



**United Nations
Environment
Programme**

Distr.: General
11 November 2008

Original: English



**Ad hoc intergovernmental and multi-stakeholder meeting on an
intergovernmental science-policy platform on biodiversity
and ecosystem services**

Kuala Lumpur, 10–12 November 2008

Item 3 (a) of the provisional agenda*

**Consideration of an intergovernmental science-policy platform
on biodiversity and ecosystem services:
objectives and functions of an intergovernmental science-policy
platform on biodiversity and ecosystem services**

**Consideration of an intergovernmental science-policy
platform on biodiversity and ecosystem services**

Submission by India

Note by the secretariat

The annex to the present note contains comments on an intergovernmental science-policy platform on biodiversity and ecosystem services submitted by the Government of India. The annex is being reproduced as submitted and has not been formally edited.

* UNEP/IPBES/1/1.

Annex

The COP-9 to the CBD in its decision IX/15 on 'Follow-up to the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment' has taken note of the consultative process towards an international mechanism of scientific expertise on biodiversity (IMOSEB). Noting the need for improved scientific information related to CBD and other biodiversity related conventions, the COP has also welcomed the agreement of UNEP to convene an intergovernmental multistakeholder meeting to consider establishing an international science-policy interface on biodiversity, ecosystem services and human well-being.

In this background, we welcome the organisation of the meeting on IPBES by UNEP in Kuala Lumpur from 10–12 Nov. 2008. Earlier, the proposal for IMOSEB, which may be called as a precursor to IPBES, and was initiated and supported by the French Government with the support of EU, has gone through a consultative process extending over more than two years. At that stage, many of the developing countries including India were hesitant and apprehensive to support any such venture on biodiversity as they felt it would duplicate the role of SBSTTA, the scientific body of CBD. Further, the general view was that such a mechanism should be predominantly intergovernmental, and preferably under the aegis of a UN body.

A perusal of the documents for the Kuala Lumpur meeting indicated that the above-mentioned concerns seem to have been taken care of in the reincarnation of IMOSEB as IPBES.

Thus, broadly we agree on the need for establishing of a scientific mechanism on biodiversity, which is intergovernmental, and which provides for a science-policy interface by complimenting and strengthening existing scientific mechanisms of CBD and other biodiversity related conventions. However, considering that demands for biodiversity expertise tend to be much more diverse than say for climate change by virtue of the multi-disciplinary nature of the subject of biodiversity, establishing such a mechanism for biodiversity may not be a simple straight forward exercise.

In addition, there are a few points that still need to be deliberated upon/clarified. These include: role of UNEP, status of IPBES vis-a-vis the CBD process including COP and Secretariat.

It is expected that this meeting would provide a useful opportunity to deliberate at length on such issues, and come out with clarifications that would help the process to move forward. However, it is also the understanding that the meeting is only one step in moving towards establishing of such a mechanism, and not an occasion to possibly "launch" the process, as mentioned in the Aid Memoire received from the French Government, since there seems to be still some way to go for that.
