



CIVIL SOCIETY ORGANIZATIONS INVOLVEMENT IN THE INTERGOVERNMENTAL PLATFORM ON BIODIVERSITY AND ECOSYSTEM SERVICES (IPBES)

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

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1. The present document focuses on the ways and means to strengthen the participation of Civil Society Organizations (CSOs) in the IPBES work and governance. It is proposed by the International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN), which is an intergovernmental and multi-stakeholder organization composed of over 70 governments, 120 government agencies and 800 non-governmental organizations.
2. This paper is intended to stimulate discussions on the role of civil society in IPBES and serve as a basis for the proposals on existing examples and the preparatory documents for the First IPBES Plenary to be held in Nairobi, in October 2011. These proposals therefore need further discussion before being finalized for the operationalization of IPBES.
3. IUCN considers IPBES as a science-policy interface and acknowledges the role of the scientific community and other knowledge holders as crucial for the success of the delivery of the IPBES work programme. Therefore the way scientific community and other knowledge holders are involved in IPBES is a key issue.
4. Taking into account the scope of civil society participation agreed/formulated by governments in the Busan Outcome, in June 2010, three models for the involvement of civil society in IPBES are considered in this paper. They are based on the participation of CSOs in various existing intergovernmental mechanisms and Multilateral Agreements.
5. The Minimalist model stands for the most restricted level of the civil society engagement. According to this model, the civil society engagement is restricted to the submission of research and science and the civil society participation is limited in the plenary deliberations.
6. According to the Policy Development model, CSOs are actively involved in the agenda-setting and the development of norms but they do not participate in the work of the governing bodies.
7. According to the *Ex Officio* model, civil society participates in all aspects of the deliberative work and is directly involved in the work of the governing bodies, as non-voting members.
8. All three proposed models, including the one that allows the highest participation of civil society, do not necessarily diminish the authority of governments.
9. These three models are based on detailed analysis of the existing systems. The design of the role of civil society for IPBES could also be innovative. Given that applications of the models to IPBES case study are not mutually exclusive, a combination of them could be adopted.

10. This paper proposes an assessment of the three proposed models regarding to credibility, saliency, legitimacy, transparency, ownership and policy impact of the work of IPBES.
11. Given that, according to the Busan Outcome, the most of decisions at all governance levels will be taken by consensus amongst governments and not by majority voting, the non-voting participation by civil society in the governance bodies provides an important opportunity for governments to benefit from input by CSOs. This might also foster a sense of legitimacy among CSOs without detracting from the decision-making power of the governments whose financial and political support is a prerequisite for the success of IPBES.
12. The possibility for CSOs to play a role in shaping the scope of IPBES and to contribute to the decision-making process might also enhance the likelihood of the acceptance of the IPBES findings and of the implementation of its recommendations. Therefore the involvement of CSOs in all IPBES aspects of work and governance would facilitate the implementation of the IPBES activities and increase its impacts on both policy and practice worldwide.
13. Finally, the paper proposes an assessment of the three proposed models in regards to credibility, salience, legitimacy, transparency, ownership and policy impact of the work of IPBES.
14. A summary of options and their implications is presented below:

	CSOs involved according to a Minimalist Model	CSOs involved according to a Policy Development Model	CSOs involved according to an Ex Officio Model
Status of participation	<p>Consultative voice</p> <p>CSOs would be only ad hoc observers, accredited for each plenary.</p>	<p>Consultative voice</p> <p>Relevant stakeholders would be permanent observers. Other CSOs could be accredited as ad hoc observer.</p>	<p>Consultative voice</p> <p>Relevant stakeholders would be permanent observers. Other CSOs could be accredited as ad hoc observer.</p>
In the Plenary	<p>Silent observer: access to documents but no written or oral statements during sessions</p> <p>Written inputs prior the session but no requests</p>	<p>Silent observer: access to documents but no written or oral statements.</p> <p>As far as they participate to the plenary, CSOs would be involved in provisional agenda setting and proposed development of norms</p>	<p>Written and oral statements allowed, provided, circulated and taken into account, prior to and during sessions.</p> <p>Options for oral interventions: the Plenary could be either defined slots or permanent access</p>
Application for requests to be submitted to the Plenary	<p>Only requests from members would be examined</p>	<p>A process is established to receive and prioritize requests by anyone</p> <p>Priority given to requests by members</p>	<p>A process is established to receive and prioritize requests by anyone</p> <p>All applicants would fall under a unique and transparent set of criteria and would be treated equally</p>

	CSOs involved according to a Minimalist Model	CSOs involved according to a Policy Development Model	CSOs involved according to an Ex Officio Model
In the subsidiary bodies			
Executive Board/Bureau	No participation	No participation	Participation of CSOs to a level determined by the plenary along a defined ratio that could span from a low rate to total equity.
Executive committee	No participation	No participation	Participation depending on level of expertise and relevance
Scientific Advisory Panel	Scientists from governmental institutions	Scientists nominated as <i>intuitu personae</i> using a set of criteria including independence and leadership	Scientists nominated as <i>intuitu personae</i> using a set of criteria including independence and leadership
Working groups	No restriction on the origins of experts	Full participation of experts including: -Submitting names of authors for the assessments; -Providing assistance in conceptual approaches and methodology development -Participating in the peer-review process.	Full participation of experts including: -Submitting names of authors for the assessments; -Providing assistance in conceptual approaches and methodology development -Participating in the peer-review process.
Level of the expert implication	Experts do not interact with decision-makers	Experts work and report under ruling of decision-makers	Experts work, report and directly interact with decision-makers
Assessment of the credibility, legitimacy transparency, saliency of the governance	Low credibility and legitimacy, could be balanced through communication	Medium credibility and saliency but high transparency Speeding up policy impact	High credibility, legitimacy and transparency Very strong ownership Permanent monitoring of implementation

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Background	5
I.1. Preliminary note	5
I.2. Definition and scope of Civil Society Organizations (CSOs)	5
I.3. Scope of expected added values of CSOs for IPBES	6
I.4. Agreed elements of civil society participation (the Busan Outcome)	6
II. Options for the participation of CSOs in the IPBES work and governance	7
II.1. Introduction to options for civil society participation	7
II.2. Options for the Observer Status of CSOs	8
II.2.1. Types of observer status and eligibility	8
II.2.2. Options for eligibility as Observers	9
II.3. Options for the participation of CSOs in the IPBES Plenary	9
II.4. Options for a process to receive and prioritize CSOs requests submitted to the plenary	11
II.5. Options for the participation of CSOs in the IPBES subsidiary bodies	11
II.5.1. In the Executive Board/Bureau	11
II.5.2. In the Executive Committee	12
II.5.3. In the Scientific Advisory Panel	13
II.5.4. In the Working Groups	14
II.6. Options for the participation of CSOs in the Secretariat	14
III. Assessment of the three models of the civil society participation in the IPBES work and governance.	15

I. BACKGROUND

I.1. Preliminary note

1. The first sessions of the plenary meeting of the Intergovernmental Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES) will be held on the 3-7 October 2011 in Nairobi, Kenya to consider modalities and arrangements to fully operationalize the IPBES.
2. This paper informs the sessions on Item 4 (b) "Functions and operating principles", Item 4 (c) (b), "Functions and structure of bodies" and Item 4 (d) "Rules of procedures" for meetings of the Platform of item 4 of the agenda: Consideration of the modalities and institutional arrangements for IPBES.
3. The present document will focus on the ways and means to strengthen the participation of Civil Society Organizations (CSOs) in the IPBES work and governance.
4. The options developed in this paper are based on the document "Assessing the value of civil society involvement in IPBES governance" prepared under the auspices of IUCN in 2009.¹
5. The governance structure that this document follows is based on the working document Nr. UNEP/IPBES.MI/1/4 on the functions and structures of bodies that might be established under an IPBES; i.e. the document presents options for the participation of CSOs in the IPBES Plenary, in the Executive Board/Bureau as well as in the Scientific Advisory Body, if it is decided that this Scientific Advisory Body should be established.
6. It also refers to the working document Nr. UNEP/IPBES.MI/1/5 on the draft rules and procedures for meetings of IPBES and provides relevant information to specific issues such as observers, level of the participation of CSOs and potential rules governing the treatment of requests from CSOs.
7. This document presents options for procedures that would ensure different levels of the participation of civil society in the IPBES work, taking into account the scope of participation established in Busan in 2010. Existing examples of the different options are also provided. They are based on the precedent set by eight selected intergovernmental and multi-stakeholder institutions, platforms and processes from the environment, development, economic and humanitarian sectors which include the mechanisms for multi-stakeholder engagement, including NGOs, IGOs, industry groups and other stakeholders in consultation processes, discussions, and decisions related to their work and mandates. They are the Advisory Scientific and Technical Group for the Inter-Agency Task Force on Disaster Reduction, The United Global Environmental Outlook (GEO), the International Assessment of Agricultural Knowledge, Science and Technology for Development (IAASTD), the International Labour Organization (ILO), the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), the International Union for the Protection of New Varieties of Plants (UPOV), the International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN), the UN Commission for Sustainable Development (CSD), the International Criminal Court (ICC), the OECD Development Assistance Committee, the Joint United Nations Programme on HIV/AIDS (UNAIDS) and the World Trade Organization (WTO).

I.2. Definition and scope of Civil Society Organizations (CSOs)

8. For the purpose of this paper, civil society is defined as any non-state actor, including the private sector.² In the context of IPBES any non-state relevant actor therefore includes inter-governmental organizations (IGOs), international and national non-governmental organizations (NGOs), academia, scientific organizations, business and industry, farmers, indigenous peoples, local authorities, workers and trade unions. Some of those are already included in the nine Major Groups represented at meetings sponsored

¹ Briefing paper prepared for IUCN by Johann Bernsten Environmental Law and Policy Consulting- Bernsten J. et al., May 2010.

² See Organization of American States, 2010.

by UNEP.

9. If considered the past discussions to create a permanent interface science-policy on biodiversity and ecosystem services, the main actors from civil society are to be found among NGOs focused on environment and scientific organizations.
10. This paper does not include options for the participation of the United Nations organizations/agencies (UNEP, UNESCO, UNDP and FAO) and the secretariats of biodiversity-related multilateral environmental agreements (MEAs) in the IPBES work and governance.

I.3. Scope of expected added values of CSOs for IPBES

11. In the field of biodiversity, ecosystem services and human well-being, civil society (including NGOs, academia, scientific and research organizations sometimes related to governments but many times independent from the governmental bodies) is holder of relevant data and information. These institutions have long experience in, among other functions, monitoring the status of biodiversity and ecosystems as well as the trends in economic and social sciences in developing and developed countries. Further, governments have developed policies using outputs of such assessments. In addition to the above mentioned institutions, actors within the private sector at a local to global scale are also important users of biodiversity and ecosystem services and have direct impact on human well-being. Furthermore, they have the potential to reverse negative trends through investment and innovation. They also hold information on the use, practices and existence of species and varieties, that is not always scientifically documented.
12. As provider and user of knowledge on biodiversity and ecosystem services, organizations representing civil society should have a role in the governance and work of IPBES. Consequently, the value, legitimacy and utility of IPBES would be strengthened through a fair representation and participation of CSOs in its governance structure as well as in the work programme. IPBES would benefit from the participation of CSOs in terms of credibility, saliency, legitimacy, transparency, ownership and policy impact.
13. It would increase the capacity of IPBES to produce credible outputs by involving the highest possible level of expertise, by broadening perspectives and by mobilizing a wider body of knowledge (credibility);
14. The ability to identify and formulate the pertinent questions and answers and the relevance of the findings would be strengthened by CSOs that are working on these issues closely and on a daily basis (saliency);
15. The widest possible representation and involvement of multi-stakeholders would foster the acceptance and justification of IPBES and its mandate to carry out work and provide valuable outputs to the relevant community or actor (legitimacy);
16. It would improve the degree of openness of the IPBES decision-making processes (transparency);
17. It would help to create a collegial platform where different expertise, disciplines and roles meet to address the same objective (ownership);
18. The implementation of the findings emanating from IPBES would be improved (policy impact).
19. A full assessment of the three models for the civil society participation according to these principles is presented in the final section of this document.

I.4. Agreed elements of civil society participation (the Busan Outcome)

20. According to the Busan Outcome³, IPBES is established as an intergovernmental body and the Plenary is the IPBES decision making body. It is already agreed that the plenary has a role in liaising with CSOs

³ Third ad hoc intergovernmental and multi-stakeholder meeting on an intergovernmental science-policy platform on biodiversity and ecosystem services, Busan, Republic of Korea, 7-11 June 2010

however this role is still to be defined.

21. Based on Paragraph 6 (a) of the Busan Outcome: “The platform should respond to requests from Governments, including those conveyed to it by multilateral environmental agreements related to biodiversity and ecosystem services as determined by their respective governing bodies. The plenary should welcome inputs and suggestions from, and the participation of, United Nations bodies related to biodiversity and ecosystem services as determined by their respective governing bodies. The plenary should also encourage and take into account, as appropriate, inputs and suggestions made by relevant stakeholders, such as other intergovernmental organizations, international and regional scientific organizations, environment trust funds, non-governmental organizations and the private sector. To facilitate this, and to ensure that the platform’s work programme is focused and efficient, a process to receive and prioritize requests should be established by the plenary”.
22. Furthermore as stated in Paragraph 6 (g): “The plenary, which should be the platform’s decision-making body, should be open to participation by all States Members of the United Nations and by regional economic integration organizations. Intergovernmental organizations and other relevant stakeholders should participate in the plenary as observers, in accordance with the rules of procedure established by the plenary.”

II. OPTIONS FOR THE PARTICIPATION OF CSOS IN THE IPBES WORK AND GOVERNANCE

II.1. Introduction to options for civil society participation

23. The three proposed models for the civil society participation in international institutions governance and work are presented below, taking into account the scope adopted in Busan. They range from minimal engagement to full participation in governance, without voting power.
24. The Minimalist Model is applied to international institutions with the most restricted level of civil society engagement. In these forums, the only mechanism available for the civil society engagement is in the submission of research and science and limited participation in the plenary deliberations. In terms of the key criteria of salience, credibility, legitimacy, policy impact, ownership and transparency, this model of engagement mechanisms ranks low. IPCC is an example of this model.
25. According to the Policy Development Model, CSOs are actively involved in the agenda-setting and the development of norms. The institutions that operate according to this model include the CSD, ICC, the OECD Development Assistance Committee, and the United Nations International Strategy on Disaster Reduction (UNISDR). The engagement is significantly greater than in the previous model, where it is limited to the submission of research and scientific evidence. However, the institutions falling into this model offer limited involvement by virtue of the fact that CSOs do not participate in the actual governance of these institutions.
26. The *Ex-Officio*⁴ Model sets out a permanent regular and extensive participation of CSOs by enabling deep and iterative interaction between civil society and governments. Examples of institutions or processes running under this model of participation include the GEO, IAASTD and UNAIDS. In each of these bodies and processes, civil society representatives are recognized *de facto* as participants in all aspects of the deliberative work and are directly involved in the governing bodies, albeit as non-voting members. According to this model, public debates on specific matters are common as well as the elaboration of specific products and assessments through a collaborative process regardless the voting power of the participant. In terms of the key criteria of salience, credibility, legitimacy, policy impact, ownership and transparency, this model of engagement ranks very high.
27. Some organizations run under a full participation model, along which CSOs have voting rights. Millennium

⁴ *Ex-officio* stands for ‘from the office’ meaning that access to discussions is automatic regarding your position

Ecosystem Assessment, International Labour Organization, and World Commission on Dams are examples of precedent. As models are not mutually exclusive, the options proposed took consideration of these models, in full respect with the Busan Outcome.

28. The three models presenting the options for the participation of CSOs in the IPBES work and governance are presented below:

	Minimalist Model	Policy Development Model	Ex-Officio Model
Scope of role:	Civil society role limited to mere submission of research. Experts <u>do not directly interact</u> with policy-makers	Civil society involved in the agenda- setting, the development of norms and policy development Experts work <u>for</u> decision-makers	Civil society involved in all aspects of the work of IPBES, helping to shape scope and substance Experts <u>work directly</u> with decision-makers
Level of participation	Through tokens	No involvement in the governance bodies	Participation on the governance body as non-voting members
Status in governing body	Silent observer	Silent observer	Observer with non-voting rights
Examples of Organizations running under this model	IPCC ICCM	ICC OECD Advisory Committees CSD UNISDR	UNEP GEO Land Mines Treaty UNAIDS IAASTD

II.2. Options for the Observer Status of CSOs

II.2.1. Types of observer status and eligibility

29. According to the existing examples in the international context, the purpose of an observer status is to enable CSOs to follow discussions on matters of direct interest to them.
30. In the context of IPBES, the Busan Outcome states that the Plenary should encourage and consider inputs and suggestions made by relevant stakeholders.
31. The preparatory paper under the reference Nr. UNEP/IPBES.MI/1/5 proposes, under its rules 5 to 7, a procedure to introduce request for accreditation. After being admitted as observers, CSOs could, , designate their representatives to attend the IPBES Plenary sessions and working groups, similarly to the processes of IPCC. The Observer organizations would be required to register their representatives for each session in advance. The participation of CSOs as an observer in the Plenary sessions or working groups would not imply their admission or invitation to every workshop and expert meeting. Certain meetings might be closed to the observers. The status of the observer might be granted for a limited period of time.
32. One should consider, with regards to the type of CSO and their area of expertise, the permanent and the *ad hoc* observer status.

33. The status of the Permanent Observer is an established precedent in some international organizations where national governments are the members. The Permanent Observers are the non-Members that have certain specified rights beyond those of other stakeholders.
34. The Permanent Observers typically have some, but not all, of the rights and privileges of the Members of such organizations. They do not have the right to vote, however other rights and privileges may be given such as an attendance to meetings, a right to present information and speak at meetings and a participation in working groups.
35. Typically, governments or intergovernmental organizations become permanent observers when they either do not qualify for membership or do not wish to become full members. WTO is an example of organization that has permanent observers. The purpose of the observer status in WTO is to enable permanent observers to follow discussions on matters of direct interest to them. According to practice, the permanent observer status is generally granted to organizations which already have an observer status with the United Nations co-sponsoring organizations/agencies.

II.2.2. Options for eligibility as Observers

36. The Busan Outcome particularly pinpoints the organizations whose inputs and requests should be considered: intergovernmental organizations, international and regional scientific organizations, environment trust funds, NGOs and the private sector.
37. According to the Minimalist Model of participation of CSOs, there would be no Permanent Observer accreditation given to any CSO. CSOs would be required to request accreditation on a one-shot basis requiring application for observer status at each meeting. This would lead to a progressive lack of interest to participate and generate instability of participants.
38. According to the Policy Development Model and the *Ex-Officio* model, there would be both permanent observers and ad hoc observers.
39. The Permanent Observers would be designated along the relevant following groups: intergovernmental organizations, international research organizations, relevant regional research organizations, environment trust funds, NGOs and the private sector (see above). Regarding the maximum number of the permanent observers that could be decided by the Plenary, it would be necessary to institute a rotational mechanism to enable different CSOs ranking among these groups to participate. There would be an additional *ad hoc* complementary participation of CSOs. This participation would then follow the same rules of procedure than in the Minimalist model, stated above.

II.3. Options for the participation of CSOs in the IPBES Plenary

40. Based on the three proposed models - The Minimalist Model, the Policy Development Model and the *Ex Officio* Model, the following sections of this paper address options for the participation of CSOs in each of the possible IPBES governing bodies, taking into account the agreement reached in Busan, in 2010.
41. According to the role of the Plenary as proposed in the working paper Nr. UNEP/IPBES.MI/1/4, the plenary is the main governing body of the platform and is responsible for: Overseeing the platform's operation; Establishing priorities for action by the platform in response to the needs of and requests from Governments, including those conveyed to it by multilateral environmental agreements related to biodiversity and ecosystem services as determined by their respective governing bodies; Adopting a programme of work for the platform and reviewing its implementation; Approving a budget and providing oversight of the allocation of funds; Reviewing, adopting or approving major reports or executive summaries; Establishing subsidiary bodies and working groups; Considering and undertaking any

additional action that might be required to achieve the platform's objectives⁵.

42. The granting of observer status, either Permanent or *ad hoc*, entails different participation rights in the governing bodies where they are applied to.
43. Under the Minimalist Model or the Policy Development Model, the following rules might apply: the observers may have access to documents but do not have right to speak and/or make circulate any statement. They are attending the sessions as silent observers. The participation in the IPBES Plenary is thus restricted only to government delegations. Accredited CSOs, including IGOs, NGOs, academia and scientific institutions as well as the private sector, would be allowed to participate as the silent observers at the opening plenary session and some other sessions over the course of the report production cycle. While CSOs might sometimes participate in the IPBES assessment process, they would not be entitled to provide any written or oral statements. The decisions would thus be made entirely by the government representatives.
44. Thus, according to the Minimalist Model, CSOs would not have any voice in shaping the scope and content of the assessment reports. However, the Policy Development Model would enable CSOs as the Permanent Observers and they would provide regular and continuous inputs thanks to the regularity of their participation. The rules could allow a parallel process to the Plenary for the expression of civil society. The revised examples suggest organized multi-stakeholder dialogues, a multi-stakeholder implementation follow-up process, a dedicated steering committee, introduction of days dedicated space and opportunity to share their field-level experiences and views. CSD provides an example of the precedent for this kind of involvement.
45. By contrast, in the *Ex Officio* Model, accredited CSOs (including IGOs, NGOs, academia and scientific institutions as well as the private sector) are allowed to fully participate in the Plenary as the observers without the right to vote. However, CSOs are entitled to provide written and oral statements on matters within the scope of their activities related to the IPBES functions. Written statements would have to be communicated to the IPBES Secretariat for consideration by the Members before the Plenary or during sessions. Such statements might be circulated prior to the sessions for the consideration of the members. The release of such statements may be placed under the supervision of the Chairperson. Examples of the precedent for this kind of involvement include ILO.
46. The Observers may request to include issues of a particular interest to them in the provisional agenda of the governing body. Regarding oral statements, CSOs would have the right to intervene at each item of the agenda by asking for the floor and the right to intervene at the end of each session, after governments have spoken. Under the conditions to be determined, the Chairman may give the floor to the observers to respond to questions directed at them by the participants. Although CSOs would be entitled to participate in the sessions, they would not have the right to vote.
47. The rules of procedures could define specific rules for statements to be made by the non-members. This would be crucial during the adoption of executive summary of reports, as the precedent of IPCC shows. The rules of procedures could then allow to introduce oral statements at any time of the discussion, for instance on each paragraph of a text. The rules of procedures should not discriminate between the member and observer speaking rights. Or, they could be only granted to a specific slot of speaking (for instance, at the beginning or at the end of the sessions) or be allowed to speak in groups (the observers would be obliged to form a group to introduce a statement).
48. The *Ex Officio* Model improves the permanent expression of ideas, experience, feedback and inputs from civil society. Such open debates might be of great importance for the IPBES work since CSOs can provide a ground checking for policy discussions (An example of THE precedent through the participation of AIDS affected communities is UNAIDS).

⁵ UNEP/IPBES.MI/1/4, Part. II. C (paragraph 11).

II.4 Options for a process to receive and prioritize CSOs requests submitted to the Plenary

49. In respect to the Busan Outcome, different options could be considered for the application of requests. There are very few existing examples of rules to prioritize requests in order to improve the involvement of civil society. ILO could be a source of inspiration in this area. The working paper UNEP/IPBES.MI/1/5 (rule 8) states that any participant could introduce a request. The working paper UNEP/IPBES.MI/1/4 paragraph 19 (b) (v) proposes that the Bureau could perform the reviewing requests.
50. Following the IPCC example, which relates to the Minimalist Model, only the requests from the members of the Plenary would be simply reviewed and introduced in the agenda. Thus, the requests would only emphasize some issues that, unless the requests are adopted by a member, have no chance to be examined.
51. The Participants to the plenary, including the members and non-members, might wish to ensure that civil society participate effectively in the design of the work programme. This implies the selection of a more participative model. In the case of the Policy Development Model or the *Ex Officio* Model, broader participation should be considered and thus to a process to receive and prioritize request of non-participants to the plenary should be designed
52. This process could run under the following principles:
 - a) The requests should be addressed to the Secretariat within a period of time that allows reviewing and prioritizing;
 - b) Reviewing and prioritizing could be decided by the Bureau after a formal consultation of the members and permanent observers. This consultation could lead to an informal reviewing or to a formal vote among the participants, if consensus on a point to be included in the agenda is not attained;
 - c) The requests of the applicants would be only eligible to be submitted if they strictly fall within an appropriate set of objective criteria. That could include: consistency with the scope of the work programme, relevance, urgency and quality of the process that originated the request.
53. It is suggested that, according to the Policy Development Model, a priority rule would be designed to favour the requests introduced by permanent members. According to the *Ex Officio* Model, all requests would be examined and so every participant would have an equal chance to see its request introduced in the agenda.
54. In order to ensure an equitable treatment of requests submitted by governments and CSOs, transparent rules must be adopted and used by the Plenary.

II.5 Options for the participation of CSOs in the IPBES subsidiary bodies

II.5.1 In the Executive Board/Bureau

55. According to the working paper Nr. UNEP/IPBES.MI/1/4, a subsidiary body such as an Executive board/Bureau might be established by the Plenary.
56. Such body would support the functions of IPBES regarding urgent issues arising between sessions of the plenary. If needed, it would address issues and requests related to the IPBES programme of work. The Executive body/Bureau would also perform administrative functions such as monitoring the effective implementation of the decisions of the plenary, the work of any task groups established, the observance of the IPBES principles and procedures; reviewing requests by the observer organizations for admission to the plenary; identifying donors and developing partnership arrangements for the implementation of activities; and supervising the management of financial resources⁶.

⁶ UNEP/IPBES.MI/1/4, Part. III. A (paragraph 19).

57. In the case that no scientific body would be established, the Executive board/Bureau would ensure the scientific and technical functions such as providing advice on scientific and technical aspects of the platform's programme of work and by overseeing the scientific quality of the platform's products.
58. According to the Minimalist and Policy Development models, the CSOs participation would not be allowed in this specific body. Only representatives from Governments would be allowed to have a seat.
59. However, the *Ex Officio* model for the participation of CSOs would entail the need for an adequate participation, regarding the urgency or the nature of the issue. Thus, the delegates of CSOs with scientific expertise would be represented at the Executive board/Bureau so that urgent decision-making is appropriately scientifically informed, and if so formed, the bureau itself could oversee the scientific aspects of the IPBES governance.
60. Under this model, the Executive board/Bureau of IPBES, to be designated by the plenary among nominates by all participants to the plenary, including observers, should ensure a balanced geographic representation and the relevant multidisciplinary stakeholder expertise. The Executive board/Bureau could then be comprised of a shared number of seats between Governments and representatives of CSOs.
61. The structure of the body would define the ratio chosen. IAASTD is established under equity in number since it includes 30 governments and 30 CSOs. The Bureau of the ILO is another example of such equity since it comprises 28 Government regular members, 14 Worker regular members and 14 Employer regular members.
62. Other criteria could be defined for the nomination of the Executive board/Bureau members, such as reflection of the different types of relevant Civil Society stakeholders (NGOs, academia and scientific organizations and the private sector) or geographical representation and a balanced gender representation.
63. While CSOs would not have the voting right in the Executive board/Bureau according to this model, they would share the same participation/intervention opportunities as governments. They would be entitled to submit reports, proposals and amendments. The modalities and functions of the CSOs representatives and participation in the Executive board/Bureau might be determined by the plenary. The term of office might be a maximum of three years or otherwise correspond to the duration of a global assessment cycle or have a permanent observer status (all or some of the CSOs).
64. Thus, the integrated Executive board/Bureau would allow the full range of non-voting civil society stakeholders to meet with the governments representatives creating opportunities for constructive exchanges and consensus-building, while maintaining ownership by governments.

II.5.2. In the Executive Committee

65. As an option proposed in the working paper Nr. UNEP/IPBES.MI/1/4, the plenary might establish a subsidiary body focused on supporting the functions of the platform regarding urgent issues, while the Bureau will be in charge of administrative and scientific overseeing and advice. Based on the lessons learned in the IPCC, it might be valuable to consider such a body to support the plenary and to act on its behalf and address urgent issues arising between plenary sessions. This body is elected by and reports to the Plenary.
66. According to the Minimalist and Policy Development models, CSOs may not be represented at this specific body. In contrast, according to the *Ex Officio* model, the representation of civil society with relevant experience and qualifications would be allowed. The most of the members of the Executive Committee could be drawn from the Bureau and thus could be knowledgeable about the assessment process. A small number of the members could be gathered to optimize mobilization: the members could be comprised of the IPBES Chair, the Working Group Co-chairs, one representative of the UN agencies and three representatives from Civil Society Organizations. These representatives would be widely respected in their fields and might be drawn from the three following groups: academia or scientific organizations, NGOs and the private sector. The identification and selection of the individuals might be

made among the qualified scientific experts from organizations that currently submit nominations for the Bureau and other positions.

67. The members of the Executive Committee might serve for three years or otherwise correspond to the duration of global assessment cycle.

II.5.3. In the Scientific Advisory Panel

68. In the case of the Bureau with a separate Scientific Advisory Panel (SAP), the latter will primarily serve to oversee the IPBES scientific credibility.
69. The functions of the SAP might include the following: to participate in an editorial board in finalizing technical papers; to provide advice on scientific and technical aspects of the IPBES programme of work; to provide advice and assistance on technical and/or scientific communication matters; to oversee a peer-review process to ensure the highest levels of scientific quality and credibility for all products delivered by the platform; to develop and agree upon a list of authors, review editors and expert reviewers, taking into account the need for balance in expertise, geographical coverage and gender; to engage the scientific community both globally and regionally on issues relating to the platform; to approve specific scientific procedures related to the conduct of assessments and to oversee the scientific quality of the IPBES products.
70. The composition of the SAP might reflect a multi-disciplinary approach (economic, social and environmental) and therefore experts might be drawn from various fields. In addition, members might be drawn from different geographical regions and from among renowned individuals and institutions. Scientists might be nominated by relevant scientific bodies and Governments in respective regions and approved subsequently by the plenary.
71. The members of Scientific Panels would be nominated *intuitu personae*, meaning that they would not represent the institution they belong to. The GEF Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel is an example of the precedent.
72. Two main criteria might be considered when selecting the members of the Scientific Advisory Panel: a) Professionalism: the selected members should be able to work across different sectors and to manage scientific research involving multiple stakeholders; they should be also capable of bridging scientific, technological, economic, social and political issues; b) *Leadership*: members should have an extensive access to scientific networks and an ability to engage with these networks, as well as a demonstrated expertise in the matters related to IPBES.
73. Regarding the Minimalist Model of the civil society participation, the scientific community which would be represented in the SAP would consist of experts originating in governments or governmental agencies. This would nevertheless not deter other leading scientists to participate in the assessment process by providing research but this would prevent them from interacting in the decision and verification process.
74. Following the Policy Development Model and the *Ex Officio* Model, the scientific and technical contribution of CSOs to the fulfilment of the SAP mandate is strongly encouraged. The IGOs, NGOS, academia, and private sector might apply and present delegates to be part of the SAP. The delegates could be qualified experts. The list of applicants could communicate to the SAP and approved by the plenary.
75. The SAP might take decisions by consensus. If consensus cannot be achieved, decisions on proposals might be taken by a simple majority vote. In this case, the CSOs expert might be entitled with a deliberative voice (International Union for the Protection of New Varieties of Plants (UPOV) & Advisory Scientific and Technical Group for the Inter-Agency Task Force on Disaster Reduction - examples of precedent).
76. Additionally, the rules of procedures for the Scientific Advisory Panel should ensure a fair share of each side of the scientific debate. In case of dispute on the statements and outcomes of the panel, there would be an obligation to clearly mention on which points the consensus has not been reached. These disagreements might be duly mentioned in the issued statements (see example of IPCC). This rule would ensure transparency of CSOs not only in the process of IPBES production but also in the process of

scientific debates⁷.

77. In order to encourage the widest participation of the scientific community, while ensuring continuity in the work of the Advisory Scientific Panel, the membership might correspond to the duration of a global assessment cycle.

II.5.4. In the Working Groups

78. The working groups overseeing the work programme will be central to the work of the platform. Working groups will be composed of individuals and not representatives.
79. Regarding their respective inputs of knowledge, scientific institutions and other CSOs encompass high-quality profiles to take an active part in the working groups. Thus the founding texts of IPBES should not restrict the origin of experts that will participate to working groups.
80. The precedent of the UNEP GEO proved that a high participation of experts from various origins is crucial for the effective operation of the groups. Experts originating from civil society organization would improve:
- a) the range of names of authors for the assessments: the working groups might write reports produced under the responsibility of a lead author and associated authors. The CSOs might be able to submit a proposal for names of authors to the Plenary/Scientific Advisory Panel which could then validate the names. The proposal might come along with full and supportive arguments based on legitimacy, leadership, relevance and experience.
 - b) the assistance in conceptual approaches and methodology development: CSOs have developed a wide variety of capacity building experiences tools and methodologies.
 - c) the participation in the peer-review process: a comprehensive peer review of the assessment might be made in consultation with governments, CSOs and scientific institutions. Two rounds of peer review might be envisaged for the assessments. The drafts could be sent to experts and copied to the plenary members and the observers. The reports might be finalized by working groups, and the peer review comments on scientific matters would need to be based on scientific studies; likewise, policy-relevant comments would be made on a policy-sound basis. After a revision phase, there might not be any option for further changes; eventual objections by the plenary or its members, and their respective scientific rationale, could supplement the reports as separate descriptive documents (see IPCC).
81. As far as the composition of working groups is concerned, it would be essential to follow a transparent process in designating members, which were accredited by the plenary.

II.6. Options for the participation of CSOs in the Secretariat

82. The implementation of the Policy Development Model and of the *Ex Officio* Model, would be facilitated if formal links are established between the Secretariat and one or several Civil Society Organization. Indeed, the future secretariat administrative functions could provide opportunities for civil society to be involved at the level of the secretariat (UNEP/IPBES.MI/1/4 paragraph 28(e)). In this regard, CSOs would not play a central role in the secretariat but be in charge of specific functions pertaining civil society involvements. For instance, they could be in charge of an interface mechanism between IPBES and civil society, running and coordinating inputs and playing an active role in dissemination of the platform's production.
83. Furthermore, in regards to the decision by the Plenary to request the Secretariat to undertake technical functions, civil society would be able to provide relevant assistance to ensure that the platform implements its work programme (UNEP/IPBES.MI/1/4 paragraph 29). It could be achieved by hosting the

⁷ Conservation for a New Era, Mc Neely, J. and Moina, S. IUCN 2008.

Secretariat of a specific Working Group: like in the case of the IPCC, it could be envisaged that, on a rotating basis and in accordance to the assessment cycle, a civil society institution hosts the Working Group and assists members of the Working Group fulfil its specific function.

84. With regards to the institutional arrangements for the Secretariat and in accordance with the Busan Outcome, decision on the participation of CSOs to provide support for carrying out a part of the administrative functions of the Secretariat could be taken. In this case, CSOs might partner central secretariat or a central secretariat hub. The form of this partnership would then need to be defined (strategic partnership, staff secondment...).

III. ASSESSMENT OF THE THREE MODELS OF CIVIL SOCIETY PARTICIPATION IN THE IPBES WORK AND GOVERNANCE

85. The different options proposed in this document were duly assessed regarding credibility, legitimacy, saliency, transparency, ownership and policy impact of IPBES. Results are shown below:

	CSOs involved along a Minimalist Model	CSOs involved along a Policy Development model	CSOs involved along an Ex-Officio model
Credibility	Low	High but depending of the gap to be filled and thus the existing initiatives	High
Legitimacy	Low due to the limitation in inputs	High. Science directed by policy	Very high, effective science-policy interface
Saliency	Low due to limitation for introducing requests	Medium Very dependent on the participation	Strong Ability to deal with complexity and interlinkages.
Transparency	Strongly dependant on the communications efforts of the Secretariat	High Some communication relays	High Many communication relays
Ownership	Low No reduction of government authority	Strong No reduction of government authority	Very strong Should be maintained very strong for governments by having a final approval stage only by them No reduction of government authority
Policy impact	Low but depending on social and political factors in the implementation	Speed up	Monitoring implementation and compliance with the products, tools and funds provided