

**Intergovernmental Science-Policy
Platform on Biodiversity and
Ecosystem Services**Distr.: General
4 December 2017

Original: English

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

Medellin, Colombia, 18–24 March 2018

Item 8 of the provisional agenda*

Pending assessments: thematic assessment of the sustainable use of wild species; methodological assessment regarding the diverse conceptualization of multiple values of nature and its benefits; and thematic assessment of invasive alien species

Pending assessments: thematic assessment of the sustainable use of wild species; methodological assessment regarding the diverse conceptualization of multiple values of nature and its benefits; and thematic assessment of invasive alien species

Note by the secretariat**Introduction**

1. In decision IPBES-4/1, the Plenary of the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES) approved the scoping report for deliverable 3 (b) (ii) for a thematic assessment of invasive alien species and their control (reproduced in background document IPBES/6/INF/10), along with a revised scoping report for deliverable 3 (d) for a methodological assessment of diverse conceptualization of multiple values of nature and its benefits to people (reproduced in background document IPBES/6/INF/9).
2. In decision IPBES-5/1, the Plenary approved the scoping report for deliverable 3 (b) (iii) for a thematic assessment on the sustainable use of wild species (reproduced in background document IPBES/6/INF/8). In that same decision, the Plenary requested the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel, in consultation with the Bureau, to evaluate the need for any changes to already approved scoping documents based on major scientific findings of other IPBES assessments and to report to the Plenary if any significant modifications were needed.
3. In addition, in decision IPBES-5/6, paragraph 5, on financial and budgetary arrangements, the Plenary decided to consider at its sixth session, subject to the availability of sufficient funds, the three assessments mentioned in paragraphs 1 and 2 above, referred to as the three pending assessments in this document.
4. In accordance with these decisions, section I, subsection A, of the present note includes suggestions from the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel and the Bureau on the need to make any changes to already approved scoping documents of the three pending assessments, based on major scientific findings of other IPBES assessments. Subsection B suggests several modifications to the methodological approach

* IPBES/6/1.

presented in the three scoping reports, with implications for the cost of each assessment. A revised suggested overall cost for each of the three pending assessments is included in the annex to the note.

5. Section II sets out further suggestions from the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel and the Bureau, regarding a possible sequence for the initiation of the three pending assessments.
6. Section III suggests actions that the Plenary might wish to take.

I. Scoping reports

7. The Multidisciplinary Expert Panel and the Bureau, in response to the request from the Plenary to evaluate the need to make any changes to the three scoping reports at their tenth meetings in October 2017, made the following recommendations, set out in subsections A and B below.

A. Overall scope

8. Concerning the overall scope of the three pending assessments, the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel concluded that no modifications are needed in the light of major scientific findings of other IPBES assessments.

B. Methodological approach and cost estimate

9. Based on lessons learned from both the ongoing and finalized assessments, and also on the conclusions of the internal review of IPBES (as set out in background document IPBES/6/INF/32), the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel and the Bureau suggest the following changes to the methodological approach presented in the scoping reports, which would increase the total cost per assessment from \$997,000 to \$1,445,000:

(a) Increase the number of lead authors per chapter, from six to eight, thus bringing the total number of experts per chapter to twelve, including eight lead authors, two coordinating lead authors, and two review editors. The number of coordinating lead authors and review editors per chapter would remain unchanged. This increase would allow for sufficient diversity of expertise and views in each chapter, and would make possible a better distribution of the workload among experts. This number would be similar to the land degradation and restoration assessment;

(b) Allow the convening of three inclusive author meetings with lead authors in attendance, rather than only two such meetings: this is seen as a key criterion for success in order to ensure the full integration and involvement of lead authors during this three-year process;

(c) Increase the size of technical support units so that they include a minimum of two technical and programmatic staff members, together with one half-time administrative staff member, rather than one technical staff member as proposed before. This would be necessary, based on lessons learned, to deal with the heavy workload related to coordinating the delivery of an assessment, and would be similar to the size of the technical support units established for the IPBES regional assessments;

(d) Increase the budget for the design, printing, outreach and dissemination of the assessment reports, based on the costs of communication for the four regional assessments and the land degradation and restoration assessment.

10. A generic budget, applicable to each of the three pending assessments, is presented in the annex to the present note. The generic budget is based on the above-mentioned considerations, as follows:

(a) Each assessment would be carried out over a period of three years;

(b) Each assessment would include three fully inclusive author meetings with the lead authors in attendance at each of those meetings;

(c) Each assessment would include a total of 74 experts (2 co-chairs, 12 coordinating lead authors, 48 lead authors and 12 review editors) or some 10 experts per chapter, 75 per cent of whose costs would be supported by the trust fund;

(d) Each assessment would have a technical support unit of two technical and programmatic staff members and one half-time administrative officer, and 50 per cent of that support would be covered by the trust fund, to be matched by a similar amount from a host institution, as in-kind support to IPBES;

-
- (e) Each assessment would have a communications budget covering the design, printing, outreach and dissemination activities of the assessment reports.

II. Sequence of initiation

11. The Multidisciplinary Expert Panel and the Bureau further suggest that the Plenary, should it decide to initiate the undertaking of all three pending assessments, might wish to stagger their initiation, according to the following sequence: initiation of two assessments at the sixth session of the Plenary, in 2018, and of one at the seventh session, in 2019. This suggestion is made to avoid having more than three assessments being performed in parallel, taking into account the conclusions of the internal review (IPBES/6/INF/32), and in the light of the global assessment being presented to the Plenary at its seventh session.

III. Suggested action by the Plenary

12. The Plenary may wish to consider the suggestions made by the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel and the Bureau:
- (a) Not to modify the scope of the three pending assessments;
 - (b) To revise the cost of each pending assessment, in the context of the discussion on the budget under item 9 of the agenda of this session of the Plenary;
 - (c) To consider staggering the initiation of the three pending assessments, starting with two in 2018, followed by one in 2019.

Annex

Estimated cost of an assessment

<i>Year</i>	<i>Cost item</i>	<i>Assumptions</i>	<i>Estimated costs (United States dollars)</i>
Year 1	Management committee meeting (2 co-chairs, members of the secretariat, including technical support unit, Multidisciplinary Expert Panel and Bureau)	Cost of venue (half a week, for 6 participants, in Bonn)	0
		Travel and daily subsistence allowance for 4 supported participants (4 × \$3,750)	15 000
	First author meeting (2 co-chairs, 12 coordinating lead authors, 48 lead authors and 6 Multidisciplinary Expert Panel and Bureau members)	Cost of venue (corresponding to 75 per cent, to be complemented with 25 per cent in kind; for 68 participants)	18 750
		Travel and DSA for 51 supported participants (51 × \$3,750)	191 250
	Technical support unit	Corresponding to the costs of one full-time equivalent professional position and one part-time administrative assistant, including travel and overheads (to be matched by an in-kind offer of an equivalent value)	150 000
Total year 1:			375 000
Year 2	Second author meeting (2 co-chairs, 12 coordinating lead authors, 48 lead authors, 12 review editors and 6 Multidisciplinary Expert Panel and Bureau members)	Cost of venue (corresponding to 75 per cent, to be complemented with 25 per cent in kind; for 80 participants)	20 000
		Travel and daily subsistence allowance for 60 supported participants (60 × \$3,750)	225 000
	Technical support unit	Corresponding to the costs of one full-time equivalent professional position and one part-time administrative assistant, including travel and overheads (to be matched by an in-kind offer of an equivalent value)	150 000
	Total year 2:		
Year 3	Third author meeting (2 co-chairs, 12 coordinating lead authors, 48 lead authors, 12 review editors and 6 Multidisciplinary Expert Panel and Bureau members)	Cost of venue (corresponding to 75 per cent, to be complemented with 25 per cent in kind; for 80 participants)	20 000
		Travel and daily subsistence allowance for 60 supported participants (60 × \$3,750)	225 000
	Technical support unit (including 3 months after launch of the assessment report at Plenary)	Corresponding to the costs of one full-time equivalent professional position and one part-time administrative assistant, including travel and overheads (to be matched by an in-kind offer of an equivalent value)	187 500
	Participation of 8 experts, including 2 co-chairs and 6 coordinating lead authors or lead authors in the eighth session of the Plenary	Travel and daily subsistence allowance for 6 supported participants (6 × \$3,750)	22 500
	Design, layout, dissemination and outreach	Including the following activities: design and layout of the assessment report including its technical graphics, production of a promotional outreach video, public relations support, launch events, printing of the summary for policymakers as well as the assessment reports and the subsequent distribution	220 000
	Total year 3:		
Total:			1 445 000