



Distr.: General
24 August 2011

English only



**United Nations
Environment
Programme**

Plenary meeting to determine modalities and institutional arrangements for an intergovernmental science-policy platform on biodiversity and ecosystem services
First session

Nairobi, 3–7 October 2011

Indicative and possible budget requirements for the administration and implementation of the intergovernmental science-policy platform on biodiversity and ecosystem services

Note by the secretariat

Introduction

1. The present note provides an indication of the potential budget requirements for the administration and implementation of the intergovernmental platform on biodiversity and ecosystem services.
2. At this stage, indicative annual average budget figures have been provided based on the options available for the administration and possible work programme of the platform. A more accurate budget will be developed once the platform's structure, institutional arrangements and work programme have been discussed. It is anticipated that a working document on the budget will be made available at the second session of the plenary meeting, reflecting the decisions taken at the first session.
3. In preparing the present note, the secretariat reviewed the costs of meetings, travel and other related issues using various locations around the world. The indicative low-end and high-end costs have been highlighted, drawing on the options presented in the various working and information documents. Indicative costs in relation to the potential work programme have taken into account potential start-up costs within the first year of implementation.
4. Selected case studies of other related processes, such as the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment, the International Assessment on Agriculture, Science and Technology for Development, and the Global Environment Outlook, have been presented to provide guidance on costing based on previous and related initiatives.
5. All figures are given in United States dollars (\$).

I. Indicative budget for the administration of the platform

6. The present section provides an overview of estimated annual costs for administering the platform.

A. Secretariat

7. The information below is subject to adjustments depending on agreement on the work programme areas and related activities, and the functions of the secretariat in relation to providing administration and technical support to the work programme activities.

8. The figures are based on the base salaries and post adjustment of United Nations staff (high end: Geneva post adjustment; low end: Nairobi post adjustment). Other benefits, such as dependency allowance, education allowance and home leave, have not been included.

Table 1

Staffing of the secretariat

<i>Staff complement</i>	<i>High end</i>	<i>Low end</i>
7 staff members: Head of the secretariat (D-2); Deputy Head (D-1); two Senior Programme Officers (P-5); one Communications Officer (P-3); one Budget/Finance Officer (P-3); two Administrative Officers (G-7, G-6)	1 800 000	950 000
14 staff members: Head of the secretariat (D-2); Deputy Head (D-1); one Senior Programme Officer (P-5); two Programme Officers (P-4); three Programme Officers (P-3); six Administrative Officers (G-4–G-7)	2 700 000	1 250 000

B. Meetings of the governing bodies

9. Meetings of the governing bodies include regular meetings of the platform, such as the meetings of its governing body (the plenary) and its subsidiary bodies. Costs for meetings that are related directly to the platform's work programme are not included.

1. Plenary meeting

10. The figures below are for one plenary meeting per year (five days, interpretation in the six official languages of the United Nations, support for developing-country participants, documents in the six official languages of the United Nations), with 300 estimated participants (the participation of 150 of whom is supported by the platform):

- (a) High end: \$1,150,000 (meeting costs: \$400,000; travel costs: \$750,000);
- (b) Low end: \$1 million (meeting costs: \$250,000; travel costs: \$750,000).

2. Meetings of subsidiary bodies

11. The information below relates to meetings of subsidiary bodies. It is assumed that these meetings will be conducted in English only and all documentation will be in English only.

Table 2

Costs of meetings of subsidiary bodies

<i>Number of participants</i>	<i>Number of Days</i>	<i>Cost: high-end</i>	<i>Cost: low-end</i>
10	3	60,000 (meeting costs: 10,000; travel costs: 50,000)	50,000 (meeting costs: 5,000; Travel costs: 25,000 – for 5 participants)
30	3	100,000 (meeting costs: 25,000; travel costs: 75,000 – for 15 participants)	85,000 (meeting costs: 10,000; travel costs: 75,000 – for 15 participants)

C. Publications, outreach and communication

12. This component refers to general outreach and communication in relation to the platform. Specific products and services under this component will include the website, newsletters and translation costs. Costs for publications, outreach and communication related directly to the platform's work programme are not included.

13. The budget is estimated as follows:
- (a) Publications: \$300,000;
 - (b) Outreach and communications: \$320,000;
 - (c) Total corporate communications costs: \$620,000.

D. Other miscellaneous expenses

14. The information below refers to miscellaneous expenses.

Table 3

Miscellaneous expenses

<i>Item</i>	<i>High end</i>	<i>Low end</i>
Travel of secretariat staff on official business	100 000	50 000
Equipment and premises ¹	150 000	100 000
Monitoring and evaluation	100 000	50 000
Miscellaneous/contingency	10% of total budget	5% of total budget

II. Possible budget for work programme areas

A. Generation of knowledge

15. As outlined in the information document on knowledge generation (UNEP/IPBES.MI/1/INF/3), a number of potential activities for the platform's work programme on knowledge generation might be considered, including:

- (a) Activities related to the filling of fundamental knowledge gaps that exist with regard to the interactions between drivers of change, ecosystems and human well-being:²
 - (i) Organizing a multidisciplinary and multi-stakeholder expert workshop to discuss and agree on a conceptual framework for the platform: \$300,000;
 - (ii) Other activities could be undertaken online, and will require staff time;
- (b) Activities related to common and regularly reviewed guidance on a strategic approach to research to ensure that the more important needs in terms of knowledge to support more effective governance at all levels are being identified and responded to in a coordinated manner:
 - (i) Performing a rapid assessment: \$50,000;
 - (ii) Other activities involve partnerships and coordination with other relevant stakeholders, and will require staff time;
- (c) Activities related to ensuring the effective incorporation of relevant types of knowledge into the platform knowledge base, including the incorporation of knowledge from other sectors and disciplines, non-formal knowledge and mutual learning:
 - (i) Promoting studies on and assessing local knowledge with a view to its integration into scientific literature: \$200,000 (four pilot case studies);
 - (ii) Organizing expert meetings with scientists, indigenous and local community representatives: \$200,000 (one meeting per region);
 - (iii) Other activities require a coordination role and staff time;
- (d) Activities related to the need to fill remaining significant gaps in long-term observation and monitoring programmes, in particular as regards data and information on interactions between drivers of change, ecosystems and human well-being:
 - (i) Developing a partnership with the global observing systems for climate, oceans and terrestrial systems: \$50,000 (seed funding);

¹ The actual figure will depend on the hosting arrangements and the support provided by the hosting Governments and/or United Nations agencies.

² It should be noted that this activity could also be considered under the work programme area on assessment.

- (ii) Informing, encouraging and guiding the full design and implementation of the Biodiversity Observation Network (commonly known as “GEO BON”): \$50,000;
- (e) Activities related to the need to improve access to the data, information and knowledge that are already available: developing an online data portal to promote open access of data and information pertaining to the platform: \$500,000;
- (f) Organizing a multidisciplinary and multi-stakeholder expert workshop on the knowledge generation function: \$150,000;
- (g) Other activities may be considered subject to additional funding.

16. The total indicative start-up (two-year) cost for knowledge generation is \$1.5 million (\$750,000 per year).

B. Regular and timely assessments

17. As outlined in the information document on assessments (UNEP/IPBES.MI/1/INF/4), a number of potential activities for the platform’s work programme on assessments might be considered. They are described in table 4.

Table 4

Potential activities for the platform’s work programme on assessments

<i>Type of assessment</i>	<i>No. of assessments</i>	<i>Implementation period</i>	<i>Cost per assessment</i>	<i>Total cost per year</i>
Global assessment	1	5 years	5 000 000	1 000 000
Regional assessments	5 (1 per region)	3 years	600 000	1 000 000
Subregional assessments	10 (2 per region)	3 years	300 000	1 000 000
Thematic assessments	2	2 years	300 000	300 000
Total				3 300 000

18. The total indicative cost for assessment would be \$3.3 million.

19. Discussion of the capacity-building needs for undertaking assessments, the function of maintaining a catalogue of assessments and other areas of the assessment work programme will also result in further funding requirements.

C. Supporting policy formulation and implementation

20. As outlined in the information document on policy-relevant tools and methodologies (UNEP/IPBES.MI/1/INF/5), a number of potential activities for the platform’s work programme on policy-relevant tools and methodologies might be considered, including:

- (a) Identifying policy-relevant tools and methodologies: rapid assessment and/or a horizon scanning process: \$200,000;
- (b) Promoting and catalysing the further development of the identified policy-relevant tools and methodologies: developing, testing and/or customizing policy-relevant tools and methodologies: \$300,000;
- (c) Enabling policymakers to gain access to identified policy-relevant tools and methodologies: developing a knowledge-management platform for all platform functions: \$300,000;
- (d) Other activities may be considered subject to additional funding.

21. The total indicative cost for policy-relevant tools and methodologies is \$800,000.

D. Building capacity

22. As outlined in the information document on capacity-building (UNEP/IPBES.MI/1/INF/6), a number of potential activities/options for the platform’s work programme on capacity-building might be considered, including:

- (a) Identifying and prioritizing needs: reviewing capacity-building needs and prioritizing those needs: \$100,000;
- (b) Increasing access to funding: organizing periodic meetings with donors, potential donors and practitioners: \$40,000 (on the assumption that donors would cover their own travel costs to these meetings);
- (c) Increasing access to data and information: establishing a knowledge platform for access to data and information, including for standardization, quality control and replicability: \$500,000;³
- (d) Increasing communication and raising awareness:
- (i) Implementing an outreach and communication strategy, in particular for the work programme areas (10 per cent of the total work programme area budget);
- (ii) Performing additional translation of all materials, including the website, into the six official languages of the United Nations: \$500,000;
- (e) Catalysing and promoting action: supporting and promoting subglobal assessments: (seed funds for 10 subglobal assessments and technical support as per the assessment budget);
- (f) Securing participation: this activity will be costed following discussions at the two plenary sessions.
- (g) Other activities may be considered subject to additional funding.

23. The total indicative cost for capacity-building is \$1,140,000.

III. Overview of an indicative budget for the platform's administration and for implementing various options of the work programme

24. The budget figures below are indicative, and based on a range of plausible assumptions. They are, however, subject to considerable change based on further discussion and agreement on the scope of activities that might be undertaken as part of the platform's work programme, and on the details of the overall modalities and institutional arrangements of the platform.

Table 5

Overview of an indicative budget for the platform's administration

<i>Structure and administration</i>	<i>High end</i>	<i>Low end</i>
Secretariat	2 700 000	950 000
Meetings of the platform's bodies	1 310 000	1 135 000
Publications and outreach	620 000	620 000
Miscellaneous expenses	350 000	200 000
Contingency	490 000	290 000
Total	5 470 000	3 195 000

Table 6

Overview of an indicative budget for implementing various options of the work programme

<i>Work programme areas</i>	<i>Indicative annual cost</i>
Knowledge generation	750 000
Assessments	3 300 000
Policy support	800 000
Capacity-building	1 140 000
Total	5 990 000

IV. Case studies

25. With a view to informing discussions and providing a comparison, a number of case studies are set out below.

³ As noted under the work programme areas on knowledge generation and policy-relevant tools and methodologies, this is a cross-cutting activity and the costs can be reduced if they are shared across the work programme areas.

A. Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change

26. The annual budget for 2009 for IPCC was \$7,064,625, disaggregated as set out in table 7.

Table 7

Annual budget for IPCC for 2009

<i>IPCC budget categories</i>	<i>Allocated budget</i>
Governing bodies	2 856 025
Lead authors, scoping and expert meetings for reports	1 278 225
Scoping meetings, expert meetings and workshops	957 375
Other expenditure ⁴	1 973 000
Total	7 064 625

27. Below is an overview of the actual expenditure from 2000 to 2008, which includes the categories listed above.

Table 8

Actual expenditure from 2000 to 2008

<i>Year</i>	<i>Actual expenditure⁵</i>
2000	8 593 190
2001	7 732 770
2002	4 744 058
2003	5 951 098
2004	5 871 820
2005	7 477 425
2006	6 233 535
2007	6 687 701
2008	3 927 899

28. The additional contributions in the form of support from agencies were as follows:

(a) The World Meteorological Organization contributed approximately \$260,000 (based on Geneva post adjustment) per annum for the post of Secretary of IPCC (D-2 level);

(b) The United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) contributed approximately \$240,000 (based on Geneva post adjustment) per annum for the post of Deputy Secretary of IPCC (D-1 level).

29. The total annual cost of senior staff seconded to the IPCC secretariat is approximately \$500,000.

30. Significant additional contributions (between \$1 million and \$2 million, depending on the activity and amount of work and number of special reports to be prepared) are provided by Governments for the technical support units and work of the task force.

B. International Assessment on Agriculture, Science and Technology for Development

31. The assessment took place over the period 2004–2007. The average annual budget was \$2.6 million.

32. The overall assessment comprised one global assessment and five subglobal assessments, which were peer reviewed by Governments and experts, and approved by a panel of participating Governments. The five subglobal assessments that were undertaken were managed by regional institutes and covered Central and West Asia and North Africa; East and South Asia and the Pacific; Latin America and the Caribbean; North America and Europe; and Sub-Saharan Africa.

33. The Assessment had an intergovernmental governance structure, which resembles that of IPCC, but contained a bureau similar to the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment Board of Directors. The governing body (i.e., the panel of participating Governments) elected the government representatives of the bureau. The assessment had a distributed secretariat with the major component

4 Including the costs of the secretariat (\$1.1 million during 2009).

5 Not including Secretariat costs.

in Washington, D.C., and other components in Rome (at the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations), Nairobi (UNEP), and Paris (the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization). Other members of the distributed secretariat included staff located in the regional institutes.

34. The budget has been summarized in the tables below.

Table 9

Costs of assessment

<i>Expenditure</i>		<i>Amount</i>
Design teams	5 meetings (1 global + 5 subglobal)	461 000
Meetings: global authors	4 meetings	992 000
Meetings: subglobal authors	4 meetings x 5 subglobal assessments	1 596 000
Meetings: governing body and bureau	2 meetings (back-to-back)	743 000
Subglobal institutions	5 regional institutes	800 000
Secretariat		3945000
Communication and outreach		470000
Publications/translation		1240000
Contingency		—
Honoraria		150 000
Total		10 397 000

Table 10

In kind contributions from co-sponsoring agencies

Co-sponsoring agency in-kind (staff costs and travel) (USD)	
World Bank	1,500,000
UNEP	690,000
United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization	225,000
Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations	150,000
Total	2,565,000

Table 11

Other in kind contributions

Other in kind contributions estimated at \$14,012,000					
<i>Authors: global and subglobal</i>	8 100 000	<i>Peer review</i>	2 592 000	<i>Travel of developed-country participants</i>	3 320 000
4 meetings of 5 days each		2 peer-review rounds			
10 weeks authors' time including meetings		40 chapters each with 40 reviewers			
225 authors/150,000/yr		3 days per reviewer per round of review			
225 subglobal authors/30,000/yr		40 editors each for 4 weeks			

C. Millennium Ecosystem Assessment

35. The Millennium Ecosystem Assessment was run over four years from 2001 to 2005. The average annual budget was approximately \$4 million, in addition to approximately \$2 million of in kind contributions for the subglobal assessments, and the in kind contributions of authors' time.

36. The budget covers the following categories:

- (a) Governing bodies (board;⁶ assessment panel;⁷ Director; technical support unit);⁸
- (b) Lead authors, scoping and expert meetings for reports (four working groups);⁹
- (c) Scoping meetings, expert meetings and workshops;
- (d) Review process;¹⁰
- (e) Other expenditure (electronic publications, publication and translation, outreach, secretariat, co-chairs).

Table 12
Millennium Ecosystem Assessment budget

<i>Budget categories</i>	<i>Cost 2001–2005</i>
1. Technical support unit and co-chair support	5 608 234
Technical support units and post-doc technical support	3 548 587
Administration and overheads	839 815
Additional co-chair support	160 680
Staff travel	384 687
Rent, supplies, communication, etc.	674 465
2. Meeting costs	6 072 395
Meeting logistical support	642 619
Working group meetings	3 910 243
Engagement and outreach events	260 488
Assessment panel and synthesis meetings	804 686
Fellows travel and scenarios training meetings	184 096
Board and executive committee meetings	270 263
3. Subcontracts and consultants	3 212 695
Consultants for technical contributions	231 061
Data and indicators	382 892
Website design and server rental	146 251
Capacity-building consultants	88 579
Southern Africa subglobal assessment grant	830 599
Subglobal seed funding	332 503
Subglobal linkage activities	84 990
Subglobal core funding (non- Southern Africa subglobal assessment)	650 764
Communications consultant	160 006
User forums	85 204
Scenarios modelling	219 846
4. Publications	1 191 533
Contingency	92 479
Assessment and synthesis reports	848 184
Internet publications, website translations, etc.	27 900
Promotional materials	200 237
Subglobal communication	22 733
Total	16 084 857

37. The overall budget was approximately \$24 million, of which some \$8 million was provided through in kind contributions for the subglobal assessments. In addition, significant contributions of data, time and expertise were made through in kind contributions by such groups as the International

6 The board includes representatives of multilateral environmental agreements, national Governments, United Nations agencies and civil society.

7 The assessment panel, comprising the co-chairs of the working groups and additional scientific experts, oversaw the assessment work.

8 The technical support units and the Director's office formed a distributed secretariat across a network of co-executing agencies that managed logistical, administrative and technical support.

9 Three of these working groups (condition and trends; scenarios; responses) carried out the global assessment component of the Assessment. The fourth working group (subglobal) involved all the subglobal assessments.

10 The review process was overseen by an independent board of review editors.

Food Policy Research Institute and the World Resources Institute. UNEP provided overall coordination, specifically by administering more than half of the core financial support for the Assessment, and by employing the Director.

38. The Director's office was based in Malaysia at the WorldFish Center, as was the technical support unit for the subglobal working group. The UNEP World Conservation Monitoring Centre hosted the technical support unit for the condition and trends working group, and the Scientific Committee on Problems of the Environment of the International Council for Science supported the scenarios working group.¹¹ The Institute of Economic Growth in Delhi, India, supported the responses working group. The World Resources Institute, in partnership with the Meridian Institute, supported the outreach and engagement activities, and coordinated the publications process.

D. Global Environment Outlook

39. The 2009 budget for activities related to the Global Environment Outlook was \$1,619,500.

40. The Outlook is a report on the state and trends of the global environment, coordinated by UNEP and involving a wide range of partners. These include Governments, who participate actively in design and review of the assessment, in particular its summary for policymakers; experts, who contribute to the report; and a range of academic institutions and partner organizations.

41. Below is a snapshot focusing on the 2008–2009 budget. It includes both assessments and related activities on issues such as data and indicators and outreach. The period 2008–2009 has been selected since it reflects a capacity-development programme involving a South-South network of collaborating centres in developing countries. The table does not include substantial contributions to the reports in terms both of UNEP staff and the time of experts involved in preparing the reports.

Table 13

Global Environment Outlook budget

<i>Item</i>	<i>2008</i>	<i>2009</i>
Yearbook (annual publication to inform decision makers of recent environment developments)	50 000	150 000
Regional and subregional assessment reports	125 000	100 000
Outreach and communications materials	215 000	134 000
Global and regional launches	200 000	80 000
Multi-stakeholder consultations on the fifth report	—	139 000
Data and indicators working group and support	358 000	367 000
Observation and information networks	140 000	165 000
Capacity-building working group meeting	30 000	—
Technical advisory services to Governments	167 750	97 500
Training to build capacity in mapping vulnerability to climate and ecosystem change	80 000	80 000
Training on assessment methodologies	80 000	185 000
Development of regional and thematic assessment methodologies (e.g., climate change, cities, resource efficiency)	146 000	77 000
Development of e-learning materials on integrated environmental assessment	45 000	45 000
Total	1 636 750	1 619 500

¹¹ The scenarios working group was a joint activity of the Assessment and the Scientific Committee on Problems of the Environment.