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Method proposed

- Structuring and Introducing the final discussion through voting on Scientific key messages and questions of the “after-Ghent” with MentiMeter
- Possible (limited) discussion after each vote
- Keep some time (10-30 minutes) for a more general discussion at the end.
## Results on KMs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KM</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Mean Policy Relevance</th>
<th>Scientifically &quot;Well established&quot; (%)</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KM1d</td>
<td>Biodiversity strategy/climate change</td>
<td>8,2</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KM2d</td>
<td>Monitoring and evaluation</td>
<td>8,9</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KM3e</td>
<td>Core drivers of biodiversity loss</td>
<td>8,5</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KM4d</td>
<td>Values</td>
<td>8,8</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KM5c</td>
<td>Mind-set changes</td>
<td>8,3</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KM6b</td>
<td>Restoration of ecological functions</td>
<td>7,8</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KM7c</td>
<td>European and global policies</td>
<td>7,8</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KM8c</td>
<td>Research and knowledge-informed DM</td>
<td>8,5</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KM9b</td>
<td>Importance of multi-/…disciplinary research</td>
<td>7,9</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KM10a</td>
<td>Decoupling economic growth from environmental degradation</td>
<td>8,8</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KM11a</td>
<td>Participation</td>
<td>7,7</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KM12c</td>
<td>Spatial and temporal scales</td>
<td>7,9</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KM13b</td>
<td>Nature based solutions</td>
<td>7,1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KM14b</td>
<td>Inter-generational sustainable transformations</td>
<td>8,2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KM15b</td>
<td>Comprehensive policy mixes</td>
<td>7,3</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KM17</td>
<td>Specificity of freshwater biodiversity</td>
<td>10,0</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Biodiversity Strategy / Climate change. Some action is required by the EC for more systemic changes in biodiversity conservation policies in the light of climate change. The 2020 Biodiversity strategy and previous EU Nature policies (esp. the Habitats directive) have been developed with no consideration on climate change. This context has changed and some voices have proposed to re-think and re-evaluate e.g. protected area networks in general and Natura 2000 in particular in the light of ongoing climate change. This has partly been taken into account by the EC through its guidelines on Climate Change and Natura 2000, but more should be done. Further new actions taken by the EC could include: jointly rethinking different actions (e.g. Habitats Directive and the Green Infrastructure strategy) in the light of climate change; revising the Habitats directive, e.g. incorporating the possibility that habitat types within a site may be adapted as climate change demands so; establishing the network more coherently across boundaries instead of establishing it independently within each EU member state; considering protecting non pristine sites with high ecological potential (climate change, connectivity...) ...

Link with EU Biodiversity strategy: whole strategy, with a specific focus on: Target 1, Protect species and habitats, particularly Action 1: Complete the Natura 2000 network and ensure its good management http://ec.europa.eu/environment/nature/biodiversity стратегия/target1/index_en.htm
**KM1e – Type of answers**

- ☐ Yes, as such
- ☐ Yes, with rewording
- ☐ No, fuse it with another KM
- ☐ No, remove it
**KM2e**

**KM2e: Monitoring and evaluation.** Monitoring trends in biodiversity and ecosystem services are necessary for: the implementation of policy, for example by assessing progress towards policy targets; evaluating the effectiveness of specific policies; informing the development of new nature conservation policies; provide early warnings to enable where and when action [intervention (2.11)] is needed [2.3; 2.10; 2.11]; support adaptive management [2.8]; and enabling the mainstreaming of biodiversity in other policy sectors, ensuring throughout that the purpose of monitoring is made clear [2.4]. Although many species and habitats are already monitored, recent evidence of declines in insect abundance, for example, have shown that not all taxa are adequately monitored, including those assumed not to be endangered. Thus there is a need to ensure that reporting is based on adequate monitoring across all taxa and biogeographical areas and includes sufficient data in terms of quantity and quality to allow vigorous evaluation of policies such as the Habitats Directive and Natura 2000. Data from LIFE and other EU projects could be incorporated in monitoring programmes because of their data on the conservation status of some species, although there needs to be recognition that not all Member States have sufficient resources and the data from some countries may not be up to date. Monitoring of biodiversity should be adequately supported by experts, including taxonomists, and the latest developments in species identification. Monitoring should address status and trends in ecosystem, species and genetic diversity [2.14]. Volunteer citizen scientists can play a major role in monitoring but this requires incentives and support mechanisms for the collection, sharing and analysis of data [2.1; 2.2; 2.7; 2.12]. The need to adequately share data should be addressed through, for example, funding for database construction [2.5]. Equally important is the need for collecting and synthesizing social science data along with environmental data, including data on drivers of biodiversity change [2.1b; 2.11], from agriculture, energy, transport and other sectors [2.7], in order to produce knowledge useful for developing, implementing and evaluating policies and practices related to the conservation of biodiversity and the sustainable use of ecosystem services. These data should include change in societal attitude, and effectiveness of education related to biodiversity. Monitoring and evaluation are currently underfunded: a set proportion of finds should be set aside for monitoring, e.g. 10% for adaptive management projects [2.13].

Link with EU Biodiversity strategy: Target 1, esp. Action 4.
**KM3f**

**KM3f: Core drivers of biodiversity loss and integration across sectors.** Better integration across sectors is needed because the direct drivers of biodiversity loss (including climate change, habitat degradation, loss of functional connectivity and alien [R44] invasive species) are the consequence of indirect, or core, drivers such as human population density and the consumption of resources, particularly in agriculture, forestry and fisheries. There needs to be greater recognition of the relationships between human activity and biodiversity across all policy sectors and across relevant spatial and temporal scales in order to make a greater effort in mainstreaming biodiversity, thereby transforming all relevant policies through, for example, the elimination of harmful subsidies in the CAP [3.2; 3.4]. Improved coordination across sectors would enable facilitate [3.3] better consideration of biodiversity and ecosystem services, taking trade-offs between different policy and economic sectors into account, and potentially identifying the conditions that lead to sudden ecological collapse [3.1].

There is, for example, ample room for further exploiting this potential for the agriculture, urban planning, water use and fisheries sectors and forestry. An example of the latter nexus [R45] is the need to consider the impact on biodiversity of renewable energy policy implemented through bioenergy fuelwood. Regarding an economy-wide perspective, this includes measuring national welfare using economic indicators that take into account the diverse values of nature. Ecological fiscal reforms would provide integrated incentives and provide leverage to redirect activities that support sustainable development.

Link with EU Biodiversity strategy: new target.
"Key message n°4 (KM4e)

Biodiversity and ecosystem services have both intrinsic value and are a condition for human activities and quality of life and should be valued as such. Policy and international regulation should change from an approach in which human use is merely asked to take conservation into consideration to making it an obligatory measure for development activities across sectors. Biodiversity and ecosystem services are not a sectorial business but the fundamental baseline condition for all human activities and human quality of life. As expressed in the UN Sustainable Development Goals, biodiversity and ecosystem services are the foundation of all potential human activities and quality of life rather than a means to sectorial goals that benefit a small minority of people and so it should be treated accordingly. This urges for the maintenance of biodiversity and ecosystem services despite all kinds of human use and exploitation of natural resources. Although the 2020 strategy addresses certain major sectors to be more sustainable, also other human uses of resources should be judged according to their impact on biodiversity and ecosystem services.

Link with EU Biodiversity strategy: Target 2, Maintain and restore ecosystems, Target 3, Achieve more sustainable agriculture and forestry, Target 4, Make fishing more sustainable and seas healthier, and Target 6, Help stop the loss of global biodiversity. http://ec.europa.eu/environment/nature/biodiversity/strategy/index_en.htm#stra
New text proposal KM5d:
Mind-set changes for biodiversity and ecosystem services.

Reversing the on-going biodiversity and ecosystem services decline is hampered by the disconnection between human and nature because of technological and cultural processes among others. People migrating to urbanized areas, buying their food directly in supermarkets and having their jobs and daily life not in direct contact with nature get distanced to the meaning and origin of biodiversity and its benefits to people. To enable the reversion of the on-going biodiversity loss and ecosystem services degradation a change in human mind-sets is needed. The EU strategy so far does not (sufficiently) include measures to establish a general change in (European, global) mind-setting, focussing on consumption decline, environmental respect, awareness of human dependence of biodiversity and ecosystem services, awareness of limits to growth, awareness of the advantages of cyclic approaches, etc. Possible solutions for this could be the integration of transdisciplinary approaches based on social learning for sustainability, inclusion of topics such as ecology and environmental management in primary and secondary school curriculums and coupling human information, knowledge systems within Social-Ecological Systems Changes, and profound inclusion of relational values emphasising people’s bond with nature and the inclusion of behaviour economics. These examples all play a key role in transforming behaviours and institutional practices as well as .
KM 6b: Restoration of ecological functions should be part of the scope of European Directives, particularly those affecting biodiversity and ecosystem services, as it provides an important nexus for the management of ecosystems. In so doing, we must both recognize that restoration is socially mediated and contested – politics are involved, there are winners and losers – and that climate change should be taken into account as baselines in terms of functions are shifting. This echoes that the decade 2021 to 2030 has been declared by the UN the decade on Restoration. This will benefit from some research on the link between biodiversity and ecosystem services through ecological functions and subsequently a refinement of the notion of healthy ecosystems.

Link with EU Biodiversity strategy: Target 2 and Green Infrastructure strategy: [http://ec.europa.eu/environment/nature/ecosystems/index_en.htm](http://ec.europa.eu/environment/nature/ecosystems/index_en.htm)
**KM7d: European and global policies.** Europe should take a leading role in establishing an improved global policy on biodiversity. European policy on biodiversity has been based on the recognition that biodiversity and the drivers affecting it have to be dealt with at an international scale, not only at the European scale but also globally, recognising the (downscale) impact of international decisions on local biodiversity and vice versa. The development of European policy on biodiversity, whilst addressing the limitations of current policy [7.1] including the perverse effects of European policy elsewhere in the world [7.3; 7.4; 7.5], must therefore be done in close collaboration with the UN Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), Agenda 2030 and the SDGs [7.2]. In so doing, however, the European Union should not simply follow the example of global policy developments but take an ambitious lead to halt the loss of biodiversity. It should learn from best practice everywhere, but not limit itself from a lack of vision and ambition.

Link with EU Biodiversity strategy: Target 6.
**KM8d**

**New KM8d:**
Research and knowledge-informed decision-making and implementation. Institutional mechanisms for effectively compiling and applying scientific and other types of knowledge for conservation practice should be embedded into the Biodiversity Strategy. Policy development, implementation and assessment must be informed by the best available knowledge, both from scientific research and from local and indigenous knowledge (as highlighted in the assessments of the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem services – IPBES). It also requires the cooperative engagement of decision-makers, relevant knowledge holders and society as a whole. An effective Biodiversity Strategy must therefore include a knowledge strategy that promotes new research (including transdisciplinary research), knowledge synthesis and the development of policy options. In addition, such a strategy should make use of mechanisms that support knowledge-informed decision-making, such as EKLIPSE. In addition, the strategy will need to acknowledge that decision-makers often work in institutional settings that do not encourage them to acknowledge uncertainty, policy problems etc. As such, research and action to overcome this would be valuable, including details of how policy-makers can and will actively incorporate knowledge into actions to address biodiversity loss.

Link with EU Biodiversity strategy: Knowledge and Data.

http://ec.europa.eu/environment/nature/knowledge/index_en.htm
**KM9b**

**KM9b: Importance of multi- inter- and trans-disciplinary research.** Research on biodiversity and ecosystem services benefits both from high level disciplinary researches and from interdisciplinary and transdisciplinary approaches. Given the complexity of the basic problem of biodiversity and ecosystem services decline, as many as possible of the relevant scientific disciplines should both deepen and cooperate to gain insight in the interactions of all factors. This includes e.g. life sciences, social sciences, humanities, engineering and many other disciplines. Transdisciplinarity, i.e. engagement of citizens, field practitioners etc., is of great significance in improving the insights in these interactions and key to achieve sustainable development, but should be treated with caution to avoid promoting own interests.

Link with EU Biodiversity strategy: Knowledge and Data.
KM10b: Decoupling economic growth from environmental degradation. The new EU biodiversity strategy should stimulate policies that decouple economic growth—[10.1]—from environmental degradation. Economic growth is generally not decoupled from environmental degradation. Economic growth, as measured through traditional gross domestic product (GDP), across Europe and Central Asia has indirectly reinforced drivers of biodiversity loss, which in turn has reduced ecosystem services. Although a range of policies, including environmental taxation, have been implemented to decouple economic growth from detrimental drivers, there still exist policy instruments, such as harmful agricultural and fishing subsidies, which continue to impede transitions towards a sustainable future. ThisA decoupling of economic development, promoting such development within the ecological limits of the planet [10.1], would require a transformation in policies and tax reforms across the region. Decoupling would be assisted by new indicators that incorporate well-being, environmental quality, employment and equity, biodiversity conservation and nature's ability to contribute to people. Existing problematical metrics such as GDP could, for example, be replaced by a natural capital accounting approach [10.2] and quality of life indicators such as a happiness index [10.3]. Link with EU Biodiversity strategy: new target.
Key message n°11bα

“Increasing participation and stakeholder involvement in management. Increasing participation and stakeholder involvement and building communities of practice will help to integrate various forms of knowledge in policy- and decision-making while promoting shared responsibility and transparency of decision-making. Engagement and participation should happen early on and be multidirectional in the sense that environmental research, policymaking and management actively involve researchers, local people and landowners, policymakers, the private sector and other stakeholders in a process of co-creation of knowledge for sustainable policies. Engagement should however not be a given, but rather carefully planned and designed in order to ensure it improves the quality of environmental management and decision making. The objectives of engagement and the use of knowledge in decision-making should be transparent. This involvement can be strengthened by careful monitoring and evaluation (see KM2), taking various values into consideration, including those of indigenous peoples and local communities. Despite requiring more time and effort the results of engagement can aid to creating more sustainable and long-lasting policies.

Link with EU Biodiversity strategy: new target"
KM12d: Incorporate regional/transnational processes and long-term temporal scales to enhance success and efficiency of biodiversity policy. Policy (e.g. Habitats Directive, CAP...) and management (biomonitoring, restoration, conservation) should incorporate large temporal scales and regional processes (including transnational aspects when relevant) to enhance success and efficiency of conservation and restoration of biodiversity and ecosystem services. To date, most if not all management practices and the underlying legislation and policies for ecosystem management are based on local scale processes. However, the meta-ecosystem paradigm, which emerged in the past decade, acknowledges that both local (i.e. environmental filtering and biotic interactions) and regional (i.e. dispersal and spatial flows of material and energy) processes interact to determine the spatial organization of populations, communities, and ecosystem processes in a given landscape. Biodiversity changes in one system affect biodiversity and processes in other systems. As of long-term temporal scales, they can both provide policy with historical baselines and with the very likely occurrence of time-lags between action and results on biodiversity.

Link with EU Biodiversity strategy: Targets 2 and 6.
Natures based solutions (NBS) and conservation for sustainable development. A better integration of socio-economic aspects and values together with ecological values in conservation projects under the framework of nature-based solutions would improve the acceptance and effectiveness of these initiatives, solving at the same time societal and biodiversity challenges. Monitoring and evaluation of the NBS as per MEEM recommendations should be included in the design of the initiatives.

For example European programs that promote biodiversity and its conservation and the funding instruments only include local development objectives as secondary added to objectives focused on species and habitats. This makes it challenging for the local communities to relate to conservation and sustainable development, creating a rejection of these projects and blocking positive synergies. Nature based solutions offer ways to address simultaneously societal and ecological needs when designed in an environmentally sustainable manner.

https://ec.europa.eu/research/environment/index.cfm?pg=nbs
New text proposal KM14c:

KM14c: Inter-generational sustainable transformations. A Biodiversity Strategy should be visionary and incorporate the responsibility towards future generations through new models for participatory processes and thus explicitly include the engagement of the younger generations also recognizing the efforts and experience of previous generations to safeguard the ethical foundations for decision-making across generations. Currently, youth worldwide protest against climate and environmental change. They indicate clearly that they have lost patience with politicians' plans and miss action. The Biodiversity Strategy targets implicitly will benefit the future generation(s), but solutions are often sought within the current socioeconomic setting with not enough consideration of other value systems such as the intrinsic value of biodiversity. The ethical implications of this is that sustainable societal transformations are difficult to realize, as they have to encompass more than one generation. Involving young people (or their representatives) in monitoring – and in observing if not participating in its subsequent evaluation and use – could be one way of helping to strengthen young people’s presence in environmental decision-making.

Link with EU Biodiversity strategy: new target.
**KM15c**

**New KM15c:**
Design comprehensive biodiversity policy mixes. While mainstreaming biodiversity policies into other sectoral policies is key, there is a crucial gap in evaluating current overall policy approaches aimed relevant to biodiversity (and their implementation) and designing comprehensive biodiversity policy mixes to reach EU biodiversity targets and SDGs.

Regulation is not the only approach public administrations can take for conservation policies – other options such voluntary/advisory initiatives should also be considered as part of the mix. Through integrating appropriate indicators that make a portion of EU funds conditional on ecological performance, public administrations and other stakeholders (e.g. private sector) can directly be incentivized to increase their efforts. The EU biodiversity policy should therefore consider allocating a portion of EU funds to habitat quality or other management outcomes (e.g. in CAP Pillar 2). Link with EU Biodiversity strategy: new target or general.
New KM17a:

**Specificity of Freshwater Biodiversity.** We recommend that the new EU biodiversity strategy explicitly address the conservation and sustainable use of inland water ecosystems in all relevant targets. Freshwater ecosystems are a unique and important component of global biodiversity, providing clean water, food, livelihoods, and many other ecosystem services, as recognized in the goals of the Water Framework Directive (WFD). Freshwaters are often perceived as components of terrestrial ecosystems, leading to their conservation targets being combined with terrestrial targets (e.g. Aichi Target 11). This obscures the distinct threats that inland waters face, compounded by the current monitoring data not being sufficiently sensitive. Building on the WFD, post-2020 targets must explicitly mention inland waters and must avoid viewing the conservation of inland water ecosystems principally in terms of delivery of water. Instead, post-2020 targets should ensure the conservation of freshwater species and ecosystems, their genetic and functional diversity and the linkages and dynamics between land and water (including telecoupling of wasteflows). Given the integrated nature of freshwater ecosystems and the ecosystem services they provide that sustain human livelihoods, minimum requirements to achieve basic human rights to water should also be addressed.

Link with EU Biodiversity strategy: Target 1 - Protect species and habitats Target 2 - Maintain and restore ecosystems Target 6 - Help stop the loss of global biodiversity.