G7 Workshop on Invasive Alien Species: SUMMARY

November 20 – 22, Hamamatsucho Convention Hall, Tokyo

Organizer: Ministry of the Environment (MOE), Japan

Table of Contents

Overview

Invasive alien species (IAS) are one of the main direct drivers of global biodiversity loss, as reflected in the Global Assessment Report on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services[1] of the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES).Their negative impact has been intensifying globally, requiring strengthened collaboration across sectors and government agencies at all levels and areas to effectively manage increasing intentional and unintentional transport (movement) of IAS across borders.

Reflecting the need for enhanced actions, Target 6 of the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework (GBF)[2] aims to reduce rates of introduction and establishment of invasive alien species by 50 per cent by 2030. Furthermore, IPBES recently launched a thematic assessment report on invasive alien species and their control[3] (hereinafter, IPBES IAS Assessment), providing useful scientific information to act upon. At the G7 Ministers' Meeting on Climate, Energy and Environment held in Japan in April 2023[4], Ministers highlighted the need to address IAS and decided to develop a set of recommendations on strengthening international cooperation in this regard.

As a result of this highlighted need, three events were convened by the Ministry of Environment of Japan[5]. The first two were precursors to this G7 workshop to exchange relevant information on IAS. The first was a webinar on October 5, 2023, and the second a side event on October 15, 2023, at the 25th meeting of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice (SBSTTA-25).

The G7 Workshop on Invasive Alien Species began with opening remarks and an explanation of the purpose of the workshop from the Ministry of Environment (MOE) of Japan. Following that, were inputs from the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), the co-chairs of the IPBES IAS Assessment, and the International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN). Then each of the G7 member representatives shared information about their actions and policies to address IAS. Toward the end of the first day discussions began to refine a "G7 statement on invasive alien species," which was finalized and published on the last day of the workshop.

Opening remarks

SHIRAISHI Takao, Director General, Nature Conservation Bureau, Ministry of the Environment, Japan

Mr. Shiraishi began by outlining the issue of invasive alien species (IAS) as one of the five main direct drivers of global biodiversity loss that require global cooperation and action. He noted the importance of the recently adopted GBF with its Target 6[6] on IAS and the IPBES IAS report, in addressing the challenge. He also noted that Japan hosted the technical support unit (TSU) for the assessment at the Institute for Global Environmental Strategies (IGES), and has been strengthening national policies on IAS and supporting global coordination, for example through this workshop during Japan's G7 presidency.

[1] IPBES Global Assessment Report on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services, https://www.ipbes.net/global-assessment

[2] Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework, https://www.cbd.int/doc/decisions/cop-15/cop-15-dec-04-en.pdf

[3] IPBES Thematic Assessment Report on Invasive Alien Species and their Control, https://doi.org/ 10.5281/zenodo.7430682

[4] G7 Climate, Energy and Environment Ministers' Communiqué, https://www.meti.go.jp/press/2023/04/20230417004/20230417004-1.pdf (ENG); https://www.env.go.jp/content/000163420.pdf (JPN)

[5] Link to the first two IAS events held by the Ministry of Environment of Japan https://www.env.go.jp/en/nature/gairai_inter-conf_2023.html (ENG); https://www.env.go.jp/nature/gairai_inter-conf_2023.html (JPN)

[6] Target 6: Eliminate, minimize, reduce and or mitigate the impacts of invasive alien species on biodiversity and ecosystem services by identifying and managing pathways of the introduction of alien species, preventing the introduction and establishment of priority invasive alien species, reducing the rates of introduction and establishment of other known or potential invasive alien species by at least 50 per cent by 2030, and eradicating or controlling invasive alien species, especially in priority sites, such as islands.

Purpose of the workshop

NAKAO Fumiko, Senior Analyst for Biodiversity information, Nature Conservation Bureau, Ministry of the Environment, Japan

Ms. Nakao overviewed the workshop programme and then gave an introductory presentation, referring to the agreement, in the G7 Climate, Energy and Environment Ministers' Communiqué[7], to convene the workshop. She echoed Mr. Shiraishi's plea for international corporation, the importance of Target 6 and the insights gained from the IPBES IAS report[8], and she briefly reported on the webinar and the SBSTTA side event that preceded this G7 workshop. She explained that input received during these events was taken into consideration in the drafting of the G7 workshop outcome document.

Inputs from relevant international organizations

Marianela ARAYA-QUESADA, IAS/Biodiversity and Health Officer, Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity

Ms. Araya-Quesada explained that CBD involvement in IAS dates to the origin of the Convention, with Article 8(h)[9] focusing on this topic. The Convention has served as an international governance mechanism that has translated into national policies and regulations. She noted the need for a strategic approach to achieve Target 6, building on existing work including the IPBES IAS Assessment. Echoing the report itself, she said countries need to work together, taking a whole-of-government and the whole-of-society approach, and to support countries with limited capacities. She noted the current opportunity to update national invasive species strategies and action plans (NISSAPs) and national biodiversity strategies and action plans (NBSAPs), and thereby secure funding and other support for IAS activities. She introduced the Interagency Liaison Group on Invasive Alien Species (ILG), established under the Convention, which help with networking and collaboration and will support the updating of a toolkit to support the implementation of Target 6.

Helen ROY, Co-chair, IPBES IAS Assessment

Prof. Roy acknowledged Japan's role in the assessment by hosting its TSU at IGES. She briefly described the 4-year process of the assessment and noted that it drew on various values and knowledge systems and reviewed, in depth, more than 13,000 documents. Referencing the report, which is global in its scope, she explained that 37,000 alien species have been introduced and have established worldwide, with 200 new alien species recorded every year. Of these, 3,500 are invasive (with negative impacts on nature), while 2,300 are found on the lands of Indigenous Peoples and local communities. Prof. Roy said that policies have been insufficient in dealing with IAS. Even though 80% of countries have NBSAP IAS targets, 83% do not have national legislation or regulation on IAS and nearly half do not invest in IAS management. Nevertheless, the report states that 60% of global species extinctions have been caused, at least partly, by IAS and the global annual cost in 2019 was at least 423 billion USD, far outweighing the benefits of IAS.

Aníbal PAUCHARD, Co-chair, IPBES IAS Assessment

Prof. Pauchard pointed out a key attribute of the IPBES IAS Assessment: it is the most comprehensive global assessment on IAS so far. He added to Prof. Roy's numbers from the report saying that, at the current rate, by 2050 the total number of alien species could be one third higher than in 2005. And yet, they interact with other drivers of change like land-use change and climate change, highlighting the importance of integrated management. He noted the importance of managing pathways of introductions but emphasized the primacy of prevention. He also noted that adaptive management, including restoration, is critical to address IAS, and that marine and terrestrial systems need to be managed differently from one-another.

[7] G7 Climate, Energy and Environment Ministers' Communiqué: https://www.meti.go.jp/press/2023/04/20230417004/20230417004-1.pdf

[8] IPBES assessment report on invasive alien species and their control: https://www.ipbes.net/ias

[9] Article 8. In-situ Conservation: https://www.cbd.int/convention/articles/?a=cbd-08

Peter STOETT, Co-chair, IPBES IAS Assessment

Prof. Stoett said that the assessment indicated that, with immediate and sustained action, sufficient resources, and long-term commitment, the international community can stem the tide of IAS. Furthermore, pursuit of Target 6 also increases the likelihood of reaching other GBF targets and SDGs. He was also optimistic about the role of the report in this regard, especially in developing countries. Prof. Stoett provided an overview of the media coverage of the IPBES IAS Assessment Report's launch in over 50 languages and over 100 countries, and actions that have been taken in response by governments, organizations, and the private sector. The assessment's impacts and uptake include its use in biodiversity strategy formulation, its translation into other languages, events, and its use to motivate for project funding.

Kevin SMITH, IAS Programme Officer, The International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN)

Mr. Smith presented ways in which IUCN has been working on IAS. He said the Species Survival Commission has an Invasive Species Specialist Group (ISSG) that works with the IUCN secretariat to develop standards and technical guidance projects to support policy on IAS. He presented tools that can be used to further this work that have been developed by IUCN, often in partnership with others. These include the Global Register of Introduced and Invasive Species (GRIIS)[10]; guidance on CBD categories of IAS pathways[11]; the IUCN Global Invasive Species Database[12]; a standard on measuring the environmental impacts of IAS called the Environmental Impact Classification for Alien Taxa (EICAT)[13]; and the Red List of Threatened Species[14]. He added that IUCN and others develop guidance on IAS, for example supporting the European Commission in the implementation of EU IAS regulation. Looking ahead he said that, among other things, IUCN is interested in working more closely with the private sector to identify actions they can take to address IAS.

Information sharing among G7 members

The G7 members shared the status of IAS measures within their countries. The overview of their presentations is shared as "G7 Members' Policies and Good Practices on Invasive Alien Species" on the following website: https://www.env.go.jp/en/nature/gairai_inter-conf_2023.html.

Japan

Japan explained that damage from IAS is covered by the Act on the prevention of adverse ecological impacts caused by IAS[15] and related policy and management action plan. The Act, which was amended last year, designates certain species that require urgent action, such as the red imported fire ants (*Solenopsis invicta*). The revised Act also clarifies the responsibilities of the central and local governments. It is expected that the clarification of the responsibilities of the local governments will further promote measures against IAS. The private sector has been engaged through new guidelines on red imported fire ants, and emphasis is focused on strengthening international cooperation and promoting the participation of the business sector. MOE has also been working with relevant ministries, experts, and the public, for example to control red swamp crayfish (*Procambarus clarkii*) and red-eared slider turtles (*Trachemys scripta*). The IAS Action Plan is undergoing a review process in light of Japan's recent NBSAP[16].

Japan faces high risk of unintentional introduction of IAS through imported products. They said that chemical bait treatments had been used to eradicate the Argentine ant (*Linepithema humile*) in a test area, while native arthropod communities quickly recovered after the control measures were concluded. They explained that a manual on this approach is now being successfully used by local governments. Similar successful measures are now being applied to the red

[10] Global Register of Introduced and Invasive Species: https://griis.org

[11] Guidance for interpretation of the CBD categories of pathways for the introduction of invasive alien species: https://op.europa.eu/en/publication-detail/-/publication/f8627bbc-1f15-11eb-b57e-01aa75ed71a1

[12] Global Invasive Species Database: http://www.iucngisd.org/gisd/

[13] Environmental Impact Classification for Alien Taxa: https://portals.iucn.org/library/sites/library/files/documents/2020-026-En.pdf

[14] IUCN Red List of Threatened Species: https://www.iucnredlist.org

[15] See https://www.env.go.jp/en/nature/as.html

[16] Japan's National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan 2023-2030: https://www.cbd.int/doc/world/jp/jp-nbsap-v6-ja.pdf

imported fire ant. They said they are also using a compound derived from wasabi, Pyrethroid aerosol sprays to disinfect containers at ports, and a DNA amplification technique that has been distributed nationwide as a kit.

Italy

Italy said that their legal framework is set by the European Union in Regulation 1143/2014. The national framework includes various national acts, action plans and technical guidelines (e.g., to establish regional systems and monitoring programs and to report on the Nature Directive). The national competence is the Ministry for Environment, shared with other ministries and regions and supported by the Italian Institute for Environmental Protection and Research (ISPRA), which is also responsible for an IAS website and a national IAS database. They said Italian regions (autonomous entities that compose the Republic of Italy, together with the State and the municipalities), are responsible for the implementation of the European regulations. This responsibility regards, in particular, surveillance, eradication and management measures of IAS in the territory, and environmental restoration. Most international database**s** on IAS, as well as EICAT assessments, are hosted in ISPRA. Italy explained that Italian good practices on IAS include a national communication program on awareness, communication and training including training in dedicated courses. They added that there are 50 memorandums of understanding with industry**,** organizations for the dissemination of good practice and implementation of voluntary measures.

Canada

Canada shared that the 2020 Wild Species Report (updated every five years) found that 3,200 of over 50,000 species analyzed in Canada were alien species. In addition, there are currently 42 listed species at risk that face a high or medium threat from IAS. Annual municipal expenditures on IAS are estimated to be about 247.9 million CAD, and municipalities surveyed noted that they felt current funding on IAS was insufficient. Furthermore, Canada shared that the economic impact of one species, zebra mussels (*Dreissena polymorpha*), was estimated to be between 75 - 95 million CAD in the province of Ontario alone. The presentation underlined that federal-provincial-territorial committees play a key role in IAS-related coordination between Canadian jurisdictions, which have their own lists of IAS. There are over 60 pieces of regulation related to IAS in Canada, including two federal lists: the *Aquatic Invasive Species Regulations* and *Plant Protection Act* and *Regulations*. The 2004 IAS Strategy for Canada, which was approved by the federal government and provinces and territories, identifies the Ministers of Environment and Climate Change, of Agriculture and Agri-Food, and of Fisheries and Oceans as federal leads on IAS. Recommendations to better implement the Strategy were released in 2017. Canada explained that a 2030 National Biodiversity Strategy is planned for 2024. Development of the Strategy involves more than 20 federal departments, all provinces and territories, National Indigenous Organizations, as well as the public and various stakeholders. In terms of existing initiatives, the representative from Canada noted that risk assessment, economic impact, and management options are being researched, and automated systems are being tested for border control to identify high-risk aspects. Partnerships are key to achieving the implementation of Target 6, and include support for nongovernmental organizations and subnational government, and work with national organizations like the Canadian Council on Invasive Species and the Invasive Species Centre. Meanwhile, at the regional level, the North American IAS forum connects Canada with Mexico, and the USA, with whom Canada also collaborates on aquatic IAS.

France

France said that national legislation on biodiversity conservation was published in 2016, and that national law on IAS is submitted to European Union regulation. They said that a national strategy on IAS was published in 2017 and the current strategic plan to prevent the introduction and dissemination of IAS runs from 2022 – 2030. These issues are regulated by the Ministry of Ecological Transition and Territorial Cohesion, and most of the actions on IAS are treated under a national agency on biodiversity. Besides the species under EU regulation, thirty other species are regulated in metropolitan region, with a simple interdiction of introduction in nature. The French IAS resource center produces technical documents and sheets intended to managers working on IAS. They said that all codes of conduct published by the European Council as well as IUCN guides have been translated into French and/or adapted to specific situations, and also mentioned an application that uses citizen participation to identify or obtain information about IAS. The new national strategy for biodiversity has been published in November 2023, for 2022 – 2030, in line with the GBF and including comprehensive measures on IAS. In terms of funding, the Ministry of Ecological Transition and Territorial Cohesion, through the national strategy for

biodiversity, has a budget of 16 million EUR per year from 2024 to 2030 on IAS. They said that areas to be strengthened include, for example, the enhancement of the coordination among ministries and of organisms of control.

United States of America

The USA explained that their National Invasive Species Council (NISC), established in 1999, was updated in 2016, to provide whole-of-government coordination on IAS across 12 federal departments and four White House offices. In 2020, NISC shifted to a focus on thematic priorities like climate change, wildland fire, and early detection/rapid response. On climate, NISC convenes a regular Community of Practice to share information on, for example, range-shifting species which are often IAS. Additional areas of climate-related work include guidance on addressing the IAS risks associated with the managed relocation of threatened species facing climate constraints in their native habitat. In terms of work on wildland fire, an interagency task team has been focusing on invasive plants exacerbating fire risk, as recently reported in Hawaii, including proactive and pre-fire management; response to wildfire; and post-fire restoration and recovery. They said attention is being given to the development of a national early detection and rapid response framework focused on non-agricultural species. Early detection and rapid response for agriculture and at ports of entry is robust, but for wildlife and aquatic IAS, capacity needs to be bolstered, requiring interagency communication. A national IAS Information Center is trying to collect information to be accessed by the public and others, while a website, Recreation.gov, provides IAS information to campers. The USA said that addressing the impacts of IAS on underserved communities has been a major priority, while the 2024 work plan also includes work on biological control and Island biosecurity. In terms of spending, a "crosscut budget" looked at spending by federal departments across seven areas related to IAS and came to 3.6 billion USD.

United Kingdom

The UK said that there are about 2,000 non-native species established in Great Britain with 10 to 12 new ones establishing every year. About 10 to 15% of those species can cause significant adverse impacts with an estimated direct cost of about 1.9 billion GBP per year, excluding fungi. The UK explained that Great Britain, excluding Northern Ireland, shares an IAS strategy, the most recent of which is for 2023 to 2030, incorporating Target 6 and with a strengthened legislative framework. Target 6 is also incorporated into England's environmental improvement plan. A non-native species inspectorate has been established to enforce relevant legislation to educate stakeholders and aims to reduce establishments by at least 50% compared to 2000 levels. They said their main legislation is the IAS enforcement and permitting order of 2019, based on EU regulation. A list of species of special concern is being adapted to fit UK requirements. The UK said that 40 different pathways for introduction had been identified, and prioritizing is a major focus. For each priority pathway identified, a pathway action plan is established. Species are prioritized using a combination of risk assessment and risk management, taking into account the risk they pose and the feasibility of management. Action plans or contingency plans are then put in place to deal with them. UK overseas territories have more than 90% of the UK's biodiversity and are particularly vulnerable to invasive species. The UK Government has been working on a project to help improve biosecurity in the UK's Overseas Territories, including sharing UK expertise, processes and systems. The UK explained their funding situation, in which non-native species receives only a fraction of the funding of plant health and animal health. Furthermore, most funding is spent on existing problem species rather than prevention and rapid response to newly introduced species. Initial evidence gathered by the new non-native species inspectorate suggests that about 20% of anglers and boaters, and about 5% of containers have the potential to inadvertently bring in species that could become a problem. The UK concluded by agreeing with the IPBES SPM, that IAS can be dealt with greater ambition, resources, integrated governance and collaboration. In working towards this we can learn from other biosecurity disciplines, such as plant and animal health.

Germany

Germany explained that they implement the EU-Regulation 1143/2014 on IAS, which is based on the EU list currently counting 88 species (Union list). Species of the Union list shall not be intentionally kept, transported to, from or within the Union, and bred, among others. According to the EU-Regulation on IAS not widely spread species of the Union list require notification and rapid eradication measurements, while widely spread species require management measures. In Germany each federal state is responsible for the implementation of measures against not widely and widely spread species among others. Public awareness for IAS is being raised through e.g. a IAS website of the Federal Agency for Nature Conservation

and a biennial conference, where for example the IPBES IAS report will soon be featured. Germany published their first action plan on unintended priority pathways of IAS in 2021, involving federal ministries and federal regions and a public consultation. The action plan on the pathways of IAS is currently being updated for submission to the European Commission in 2025. Germany said that, in the first action plan 14 priority pathways were identified and prioritized based on the volume of species using the pathway. Twenty-four measures, namely on research, education, public outreach, and guidelines and handbooks were then developed and included in the action plan to address the unintentional introduction and spread of IAS. Many of the measures cross sectors and pathways, but the fact that they are not obligatory makes implementation challenging. Germany said this year a project began to develop a data portal, which aims to enable a more fluent administration work on IAS and implementation of the EU-Regulation on IAS. In the data portal it is planned to merge all geodata on alien species and IAS, to produce distribution maps and to perform analysis on alien species and IAS among others. Germany explained that at European level, the so-called LIFE Programme exists, " that funds projects on environment and climate action. For example, the "MICA LIFE-Project" includes a collaboration between Netherlands, Germany and Belgium to control the population of the coypu and muskrat. At international scale, they said, there is financing or support of projects focusing on IAS for example within the International Climate Initiative (IKI).

European Union

The EU said that Member States are required to take measures to prevent the spread, and strive for the eradication, of IAS at national level and to prepare reports to the European Commission. They said the updated (2022) EU list has 22 new species, with the following update expected in 2024. The Commission will make a proposal in early 2024 for new implementing regulation to revise the technical format for reporting by Member States, to facilitate more complete and comparable reports. They explained that the EU biodiversity strategy for 2030 includes IAS, and its ultimate objective is to decrease the number of Red List species threatened by IAS, by 50%. The EU ended by announcing a special event on IAS in Brussels on 14th of March 2024, to be attended by national officers from customs, sanitary agencies, and environmental ministries from Member States. EU enforcement of border controls will be discussed at the event.

Discussion on the G7 statement on IAS

Facilitated by the CHAIR, Ms. Nakao, the G7 members refined the draft set of recommendations that G7 members had been working on since earlier in 2023. These discussions were informed by the IAS Assessment of IPBES. The outcome document was finalized and published after the workshop as a "G7 statement on IAS" which is shared on the following website: https://www.env.go.jp/en/nature/gairai_inter-conf_2023.html.

The statement consists of the following sections: I. Introduction; II. Our common general views on addressing IAS, III. Our common views to enhance international cooperation to address the threats from IAS and our initial actions toward the achievement of Target 6 of the GBF; and IV. Follow-up process.

The introduction framed the challenge posed by IAS and recent global developments in response to that challenge and outlined the process that had led to the G7 statement.

The second section was an expression of the common understanding, among G7 members, of the IAS challenge and a statement of G7 members' aspiration to work together to address this challenge.

The third and longest section had a more precise focus on how to collaborate to address IAS, divided into four sub-sections. The first sub-section listed ways of promoting global, regional and bilateral collaboration; the second elaborated the importance of strengthening scientific research and of global databases and information systems; the third detailed G7 members' common views on outreach and mainstreaming through a whole-of-government and whole-of-society approach; and the fourth emphasized the importance of capacity building to address IAS.

A short final section on the follow-up process ensured that the statement and its sentiments would lead to continued and broadened collaboration on the important topic that it addressed.

Discussion on next steps

After finalizing the document, G7 members shared further views on how to enhance international cooperation on measures against IAS. They undertook to share information, as their first immediate action following the workshop.

The CHAIR thanked all involved, including participants for participation throughout the workshop, in this step towards achievement Target 6 of the GBF.

The official closing was later delivered by Mr. Shiraishi.

Annex 1. List of attendees

Japan

Mr. SHIRAISHI Takao, Director General, Nature Conservation Bureau, Ministry of the Environment

Dr. NAKAZAWA Keiichi, Director, Wildlife Division, Nature Conservation Bureau, Ministry of the Environment

Mr. MATSUMOTO Hideaki, Director, Office for Alien Species Management, Wildlife Division, Nature Conservation Bureau, Ministry of the Environment

Prof. GOKA Koichi, Chief, Biodiversity Division, National Institute for Environmental Studies

Dr. SAKAMOTO Hironori, Chief Research Officer, Biodiversity Division, National Institute for Environmental Studies

Italy

Ms. Anna IELE, Agricultural Expert, section for agri-food policies, Italian embassy in Tokyo

Canada

Ms. Rachel Tu-Van ARIEY-JOUGLARD, Senior Policy Advisor, Canadian Wildlife Service, Environment and Climate Change

France

Ms. Roseli PELLENS, Associated Professor in Macroecology and Systematics, Institute of Systematics, Department of Evolution and Biodiversity, National Museum of Natural History, Paris

Mr. Rémy CARDINET, Counsellor of sustainable development, French Embassy in Japan, Ministry of Economics, Finance and Industrial and Digital Sovereignty

United States of America

Dr. Stanley (Stas) Ware BURGIEL, Executive Director, National Invasive Species Council

United Kingdom

Mr. Finn EATON, Head of Invasive Species Policy, Department of Environment, Food & Rural Affairs

Mr. Olaf BOOY, Deputy Chief Non-native Species Officer, Department of Environment, Animal and Plant Health Agency

Germany

Mr. Ralf BECKER, Deputy Head of Division, Directorate Nature Conservation, Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation, Nuclear Safety and Consumer Protection

Ms. Clara FRASCONI WENDT, Research assistant, Zoological species protection, Federal Agency for Nature Conservation

European Union

Ms. Nevena MATEEVA, First Secretary, Trade Section, Delegation of the EU to Japan

Relevant Organizations/ Experts:

Ms. Marianela ARAYA QUESADA, Program Officer, Science, Society and Sustainable Futures Division, Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity (SCBD)

Mr. Kevin Graham SMITH, Senior Programme Officer, Science and Data Centre, The International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN)

Prof. Anibal PAUCHARD, Professor, Facultad de Ciencias Forestales, Universidad de Concepcion (Chile) / Co-chair, IPBES Assessment of Invasive Alien Species and their Control

Prof. Helen Elizabeth ROY, Ecologist, UK Centre for Ecology & Hydrology (UK) / Co-chair, IPBES Assessment of Invasive Alien Species and their Control

Prof. Peter STOETT, Dean, Faculty of Social Science and Humanities, Ontario Tech University (Canada) / Co-chair, IPBES Assessment of Invasive Alien Species and their Control

Chair

Ms. NAKAO Fumiko, Senior Analyst for Biodiversity information, Nature Conservation Bureau, Ministry of the Environment, Japan

Annex 2. Programme of the workshop

Monday, Nov. 20th			
10:00	-	10:05	Opening remarks by Director General, Nature Conservation Bureau, Ministry of the Environment, Japan*
10:05	-	10:15	Purpose of the workshop*
10:15	-	11:15	Inputs from relevant international organizations (SCBD, IPBES, IUCN) (15 min with Q&A 5 min each) *
11:15	-	11:25	Photo session*
11:25	-	13:00	Lunch
13:00	-	15:40	Information sharing among G7 members (15min with Q&A 5 min each)
15:40	-	16:00	Coffee break
16:00	-	17:20	**I. Introduction ／ II. Our common general views on addressing IAS**
17:20	-	17:40	Coffee break
17:40	-	19:00	**III. Our common views to enhance international cooperation to address the threats from IAS and our initial actions toward the achievement of Target 6 of the GBF** **1. Promoting global, regional, and bilateral collaborations**
19:00	-	21:00	Welcome Reception
Tuesday, Nov. 21st			
10:00	-	11:40	**III 2. Strengthening scientific research, global databases and information systems**
11:40	-	12:00	Coffee break
12:00	-	13:00	**III 3. Outreach and mainstreaming through a whole-of-government and whole-of-society approach**
13:00	-	14:30	Lunch
14:30	-	15:00	**III 3. Outreach and mainstreaming through a whole-of-government and whole-of-society approach (**continued)
15:00	-	16:30	**III 4. Capacity building**
16:30	-	16:50	Coffee break
16:50	-	18:00	**IV. Follow-up process**
18:00	-	19:00	[Continued discussion on remaining issues]
Wednesday, Nov. 22nd			
10:00	-	11:50	[Continued discussion on remaining issues]
11:50	-	12:00	Closing