
Asia Pacific Regional Meeting of the second session of the Ad hoc open-ended working group on a science-policy panel to contribute further to the sound management of chemicals and waste and to prevent pollution

Thursday, 7 September 2023

08:00 – 18:00 (Bangkok, Thailand; GMT + 7)

In-person / hybrid meeting

Draft relationships with Relevant Key Stakeholders

Note by the secretariat

The annex to the present note contains draft relationships with relevant key stakeholders for the second ad hoc open-ended working group (OEWG 2) for the science-policy panel to contribute further to the sound management of chemicals and waste and to prevent pollution. The annex has not been formally edited.



UNITED
NATIONS



United Nations
Environment
Programme

UNEP/SPP-CWP/OEWG.2/5

Distr.: General
XX October 2023
English only

**Ad hoc open-ended working group on a science-policy panel
to contribute further to the sound management of
chemicals and waste and to prevent pollution**
Second session
XXXX, 11 December – 15 December 2023

Draft relationships with Relevant Key Stakeholders

Note by the secretariat

I. Introduction

1. At its resumed fifth session, held in Nairobi from 28 February to 2 March 2022, the United Nations Environment Assembly decided, by resolution 5/8, to establish a science-policy panel to contribute further to the sound management of chemicals and waste and to prevent pollution, with details to be further specified according to the resolution.
2. By the same resolution, the Environment Assembly decided that the ad hoc open-ended working group would prepare proposals for the science-policy panel to consider a number of issues, including: “5(d) Relationships of the panel with relevant key stakeholders, including governmental and non-governmental organizations, and civil society”.
3. The present document is based on a comprehensive, but non-exhaustive, review of the relationships of other science-policy interfaces’ with stakeholders, complemented by further evaluations and relevant literature. The document is accompanied by information document UNEP/SPP-CWP/OEWG.2/INF/5.
4. Section II discusses potential roles that stakeholders may have in a science-policy panel. Section III identifies approaches towards relationships with stakeholders, building on lessons learned. Section IV sets out a proposal on the way forward.

II. Potential roles that stakeholders may have in the panel

5. **Addressing issues related to chemicals, waste and the prevention of pollution is complex and multifaceted.** Chemicals, waste and pollutants can travel long distances and have long-term consequences for ecosystems and human health, including for future generations, extending the issue well beyond immediate concerns. Furthermore, of the tens of thousands man-made chemicals in commerce, many are traded globally by international companies that do not necessarily adhere to national jurisdictions. Those impacted may therefore be far away from where chemicals are produced, used and managed. This dynamic interplay between biological, physical, socio-economic, technological, and political systems adds to the complexity of the science-policy interface. Addressing issues effectively requires an understanding of sources, state and trends, impacts, drivers and barriers, including how these are perceived, interacted with, and managed. It also requires a good understanding of the conditions under which efforts achieve success and the transfer of such understanding into policymaking. There is therefore a need for co-production of science and policy, building upon

collaboration between scientists, policymakers, other relevant stakeholders, and the public and whereby practitioners participate in the process¹.

6. **The facilitation of the uptake of science in action in non-scientific settings requires collaboration and cooperation among stakeholders**^{2,3,4}. A broad range of stakeholders may therefore play a role in a science-policy interface, combining actionable science with sustained stakeholder interaction and interdisciplinarity, in line with resolution 5/8. This would include the involvement of stakeholders - including industry and civil society - across a variety of sectors, from a broad range of disciplines, those working in a range of languages and knowledge systems, as well as those operating at diverse scales, from local to international. Effectiveness reviews of existing science-policy interfaces echo this needs to engage stakeholders from a wide range of areas and sectors⁵.
7. **As an effective science-policy interface involves many stakeholders, it is important to understand their roles and identify which relationships are key for the panel.** Close relationships with relevant key stakeholders can also help ensure that the panel's work is complementary and not duplicative, in line with paragraphs 6(d) and (e) of resolution 5/8.⁶ The interfaces reviewed include the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES), the International Resource Panel (IRP), the Global Environment Outlook (GEO) process, the assessment panels of the Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer, the Arctic Monitoring and Assessment Programme (AMAP), the Science-Policy Interface of the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification (UNCCD SPI), the Joint Group of Experts on the Scientific Aspects of Marine Environmental Protection (GESAMP), and those science-policy interfaces under the World Health Organization (WHO), the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD), and the Strategic Approach to International Chemicals Management (SAICM). The examples from existing interfaces are complemented by existing reviews of these processes, peer-reviewed literature and views that were expressed during a side event held on 2 May 2023.⁷
8. **There are many roles that stakeholders are undertaking in existing science-policy interfaces.** Annex I, and the Tables 1 and 2 therein, provides a detailed overview of the various roles that stakeholders undertake in existing science-policy interfaces. Two main relationships have been distinguished: 1. Institutional engagement at the level of the panel, and 2. Participation in work programme development and implementation.
9. **The panel's relationships with stakeholders could be considered according to the general roles they have.** Based on the review, three key roles in relation to the panel could be considered: (1) contributors to the panel; (2) end users of the panel's deliverables (e.g., policy- and decision-makers, recipients of outputs), and (3) those that may be impacted -positively or negatively- by the science-policy panel's outputs and ensuing policy outcomes (including vulnerable and at-risk populations). A

¹ Meadow, A. M.; Ferguson, D. B.; Guido, Z.; Horganic, A.; Owen, G.; Wall, T. Moving toward the deliberate coproduction of climate science knowledge. *Weather, Climate, and Society* 2015, 7(2), 179–191; Wall, T. U.; Meadow, A. M.; Horganic, A. Developing evaluation indicators to improve the process of coproducing usable climate science. *Weather, Climate, and Society* 2017, 9(1), 95–107; Bamzai-Dodson, A.; Cravens, A. E.; Wade, A. A.; McPherson, R. A. Engaging with stakeholders to produce actionable science : a framework and guidance. *Weather, Climate, and Society* 2021, 13(4), 1027–1041.

² Goolsby, J. B.; Cravens, A. E.; Rozance, M. A. Becoming an actionable scientist: challenges, competency, and the development of expertise. *Environmental Management* 2023, DOI: 10.1007/s00267-023-01863-4

³ Bamzai-Dodson, A.; Cravens, A. E.; Wade, A. A.; McPherson, R. A. Engaging with stakeholders to produce actionable science : a framework and guidance. *Weather, Climate, and Society* 2021, 13(4), 1027–1041; Beier, P.; Hansen, L. J.; Helbrecht, L.; Behar, D. A how-to guide for coproduction of actionable science. *Conservation Letters* 2017, 10(3), 288–296.

⁴ Pohl, C.; Truffer, B.; Hirsch-Hadorn, G. 23 Addressing wicked problems through transdisciplinary research. In *The Oxford Handbook of Interdisciplinarity (2nd edition)* edited by Frodeman R. 2017.

⁵ Finding 14 of the 2019 IPBES effectiveness review (IPBES/7/INF/18)

⁶ Paragraph 6 of resolution 5/8: UNEA... “Further decides that the ad hoc open-ended working group should take into account the need to ensure that the panel: ... (d) Undertakes work that is complementary to and does not duplicate the work of the relevant multilateral agreements, other international instruments and intergovernmental bodies, including those that are members of the Inter-Organization Programme for the Sound Management of Chemicals; (e) Coordinates, as appropriate, with other science-policy bodies, such as the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change and the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services”

⁷ The webpage of the side event, including a summary and the video stream from the event, can be found at <https://www.genevaenvironmentnetwork.org/events/science-policy-panel-on-chemicals-waste-and-pollution-prevention-building-the-linkages-from-science-to-action-brs-cops-2023-side-event/>

wide range of stakeholders may be relevant for the science-policy panel (Annex II). They may fit in more than one category. Likewise, multiple stakeholders can contribute to each role/relationship, and often do so from different angles. For example, in the scoping of an assessment, contributors can provide aspects in terms of what knowledge is available, whereas end-users and those that may be impacted can provide aspects related to their needs.

10. **Through effective engagement and relationships, stakeholders may contribute to bolstering a science-policy interface's credibility, relevance, legitimacy, transparency, iterativity and inclusiveness.**⁸ Stakeholder engagement can contribute to expanding the pool of potential experts that engage in the panel's work. This may result in more interest to be nominated and avoid that the absence of experts could impact the panel's work⁹. Stakeholders not only provide knowledge and perspectives to the interface that contribute to the credibility of a science-policy interface, they can also enhance legitimacy and relevance by providing inputs, oversight and transparency. Engaging end users and those that may be impacted by the panel's work can further help ensure legitimacy and enhance the relevance of the panel's work. For example, the 2019 IPBES effectiveness review highlighted the needs for strong engagement of regional and national policymakers, policy practitioners, policy experts, and decision-makers of civil society organizations and business to ensure the policy relevance of the science-policy interface's outputs, starting from the development of work programmes, and fostering the subsequent uptake and impacts¹⁰. Further experiences gained in science-policy interfaces, notably IPBES, IPCC, and GEO, highlight in particular the importance of engaging Indigenous Peoples and local communities¹¹.
11. **Stakeholders may play a key role in the dissemination and uptake of outputs.** Some science-policy interfaces tend to view assessments as end products rather than as parts of a wider, more complex and longer-term process to influence policy.¹² Learning from the reviews and current practice, leveraging various stakeholders to conduct follow-ups at all levels (e.g. translation to local languages, dissemination, development of derivatives such as policy briefs, awareness-raising) could help to enhance the uptake of the panel's outputs by policy- and decision-makers.
12. **Stakeholders may be delegated to deliver some components of the interface's functions.** For example, the 2019 IPBES effectiveness review identified stakeholders as having great potential to deliver capacity building activities on the Platform's behalf¹³. There is a similar potential for stakeholder contributions in delivering on functions related to knowledge management and information sharing. For example, OECD's eChemPortal, an information-sharing portal on chemicals, benefits from key contributions from its stakeholders: it is hosted by the European Chemicals Agency, and the data sources accessed through eChemPortal are maintained by, and remain the responsibility of, the organisations that create them.¹⁴

III. Approaches towards establishing relationships with relevant key stakeholders

13. **Extensive experience gained from existing science-policy interfaces has yielded key lessons** that may inform the development of a proposal on the panel's relationships with relevant key stakeholders as requested by resolution 5/8. The examples show that stakeholders contribute in various ways and point towards a combination of approaches that are further discussed below.
14. **Approach 1: Incorporation of provisions for certain roles that stakeholders may take in the institutional arrangements, rules of procedure, and work-related processes and procedures.**

Relationships with relevant key stakeholders in existing science-policy interfaces that are incorporated in arrangements and procedures typically include:

⁸ UNEP 2020. *Assessment of options for strengthening the science-policy interface at the international level for the sound management of chemicals and waste*. Prepared for UNEA 5. Available at: <https://wedocs.unep.org/bitstream/handle/20.500.11822/33808/OSSP.pdf>

⁹ IPCC-LVII/INF.12

¹⁰ Finding 6 and Recommendations 4 and 33 of the 2019 IPBES effectiveness review.

¹¹ See for example in the case of GEO:

https://wedocs.unep.org/bitstream/handle/20.500.11822/40473/GEO_Ind_know.pdf and https://wedocs.unep.org/bitstream/handle/20.500.11822/40474/GEO_Lit.pdf

¹² IPBES/7/5 and IPBES/7/INF/18

¹³ Finding 27 of the 2019 IPBES effectiveness review.

¹⁴ <https://www.oecd.org/chemicalsafety/risk-assessment/echempportalglobalportaltoinformationonchemicalsubstances.htm>

- (a) Provisions for relevant key stakeholders' accreditation and participation in the meetings of the plenary and its subsidiary bodies in the rules of procedure,¹⁵ and
 - (b) Work-related processes and procedures that enable stakeholders to provide inputs into work programme development, nominate experts, provide feedback during the scoping of assessments and other deliverables, and review drafts.¹⁶
15. **Approach 2: Establishment of formal strategic partnerships.** Formal partnerships can encourage stakeholders' sustained engagement in the science-policy interface's work. IRP, for example, formed partnerships with many stakeholders over the years. Among these, 19 are designated "strategic partners" with the aim to support the development and dissemination of IRP publications, enhance impact, and create synergies with other relevant stakeholders.¹⁷ These "strategic partners" may include UN agencies, international, regional and national organizations, intergovernmental bodies, non-governmental organizations, private and public institutions, business and industry associations, research centres, universities, foundations, science-policy platforms.¹⁸
16. **Formalizing partnerships may bring clarity on the roles and responsibilities of partners in an open and transparent manner.** This has also been noted in the perspectives on lessons learned from AR6, which recommends that IPCC considers how to best coordinate and liaise with external organisations from the start for the preparation of products and outreach related to the IPCC.¹⁹ Similarly, the 2017 review of UNCCD SPI made an explicit recommendation that its interaction with IPBES and IPCC should be formalized.²⁰ The CBD, with its well-established partnership and cooperation with IPBES, was indeed found to stand out among the MEAs in its uptake of IPBES work²¹.
17. **The sustained interaction enabled by formal partnerships can also contribute to a synergistic co-production of science and policy** and thus enhance the long-term sustainability and effectiveness of the panel.²² Relationships with relevant key stakeholders should however not compromise the independence of the interface, and conflict-of-interest policies need to be in place to protect the interface from vested interests²³.
18. **Under IPBES,²⁴ strategic partnerships aim to support work programme implementation, through one or more of the following means:**
- (i) Increasing alignment of activities, including capacity building;
 - (ii) Direct support to the delivery of the work programme by, for example, providing technical support, contributing specific knowledge and experience, coordinating areas of work in which an organization has particular expertise, providing administrative support, engaging in outreach and communication, increasing access to data and analytical methods, and promoting and catalysing capacity building;
 - (iii) Building and managing relationships, and
 - (iv) Facilitating stakeholder engagement.

IPBES provides guidance on the development of strategic partnerships and other collaborative arrangements, including criteria to be used in identifying whether a strategic partnership is appropriate and necessary.²⁵

¹⁵ See for rules of procedure of existing science-policy interfaces document UNEP/CWP-SPP/OEWG.2/INF/4.

¹⁶ See for more information on work-related processes and procedures of different existing science-policy interfaces document UNEP/CWP-SPP/OEWG.2/6.

¹⁷ Policies and Procedures of the International Resource Panel. IRP-PP-2016.

¹⁸ The full list of partner organizations can be found at <https://www.resourcepanel.org/partners>.

¹⁹ IPCC-LVII/INF.12, Lesson 4.

²⁰ https://www.unccd.int/sites/default/files/relevant-links/2017-05/FinalReportof%20the_SPI_Assessment.pdf

²¹ Finding 9 of the 2019 IPBES effectiveness review

²² Lemos, M.C., Morehouse, B.J. 2005. The co-production of science and policy in integrated climate assessments. *Global Environmental Change* 15, 57–68.

²³ More details on conflict-of-interest procedures can be found in document UNEP/SPP-CWP/OEWG.2/6.

²⁴ Annex III of Decision IPBES/3/18

²⁵ Annex III of IPBES/7/INF/18 *Guidance on the development of strategic partnerships and other collaborative arrangements* including the following criteria to be used in identifying whether a strategic partnership is

IPBES differentiates formal partnerships by type of stakeholders:

- (i) UN entities: Formal institutional links between IPBES and UNEP, UNESCO, FAO and UNDP through collaborative partnership arrangements, particularly with regard to secretariat services/arrangements and implementation support;
- (ii) MEAs: Partnerships between the IPBES secretariat and secretariats of several MEAs through memoranda of cooperation, particularly regarding promoting synergy, avoiding overlaps and unnecessary duplication, and ensuring effective cooperation; and
- (iii) Other relevant key stakeholders: For example, partnerships with several international organizations through memoranda of understanding,²⁶ particularly with regard to supporting the work of task forces; thematic and global, regional and subregional assessments; policy support, and communications, outreach and stakeholder engagement.

It is noted that to establish formal partnerships with relevant multilateral agreements, international instruments and intergovernmental bodies, approval from the governing bodies of each entity may be needed. Such approvals may require time and coordination as these have their own processes to manage with governing bodies which operate on different timeframes. This requires careful alignments and planning²⁷.

- 19. Relationships with various stakeholders may need to be further differentiated.** The effective implementation of partnerships under some science-policy interfaces has been hampered by the single formal status of observers available to all non-members and non-State actors (partners or otherwise). In particular, the IPBES effectiveness review found that, while UN entities and MEAs are well-defined in its stakeholder engagement strategies, “there is currently a very significant lack of clarity in IPBES regarding the various types of actors that are interested or involved in the Platform.” It further recommended a differentiated approach to relationships with stakeholders other than UN entities and MEAs by developing additional categories of partners and stakeholders for more efficient and effective engagement²⁸. Such differentiation may also enhance visibility and recognition of the role of other relevant key stakeholders, including civil society and the private sector.
- 20. One way to differentiate stakeholders is to consider the “Major Groups” as the GEO process does.** This stakeholder grouping also applies to the ad hoc open-ended working group, having adopted the rules of procedure of the Environment Assembly.²⁹ It is however noted that the stakeholder landscape has become more diverse, and many non-governmental organizations do not necessarily consider themselves associated with one of the nine Major Groups, including for example foundations, faith

appropriate and necessary: (a) necessity of using a formal partnership approach rather than other available mechanisms; (b) relevance of the potential partnership to delivery of the work programme agreed upon by the Plenary, including consideration of any priorities agreed upon by the Plenary; (c) opportunity to perform work programme activities more effectively, efficiently, economically and ethically; (d) experience and capacity of the potential strategic partner in fields relevant to the Platform and its willingness to collaborate in delivering the work programme; (e) achievement of a more appropriate regional or thematic balance in the delivery of the work programme.

²⁶ As of August 2023, they are Future Earth, the Global Biodiversity Information Facility, the Inter-American Institute for Global Change Research, and the International Union for Conservation of Nature.

²⁷ Finding 9 of the 2019 IPBES effectiveness review.

²⁸ Recommendation 3 of the 2019 IPBES effectiveness review.

²⁹ UNEP’s Stakeholder Engagement Policy is grounded in rule 70 of the Rules of Procedure of the UN Environment Assembly, with the current practice described in UNEP’s Stakeholder Engagement Handbook (https://wedocs.unep.org/bitstream/handle/20.500.11822/32831/stakeholder_handbook_EN.pdf). The nine major groups are: women, children and youth, Indigenous Peoples, non-governmental organizations, local authorities, workers and trade unions, business and industry, scientific and technological community, and farmers. In 2012, the *Future We Want* further acknowledged other stakeholders, including local communities, volunteer groups and foundations, migrants and families, as well as older persons and persons with disabilities, as relevant key stakeholders to UN processes related to sustainable development; their participation is undertaken through close collaboration with the Major Groups (<https://sustainabledevelopment.un.org/aboutmajorgroups.html>).

groups, informal workers associations, health organizations or academic institutions.³⁰ Further (innovative) approaches to differentiating stakeholders could therefore be considered.

21. **IPBES has also established multiple technical support units (TSU) to support its work, many of which are hosted by stakeholders.** TSUs could be provided by partner institutions outside UNEP in support of specified time-bound expert driven tasks. GEO has is recognizing TSUs as well as type of partnerships and has included TSUs in the procedures adopted in 2022.³¹
22. **Furthermore, GEO has a long history of working with Collaborating Centres that partner with the secretariat to support various enabling functions such as capacity building, knowledge generation and support for policymaking.**³² These centres could also provide expert support needed that may not be available within the secretariat (e.g. for translations, identifying emerging issues, outreach, providing regionally relevant data, hosting meetings).
23. **Approach 3: Promote involvement of stakeholders through informal arrangements, including in delivery of the work programme.** Such an approach creates opportunities to engage a broad array of stakeholders.

Examples of informal arrangements to engage a wide range of interested organizations from existing science-policy interfaces, notably IPBES, include:

- (a) Guidance to stakeholders on their engagement as collaborative supporters for achieving the work programme;^{33,34}
- (b) Self-organised stakeholder networks;³⁵
- (c) Open-to-all stakeholder days in advance of plenary session,³⁶ and
- (d) A secretariat-maintained stakeholder registry with an updated list of contact information.

The latter could both assist stakeholders in networking with each other and as well as enable the secretariat to directly share announcements, news, calls and other important information with stakeholders.³⁷

24. **Strong two-way communication supports effective relationships with relevant key stakeholders.** Stakeholder engagement strategies, roadmaps and activities may need to be closely aligned with, and connected to, the panel's communication strategies, noting varied needs of communications by different stakeholders (languages, formats, channels, etc.). Communication with media can start during the initial development of the assessments or during ongoing assessment production; not only during and post-product release. Furthermore, OECD's active participation in business, trade union and environmental NGO meetings and workshops, has contributed to mutual trust and a better flow of information and

³⁰ *Established practices for the participation of accredited representatives of Major Groups and Stakeholders in meetings of UNEA and its subsidiary bodies.* Pre-session document for the Meeting of the Bureau of the Ad hoc open-ended working group on a science-policy panel to contribute further to the sound management of chemicals and waste and to prevent pollution.

https://wedocs.unep.org/bitstream/handle/20.500.11822/42814/SPP_OEWG_MGS_modalities.pdf

³¹ Global Environment Outlook (GEO). Intergovernmental and Expert-led Scientific Assessment Procedures. https://wedocs.unep.org/bitstream/handle/20.500.11822/40633/GEO_procedures.pdf

³² A list of past GEO Collaborating Centres and other contributing institutions listed in GEO reports can be found at <https://www.degruyter.com/document/doi/10.1515/9789633864326-020/html>.

³³ It identifies the principles, strategic directions, modalities and actions for building and further developing the capacities of individuals and institutions based on the priority needs established by the IPBES Plenary, including with in-kind support from partners and the task force on capacity-building and its technical support unit, as well as support from other sources including through the capacity-building forum with conventional and potential sources of funding. <https://www.ipbes.net/resource-file/19145>.

³⁴ <https://www.ipbes.net/sites/default/files/inline-files/National%20platforms%20and%20networks%20-%20opportunities%20to%20engage%20with%20and%20contribute%20to%20the%20work%20of%20IPBES.pdf>

³⁵ These are the Open-Ended Network of IPBES Stakeholders (ONet; <https://onet.ipbes.net/about>) aiming to facilitate and maximize the effective engagement of stakeholders and knowledge holders in the IPBES process, and the International Indigenous Forum on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IIFBES; <https://www.ipbes.net/IIFBES>) aiming to facilitate and enhance the effective participation of Indigenous Peoples and local communities in IPBES process.

³⁶ <https://www.ipbes.net/stakeholder-events>

³⁷ <https://www.ipbes.net/stakeholder-registry>

ideas.³⁸ These may be useful models to consider for the panel to ensure active communication and engagement with stakeholders.

25. **Ongoing dialogues and processes of engagement by the secretariat with national focal points may also help to ensure that knowledge, data and views by national experts and stakeholders are captured by the panel's work.** Under IPBES, stakeholder engagement by national focal points has led to the broadening of the involvement of stakeholders and raised awareness and understanding of what the Platform does and how it operates. Furthermore, national focal points can bring critical feedback of national stakeholders at an early stage, for example during work programme development or scoping of assessments, to enhance policy relevance of the panel's work.
26. **In-kind contributions should be recognized and incentivized in such informal arrangements.** The IPCC working group co-chairs³⁹ and the 2019 IPBES effectiveness review both have highlighted that science-policy interfaces' work heavily relies on in-kind contributions from the scientific community, partners and other stakeholders, which can cause fatigue and demotivation among experts over time. The 2019 effectiveness review of IPBES further recommends that an incentive system for in-kind contributions is put in place (e.g. visibility, recognition). One way of doing so could be to align the panel's work and outputs with the "currency" of relevant key stakeholders.⁴⁰ For example, GESAMP's scientific members can produce peer-reviewed publications as part of the GESAMP work. This has been done by experts under other science-policy interfaces as well⁴¹.

IV. Proposal on the way forward

27. **Sustained engagement and collaboration with key stakeholders can improve the strength of the panel and increase the likelihood of uptake of its deliverables⁴².** Strong two-way communication can support effective relationships with relevant key stakeholders, and engagement with national focal points has shown to assist as well in ensuring that knowledge, data and views from experts and stakeholders are captured in the panel's work.
28. **A key lesson is the need to engage more and diverse stakeholders and to differentiate relationships other than with UN entities and MEAs by developing additional categories of partners and stakeholders.** Such differentiation may result in more efficient and effective engagement and enhanced visibility and recognition of the role of other key stakeholders. The review has shown that inclusive participation of stakeholders through co-production of science and policy is now common practice in many settings and important to strengthen attributes of an effective science policy interface, such as relevance, credibility and legitimacy. Further consideration of the identification of specific relevant key stakeholders or stakeholder groups to engage with and practical approaches to bringing these together may be required.
29. **In establishing effective relationships with stakeholders, the panel can build upon formal and informal approaches, which complement each other.** Regardless of the approach or combination of approaches chosen, the relationships needs to be clearly communicated in a transparent manner, particularly with regard to the relevance and roles of different stakeholders in the panel's work.
30. **The open-ended working group may therefore wish to consider the following:**
 - (a) A description of stakeholders in the context of the panel. The open-ended working group may wish to use the following text:

In the context of the science policy panel, stakeholders are institutions and individuals that belong to one or more of the following categories: (1) contributors to the panel, (2) end users of the panel's deliverables, and (3) those that may be impacted by the science-policy panel's outputs and ensuing policy outcomes.

³⁸ <https://www.oecd.org/env/theoecdspartnerpartners.htm>

³⁹ IPCC-LVII/INF.12

⁴⁰ Hering, J.G. 2016. Do we need "more research" or better implementation through knowledge brokering? *Sustain. Sci.* 11, 363–369.

⁴¹ <https://www.ipbes.net/news/new-article-science-ipbes-global-assessment-authors>

⁴² As per UNEPs report on this and many others

- (b) Approaches to pursue towards establishing relationships with relevant key stakeholders, building on good practice and lessons learned;
- (c) Providing guidance to the secretariat on further work to inform the finalization of a proposal on the panel's relationships with relevant key stakeholders if necessary.

Unedited Advance

Annex I: Roles that stakeholders undertake in existing science-policy interfaces

Table 1. Roles that stakeholders undertake in existing science-policy interfaces related to institutional engagement at the level of the panel.

Role	Examples of interfaces that include the role (non-exhaustive)	Contribution to science-policy interface
<i>Roles commonly addressed under institutional arrangements / Rules of Procedure</i>		
Participate in the meetings of the governing body (and subsidiary bodies), and intervene as permitted by the Rules of Procedure	AMAP, GEO, IPCC, IPBES, IRP, OECD, UNCCD SPI, WHO, assessment panels of the Montreal Protocol	Enhancing policy relevance and legitimacy; Ensuring that the interface is regularly and fully apprised of relevant developments in the science-policy domain; Enhancing cooperation and avoiding duplication of work
Participate in focal point networks	GEO, IPCC, IPBES, SAICM, assessment panels of the Montreal Protocol	
<i>Roles not commonly addressed under institutional arrangements / Rules of Procedure</i>		
Provide secretariat services	GEO, IPCC, IPBES	Strengthening capacity of the panel to execute the work programme; Using existing networks and sectoral expertise, enhancing cooperation and avoid duplication
Provide support to fundraising and resource mobilization	IPCC	Contributing to long-term sustainability of the panel;
Provide financial and/or in-kind support, including hosting expert workshops or meetings	AMAP, GEO, IPBES, SAICM, WHO, IRP	Enhancing interdisciplinarity and developing country representation of the panel;
Contribute to expanding the pool of potential experts for the panel's work	GEO, IPBES, IPCC, UNCCD SPI, IRP	Enhancing cooperation and avoiding duplication of work; Strengthening capacity of the panel to execute the work programme
Contribute to stakeholder engagement, e.g., by building up of stakeholder networks	IPBES, IRP, UNCCD SPI	
Provide feedback on process as part of effectiveness evaluation	IPBES, SAICM	Enhancing relevance

Table 2. Roles that stakeholders undertake in existing science-policy interfaces related to the development and execution of work programmes, including horizon scanning, assessment, capacity building, knowledge-management and information-sharing⁴³.

⁴³ The knowledge-management and information-sharing functions here refer to the following two principal functions agreed on by the open-ended working group at its first session: (c) providing up-to-date and relevant information, identifying key gaps in scientific research, encouraging and supporting communication between scientists and policymakers, explaining and disseminating findings for different audiences, and raising public awareness; (d) facilitating information-sharing with countries, in particular developing countries seeking relevant scientific information

Role of stakeholders	Examples of interfaces that include the role (non-exhaustive)	Contribution to science-policy interface
<i>Roles commonly addressed under work-related processes and procedures</i>		
Propose possible activities for a new work programme	AMAP, GEO, IPBES, IPCC, IRP, WHO	Enhancing policy relevance; Enhancing cooperation and avoid duplication
Express views on proposals for a new work programme under development, including their prioritization	AMAP, GEO, IPBES, IRP	
Express views on scoping	GEO, IPBES, IPCC, IRP, WHO	Enhancing policy relevance, credibility, legitimacy, transparency; Enhancing interdisciplinarity, geographical distribution and gender balance; Enhancing buy-in and ownership; Enhancing cooperation and avoid duplication
Nominating and express views on selecting experts	GEO, IPBES, IPCC, WHO	
Provide data and knowledge	GEO, IPBES, IPCC, TEAP, WHO, IRP	
Review drafts of the panel’s deliverables	GEO, IPBES, IPCC, IRP, UNCCD SPI, WHO, assessment panels of the Montreal Protocol	
<i>Roles not commonly addressed under work-related processes and procedures</i>		
Conduct/foster research and generate/publish relevant data and knowledge for the assessments	IPCC	Contributing to the comprehensiveness of assessments, and to interdisciplinarity
Provide data, knowledge and advice related to specific knowledge-management and information-sharing activities	OECD, IPBES	Enhancing relevance
Advise on the identification of knowledge gaps	GEO, IPBES	Enhancing relevance, legitimacy and inclusiveness
Undertake delegated work related to knowledge management and information sharing	OECD, IPBES	Strengthening capacity of the panel to execute the work programme
Undertake work to fill identified knowledge gaps	GEO, UNCCD SPI	Enhancing impacts of the interface’s work
Oversee the scientific integrity of the entire process	GEO	Enhancing credibility and legitimacy
Provide validation of the assessment outputs through specific institutional mechanisms	GEO, IRP	Enhancing legitimacy and policy impact
Disseminate the assessment outputs at international, regional, national and local levels, also beyond six UN languages	IPBES, IPCC, IRP, UNCCD SPI, WHO	Enhancing outreach and policy impacts; Strengthening capacity of the panel to execute the work programme
Foster uptake by policy-makers and decision-makers	IPBES, UNCCD SPI, WHO, IRP	Enhancing policy impacts
Conduct joint assessments	IPBES, IPCC, WHO, TEAP, IRP	Enhancing policy relevance, interdisciplinarity of the panel, and cooperation
Advise on the identification of needs and terms for capacity-building	GEO	Enhancing relevance, legitimacy and inclusiveness
Capacity-building activities at the regional and national level, based on the interface’s outputs	IPBES, GEO	Strengthening capacity of the panel to execute the work programme
Address the capacity-building needs identified that are beyond the scope and functions of the interfaces	GEO, IPBES, SAICM	Enhancing impacts of the interface’s work

Annex II: Overview of the range of relevant stakeholders, by type of entity, whose engagement may be key to the successful functioning of the panel.

<u>National and local governments, and their networks.</u>	Including legislatures and legislators (e.g. the Inter-Parliamentary Union), executive offices (i.e., different ministries, mayors, development agencies), judiciary branches (at varied scales), and regional economic integration organizations;
<u>The scientific community</u>	Including academic societies, research institutions, universities, (national) science foundations, publishers, and individual scientists and scholars working in and across fields and disciplines (e.g. medicine, law, engineering, social sciences, humanities, and natural sciences)
<u>Civil society organizations (CSOs)</u>	Including those acting on specific interests (e.g. protecting the environment, health, human rights); representing a specific group (e.g. women, youth, workers, farmers, Indigenous Peoples and local communities, consumers, disabled persons); or bringing forward the voice of specific types of actors (e.g. philanthropies)
<u>Private sector</u>	Including chemical and product manufacturers, distributors, brands and retailers, waste managers, and banking and financial institutions;
<u>Media</u>	Including journalists, newspapers, social media platforms, internet media;
<u>The public</u>	Including vulnerable and at-risk populations, and local and Indigenous communities.
<u>UN entities</u>	Including FAO, ILO, UNDP, UNEP, UNIDO, UNITAR, WHO, World Bank, World Trade Organization (WTO), UNICEF, International Maritime Organization (IMO), UN Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) and UN-Habitat
<u>Global multilateral environmental agreements</u>	Including the Basel, Rotterdam, Stockholm and Minamata Conventions; Vienna Convention for the Protection of the Ozone Layer and its Montreal Protocol; Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD); United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC); United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification (UNCCD); and United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS) and Agreement on the Conservation and Sustainable Use of Marine Biological Diversity of Areas Beyond National Jurisdiction (BBNJ).
<u>Regional agreements</u>	Including the Bamako Convention; Convention on Long-range Transboundary Air Pollution (CLRTAP); UNECE Aarhus Convention on Access to Information, Public Participation in Decision-making and Access to Justice in Environmental Matters; Regional Agreement on Access to Information, Public Participation and Justice in Environmental Matters in Latin America and the Caribbean (Escazú Agreement) and Regional Sea Conventions and Action Plans;
<u>Other international science-policy interfaces.</u>	Including IPCC and IPBES (which are specifically noted in resolution 5/8,) IRP, GEO, assessment panels of the Montreal Protocol and AMAP.
<u>Other international instruments and intergovernmental bodies.</u>	Include SAICM and the beyond 2020 framework on chemicals and waste, OECD, and various international development finance institutions ⁴⁴

⁴⁴ <https://www.oecd.org/development/development-finance-institutions-private-sector-development.htm>