

## PROPOSALS AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF IUCN ON THE CONSIDERATIONS OF THE MODALITIES AND INSTITUTIONAL ARRANGEMENTS FOR AN IPBES

### First Session of the Plenary Meeting on IPBES, 3-7 October 2011, Nairobi, Kenya

Reference	Version of the working paper	IUCN's proposals and recommendations	Rationale
Item 4(a) UNEP/IPBES.MI/1/2 Legal issues relating to the establishment and operationalization of the platform	<p>Four options are presented:</p> <p>1 The platform has already been established ;</p> <p>2(a) Establishment at the current plenary meeting, by the members;</p> <p>2(b) Executive heads of selected organizations to establish the platform;</p> <p>2(c) Intergovernmental organs of the United Nations, its programmes and funds and/or specialized agencies to establish the platform.</p>	<p>Modalities and institutional arrangements should be all set before the end of 2012. The operational working of IPBES should begin no later than early 2013.</p> <p>Adequate funding for the operationalization of the platform should be provided on the basis of the 1<sup>st</sup> work programme.</p> <p>Option 2(a) offers the best guarantee and the highest flexibility to reach operationalization at the earliest opportunity.</p>	<p>The conservation community needs an authoritative and reliable tool.</p> <p>The credibility of IPBES will strongly depend on its first results.</p> <p>The 2 sessions of the plenary offer good opportunity for debate and sharing views. The work has been seriously prepared through in-depth work especially through an informal multi-stakeholder planning group.</p>

Reference	Version of the working paper	IUCN's proposals and recommendations	Rationale
<p>Item 4(b) UNEP/IPBES.MI/1/3 Functions and operating principles of the platform</p>	<p>Functions and operating principles originate from Busan Outcome.</p>	<p>The platform should address both needs expressed by governments and by non-governmental stakeholders.</p> <p>A dedicated operating principle should recognize the need of a strong participation of civil society in implementing the functions of the platform, with priority involvement of relevant NGOs and scientific organizations.</p> <p>A dedicated operating principle should stress on the need for a broadly-targeted dissemination of all the findings and insights of IPBES. Resource should be permanently mobilized on this purpose.</p> <p>Clarify modalities of the periodic review of the platform's efficiency and effectiveness.</p> <p>The knowledge and datasets used to achieve IPBES work programme should be regularly monitored for quality and reliability. Recognized existing assessments built on extensive datasets, like the IUCN Red List of Threatened Species, should be taken into account as a high-quality input.</p>	<p>Civil society should be considered as the main beneficiaries of IPBES. This will improve saliency of the work.</p> <p>Civil society participation should inspire every aspect of governance and working of IPBES.</p> <p>Transparency and impact would be highly optimized by communication of IPBES findings and insights. This should include vulgarizing at global, regional and sub-regional, and national scales.</p> <p>Lessons learnt from other intergovernmental mechanism to improve legitimacy and credibility (e.g. IPCC).</p> <p>Rely exclusively on expertise and simple peer-reviewing could bias the findings because biodiversity and ecosystem services are such a wide topic and because there is no universal metrics to measure status and trends so far.</p>

Reference	Version of the working paper	IUCN's proposals and recommendations	Rationale
<p>Item 4(c) UNEP/IPBES.MI/1/4 Functions and structures of bodies that might be established under the platform</p> <p><u>I Institutional arrangements for the platform</u></p>	<p>Membership is detailed along with the definition of main bodies as the plenary and the secretariat. Some insights are presented on the evaluation of the operation of the platform.</p>	<p>Creation of an institutional permanent mechanism to ensure an interface between IPBES members and civil society.</p> <p>This mechanism could have the following functions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Stimulate expression of civil society requests;</li> <li>- Identify participants to serve as ad hoc observers and develop logistics and process understanding so the relevant CSOs will be able to maximize their presence at plenary;</li> <li>- Organize, manage and disseminate data and information on knowledge held by relevant CSOs;</li> <li>- Inform and constantly liaise with relevant stakeholders to improve ownership;</li> <li>- Check that IPBES scientific information is effectively delivered to decision-makers;</li> <li>- Propose terms of reference to address specific needs for tools and methodologies for non-governmental stakeholders;</li> <li>- Consult with networks to identify common views on progress made, outline obstacles, constraints to implementation, new challenges.</li> </ul>	<p>This recommendation is aimed to fully recognize the need for the platform to benefit from the civil society engagement as knowledge provider and user. As crucial inputs are expected, it is vital to organize this participation.</p> <p>Transparency would be enhanced since this mechanism will multiply the targets for IPBES findings and will give a feedback on how it is used.</p>
<p>Item 4(c) UNEP/IPBES.MI/1/4 Functions and structures of bodies that might be established under the platform</p> <p><u>II Plenary</u></p>	<p>Membership of the plenary is specified. The participation of UN bodies, other intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations is clarified.</p> <p>Functions of the plenary are detailed following the Busan Outcome</p> <p>Details are provided on the officers of the plenary.</p>	<p>Permanent and high participation of civil society organizations in the plenary under an <i>ex officio</i> capacity.</p> <p>This requires introducing permanent observers on a closed term. This status could be granted to relevant coordinating civil society organizations, including scientific community and NGOs, that can be selected among the following categories:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- intergovernmental organizations;</li> <li>- international research organizations;</li> <li>- concerned regional research organizations;</li> <li>- environment trust funds;</li> <li>- NGOs;</li> <li>- private sector.</li> </ul> <p>Additional <i>ad hoc</i> observer status should be available through a simple accreditation scheme.</p> <p>IUCN welcomes that the plenary should encourage and take into account inputs and suggestions from relevant stakeholders.</p>	<p>Relevant stakeholders should be recognized as credible and permanent contributors to the work of the platform.</p> <p>Their <i>ex officio</i> place should not be questioned to preserve a high quality dialogue with policy-makers.</p> <p>The status of Permanent observer, coupled with extended rights to introduce requests, to provide and to circulate statements, is the appropriate option in this regard.</p>

Reference	Version of the working paper	IUCN's proposals and recommendations	Rationale
<p>Item 4(c) UNEP/IPBES.MI/1/4 Functions and structures of bodies that might be established under the platform</p> <p><u>III Subsidiary bodies of the plenary</u></p>	<p>Three options are proposed to organize the implementation of support, administrative and technical functions:</p> <p>Option 1 states for the creation of a unique body in the form of a bureau Option 2 implies the creation of an executive committee and a bureau Option 3 is about creating three subsidiary bodies: a bureau, an executive committee and a scientific advisory panel and propose to share functions amongst these three.</p> <p>The administrative function of the potential subsidiary body encompasses the reviewing requests by observer organization for admission by the plenary°.</p> <p>The possibility to establish working groups is detailed and propositions are made to precise their role.</p>	<p>IUCN favors the option that enhances efficiency, effectiveness and provides adequate and equitable participation of government nominees and representatives of non government stakeholders.</p> <p>The nomination of members of any subsidiary body should be transparent. Representatives should be individuals nominated following criteria among others scientific experience, peer-recognition, and list of publications.</p> <p>Open process for reviewing and prioritizing the requests should be established. All requests to be submitted to the plenary should undergo the same processing. The appropriate subsidiary body should be accountable for reviewing the requests according to a set of objective criteria. That could include among others: consistency with the scope of the work programme, relevance, urgency and quality of the process that originated the request, etc.</p> <p>While the supporting, administrative and technical functions proposed by UNEP could be undertaken by adequate subsidiary body of the plenary, there is still a need for an independent panel specifically dedicated to monitor the quality of knowledge mobilized by IPBES.</p> <p>IUCN acknowledges the openness for the composition of the working groups and asks that no restriction would be added to this respect.</p>	<p>Together with governmental organizations, non-governmental organizations could mobilize the best possible level of expertise to implement the 4 functions and follow the work programme.</p> <p>The composition of the subsidiary bodies is of great importance for the legitimacy of IPBES findings. The institutional arrangements should favor technical and scientific debates among individual experts.</p> <p>The reviewing and prioritizing process is crucial for the saliency of the platform's work. The proposed option will lead to address useful and salient questions pertaining drivers of biodiversity loss and ecosystem services degradation.</p> <p>Data and knowledge quality is highly variable even under peer-reviewing. Particularly, the topics of biodiversity and ecosystem services require long-term monitoring and interdisciplinary approaches. The variability and the heterogeneity of the data to be mobilized could lead to serious biases. This explains the need for a constant and independent evaluation.</p>
<p>Item 4(c) UNEP/IPBES.MI/1/4 Functions and structures of bodies that might be established under the platform</p> <p><u>IV Secretariat</u></p>	<p>The administrative functions of the secretariat are defined. It includes the function to liaise with Governments, civil society organizations and all other relevant stakeholder organizations (paragraph 28 (e)).</p> <p>The secretariat is in charge of facilitating the evaluation of efficiency and effectiveness (paragraph 28 (m)).</p>	<p>The secretariat should be in charge of building an interface between IPBES and civil society, further than only liaising with non-governmental organizations.</p> <p>IUCN proposes that a special mechanism, adequately funded, to be designed as a permanent function of the secretariat to run the interface between members and civil society.</p> <p>An autonomous body or process could be established to evaluate effectiveness and efficiency. This needs further specifications.</p>	<p>The interface will enhance cross-viewing on the needs for knowledge, tools, methodology and capacity building. This will improve legitimacy and saliency of IPBES and broaden ownership on its findings.</p> <p>Evaluation is a crucial part for public policies. Credibility of IPBES relies very much on the value of its product and the conduct of its business. The evaluation of efficiency is crucial to maintain financial resources.</p>

Reference	Version of the working paper	IUCN's proposals and recommendations	Rationale
<p>Item 4(c) UNEP/IPBES.MI/1/4 Functions and structures of bodies that might be established under the platform</p> <p><u>V Trust Fund</u></p>	<p>It is proposed that funding is established under voluntary basis. It targets governments, United Nations bodies, the Global Environment Facility, other intergovernmental organizations and other stakeholders, such as the private sector and foundations.</p>	<p>Voluntary contribution from non-governmental sources would be enhanced by a clear recognition of the role of non-governmental stakeholders in the work and governance of IPBES.</p>	
<p>Item 4(d) UNEP/IPBES.MI/1/5 Rules of procedure for meetings of the platform</p>	<p>It is proposed a simple process for accreditation for observers.</p>	<p>The representation and credentials framework for permanent observers should be the same as the one for members.</p> <p>Accreditation Permanent observers should remain simple and widely open.</p> <p>The rules of procedure should allow written and oral statements provided by non-voting members to circulate and fertilize the debates.</p> <p>Designing a special process to enable supplementary items to be added or completed in the agenda by observers.</p>	

Reference	Version of the working paper	IUCN's proposals and recommendations	Rationale
Item 4(f) UNEP/IPBES.MI/1/7 Work programme	Work programme is merely addressed through voluntary contributions of several institutions and governments that have been made in the course of year 2011.	<p>IUCN welcomes the importance and quality of work already done in this scope and thanks the institutions which undertook these initiatives.</p> <p>Several options could be followed to define the work programme. IUCN considers that the four functions of IPBES, knowledge generation, assessment, capacity building and policy support, are intimately interlinked and has to be reflected in the work programme.</p> <p>IUCN contributes to the debates about the work programme with the following:</p> <p>On knowledge management, IPBES should (see Annex IV):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- promote open access to data and products;</li> <li>- design appropriate access restriction ;</li> <li>- assess the quality of the different datasets;</li> <li>- promote long time-series datasets;</li> <li>- acknowledge the need to respect IPR of data providers.</li> </ul> <p>Assessments, undertaken by IPBES should (see Annex V):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- seek comprehensiveness;</li> <li>- undergo a review process;</li> <li>- characterize and communicating uncertainty;</li> <li>- be transparent on the methodologies;</li> <li>- identify the need for original research (to be linked with the knowledge generation function of IPBES);</li> <li>- be flexible and adaptable for any scale of action, from global to national;</li> <li>- be kept up to date.</li> </ul> <p>IUCN wishes that its top-leading and recognized products, in relevance with the work programme to be defined, would be use, including the IUCN Red List of Threatened Species, the World Database of Protected Areas, the Global Invasive Species Database and the coming IUCN Red List of Ecosystems.</p>	

For more information, please contact:

**Pierre Commenville**  
Programme Officer, IPBES  
Global Policy Unit

IUCN World Headquarters  
Rue Mauverney 28, 1196 Gland, Switzerland  
Tel :+41 22 999 0348; Fax: +41 22 999 0002  
E-mail: [pierre.commenville@iucn.org](mailto:pierre.commenville@iucn.org)  
[www.iucn.org/ipbes](http://www.iucn.org/ipbes)

