



联合国

UNEP/SPP-CWP/OEWG.2/4*



环境署

联合国
环境规划署

Distr.: General
28 August 2023

Chinese
Original: English

关于进一步促进化学品和废物健全管理
并防止污染的科学与政策委员会的
不限成员名额特设工作组
第二届会议

2023 年 12 月 11 日至 15 日，内罗毕
临时议程**项目 4

编写关于设立科学与政策委员会的提案

全体会议届会的机构安排和议事规则

秘书处的说明

一、 引言

1. 在 2022 年 2 月 28 日至 3 月 2 日于内罗毕举行的第五届会议续会上，联合国环境规划署（环境署）联合国环境大会在其第 5/8 号决议中决定设立进一步促进化学品和废物健全管理并防止污染的科学与政策委员会，具体细节将根据该决议进一步具体说明。
2. 在同一决议中，环境大会决定召集一个不限成员名额特设工作组，为科学与政策委员会拟定提议，以审议若干问题，包括委员会的机构设计和管理（第 5 (a)段）、为委员会提供秘书处支助的安排（第 5 (h)段）、为委员会工作提供自愿资金的备选方案（第 5 (i)段）以及委员会工作议事规则（第 5 (j)段）。
3. 本文件第二节讨论了委员会的主要设计特点，并介绍了关于委员会机构安排的提议。第三节中的目录作为拟定全体会议届会议事规则的起点。本文件由资料文件（[UNEP/SPP-CWP/OEWG.2/INF/4](#)）补充。

二、 机构安排

4. **机构安排规定了委员会运作和履行其职能所需的架构。**现已审查科学与政策互动机制的五个实例（政府间气候变化专门委员会、生物多样性和生态系统服务政府间科学与政策平台、国际资源委员会和全球环境展望进程以及《关

* 由于技术原因于 2023 年 11 月 13 日重发。

** UNEP/SPP-CWP/OEWG.2/1。

于消耗臭氧层物质的蒙特利尔议定书》评估小组)的组织特点。此外,机构安排往往包括财务安排,已审查的每项安排都有:

- (a) 一个决策机构;
- (b) 一个或多个提供行政管理和科学监督的机构;
- (c) 开展或支持科学与政策互动机制工作的其他机构;
- (d) 一个秘书处。

5. 从组成、工作方式和职能方面讨论了机构安排。¹

(a) **组成**。组成凸显了参与机构或安排的人员。下文提出的备选方案侧重于满足环境大会第 5/8 号决议第 6 (b)段提出的需要,即确保委员会“具有跨学科性,确保具有广泛学科专长的专家作出贡献;包容性参与,包括土著人民;具有地域、区域和性别平衡”;

(b) **工作方式**。工作方式包括对机构或安排如何开展工作的考虑。下文提出的备选方案侧重于满足环境大会第 5/8 号决议第 6 (c)、(f)和(h)段中提出的需求,即确保委员会“制定程序,确保委员会的工作透明、公正,并能够提出可信和科学上可靠的报告和评估”;“有能力解决潜在的利益冲突并保护商业敏感信息”;“具有成本效益,结构最精简,效果最大”;

(c) **职能**。这些职能涉及机构或安排将交付的成果。以下提出的备选方案侧重于满足决议第 6 (d)、(e)和(g)段中提出的需要,即确保委员会“开展的工作与相关多边协定、其他国际文书和政府间机构(包括组织间健全管理化学品方案成员机构)的工作相辅相成,而不是重复他们的工作”;“酌情与其他科学与政策机构协调,如政府间气候变化专门委员会和生物多样性和生态系统服务政府间科学与政策平台”;“尽可能灵活地满足利益攸关方提出并经成员国政府同意的需求,并履行其主要职能”。

A. 决策机构

6. **科学与政策互动机制的决策机构通常反映互动机制的成员组成**。环境大会在其第 5/8 号决议第 3 段中决定,“委员会应是独立的政府间机构,其工作方案应得到成员国政府核准,以提供与政策相关的科学依据,但不具有政策规范性”。根据环境大会第 5/8 号决议第 6 (a)至(e)段,决策机构的特点还有助于确保:

- (a) 提供政策相关产出的能力,但不具政策规范性;
- (b) 具有跨学科性,确保具有广泛学科专长的专家作出贡献;包容性参与,包括土著人民;地域、区域和性别平衡;
- (c) 确保委员会的工作透明、公正,并能提出可信和科学上可靠的报告和评估;

¹ 这种三方面兼顾的方法符合 Sheila Jasanoff, “Judgment under siege: the three-body problem of expert legitimacy”, in *Democratization of Expertise? Exploring Novel Forms of Scientific Advice in Political Decision-making*, Sabine Maasen 和 Peter Weingart 合编(pp. 209–224), (Netherlands, Dordrecht: Springer, 2005)。

(d) 其工作与相关多边协定、其他国际文书和政府间机构（包括组织间健全管理化学品方案成员）的工作相辅相成，互不重复；

(e) 酌情与其他科学与政策机构协调，如政府间气候变化专门委员会和生物多样性和生态系统服务政府间科学与政策平台。

7. 本文件附件表 1 汇总了经审查的科学与政策互动机制决策机构的主要特点。决策机构的最大差异在于决策机构是由成员政府代表还是以个人身份任职的专家组成。

8. **对委员会决策机构组成的主要考虑。**委员会的决策机构将由作为委员会成员的联合国会员国代表组成。利益攸关方可作为观察员参加决策机构的会议。

9. **对委员会决策机构工作方式的主要考虑。**预算承付款与委员会可能开展的工作的速度和规模之间的潜在权衡可能决定工作方式。例如，对决策机构会议频率的限制可能会导致附属机构完成交付成果与决策机构通过或批准之间的延误。这一关切也可能适用于编制交付成果的任何临时措施。不过，通过将监督权下放给 B 节所述的机构，这一问题一般都得到了解决。在会议上提供同声传译是潜在权衡的另一个例子。会议口译费用可能很高，但提供口译服务可以大大提高委员会程序的透明度和合法性。观察员参与决策机构会议的模式也可在以下方面发挥关键作用：委员会提供与政策相关但不具有政策规范性的产出的能力，以及委员会的包容性参与，以及与现有政府间机构和科学与政策互动机制的协调。

10. **对委员会决策机构职能的主要考虑。**决策机构的共同职能包括监督秘书处和在委员会下设立的任何其他机构，并为该小组制定工作方案和预算。在考虑进一步的职能时，必须纳入提供必要职能，以交付与委员会职能相关的成果。此举旨在确保委员会“具有成本效益以及与实现最大效果相一致的最精简的结构”（环境大会第 5/8 号决议，第 6 (h) 段）。限成员名额特设工作组不妨考虑其中若干职能是否可由委员会一个或多个行政和科学监督机构更好地履行。

关于前进方向的提议

11. 不限成员名额特设工作组不妨建议指定全体会议为委员会决策机构，并具有以下主要特点：

(a) 组成：

(一) 向是委员会成员的联合国会员国开放；

(b) 工作方式：

(一) 至少每年召开一次会议，或根据全体会议批准的工作方案的要求随时召开会议；

(二) 为全体会议的会议提供联合国六种正式语文的口译服务；

(三) 委员会成员以协商一致方式就实质性事项做出决定，除非委员会规则另有规定；

(四) 开放供非委员会成员国、联合国机构和其他政府间组织和非政府组织参加的会议；

- (五) 任何非委员会成员的国家、任何联合国机构和任何其他机关、组织或机关（无论是国家还是国际、政府、政府间还是非政府性质）、土著人民和地方社区，只要在委员会所涉事项方面具有资格，并已通知委员会秘书处希望派代表参加全体会议届会，均可作为观察员参加委员会，但须遵守议事规则。作为观察员参加不能投票或加入或阻止达成共识；
 - (六) 区域经济一体化组织作为观察员参加。允许欧洲联盟更多地参加全体会议届会，包括轮流发言的权利、答辩权、提出建议的权利、提供意见的权利以及通过财政支助等途径支持执行委员会工作方案的能力。这些权利并不赋予投票或被选入委员会主席团的能力；
- (c) 职能：
- (一) 作为委员会的决策机构；
 - (二) 回应各国政府的请求，包括由相关多边环境协定根据各自理事机构的决定转达的请求；
 - (三) 欢迎联合国相关机构根据各自理事机构的决定提供意见和建议，并欢迎这些机构的参与；
 - (四) 鼓励并酌情考虑到其他政府间组织、国际和区域科学组织、环境信托基金、非政府组织、土著人民和地方社区以及私营部门等相关利益攸关方提出的意见和建议；
 - (五) 确保民间社会积极有效地参加全体会议；
 - (六) 根据有待全体会议决定的标准、提名程序和任职期限，选举全体会议主席团成员，同时适当考虑到地域平衡原则；
 - (七) 酌情设立附属机构，并根据有待全体会议决定的标准、提名程序和任职期限，在适当考虑到地域平衡原则的情况下甄选其成员；
 - (八) 批准预算并监督财务安排的分配；
 - (九) 决定定期独立审查委员会效率和成效的评价程序；
 - (十) 通过委员会工作方案，以履行委员会的各项职能；
 - (十一) 为委员会编制交付成果建立透明的同行审查程序；
 - (十二) 就界定报告范围以及通过或批准委员会所交付任何成果的程序作出决定（在商定工作方案之后）；
 - (十三) 通过和修订议事规则和财务细则。

B. 提供行政和科学监督的机构

12. 大多数科学与政策互动机制的行政和科学监督机构合并或分开。根据环境大会第 5/8 号决议第 6 (a)至(c)段，决策机构有助于确保：

- (a) 提供政策相关产出的能力，但不具有政策规范性；

(b) 跨学科性，确保具有广泛学科专长的专家作出贡献；包容性参与，包括土著人民；地域、区域和性别平衡；

(c) 制定程序，力求确保委员会的工作透明、公正，并能够提出可信和科学上可靠的报告和评估。

13. 本文件附件表 2 汇总了经审查的科学政策互动机制监督机构的主要特点。机构安排的最大差异在于行政监督和科学监督是由一个机构还是由不同机构进行。

14. **行政监督和科学监督分开有利有弊。**在一个监督机构中维持行政监督和科学监督可能有助于协调统一，特别是在有关科学问题的决定可能影响行政决定的情况下。将行政监督和科学监督分开，可以通过区分每个机构的组成和工作方式，使责任更有针对性，更易于管理，并具有更大的灵活性。行政监督机构的成员可以旁听科学监督机构的会议，从而解决对协调的关切。

15. **对委员会一个或多个行政和科学监督机构组成的主要考虑。**虽然相关专门知识对行政和科学监督机构的成员都至关重要，但单独的监督机构可以进一步区分对专门知识的需求和每个机构成员组成的方式。例如，行政监督机构可在其成员甄选过程和组成中优先考虑区域代表性，而对应的科学监督机构可优先考虑跨学科性和包容性。根据环境大会第 5/8 号决议关于委员会将是“一个独立的政府间机构”的规定，行政监督机构可为每个区域设立 2 或 3 个席位，而科学监督机构可选择为每个区域设立 5 个席位，并为特定的政府间组织或利益攸关方团体分配席位。² 例如，根据《联合国防治荒漠化公约》，25 名科学与政策互动机制的成员包括 5 个观察员席位，其中相关民间社会组织、相关国际组织和相关联合国组织至少各占一席。³ 《全球环境展望》表明，有机会对行政和科学监督机构成员的专业进行区分。例如，《全球环境展望》行政监督机构的成员应“具有与环境政策和可持续发展有关的政府间进程方面的经验”，而科学监督机构的成员应“具备科学、技术或政策方面的专门知识，并了解”《全球环境展望》进程的“主要工作内容”。⁴

16. **对委员会一个或多个行政和科学监督机构工作方式的主要考虑。**科学与政策互动机制的通常做法是，行政和科学监督机构一旦设立，就应制定自己的工作方式。在委员会机构安排中可纳入若干一般性考虑，包括在全体会议届会之外举行会议时在线工作的规定，以及详细说明谁可以参加会议的办法。关于谁可以参加国际化学品管理战略方针主席团会议的办法可以为科学监督机构提供一个指导模式。非政府参与方的 4 名代表以及组织间健全管理化学品方案主席参加主席团会议。非政府参与方的 4 名代表由非政府参与方选举产生，分别代表卫生、工业、工会和公共利益团体。⁵

² 区域数目可在设立委员会时确定，但最合适的做法可能是使委员会的区域数目与作为秘书处东道方的组织或为委员会提供秘书处服务的组织的区域数目相一致（见本文件第二.D 节）。

³ 见《联合国防治荒漠化公约》科学政策互动机制的职权范围，2017 年，C：组成（第 2 页），可查阅 https://www.unccd.int/sites/default/files/2022-02/SPI_Terms_of_Reference_110717_1.pdf。

⁴ 见环境署，“《全球环境展望》：政府间和专家领导的科学评估程序”，第 4.2 (d) 和 4.3 (d) 节（第 7 至 8 页），政府间和多方利益攸关方咨询小组以及多学科专家科学咨询小组各自成员的提名和甄选准则。

⁵ 见会议主席团和工作组，可查阅 <https://www.saicm.org/About/Bureau/tabid/5458/language/en-US/Default.aspx>。

17. **对委员会一个或多个行政和科学监督机构职能的主要考虑。**行政和科学监督机构需要履行的许多职能都反映了科学与政策互动机制的职能。此外，为编制科学与政策互动机制的交付成果制定了一些工作流程和程序，随着时间的推移以及流程的发展和完善，这些职能可能会增加。

关于前进方向的提议

18. 不限成员名额特设工作组不妨考虑：

(a) 设立一个提供行政监督的主席团，其主要特点如下：

(一) 组成：

- a 该机构每个区域的 2 名成员提供秘书处服务；
- b 主席团成员由各区域提名，并由全体会议选举产生，同时名词主席团成员的地域、区域和性别平衡；
- c 成员当选是因为他们具有专题方面的专门知识，并显示出以前在相关政府间进程中的经验；

(二) 工作方式：

- a 主席团视需要举行会议，包括在全体会议届会期间；
- b 主席团会议，特别是闭会期间会议，应在线召开；
- c 主席团会议以英语进行；
- d 主席团会议闭门举行，但为透明起见，主席团会议的报告可供查阅；

(三) 职能：

- a 处理与委员会工作方案和产品相关、需要委员会在全体会议届会之间关注的请求；
- b 监督传播和外联活动；
- c 根据全体会议的指示，审查全体会议各项决定的执行进展情况；
- d 监测秘书处业绩；
- e 组织并协助举行全体会议届会；
- f 审查委员会规则和程序的遵守情况；
- g 审查资源管理和财务细则遵守情况，并就此向全体会议提出报告；
- h 就委员会与其他相关机构之间的协调向全体会议提供咨询意见；
- i 确定捐助方并制定伙伴关系安排，以落实委员会的各项活动；

(b) 设立一个跨学科专家委员会，负责科学监督，其主要特点如下

(一) 组成：

- a 该机构每个区域的 5 名成员提供秘书处服务；
- b 非政府参与方的 4 名代表以及联合国环境管理小组主席可参加跨学科专家委员会会议。非政府参与方的 4 名代表由参与委员会工作的非政府参与方内部选举产生，分别代表卫生、工业、工会和公共利益团体；
- c 跨学科专家委员会成员由各区域提名并由全体会议选举产生，同时考虑到需要确保该委员会具有跨学科性，并确保具有广泛学科专门知识的专家作出贡献；包容性参与，包括土著人民；地域、地区和性别平衡；
- d 跨学科专家委员会成员当选是因为他们具有科学、技术或政策方面的专门知识，以及了解委员会工作的主要内容；
- e 成员任期三年；任期交错。

(二) 工作方式：

- a 必要时召开跨学科专家委员会会议，包括在全体会议届会之间；
- b 跨学科专家委员会会议，特别是闭会期间会议，应在线召开；
- c 跨学科专家委员会会议以英语进行；
- d 主席团成员、其他相关科学与政策互动机制（包括政府间气候变化专门委员会和生物多样性和生态系统服务政府间科学与政策平台）的代表以及相关多边环境协定的代表可作为观察员参加跨学科专家委员会的会议；

(三) 职能：

- a 就委员会工作方案的科学和技术问题向全体会议提供咨询意见；
- b 就技术和/或科学交流事宜提供咨询意见和协助；
- c 管理委员会的同行审查程序，确保委员会在这一程序各个阶段提供的所有产品都具有最高水平的科学质量、独立性和可信度；
- d 让科学界和其他知识拥有者参与工作方案，同时考虑到需要不同学科和知识类型、性别平衡以及发展中国家专家的有效贡献和参与；
- e 确保在委员会之下设立各机构之间进行科学和技术协调，并促进委员会与其他相关进程之间的协调，以便在现有努力的基础上再接再厉。

C. 开展或支持科学与政策互动机制工作的其他机构

19. **经审查的科学与政策互动机制在交付成果方面由一系列其他机构提供支助。**根据环境大会第 5/8 号决议第 6 (b)至(c)和(f)至(g)段的规定，这些机构帮助确保：

(a) 跨学科性，确保具有广泛学科专长的专家作出贡献；包容性参与，包括土著人民；地域、区域和性别平衡；

(b) 制定程序，确保委员会的工作透明、公正，并能够提出可信和科学上可靠的报告和评估；

(c) 有能力处理潜在利益冲突和保护商业敏感信息；

(d) 尽可能灵活地满足利益攸关方确定并经成员国政府同意的需求，并履行委员会的主要职能。

20. 本文件附件表 3 汇总了经审查的科学与政策互动机制其他所选机构的主要特点。这些机构一般分为两大类：一类是专门为履行互动机制的某项职能而设立，另一类则更广泛地支持互动机制的工作。

21. **对委员会其他机构组成的主要考虑。**承担或支持委员会工作的其他机构包括各专家工作组、工作队、委员会和撰稿团队。在设立另一个机构后，互动机制的决策机构通常会通过详细的职权范围，规定其组成、模式和职能。这些其他机构的组成反映其具体任务所要求的专业知识和其他需求，也往往反映互动机制运作原则中详述的与包容性和平衡有关的主要特点。这些其他机构的规模有很大差异。较大机构可以更容易践行平衡和包容概念；反之，召集和管理这些机构可能需要更多时间和成本。

22. **对委员会其他机构工作方式的主要考虑。**确定会议频率和方式的一个主要考虑因素是这些其他机构将要开展的工作性质，以及按照最佳做法开展工作所需的时间（例如，有足够的时间进行审查）。关于设立哪些附属机构及其工作方式的决定也涉及预算问题。尽管自 2020 年 3 月以来在扩大虚拟工作方式方面取得了巨大进展，但仍有许多人认为现场工作具有优势，特别是在汇集来自不同区域（和时区）的参与者时。涉及预算问题的另一个考虑与互动机制之间的一个主要区别有关，即为会议提供口译服务。只有政府间气候变化专门委员会为附属机构的会议（即其三个工作组为完成工作而举行的全体会议）提供口译服务。在化学品、废物和防止污染领域的科学与政策互动机制之间也存在类似差别。例如，《关于持久性有机污染物的斯德哥尔摩公约》的持久性有机污染物审查委员会的会议有同声传译，包括会前工作文件的翻译，而《关于在国际贸易中对某些危险化学品和农药采用事先知情同意程序的鹿特丹公约》的化学品审查委员会的会议仅以英语举行。⁶

⁶ 见载于第 RC-1/6 号决定的《鹿特丹公约》化学品审查委员会的职权范围，可查阅 <https://www.pic.int/Portals/5/download.aspx?d=UNEP-FAO-RC-COP.1-RC-1-6.En.pdf>，以及载于第 SC-1/7 号决定的《斯德哥尔摩公约》审查委员会的职权范围，可查阅 <https://chm.pops.int/Portals/0/download.aspx?d=UNEP-POPS-COP.1-SC-1-7.English.PDF>，分别经第 SC-4/20 号决定和第 SC-5/11 号决定修订，可查阅 <https://chm.pops.int/Portals/0/download.aspx?d=UNEP-POPS-COP.4-SC-4-20.English.PDF> 和 <https://chm.pops.int/Portals/0/download.aspx?d=UNEP-POPS-COP.5-SC-5-11.English.PDF>。请注意，根据 SC-4/20 号决定对《斯德哥尔摩公约》审查委员会的职权范围进行了修订，指出出于实际原因，只将会议的主要资源文件翻译成联合国六种正式语文，并至少在开会前六周分发。

23. **对委员会其他机构职能的主要考虑。**考虑到科学与政策委员会的五项计划履行的职能（进行前景扫描、开展评估、知识管理、信息共享和能力建设），⁷注意到表 3 中汇总的许多其他机构主要侧重于评估职能可能会有帮助。鉴于需要确保委员会“具有成本效益，结构最精简，效果最大”（第 6 (h) 段），明确界定和划分的职能可以成为确保委员会设立的任何其他机构执行任务的重要途径。

关于前进方向的提议

24. 不限成员名额特设工作组不妨提议：

(a) 全体会议和行政与科学监督机构可在委员会之下设立其他机构，以协助履行委员会各项职能或满足委员会的跨领域需求，并将这一规定纳入各自的职能和议事规则；

(b) 规定可设立的其他机构的具体类型，例如包括进行评估或前景扫描的专家组，以及就交叉问题开展工作的专责小组；

(c) 就委员会可能设立的任何预定类型的其他机构的组成、工作方式和职能提供指导；

(d) 为根据成果设立的任何其他机构拟定职权范围（包括组成、工作方式和职能），以审查供不限成员名额特设工作组审议的其他问题，例如包括与工作产品和程序有关的问题。

D. 秘书处安排

25. **第 5/8 号决议（第 5 (h) 段）规定，不限成员名额特设工作组负责拟定关于向委员会提供秘书处支助安排的提议。**秘书处支助至关重要，以帮助按照第 6 (c)、(e)、(g) 和 (h) 段的规定确保：

(a) 委员会的工作透明、公正，能够提出可信和科学上可靠的报告和评估；

(b) 委员会酌情同其他科学与政策机构进行协调，如政府间气候变化专门委员会和生物多样性和生态系统服务政府间科学与政策平台；

(c) 委员会具有灵活性，尽可能满足利益攸关方提出并经其成员国政府同意的需求，并履行其主要职能；

(d) 委员会具有成本效益，结构最精简，效果最大。

26. 本文件附件表 5 汇总了经审查的科学与政策互动机制秘书处各项安排的主要特点。该表突显了由国家或伙伴组织担任东道方的技术支助单位的使用情况，以此向委员会下设立的其他机构提供有针对性的行政和科学支持。

27. **对委员会秘书处各项安排的组成的主要考虑。**一些科学与政策互动机制将技术支助单位作为其秘书处安排的一部分，专门为科学与政策互动机制的一个机构提供行政和科学支持。它们通常由政府（或有关国家的科学机构）担任东道方。技术支助单位的工作人员由东道机构聘用，可以有效地为科学与政策

主要资料文件一词“指支持将某一化学品添加到《公约》附件 A、B 或 C 的提案的文件、风险简介、风险管理评价以及提交会议的任何报告或建议的英文摘要”。

⁷ 见 UNEP/SPP-CWP/OEWG.1/7，附件二。

互动机制的工作提供实物支持。如果秘书处和技术支助单位都为委员会提供秘书处安排，则应注意明确工作职责，并制定战略，确保其工作的协调，因为两者都有能力提供技术援助和实质性支助等。

28. 对委员会秘书处各项安排的工作方式的主要考虑。在设立秘书处时，一个核心考虑因素是确定秘书处是否应设在一个或多个现有政府间组织内或由其东道方。现有的科学与政策互动机制指向各种战略，以确保秘书处能够受益于政府间组织的现有基础设施，如现行财务细则。这些战略可包括担任或共同担任东道方，即明确指定一个或多个政府间组织作为“母”机构（政府间气候变化专门委员会采用这种模式），或安排政府间组织向独立的秘书处提供秘书处服务（生物多样性和生态系统服务政府间科学与政策平台采用这种模式）。选择其中一项战略并不妨碍科学与政策互动机制与其他政府间组织建立特殊关系或伙伴关系（见 [UNEP/SPP-CWP/OEWG.2/5](#)）。不限成员名额特设工作组在联合国环境大会的主持下召开会议，环境大会在其第 5/8 号决议第 9 段中邀请世界卫生组织（世卫组织）在该工作组中“酌情发挥作用”。在审议秘书处安排时，可以利用与环境署和世卫组织的密切伙伴关系所带来的益处，例如利用每个组织的深厚专门知识，以及接触在环境和健康问题领域广泛参与的利益攸关方。

29. 对委员会秘书处各项安排的职能的主要考虑。除了具体说明科学与政策互动机制日常运作所产生的秘书处职能（筹备和支持会议、编制预算和监督财务安排），秘书处职能还可包括科学与政策互动机制的职能和设立其他机构所产生的职能。在向秘书处分配职能时，必须考虑是行政还是实务任务。如果工作需要专家作出判断，在科学与政策互动机制下设立专家机构可能是确保委员会合法性和可信度的一种途径。反之，在考虑在科学与政策互动机制下设立一个机构时，仔细考虑其设想的职能可能有助于确定这些职能是否更适合或更有效地由技术支助单位或秘书处承担。

关于前进方向的提议

30. 不限成员名额特设工作组不妨提议：

(a) 为委员会设立一个秘书处，其职能如下：

- (一) 组织会议并为会议提供行政和技术支助，包括视需要编写提交全体会议及其附属机构的文件和报告；
- (二) 协助全体会议成员以及行政和科学监督机构履行全体会议决定的各自职能，包括促进委员会各利益攸关方之间的沟通；
- (三) 促进委员会可能设立的任何其他机构之间的沟通；
- (四) 传播公共信息，协助开展外联活动和制作相关宣传材料；
- (五) 编制委员会提交全体会议的预算草案，管理财务安排，并编制任何必要的财务报告；
- (六) 协助调动财政资源；
- (七) 协助促进对委员会工作的监测和评价；

(b) 为技术支助单位编列经费，以便向在委员会下设立的机构提供科学、技术和组织协助，其职能如下：

- (一) 向他们代表委员会协助的机构的共同主席和主席团提供支助；
- (二) 推动执行相关政策，如利益冲突政策（如果有）；
- (三) 通过其技术支助单位负责人，作为咨询成员参加委员会的行政监督机构；

(c) 从环境署和世卫组织或从另一政府间组织获得秘书处服务，或与环境署和世卫组织作出东道或共同东道安排；

(d) 不限成员名额特设工作组秘书处向各国征求关于秘书处东道国的提议，供不限成员名额特设工作组第三届会议审议。

E. 财务安排

31. **第 5/8 号决议（第 5 (i) 段）规定，不限成员名额特设工作组负责拟定关于为委员会工作自愿供资的提议。**根据第 5/8 号决议第 6 (a)、(c)、(g) 和 (h) 段，财务安排至关重要，以帮助确保：

- (a) 委员会有能力提供与政策相关的产出，而不具有政策规范性；
- (b) 委员会制定程序，力求确保委员会的工作透明、公正；
- (c) 委员会具有灵活性，可尽可能满足利益攸关方确定并经其成员国政府同意的需求，并履行其主要职能；
- (d) 委员会具有成本效益，结构最精简，效果最大。

32. 本文件附件表 6 汇总了经审查的科学政策互动机制财务安排的主要特点。该总表突显自愿捐助（包括资金和实物）的重要性，以及捐助和预算流程透明的必要性。

33. 财务安排通常包括用于收集资源的信托基金和用于分配和支付资金的预算流程（通常与工作方案挂钩）。预算通常由互动机制的决策机构在设定的时间间隔内通过。

34. 科学与政策互动机制的财务安排必须透明，监督通常由决策机构和行政监督机构共同进行，而行政管理则属于秘书处的职能范围。尽管实际上大多数资源来自成员国政府，但通常欢迎各种资源为科学与政策互动机制提供捐助。科学与政策互动机制还依赖一系列实物捐助。除了参与委员会工作的专家所做的重要贡献外，这些实物捐助还包括秘书处人员配备、提供技术支助服务、提供会议服务和通信服务。实物捐助和货币捐助来源透明可以防止潜在的利益冲突。

35. 科学与政策互动机制的财务安排至关重要，以确保委员会具有灵活性，尽可能满足利益攸关方确定并经其成员国政府同意的需求，并履行其主要职能。

关于前进方向的提议

36. 不限成员名额特设工作组不妨提议：

- (a) 议建立一个信托基金，由全体会议以公开和透明的方式进行分配，以收集自愿资金，支持委员会的工作，并遵循全体会议通过的财务细则和程序；
- (b) 欢迎各国政府以及联合国机构、全球环境基金、其他政府间组织以及私营部门和基金会等利益攸关方提供捐助，但有一项谅解，即此类资金不附带任何条件，不指导委员会的工作，也不能指定用于具体活动；
- (c) 作为例外，允许为全体会议核准的具体活动提供额外捐款，例如：
 - (一) 每个捐款方每项活动的单笔捐款超过 300 000 美元，须经全体会议核准；
 - (二) 每个捐款方每项活动的单笔捐款不超过 300 000 美元，须经主席团核准；
- (d) 为全体会议编列经费，用于定期审查委员会支出和拟议预算，并通过委员会的预算；
- (e) 为行政监督机构编列经费，用于定期审查秘书处编制的预算信息；
- (f) 为秘书处编列经费，以编制提交全体会议的委员会预算草案，管理财务安排，并编写任何必要的财务报告。

三、 全体会议届会议事规则

37. 预计关于本文件第二节所讨论项目的决议将在很大程度上议事规则文件的细节。在审查其他科学与政策互动机制议事规则的基础上拟定的委员会全体会议届会议事规则拟议目录如下：

- (a) 范围
- (b) 定义
- (c) 会议地点、日期和通知
- (d) 成员和观察员
- (e) 接纳观察员
- (f) 议程
- (g) 代表性、全权证书和核证
- (h) 主席团和/或同等结构/机构的成员和运作
- (i) 选举主席团和/或同等结构/机构的成员
- (j) 提名
- (k) 附属机构（成员、运作、成员选举等）
- (l) 议事方式
- (m) 决策
- (n) 语文
- (o) 修改议事规则

关于前进方向的提议

38. 不限成员名额特设工作组不妨考虑：

(a) 议事规则纲要是否可作为拟定全体会议届会议事规则的适当起点，供不限成员名额特设工作组第三届会议审议，并反映第二届会议期间达成的一致意见；

(b) 全体会议届会议事规则的可能纲要。

Annex*

The summary tables in this annex provide an overview of the relevant key features of institutional arrangements for the following science-policy interfaces:

- Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC);
- Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES);
- International Resource Panel (IRP);
- Global Environment Outlook (GEO); and,
- Assessment Panels of the Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer, including the Scientific Assessment Panel (SAP), the Environmental Effects Assessment Panel (EEAP), and the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel (TEAP) and its Technical Options Committees (TOCs) and Temporary Subsidiary Bodies (TSBs, e.g., task forces).

Additional information on these institutional arrangements is available in UNEP/SPP-CWP/OEWG.2/INF/4.

* The annex has not been formally edited.

Table 1

Summary Table: Relevant key features of science-policy interfaces' decision-making body

<i>Relevant key features of decision-making body</i>	<i>Science-policy interface</i>					<i>Comments</i>
	<i>IPCC¹</i>	<i>IPBES²</i>	<i>IRP³</i>	<i>GEO⁴</i>	<i>Montreal Protocol⁵ Assessment Panels</i>	
Name	IPCC Plenary	Plenary	IRP Steering Committee	Ad Hoc Open-Ended Meetings of Member States, stakeholders and experts (AHOM)	SAP, EEAP, TEAP (panels themselves are the decision-making bodies)	Using a term like “plenary” to differentiate between the decision-making body and the science-policy interface can provide clarity in documents and reports.
Composition	195 member governments (open to all WMO and UN Member countries)	143 State Members. (open to UN Member countries who express intent to be members)	Representatives from 28 Member States of the UN, and one each from the EC and UNEP. Membership in Steering Committee tied to annual contribution.	Open to Member States of UNEA and members of specialized agencies.	SAP: hundreds of experts; EEAP: about 30 experts; TEAP: 19 experts, with its five Technical Options Committees (TOCs) consisting of 20-40 experts, each (approximately 150 TOC experts)	The IPBES plenary composition is most in line with UNEA resolution 5/8's paragraph 3: “the panel should be an independent intergovernmental body with a programme of work approved by its member Governments”.
Modalities of work						
<i>Frequency of meetings</i>	Panel meets in Plenary Session at least once a year, and	Plenary meets approximately once a year.	IRP (includes Panel and Steering Committee) meets twice a year	As needed within the GEO process.	SAP meets at least once every 4 years;	Frequency of meetings is tied to the functions assigned to the decision-making body as well as

¹ Relevant sources: IPCC. 2011. [Governance and Management: IPCC Executive Committee](#); IPCC. 2022. [Appendix C to the Principles Governing IPCC Work](#); Appendix C (Procedures For The Election Of The IPCC Bureau And Any Task Force Bureau) is available in UN languages at: <https://www.ipcc.ch/documentation/procedures/>.

² Relevant sources: Resolution establishing IPBES, including its appendix I: [Functions, operating principles and institutional arrangements of the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services](#). 2012; [Rules of procedure](#): adopted in decision IPBES-1/1 and amended in decision IPBES-2/1; Paragraph 22 of [report of IPBES 1\(IPBES/1/12\)](#) for interim observer admission procedure; [decision IPBES-5/4](#) on Enhanced participation of the European Union in sessions of the Plenary of the Platform.

³ Relevant sources: IRP. 2016. [IRP Policies and Procedures](#).

⁴ Relevant sources: [Global Environment Outlook \(GEO\): Intergovernmental and Expert-led Scientific Assessment Procedures](#); [UNEA Rules of Procedure](#).

⁵ Relevant sources: [Ozone Secretariat Science Pages](#); [Terms of reference of the TEAP and its technical options committees and temporary subsidiary bodies](#) (Annex to decision XXIV/8); MOP decisions, eg: XXXI/2 “Potential areas of focus for the 2022 quadrennial reports of the Scientific Assessment Panel, the Environmental Effects Assessment Panel and the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel”. The Terms of reference (TORs) of the Assessment panels, as well as the appointment of their co-chairs and TEAP membership, are set out in Montreal Protocol decisions adopted by the Meeting of the parties (MOP). Peer review processes are set up by the SAP and EEAP.

Relevant key features of decision-making body	Science-policy interface					Comments
	IPCC ¹	IPBES ²	IRP ³	GEO ⁴	Montreal Protocol ⁵ Assessment Panels	
	more frequently as required by the work programme ⁶				EEAP and TEAP, as well as each of its TOCs, meet at least once a year. All Panels meet in between, as needed, within their workflows.	to the time-frame of required decisions (especially the timeframe for setting and approving budgets and work programmes).
Availability of interpretation/ Languages	Interpretation in all UN languages for all sessions of Plenary	Interpretation in all UN languages for all sessions of Plenary.	English only	English only	English only	Interpretation has budgetary implications, but also yields gains in transparency and credibility, relevance, and legitimacy
Observers	Bodies/organisations part of UN System are considered participating organizations of the IPCC; Organisations with observer status with WMO, UNEP or UNFCCC can be observers with IPCC if they request so, subject to acceptance by the Panel. Organisations can request admission as an observer.	Participation is open to regional economic integration organizations as observers. ⁷ Any Observer may, upon the invitation of the Chair, participate in the Plenary without the ability to cast votes or join or block consensus.	The Secretariat may invite an individual or body, whether national or international, governmental or nongovernmental, qualified in the topics covered by the IRP, to participate in IRP biannual meetings as observers.	Any accredited observer of UNEA who is qualified in matters covered by the authorising body, and which has informed the Secretariat of its wish to be represented at the meetings, may participate as an observer. Experts deemed relevant to the GEO process may also attend.	No observers are permitted at the meetings of TEAP, TOC and TSBs. However, anyone can present information to TEAP/TOCs/TSBs with prior notice and can be heard personally if the TEAP/TOCs/TSBs consider it necessary.	May be appropriate to differentiate among three broad groups of observers: bodies/organisations that are part of UN system; regional economic integration organizations; and other stakeholders that do not fall under the two categories above. Details of the latter may best be elaborated under Relationship with relevant key stakeholders (UNEP/SPP-CWP/OEWG.2/5)
Decision-making	“use all best endeavours to reach consensus”; for approval, adoption and acceptance of	The members of the Platform take decisions on matters of substance by consensus, unless	N/A	Meetings governed by UNEA Rules of Procedure	Reports are developed through a consensus process. The reports must reflect any minority views appropriately.	Elections can be one area of decision-making that employs

⁶ For example, IPCC is expecting to convene three sessions of the plenary in 2023 due to the transition from the sixth assessment cycle to the seventh assessment cycle (one session to adopt the summary for policymakers of the synthesis report, one session to elect the Chair and Bureau members for the seventh cycle, and one session to launch the AR7 work).

⁷ Per [decision IPBES-5/4](#), the European Union is allowed enhanced participation in sessions of the Plenary, including “the right to speak in turn; the right to reply; the right to introduce proposals; the right to provide views; and the ability to support the implementation of the work programme of the Platform through financial support, among other means”, these rights “are exclusive and do not grant the ability to vote or to be elected to the Bureau of the Platform.

Relevant key features of decision-making body	Science-policy interface					Comments
	IPCC ¹	IPBES ²	IRP ³	GEO ⁴	Montreal Protocol ⁵ Assessment Panels	
	reports, differing views shall be explained and, upon request, recorded.	otherwise provided in its rules.				voting, most notably for elections of members of the IPCC Bureau. ⁸
Functions (selected)	Takes major decisions of the IPCC (including on budget); Conclusions drawn by IPCC Working Groups and any Task Forces are not official IPCC views until they have been accepted by the Panel in a plenary meeting.	Takes major decisions of IPBES (including on budget); adopts programme of work; establishes subsidiary bodies; sets up transparent peer review process; adopts and amends rules of procedures and financial rules.	Provides input and recommendations for the strategic planning exercise; reviews and approves the Work Programme; Endorses the IRP budget and provides recommendations for the mobilization of resources; reviews and approves IRP Policies and Procedures and their amendments.	Elects GEO Co-Chairs, Vice-Chairs and Rapporteur; Reviews and adopts procedures for conducting the GEO process; reviews and adopts the scoping document of GEO assessments; and reviews and approves the summary for policy makers of GEO assessments.	SAP assesses the status of the depletion of the ozone layer and relevant atmospheric science issues. EEAP assesses the various effects of ozone layer depletion. TEAP provides technical information related to alternative controlled substances and technologies. Panel reports are presented to parties for their consideration and informed decision-making.	Given budgetary implications of convening meetings of the decision-making body, it may be appropriate to consider whether some functions can be carried out by the panel's administrative and scientific oversight body/bodies or by the Secretariat. In considering whether a function is suitable to such delegation, important to consider impacts on the panel's legitimacy.

⁸ [Appendix C to the Principles Governing IPCC Work](#); Appendix C (Procedures For The Election Of The IPCC Bureau And Any Task Force Bureau) is available in UN languages at: <https://www.ipcc.ch/documentation/procedures/>.

Table 2

Summary Table: Relevant key features of science-policy interfaces' administrative and scientific oversight body/bodies

Relevant key features of administrative and scientific oversight body/bodies	Science-policy interface					Comments
	IPCC ⁹	IPBES ¹⁰	IRP ¹¹	GEO ¹²	Montreal Protocol Assessment Panels ¹³	
Combined or separate	Combined	Separate	Separate	Separate	Combined	Separate approach employed by IPBES also taken up by IRP and GEO, points to acceptance of this approach.
Name of oversight body/bodies	Bureau (and Executive Committee)	<i>Bureau</i> : oversees administrative functions <i>Multidisciplinary Expert Panel (MEP)</i> : carries out scientific and technical functions	<i>Panel</i> is the scientific body of IRP, administrative oversight is provided by the <i>Steering Committee</i> which is	<i>Intergovernmental and Multi-stakeholder Advisory Group (IMAG)</i> and <i>Multidisciplinary Expert Scientific</i>	Each assessment panel has a team of co-chairs overseeing and coordinating the panel's administrative and scientific work. The Secretariat also facilitates this work.	Identifying administrative oversight body as "Bureau" is in line with approach used in other settings. Name of scientific oversight

⁹ Relevant sources: IPCC. 2011. [Governance and Management: IPCC Executive Committee](#); IPCC. 2022. [Appendix C to the Principles Governing IPCC Work](#); Appendix C (Procedures For The Election Of The IPCC Bureau And Any Task Force Bureau) is available in UN languages at: <https://www.ipcc.ch/documentation/procedures/>.

¹⁰ Relevant sources: Resolution establishing IPBES, including its appendix I: Functions, operating principles and institutional arrangements of the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services. 2012; Rules of procedure: adopted in decision IPBES-1/1 and amended in decision IPBES-2/1 Paragraph 22 of report of IPBES 1(IPBES/1/12) for interim observer admission procedure.

¹¹ Relevant sources: IRP. 2016. [IRP Policies and Procedures](#).

¹² Relevant sources: [Global Environment Outlook \(GEO\): Intergovernmental and Expert-led Scientific Assessment Procedures](#); [UNEA Rules of Procedure](#).

¹³ Relevant sources: [Ozone Secretariat Science Pages](#); [Terms of reference of the TEAP and its technical options committees and temporary subsidiary bodies](#) (Annex to decision XXIV/8); Decision XXXI/8, paras. 3 and 5.

When nominating experts to the Panel, its technical options committees or its temporary subsidiary bodies, parties are requested to use the Panel's nomination form and associated guidelines so as to facilitate the submission of appropriate nominations, taking into account the matrix of needed expertise, and geographical and gender balance, in addition to the expertise needed to address new issues related to the Kigali Amendment, such as energy efficiency, safety standards and climate benefits.

Nominating parties are also urged to follow the terms of reference of the Panel, consult the Panel's co-chairs and refer to the matrix of needed expertise prior to making nominations for appointments to the Panel. When nominating experts to the Panel, its technical options committees or its temporary subsidiary bodies, parties are requested to use the Panel's nomination form and associated guidelines so as to facilitate the submission of appropriate nominations, taking into account the matrix of needed expertise, and geographical and gender balance, in addition to the expertise needed to address new issues related to the Kigali Amendment, such as energy efficiency, safety standards and climate benefits. Nominating parties are also urged to follow the terms of reference of the Panel, consult the Panel's co-chairs and refer to the matrix of needed expertise prior to making nominations for appointments to the Panel.

Relevant key features of administrative and scientific oversight body/bodies	Science-policy interface					Comments
	IPCC ⁹	IPBES ¹⁰	IRP ¹¹	GEO ¹²	Montreal Protocol Assessment Panels ¹³	
			also the IRP's decision-making body	Advisory Group (MESAG)		body for panel might emphasize its interdisciplinary expert nature.
Composition	Bureau for Seventh Assessment Cycle: 34 members. Executive Committee: 12 members and 5 advisory members	Bureau: 10 members MEP: 25 members	Panel: group of 35 to 40 eminent scientists and experts on sustainable resource management and sustainable development. Steering Committee: see Table 1	IMAG: 35 members MESAG: 30 members	Typically, 2-4 Co-Chairs per Panel (currently a total of 10 co-chairs across all three panels)	IPCC Executive Committee points to limitations of 35-40 member body and to advantages of smaller committees, especially in an intergovernmental context.
Membership	Bureau: IPCC Chair, three IPCC Vice Chairs, Co-Chairs of the three Working Groups and the Task Force on National Greenhouse Gas Inventories (TFI) and the members of the Bureau of each Working Group. Executive Committee: Members: IPCC Chair, IPCC Co-Chairs of Working Groups I, II and III and of the TFI, and IPCC Vice Chairs Advisory Members: Head of Secretariat, the four Heads of the Technical Support Units	Bureau: 10 members (two per UN region, taking into account the principle of geographical representation) elected from among members of the Platform. The Chair and four Vice-Chairs, one of whom acts as Rapporteur, selected with due consideration to scientific and technical expertise and selected from each of the five UN regions. MEP: Taking into account disciplinary and gender balance, each region will nominate five candidates for membership of the MEP.	Panel members serve in their individual capacity and not as representatives of organizations or governments.	IMAG: 25 Member State experts (5 per UN region) and 10 representatives from Major Groups and Stakeholders. MESAG: 30 members, including two Co-Chairs, two Vice Chairs and a Rapporteur and other nominated experts to ensure disciplinary and gender balance as well as balanced geographical representation across the five UN regions. Selected by the Executive Director, with the advice of IMAG.	Panel members serve in their individual capacity and not as representatives of organizations or governments. SAP: hundreds of experts; EEAP: about 30 experts; TEAP: about 18-22 members, including 2 or 3 TEAP co-chairs, 2-3 TOC co-chairs and 2-4 Senior Experts. Members selected taking into account gender and geographical balance. The overall goal is to achieve a representation of about 50 per cent for Article 5(1) (developing) parties in the TEAP and TOCs and appropriate representation of expertise.	Scientific oversight bodies emphasize members serving in their individual capacity. Geographical balance often first consideration in planning membership, gender and disciplinary balance may be secondary in practice. Different interpretations of geographic balance across science-policy interfaces.

Relevant key features of administrative and scientific oversight body/bodies	Science-policy interface					Comments
	IPCC ⁹	IPBES ¹⁰	IRP ¹¹	GEO ¹²	Montreal Protocol Assessment Panels ¹³	
<i>Nomination process, terms</i>	Members of the Bureau should have appropriate scientific and technical qualifications and experience relevant to the work of the Bureau, as defined by the Panel	<i>Bureau:</i> All nominees for election, as the Chair and Vice-Chairs, need to have relevant expertise from agreed guidelines. The term of office of a Bureau member is 3 years with the opportunity for re-election for one consecutive term. <i>MEP:</i> MEP members are elected for their personal expertise and are not intended to represent any particular region. The term of office of all MEP members is 3 years with a possibility of re-election for one consecutive term.	Panel members serve a four-year term, renewable for up to two additional consecutive terms. The renewal of Panel member terms is staggered such that no more than one-third of the total membership is replaced each year.	<i>IMAG:</i> Nominated by Member States, members of specialised agencies, and UNEP-accredited Major Groups and Stakeholders. <i>MESAG:</i> Members act in their individual capacity and serve for the length of a GEO assessment cycle.	SAP, EEAP and TEAP co-chairs, as well as TEAP members (including TOC co-chairs and Senior Experts), are nominated by parties and endorsed by MOP decisions. TEAP members are appointed for up to 4 years, renewable. Nominations ¹⁴ of members to a TOC (other than TOC co-chairs) are made by individual parties or TEAP and TOC co-chairs suggest to individual parties experts to consider nominating. Nominations to a TSB can be made by the TEAP Co-chairs.	Nomination process important for achieving balance and inclusiveness goals. Consideration of term renewals, limits on renewals, and staggering of elections can be important for balancing the need for continuity and retaining institutional history with the need for membership rotation.
Modalities of work						
<i>Frequency of meetings</i>	Bureau meets at least once a year; Executive Committee meets on a regular basis.	<i>Bureau and MEP:</i> meet as necessary, usually twice per intersessional period. Efforts made to hold meetings of the Bureau and MEP concurrently or in association, where appropriate, to allow for a maximum complementarity and coordination of work, and cost savings.	As necessary, biannual meetings of IRP (including Panel and Steering Committee)	As necessary	SAP meets once every 4 years and in between as necessary; EEAP, and TEAP and its TOCs meet at least once a year and in between, as necessary.	Frequency of meetings may reflect the functions of the oversight body/bodies. Online meetings may aid in meeting budgetary constraints.
<i>Use of interpretation</i>	Bureau meetings have interpretation into all official UN languages	No interpretation at Bureau or MEP meetings	No interpretation at IRP meetings	No interpretation at MESAG or IMAG meetings	SAP, EEAP and TEAP operate in English only.	Prevailing norm, other than for IPCC, is for oversight bodies to

¹⁴ All nominations to TOCs and TSBs shall be made in full consultation with the national focal point of the relevant party. In appointing or re-appointing members of TEAP, the parties should ensure continuity, balance as well as a reasonable turnover.

Relevant key features of administrative and scientific oversight body/bodies	Science-policy interface					Comments
	IPCC ⁹	IPBES ¹⁰	IRP ¹¹	GEO ¹²	Montreal Protocol Assessment Panels ¹³	
						operate in English only.
Decision-making	“all best endeavours to reach consensus” ¹⁵	Take decisions on matters of substance by consensus	N/A	N/A	SAP, EEAP and TEAP reports developed through a consensus process; TEAP/TOC reports must reflect any minority views appropriately.	Prevailing norm of decision-making by consensus.
Functions (selected)	<i>Bureau</i> : advises the Panel and the Chair of the IPCC on a range of issues including the Programme of Work and application of Procedures and Guidelines governing IPCC work. The Bureau also functions in the role of an Editorial Board in finalizing Technical Papers. The <i>Executive Committee</i> : addresses urgent issues that require prompt attention by the IPCC between Panel sessions; and oversees the response to possible errors in IPCC products.	<i>Bureau</i> : addresses work programme requests; monitors the secretariat’s performance; reviews observance of rules and procedures, including financial rules; identifies donors and develops partnership arrangements. <i>MEP</i> : provides advice to Plenary on scientific and technical aspects of programme of work and on technical and/or scientific communication matters; manages the Platform’s peer-review process; engages the scientific community and other knowledge holder.	<i>Panel</i> carries out scientific scoping work for the strategic planning exercise and contributes to the development of the Work Programme; prepares, reviews and approves the terms of reference of scientific studies and assessments; recommends candidates for Panel members, Panel Co-Chairs, Working Group members, Review Editors and Expert Reviewers; participates in the Group of Scientific Reviewers for the appointment of new Panel members and renewal of existing ones.	<i>IMAG</i> : provides policy guidance <i>MESAG</i> : Oversees the scientific integrity of the entire GEO process, provides scientific oversight and advice on the selection of authors, fellows and review editors and represents the GEO process at key science events.	At the request of the parties: <i>SAP</i> provides information on the status of the depletion of the ozone layer and relevant atmospheric science issues; <i>EEAP</i> assesses the various effects of ozone layer depletion. <i>TEAP</i> provides technical information related to alternative controlled substances and technologies that have been investigated and employed to make it possible to virtually eliminate use of Ozone Depleting Substances and HFCs, that harm both the ozone layer and the climate.	Common administrative oversight functions include: oversight of Secretariat; oversight/review of financial rules and budget reports; and issues related to work programme requests. Common scientific oversight functions include: oversight of peer review process for preparation of deliverables; participation in identifying experts to serve in other bodies of the science-policy interface; and outreach to expert and scientific community. Functions of the oversight body/bodies may also include specific tasks agreed under work processes

¹⁵ More details in Rule 10 of Principles Governing IPCC Work.

Relevant key features of administrative and scientific oversight body/bodies	Science-policy interface					Comments
	IPCC ⁹	IPBES ¹⁰	IRP ¹¹	GEO ¹²	Montreal Protocol Assessment Panels ¹³	
						and procedures for the panel.

Table 3

Summary Table: Relevant key features of select other bodies undertaking or supporting the science-policy interface's work

Relevant key features of select other bodies undertaking or supporting the interface's work	Science-policy interface					Comments
	IPCC ¹⁶	IPBES ¹⁷	IRP ¹⁸	GEO ¹⁹	Montreal Protocol Assessment Panels ²⁰	
Examples of select bodies	Working groups, task forces, committees	Expert groups and task forces, committees	IRP Working Groups	Author teams and task forces	TEAP TOCs and temporary subsidiary bodies (TSBs) such as task forces	Some institutional arrangements specify the establishment of other bodies (in addition to decision-making and oversight bodies), others include the establishment of additional bodies under functions of decision-making and/or oversight bodies.
Composition	<i>Working Groups (WGs) and Task Forces (TFs):</i> Made up of experts nominated by governments and observer organizations.	<i>Expert Groups:</i> (such as: <i>Expert groups to deliver a scoping report</i>): scientists from all relevant disciplines, indigenous and local	Each <i>Working Group</i> consists of Panel members and external experts with expertise in a field relevant to the scientific study and	<i>Author Teams</i> consist of two co-chairs, two vice-chairs, a rapporteur, coordinating lead authors, lead authors,	Each <i>TOC</i> (sector specific) consists of about 20 to 40 members (about 150 members in total). The <i>TOC</i> members are appointed by the <i>TOC</i>	Composition of a body often a reflection of both the body's functions and the science-policy interface's principles.

¹⁶ Relevant sources: IPCC Conflict of Interest Policy (available in all UN languages at: <https://www.ipcc.ch/documentation/procedures/>); IPCC. 2022. [Appendix C to the Principles Governing IPCC Work](#); Appendix C (Procedures For The Election Of The IPCC Bureau And Any Task Force Bureau) is available in UN languages at: <https://www.ipcc.ch/documentation/procedures/>; [Method of working of the COI Committee](#).

¹⁷ Relevant sources: [Decision IPBES-7/1: Rolling work programme of the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services up to 2030](#); [Decision IPBES-3/3: Procedures for the preparation of Platform deliverables](#); [Conflict of interest policy and implementation procedures](#) (Decision IPBES3/3).

¹⁸ Relevant sources: IRP. 2016. [IRP Policies and Procedures](#).

¹⁹ Relevant sources: [Global Environment Outlook \(GEO\): Intergovernmental and Expert-led Scientific Assessment Procedures](#); [UNEA Rules of Procedure](#).

²⁰ Relevant sources: [Ozone Secretariat Science Pages](#); [Terms of reference of the TEAP and its technical options committees and temporary subsidiary bodies](#) (Annex to decision XXIV/8).

Relevant key features of select other bodies undertaking or supporting the interface's work	Science-policy interface					Comments
	IPCC ¹⁶	IPBES ¹⁷	IRP ¹⁸	GEO ¹⁹	Montreal Protocol Assessment Panels ²⁰	
	Bureau of relevant WG or TF selects experts “taking into account the range of scientific, technical and socio-economic views and backgrounds, as well as geographical and gender balance” <i>Conflict of Interest (COI) Committee</i> : comprising all elected members of the Executive Committee and two additional members with appropriate legal expertise appointed by UNEP and WMO; All members of the COI Committee participate in its work in their personal capacity and cannot be represented by other persons.	knowledge experts, policy practitioners, and experts from all relevant stakeholder groups. ²¹ <i>Committee on Conflicts of Interest (COI)</i> : three elected members from the Bureau, including one of the Bureau vice-chairs as chair, and five members, one per UN region, selected by the Bureau. One additional member with appropriate legal expertise from, and appointed by, UNEP	assessment it will develop. Each <i>Working Group</i> includes Lead Author(s) and Contributing Author(s). Due acknowledgement of all members will be included in the final publication of the scientific study and assessment. <i>Working Group</i> members serve in their individual capacity and not as representatives of organizations or governments.	contributing authors and fellows. Their selection is decided on by the Executive Director with the advice of the IMAG. Task Forces can guide the development and implementation of methodologies and the undertaking of functions other than assessments, such as capacity building. Their establishment will be decided on by the Executive Director with the advice of the IMAG and MESAG.	co-chairs, in consultation with TEAP, for a period of no more than four years. TOC members may be re-appointed following the procedure for nominations for additional periods of up to four years each. All nominations to TOCs and TSBs shall be made in full consultation with the national focal point of the relevant party.	
Modalities of work						
<i>Mode and frequency of meetings</i>	WGs and TFs: set by schedule of preparation of deliverables under each assessment cycle	<i>Expert groups and task forces</i> : as needed <i>Committee on COI</i> : meets by teleconference as necessary. If a	<i>Working Group</i> meetings will be organized in cooperation and	According to timeline set for GEO-7, with projected launch of GEO-7 at UNEA in February 2026. ²²	<i>TOCs and TSBs</i> : TOCs meet at least once a year. Additionally, TOCs and TSBs meet as required by work set out by the MOP	Many of these other bodies rely on online meetings to carry out their work, yet the scientific and technical

²¹ Under the rolling work programme adopted in Decision IPBES 7/1 in 2019, each of the task forces sets out a similar composition: up to 14 members covering the five UN regions, including: (a) up to 4 members of the Bureau and MEP; (b) representatives of qualified national, regional and international scientific organizations, centres of excellence and institutions, including experts on indigenous and local knowledge, which are known for their work and expertise on issues related to the mandate of the task force and are existing or prospective partners or collaborative supporters in the capacity-building activities of IPBES; and (c) recognized individual experts, including indigenous and local knowledge experts, on matters related to the mandate of the task force. These provisions point to an evolution from Decision IPBES 2/5 in 2013 which sets out the composition of the task force on capacity building as comprising “two Bureau members and three members of the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel, between them covering the five United Nations regions, and up to 20 additional experts on capacity-building”.

²² See expected meeting frequency set out in [GEO-7 Timeline](#).

Relevant key features of select other bodies undertaking or supporting the interface's work	Science-policy interface					Comments
	IPCC ¹⁶	IPBES ¹⁷	IRP ¹⁸	GEO ¹⁹	Montreal Protocol Assessment Panels ²⁰	
	COI Committee: meets at least once a year in advance of the IPCC Session, and in person or otherwise as often as required.	physical meeting is needed, it will be held before or after regular Bureau meetings.	consultation with the Secretariat.		and based on schedule of both MOP and Open Ended Working Group (OEWG) meetings	nature of their mandates may warrant in-person meetings at some stages of their work, including for example workshops. These other bodies typically work in English only.
Procedures	WGs: in line with procedures for clearing products/outputs ²³ COI Committee: members of the Committee are expected to reach consensus. If, exceptionally on matters of particular urgency, consensus is not possible, the Chair may take the final decision, having regard to the weight of opinion in the COI Committee.	Task Force on Capacity Building: Products of the task force deliverables be reviewed by the Bureau and the MEP and forwarded to the Plenary for its information and consideration. Committee on Conflicts of Interest (COI): members of the Committee are expected to reach consensus. If it cannot be reached, exceptionally, on matters of particular urgency, the chair of the Committee may take a final decision with due regard to the weight of opinion expressed in the Committee.	Approval process for studies and assessments requires, after external review: submission to the Steering Committee for input and recommendations and to the Panel for approval as "ready for publication". The approval requires the agreement of two-thirds of the total number of Panel members (excluding members involved in the preparation of the report).	Procedures set out process for preparation of comprehensive and thematic assessments set out a collective and iterative process	Reports of TEAP/TOCs developed through a consensus process; reports must reflect any minority views appropriately.	Specific procedures and terms of reference for other bodies of a science-policy interface are typically elaborated at the time of a body's establishment.
Functions (selected)	TF on National Greenhouse Gas Inventories (TFI):	Task Force on Capacity Building: oversees and take part in the	IRP Working Groups are created to develop scientific studies and	Author teams are constituted for the undertaking of time-	TOCs and TSBs (e.g., task forces) provide information on a broad	Functions of these other bodies may be tied to the delivery of a specific

²³ These processes are discussed in detail in UNEP/SPP-CWP/OEWG.2/6.

Relevant key features of select other bodies undertaking or supporting the interface's work	Science-policy interface					Comments
	IPCC ¹⁶	IPBES ¹⁷	IRP ¹⁸	GEO ¹⁹	Montreal Protocol Assessment Panels ²⁰	
	develops and refines an internationally-agreed methodology and software for the calculation and reporting of national GHG emissions and removals <i>COI committee</i> : determining whether members of the IPCC Bureau, and TFI Bureau have COIs; determining COI cases referred to it by the WG or TF Bureaux; reviewing the WG or TF Bureaux decisions in respect of conflict-of-interest issues.	implementation of the capacity-building deliverables; guides the secretariat, including the dedicated technical support unit, in implementing the capacity-building rolling plan. <i>Committee on Conflicts of Interest (COI)</i> : implementing IPBES Conflicts of Interest policy and determining conflict of interest cases referred to it by the Bureau of the Platform.	assessments for consideration and approval by the Panel, as per the objective and principles of IRP.	bound assessments in accordance with the adopted scope (design). Task Forces guide the development and implementation of methodologies and the undertaking of functions other than assessments, such as capacity building	range of issues related to alternative controlled substances and technologies including, if applicable, recommendations related to critical or essential use nominations for exemptions submitted by parties.	function of the panel (eg: IPCC Working Groups undertaking assessments) while others may address cross-cutting needs (eg: COI committees of IPCC and IPBES).

Table 4

Summary Table: Relevant key features of science-policy interface's technical support units

Relevant key features of technical support units	Science-policy interface					Comments
	IPCC ²⁴	IPBES ²⁵	IRP ²⁶	GEO ²⁷	Montreal Protocol Assessment Panels ²⁸	
Composition	TSU office hosted by one or more countries/organizations; staffed by hosting organization. During IPCC's 6 th assessment cycle, TSU size ranged from 5 to 26 staff ²⁹	TSU office hosted by one or more countries/organizations; TSUs staffed by hosting organization. Existing TSUs range in size from 3-5 staff including TSU head.	N/A	Provision for both TSUs and Collaborating Centers (CC). Neither yet established for GEO-7. Call for collaborating centres issued on 30 November 2022.	N/A	TSUs are time-limited and staffed by the hosting organization and provide essential support to a subsidiary body of the science-policy interface.
Modalities of Work	TSU hosting institution hires, assigns and supervises staffing. TSU work typically in close coordination with co-chairs of working group/task force and Bureau.	TSU hosting institution hires, assigns and supervises staffing. TSUs work typically in close coordination with co-chairs of expert group/task force.	N/A	TSUs "work under contract with the nominating Member State and under the supervision of the UNEP Secretariat." TSUs "provide in-kind support to the process but could also receive agreed financial support." GEO also provides for Collaborating Centres (CCs), most likely established within	N/A	Modalities of work of the TSUs themselves vary according to the hosting government/institution. Experience with TSUs points to the importance of clearly defining TSU roles and providing means of ensuring institutional continuity. ³⁰

²⁴ Relevant sources: [Governance and Management: Functions of the IPCC Secretariat and Technical Support Units](#) (2012); [1989 MOU between UNEP and WMO](#).

²⁵ Relevant sources: [Decision IPBES/1/4 administrative and institutional arrangements](#); [Decision IPBES/2/8](#); [Rules of Procedure for sessions of the Plenary](#); [Institutional Arrangements for IPBES](#); IPBES Secretariat Website.

²⁶ Relevant sources: IRP. 2016. [IRP Policies and Procedures](#).

²⁷ Relevant sources: [Global Environment Outlook \(GEO\): Intergovernmental and Expert-led Scientific Assessment Procedures](#).

²⁸ Relevant sources: [Ozone Secretariat Science Pages](#); [Terms of reference of the TEAP and its technical options committees and temporary subsidiary bodies](#) (Annex to decision XXIV/8); Decision XXXI/8, paras. 3 and 5; Article 7 of the Vienna Convention and Article 12 of the Montreal Protocol.

²⁹ TSU staff info based on participant lists included in reports of IPCC Sessions 54 to 58.

³⁰ See 2022 "Working Group Co-Chairs' Perspectives on Lessons Learned from AR6" ([IPCC-LVII/INF.12](#)) and 2019 Report on the review of the Platform at the end of its first work programme ([IPBES/7/INF/18](#)), prepared by a review panel appointed according to IPBES decision 5/2; the executive summary, findings and recommendations of the review panel ([IPBES/7/5](#)); responses to the review panel's report by the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel and the Bureau ([IPBES/7/INF/19](#)) and by the IPBES Executive Secretary ([IPBES/7/INF/20](#)); and the 2017 Report of the internal review team ([IPBES/6/INF/32](#)).

Relevant key features of technical support units	Science-policy interface					Comments
	IPCC ²⁴	IPBES ²⁵	IRP ²⁶	GEO ²⁷	Montreal Protocol Assessment Panels ²⁸	
				institutions through an MOU with UNEP. CCs provide expert support needed that may not be available within the Secretariat (e.g., translations, identifying emerging issues, outreach, providing regionally relevant data).		
Functions (selected)	“Provide scientific, technical and organizational support and support the Co-Chairs and Bureaux in the preparation and production of all relevant IPCC products” “Contribute to the implementation of the IPCC Protocol for addressing errors, the IPCC Communication Strategy and the Conflict of Interest Policy” “Participate, through their TSU heads, in the IPCC Executive Committee as Advisory Members”	TSUs “coordinate and support work of expert group or task force” ³¹	N/A	Currently seeking partnerships with CCs from all regions of the world, specifically for (but not limited to these technical areas): Developing scenarios and modelling of solutions pathways; Providing scientific information and expertise for respective regional/sub regional and/or thematic areas; Providing support for capacity-building, knowledge generation and policymaking at global, regional and national levels; Outreach and communication support for disseminating findings.	N/A	Functions of the TSU typically align with the science-policy interfaces needs, with an emphasis on support that is not already provided by the secretariat.

³¹ Decision IPBES-7/1: Rolling work programme of the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services up to 2030.

Table 5
Summary Table: Relevant key features of science-policy interface's secretariat

<i>Relevant key features of secretariat</i>	<i>Science-policy interface</i>					<i>Comments</i>
	<i>IPCC³²</i>	<i>IPBES³³</i>	<i>IRP³⁴</i>	<i>GEO³⁵</i>	<i>Montreal Protocol Assessment Panels³⁶</i>	
Secretariat	IPCC Secretariat	IPBES Secretariat	IRP Secretariat	UNEP	Ozone Secretariat	
Composition³⁷ Secretariat	14 Members of staff and 4 interns ³⁸ ; led by Secretary	23 Members of staff ³⁹ , led by Executive Secretary	7 Members of staff and 2 interns, ⁴⁰ led by Head of Secretariat	N/A	17 members of staff, 1 Junior Professional Officer (JPO), 2 UN Volunteers, 1 intern and 1 consultant; led by Executive Secretary	Composition of secretariat, may, depending on the hosting arrangements, include in-kind staffing contribution from host/partner organization.
Modalities of work Hosting arrangements	Joint UNEP/WMO Secretariat located in WMO building in Geneva, Switzerland.	Located in Bonn, Germany; Secretariat provided by UNEP and is "solely accountable to the IPBES Plenary on policy and programmatic matters".	Located in Paris, France; hosted by UNEP.	Located in Nairobi, Kenya. The Executive Director of UNEP provides the Secretariat for the GEO process as part of UNEP's science-policy interface.	Located in Nairobi, Kenya and housed within UNEP.	These examples illustrate a variety of hosting arrangements that provide different levels of independence and also point to varied means of benefiting from the existing infrastructure of an intergovernmental organisation (including for example financial rules and human resource provisions)

³² Relevant sources: [Governance and Management: Functions of the IPCC Secretariat and Technical Support Units](#) (2012); [1989 MOU between UNEP and WMO](#).

³³ Relevant sources: [Decision IPBES1/4 administrative and institutional arrangements](#); [Decision IPBES2/8](#); [Rules of Procedure for sessions of the Plenary](#); [Institutional Arrangements for IPBES](#); IPBES Secretariat Website.

³⁴ Relevant sources: IRP. 2016. [IRP Policies and Procedures](#).

³⁵ Relevant sources: [Global Environment Outlook \(GEO\): Intergovernmental and Expert-led Scientific Assessment Procedures](#).

³⁶ Relevant sources: [Ozone Secretariat Science Pages](#); [Terms of reference of the TEAP and its technical options committees and temporary subsidiary bodies](#) (Annex to decision XXIV/8); Decision XXXI/8, paras. 3 and 5; Article 7 of the Vienna Convention and Article 12 of the Montreal Protocol.

³⁷ Composition of UNEP as a whole are not noted in this table as it provides services beyond those of the secretariat for an independent science-policy interface.

³⁸ From [IPCC Secretariat website](#), accessed: 12 August 2023.

³⁹ From [IPBES Secretariat website](#), accessed: 12 August 2023.

⁴⁰ From [IRP Secretariat website](#), accessed: 12 August 2023.

<i>Relevant key features of secretariat</i>	<i>Science-policy interface</i>					<i>Comments</i>
	<i>IPCC</i> ³²	<i>IPBES</i> ³³	<i>IRP</i> ³⁴	<i>GEO</i> ³⁵	<i>Montreal Protocol Assessment Panels</i> ³⁶	
Functions (selected)	Supports Panel, Chair, Executive Committee, Bureaux; Manages the IPCC Trust Fund; Organises and prepares IPCC sessions and meetings; Supports Working Groups and Task Forces; Provides information management; Contributes to implementing protocols/strategies/policies; Promotes and maintains cooperation with UN system and liaises with two parent organizations: WMO and UNEP	Organizes meetings and provides administrative support for meetings; assists members of Plenary, Bureau and MEP; Disseminates public information and assists in outreach activities; Prepares draft budget, manages trust fund and prepares necessary financial reports; Assists in mobilization of financial resources.	Coordinates administrative and operational functions of IRP. Organizes meetings; invites new members; prepares proposals for strategic direction and work plans; organizes internal and external peer reviews for each assessment report; as well as editing and publication, and conducting communication and dissemination activities.	Provides the administrative and technical support needed for the governance and implementation structures set out in the GEO procedures. Provides day-to-day management and administration of processes, budgets and funds needed for implementation of GEO procedures.	Provides institutional advice and administrative support to the panels (including financial meeting support to experts from developing countries) and conducts communication and dissemination activities.	Common functions include preparing and supporting meetings of the decision-making body and any other bodies of the science-policy interface; and preparing budgets and managing financial arrangements. Secretariats may also undertake functions aimed at supporting specific functions of the science-policy interface, such as for example facilitating information sharing.

Table 6

Summary Table: Relevant key features of science-policy interface's financial arrangements

Relevant key features of financial arrangements	Science-policy interface					Comments
	IPCC ⁴¹	IPBES ⁴²	IRP ⁴³	GEO ⁴⁴	Montreal Protocol Assessment Panels ⁴⁵	
Composition Name of fund	IPCC Trust Fund	IPBES Trust Fund	UNEP Environment Fund, extrabudgetary funding	UNEP Environment Fund, extrabudgetary funding	Montreal Protocol Trust Fund and voluntary contributions by parties	
Modalities of work Administration arrangements	Fund administered, by mutual agreement between the WMO and UNEP, under the Financial Regulations of the WMO	All cash contributions paid into the bank account designated by UNEP	UNEP	As part of Secretariat functions, UNEP Executive Director provides day-to-day management and administration of budgets and funds needed for the implementation of the GEO procedures.	Panels are supported through the budget process of the Montreal Protocol, set by Parties to the Protocol and administered by the Ozone Secretariat.	These examples point to the practice of science-policy interfaces delegating fund administration to an intergovernmental organization.
Budget process	Secretary prepares budget in consultation with co-Chairs of the working groups and TFI (due 60 days before plenary session), Panel adopts budget by consensus. Panel establishes a Financial Task Team (FiTT) for each assessment cycle. FiTT considers the budget, then makes recommendations and the decisions on the	In consultation with the Bureau, the Secretariat prepares a proposal for the budget. Budgets must be adopted by consensus by Plenary prior to the commencement of the periods that they cover.	Secretariat prepares budget proposals; Steering Committee endorses budget and provides recommendations for the mobilization of resources.	IMAG provides advice on the development of a flexible, multi-year workplan and timebound budget, setting out a programme of activities, such as assessments and support services.	Secretariat prepares budget for review and approval by the Meeting of the Parties to the Montreal Protocol. Relevant budget includes panel meetings and the participation in panels of experts from developing country parties. Participation of some developed country experts is funded through voluntary contributions.	The budget process is closely aligned with the setting and approval of the work programme and the prioritization of activities within that work programme. There is some variation across science-policy interfaces as to what is covered under financial arrangements, notably whether experts' cost of participation in meetings is covered, and how.

⁴¹ Relevant sources: [Appendix B to the Principles Governing IPCC Work](#)⁴¹ (1996, revised 2011), ; [1989 MOU between UNEP and WMO](#).

⁴² Relevant sources: Resolution establishing IPBES, including its appendix I: Functions, operating principles and institutional arrangements of the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services. 2012; [Consolidated financial procedures](#) (IPBES decisions 2/7 and 3/2) .

⁴³ Relevant sources: IRP. 2016. [IRP Policies and Procedures](#).

⁴⁴ Relevant sources: [Global Environment Outlook \(GEO\): Intergovernmental and Expert-led Scientific Assessment Procedures](#); [UNEA Rules of Procedure](#).

⁴⁵ Relevant sources: [Ozone Secretariat Science Pages](#); [Terms of reference of the TEAP and its technical options committees and temporary subsidiary bodies](#) (Annex to decision XXIV/8); Annual budget documents posted on the meeting portals of the respective MOP meetings.

Relevant key features of financial arrangements	Science-policy interface					Comments
	IPCC ⁴¹	IPBES ⁴²	IRP ⁴³	GEO ⁴⁴	Montreal Protocol Assessment Panels ⁴⁵	
	budget are taken by the Panel's plenary session.					
Contributions	WMO (person-year costs of Secretary, cost of housing IPCC Secretariat, annual cash contributions) UNEP (person year costs of Deputy Secretary, annual cash contributions) UNFCCC (annual cash contributions) IPCC members (in-kind contributions) Other cash and in-kind contributions <i>Sub-paragraphs in Appendix B on annual cash contributions by IPCC Members are to be treated as if in square brackets</i>	Open to voluntary contributions from all sources, including Governments, UN bodies, the Global Environment Facility (GEF), other IGOs and other stakeholders, such as the private sector and foundations. The resources of the Platform consist of: costs of any staff seconded to the secretariat; costs of housing the secretariat, provided by Germany; voluntary cash contributions provided by members of the Platform and other contributors to the Trust Fund; in-kind contributions.	The operation of the IRP relies on voluntary contributions by Steering Committee members and other donors from public and private sources. Steering Committee members from OECD countries provide annual financial contributions to the IRP. May also provide in-kind contributions to the IRP. Steering Committee members from non-OECD countries "shall strive to provide annual financial or in-kind contributions to the IRP in accordance with their capacities."	N/A	Contributions by parties based on the UN scale of assessment and voluntary contributions by parties to the Montreal Protocol	There are varied sources of contributions, across these science-policy interfaces member governments have provided the bulk of resources, followed by IGOs. These examples also point to ongoing efforts to broaden sources of contributions, including from the private sector, foundations and civil society,
Are there limits on contributions?	N/A	The amount of contributions from private sources must not exceed the amount of contributions from public sources in any biennium. ⁴⁶	The amount of contributions received from private sources must not exceed the amount of contributions received from public sources per year.	N/A	No contribution is expected from parties whose scale of assessment is less than 0.1%.	In the light of efforts to broaden funding sources, attention must be paid to concerns over institutional conflicts of interest and potential harm to the interface's credibility and legitimacy. Such contributions thus typically benefit from safeguards

⁴⁶ Additional contributions for specific activities approved by the Plenary may be accepted. Single contributions in excess of USD 300,000 per contributor per activity require approval by the Plenary. Single contributions not exceeding USD 300,000 per contributor per activity require approval by the Bureau.

Relevant key features of financial arrangements	Science-policy interface					Comments
	IPCC ⁴¹	IPBES ⁴²	IRP ⁴³	GEO ⁴⁴	Montreal Protocol Assessment Panels ⁴⁵	
						and oversight, including transparency.
<i>In kind contributions</i>	In-kind contributions include “support for Technical Support Units, publications, translation, meetings, workshops, etc.”	In-kind contributions from Governments, the scientific community, other knowledge holders and stakeholders will be key to the success of the implementation of the work programme. In-kind contributions will not orient the work of the Platform, and will be consistent with the functions, operating principles and institutional arrangements of the Platform.	In-kind contributions comprise support to the development of scientific studies and assessments (expertise, data and case studies); hosting IRP biannual meetings and expert workshops, Working Group meetings, outreach and capacity development events; translating scientific studies and assessments; among others.	TSUs and Collaborating Centers provide in-kind support	In-kind contributions comprise support for the development of scientific reports and assessments	In-kind contributions play an essential role in these science-policy interfaces. In addition to the in-kind contributions by entities such as technical support units, the in-kind contribution of knowledge holders also are key to the success of a science-policy interface.