

Our Ref: UNEA/GEO7/IK&LK/1/2023

30/10/2023

Outcomes Document

First Face to Face Meeting of the Indigenous Knowledge and Local Knowledge Taskforce

24th to 26th October 2023

Agenda Items Include:

- Discuss the IK & LK methodological approach for GEO-7 (definitions, concepts, positionality, ethical concerns based on the IPBES methodological approach).
- Discuss the approach for regional and sub-regional incorporation of IK & LK issues within GEO-7
- Discuss GEO-7 chapters to identify key areas for integration of IK & LK issues (following the zero order draft review).
- Identify any gaps in expertise of the IL & LK taskforce and identify additional authors (Contributing Authors) that may be needed.
- Discuss the IK & LK evidence base and literature for GEO-7.
- Discuss the IPLC dialogues, including the process of inviting them to IPLC dialogue meetings.
- Discussion on how to conduct the call for indigenous knowledge.
- Discuss process for the IK & LK Taskforce's approval of the work plan for the coming years and the next steps.

On these agenda items, the meeting decided:

- The meeting decided to discuss with IMAG on the definition of terms whether they will refer to Indigenous and Local Knowledge (ILK) as Indigenous Knowledge and Local Knowledge (IK & LK).
- To organize a dialogue meeting in parallel with the second authors meeting in January 2024.
- To have a total of 4 IPLC dialogues which can be hybrid to support appropriate levels of participation and to work within budget.
- The dialogues will be in different regions to engage the IPLCs of the different regions; the first 3 regional/global dialogue consultations will be between March- Sept 2024.
- To have the dialogues after each draft review- FOD, SOD, in order to give a lot of shaping of IK & LK perspectives into the future reports. Dialogues after SOD will not make any fundamental changes to the report.
- The fourth dialogues (budget dependent) is a dialogue on giving back and showing the ILK authors the outcome of their contributions.
- To organise fewer IPLC dialogue meetings instead of having a back to back meetings as proposed by secretariat.
- The IK & LK taskforce will be part of the writing team (as Lead Authors (LA), additional Contributing Authors (CA) will be included depending on the level of engagement.
- The IK & LK taskforce will be supported by members of the MESAG with relevant expertise.

- The role of the rapporteur will be dependent on availability, another taskforce member could perform the role under the direction of the co-convenors.
- To provide names of additional authors and fellows to fill the gaps of expertise for the chapters.
- To include sub-sections that will identify ILK issues which need to be embedded in the report and give emphasis to incorporating ILK into different sections.
- To build up on the Global Sustainable Development Report call and identify any IK & LK expertise from the call.
- The meeting decided to send emails to the CLAs, requesting for the type of expertise required from the IK & LK Taskforce. Which expertise is relevant for the different sections of the report.
- To prepare glossary terms- IK & LK definition terms from the IPBES definitions on IK & LK and add IK & LK glossary terms to be debated upon in the glossary tool.
- To reach out to various networks to identify IPLCs and raise funds for meetings and dialogues.
- The meeting agreed that the dialogues are to fill knowledge gaps before the SOD.
- To include several sections and blocks for IPLCs to include text in the report. This was for the IPLCs to have their take on the framing of the IK & LK issues.
- IK & LK views will be included in the regional chapters. The group decided that there is no need to generalise IK & LK for only one region since different knowledge varies across different regions.
- Knowledge per region cannot be synthesized per region especially where illustrations and specific knowledge will be placed per region, references to this type of knowledge will be added in different sections.
- The IK & LK Taskforce will meet with the CLAs for each sections and chapters to see where the IK & LK sections will be discussed within their chapters.
- The IK & LK Taskforce will develop ILK questions that need to be addressed by the authors for the report.
- The IK & LK Taskforce agreed to write text for the authors ahead of the FOD.
- The taskforce will need to come up with keywords to use in the report. These keywords will be suggested to CLAs in order to bring out the literature on IK & LK.
- The IK & LK Taskforce should identify ethical materials to be used for the dialogues and ways to ensure how the dialogue meetings will be run.
- The IK & LK Taskforce should come up with a format on identifying protocols of engaging Indigenous Peoples based on what IPBES is currently doing.
- The meeting decided to schedule an open call for ILK inputs, these can be processed by the TSU or Collaborating Centers.
- The IK & LK Taskforce will write the sub-sections of the report which will include inputs from the conceptualization meeting and writing text to be inserted in the FOD.
- The meeting decided to include at least one taskforce member in separate GEO-7 thematic meetings/workshops.
- The IK & LK Taskforce will prepare the call for submission questionnaire which will be shared with IPLCs.
- The group decided that the call for IK & LK submissions will be run for 1 month (March) and processing of the submissions will take 2 months.
- The IK & LK taskforce agreed to approve the IK & LK workplan before the next meeting of the MESAG (20th November 2023).
- The secretariat will organize bi-weekly calls of the IK & LK Taskforce following the London Meeting.

- The secretariat will prepare a summary document as a resolution to present to UNEA-6 on whether the IK & LK summary document can be released without prior approval from advisory bodies.

Rapporteur	Signature
Ms. Jyoti Jyotsna Krishnakumar	

Meeting Summary

DAY 1: Opening of the meeting

The meeting began with a roundtable of introductions from participants present at the meeting. Following the introductions, the Indigenous Knowledge and Local Knowledge (IK & LK) convenors invited the secretariat to give a brief of GEO-7 and the importance of integrating IK & LK within the assessment. The co-chairs of the assessment gave a brief of the GEO-7 chapter outlines and emphasized that the assessment will be a solutions focused assessment. The Co-chairs added that the taskforce will need to ensure IK & LK issues are well discussed and captured. The Co-chair of the advisory group MESAG also provided what the role of the [Multidisciplinary Expert Scientific Advisory Group](#) (MESAG) is in the GEO-7 process.

Following the opening remarks, the IK & LK convenor opened the floor for questions and comments. A question was asked whether the MESAG will be engaged throughout the IK & LK process and meetings. To this, the MESAG co-chair responded their involvement will be minimal and they are there to ensure the process is scientific and credible. However, the IK & LK taskforce will be as independent as possible. The secretariat asked the IK & LK experts, where they would see Indigenous Knowledge and Local Knowledge fit within the three systems and how these can be done in a way that's consistent for Indigenous Peoples. Some clarity was requested on the level of literature that can be used and whether new knowledge can be included as literature in the assessment. One of the IK & LK experts mentioned the need to include literature on the impact of Covid-19 pandemic.

Having no other business, the meeting moved to the next agenda item.

Election of a rapporteur for the IK & LK Taskforce meeting

Following the introduction of all participants, the IK & LK convenors moved to the next agenda item on the election of a rapporteur for the IK & LK taskforce meetings. The secretariat explained the role of the rapporteur and the expression of interest from one of the experts on this role. The Secretariat announced Ms Jyotsna ('Jyoti') Krishnakumar (India) and this was accepted on a "no objection" basis. The meeting decided that in the event the rapporteur is not available to perform this function another taskforce member, under the direction of the co-convenors, can step in temporarily to perform this function.

Approval of agenda

The objectives of the meeting were presented to the group including the changes and the agenda of the three-day meeting was adopted by the participants. Discussions on this agenda included the IPBES nexus assessment and what GEO-7 can build upon their literature, whether the literature will be available for use to address the IK & LK issues to integrate IK & LK in the first order draft. Unfortunately, during the GEO-7 scoping stage Indigenous Peoples issues were not captured. Therefore, the

secretariat mentioned that the authors will need to look into the literature that will be developed by the IK & LK experts. The taskforce will need to be clear on what should be done after the FOD and will need to look at these issues and bring in this knowledge to the authors for them to be addressed.

Discussion on the IK & LK methodological approach for GEO-7

The IK & LK Taskforce started off this discussion with a roundtable of who identifies as an Indigenous Person to find out the positionality of the members. The IK & LK convenors mentioned that there is a need to identify and explained the importance of this for the IK & LK dialogues. In conclusion, the group welcomed the depth and breadth of the knowledge and perspectives of its' members. This is an important element of co-constructing a well-balanced IK & LK taskforce that is capable of undertaking the role.

The taskforce comprises of IK & LK experts who identify themselves as scholars (with a Western science perspective), Indigenous Peoples/ Local Community members (IK & LK perspectives) and members who identify as both. The experts also discussed in what capacity they could contribute to the IK & LK Taskforce and GEO-7 process through the perspectives and whether they could synergize between them.

The experts also noted that authors are moving the ZOD towards the FOD and need to recognize how to include IK & LK, what are the IK & LK issues relevant for each chapter- IPBES included policy issues and ILK issues which need to be embedded in the report.

The ILK taskforce noted there is a duty to address ethical concerns as follows:

- The IK & LK Taskforce has an ethical duty to protect the needs and rights of Indigenous Peoples/ Local Community members
- Careful attention needs to be paid to avoid 'extractivism' and make sure the approach is not predatory
- Those who contribute with knowledge have the right to use it
- Equal validity – it is not sufficient to 'integrate' IK & LK into a Western science framework, but to represent both systems
- Different world views and perspectives need to be represented through the assessment
- Avoid positioning IK & LK in boxes and add ons, which would be perceived as a 'tick-box' exercise
- Follow the do no harm principle both in the process and through the assessment findings and recommendations
- Recognise a diversity of views with IK & LK communities including age and gender

The meeting took note of the fact that the [GEO-7 scoping document](#) recognizes the need to include IK & LK, however the taskforce was established after this process. GEO-7 approach has started with a Western science perspective and methodology and the experts on IK & LK will need to work to identify where and how to bring in IK & LK perspectives. During the discussion, it was recognized that involving IK & LK experts should happen at the scoping stage, the taskforce discussed key areas that require IK & LK issues to be discussed broadly in the report; introduction, drivers and pressures, transformations and outlooks. One of the questions from the group was on whether new chapters can be added to the report. To this response, the co-chairs and secretariat clarified that since the structure of the assessment has been agreed by an open ended Ad-hoc working group/advisory bodies during the scoping stage, this cannot be done, however, it was agreed that IK & LK taskforce can write sub-sections of the report.

The meeting discussed how to apply the IPBES IK & LK approach for GEO-7, it was agreed that the IPBES approach will be applied as it's considered the best practice. The IK & LK convenors presented the IPBES methodological guidance and the discussions around the guidance included the best way to apply this approach to GEO-7. The IK & LK experts agreed to work to develop a GEO methodological approach which will include ways to ensure IK & LK is incorporated within the report.

The group discussed and agreed on the following:

- Since an IK & LK dialogue was not conducted at the scoping stage in GEO-7 as with IPBES, a conceptualization is required at the first IPLCs dialogue meeting.
- Uncertainty over funding and the therefore the ability to undertake the IPBES best practice approach in its' entirety – modifications may have to be made according to budget (i.e. less dialogues/ hybrid/online dialogues / use planned and relevant conferences¹ or events where relevant stakeholders will already be present).
- The scope of GEO-7 is much broader in scope than the recent IPBES assessments.
- Questions should be developed for each chapter.
- The Taskforce will be part of the writing team (as Lead Authors (LA) or Contributing Authors (CA) depending on the level of engagement).
- Identify existing IK & LK expertise within each chapter team with a view to selecting them or the respective CLAs to participate in the Dialogues – even if it is virtually to follow the process, present information, or to support the appropriate representation of IK & LK in the assessment and contribute to developing content.
- Dialogues can be hybrid to support appropriate levels of participation and to work within budget.
- Published records of the dialogues will be made public (prior informed consent & do no harm principles).
- There are likely to be linguistic issues during the literature review which will need to be recognized and addressed.
- The Taskforce will agree which definitions will be used for the GEO-7 glossary before the next author meeting in January 2023.
- The Taskforce will recommend, nominate and select 2 fellows to support their work including citations and translation/ interpretation. The secretariat will circulate the ToRs for fellows
- Dedicated MESAG members will continue to support the Taskforce throughout the process.

The meeting discussed the GEO-7 approach to incorporate IK & LK issues into the assessment, the IK & LK convenors started off this discussion by establishing key aspects of the report and agreed on what the Terms of References would be for contributing authors, components of the draft workplan, key considerations for the process and activities, methodological approach, access to and types of evidence and information for inclusion. The experts agreed to reach out to their networks and relevant organizations and groups.

Following the discussion on the GEO-7 approach, the experts reviewed the zero order draft chapters and comments from the review period and discussed several chapters that require IK & LK issues to be addressed. It was decided that:

- Authors and the taskforce will undertake the following:
 - Literature review
 - Dialogues to fill gaps in the literature review, develop content and review of drafts

¹ For example: Congress for Ethnobiology (May 2024), 12th World Wilderness Conference (August 2024)

- Publish records of the dialogues so that they can be cited in the assessment report
- Identify Contributing Authors (CA) and reviewers, as required
- Call for contributions: It will be necessary to launch a call for the submission of IK & LK to develop content and fill gaps.
- Giving back – A final Dialogue with IPLCs to discuss their inputs, key findings and outreach at relevant events, summary produced for IPLCs based on the findings of the main GEO-7 report and the negotiated and adopted Summary for Policy Makers (SPM).

Following the discussions, the meeting moved to the next agenda item.

Discuss the approach for regional and sub-regional incorporation of ILK issues within GEO-7

This discussion was opened by the secretariat with an overview of the M-49 paper. The Secretariat explained the [M-49 paper](#) to participants and what it represents and how this was formed. The experts suggested to include sub-sections of IK & LK views within the 4 sections of the report. It was agreed that only within the regional chapters there will be a decision for which region text would be included. Interventions from the experts were on whether the IK & LK issues will be discussed as a whole and to this the response was that there is no need to generalise IK & LK for only one region since different knowledge vary across different regions. The experts mentioned that IK & LK knowledge per region cannot be synthesized within only one region and references to this type of knowledge will be added in different sections.

Following the discussions on the regional and sub-regional approach, the meeting moved to discussing the terms IK & LK and where it was derived from. To this, the secretariat responded that the term in the scoping document is Indigenous Knowledge and Local Knowledge (IK & LK). The terms was agreed by the experts and other terms were suggested to be debated upon on the glossary platform by the IK & LK experts.

The discussion moved to whether the IK & LK Taskforce will be able to attend the meeting a day earlier to have and plan an approach for the second authors meeting. The aim of this meeting was to strategically discuss in advance where the IK & LK issues will be discussed in different sections. The IK & LK Taskforce will need to meet with the CLAs for each sections and chapters to see where the IK & LK sections will be discussed within their chapters.

Having no further discussions, the meeting moved to the next agenda item.

Discuss and review the GEO-7 chapters to identify key areas for integration of ILK issues (following the zero-order draft review)

The discussion began with a brief overview of the zero-order draft review where the authors reviewed the zero-order draft chapters and provided comments on where IK & LK issues need to be addressed further. The taskforce agreed to assign themselves to various chapters and the IK & LK convenors mentioned that once assigned they will be expected to write text on those chapters. It was also suggested that once assigned, if the authors could attend the chapter meetings of the chapters they are assigned to. During the discussions, the experts mentioned that in order to be able to contribute better, they will be assigned chapters to follow and be aligned to one (or more) of the 4 sections of the assessment based on their skills and experience. One taskforce member will be assigned as a lead for each section. It was noted that the members of the taskforce who were unable to join the meeting, will need to self-assign to a chapter/section.

The taskforce agreed to provide the questions and guidance for each chapter to influence the thinking and development of the First Order Draft (FOD) whilst the literature review and dialogues

take place. Also placeholders can be inserted into the text where it is appropriate to include IK & LK.

Following the several discussions on the chapter assignments, the meeting moved to discuss the IP, LC dialogues and whether through these dialogues, the experts can draw some information which will contribute to the text authors will need to include to their various chapters. The experts suggested the need to raise funds in order to organize these dialogues. A question was raised on what the taskforce hopes to achieve from these dialogues and how many dialogues can be organised. To this, the secretariat and co-chair responded that face to face and virtual dialogues can be done, depending on the amount of financing received. Participants identified various upcoming meetings where dialogues can be done as a side-event. It was noted that the dialogues are to fill knowledge gaps before the Second Order Draft. There was a suggestion to organise fewer IPLC dialogue meetings instead of having a back to back meetings as proposed by secretariat.

Having no further contributions on this agenda item, the day 1 meeting closed at 17H00 GMT

DAY 2: Recap of the Previous Day

The meeting began with a recap of the previous day.

Continued discussion on the GEO-7 chapters to identify key areas for integration of IK & LK issues (following the zero-order draft review)

Following the recap, the group continued discussing ways to fill the gaps of expertise for the chapters. It was noted that additional authors with different expertise will be needed to fill certain gaps. The meeting also discussed several ways to contribute to text in different chapters and identify areas that will need additional expertise. The group also discussed further about areas that the expertise will need further expertise contributed, instead of going through the section line by line, there's a need to go through what the IK & LK perspectives in each section is. The meeting decided to have a separate sub-section that will discuss the IK & LK perspectives and will contribute text in that sub-section.

The discussion continued around what some of the chapters need to identify within the sections and suggested that the questions that can be provided to the authors will need to be in various sections as follows:

Section 1

- What Indigenous framing needs to be provided here?
- There is a need a complete overview on all four parts of the GEO. (acknowledge diversity, including inter-generational one)
- Imbedding different world views, recognize differences in world views, layout these different world views.
- What are the drivers on this from an IK&LK perspective.

Section 2

- What is happening with each of these systems, e.g. land degradation, what is happening with biodiversity.
- What is happening in the land of indigenous people, on to what degree do you think the change is being experienced on the Indigenous Land, what are the implications of these changes to the Indigenous peoples?

- How is the framing of 'State of the Environment' different from an Indigenous perspective (provide up front text).

It was noted that the IK & LK authors will need to be included to the various regional chapters.

Section 3

- What is transformation on IK & LK perspective.
- What do you need transformation.
- What are the principles of transformation: (five sectors/systems) /IK & LK for transformation?
- How do we think on transformation in IPLCs? what are the principles for transformation?
- What is Environmentally and socially sustainable for the IK & LK?
- How do you think on transformation on every stage?
- What are the pathways for different (IPLCs?) peoples? Identify the levers for transformation
- Identify the IK & LK perspectives of how to use the different levers.
- IK & LK can be clearly shown on how the pathways would be good for transformative change, implications of the different pathways on IPLCs.
- Include the role of the IK & LK on the different pathways and methodological approaches.

The group suggested to include a sub-section in Chapter 9 where IK & LK perspectives are included and on other chapters to include the potential contribution of IK & LK to specific sub-chapters. The MESAG chair suggested to include the IK & LK values and this can be framed around the assessment which will bring different perspectives.

Section 4

The Co-chair gave a brief overview of this section and what it aims to achieve and what the global implications of this section are. The questions that the IK & LK suggested the section should address include:

- How would you do methodologies? is there an alternative to complement methodologies.
- what will happen if we stay in this pathway Two : 1. technological pathway , 2. social pathways behavioural change. The group suggested these could be added as stories or case studies in the report.
- What should the Indigenous narrative or storyline be in this outlooks framework?
- What are the Indigenous people disaggregated pathways /Implications for regions, implications for indigenous and local communities? There should be an effort to answer the question, what will happen to my community?
- What would be the possible regional implications for IPs and LCs?

The group suggested to have the taskforce members participate in the Chapter 8 and Chapter 20 joint calls to provide the Indigenous peoples perspective. The joint discussions will focus on the priorities for each region. Indigenous Peoples priorities should be reflected in the regional priorities.

Discuss the IK & LK evidence base and literature for GEO-7

The meeting discussed the need for a literature review protocol and check what IPBES uses. The IK & LK experts went over the sections and chapters of the assessment identifying examples of the types of evidence base literature that can be used. There was a suggestion to use the available literature from the different IPBES assessments. The starting point for the experts would be the IPBES methodological approach which will be used by the experts.

The discussion also mentioned the outcomes from the dialogues can be used to provide more literature to be used in the assessment. The taskforce agreed to prepare a preliminary list of literature will be drawn up by the taskforce.

The taskforce noted that they will provide 2 or 3 relevant papers for the CLAs of each part of the assessment to become familiar with ideas, concepts and issues for representation of IK & LK issues.

The group agreed that the follow-up taskforce virtual meeting will be dedicated to developing the key questions for each chapter and selecting the literature to distribute to authors. There is a need to add a reference in the forthcoming MESAG AI guidance document to specific AI tools that are being used for research on IK & LK issues which will be circulated to the taskforce. The group also agreed to come up with keywords to use in the report and suggest to CLAs the keywords to use in the report in order to bring out the literature on IK & LK.

Discuss the IPLC dialogues, including the process of inviting them to IPLC dialogue meetings

In this agenda item, the IK&LK convenors started with an overview of the IPBES method of conducting dialogues, the convenor stated that the literature review protocols from IPBES can be adopted to GEO-7. The convenor continued by suggesting the need to set up the literature review step within the GEO-7 taking into account the limitations and time the taskforce has. To this, the response was to inform the CLAs on the keywords being used by the authors. The CLAs of the chapters will need to identify the specific IK & LK keywords to identify the IK & LK issues that have already been included in the chapters. The secretariat mentioned that the GEO authors have written previous GEOs and have literature base that they draw on, therefore, the authors will need to develop new literature. The secretariat mentioned the list of broad terms can be specific to IK & LK can be shared with the authors. On the question of how to develop a literature review protocol, the Secretariat responded that the taskforce would need to provide some guidance to the authors. The group suggested writing 3 papers for each section of the GEO-7 on what the key IK & LK issues and references are and what needs to be taken on board by the CLAs. The secretariat suggested requesting the CLAs if they have examples of literature review protocol that can be built upon for the IK & LK issues, since the GEO process has not done this before. The IK & LK convenor mentioned that this is something to check on in the literature review protocol of IPBES.

In terms of the timeline, there was a question on when the smaller groups can meet to identify key references that can be sent to the CLAs. To this, the secretariat responded that the CLAs will need to meet and get to know the IK & LK convenors ahead of meeting with the larger group.

Following the discussion on evidence base literature, the meeting moved to discussing the IPLC dialogues and the process of inviting them to IPLC dialogue meetings. It was suggested to have four separate dialogues. Participants will include selected members of the taskforce including fellows, when nomination and selection has been done as currently the taskforce has no fellows to assist with citations, graphics, data and research etc. Several questions on the terms of references were explained by the secretariat on what the benefits of the fellows are.

The group continued with discussions on the dialogues which will have up to 20 IPLCs, CLAs from the 4 assessment parts, relevant assessment co-chairs and secretariat staff will be invited to the dialogue meetings. The group suggested the need to identify focal points from global/ regional networks and relevant stakeholders to participate in the dialogues. A comment was made on the possibility of convening one of the dialogues in a rural/ community setting and how long the dialogues will last. A protocol will need to be developed or used to guide the actual dialogue and ethical considerations taken into account, the invitation letter should include a reference to these ethical concerns.

The secretariat mentioned the Collaborating Centers that have been selected and the role of these centers. The current list of Collaborating Centres does not have IK & LK experience and this expertise

is needed in order to play a role in organizing the dialogues- support will also be requested from UNESCO & FAO. The secretariat clarified that all dialogues will be held in English with translation/ interpretation support from taskforce members and fellows.

The below action items for this agenda item included:

- The group proposed to have 3 regional/global dialogue consultations between February-June 2024.
- Another suggestion on the dialogues was to have the dialogues after each draft review- FOD, SOD, in order to give a lot of shaping of IK & LK perspectives into the future reports.
- Dialogues after SOD will not make any fundamental changes to the report.
- One workshop for only the conceptualization on the 4 sections of the report, the next workshop will be on the FOD.
- What needs to be done beyond conceptualization.

To the above decisions, the group agreed to:

- Organise the first IK & LK dialogue (3-days)- global in nature, focus on indigenous conceptualization on the 4 sections of GEO-7.
- 2nd Dialogue, identify where the gaps on IK & LK issues are from the review drafts.
- Differentiate review as an objective and dialogues. The IK & LK Taskforce has the capacity, training and expertise to conduct the reviews.
- Conceptualization dialogue needs to be done after the FOD as the content of IK & LK will depend on the IK & LK Taskforce.
- Fourth step of dialogues (budget dependent) will be a dialogue on giving back and showing the IPLCs the outcome of their contributions.

Summary of the 4 IPLC Dialogue Meetings

Dialogue 1 (January 2024):

- Should be held as soon as possible. The option is to have it in parallel to the authors meeting in January in Vienna or a separate meeting as soon as possible after the authors meeting in January.
- The first dialogue will focus on framing, conceptualization and key themes/ messages for each part of the assessment.

Dialogue 2 (March 2024):

- Should be held as soon after the first dialogue to fill gaps and develop content.

Dialogue 3 (October 2024):

- Focused on the inclusion of IK & LK in the SOD and the FOD of the SPM.

Dialogue 4 (March 2026):

- This will take place after the launch of the GEO-7 main assessment report and agreed SPM.
- The focus of this dialogue will be to feedback to the IPLCs.

Before wrapping up day 2 of the meeting, the secretariat reminded the experts the change of venue for the 3rd day.

DAY 3: Recap of the Previous Day

The meeting began with a brief recap of the previous day from the IK & LK convenor on the key points of discussion of the day before moving to the first agenda item.

Discussion on how to conduct the call for indigenous knowledge

The discussion began with the IK & LK convenor suggesting that the taskforce should design a questionnaire as soon as possible to facilitate the call for submissions. The secretariat again mentioned the UNEP GEO Collaborating Centres with IK & LK experience that will be identified and may be able to play a role in assisting with processing the submissions from the call.

The meeting discussed what the 2nd and 3rd dialogues objectives will be. The secretariat mentioned the revised timeline which included the 2nd and 3rd dialogues. If it is the IPBES strategy that will be followed, the 2nd dialogue should focus on gap filling and content development of the report and the 3rd dialogue should be focused on the inclusion of IK & LK in the second order draft and first order draft of the SPM. The co-chair suggested to focus on the 1st dialogue and have the 2nd dialogue as soon as possible after the first one in order to provide input that will go into the second order draft.

The secretariat presented the IK & LK budget estimate and what it takes to prepare for a GEO meeting; tickets, dsa and planning requirements to get people to the meeting. This brief gave an overview of what the financial challenges are in planning these meeting. Following the presentation, the intervention from the floor was the suggestion to have a translation and interpretation of the dialogues. In response to this, the group decided to identify a Spanish speaking fellow to be a translator for the Indigenous Leaders/Groups.

It was noted that the meetings will be attended by the IK & LK dialogues will include; Taskforce members, IPLC networks, Lead CLAs, MESAG and Fellows. The agreed objectives of the meetings include:

- Conceptualization
- Gap filling of literature and generating new understanding
- Review and messaging
- Giving back

The 2nd meeting will not include all the taskforce members, the CLAs will attend the meetings virtually and the challenge with this is the different timezones that should be considered when scheduling the meetings. It was noted that the 3rd meeting should consider the ethical considerations as well. To this, the secretariat clarified that the GEO process attempts to have no attributions. The taskforce action item included to identify ethical materials to be used for the dialogues and to include the FPIC document (Free, Prior and Informed Consent) for the dialogues.

The meeting agreed that depending on funds, teleconferences can be organised to get input from additional people- for example; webinars can be organised or have the 3-day meeting running the meeting in parallel during the 2nd authors meeting. The Secretariat mentioned the need for a plan B of the networks and once again brought up the GEO-7 Collaborating Centers (CCs) and requested the IK & LK taskforce to identify IK & LK related collaborating centers. The Secretariat will research on the Collaborating Centers profiles and suggest an institution that can plan different dialogues and help run the call for IPLC submissions, process the information and organise the dialogues with Indigenous Peoples..

Action items from this agenda item included:

- The Secretariat will prepare a list of CCs that have IK & LK research expertise and get feedback from co-chairs on this.
- Carol from the IK & LK will put secretariat in contact with FAO IK & LK TSU focal point.

- The taskforce and secretariat will prepare the documents required and schedule an open call for IK & LK inputs which can be processed by the TSU.
- Suggestions to include sub-sections in different chapters of the report. The sub-sections will include inputs from the conceptualization meeting and writing text to be inserted in the FOD.
- The IK & LK taskforce will follow up different ethical concerns from IPs.
- Suggestion to include 1 taskforce member in separate GEO-7 thematic meetings/workshops; Flexibility on where the IK & LK/IP dialogues will be held.
- The IK&LK taskforce should prepare a call for submission questionnaire. One of the outputs can be draft questions that will be prepared by the taskforce.

On some of the action items, the meeting agreed to:

- Have the call for IK & LK submissions to 1 month (March) and processing of the submissions will take two months.
- The Secretariat agreed to develop a resolution document to be decided at UNEA-6 in Feb/March 2024.

The meeting also discussed the structure of the GEO-7 and it was agreed that the chapters cannot be moved around and the co-chair clarified that instead there will be sub-sections included based on the output of the conceptualization which can provide input of text to be written by the taskforce and provided to the authors which can be inserted in the first order draft. The 2nd gap filling dialogue mid-March will give ample time to the taskforce to provide this text to the authors.

The Secretariat mentioned the development of a knowledge hub that would be developed by the partner who will also assist with the call for Indigenous Knowledge submissions. The Secretariat also mentioned whether once the networks have been identified, whether the ILK convenors and other taskforce members can be available on the calls or possibly reach out to their various networks. It was noted that the call for IK & LK submissions will go after the FOD and SOD and whether the calls will be based on the indigenous perspectives or whether they will be framed around the questions that will be developed by the taskforce.

The presentation of the draft timeline included the preparation of the dialogue meetings and conceptualization meeting of the IK & LK taskforce which will be held in parallel to the 2nd authors meeting in January. Following the discussions on the workplan and IP calls, the meeting moved to discuss the proposed budget. The Secretariat mentioned that they will reach out to US and Canada as well as Finland, Germany, UK, Japan and South Korea who were identified as potential donors with interests in IK & LK. It was noted that the taskforce will need to approve IK & LK workplan before the next meeting of the MESAG (20th November 2023). The Secretariat continued presenting the proposed workplan to the group (**Annex 1**). An intervention from the floor was on the document that will be prepared, the ILK summary of the key findings that will be launched and whether the document is an official document that will be approved or will it be a non-formal GEO-7 document, to this, the Secretariat mentioned that before this is decided, the decision on whether the IK & LK summary of key findings can be launched will need to be prepared as a resolution text to be presented at UNEA-6. To this, the Secretariat responded that GEO-7 should prepare a summary of key messages from the approved SPM and with this, there will be no need to get the summary pre-approved by the advisory bodies. The meeting discussed the need for to ensure the giving back dialogue centers the need of the IPLCs and acknowledges their contributions to the assessment.

Having no other interventions, the meeting moved to the next agenda item.

Discuss process for the IK & LK Taskforce's approval of the work plan for the coming years and the next steps

Following the break, the Secretariat gave an overview of the elements of the draft workplan. The additions to the workplan were discussed and added by the Secretariat which were agreed upon by the taskforce. It was noted that there will be bi-weekly calls of the taskforce following the London meeting.

The Secretariat requested whether there is any detail that should be added to the workplan. It was agreed there is no need to add details to the current workplan as it's short and precise.

Another suggestion was to switch items 11 and 10. Another question on the UNEA-6 endorsement was on whether GEO-7 will be allowed to approve the IK & LK key messages summary and whether this can be produced. The Secretariat and co-chairs clarified that the document can be produced in a format that is consistent with the accepted text of the GEO-7 and the approved SPM.

The taskforce was requested to include the specific terms that will be debated upon on the glossary platform. The co-chair suggested that the terms and definitions be drawn from IPBES and IPCC and the group can debate upon why these terms cannot be used for the GEO-7 assessment.

The IK & LK convenor requested if there are any further questions or interventions regarding the draft workplan. The Secretariat mentioned the tasks ahead until January and the need for the taskforce to attend the virtual calls of the group as well as the author calls that will be scheduled by the Secretariat. The process of agreeing on the workplan involves sending the draft to the taskforce for comments and inputs in track changes for a week and if there are no comments the draft workplan will be approved at a "no objection basis".

Having no other interventions or comments, the Secretariat and co-chair thanked all participants for their participation and contribution to the meeting. The meeting closed at 13h00 GMT.

Annex 2: Participants List

Title	First Name	SURNAME
Assessment Co-chairs		
Prof.	Robert	WATSON
Prof.	Nyovani	MADISE
MESAG Members		
Mr.	Alberto Santos	CAPRA
Prof.	James	FORD
Prof.	Nicolas	KING
Prof.	Monica	MORAES
IK & LK Taskforce Members		
Dr.	Jyotsna	KRISHNAKUMAR
Dr.	Sarah	LAN MATHEZ
Prof.	Jinlong	LIU
Dr.		
Mr.	Kamal Kumar	RAI
Mr.	Aibek	SAMAKOV
Dr.	Carol	ZVALETA-CORTIJO
UNEP Secretariat		
Mr.	Pierre	BOILEAU
Mr.	Matthew	BILLOT
Ms.	Grace	ODHIAMBO
Ms.	Brigitte	OHANGA
Virtual Participation		
Prof.	William A	MALA
Ms.	Valerie	NELSON

Absent with apologies

Mr.	Eduardo Erazo	ACOSTA
Ms.	Naomi	KIPURI