

Latin America and the Caribbean 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

Saturday, 7 October 2023

08:00 – 18:00 (Brasilia, Brazil; GMT - 3)

In-person meeting (Brasilia)

Draft institutional arrangements and rules of procedure for sessions of the plenary

Note by the secretariat

The annex to the present note contains the draft institutional arrangements and rules of procedure for sessions of the plenary. The ad hoc open-ended working group 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

UNEP/SPP-CWP/OEWG.2/4



United Nations
Environment
Programme

Distr.: General
X October 2023
Original: English

**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**

Dead Sea, Jordan, 11 December-15 December 2023
Agenda item 4

**Preparation of proposals for the establishment of a science-policy
panel**

**Draft institutional arrangements and rules of procedure for
sessions of the plenary**

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 (OEWG) would prepare proposals for the science-policy panel to consider a number of issues, including: the institutional design and governance of the panel (paragraph 5(a)), arrangements for secretariat support of the panel (paragraph 5(h)), options for voluntary financing of the work of the panel (paragraph 5(i)) and the rules of procedure governing the work of the panel (paragraph 5(j)).
3. Section II discusses key design features and presents proposals for the panel's institutional arrangements. Section III presents a table of contents as a starting point for elaborating the rules of procedure for sessions of the plenary. The present document is complemented by information document UNEP/SPP-CWP/OEWG.2/INF/4.

II. Institutional arrangements

4. **Institutional arrangements set out the architecture required for the panel to operate and deliver on its functions.** Five examples of 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) process, and assessment panels of the Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer were reviewed for organizational features. Each of these had:

- (a) A decision-making body;
- (b) One or more bodies providing administrative and scientific oversight;
- (c) Other bodies undertaking or supporting the science-policy interface's work;
- (d) A secretariat.

In addition, institutional arrangements often encompassed financial arrangements.

5. Institutional arrangements are discussed according to three dimensions: (1) composition; (2) modalities of work; and (3) functions.¹ **Composition** focuses on who is engaged in the body or arrangement. The options put forward below focus on meeting the need, set out in UNEA resolution 5/8 paragraph 6(c), that the panel be “interdisciplinary, ensuring contributions from experts with a broad range of disciplinary expertise; has inclusive participation, including indigenous peoples; and has geographical, regional and gender balance.” **Modalities of work** encompass considerations of how the body or arrangement undertakes its work. The options put forward below focus on meeting the need, set out in UNEA resolution 5/8 paragraphs 6(c), (f) and (h), that the panel: has “procedures that seek to ensure that the work of the panel is transparent and impartial and that it can produce reports and assessments that are credible and scientifically robust;” has “the ability to address potential conflicts of interest and safeguard commercially sensitive information;” and is “cost-effective, with the leanest structure consistent with achieving the highest impact.” **Functions** addresses what the body or arrangement will deliver. The options put forward below focus on meeting the need, set out in paragraphs 6(d), (e) and (g), that the panel: “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” (IOMC); “coordinates, as appropriate, with other science-policy bodies such as IPCC and IPBES”; and “has the flexibility to respond, to the extent possible, to the needs identified by stakeholders and agreed to by its member Governments, and to fulfil its principal functions”.

A. Decision-making body

6. A science-policy interface's decision-making body typically reflects the membership of the interface. The Environment Assembly decided in paragraph 3 of UNEA resolution 5/8 that “the panel should be an independent intergovernmental body with a programme of work approved by its member Governments to deliver policy-relevant scientific evidence without being policy prescriptive”. Features of the decision-making body also help ensure, in accordance with resolution 5/8 paragraph 6a)-(e), the following:

- (a) Ability to deliver outputs that are policy relevant without being policy prescriptive;
- (b) Interdisciplinarity, ensuring contributions from experts with a broad a range of disciplinary expertise; inclusive participation, including indigenous peoples; and geographical, regional and gender balance;
- (c) Procedures that seek to ensure that the work of the panel is transparent and impartial and that it can produce reports and assessments that are credible and scientifically robust;
- (d) That its work 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 IOMC;

¹ This three-pronged approach is in line with Jasanoff, S., 2005. Judgment under siege: The three-body problem of expert legitimacy. In *Democratization of expertise? Exploring novel forms of scientific advice in political decision-making* (pp. 209-224). Dordrecht: Springer Netherlands

(e) That it coordinates, as appropriate, with other science-policy bodies, such as IPCC and IPBES.

7. Table 1 in Annex I summarizes key features of the decision-making bodies of the science-policy interfaces reviewed. The greatest variation in decision-making bodies relates to whether the decision-making body is made up of member government representatives or experts serving in their personal capacity.

8. **Key considerations for the composition of the decision-making body of the panel:**

The decision-making body of the panel would be made up of representatives of UN Member countries who are members of the panel. Stakeholders could be participate in meetings of the decision-making body as observers.

9. **Key considerations for the modalities of work of the decision-making body of the panel:** Potential trade-offs between budgetary commitments and the pace and scale of the work the panel might undertake may determine the modalities. For example, limits on the frequency of meetings of the decision-making body might lead to delays between the completion of deliverables by a subsidiary body and its adoption or endorsement by the decision-making body. This concern might also apply to any interim steps in preparing deliverables. This however has generally been overcome through the delegation of oversight to the oversight bodies described in section B. The provision of simultaneous interpretation of meetings provides another illustration of potential trade-offs. The cost of interpretation at meetings can be significant, but its availability can greatly improve the transparency of the process and the legitimacy of the panel. Modalities for observer participation in meetings of the decision-making body can also play a key role in the panel's ability to deliver outputs that are policy relevant without being policy prescriptive, and in the panel's inclusive participation and its coordination with existing intergovernmental bodies and science-policy interfaces.

10. **Key considerations for the functions of the decision-making body of the panel:**

Common functions of the decision-making body include oversight of the secretariat and any other bodies established under the panel, and setting the work programme and budget for the panel. In considering further functions, it is important to include any functions that are required to produce deliverables related to the functions of the panel. In so doing, and with the view of ensuring the panel is "cost-effective, with the leanest structure consistent with achieving the highest impact" (resolution 5/8 paragraph 6 (h)), OEWG may wish to consider whether some of those functions may be better undertaken by the panel's administrative and scientific oversight body/bodies.

11. **Proposal for a way forward:** The OEWG may wish to propose designating the plenary as the decision-making body of the panel with the following key features:

(a) Composition:

- (i) Open to UN Member countries who are members of the panel

(b) Modalities of work:

- (i) Meets at least annually, or as often as required by the work programme approved by the plenary;
- (ii) Interpretation in all UN languages available for meetings of the plenary;
- (iii) Members of the panel take decisions on matters of substance by consensus, unless otherwise provided in its rules;
- (iv) Its meetings are open to participation of States not members of the panel, United Nations bodies and other intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations;
- (v) Any State not a member of the panel, any United Nations body and any other body, organization or agency, whether national or international, governmental, intergovernmental or non-governmental, indigenous peoples and local communities qualified in matters covered by the panel, and which has informed the secretariat of the panel of its wish to be represented at sessions of the plenary, may participate in the panel as an observer, subject

to the rules of procedure. Observers participate without the ability to cast votes or join or block consensus.

- (vi) Regional economic integration organizations can participate as observers; 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 panel through financial support, among other means. These rights do not grant the ability to vote or to be elected to the Bureau of the panel.

(c) Functions may include:

- (i) Acting as the panel's decision-making body;
- (ii) Responding to requests from Governments, including those conveyed to it by relevant multilateral environmental agreements as determined by their respective governing bodies;
- (iii) Welcoming inputs and suggestions from, and the participation of, related United Nations bodies as determined by their respective governing bodies;
- (iv) Encouraging and taking into account, as appropriate, inputs and suggestions made by relevant stakeholders, such as other intergovernmental organizations, international and regional scientific organizations, environmental trust funds, non-governmental organizations, indigenous peoples and local communities and the private sector;
- (v) Ensuring the active and efficient participation of civil society in the plenary;
- (vi) Selecting officers of the plenary, taking due account of the principle of geographical balance, based on criteria, a nomination process and length of service to be decided by the plenary;
- (vii) Establishing subsidiary bodies as appropriate and selecting their members, taking due account of the principle of geographical balance, based on criteria, a nomination process and length of service to be decided by the plenary;
- (viii) Approving a budget and overseeing the allocation of the financial arrangements;
- (ix) Deciding on an evaluation process for independently reviewing the panel's efficiency and effectiveness periodically;
- (x) Adopting a programme of work for the panel to deliver on each of the functions of the panel;
- (xi) Setting up a transparent peer review process for the production of deliverables by the panel;
- (xii) Deciding on a process for defining the scope of reports and for the adoption or approval of any deliverables produced by the panel (following agreement on the work programme);
- (xiii) Adopting and amending rules of procedure and financial rules.

B. Bodies providing administrative and scientific oversight

12. **Most science policy interfaces have either combined or separated administrative and scientific oversight bodies.** They help ensure, in accordance with resolution 5/8 paragraph 6(a)-(c), the following:

- (a) Ability to deliver outputs that are policy relevant without being policy prescriptive;
- (b) Interdisciplinarity, ensuring contributions from experts with a broad range of disciplinary expertise; inclusive participation, including indigenous peoples; and geographical, regional and gender balance;
- (c) Procedures that seek to ensure that the work of the panel is transparent and impartial and that it can produce reports and assessments that are credible and scientifically robust.

13. Table 2 in Annex I summarizes key features of the oversight bodies of the science-policy interfaces reviewed. The greatest variation in institutional arrangement relates to whether administrative and scientific oversight are undertaken by a single or separate bodies.

14. **Advantages and disadvantages of separating administrative and scientific oversight:** Maintaining administrative and scientific oversight in a single oversight body might facilitate coordination and coherence, especially when decisions on a scientific issue might have implications for administrative decisions. Separating out administrative and scientific oversight may allow for: more targeted, and more manageable, responsibilities; and more flexibility by differentiating the composition and modalities of work of each body. Concerns over coordination can be addressed by providing for members of the administrative oversight body to observe meetings of the scientific oversight body.

15. **Key considerations for the composition of the body/bodies providing administrative and scientific oversight of the panel:** While relevant expertise is essential for members of both administrative and scientific oversight bodies, separate oversight bodies can allow for further differentiating the expertise needs and approach to membership for each body. For example, an administrative oversight body might prioritize regional representation in its member selection process and composition, while the counterpart scientific oversight body might prioritize interdisciplinarity and inclusiveness. In light of UNEA resolution 5/8's provision that the panel will be "an independent intergovernmental body," an administrative oversight body might include two or three seats per region, while a scientific oversight body might opt to include five seats for each region as well as allocate seats for specific intergovernmental organizations or stakeholder groups.² For example, under the UN Convention to Combat Desertification, the membership of the 25-person Science-Policy Interface includes five seats for observers with at least one each from a relevant civil society organization, a relevant international organization and a relevant United Nations organization.³ GEO illustrates the opportunity to differentiate the specializations sought from members of an administrative and scientific oversight body. For example, members of GEO's administrative oversight body should have "demonstrated previous experience with intergovernmental processes in relation to environmental policy and sustainable development" while members of the scientific oversight body should have "Scientific, technical or policy expertise and knowledge of the main elements of the work" of the GEO process.⁴

16. **Key considerations for the modalities of work of the body/bodies providing administrative and scientific oversight of the panel:** It is common practice for science-policy interfaces to provide for the administrative and scientific oversight bodies to establish their own modalities of work once established. Some general considerations can be included in the institutional arrangements for the panel, including provisions for online work when meeting outside of sessions of plenary and detailing the approach to who can participate in meetings. The approach to who can participate in meetings of the Bureau for the Strategic Approach to International Chemicals Management (SAICM) may present an instructional model for a scientific oversight body. Four representatives of non-governmental participants as well as the

² The number of regions can be set in the context of establishing the panel, but it may be most appropriate to align the number of regions for the panel with the number of regions of the organization hosting the secretariat or providing secretariat services for the panel (see section D of this document).

³ [Terms of Reference of the UNCCD Science-Policy Interface](#), 2017, C : Composition (p.2)

⁴ See [Global Environment Outlook \(GEO\): Intergovernmental and Expert-led Scientific Assessment Procedures](#) section 4.2 (d) and 4.3 (d) (pp.7-8) for guidelines for the nomination and selection of IMAG and MESAG members respectively.

chair of the IOMC participate in Bureau meetings. The four representatives of non-governmental participants are elected by and from non-governmental participants to represent each of the health, industry, trade union, and public interest groups.⁵

17. Key considerations for the functions of the body/bodies providing administrative and scientific oversight of the panel: Many of the functions required of administrative and scientific oversight bodies are a reflection of a science-policy interface's functions. In addition, some of the work processes and procedures that are put in place to prepare a science-policy interface's deliverables may lead to additions to these functions over time and as processes are developed and refined.

18. Proposal for a way forward: The OEWG may wish to consider:

- (a) Establishing a Bureau to provide administrative oversight, with the following key features:
 - (i) Composition:
 - a. Two members from each of the regions of the institution providing secretariat services;
 - b. Members of the Bureau are nominated by regions and elected by plenary, keeping in mind the need for the Bureau's membership to have geographical, regional and gender balance;
 - c. Members are selected for their subject matter expertise and demonstrated previous experience with relevant intergovernmental processes.
 - (ii) Modalities of work:
 - a. Bureau meets as necessary, including during sessions of the plenary;
 - b. Bureau meetings, especially intersessional meetings, should be convened online;
 - c. Bureau meetings are conducted in English;
 - d. Bureau meetings are closed, but reports of Bureau meetings are made available for transparency.
 - (iii) Functions may include:
 - a. Addressing requests related to the panel's programme of work and products that require attention by the panel between sessions of the plenary;
 - b. Overseeing communication and outreach activities;
 - c. Reviewing progress in the implementation of decisions of the plenary, if so directed by the plenary;
 - d. Monitoring the secretariat's performance;
 - e. Organizing and helping to conduct the sessions of the plenary;
 - f. Reviewing the observance of the panel's rules and procedures;
 - g. Reviewing the management of resources and observance of financial rules and reporting thereon to the plenary;
 - h. Advising the plenary on coordination between the panel and other relevant institutions;
 - i. Identifying donors and developing partnership arrangements for the implementation of the panel's activities.

⁵ SAICM. 2023. [Bureau of the Conference and the Working Group](#).

(b) Establishing an Interdisciplinary Expert Committee (IEC) to provide scientific oversight, with the following key features:

(i) Composition:

- a. Five members from each of the regions of the institution providing secretariat services;
- b. Four representatives of non-governmental participants as well as the chair of the Environment Management Group may participate in IEC meetings. The four representatives of non-governmental participants are elected by and from non-governmental participants engaged in the work of the panel to represent each of the health, industry, trade union, and public interest groups;
- c. Members of the IEC nominated by regions and elected by plenary, taking into account the need for the IEC to be interdisciplinary, ensuring contributions from experts with a broad range of disciplinary expertise; has inclusive participation, including indigenous peoples, and be geographical, regional and gender balanced;
- d. IEC members are selected for their scientific, technical or policy expertise and knowledge of the main elements of the work of the panel;
- e. Members serve for three years; terms are staggered.

(ii) Modalities of work:

- a. IEC meets as necessary, including during sessions of the plenary;
- b. IEC meetings, especially intersessional meetings, should be convened online;
- c. IEC meetings are conducted in English; and,
- d. Members of the Bureau, representatives of other relevant science-policy interfaces (including IPCC and IPBES), and representatives of relevant multilateral environmental agreements can participate as observers in meetings of the IEC.

(iii) Functions may include:

- a. Providing advice to the plenary on scientific and technical aspects of the panel's programme of work;
- b. Providing advice and assistance on technical and/or scientific communication matters;
- c. Managing the panel's peer-review process to ensure the highest levels of scientific quality, independence and credibility for all products delivered by the panel at all stages of the process;
- d. Engaging the scientific community and other knowledge holders with the work programme, taking into account the need for different disciplines and types of knowledge, gender balance, and effective contribution and participation by experts from developing countries; and,
- e. Assuring scientific and technical coordination among structures set up under the panel and facilitating coordination between the panel and other related processes to build upon existing efforts.

C. Other bodies undertaking or supporting the science-policy interface's work

19. **The science-policy interfaces reviewed turn to a range of other bodies for delivering on their work.** They help ensure, in accordance with resolution 5/8 paragraph 6 (b)-(c) and (f)-(g), the following:

(a) Interdisciplinarity, ensuring contributions from experts with a broad range of disciplinary expertise; inclusive participation, including indigenous peoples; and geographical, regional and gender balance;

(b) Procedures that seek to ensure that the work of the panel is transparent and impartial and that it can produce reports and assessments that are credible and scientifically robust;

(c) Ability to address potential conflicts of interest and safeguard commercially sensitive information;

(d) Flexibility to respond, to the extent possible, to the needs identified by stakeholders and agreed to by its member Governments, and to fulfil the panel's principal functions;

20. Table 3 in Annex I summarizes key features of a selection of other bodies of the science-policy interfaces reviewed. There are generally two broad categories of such bodies: those established specifically to fulfil one of the interface's functions and those that support the interface's work more generally.

21. **Key considerations for the composition of the other bodies of the panel:** Examples of these other bodies undertaking or supporting the panel's work include expert working groups, task forces, committees and author teams. Upon another body's establishment, the interface's decision-making body will typically adopt for it detailed terms of reference setting out composition, modalities and function(s). The composition of these other bodies reflect the expertise and other needs dictated by the body's specific mandate; their composition will also often reflect key features related to inclusiveness and balance detailed in the interface's operating principles. There is a great deal of variety in the size of these other bodies. Larger bodies can make it easier to satisfy notions of balance and inclusiveness; conversely, they can be more time and cost intensive to convene and administer.

22. **Key considerations for the modalities of work of other bodies of the panel:** The nature of work to be undertaken by these other bodies, and the time needed to undertake the work according to best practices (for example adequate time for review processes), will be a key consideration in setting the frequency and mode of meetings. Decisions related to which subsidiary bodies to establish, and their modalities of work, also carry with them budgetary implications. Even as great progress has been made in expanding virtual work modalities since March 2020, many arguments remain for the advantages of in-person work, especially when bringing together participants from across regions (and time zones). Another consideration with budgetary implications relates to a key difference among the interfaces relates to the provision for interpretation of meetings. Only IPCC provides for interpretation of meetings of subsidiary bodies, namely meetings of its three working groups when they meet in plenary to finalize their work. Similar differences exist among science-policy interfaces in areas of chemicals, waste and prevention of pollution. For example, meetings of the Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs) Review Committee of the Stockholm Convention on POPs have simultaneous translation and include translation of working documents in advance of meetings while meetings of the Chemical Review Committee of the Rotterdam Convention on the Prior Informed Consent Procedure for Certain Hazardous Chemicals and Pesticides in International Trade are in English only.⁶

⁶ See Terms of Reference of CRC, [decision RC-1/6](#) and Terms of Reference of POPRC, decision [SC-1/7](#), amended by decisions [SC-4/20](#) and [SC-5/11](#). Note that under the SC-4/20 revision of the POPRC Terms of Reference, "For practical reasons, only the major resource documents for a meeting will be translated

23. **Key considerations for the functions of other bodies of the panel:** Considering the five foreseen functions of the science-policy panel (undertaking horizon scanning; conducting assessments, knowledge management, information sharing, and capacity building),⁷ it may be helpful to note that many of the other bodies summarized in Table 3 focus primarily on an assessment function. In light of the need to ensure that the panel “is cost-effective, with the leanest structure consistent with achieving the highest impact” (paragraph 6(h)), clearly defined and delineated functions can be an important means of ensuring any other bodies that are established by the panel deliver on their mandate.

24. **Proposal for a way forward:** The OEWG may wish to propose:

(a) That the plenary and administrative and scientific oversight body/bodies may establish other bodies under the panel, whether to aid in delivering panel functions or in meeting the panel’s cross-cutting needs; and include that provision in their respective functions and in the rules of procedure;

(b) Providing for specific types of other bodies that can be established, including for example expert groups that will undertake assessments or horizon scanning and task forces that will undertake work on cross-cutting issues;

(c) Providing guidance on the composition, modalities of work and functions of any predefined types of other bodies the panel may establish;

(d) Preparing terms of reference (including composition, modalities of work, and functions) for any other bodies that are provided to be established as a result of outcomes on other issues for consideration before the OEWG, including for example relating to work products and processes.

D. Secretariat arrangements

25. **Resolution 5/8 (paragraph 5(h)) provides for the OEWG to prepare proposals for arrangements for secretariat support of the panel.** Secretariat support is essential to help ensure, in accordance with paragraph 6(c), (e) and (g)-(h), the following:

(a) That the work of the panel is transparent and impartial and that it can produce reports and assessments that are credible and scientifically robust;

(b) That the panel coordinates, as appropriate, with other science-policy bodies, such as IPCC and IPBES;

(c) That the panel has the flexibility to respond, to the extent possible, to the needs identified by stakeholders and agreed to by its member Governments, and to fulfil its principal functions;

(d) That the panel is cost-effective, with the leanest structure consistent with achieving the highest impact.

26. Table 4 in Annex I summarizes key features of secretariat arrangements of the science-policy interfaces reviewed. It highlights the use of technical support units, hosted by countries or partner organizations as a means of providing targeted administrative and scientific support for other bodies established under the panel.

27. **Key considerations for the composition of the secretariat arrangements of the panel:** Some science-policy interfaces turn to technical support units (TSUs) as part of their secretariat arrangements to provide administrative and scientific support dedicated to one of the science-policy interface’s bodies. They are typically hosted by a government (or a science institution in that country). TSU staff are employed by the host institution and can be an effective means of deploying in-kind support for the work of the science-policy interface. If both a secretariat and

into the six official languages of the United Nations and distributed at least six weeks in advance of the meeting. The term “major resource documents” means the summary in English of the documents supporting the proposal for adding a chemical to Annexes A, B or C to the Convention, the risk profile, the risk management evaluation and any report or recommendation for the meeting.”

⁷ see [report of OEWG1.2](#), UNEP/SPP-CWP/OEWG.1/7 Annex II

TSUs are to make up secretariat arrangements for the panel, then attention should be paid to clarifying work responsibilities and providing for strategies to ensure coordination of their work as both are in a position to for example provide technical assistance and substantive support.

28. Key considerations for the modalities of work of the secretariat arrangements of the panel: Determining whether the secretariat should be housed or hosted by one or more existing intergovernmental organizations is a central consideration for establishing the secretariat.

Existing science policy interfaces point to a variety of strategies to ensure the secretariat can benefit from the existing infrastructure of an IGO, such as existing financial rules. These strategies can include hosting or co-hosting, where one or more IGOs are explicitly designated as “parent” institutions (IPCC follows this model), or arranging for the IGO to provide secretariat services to an independent secretariat (IPBES follows this model). Selecting either strategy does not preclude the science-policy interface establishing special relationships, or partnerships, with other IGOs (see UNEP/SPP-CWP/OEWG.2/5). The OEWG is convening under the auspices of the UNEA and resolution 5/8 paragraph 9 invites WHO “to play a role, as appropriate” in the OEWG. In considering secretariat arrangements, benefits could be harnessed that would arise from close partnerships with UNEP and WHO, such as access to the depth of expertise among each organization as well as access to the breadth of engaged stakeholders across both the environment and health issue arenas.

29. Key considerations for the functions of the secretariat arrangements of the panel: In addition to specifying those secretariat functions that arise from the everyday operation of a science-policy interface (preparing and supporting meetings, preparing the budget and overseeing financial arrangements), secretariat functions can also include those arising from the functions of the science-policy interface and the establishment of other bodies. In assigning functions to the secretariat, it is important to consider whether the task is administrative in nature or substantive. If work will require expert judgment, an expert body under the science-policy interface may be a means of ensuring the panel’s legitimacy and credibility. Conversely, when considering establishing a body under the science-policy interface, careful consideration of its envisioned functions may help in determining whether these may more suitably, or more efficiently, be undertaken by a TSU or the secretariat.

30. Proposal for a way forward: The OEWG may wish to propose:

- (a) Establishing a secretariat for the panel with the following functions:
 - (i) Organizing meetings and providing administrative and technical support for meetings, including the preparation of documents and reports to the plenary and its subsidiary bodies as needed;
 - (ii) Assisting members of the plenary, and administrative and scientific oversight body/bodies to undertake their respective functions as decided by the plenary, including facilitating communication between the various stakeholders of the panel;
 - (iii) Facilitating communication among any other bodies that might be established by the panel;
 - (iv) Disseminating public information and assisting in outreach activities and in the production of relevant communication materials;
 - (v) Preparing the panel’s draft budget for submission to plenary, managing the financial arrangements and preparing any necessary financial reports;
 - (vi) Assisting in the mobilization of financial resources;
 - (vii) Assisting in the facilitation of monitoring and evaluation of the panel’s work.
- (b) The provision for technical support units to provide scientific, technical and organisational support to bodies established under the panel, with the following functions:
 - (i) Support the Co-chairs and Bureau of the body they are supporting for the panel;

- (ii) Contribute to the implementation of relevant policies, such as the conflict of interest policy if there is one;
 - (iii) Participate, through their TSU heads, as advisory members in the administrative oversight body of the panel.
- (c) Securing secretariat services from, or hosting or co-hosting arrangements with, UNEP, WHO, UNEP and WHO, or from another IGO;
- (d) That the OEWG secretariat solicit proposals from States to host the Secretariat for consideration at OEWG-3.

E. Financial Arrangements

31. **Resolution 5/8 (paragraph 5(i)) provides for OEWG to prepare proposals for voluntary financing of the work of the panel.** Financial arrangements are essential to help ensure, in accordance with resolution 5/8 paragraph 6(a), (c) and (g)-(h), the following:

- (a) The panel's ability to deliver outputs that are policy relevant without being policy prescriptive;
- (b) The panel has procedures that seek to ensure that the work of the panel is transparent and impartial;
- (c) The panel has the flexibility to respond, to the extent possible, to the needs identified by stakeholders and agreed to by its member Governments, and to fulfil its principal functions;
- (d) The panel is cost-effective, with the leanest structure consistent with achieving the highest impact.

32. Table 5 in Annex I summarizes key features of financial arrangements of the science-policy interfaces reviewed. The summary table highlights the importance of voluntary contributions, both financial and in-kind and the need for transparency regarding contributions and the budget process.

33. Financial arrangements typically include a trust fund for collecting resources and a budget process (often tied to the programme of work) for allocating and disbursing funds. The budget is typically adopted at set intervals by the interface's decision-making body.

34. The financial arrangements of a science-policy interface require transparency, and oversight is typically provided by both the decision-making body and the administrative oversight body, while administration falls under the secretariat functions. Contributions to a science-policy interface are typically welcomed from a range of resources, even as in practice most resources are from member governments. Science-policy interfaces also rely on a range of in-kind contributions. In addition to the essential contribution by experts participating in the work of the panel, such in-kind contributions can include secretariat staffing, the provision of technical support unit services, provision of conference services, and provision of communication services. Transparency as to the origin of in-kind and monetary contributions can guard against potential conflicts of interest.

35. The financial arrangements of a science-policy interface are essential to ensure the panel has the flexibility to respond, to the extent possible, to the needs identified by stakeholders and agreed to by its member Governments, and to fulfil its principal functions.

36. **Proposal for a way forward:** The OEWG may wish to propose:

- (a) Establishing a trust fund, to be allocated by plenary in an open and transparent manner, to collect voluntary financing to support the work of the panel, to be governed by financial rules and procedures adopted by the plenary;
- (b) Contributions be welcomed from Governments, as well as from United Nations bodies, the Global Environment Facility, other intergovernmental organizations and stakeholders such as the private sector and foundations, on the understanding that such funding will come without conditionalities, will not orient the work of the panel and cannot be earmarked for specific activities;

- (c) Providing for the plenary to regularly review panel expenditures and budget proposals, and to adopt budgets for the panel;
- (d) Providing for the administrative oversight body to regularly review budget information prepared by the secretariat;
- (e) Providing for the secretariat to prepare the panel's draft budget for submission to plenary, managing the financial arrangements and preparing any necessary financial reports.

III. Rules of procedure for sessions of the plenary

37. It is expected that resolution on items discussed in Section II of this document will largely inform the details of the rules of procedure document. A proposed table of contents for the rules of procedure for sessions of the panel's plenary, developed based on a review of rules of procedure of other science-policy interfaces, is set out below:

- (i) Scope
- (ii) Definitions
- (iii) Venues, dates and notice of sessions
- (iv) Members and observers
- (v) Admission of observers
- (vi) Agenda
- (vii) Representation, credentials and accreditation
- (viii) Members and operation of the Bureau and/or equivalent structure(s)/institution(s)
- (ix) Election of members of the Bureau and/or equivalent structure(s)/institution(s)
- (x) Nominations
- (xi) Subsidiary bodies (members, operation, election of members...)
- (xii) Conduct of business
- (xiii) Decision-making
- (xiv) Languages
- (xv) Modifications to the rules of procedure

38. **Proposal for a way forward:** The OEWG may wish to consider:

- (a) Whether the outline for the rules of procedure may serve as an appropriate starting point for developing rules of procedure for sessions of the plenary, for consideration at OEWG-3, reflecting agreements reached during OEWG-2;
- (b) The potential outline for rules of procedure for sessions of the plenary.

Annex I

Summary Tables

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).

Comprehensive versions of these tables are available in UNEP/SPP-CWP/OEWG.2/INF/4.

Table 1. Summary Table: Relevant key features of science-policy interfaces' decision-making body

Relevant key features of decision-making body	Science-policy interface					Comments
	IPCC ⁸	IPBES ⁹	IRP ¹⁰	GEO ¹¹	Montreal Protocol Assessment Panels ¹²	
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	Open to Member States of UNEA and members of specialized agencies.	SAP: hundreds of experts; EEAP: about 30 experts;	The IPBES plenary composition is most in line with UNEA resolution 5/8's paragraph 3: “the panel should be an independent intergovernmental

Relevant key features of decision-making body	Science-policy interface					Comments
	IPCC ⁸	IPBES ⁹	IRP ¹⁰	GEO ¹¹	Montreal Protocol Assessment Panels ¹²	
			in Steering Committee tied to annual contribution.		TEAP: 19 experts, with its five Technical Options Committees (TOCs) consisting of 20-40 experts, each (approximately 150 TOC experts)	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 more frequently as required by the work programme ¹³	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; 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.	Frequency of meetings is tied to the functions assigned to the decision-making body as well as to the time-frame of required decisions (especially the timeframe for setting and approving budgets and work programmes).
<i>Availability of interpretation/ Languages</i>	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
<i>Observers</i>	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,	Participation is open to regional economic integration organizations as observers. ¹⁴ Any Observer may, upon the invitation of the Chair, participate in the Plenary without the ability to cast	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	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	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	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

Relevant key features of decision-making body	Science-policy interface					Comments
	IPCC ⁸	IPBES ⁹	IRP ¹⁰	GEO ¹¹	Montreal Protocol Assessment Panels ¹²	
	subject to acceptance by the Panel. Organisations can request admission as an observer.	votes or join or block consensus.	biannual meetings as observers.	observer. Experts deemed relevant to the GEO process may also attend.	TEAP/TOCs/TSBs consider it necessary.	with relevant key stakeholders (UNEP/SPP-CWP/OEWG.2/5)
<i>Decision-making</i>	“use all best endeavours to reach consensus”; for approval, adoption and acceptance of reports, differing views shall be explained and, upon request, recorded.	The members of the Platform take decisions on matters of substance by consensus, unless otherwise provided in its rules.	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 voting, most notably for elections of members of the IPCC Bureau. ¹⁵
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.

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 ¹⁶	IPBES ¹⁷	IRP ¹⁸	GEO ¹⁹	Montreal Protocol Assessment Panels ²⁰	
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 also the IRP's decision-making body	<i>Intergovernmental and Multi-stakeholder Advisory Group (IMAG)</i> and <i>Multidisciplinary Expert Scientific Advisory Group (MESAG)</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 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	<i>Bureau</i> : 10 members <i>MEP</i> : 25 members	<i>Panel</i> : group of 35 to 40 eminent scientists and experts on sustainable resource management and sustainable development. <i>Steering Committee</i> : see Table 1	<i>IMAG</i> : 35 members <i>MESAG</i> : 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.
<i>Membership</i>	<i>Bureau</i> : IPCC Chair, three IPCC Vice Chairs, Co-Chairs of the three Working Groups and the Task Force on National	<i>Bureau</i> : 10 members (two per UN region, taking into account the principle of geographical representation)	Panel members serve in their individual capacity and not as representatives of organizations or governments.	<i>IMAG</i> : 25 Member State experts (5 per UN region) and 10 representatives from Major Groups and Stakeholders..	Panel members serve in their individual capacity and not as representatives of organizations or governments.	Scientific oversight bodies emphasize members serving in their individual capacity. Geographical balance often first consideration in planning membership, gender and

Relevant key features of administrative and scientific oversight body/bodies	Science-policy interface					Comments
	IPCC ¹⁶	IPBES ¹⁷	IRP ¹⁸	GEO ¹⁹	Montreal Protocol Assessment Panels ²⁰	
	Greenhouse Gas Inventories (TFI) and the members of the Bureau of each Working Group. <i>Executive Committee:</i> <u>Members:</u> IPCC Chair, IPCC Co-Chairs of Working Groups I, II and III and of the TFI, and IPCC Vice Chairs <u>Advisory Members:</u> Head of Secretariat, the four Heads of the Technical Support Units	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. <i>MEP:</i> Taking into account disciplinary and gender balance, each region will nominate five candidates for membership of the MEP.		<i>MESAG:</i> 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.	<i>SAP:</i> hundreds of experts; <i>EEAP:</i> about 30 experts; <i>TEAP:</i> 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.	disciplinary balance may be secondary in practice. Different interpretations of geographic balance across science-policy interfaces.
<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.	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.	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.

Relevant key features of administrative and scientific oversight body/bodies	Science-policy interface					Comments
	IPCC ¹⁶	IPBES ¹⁷	IRP ¹⁸	GEO ¹⁹	Montreal Protocol Assessment Panels ²⁰	
		MEP: 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.			Nominations ²¹ 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.	
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 operate in English only.

Relevant key features of administrative and scientific oversight body/bodies	Science-policy interface					Comments
	IPCC ¹⁶	IPBES ¹⁷	IRP ¹⁸	GEO ¹⁹	Montreal Protocol Assessment Panels ²⁰	
<i>Decision-making</i>	“all best endeavours to reach consensus” ²²	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 and procedures for the panel.

²² More details in Rule 10 of Principles Governing IPCC Work

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 ²³	IPBES ²⁴	IRP ²⁵	GEO ²⁶	Montreal Protocol Assessment Panels ²⁷	
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. Bureau of relevant WG or TF selects experts "taking	<i>Expert Groups:</i> (such as: <i>Expert groups to deliver a scoping report</i>): scientists from all relevant disciplines, indigenous and local knowledge experts, policy practitioners, and experts from all	Each <i>Working Group</i> consists of Panel members and external experts with expertise in a field relevant to the scientific study and assessment it will develop. Each <i>Working Group</i> includes Lead	<i>Author Teams</i> consist of two co-chairs, two vice-chairs, a rapporteur, coordinating lead authors, lead authors, contributing authors and fellows. Their selection is decided on by the Executive	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> co-chairs, in consultation with <i>TEAP</i> , for a period of	Composition of a body often a reflection of both the body's functions and the science-policy interface's principles.

²³ 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](#);

²⁴ 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)

²⁵ Relevant sources: IRP. 2016. [IRP Policies and Procedures](#)

²⁶ Relevant sources: [Global Environment Outlook \(GEO\): Intergovernmental and Expert-led Scientific Assessment Procedures](#); [UNEA Rules of Procedure](#)

²⁷ 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 ²³	IPBES ²⁴	IRP ²⁵	GEO ²⁶	Montreal Protocol Assessment Panels ²⁷	
	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.	relevant stakeholder groups. ²⁸ <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	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.	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.	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						

²⁸ 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”.

Relevant key features of select other bodies undertaking or supporting the interface's work	Science-policy interface					Comments
	IPCC ²³	IPBES ²⁴	IRP ²⁵	GEO ²⁶	Montreal Protocol Assessment Panels ²⁷	
<i>Mode and frequency of meetings</i>	<i>WGs and TFs:</i> set by schedule of preparation of deliverables under each assessment cycle <i>COI Committee:</i> meets at least once a year in advance of the IPCC Session, and in person or otherwise as often as required.	<i>Expert groups and task forces:</i> as needed <i>Committee on COI:</i> meets by teleconference as necessary. If a physical meeting is needed, it will be held before or after regular Bureau meetings.	<i>Working Group</i> meetings will be organized in cooperation and consultation with the Secretariat.	According to timeline set for GEO-7, with projected launch of GEO-7 at UNEA in February 2026. ²⁹	<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 and based on schedule of both MOP and Open Ended Working Group (OEWG) meetings	Many of these other bodies rely on online meetings to carry out their work, yet the scientific and technical 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.
<i>Procedures</i>	<i>WGs:</i> in line with procedures for clearing products/outputs ³⁰ <i>COI Committee:</i> 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.	<i>Task Force on Capacity Building:</i> Products of the task force deliverables be reviewed by the Bureau and the MEP and forwarded to the Plenary for its information and consideration. <i>Committee on Conflicts of Interest (COI):</i> members of the Committee are expected to reach consensus. If it cannot be reached, exceptionally, on	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.

²⁹ See expected meeting frequency set out in [GEO-7 Timeline](#).

³⁰ 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 ²³	IPBES ²⁴	IRP ²⁵	GEO ²⁶	Montreal Protocol Assessment Panels ²⁷	
		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.				
Functions (selected)	<i>TF on National Greenhouse Gas Inventories (TFI)</i>: 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.	<i>Task Force on Capacity Building</i>: oversees and take part in the 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.	IRP Working Groups are created to develop scientific studies and assessments for consideration and approval by the Panel, as per the objective and principles of IRP.	Author teams are constituted for the undertaking of time-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	TOCs and TSBs (e.g., task forces) provide information on a broad 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.	Functions of these other bodies may be tied to the delivery of a specific 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 secretariat arrangements

Relevant key features of secretariat arrangements	Science-policy interface					Comments
	IPCC ³¹	IPBES ³²	IRP ³³	GEO ³⁴	Montreal Protocol Assessment Panels ³⁵	
Secretariat	IPCC Secretariat	IPBES Secretariat	IRP Secretariat	UNEP	Ozone Secretariat	
Composition ³⁶ <i>Secretariat</i>	14 Members of staff and 4 interns ³⁷ ; led by Secretary	23 Members of staff ³⁸ , led by Executive Secretary	7 Members of staff and 2 interns, ³⁹ 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	Some science-policy interfaces also turn to technical support units (TSUs) to support the interface's bodies and preparation of deliverables. TSUs are staffed by the hosting organization and provide essential support to the interface. Experience with TSUs points to the importance of clearly defining TSU roles and
<i>Technical Support Units</i>	TSU office hosted by one or more countries; staffed by hosting organization.	TSU office hosted by one or more countries; TSUs	N/A	TSU provided by partner institutions outside UNEP in support of specified	N/A	

³¹ Relevant sources: [Governance and Management: Functions of the IPCC Secretariat and Technical Support Units](#) (2012); [1989 MOU between UNEP and WMO](#)

³² 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

³³ Relevant sources: IRP. 2016. [IRP Policies and Procedures](#)

³⁴ Relevant sources: [Global Environment Outlook \(GEO\): Intergovernmental and Expert-led Scientific Assessment Procedures](#)

³⁵ 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

³⁶ 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.

³⁷ From [IPCC Secretariat website](#), accessed : 12 August 2023

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

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

Relevant key features of secretariat arrangements	Science-policy interface					Comments
	IPCC ³¹	IPBES ³²	IRP ³³	GEO ³⁴	Montreal Protocol Assessment Panels ³⁵	
	TSUs “provide scientific, technical and organizational support and support the Co-Chairs and Bureaux in the preparation and production of all relevant IPCC products”	staffed by hosting organization. TSUs “coordinate and support work of expert group or task force” ⁴¹		time-bound expert-driven tasks. TSUs work under contract with the nominating Member State and under the supervision of the UNEP Secretariat.		providing means of ensuring institutional continuity. ⁴⁰
Modalities of work <i>Hosting arrangements</i>	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)
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;	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	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	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	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

⁴¹ [Decision IPBES-7/1: Rolling work programme of the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services up to 2030](#)

⁴⁰ 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 secretariat arrangements	Science-policy interface					Comments
	IPCC ³¹	IPBES ³²	IRP ³³	GEO ³⁴	Montreal Protocol Assessment Panels ³⁵	
	Contributes to implementing protocols/strategies/policies; Promotes and maintains cooperation with UN system and liaises with two parent organizations: WMO and UNEP	prepares necessary financial reports; Assists in mobilization of financial resources.	well as editing and publication, and conducting communication and dissemination activities.	and funds needed for implementation of GEO procedures.		example facilitating information sharing.

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

Relevant key features of financial arrangements	Science-policy interface					Comments
	IPCC ⁴²	IPBES ⁴³	IRP ⁴⁴	GEO ⁴⁵	Montreal Protocol Assessment Panels ⁴⁶	
Composition <i>Name of fund</i>	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 <i>Administration arrangements</i>	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	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.

⁴² Relevant sources: [Appendix B to the Principles Governing IPCC Work](#)⁴² (1996, revised 2011), ; [1989 MOU between UNEP and WMO](#)

⁴³ 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)

⁴⁴ Relevant sources: IRP. 2016. [IRP Policies and Procedures](#)

⁴⁵ Relevant sources: [Global Environment Outlook \(GEO\): Intergovernmental and Expert-led Scientific Assessment Procedures](#); [UNEA Rules of Procedure](#)

⁴⁶ 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 ⁴²	IPBES ⁴³	IRP ⁴⁴	GEO ⁴⁵	Montreal Protocol Assessment Panels ⁴⁶	
				implementation of the GEO procedures.		
<i>Budget process</i>	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 budget are taken by the Panel's plenary session.	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.
<i>Contributions</i>	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</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;	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-	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,

Relevant key features of financial arrangements	Science-policy interface					Comments
	IPCC ⁴²	IPBES ⁴³	IRP ⁴⁴	GEO ⁴⁵	Montreal Protocol Assessment Panels ⁴⁶	
	<i>cash contributions by IPCC Members are to be treated as if in square brackets</i>	voluntary cash contributions provided by members of the Platform and other contributors to the Trust Fund; in-kind contributions.	OECD countries “shall strive to provide annual financial or in-kind contributions to the IRP in accordance with their capacities.”			
<i>Are there limits on contributions?</i>	N/A	The amount of contributions from private sources must not exceed the amount of contributions from public sources in any biennium. ⁴⁷	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 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	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.

⁴⁷ 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 ⁴²	IPBES ⁴³	IRP ⁴⁴	GEO ⁴⁵	Montreal Protocol Assessment Panels ⁴⁶	
		arrangements of the Platform.				