



**United Nations  
Environment  
Programme**

Distr.: General  
21 December 2012

English only

---

**Plenary of the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform  
on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services**

**First session**

Bonn, Germany, 21-26 January 2013

Item 5 of the provisional agenda\*

**Initial work programme of the Platform**

**Draft procedures for the preparation, review, acceptance,  
adoption, approval and publication of assessment reports  
and other Platform deliverables**

**Note by the secretariat**

The annex to the present note was prepared by the secretariat of the United Nations Environment Programme, taking into consideration the comments provided by Governments and other stakeholders during the intersessional period on draft procedures for the preparation, review, acceptance, adoption, approval and publication of assessment reports and other deliverables of the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services. Given that the draft procedures will need to be updated once agreement has been reached on the nature of the Platform's assessment reports and other deliverables, they might be adopted by the Plenary at its second session. All the submissions received are also available online ([www.ipbes.net](http://www.ipbes.net)). The annex has been reproduced as received, without formal editing.

---

\* IPBES/1/1.



## Annex

# **Draft procedures for the preparation, review, acceptance, adoption, approval and publication of assessment reports and other Platform deliverables**

## **CONTENTS**

1. DEFINITIONS
  2. IPBES MATERIAL
  3. ASSESSMENT REPORTS, SYNTHESIS REPORTS, AND SPECIAL REPORTS<sup>1</sup>
    - 3.1 Convening a Scoping Meeting to Prepare Report Outline
    - 3.2 General Procedures for Preparing IPBES Reports and other deliverables
    - 3.3 Preparation of Reports
    - 3.4 Preparation, Approval and Acceptance of Summaries for Policymakers
    - 3.5 Acceptance of Reports
    - 3.6 Reports Approved and/or Adopted by the IPBES Plenary
    - 3.7 Addressing Possible Errors in Reports
  4. TECHNICAL PAPERS
  5. IPBES SUPPORTING MATERIAL
  6. WORKSHOPS AND EXPERT MEETINGS
    - 6.1 IPBES Workshops and Expert Meetings
    - 6.2 Co-sponsored Workshops and Expert Meetings
- ANNEX 1: TASKS AND RESPONSIBILITIES FOR LEAD AUTHORS, COORDINATING LEAD AUTHORS, CONTRIBUTING AUTHORS, EXPERT REVIEWERS AND REVIEW EDITORS OF IPBES REPORTS AND GOVERNMENT FOCAL POINTS
- ANNEX 2: PROCEDURE ON THE USE OF LITERATURE IN IPBES REPORTS
- ANNEX 3: PROCEDURES FOR RECOGNITION AND INCORPORATION OF INDIGENOUS AND LOCAL KNOWLEDGE
- ANNEX 4: IPBES PROTOCOL FOR ADDRESSING POSSIBLE ERRORS IN IPBES REPORTS

### **1. DEFINITIONS**

The definitions of terms used in this document are as follows:

1. **“Acceptance”** of IPBES Reports at a Session of a [Working Group or plenary] signifies that the material has not been subject to line by line discussion and agreement, but nevertheless presents a comprehensive, objective and balanced view of the subject matter.
2. **“Adoption”** of IPBES Reports is a process of endorsement section by section (and not line by line) as described in section 3.4.

---

<sup>1</sup> The finalization of this section will depend on the final decision of the Platform regarding the kinds of reports to be produced by IPBES.

3. **“Approval”** of IPBES [Summaries for Policymakers] signifies that the material has been subject to detailed, line by line discussion and agreement.
4. **“Assessment Reports”** are published materials composed of the full scientific, technical and socio-cultural global, regional, or sub-regional assessment. They may be composed of two or more sections including: (a) a Summary for Policymakers, (b) an optional technical summary, and (c) individual chapters and their executive summaries.
5. **“Multidisciplinary Expert Panel (MEP)”** is a subsidiary body established by the Plenary, which carries out the scientific and technical functions agreed by the Plenary, as articulated in the Document on Functions, Operating Principles and Institutional Arrangements of the Platform.
7. **“Reports”** refer to the main IPBES deliverables [including Assessment, Synthesis, and Special Reports and their Summaries for Policymakers and Overview Chapters].
8. [**“Session of a Working Group”** refers to a series of meetings of a Working Group of the IPBES].
9. **“Session of the Bureau”** refers to a series of meetings of the elected members of the IPBES Bureau.
10. **“Session of the Plenary”** refers to any ordinary or extraordinary session of Platform plenary.
11. **“Special Report”** is an assessment of a specific issue and generally follows the same structure as the Assessment Reports.
12. **“Summary for Policymakers”** (“SPM”) is a component of any Report, which provides a policy-relevant but not policy-prescriptive summary of that Report.
13. **“Supporting Material”** consists of three categories: (a) Workshop proceedings and material from Expert Meetings which are either commissioned or supported by the IPBES, (b) software or databases to facilitate the use of the IPBES Reports, and (c) guidance material (guidance notes and guidance documents) to guide and assist in the preparation of comprehensive and scientifically sound IPBES Reports and Technical Papers.
14. [**“Synthesis Reports”** synthesize and integrate materials contained within the Assessment Reports and Special Reports and are written in a non-technical style suitable for policymakers and address a broad-range of policy-relevant but policy-neutral questions. They are composed of two sections as follows: (a) a Summary for Policymakers, and (b) a longer report.]
15. [**“Technical Papers”** are based on the material already in the Assessment Reports and Special Reports and are prepared on topics for which an objective international scientific/technical perspective is deemed essential.]

16. “Traditional and local knowledge” refer to<sup>2</sup> [ ].

## 2. IPBES MATERIAL

2.1 There are three main classes of IPBES material, each of which is defined in Section 1.

- A. IPBES Reports [which include Assessment, Synthesis, and Special Reports and their Summaries for Policymakers]
- B. Technical Papers
- C. Supporting Material
- D. [ ]

2.2 The various classes of material are subject, as appropriate, to different levels of formal endorsement. These levels are described in terms of acceptance, adoption and approval, as defined in Section 1.

2.3 The different levels of endorsement for the different classes of IPBES material are as follows:

A. In general, IPBES Reports are accepted by the appropriate [Working Group]. Summaries for Policymakers are approved by the appropriate [Working Groups] and subsequently accepted by the Plenary. In the case of the Synthesis Report the Plenary adopts the underlying Report, section by section, and approves the Summary for Policymakers. The definition of the terms “acceptance”, “adoption” and “approval” will be included in the IPBES published Reports.

B. Technical Papers are not accepted, approved or adopted by the [Working Groups] but are finalised in consultation with the MEP, which will function in the role of an Editorial Board.

C. Supporting Materials are not accepted, approved or adopted.

## 3. <sup>3</sup>ASSESSMENT REPORTS, SYNTHESIS REPORTS, AND SPECIAL REPORTS

### *3.1 Scoping in Preparation of Report Outlines.*

Each IPBES Assessment Report, Synthesis Report and Special Report, as defined in Section 1, should be preceded by a scoping process (see document IPBES/1/INF/6) that develops its draft outline and explanatory notes, as appropriate.

Nominations for participation in the scoping process will be solicited from Government Focal Points, observer organizations, and MEP and Bureau members. Participants should be selected by the MEP, in consultation with the Bureau.

---

<sup>2</sup> To be inserted once there is agreement by the IPBES plenary on both the definition of the relevant terms and the procedures to implement IPBES operating principle d: “In carrying out its work the Platform will be guided by the following operating principles (...) d) Recognize and respect the contribution of indigenous and local knowledge to the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity and ecosystems”.

<sup>3</sup> The finalization of this section will depend on the final decision of the Platform regarding the kinds of reports to be produced by IPBES.

In selecting scoping meeting participants, consideration should be given to the following criteria: scientific, technical and socio-cultural expertise, including the range of views; geographical representation; a mixture of experts with and without previous experience in IPBES; gender balance; experts with a background from relevant stakeholder and user groups, including governments and traditional knowledge holders and experts. The MEP will report to the plenary on the selection process including a description of how the selection criteria for participation and any other considerations have been applied, and including a list of participants

Based on the report of the scoping meeting the plenary will decide whether to prepare a report and agree on its scope, outline, and the work plan including schedule and budget on the basis of advice from the Bureau and the MEP. The following criteria could assist the plenary in its decision on whether to have a report prepared: availability of knowledge, policy relevance, regional/global relevance, deliverables, and funding availability, among others.

If the Plenary decides, based on the report of the scoping process, against preparation of a report for lack of sufficient knowledge, this should be identified as a critical gap and be taken up by the knowledge generation function of the Platform.

### ***3.2 General Procedures for Preparing IPBES Reports***

In Assessment Reports, Synthesis Reports, and Special Reports, Coordinating Lead Authors (CLAs), Lead Authors (LAs), Reviewers (Rs) and Review Editors (REs) of chapter teams are required to consider the range of scientific, technical and socio-cultural views, expressed in balanced assessments.

Authors should use calibrated uncertainty language that expresses the diversity of the scientifically, technically and socio-culturally valid evidence, based mainly on the strength of the evidence and the level of agreement over its interpretation and implications in the scientific, technical, and socio-cultural literature. IPBES guidance on addressing uncertainties will be developed by the MEP and adopted by the plenary. Assessments should be based primarily on publically available and peer-reviewed literature. Material which is not published in the peer-reviewed literature, including traditional knowledge, but which is available to experts and reviewers may also be considered, in accordance with annexes 2 and 3, and provided that such inclusion is fully justified in the context of the IPBES assessment process.

The review process for IPBES reports generally takes place in three stages: expert review of IPBES Reports, government/expert review of IPBES Reports, and government review of the Summaries for Policymakers and/or the Synthesis Report.

The overlap of government review periods for different IPBES Reports with Sessions of the Conference of the Parties to the Multilateral environmental agreements related to biodiversity and ecosystem services and their Subsidiary Bodies should be minimized where possible.

Expert review should normally be eight weeks, but not less than six weeks, except to the extent decided by the MEP. Government and government/expert reviews should not be less than eight weeks, except to the extent decided by the Bureau. All written expert and government review comments will be made available to reviewers on request during the review process.

The drafts of IPBES Reports and Technical Papers which have been submitted for formal expert and/or government review, the expert and government review comments, and the author responses to those

comments will be made available on the IPBES website as soon as possible after the acceptance by the plenary and the finalization of the Report or Technical Paper.

The IPBES considers its draft reports, prior to acceptance, to be pre-decisional, provided in confidence to reviewers, and not for public distribution, quotation or citation.

All draft reports, review comments, and authors' responses should be made publically available after completion of report.

### ***3.3 Preparation of Reports by the Working Groups***

It is essential that the Working Groups allow enough time in their schedules, according to procedures, for a full review by experts and governments and for the acceptance of reports. The [MEP / Working Group Co-Chairs] are responsible for ensuring that proper review of the material occurs in a timely manner.

To ensure proper preparation and review, the following steps should be undertaken:

1. Compilation of lists of potential Coordinating Lead Authors, Lead Authors, contributing Authors, Review Editors and of Government Focal Points.
2. Selection of Coordinating Lead Authors, Lead Authors and Review Editors.
3. Preparation of draft Report.
4. Review
  - a. First Review (by experts).
  - b. Second Review (by governments and experts).
5. Preparation of final draft Report.
6. Acceptance of Report at a Session of the [Working Group].

#### *3.3.1 Compilation of Lists of Potential Coordinating Lead Authors, Lead Authors, Contributing Authors, Reviewers, Review Editors and of Government Focal Points*

At the request of [the MEP / Working Group Co-Chairs], through the IPBES Secretariat, governments, and observer organizations should identify appropriate experts for each area in the Report, who can act as potential Coordinating Lead Authors, Lead Authors, Contributing Authors, Reviewers or Review Editors.

To facilitate the identification of experts and later review by governments, governments should also designate their respective Focal Points. IPBES Bureau Members should contribute here necessary to identifying appropriate Coordinating Lead Authors, Lead Authors, Contributing Authors, Reviewers and Review Editors in cooperation with the Government Focal Points within their region to ensure an appropriate representation of experts from developing and developed countries and countries with economies in transition.

These should be assembled into lists available to all IPBES Members and maintained by the IPBES Secretariat. The tasks and responsibilities of Coordinating Lead Authors, Lead Authors, Contributing Authors, Review Editors and Government Focal Points are outlined in Annex 1.

### *3.3.2 Selection of Coordinating Lead Authors, Lead Authors, Reviewers and Review Editors*

Coordinating Lead Authors, Lead Authors, Reviewers and Review Editors are selected by the MEP, from those experts cited in the lists provided by governments and observer organizations, and other experts as appropriate, known through their publications and works.

The composition of the group of Coordinating Lead Authors and Lead Authors for a chapter, a report or its summary shall aim to reflect: the range of scientific, technical and socio-cultural views and expertise; geographical representation, ensuring appropriate representation of experts from developing and developed countries and countries with economies in transition; the diversity of knowledge systems; and gender balance.

The MEP will report to the plenary on the selection process and the extent to which the above considerations were achieved. The IPBES should make every effort to engage experts from the region on the author teams of chapters addressing specific regions, but should also engage experts from countries outside of the region when they can provide an essential contribution to the assessment.

The Coordinating Lead Authors and Lead Authors selected by the MEP may enlist other experts as Contributing Authors to assist with the work. At the earliest opportunity, the IPBES Secretariat should inform all governments and observer organizations, who the Coordinating Lead Authors, Lead Authors, Reviewers and Review Editors are for different chapters.

### *3.3.3 Preparation of Draft Report*

Preparation of the first draft of a Report should be undertaken by Coordinating Lead Authors and Lead Authors.

Experts who wish to contribute material for consideration in the first draft should submit it directly to the Lead Authors. Contributions should be supported as far as possible with references from the peer-reviewed and internationally available literature, and with copies of any unpublished material cited. Clear indications of how to access the latter should be included in the contributions. For material available in electronic format only, a hard copy should be archived and the location where such material may be accessed should be cited, and a soft copy sent to the Secretariat for archiving.

Lead Authors will work on the basis of these contributions, the peer-reviewed and internationally available literature, including manuscripts that can be made available for IPBES review, and selected non-peer review literature, according to Annex 2<sup>4</sup>, and IPBES Supporting Material.

Material which is not published, including traditional and local knowledge, but which is available to experts and reviewers may be included, in accordance with annexes 2 and 3, and provided that its inclusion is fully justified in the context of the IPBES assessment process.

In preparing the first draft, and at subsequent stages of revision after review, Lead Authors should clearly identify disparate views for which there is significant scientific, technical or socio-cultural support, together with the relevant arguments. Technical summaries provided will be prepared under the leadership of the MEP.

---

<sup>4</sup> To be developed and adopted at a later stage.

### *3.3.4 Review*

Three principles govern the review process: First, the best possible scientific, technical and socio-cultural advice should be included so that the IPBES Reports represent the latest scientific, technical and socio-cultural findings and are as comprehensive as possible. Secondly, a wide circulation process, ensuring representation of independent experts (i.e. experts not involved in the preparation of that particular chapter) from developing and developed countries and countries with economies in transition, should aim to involve as many experts as possible in the IPBES process. Thirdly, the review process should be objective, open and transparent.

The MEP should normally select two Review Editors per chapter (including for the executive summaries) and per technical summary of each report. Review Editors should normally consist of two independent experts based on the lists of experts nominated as described in section 3.3.2.

Review Editors should not be involved as authors or reviewers for material for which they are a Review Editor. Review Editors should be selected from developed and developing countries and from countries with economies in transition, and should have a balanced representation of scientific, technical, and socio-cultural views.

Working Group Co-chairs should arrange a comprehensive review of reports in each review phase, seeking to ensure complete coverage of all content. Those parts of a Working Group report that are cross-cutting with other Working Group reports should be cross-checked through the relevant Authors and Co-chairs of that other Working Group.

#### *3.3.4.1 First Review (by Experts)*

First order draft Reports should be circulated by the MEP through the Secretariat for review. The MEP shall seek the participation of reviewers encompassing the range of scientific, technical and socio-cultural views, expertise, and geographical representation and shall actively undertake to promote and invite as wide a group of experts as possible. This includes experts nominated as Coordinating Lead Authors, Lead Authors, Review Editors or Contributing Authors as included in lists maintained by the IPBES Secretariat.

Government Focal Points should be notified of the commencement of this process. The first draft Reports should be sent to Government Focal Points by the Secretariat, for information, along with a list of those to whom the Report has been sent for review in that country.

The Secretariat should make available to reviewers on request during the review process specific material referenced in the document being reviewed, which is not available in the international published literature.

Expert reviewers should provide the comments to the appropriate Lead Authors through the Secretariat with a copy to their Government Focal Point, if so required.

Coordinating Lead Authors, in consultation with the Review Editors and in coordination with the respective Working Group Co-Chairs, the MEP, and the IPBES Secretariat, are encouraged to supplement the draft revision process by organizing a wider meeting with principal Contributing



Authors and expert reviewers, if time and funding permit, in order to pay special attention to particular points of assessment or areas of major differences.

#### *3.3.4.2 Second Review (by Governments and Experts)*

A revised draft should be distributed by the IPBES Secretariat to governments through the designated Government Focal Points, and to all the Coordinating Lead Authors, Lead Authors and Contributing Authors and Expert Reviewers.

The MEP shall seek the participation of reviewers encompassing the range of scientific, technical and socio-cultural views, expertise, and geographical representation and shall actively undertake to promote and invite as wide a group of experts as possible. This includes experts nominated as Coordinating Lead Authors, Lead Authors, Review Editors or Contributing Authors as included in lists maintained by the IPBES Secretariat.

Government Focal Points should be notified of the commencement of this process. Governments should send one integrated set of comments for each Report to the Secretariat through their Government Focal Points. Non-government reviewers should send their further comments to the Secretariat with a copy to their appropriate Government Focal Point.

#### *3.3.5 Preparation of Final Draft Report*

Preparation of a final draft Report taking into account government and expert comments for submission to a Session of a Working Group for acceptance should be undertaken by Coordinating Lead Authors and Lead Authors in consultation with the Review Editors. If necessary, and timing and funding permitting, a wider meeting with principal Contributing Authors and expert and government reviewers is encouraged in order to pay special attention to particular points of assessment or areas of major differences.

It is important that Reports describe different, possibly controversial, scientific, technical, and socio-cultural views on a subject, particularly if they are relevant to the policy debate. The final draft should credit all Coordinating Lead Authors, Lead Authors, Contributing Authors, Reviewers and Review Editors by name and affiliation, at the end of the Report.

### ***3.4 Preparation, Approval and Acceptance of Summaries for Policymakers***

Summary sections of Reports approved by the Working Groups and accepted by the plenary will principally be the Summaries for Policymakers, prepared by the respective Working Groups of their full scientific, technical and socio-cultural Assessments, and Summaries for Policymakers of Special Reports prepared by the Working Groups.

The Summaries for Policymakers should be subject to simultaneous review by both experts and governments, a government round of written comments of the revised draft before the approval Session and to a final approval by [the Plenary / a Session of the Working Group].

Responsibility for preparing first drafts and revised drafts of Summaries for Policymakers, lies with the respective Working Group Co-Chairs. The Summaries for Policymakers should be prepared concurrently with the preparation of the main Reports.

The first review of the Summaries for Policymakers will take place during the same time period as the Expert and Government Review of the Second Order Draft of the full report.

The final draft of the Summaries for Policymakers prepared by the respective Working Groups will be circulated for a final government round of written comments in preparation of the Session of the Working Group(s) that approves it or Session of the plenary that adopts it.

Approval of the Summary for Policymakers at the Session of the Working Group signifies that it is consistent with the factual material contained in the full scientific, technical and socio-cultural Assessment or Special Report accepted by a Working Group.

Coordinating Lead Authors should be consulted in order to ensure that the Summary for Policymakers is fully consistent with the findings in the main report. These Summaries for Policymakers should be formally and prominently described as: "A Report of Working Group "X" of the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services."

For a Summary for Policymakers approved by a Working Group to be endorsed as an IPBES Report, it must be accepted at a Session of the plenary. Because the Working Group approval process is open to all governments, Working Group approval of a Summary for Policymakers means that the plenary cannot change it. However, it is necessary for the plenary to review the Report at a Session, note any substantial disagreement and formally accept it.

### ***3.5 Acceptance of Reports***

Reports presented for acceptance at Sessions of the Working Groups are the full scientific, technical and socio-cultural Assessment Reports of the Working Groups. The subject matter of these Reports shall conform to the terms of reference of the relevant Working Groups, and to the work plan approved by the plenary. Reports to be accepted by the Working Groups will undergo expert and government/expert reviews. The purpose of these reviews is to ensure that the Reports present a comprehensive, objective, and balanced view of the areas they cover. While the large volume and technical detail of this material places practical limitations upon the extent to which changes to these Reports will normally be made at Sessions of [Working Groups / the Plenary], "acceptance" signifies the view of the [Working Group / Plenary] that this purpose has been achieved. The content of the authored chapters is the responsibility of the Coordinating Lead Authors, subject to [Working Group / Plenary] acceptance. Changes, other than grammatical or minor editorial changes made after acceptance by the [Working Group / Plenary] shall be those necessary to ensure consistency with the Summary for Policymakers. These changes shall be identified by the Lead Authors in writing and made available to the plenary at the time it is asked to accept the Summary for Policymakers.

Reports accepted by Working Groups should be formally and prominently described on the front and other introductory covers as: "A report accepted by Working Group "X" of the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services."

### ***3.6 Reports Approved and Adopted by the Plenary***

Reports approved and adopted by the plenary will be the Synthesis Report of the Assessment Reports and other Reports as decided by the plenary, whereby Section 3.4 applies *mutatis mutandis*.

### *3.6.1 The Synthesis Report*

The Synthesis Report will synthesize and integrate materials contained within the Assessment Reports and Special Reports and should be written in a non-technical style suitable for policymakers and address a broad range of policy-relevant but policy-neutral questions approved by the plenary. The Synthesis Report is composed of two sections as follows: (a) a Summary for Policymakers, and (b) a longer report.

The IPBES Chair will lead a writing team whose composition is agreed by the Bureau after nominations by the IPBES Chair in consultation with the Working Group Co-Chairs and MEP. In selecting the writing team for the Synthesis Report, consideration should be given to the following criteria: scientific, technical and socio-cultural expertise, including the full range of views; geographical representation; representation of the diversity of knowledge systems; gender balance.

The IPBES Chair will report to the plenary on the selection process including a description of how the selection criteria for participation and any other considerations have been applied. An approval and adoption procedure will allow Sessions of the Plenary to approve the SPM line by line and to ensure that the SPM and the longer report of the Synthesis Report are consistent, and the Synthesis Report is consistent with the underlying Assessment Reports and Special Reports from which the information has been synthesised and integrated. This approach might take 5-7 working days of a Session of the plenary.

Step 1: The longer report (30-50 pages) and the SPM (5-10 pages) of the Synthesis Report are prepared by the writing team.

Step 2: The longer report and the SPM of the Synthesis Report undergo simultaneous expert/government review.

Step 3: The longer report and the SPM of the Synthesis Report are then revised by Lead Authors, with the assistance of the Review Editors.

Step 4: The revised drafts of the longer report and the SPM of the Synthesis Report are submitted to Governments, and observer organizations eight weeks before the Session of the plenary.

Step 5: The longer report and the SPM of the Synthesis Report are both tabled for discussion in the Session of the plenary:

- The Session of the plenary will first provisionally approve the SPM line by line.
- The Session of the plenary will review and adopt the longer report of the Synthesis Report, section by section, in the following manner:
  - When changes in the longer report of the Synthesis Report are required either to conform it to the SPM or to ensure consistency with the underlying Assessment Reports, the plenary and authors will note where changes are required in the longer report of the Synthesis Report to ensure consistency in tone and content. The authors of the longer report of the Synthesis Report will then make changes in the longer report of the Synthesis Report. Those Bureau members who are not authors will act as Review Editors to ensure that these documents are consistent and follow the directions of the Session of the plenary.

- The longer report of the Synthesis Report is then brought back to the Session of the plenary for the review and adoption of the revised sections, section by section. If inconsistencies are still identified by the plenary, the longer report of the Synthesis Report is further refined by the Authors with the assistance of the Review Editors for review and adoption by the plenary. This process is conducted section by section, not line by line.
- The final text of the longer report of the Synthesis Report will be adopted and the SPM approved by the Session of the plenary.

The Report consisting of the longer report and the SPM of the Synthesis Report is an IPBES Report and should be formally and prominently described as: "A Report of the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services."

### ***3.7 Addressing Possible Errors in Assessments Reports, Synthesis Reports, Special Reports and Methodology Reports***

The procedures to be followed for investigating possible errors in an Assessment Report, Synthesis Report, or Special Report and, if appropriate, implementing its correction are defined in the IPBES Procedure for Addressing Possible Errors in IPBES Assessment Reports, Synthesis Reports, or Special Reports, as described in Annex 4<sup>5</sup>.

## **4. TECHNICAL PAPERS**

IPBES Technical Papers are prepared on topics for which an objective, international scientific/technical/socio-cultural perspective is deemed essential. They:

- a) are based on the material already in the IPBES Assessment Reports, or Special Reports;
- b) are initiated (i) in response to a formal request from a Conference of the Parties to a Multilateral Environmental Agreement related to biodiversity and ecosystem services or their Subsidiary Bodies and agreed by the IPBES Bureau; or (ii) as decided by the plenary;
- c) are prepared by a team of Lead Authors, including a Coordinating Lead Author, selected by the MEP in accordance with the provisions of Sections 3.3.1 and 3.3.2 for the selection of Lead Authors and Coordinating Lead Authors;
- d) are submitted in draft form for simultaneous expert and government review with circulation to expert reviewers and Government Focal Points in accordance with Section 3.3.4.1 at least four weeks before the comments are due;
- e) are revised by the Lead Authors based upon the comments received in the paragraph above, and with assistance from at least two Review Editors per entire Technical Paper who are selected as per the procedures for selecting Review Editors for Assessment Reports, Synthesis Reports, and Special Reports in Section 3.3.2 and carry out the roles as listed in Section 5 of Annex 1;
- f) are submitted for final government review at least four weeks before the comments are due;
- g) are finalised by the Coordinating Lead Authors, in consultation with the MEP which functions in the role of an Editorial Board, based on the comments received; and,
- h) if necessary, as determined by the IPBES Bureau on advice from the MEP, would include in a footnote differing views, based on comments made during final government review, not otherwise adequately reflected in the paper.

---

<sup>5</sup> To be developed and adopted at a later stage.

The following Guidelines should be used in interpreting requirement (a) above: The scientific, technical and socio-cultural information in Technical Papers must be derived from:

- a) The text of IPBES Assessment Reports and Special Reports and the portions of material in cited studies that were relied upon in these Reports.
- b) Relevant models with their assumptions, and scenarios based on scientific, technical and socio-cultural assumptions, as they were used to provide information in those IPBES Reports, as well as emission profiles for sensitivity studies, if the basis of their construction and use is fully explained in the Technical Paper.

The Technical Papers must reflect the balance and objectivity of those Reports and support and/or explain the conclusions contained in those Reports. Information in the Technical Papers should be referenced as far as possible to the subsection of the relevant IPBES Reports and related material.

Such Technical Papers are then made available to the multilateral environmental agreements related to biodiversity and ecosystem services or their Subsidiary Bodies, in response to its request, and thereafter publicly. If initiated by the platform, Technical Papers are made available publicly. In either case, IPBES Technical Papers prominently should state in the beginning: "This is a Technical Paper of the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services prepared in response to a request from (the Conference of the Parties to) / (a Subsidiary Body of) / (decision of the IPBES plenary). The material herein has undergone expert and government review but has not been considered by the plenary for formal acceptance or approval."

## 5. IPBES SUPPORTING MATERIAL

Supporting material consists of three categories:

- a) published reports and proceedings from Workshops and Expert Meetings within the scope of the IPBES work programme that have IPBES recognition,
- b) material, including databases and software, commissioned by the MEP in support of the assessment or methodology development process which the MEP and/or Bureau decides should have wide dissemination, and
- c) guidance material, which can be guidance notes or guidance documents, that guides and assists in the preparation of comprehensive and scientifically, technically and socio-culturally sound IPBES Reports and Technical Papers.

Procedures for the recognition of Workshops and Expert Meetings are given in Sections 6.1 and 6.2. Arrangements for publication of supporting material should be agreed as part of the process of IPBES recognition or commissioned by the MEP to prepare specific supporting material. All supporting material of categories a) and b) should be formally and prominently described on the front and other introductory covers as: "Supporting material prepared for consideration by the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services. This supporting material has not been subject to formal IPBES review processes."

Guidance material, which can be guidance notes and guidance documents, is material to guide and assist authors in the preparation of comprehensive and scientifically sound IPBES Reports and Technical Papers. Guidance notes and documents are usually the responsibility of the MEP or IPBES Chair as appropriate, but may also be commissioned by the plenary or the IPBES Bureau. Guidance notes and documents are developed and finalized by the MEP in consultation with the IPBES Chair, and are published.

## 6. WORKSHOPS AND EXPERT MEETINGS

### ***6.1 IPBES Workshops and Expert Meetings***

IPBES Workshops and Expert Meetings are those that have been agreed upon in advance by an IPBES Working Group, or by the plenary as useful or necessary for the completion of the work plan of a Working Group or a task of the IPBES.

Only such activities may be designated as "IPBES" Workshops or Expert Meetings. Their funding should include full and complete provision for participation of experts from developing countries and countries with economies in transition, as well as traditional knowledge holders and experts. An IPBES Expert Meeting focuses on a specific topic bringing together a limited number of relevant experts. The MEP will identify and select participants to Expert Meetings, in consultation with the IPBES Chair.

An IPBES Workshop considers cross-cutting or complex topics requiring input from a broad community of experts. It requires nominations by Government Focal Points and observer organizations. The IPBES Chair and the MEP may also nominate experts and will select the participants to the Workshop.

Proposals for IPBES Workshops or Expert Meetings will be submitted to the plenary for its decision through the MEP, or the IPBES Chair. The proposals will include descriptions of the topic(s), and clarify the choice for an Expert Meeting or a Workshop. The MEP will function as a Scientific Steering Committee to assist in organizing these meetings.

The composition of participants to Expert Meetings and Workshops shall aim to reflect:

- a) The relevant range of scientific, technical and socio-cultural views and expertise,
- b) Geographical representation as appropriate,
- c) Representation of the existing diversity of knowledge systems
- d) A mixture of experts with and without previous experience in IPBES,
- e) Gender balance.

Government Focal Points should be notified of the list of invited participants to an Expert Meeting or Workshop within two weeks after the selection has taken place. The MEP will convene the Expert Meeting or Workshop and report to the IPBES Bureau and plenary on the selection process, including a description of how the selection criteria and any other considerations for participation have been applied.

The proceedings of IPBES Workshops and Expert Meetings should normally be published summarizing the range of views presented at the meeting. Such proceedings should:

- a) Include a full list of participants;
- b) Indicate when and by whom they were prepared;
- c) Indicate whether and by whom they were reviewed prior to publication;
- d) Acknowledge all sources of funding and other support;
- e) Indicate prominently at the beginning of the document that the activity was held pursuant to a decision of the relevant Working Group or the plenary but that such decision does not imply Working Group or plenary endorsement or approval of the proceedings or any recommendations or conclusions contained therein.

## ***6.2 Co-sponsored Workshops and Expert Meetings***

IPBES co-sponsorship may be extended to other Workshops or Expert Meetings if the IPBES Chair, as well as the MEP determines in advance that the activity will be useful to the work of the IPBES. IPBES co-sponsorship of such an activity does not convey any obligation by the IPBES to provide financial or other support. In considering whether to extend IPBES co-sponsorship, the following factors should be taken into account:

- a) Whether full funding for the activity will be available from sources other than the IPBES;
- b) Whether the activity will be open to government experts as well as experts from non-governmental organizations and traditional knowledge holders and experts, participating in the work of the IPBES;
- c) Whether provision will be made for participation of experts from developing countries and countries with economies in transition;
- d) Whether the proceedings will be published and made available to the IPBES in a time frame relevant to its work;
- e) Whether the proceedings will:
  - include a full list of participants;
  - indicate when and by whom they were prepared;
  - indicate whether and by whom they were reviewed prior to publication;
  - specify all sources of funding and other support;
  - prominently display the following disclaimer at the beginning of the document: "IPBES co-sponsorship does not imply IPBES endorsement or approval of these proceedings or any recommendations or conclusions contained herein. Neither the papers presented at the Workshop/Expert Meeting nor the report of its proceedings have been subjected to IPBES review."

**ANNEX 1:  
TASKS AND RESPONSIBILITIES FOR LEAD AUTHORS, COORDINATING LEAD  
AUTHORS, CONTRIBUTING AUTHORS, EXPERT REVIEWERS AND REVIEW EDITORS  
OF IPBES REPORTS AND OTHER DELIVERABLES, AND GOVERNMENT FOCAL POINTS**

**1. LEAD AUTHORS**

*Function:*

To be responsible for the production of designated sections addressing items of the work programme on the basis of the best scientific, technical and socio-cultural information available.

*Comment:*

Lead Authors will typically work as small groups which have responsibility for ensuring that the various components of their sections are brought together on time, are of uniformly high quality and conform to any overall standards of style set for the document as a whole.

The task of Lead Authors is a demanding one and in recognition of this the names of Lead Authors will appear prominently in the final Report. During the final stages of Report preparation, when the workload is often particularly heavy and when Lead Authors are heavily dependent upon each other to read and edit material, and to agree to changes promptly, it is essential that the work should be accorded the highest priority.

The essence of the Lead Authors' task is synthesis of material drawn from available literature or other fully-justified unpublished sources as defined in Section 3.2.

Lead Authors, in conjunction with Review Editors, are also required to take account of expert and government review comments when revising text. Lead Authors may not necessarily write original text themselves, but they must have the proven ability to develop text that is scientifically, technically and socio-culturally sound and that faithfully represents, to the extent that this is possible, contributions by a wide variety of experts. The ability to work to deadlines is also a necessary practical requirement.

Lead Authors are required to record in the Report views which cannot be reconciled with a consensus view but which are nonetheless scientifically or technically or socio-culturally valid.

Lead Authors may convene meetings with Contributing Authors, as appropriate and with due regard to minimizing costs, in the preparations of their sections or to discuss expert or government review comments and to suggest any Workshops or Expert Meetings in their relevant areas to the MEP. The names of all Lead Authors will be acknowledged in the Reports.

**2. COORDINATING LEAD AUTHORS**

*Function:*

To take overall responsibility for coordinating major sections of a Report.

*Comment:*

Coordinating Lead Authors will be Lead Authors with the added responsibility of ensuring that major sections of the Report are completed to a high standard, are collated and delivered to the Working



Group Co-Chairs in a timely manner and conform to any overall standards of style set for the document.

Coordinating Lead Authors will play a leading role in ensuring that any crosscutting scientific, technical or socio-cultural issues which may involve several sections of a Report are addressed in a complete and coherent manner and reflect the latest information available. The skills and resources required of Coordinating Lead Authors are those required of Lead Authors with the additional organisational skills needed to coordinate a section of a Report. The names of all Coordinating Lead Authors will be acknowledged in the Reports.

### **3. CONTRIBUTING AUTHORS**

*Function:*

To prepare technical information in the form of text, graphs or data for assimilation by the Lead Authors into the draft section.

*Comment:*

Input from a wide range of contributors is a key element in the success of IPBES assessments, and the names of all contributors will be acknowledged in the Reports. Contributions are sometimes solicited by Lead Authors but unprompted contributions are encouraged. Contributions should be supported as far as possible with references from the peer reviewed and internationally available literature, and with copies of any unpublished material cited; clear indications of how to access the latter should be included in the contributions. For material available in electronic format only, the location where such material may be accessed should be cited. Contributed material may be edited, merged and if necessary, amended, in the course of developing the overall draft text.

### **4. EXPERT REVIEWERS**

*Function:*

To comment on the accuracy and completeness of the scientific/technical/socio-cultural content and the overall scientific/technical/socio-cultural balance of the drafts.

*Comment:*

Expert reviewers will comment on the text according to their own knowledge and experience.

### **5. REVIEW EDITORS**

*Function:*

Review Editors will assist the MEP in identifying reviewers for the expert review process, ensure that all substantive expert and government review comments are afforded appropriate consideration, advise lead authors on how to handle contentious or controversial issues and ensure genuine controversies are reflected adequately in the text of the Report.

*Comment:*

There will be two to four Review Editors per chapter, including their executive summaries, and per technical summary. In order to carry out these tasks, Review Editors will need to have a broad understanding of the wider scientific, technical and socio-cultural issues being addressed.

The workload will be particularly heavy during the final stages of the Report preparation. This includes attending those meetings where writing teams are considering the results of the two review rounds.

Review Editors are not actively engaged in drafting Reports and cannot serve as reviewers of those chapters of which they are Authors. Review Editors can be members of the MEP or outside experts agreed by the MEP. Although responsibility for the final text remains with the Lead Authors, Review Editors will need to ensure that where significant differences of opinion on scientific issues remain, such differences are described in an annex to the Report.

Review Editors must submit a written report to the Working Group Sessions or the plenary and, where appropriate, will be requested to attend Sessions of the Working Group and of the plenary to communicate their findings from the review process and to assist in finalizing the Summary for Policymakers, and Synthesis Reports. The names of all Review Editors will be acknowledged in the Reports.

## **6. GOVERNMENT FOCAL POINTS**

### *Function:*

To prepare and update the list of national experts as required to help implement the IPBES work programme, and to arrange the provision of integrated comments on the accuracy and completeness of the scientific, technical and/or socio-cultural content and the overall scientific, technical and/or socio-cultural balance of the drafts.

### *Comment:*

Government review will typically be carried out within and between a number of Departments and Ministries. For administrative convenience, each government and observer organization should designate one Focal Point for all IPBES activities, provide full information on this Focal Point to the IPBES Secretariat and notify the Secretariat of any changes in this information. The Focal Point should liaise with the IPBES Secretariat regarding the logistics of the review processes.

---