## Questions on the orientations for work programme 2025

Please click the link to download the orientations

Cluster 6 Destination 1.pdf

The questions below relate to the expected impacts and outcomes as outlined in the orientations document.

1. How relevant are the expected outcomes for achieving the expected impacts described in the orientations? Please select the answer from the scale where '1' means that the expected outcome is not relevant at all, and '10' – that it is very relevant.

The taxonomic community (biodiversity identification from molecules, species and populations to ecosystems, including genomes and e-DNA) and its capacity to engage with and support policy and other decision-making are strengthened. Strategic approaches for a systematic reinforcement of expertise on taxonomy and genetic diversity in the EU and in Associated Countries are built.				10
In situ biodiversity observations are scaled up and made available with a view to support applied research and innovation, policy development and implementation, business actions and applications, and other use cases across various sectors. Systematic biodiversity observation is established (including citizen science and environmental observations), covering also little-known taxonomic groups and going beyond what the current policy is covering.				10
The establishment of satisfactory levels for species diversity and populations, favourable reference values, threshold values for good environmental status and ecological needs of species, including quantity and quality of their habitats, are based on latest available knowledge, inter alia through appropriate modelling approaches. The links between habitats restoration and species conservation, including as regards connectivity and functionality, and competing needs of species are better understood.				10

Socio-economic impacts including estimated benefits of nature restoration are better known, including with improved modelling of trends and integrated scenarios for biodiversity, ecosystem services and good quality of life.					8		
Actors implementing nature restoration activities, in particular under the proposal for an EU Nature Restoration Law benefit from updated knowledge.							1
Alternative governance and socio-economic models that better integrate all values of biodiversity and nature are designed with the aim to ensure biodiversity protection and restoration, including through application of the non-deterioration principle and innovative market instruments.						9	
Transformative change is steered by better understanding civil society perceptions of the biodiversity crisis and its underlying conflicts. Strategies, methods and tools to improve communication, increase people's awareness, stakeholder involvement and citizen engagement are developed.							1
Practices and innovations in agriculture, forestry, fisheries, and aquaculture to support and make sustainable use of biodiversity and ecosystem functions are further developed, tested and spread.				7			
Mixed production systems are developed and fostered to enhance agrobiodiversity and the delivery of added co-benefits and ecosystem services.				7			
Land managers have access to a wider range of crops, including protein crops, and breeds with a rich genetic base, supporting biodiversity in agroecosystems and contributing to low-input, competitive and resilient agriculture and climate change adaptation.				7			
Europe's leadership to reach an ambitious global biodiversity agenda, including the support for the forthcoming global knowledge support service for biodiversity and regional support centres benefit from improved knowledge, knowledge management and innovative solutions to achieve global biodiversity commitments in Europe and beyond.							1

Additional activities under the European Biodiversity Partnership Biodiversa+ will continue					9	
to support excellent research on biodiversity with an impact for society and policy and will						
focus on the flagship programmes 2023-2027 according to the partnership's co-created						
strategic research and innovation agenda for seven years, which includes calls for						
research projects, biodiversity, and ecosystems monitoring and science-based policy						
advisory activities.						

## 2. For the expected outcomes mentioned above, please explain why you find them relevant/not relevant.

Strengthening the taxonomic community and its capacity to support policy-making is critical based on the need to foster the strategic use of taxonomic knowledge and expertise for addressing the biodiversity crisis. As there is currently a shortage of taxonomic expertise both in terms of taxa and geographically, specifically in relation to species identification in comprehensive monitoring schemes, it is crucial to ensure this outcome is met adequately. In light of that, it would make sense to build upon the already existing projects and initiatives with a focus on advancing taxonomic expertise and aligning it with policy needs. While genomic and molecular methods are important complementary elements to integrative taxonomy, it is important to keep a balanced approach, i.e. one which does not diminish the importance of traditional taxonomic tools and techniques (e.g. using reference collections). Likewise, it will be crucial to reinforce the taxonomic workforce with additional skills, and boost training of new generations of taxonomists. A multidisciplinary approach to taxonomic work will also contribute to a) foster innovations in building new tools supporting species identification (e.g. use of AI), b) data and metadata models integrated (from all type of data sources), and c) ensure the availability of professional careers for taxonomists and widen up the use of taxonomic expertise in a variety of fields (food security, health, agriculture and planning, among others).

## 3. For the orientations presented, what is missing, should be further expanded or reformulated? Please explain why?

Supporting the use of linked biodiversity data is instrumental to produce a comprehensive and harmonized baseline in support of, among others, monitoring schemes. This should include additional efforts for standardization of nomenclature, enlargement of taxonomic checklists and backbones, implementation of resolution engines for validation, expansion of reference collections and integration of specimens metadata. For that, the support of a taxonomic central hub to coordinate efforts across countries and taxa groups would be essential and ensure sustainability, inclusion and analysis over time. It could gather and coordinate the available resources including instruments and tools (from protocols to standards, platforms and guidelines), as well as experts, to facilitate mobilization, capacity building and scaling, benchmarking and replication of initiatives, whenever needed.