process): development of concept of the associated policy briefs by the SPI related to 2a and 2b. xx.xx.2016 (ca. 1 month): Review of the policy brief(s) by SPI ALL. xx.xx.2016 (ca. 1 month): Finalization of the policy brief(s). xx.xx.2017 (ca. 1month): Submission of policy brief(s) to secretariat for final lay outing and printing (invite CST Bureau for approval for print). xx.xx.2017: Translation needs will be assessed and decision subject to budget and identifying alternative strategies</p> |
| Preliminary deadline for product delivery | xx.xx.2017 |
| Cost estimate | 160,000 Euros (needs to be confirmed) |

Objective 3

| | |
|---|---|
| Objective | Encourage the development and implementation of specific rehabilitation, restoration and reclamation measures and practices in degraded lands |
| Deliverable 1: “Product” (developed by commissioned experts) | <p>A report providing:</p> <p>(a) An assessment of existing land management practices suitable for the rehabilitation, restoration and reclamation of degraded lands related to their potential, including associated costs</p> <p>(b) Scientific guidance and policy options for addressing degraded lands in reference to their potential subject to different degrees of degradation severity in different biomes and regions, based on these assessments and available best case studies.</p> |
| Deliverable 2: “Policy brief with policy proposals” (developed by SPI) | Policy brief containing policy proposals |
| Target audience and intervention level (local/national) | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Stakeholders of LDN 2) CSOs working on the ground on the topics of this objective 3) Parties of the UNCCD, synergies with the other Rio Conventions 4) other science policy interfaces 5) CBD Aichi targets 6) IPBES 7) GSP/ITPS |
| Thematic scope (key thematic elements) | <p>Assessment of restoration, rehabilitation and reclamation measures and practices and provide evidence-based policy options for addressing degraded lands.</p> <p>Discussions on SLM often do not distinguish between actions of sustainable, non-degrading land use, and actions targeting the restoration, rehabilitation and reclamation of degraded lands. Furthermore, in the land degradation discourse the terms restoration, rehabilitation and reclamation are often used interchangeably, even though Article 1(b) of the UNCCD text suggests that “<i>combating desertification</i>’</p> |

| | |
|---|--|
| | <i>includes ... prevention and/or reduction of land degradation, rehabilitating of degraded land, and reclamation of desertified land". However, currently no clear distinction exists between measures used in applying sustainable and hence non-degrading land management practices and in addressing land already degraded by applying rehabilitation, or restoration, or reclamation practices to reverse or halt land degradation.</i> |
| Expected use of the product in the UNCCD process | Implementing the SDG target 15.3 and other related SDG targets through guidance to implement voluntary LDN national target To connect other R3 initiatives with LDN. Could support CBD Aichi targets |
| Overlap/contact points with other initiatives within and outside the UNCCD process | Will be identified by the commissioned expert groups. |
| "Mechanism" for product elaboration (commissioning) | For producing this deliverable, an in-depth assessment process is required, including review of SLM literature, databases including other forms of knowledge (e.g. WOCAT, SKBP), for extracting the knowledge and experience specifically relevant to addressing the restoration, rehabilitation and reclamation of degraded lands. A small SPI team coordinated by 2 SPI members will guide the commissioned experts / consortium / institute. |
| Scientific institutions/expert groups to be considered for the "mechanism" | e.g. SER (society for ecological restoration) WOCAT Icon-SLM IUFRO CGIAR centers and CRPs ICIMOD SIACRE ... |
| SPI team responsible for the objective (team leader + limited number of SPI members) | tbd |

| | |
|--|---|
| <p>Depending on the chosen “mechanism” what will be the tasks of the SPI team (incl. timeline)?</p> | <p>The SPI team will oversee Objective 3 and will internally and externally review the assessment report provided by commissioned expert group and develop associated policy brief(s), including a set of policy-relevant recommendations on a way forward.</p> <p>The SPI team will have two coordinators leading a small team of SPI members, who will jointly ensure implementation of the following steps:</p> <p>17.10.2015: Agree on mechanism to identify experts. xx.xx.2015: Identification of experts. xx.xx.2015: Selection of experts. xx.xx.2015: Outline agreed between SPI and commissioned experts xx.xx.2016 (after 6 months): Finalization of a first draft of the assessment report. xx.xx.2016 (one month): Internal review of draft assessment by SPI ALL. xx.xx.2016 (ca. 1 month): Experts address SPI comments. xx.xx.2016 (ca. 6 weeks): External review process. xx.xx.2016 (ca. 1 month): Revision according to external review (template for review to be prepared by SPI, following international standards). xx.xx.2016 (ca. 3 months): for drafting of 1st version of associated policy brief by the SPI. xx.xx.2016 (ca. 1 month): Review of the policy brief by SPI ALL. xx.xx.2016 (ca. 1 month): Finalization of the policy brief. xx.xx.2016 (ca. 1month): Submission of policy brief to secretariat for final lay outing and printing (invite CST Bureau for approval for print). xx.xx.2017: Translation needs will be assessed and decision subject to budget and identifying alternative strategies</p> |
| <p>Preliminary deadline for product delivery</p> | <p>xx.xx.2017</p> |
| <p>Cost estimate</p> | <p>65,000 Euros (needs to be confirmed)</p> |

ANNEX IV

SPI work programme 2016/2017

Tentative pre-scoping “fact sheet” (as of 17.10.2015)

Coordination activity 1

| | |
|---|---|
| Coordination area | IPBES land degradation and restoration assessment (LDRA) |
| Overall activity | The SPI will contribute to the LDRA in accordance with the procedure established by the IPBES |
| Specific activities | tbd |
| SPI team responsible for the coordination activity (team leader + limited number of SPI members) | tbd |

Coordination activity 2

| | |
|---|--|
| Coordination area | Contribute to the development of the Global Land Outlook (GLO) |
| Overall activity | SPI members should participate in the steering committee and the review process of the GLO |
| Specific activities | tbd |
| SPI team responsible for the coordination activity (team leader + limited number of SPI members) | tbd |

Coordination activity 3

| | |
|---|--|
| Coordination area | Follow up on current collaboration with and explore further means of collaboration with the ITPS |
| Overall activity | Collaboration will be based on topics jointly agreed by SPI and ITPS 1) SDG related to LDN 2) Indicators serving the 3 Rio conventions 3) Soil organic carbon |
| Specific activities | tbd |
| SPI team responsible for the coordination activity (team leader + limited number of SPI members) | tbd |

Coordination activity 4

| | |
|---|--|
| Coordination area | Initiate and coordinate interactions between the UNCCD and IPCC |
| Overall activity | With the support of the secretariat, the SPI will explore the possibility for the IPCC to address the link between climate change and land degradation in its future work. |
| Specific activities | tbd |
| SPI team responsible for the coordination activity (team leader + limited number of SPI members) | tbd |

ANNEX V

Commitment of SPI members to objectives of the 2016-2017 SPI work programme (as of 17.10.2015)

| SPI member | WP objective | Coordination |
|------------|--------------|--------------|
| Karma | 1, 2a | 3 |
| Annete | 1, 2a | 4 |
| Jean Luc | 2b | 4 |
| Martial | 2a, | 4 |
| Tao | 1 | 1 |
| Rajendra | 2a, 2b | 4 |
| German | 1, 2b, 3 | 1,2, 3 |
| Vanina | 1, 2b | 3 |
| Klaus | 3 | 1 |
| Hamid | 1, 3 | 1 |
| Michael | 2a, 2b | 4 |
| Bouhari | 1, 3 | 2 |
| Jonathan | 1 | 1, 2 |
| Mariam | 1, 3 | 3 |
| Elena | 2a, 3 | 3 |
| Marioldy | 1,2a, 3 | 4 |
| Jorge | 2b, 3 | 1 |
| Joris | 1, 2a | 4 |
| Barron | 1 | |