



Distr.: General  
21 March 2012

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  
Second session**

Panama City, 16–21 April 2012

**Options paper for the involvement of civil society organizations  
in an intergovernmental platform on biodiversity and ecosystem  
services**

**Note by the secretariat**

The annex to the present note updates the information contained in the options paper (UNEP/IPBES.MI/1/INF/13) submitted to the first session of the plenary meeting to determine modalities and institutional arrangements for an intergovernmental science-policy platform on biodiversity and ecosystem services, held in Nairobi from 3 to 7 October 2011. The annex is presented as received from the International Union for Conservation of Nature and has not been formally edited.

## Annex

# Options paper for the involvement of civil society organizations in an intergovernmental platform on biodiversity and ecosystem services

## Executive summary

1. The present document focuses on the ways and means to strengthen the participation of Civil Society Organizations (CSOs) in the IPBES governance. It is proposed by the International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN), 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 and inform decisions on the role of civil society in IPBES. It will serve as a grid of analysis of the final agreement which will hopefully be reached on the modalities and institutional arrangements after the upcoming second plenary meeting to be held in Panama City, Panama on 16-21 April 2012. The options proposed in this paper draw from the official documents submitted for that meeting and especially on the document UNEP/IPBES.MI/2/3 (functions and structures of bodies that might be established under an IPBES) and UNEP/IPBES.MI/2/4 (Rules of procedure for the meeting of the platform's plenary).
3. IUCN considers IPBES as an opportunity to strengthen the 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. Involving stakeholders in the governance of IPBES is also critical and should be shaped in light with other comparable mechanisms, set under the rules of the United Nations System, such as the Major Groups and Stakeholders processes, or set outside of the United Nations System.
4. Taking into account the scope of civil society participation formulated by governments in the Busan Outcome in June 2010, three options for the involvement of civil society in IPBES are considered in this paper. They are based on three models of 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 inputs, such as knowledge and information and the civil society participation is limited to mere observance of 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. In an 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 models, including the one that allows the highest participation of civil society, do not necessarily diminish the authority of governments.
9. With consideration with those models, the design of the role of civil society for IPBES could be genuinely innovative. Applications of the models to IPBES case study are not mutually exclusive and a combination of them could be adopted.
10. Given that the quasi-totality 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. This might also enhance the likelihood of the acceptance of the IPBES findings and of the implementation of its recommendations. Involvement of CSOs in all aspects of IPBES governance would facilitate the implementation of the IPBES activities and increase its impacts on both policy and practice worldwide.

11. A summary of options and their implications is presented below:

	<b>CSOs involvement under a Minimalist Model</b>	<b>CSOs involvement under a Policy Development Model</b>	<b>CSOs involvement under an <i>Ex Officio</i> Model</b>
<b>Status of participation</b>	Consultative voice	Consultative voice	Consultative voice
<b>Accreditation</b>	Ad hoc observers and one-shot accreditation.	Simple accreditation criteria, drawn from the UN system	Equitable, fair and timely accreditation, waivers for some participants
<b>In the Plenary</b>	Silent observers, with right to access documents but not able to provide written or oral statements during sessions  Written inputs can, be produced in response to open consultations	Observers with limited participatory rights: circulate written statements, be granted interventions during sessions, authorized to participate in some sessions, involvement in agenda setting	Observers with extensive participatory rights: written and oral statements allowed, provided, circulated and taken into account, prior to and during sessions. Oral interventions could be granted on either defined slots or as permanent access
<b>In the subsidiary bodies that might be established</b>			
Expanded Bureau (or standing committee)	CSOs not able to nominate representatives, nor attending the meetings.	CSOs able to nominate and could attend meetings.	CSOs able to nominate and could attend meetings.
Scientific Panel	Only scientists nominated by governments	Only scientists nominated by governments	Scientists nominated as <i>intuitu personae</i> using a set of criteria including professionalism and leadership
Working groups	Working groups' officers only nominated by governments. No processes for inclusion of CSOs in the operations.	Working groups' officers only nominated by governments. Some inclusion of CSOs in the operations.	CSOs could nominate experts and could propose lists of authors. No restriction on inclusiveness in technical assistance, in the peer-review process, or other processes.
<b>Expected outcomes</b>	Low credibility and legitimacy, but could be balanced through communication	Medium policy impact, credibility and saliency but high transparency	High credibility, legitimacy and transparency, very strong buy-in which will foster use of IPBES findings.

## 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.	What does the Busan Outcome say on civil society participation?.....	6
II.	Options for the participation of CSOs in the governance of IPBES .....	7
II.1.	Introduction to models for civil society participation .....	7
II.2.	Options for the Observer Status of CSOs .....	7
II.2.1.	Types of observer status .....	7
II.2.2.	Options for eligibility as Observers.....	8
II.3.	Options for the participation of CSOs in the IPBES Plenary.....	9
II.4.	Options for the participation of CSOs in the IPBES subsidiary bodies .....	10
II.4.1	Participation in an Expanded Bureau .....	10
II.4.2.	Participation in a Scientific Panel.....	10
II.4.3.	Participation in Working Groups.....	11
III.	What would be the benefits of applying the different options of civil society participation in IPBES?.....	11

## I. Background

### I.1. Preliminary note

1. The first session of a plenary meeting to consider modalities and arrangements of an Intergovernmental Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES) was held on 3-7 October 2011 in Nairobi, Kenya and the second session will be held on 16-21 April 2012 in Panama City, Panama.
2. An intersessional process enabled sending comments and expressing views on the rules of procedures for the meetings of the platform's plenary. This process raised attention on other procedures that should also be considered as opportunities for Civil Society Organizations (hereafter referred as CSOs) to engage. Those procedures are mentioned in paragraph 7 of the official paper UNEP/IPBES.MI/2/4. They will not be informed by the present document.
3. Taking into account the progress of the negotiations and the views expressed intersessionally, this paper is an update of a paper, previously submitted to inform the first session which was held on 3-7 October 2011 in Nairobi, Kenya. That paper was labelled UNEP/IPBES.MI/1/INF/13.
4. Currently, the present paper intends to inform the sessions on Item 4 (b) "Functions and structure of bodies that might be established under the platform" and Item 4 (c) (i) "Rules of procedures for the meetings of the Platform".
5. The present paper focuses on the ways and means to strengthen the participation of CSOs in the IPBES governance. The options developed are based on a nomenclature for CSOs involvement in international processes provided in the document "Assessing the value of civil society involvement in IPBES governance" prepared under the auspices of IUCN in 2009.<sup>1</sup>
6. The governance structure that this document follows is based on the official document UNEP/IPBES.MI/2/3 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 Expanded Bureau/Standing Committee as well as in the Scientific Panel, if it is decided that those bodies should be established.
7. It also refers to the working document UNEP/IPBES.MI/2/4 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, expected outcomes of the various levels of CSOs involvement.
8. 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 eleven 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 United Nations International Strategy on Disaster Reduction (UNISDR), the Global Environmental Outlook (GEO), the International Assessment of Agricultural Knowledge, Science and Technology for Development (IAASTD), the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment (MA), 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 United Nations Commission for Sustainable Development (CSD), The United Nations Economic and Social Council (UN-ECOSOC), the International Criminal Court (ICC), the International Conference on Chemicals Management (ICCM), the OECD Development Assistance Committee, the Joint United Nations Programme on HIV/AIDS (UNAIDS), the World Commission on Dams (WCD) and the World Trade Organization (WTO).

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

9. For the purpose of this paper, civil society is defined as any non-state actor, including the private sector. 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

---

<sup>1</sup> Briefing paper prepared for IUCN by Johannah Bernstein Environmental Law and Policy Consulting-Bernstein J. et al., May 2010.

authorities, workers and trade unions. Some of those are already included in the nine Major Groups represented at meetings sponsored under UN processes.

10. Considering 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.

11. This paper does not include options for the participation of the United Nations organizations or programmes (including UNEP, UNESCO, UNDP and FAO) and the secretariats of biodiversity-related multilateral environmental agreements (MEAs) in the governance of IPBES.

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

12. 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.

13. 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.

14. 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);

15. 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);

16. 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);

17. It would improve the degree of openness of the IPBES decision-making processes and would make the concepts, results and findings of IPBES more popular (transparency);

18. It would help to create a collegial platform where different expertise, disciplines and roles meet to address the same objective (ownership);

19. The implementation of the findings emanating from IPBES would be improved (policy impact).

20. Based on these definitions, section III of this paper will provide an outline of the benefits IPBES could draw from the different options.

### **I.4. What does the Busan Outcome say on civil society participation?**

21. According to the Busan Outcome<sup>2</sup>, 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 however this role is still to be defined.

22. 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

---

<sup>2</sup> 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

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".

23. 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 governance of IPBES

### II.1. Introduction to models for civil society participation

24. Three models for the civil society participation in international institutions governance and work are presented below, with respect to the Busan Outcome. They range from minimal engagement to full participation in governance, without voting power.

25. 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.

26. 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, ICCM, ICC, the OECD Development Assistance Committees, WTO and 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.

27. The *Ex-Officio*<sup>3</sup> 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 UNEP 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.

28. Some organizations run under a full participation model, along which CSOs have voting rights. Millennium 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.

### II.2. Options for the Observer Status of CSOs

#### II.2.1. Types of observer status

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. The official document 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

<sup>3</sup> *Ex-officio* stands for 'from the office' meaning that access to discussions is automatic regardless of the status, position or situation

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.

31. An option could be introduced to simplify and clarify the accreditation process a distinction between permanent and *ad hoc* observer. The status of 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.

32. 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.

33. Typically, governments or intergovernmental organizations become permanent observers when they either do not qualify for membership or do not wish to become full members. The 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.

34. Other models, for example the UN- ECOSOC, favour Consultative Status over the Permanent Observer one. The status can be granted for non-governmental and non-profit public or voluntary organizations. Three different forms of the Consultative Status exist within the ECOSOC. The General Consultative Status reserved for large international NGOs whose area of work covers most of the issues on the agenda of ECOSOC and its subsidiary bodies. Those organizations have the right to attend all UN meetings, designate UN representatives, propose items for the ECOSOC agenda, circulate statements up to 2000 words and speak at ECOSOC meetings, as well as its subsidiary bodies' meetings. In addition, NGOs have to submit quadrennial reports. Organizations with a special consultative status (granted to NGOs which have a special competence in, and are concerned specifically with, only a few of the fields of activity covered by ECOSOC) are excluded from proposing items for the ECOSOC agenda, from speaking at ECOSOC and can only circulate statements of 500 words maximum at ECOSOC meetings and 1500 words at its subsidiary bodies' meetings. The last status within ECOSOC, the Roster status is given to organizations that apply for consultative status but do not fit in any of the other categories are usually included in the Roster. These NGOs tend to have a rather narrow and/or technical focus. This status presents the weakest form of participation. Rosters are allowed to attend UN meetings, designate UN representatives. This form equals a silent observer as used in other international organizations.

## II.2.2. Options for eligibility as Observers

35. The Busan Outcome particularly pinpoints the categories of organizations whose inputs should be considered: intergovernmental organizations, international and regional scientific organizations, environment trust funds, NGOs and the private sector.

36. With respect 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.

37. If applying the Policy Development Model or the *Ex-Officio* Model, there would be both permanent observers and *ad hoc* observers. Accreditation could be more or less simple and several conditions to access accreditation could be put resulting in fewer numbers of accreditations. These requirements could be basic, such as describing the organization, explaining motivation, inform concerned governmental authorities, or could imply recognition by a Member, such as requiring agreement from the government of the country in which the organization is heading or working. The accreditation process could be accelerated, such as the "fast track" process used for the 2002 World Summit on Sustainable Development, or even could include waivers for participants from countries where CSOs have difficulty obtaining legal status.

38. The permanent accreditation could rely on a nomenclature of stakeholders and knowledge holders. One option could be to use the categories of stakeholders mentioned in the Busan Outcome (see above). Another option could be to establish a maximum number of permanent observers. In this case, 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

39. Based on the three reference 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 Busan Outcome.

40. According to the role of the Plenary, as proposed in the official paper Nr. UNEP/IPBES.MI/2/3, the plenary would be the main governing body of the platform. In such a body, the Observer status, either Permanent or *ad hoc*, would imply a variety of participation rights for CSOs.

41. Under the Minimalist 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 could attend the sessions as silent observers. The participation in the IPBES Plenary would be 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. Thus, applying the Minimalist Model, CSOs would not have any voice in shaping the scope and content of the assessment reports.

42. By contrast, the Policy Development Model would enable CSOs as permanent observers and would allow them to provide regular and continuous inputs thanks to the regularity of their participation. The rules of procedures for the meetings of the platform's plenary could also allow a parallel process to the Plenary for the expression of civil society. The revised examples show different options such as: organizing multi-stakeholder dialogues, establishing a dedicated steering committee, devoting time and space to all delegations to give to CSOs the opportunity to share with governments' delegates their field-level experiences and views. CSD provides concrete examples of the precedent.

43. In the *Ex Officio* Model, accredited CSOs (including IGOs, NGOs, academia and scientific institutions as well as the private sector) would be allowed to fully participate in the Plenary as the observers without the right to vote. However, CSOs would be 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 and WCD.

44. 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.

45. Interventions by CSOs in plenary meetings could be fostered by the definition of clear rules. The rules of procedures for the meetings of the platform's plenary could define specific rules for statements to be made by the non-members. This could become critical during the acceptance, approval and adoption of executive summary of reports, as the precedent of IPCC shows. The rules of procedures could 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. Another option could be that observers would be granted to specific slots for their interventions, for instance, at the beginning or at the end of the sessions, or be allowed to speak in groups. In the latest case, observers would be obliged to form a group to introduce a statement.

46. Applying the *Ex Officio* Model would lead to a 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 could provide ground-checking feedback on policy discussions. UNAIDS, which allows in-depth participation of AIDS affected communities is an example.

## II.4 Options for the participation of CSOs in the IPBES subsidiary bodies

### II.4.1 Participation in an Expanded Bureau

47. According to the working paper Nr. UNEP/IPBES.MI/2/3, a subsidiary body such as an Expanded Bureau might be established by the Plenary to ensure administrative and technical functions, as established by the plenary. Applying a Minimalist Model, CSOs participation would not be allowed in such an executive body: the composition of the body will not include representative of CSOs and the deliberations would not be open to observers.

48. However, the Policy Development Model or the Ex Officio Model for the participation of CSOs would entail an adequate participation of CSOs representatives in this executive body. Under such a model, the Expanded Bureau of IPBES would be constituted of individuals nominated by all participants to the plenary, including observers. The plenary could decide to allow the right to several observers to nominate their representative. This rule would be listed, within the rules of procedure of the plenary, as a requirement for the composition of such a body, in the same way that balanced geographic representation, balanced gender representation or representation of relevant multidisciplinary expertise.

49. As a consequence, the Expanded Bureau could then comprise a good number of observers. The balance between the numbers of seats would determine the ability to share views with civil society. Examples of such a balance, can be found in other processes, where CSOs sitting in the bureau would have voting rights: IAASTD is established under equity in number since it includes 30 governments and 30 CSOs; the Bureau of the ILO comprises 28 Government regular members, 14 Worker regular members and 14 Employer regular members.

50. Applying such a model, CSOs would not have the voting right in the Expanded Bureau but they would share the same intervention opportunities as governments. They would be entitled to submit reports, proposals and amendments. The modalities and functions of the CSOs representatives and their specific participation in the Expanded Bureau might be further determined by the plenary. The term of office might be fixed and preferably correspond to the duration of a global assessment cycle.

51. In that way, the Expanded Bureau would integrate 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.4.2. Participation in a Scientific Panel

52. In the case of the Bureau with a separate Scientific Panel, the latter will primarily serve to oversee the IPBES scientific credibility. The composition of the Scientific Panel might reflect a multi-disciplinary approach 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.

53. The members of the Scientific Panel 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.

54. Two main criteria might be considered when selecting the members of the Scientific 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.

55. Applying a Minimalist Model or a Policy Development Model of the civil society participation, the scientific community which would be represented in the Scientific Panel would only consist of experts nominated by governments. This would nevertheless not deter other scientists or experts to participate in the assessment process or in any other operation, by providing data and information. This would nonetheless prevent them from directly interacting in the decision and verification process.

56. Following the *Ex Officio* Model, the observers would take part in the nomination of members of the Scientific Panel, which will not be constituted of nominees by governments but by scientists chosen after a set of criteria, regardless their country or institution of origin.

57. The Scientific Panel might take decisions by consensus. If consensus cannot be achieved, decisions on proposals might be taken by a simple majority vote. In this case, all experts, whatever their origin, might be entitled with a deliberative voice. UPOV and UNISDR are examples of precedent.

58. 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, like it is the case for the IPCC reports. This rule would ensure transparency not only in the process of producing IPBES scientific reports but also in the process of any scientific debate.

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

#### **II.4.3. Participation in Working Groups**

60. The working groups implementing the work programme will be central to the work of the platform. There again, the working groups' officers might be nominated exclusively by Members or Parties (Minimalist Model, Policy Development Model) or might include nominees by observers (*Ex-Officio* Model). Regarding their respective inputs of knowledge, scientific institutions and other CSOs could provide high-quality profiles to take an active part in the working groups.

61. The working groups would be responsible for processing various activities, including the production of scientific reports. Whatever their origin, officers of the working groups would be in charge of selecting authors and could have the ability to consult, hold public audiences, ask for assistance, all processes which could rely strongly on CSOs. Here again, there is a gradient of CSOs involvement which could be established, and here again, it could be shaped along the three models. The rules of procedure which will set the capacities of the working groups will determine the potential inclusiveness of their operations. This will concern: the process for selecting authors, the peer-review process, the process for external assistance, support services provided to the working group (such as the Technical Support Units which provide support for the IPCC's working groups).

62. 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 (IPCC be an example of such a process).

### **III. What would be the benefits of applying the different options of civil society participation in IPBES?**

63. The different options proposed in this document could produce various benefits with respect to the following critical qualities for IPBES: credibility, legitimacy, saliency, transparency, ownership and policy impact. We provide below an attempt to qualify these outcomes:

	<b>CSOs involved under a Minimalistmodel</b>	<b>CSOs involved under a Policy Development model</b>	<b>CSOs involved under an Ex-Officio model</b>
<b>Credibility</b>	Low, since findings would be suspected as they issue	High but depending of the gap to be filled and thus the involvement of existing initiatives	High thanks to inclusion of all information and knowledge possible.
<b>Legitimacy</b>	Low due to the limitation in inputs	High, since science directed by policy	Very high, effective science-policy interface
<b>Saliency</b>	Low due to limitation for introducing requests	Medium and very dependent on the participation	Strong ability to deal with complexity and find synergies with existing mechanisms
<b>Transparency</b>	Strongly dependant on the communications efforts of the Secretariat	High, through provisions of communication relays	High, through provision of communication relays
<b>Ownership by civil society</b>	Low ownership and process viewed as entirely captured by government.	Medium, shaping the agenda perceived as a crucial lever on the political roadmaps.	Very strong despite no reduction of government authority
<b>Policy impact</b>	Low but depending on social and political factors in the implementation	Medium influence on policy impact, being mainly <i>a priori</i> inputs rather than <i>a posteriori</i> control.	Monitoring implementation and compliance with the products, tools and funds provided