



**UNITED
NATIONS**

UNEP/SPP-CWP/OEWG.2/INF/5



**United Nations
Environment
Programme**

Distr.: General
30 August 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**

Nairobi, 11–15 December 2023
Item 4 of the provisional agenda*

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

**Background document on the panel's relationships with
relevant key stakeholders**

Note by the secretariat

The annex to the present note contains supporting information relevant to the panel's relationships with relevant key stakeholders. 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 may wish to consider the information provided. The annex has not been formally edited.

* UNEP/SPP-CWP/OEWG.2/1.

Annex*

I. Introduction

1. This document aims to complement working document UNEP/SPP-CWP/OEWG.2/5 “Relationships with relevant key stakeholders”.
2. Section II provides supporting information on the description of stakeholders. Section III provides a brief overview of stakeholder relationships under existing science-policy interfaces based on a non-exhaustive review of their official documentation. 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 Technology and Economic Assessment Panel of the Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer (TEAP), the Arctic Monitoring and Assessment Programme (AMAP), the Science-Policy Interface of the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification (UNCCD SPI), and those 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 information for individual interfaces is structured in three parts, where applicable: stakeholders’ roles in the interface (providing supporting details for tables 1 and 2 in the annex of working document UNEP/SPP-CWP/OEWG.2/5), approaches to relationships with stakeholders (providing supporting details for section III of working document UNEP/SPP-CWP/OEWG.2/5), and lessons learned from effectiveness evaluations (providing supporting details for sections II and III of working document UNEP/SPP-CWP/OEWG.2/5).

II. Supporting information on descriptions of stakeholders

3. Existing science-policy interfaces, other international instruments and intergovernmental bodies have used a variety of descriptions of stakeholders:
 - [IPBES](#) describes stakeholders as “both contributors to and end users of the Platform” in its stakeholder engagement strategy. The Strategy further elaborates that “stakeholders will be individual scientists and knowledge holders as well as institutions, organizations and groups working in the field that can: (a) contribute to the activities of the work programme through their experience, expertise, knowledge, data, information and capacity-building experience; (b) use or benefit from the outcomes of the work programme; and (c) encourage and support the participation of scientists and knowledge holders in the work of the Platform”.
 - [IPCC](#) describes stakeholders as “individuals or groups who have anything of value (both monetary and non-monetary) that may be affected by climate change or by the actions taken to manage anticipated climate risks. They might be policymakers, scientists, communities, and/or managers in the sectors and regions most at risk both now and in the future”.
 - [SAICM](#) defines stakeholders as follows: “The main stakeholders in the Strategic Approach are understood to be Governments, regional economic integration organizations, intergovernmental organizations, non-governmental organizations and individuals involved in the management of chemicals throughout their life cycles from all relevant sectors, including, but not limited to, agriculture, environment, health, industry, relevant economic activity, development cooperation, labour and science. Individual stakeholders include consumers, disposers, employers, farmers, producers, regulators, researchers, suppliers, transporters and workers”.
 - [WHO](#) identifies the following on its website among the diverse global health stakeholders that engage with the organization: “decision-makers: Ministries of Health, government agencies, other government departments at the national level” and “influencers: health partnerships, foundations, intragovernmental and nongovernmental organizations, civil society, media, professional associations, and WHO collaborating centres”.

* The annex has not been formally edited.

- [AMAP](#) identifies in its 2012 Communication Strategy stakeholders both within and outside the Arctic that include “business and industry groups, NGOs, etc.” and “special target groups such as health professionals”.

III. Stakeholder relationships under existing science-policy interfaces

Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC)

Stakeholders’ roles in the interface

4. Participate as observers as defined in [IPCC Policy and Process for Admitting Observer Organizations](#):

- “A body or an agency, whether national or international, governmental or non-governmental, which is qualified in matters covered by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) and which has informed the IPCC Secretariat of its wish to be represented at Sessions of the IPCC and any of its Working Groups, may be so admitted subjected to acceptance by the Panel.”
- “Only admitted observer organizations may designate representatives to attend Sessions of the IPCC and Sessions of a Working Group at plenary level. Observer organizations have to register their representatives for each Session in advance.”
- “Being admitted as observer organization to Sessions of the Panel and of its Working Groups does not imply that the organization is admitted or invited to workshops, expert meetings and other closed meetings. During a Session of the Panel or a Working Group certain meetings may be closed to observers. Observer organizations are not admitted to any Session of the IPCC Bureau or Task Force Bureau.”

5. Roles described on the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC)’s [page](#):

- “The Conference of the Parties (COP) has repeatedly expressed its appreciation for the IPCC's work and called on the Convention bodies, in particular the Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technological Advice (SBSTA), to continue its cooperation with the IPCC and to seek its advice.”
- “It has also urged Parties to contribute financially to the IPCC's work, as well as to nominate and support experts for the IPCC, especially from developing countries.”

6. Roles described in the [Decision Framework for Special Reports, Methodology Reports and Technical Papers](#): “The IPCC should continue to be responsive to the **information needs of UN conventions** [...] **Requests from UNFCCC** should be accorded higher priority than requests from other Conventions and organisations.”

7. Roles described in the [Procedures for the Preparation, Review, Acceptance, Adoption, Approval and Publication of IPCC Reports](#):

- “Each IPCC Assessment Report, Special Report, Methodology Report and Synthesis Report [...] should be preceded by a **scoping** meeting [...] Nominations for participation will be solicited from Government Focal Points, **observer organisations**, and Bureau members.”
- “Coordinating Lead Authors, Lead Authors and Review Editors are selected by the relevant Working Group/Task Force Bureau [...] from those experts cited in the lists provided by governments and observer organisations, and other experts as appropriate, known through their publications and works.”

8. Roles described in the [IPCC Factsheet: How does the IPCC review process work?](#): “[...] This First Order Draft is reviewed by experts. Every interested expert is encouraged to submit comments. Working Groups, members of the author teams, governments, IPCC observer organizations, and other organizations can all encourage experts to register as reviewers, facilitating the participation of experts encompassing as wide a range of views, expertise and geographical representation as possible.[...]”

9. **Conduct/foster research and generate relevant data and knowledge for the assessments.** e.g., “Climate Analytics scientists have served as guest editors for a special issue in the academic journal [...]. They’ve overseen the editorial process of 15 papers that have **contributed to the**

literature base on 1.5°C and small islands for the 1.5°C Special Report.” (Source: Climateanalytics.org).

10. As a counterpart in joint work with IPCC, e.g., [IPBES-IPCC Co-Sponsored Workshop on Biodiversity and Climate Change](#), and IPCC-TEAP 2005 [Safeguarding the Ozone Layer and the Global Climate System](#).
11. Roles described in the [IPCC Communications Strategy](#):
 - (a) “Third parties [*i.e.* stakeholders] can play an additional valuable role **taking elements of IPCC assessments to create accessible products aimed at specific audiences**. The IPCC takes note of such derivative products, and may engage with relevant organizations that produce them. However, such products must not be considered joint productions or in any way products of the IPCC.”
 - (b) “**Engaging and building relationships with the media** is an important way in which the IPCC can **communicate the information contained in its reports, as well as its processes and procedures**.”
 - (c) “The secretariat will support **national focal points in communications activities in their countries**, and will encourage **the translation of text into local languages**, by providing IPCC materials, where practical. The National Focal Points will receive communications materials and information about events in a timely manner, and may seek advice from the Secretariat on IPCC communications-related matters.”

Approaches to relationships with stakeholders

12. As listed above, IPCC has established rules and procedures for stakeholders to participate in the plenary as an observer and provide inputs in the panel’s work such as into work programme development and nominating experts (*i.e.*, Approach 1 outlined in working document UNEP/SPP-CWP/OEWG.2/5¹).
13. Additionally, IPCC has formal linkages with UNFCCC, through:
 - (a) **the convention text of UNFCCC**: Article 21.2 of UNFCCC, the Secretariat “will cooperate closely with [IPCC] to ensure that the Panel can respond to the need for objective scientific and technical advice.” It is further noted that “the Joint Working Group (JWG) of the SBSTA and the IPCC meets regularly to ensure coordination and exchange information on the activities of the two bodies.”
 - (b) **UNFCCC COP’s decisions**, as noted on the UNFCCC’s [website](#): “The Conference of the Parties (COP) has repeatedly expressed its appreciation for the IPCC’s work and called on the Convention bodies, in particular the Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technological Advice (SBSTA), to **continue its cooperation with the IPCC and to seek its advice**.”

Lessons learned from the effectiveness evaluation

14. *Working Group Co-Chair’s Perspectives on Lessons Learned from AR6* (IPCC-LVII/INF.12): “10. The increased relevance of IPCC assessments has resulted in requests for co-sponsored meetings. These have resulted in valuable outputs that will continue to inform IPCC assessments, but they have also **required intense engagement by Co-Chairs, Bureau members and TSUs**.”
15. Lessons captured in the *Climate change assessments – Review of the processes and procedures of the IPCC* (2010; https://archive.ipcc.ch/pdf/IAC_report/IAC%20Report.pdf):
 - (a) “Recommendation: The IPCC should complete and implement a **communications strategy** that emphasizes transparency, rapid and thoughtful responses, and **relevance to stakeholders**, and that includes guidelines about who can speak on behalf of IPCC and how to represent the organization appropriately.”

¹ Approach 1 refers to “inclusion in the institutional arrangements, rules of procedure or work-related processes and procedures of provisions for certain roles that stakeholders may take.” Relationships with relevant key stakeholders in existing science-policy interfaces that are incorporated in arrangements or procedures typically include: (a) provisions in the rules of procedure for relevant key stakeholders’ accreditation and participation in the meetings of the plenary and some of its subsidiary bodies, 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 its deliverables, and review drafts.

Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES)

Stakeholders' roles in the interface

16. Participate as observers as defined in the [Rules of Procedure for Sessions of the Plenary](#):
- (a) “Observers mean any State not a member of the Platform and any body, organization or agency, whether national or international, governmental, intergovernmental or non-governmental, including organizations of and representatives of Indigenous Peoples and local communities, which is qualified in matters covered by the Platform, and which has informed the secretariat of the Platform of its wish to be represented at session of the Plenary, subject to provision set out in the IPBES rules of procedure.
- (b) “Rule 7. Any Observer may, upon the invitation of the Chair, participate in the Plenary without the ability to cast votes or join or block consensus.”
17. Roles described in the [Financial Procedures](#):
- (a) “Rule 4: The Trust Fund is open to **voluntary contributions** from all sources, including Governments, United Nations bodies, the Global Environment Facility, other intergovernmental organizations and other stakeholders, such as the private sector and foundations. [...]”
- (b) “Rule 9: **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. [...]”
18. Roles described in the [Procedure for Receiving and Prioritizing Requests Put to the Platform](#):
- (a) “2. Governments and multilateral environmental agreements related to biodiversity and ecosystem services can **send requests** to the Platform on scientific and technical matters that require the Platform’s attention and action.”
- (b) “3. **Inputs and suggestions** from United Nations bodies related to biodiversity and ecosystem services [...] are also welcomed by the Platform. **Inputs and suggestions** made by relevant stakeholders, such as other intergovernmental organizations, international and regional scientific organizations, environment trust funds, non-governmental organizations, indigenous peoples and local communities and the private sector, will also be encouraged and taken into account, as appropriate.”
19. Roles described in the [Procedures for the Preparation of Platform Deliverables](#):
- (a) **Express views on proposals under development, including their prioritization:** para 3.1(h) “Based on the results of the detailed scoping exercise and comments received from members of the Platform and **other stakeholders**, the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel and the Bureau decide whether to proceed with the assessment, assuming that it can be conducted within the budget and timetable approved by the Plenary. If however, the Panel and the Bureau conclude that the assessment should not go forward, they will so inform the Plenary for its review and decision.”
- (b) **Express views on scoping:** para 3.1(e) “If the Plenary approves the issue for detailed scoping, the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel, through the secretariat, will request nominations from Governments and invite relevant stakeholders to present names of experts to assist with the scoping. The secretariat will compile the lists of nominations, which will be made available to Multidisciplinary Expert Panel.”
- (c) **Nominating and express views on selecting experts:** para 3.1(i) “If the decision is to proceed with the assessment, the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel requests nominations from Governments and invites relevant stakeholders to present names of experts to contribute to the preparation of the report.”
- (d) **Provide data and knowledge:** para 3.5 “Assessments should be based on publicly available and peer-reviewed literature, as well as reports and other materials, including indigenous and local knowledge, which is not published in the peer-reviewed literature but is available to experts and reviewers.”

- (e) **Review drafts:** para 3.1(s) “The Plenary reviews and may accept the report and approve the summary for policymakers”, and stakeholders may participate in the Plenary as observers as stated above.
20. Roles described in the [IPBES Manual for National Focal Points](#): being informed, submitting requests, nominating experts, reviewing drafts of IPBES products, supporting the uptake of completed IPBES assessments, engaging with the functions of IPBES other than assessments, coordinating national engagement and participation through national and/or regional platforms, and supporting the undertaking of national or subregional assessments by governments.
21. In addition, the work of IPBES is supported by [collaborative supporters](#) in other ways, inter alia:
- (a) “**Support to the organization of workshops** for IPBES fellows, for meetings of assessment authors, for dialogue workshops to support the implementation of the IPBES approach to recognizing and working with indigenous and local knowledge, or to meetings to advance the work of IPBES on scenarios and models of biodiversity and ecosystem services;”
 - (b) “**The organization of events or the preparation of information materials to support the uptake of IPBES products at the national and regional level**, in particular completed IPBES assessments and the preliminary guide on multiple conceptualizations of values;”
 - (c) “**Amplification of IPBES communications and outreach activities**, especially through print and broadcast media and social media channels, as well as through support to IPBES branding, public relations and audio-visual activities;”
 - (d) “**Support to or organization of workshops and activities to build the capacity of governments and stakeholders to engage in the work of IPBES**, for example the review of IPBES assessments, the undertaking of national and (sub)regional assessments of biodiversity and ecosystem services and the establishment of national and (sub)regional platforms or networks;”
 - (e) “**The provision of information and data** for indicators used in IPBES assessments;”
 - (f) “**The provision of information** about the work of IPBES as part of activities and events.”
22. Roles described on the *Knowledge and Data* page of the IPBES website: “Recognising the importance of raising awareness on IPBES-identified knowledge gaps and of accessing and managing data to the implementation of the platform work programme, IPBES established a **task force on knowledge and data** and agreed on terms of reference guiding its operations implementing this deliverable. Activities have been grouped under two main components: **data management and new knowledge generation**. The **technical support unit** for knowledge and data are co-hosted by [BiodivERSA](#) and the [Senckenberg Nature Research Society](#), respectively.”
- (a) **Membership:** “The task force is composed of [...] (c) **representatives** of qualified national, regional and international scientific organizations, centres of excellence and institutions, including experts on indigenous and local knowledge, known for their work and expertise on issues related to the mandate of the task force; and (d) **recognized individual experts** [...]”
 - (b) Responsibilities:
 - a. “Supporting assessment experts in **identifying, prioritizing and mobilizing existing knowledge and data** needed for IPBES assessments;”
 - b. “**Guiding** the secretariat, including the dedicated technical support unit, **in the management of the data, information and knowledge** used in IPBES products, including the development of the web-based infrastructure, to ensure their long-term availability and data interoperability;”
 - c. “**Supporting** the Bureau and the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel in **reviewing the knowledge needs and gaps** identified through IPBES assessments and other IPBES deliverables and in catalysing the generation of new knowledge and data.”

Approaches to relationships with stakeholders

23. IPBES has included some relationships with stakeholders in its institutional arrangements, rules of procedure and work-related processes and procedures for certain roles that stakeholders may take (i.e., Approach 1 outlined in working document UNEP/SPP-CWP/OEWG.2/5).
- (a) Participate as observers as defined in the [Rules of Procedure for Sessions of the Plenary](#): “Rule 25. 3 The co-chairs of the [Multidisciplinary Expert] Panel may invite the Bureau to participate as observers of the Panel. The chairs of the scientific subsidiary bodies of the multilateral environmental agreements related to biodiversity and ecosystem services and the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change will be observers. The Panel may also invite experts from the United Nations organizations that are partners of the collaborative partnership agreement to participate as observers, as appropriate.”
 - (b) Roles described in the [Procedures for the Preparation of Platform Deliverables](#):

Express views on proposals under development, including their prioritization: para 3.1(h) “Based on the results of the detailed scoping exercise and comments received from members of the Platform and **other stakeholders**, the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel and the Bureau decide whether to proceed with the assessment, assuming that it can be conducted within the budget and timetable approved by the Plenary. If however, the Panel and the Bureau conclude that the assessment should not go forward, they will so inform the Plenary for its review and decision.”

Express views on scoping: para 3.1(e) “If the Plenary approves the issue for detailed scoping, the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel, through the secretariat, will request nominations from Governments and invite relevant stakeholders to present names of experts to assist with the scoping. The secretariat will compile the lists of nominations, which will be made available to Multidisciplinary Expert Panel.”

Nominating and express views on selecting experts: para 3.1(i) “If the decision is to proceed with the assessment, the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel requests nominations from Governments and invites relevant stakeholders to present names of experts to contribute to the preparation of the report.”

Provide data and knowledge: para 3.5 “Assessments should be based on publicly available and peer-reviewed literature, as well as reports and other materials, including indigenous and local knowledge, which is not published in the peer-reviewed literature but is available to experts and reviewers.”

Review drafts: para 3.1(s) “The Plenary reviews and may accept the report and approve the summary for policymakers”, and stakeholders may participate in the Plenary as observers as stated above.
24. IPBES has established strategic partnerships with selected stakeholders (i.e., Approach 2 outlined in working document UNEP/SPP-CWP/OEWG.2/5²).
- (a) **For UN entities**, at its second session in 2014, IPBES adopted a [decision](#) on **collaborative partnership arrangement** to establish an institutional link [between IPBES and UNEP, UNESCO, FAO and UNDP](#).
 - (b) **For Multilateral Environmental Agreements (MEAs)**, in its decision IPBES-4/4, IPBES was requested to finalize **memoranda of cooperation [between the secretariats of IPBES and several MEAs](#)** (CBD, CMS, Ramsar Convention, CITES, UNCCD). Governing bodies of several MEAs have developed procedures for or taken decisions regarding their engagement with IPBES.
 - (c) Additionally, IPBES has established strategic partnerships with IUCN, Future Earth, the Global Biodiversity Information Facility (GBIF), the Inter-American Institute for Global Change Research (IAI) through **memorandums of understanding**.
 - (d) At its third session in 2015, IPBES adopted [a stakeholder engagement strategy and a guidance on the development of strategic partnerships and other collaborative arrangements](#) to formalize the procedure for establishing strategic partnerships with

² Approach 2 refers to "establishment of formal strategic partnerships."

stakeholders. The **guidance** on the development of strategic partnerships and other collaborative arrangements considered the following elements:

a. Purpose of strategic partnerships in supporting the work programme: (1) increasing alignment of activities; providing direct support; building and managing relationships; facilitating stakeholder engagement; (2) recognizing areas that can be undertaken without entering into more formal partnership arrangements: liaising and communicating; recognizing what others produce or do as contributions to the platform; promoting cooperation and coordination; informing and potentially influencing the priorities of others; informing and potentially influencing working practices.

b. Key considerations to be taken into account in establishing strategic partnerships: (1) criteria; (2) potential roles and responsibilities of the different partners; (3) specific deliverables and terms of reference; (4) necessary time frames; (5) existing partnership rules and policy of the hosting institution; (6) contract contents (purpose and objective; commitments of each party; conflict of interest; liability; intellectual property rights; confidentiality; representation and use of logos; amendment; entry into force; termination; settlement of disputes); (7) procedures and operating principles of the Platform (both in choosing partnerships and later implementation); (8) review process.

c. Form of strategic partnerships: (1) memorandum of understanding on intent, areas of common interest ... (2) joint project document or work programme; (3) transfer of funds or not; (4) Contract

d. Categories of strategic partnership and processes for their identification: (1) bodies identified in the functions, operating principles and institutional arrangements: United Nations System and Multilateral Environmental Agreements; (2) technical support for implementation of the work programme: supporting the work of task forces; supporting thematic and global, regional and subregional assessments; policy support, including that related to methodological assessments; communications, outreach and stakeholder engagement

(e) IPBES has also made calls for offers to host the **technical support unit**, e.g., for the [business and biodiversity assessment](#) and for the [transformative change assessment](#).

25. Furthermore, IPBES have implemented and is facilitating a number of informal ways to engage stakeholders in its work (i.e., Approach 3 outlined in working document UNEP/SPP-CWP/OEWG.2/5³), including:

(a) **[Self-organised stakeholder networks](#)**: IPBES encourages the self-organization of an inclusive, open-ended network of stakeholders, guided by the stakeholder engagement strategy. Presently, there are two: the Open-Ended Network of IPBES Stakeholders (ONet) and the International Indigenous Forum on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IIFBES), which co-lead the preparations for the IPBES Stakeholder Day(s) as well as facilitate the event with inputs from the secretariat.

(b) **[Stakeholder days](#)**: “open to all members, observers and stakeholders of IPBES, have been organized in advance of each previous Plenary session as opportunities for a wide range of interested organizations to get updates on the IPBES process and to discuss their engagement in IPBES through informal exchange of views on specific aspects of the Plenary session’s agenda.”

(c) **[Stakeholder registry](#)**: “The purpose of the IPBES stakeholder registry is to maintain an updated list of current contact information, both to assist stakeholders with their networking activities and to enable the secretariat to directly share breaking news, announcements, calls and other important information.”

(d) **[National and regional platforms and networks](#)**: IPBES developed [Opportunities for National Platforms and Networks to Engage with and Contribute to the Work of IPBES](#), including (1) introduction; (2) why they are important to the work of IPBES; (3) how they can engage with and contribute to IPBES; (4) how IPBES promotes them; (5) background –

³ Approach 3 refers to "promotion of stakeholder involvement through informal arrangements, including in delivery of the work programme."

the role of the task force on capacity-building. In addition, IPBES organized [online dialogue workshop](#) with them.

- (e) **Collaborative supporters:** These are organizations and institutions supporting the work of IPBES during its first work programme in the following areas:
- a. “Support to the organization of workshops for IPBES fellows, for meetings of assessment authors, for dialogue workshops to support the implementation of the IPBES approach to recognizing and working with indigenous and local knowledge, or to meetings to advance the work of IPBES on scenarios and models of biodiversity and ecosystem services;”
 - b. “The organization of events or the preparation of information materials to support the uptake of IPBES products at the national and regional level, in particular completed IPBES assessments and the preliminary guide on multiple conceptualizations of values;”
 - c. “Amplification of IPBES communications and outreach activities, especially through print and broadcast media and social media channels, as well as through support to IPBES branding, public relations and audio-visual activities;”
 - d. “Support to or organization of workshops and activities to build the capacity of governments and stakeholders to engage in the work of IPBES, for example the review of IPBES assessments, the undertaking of national and (sub)regional assessments of biodiversity and ecosystem services and the establishment of national and (sub)regional platforms or networks;”
 - e. “The provision of information and data for indicators used in IPBES assessments;”
 - f. “The provision of information about the work of IPBES as part of activities and events.”
- (f) IPBES-6/1: welcomed the efforts of partner organizations in support of capacity-building initiatives under the rolling plan, invited other organizations to join those efforts by offering technical and financial contributions that match identified capacity-building needs; welcomed the efforts of indigenous peoples and local communities and partner organizations.

Lessons learned from the effectiveness evaluation

26. Lessons captured in the *Report on the Review of the Platform at the End of its First Work Programme* ([IPBES/7/5](#) and [IPBES/7/INF/18](#)):

- (a) “More work has to be done (a) to **understand the complex web of stakeholders and potential contributors** to deliverables and to navigate the science-policy interface [...]”
- (b) “**Finding 6:** [...] Such navigation [of the interface between data, science, policy and practice] requires time, resources, and engagement from all members, partners and other stakeholders of the Platform to yield results.”
- (c) “Consideration of the need to include partnership with strategic partners from **the broad research community to work outside of the assessment scope** (e.g. for addressing gaps identified in the assessments). The need for a clear view on the **role of the private sector** as a stakeholder and not simply a funder. **Countries not platform members** are often not aware of the full potential available to them.”
- (d) “**Finding 8:** [...] So far, each of the UN-4 are involved to a different degree in the partnership. [...] Some point to “missed opportunities” in terms of expertise mobilization in IPBES activities, wider dissemination of IPBES products or joint programming to maximise synergies for instance. However, there may be good reasons for that: the distance also has benefits in terms of independence (clearly valued by both member states and stakeholders) [...]. Yet, the association with the UN-4 partners is an important source of legitimacy for IPBES in order to reach out to various sectors and stakeholder groups (see use of logos on communication materials).”
- (e) “**Finding 10:** [...] “IPBES should be **commended for being one of the first international expert organisations to formally develop a stakeholder engagement strategy and process as a key part of its mandate**. The IPBES stakeholder strategy was

determined at IPBES 2014 (Decision IPBES-3/4). There is a practice of holding stakeholder consultations ahead of Plenary meetings (stakeholder days are also live-webcast), stakeholders account for 1/4 of the participants in plenary on average, stakeholders participate remotely in the review of draft assessment reports and are able to provide inputs in terms of nominations of experts for deliverables and for the identification of priority issues to be considered in the work programme. [...] In most assessments' participation of stakeholders (outside of business interests) has occurred and has been welcome, allowing to draw on a wider pool of expertise, including from the broad scientific community. IPBES also has memoranda of understanding with a number of intergovernmental and NGO stakeholders. [...] While stakeholders have shown to be important allies in supporting IPBES' work and outreach, there are also expectations of participation in IPBES to contribute substantially and voice their own needs. [...] Stakeholder engagement also happens at national level where, in some countries, national platforms or working groups on IPBES have been established. In other countries, this work is undertaken by NFPs [National Focal Points]. This helps broadening the actors involved in IPBES, and raise awareness and understanding of what the Platform does and how it operates. However, some stakeholders operate globally (i.e. beyond one single national jurisdiction) and as such rely on the mechanisms for participation available globally (e.g. the stakeholder days prior to Plenary meeting)."

(f) “**Finding 12:** [...] [co-design and co-production of the assessments with the potential users] has begun to be addressed with a meeting organised in 2018 for the NFPs to meet with the global assessment co-chairs and some of the Coordinating Lead Authors prior to the government review of the second-order draft – a first effort that deserves continuation. As with many aspects of IPBES there are key roles for all actors in this process, not least of which are the NFPs.”

(g) “**Finding 31:** [...] IPBES has led international organisations dealing especially with IK [Indigenous Knowledge] in documenting approaches and procedures to deal with the many different worldviews inherent in IK. [...] In 2015, the Forest Peoples Program made the following observation in a blog ‘While expressing their solidarity with other stakeholders, the indigenous participants stressed they will continue to interact with the process in their own capacity as knowledge and rights holders.’”

(h) “**Finding 40:** [...] the somewhat restricted attempts to engage the private sector in providing financial support for assessments in exchange for visibilities are unlikely to yield significant results for sustainable financing.”

(i) “**Recommendation 3:** A clear strategy should be developed for enhanced and more synergetic collaboration and engagement with key strategic stakeholders as strategic partners, allowing for differentiation of status (beyond observer status) to enhance mutual benefits.”

(j) “**Recommendation 4:** [...] stakeholder engagement should occur throughout the assessment process to implement the true co-production of assessments. This will critically rely on appropriate nominations by the Platform members, partners and other stakeholders, in particular of practitioners, biodiversity managers, policy makers and policy experts, and rely on the capacity to generate mutual benefits and to communicate and coordinate at different scales (interest, capacities and coordination should be developed at the national scale, then be leveraged by IPBES at regional and global scales).”

(k) “**Recommendation 9:** One approach could be to establish **national IPBES committees, chaired by the national focal points** that can assist the nomination process. [...] The nomination process is not only about securing nominations for tasks, but also nurturing relationships with existing and potential contributors to the Platform.”

International Resource Panel (IRP)

Stakeholders' roles in the interface

27. Roles of stakeholders in IRP described in the [Policies and Procedures of the International Resource Panel](#) (IRP-PP-2016):

(a) **Participate as observers in IRP biannual meetings:** “68. The Secretariat may invite an individual or body, whether national or international, governmental or non-governmental, qualified in the topics covered by the IRP, to participate in IRP biannual meetings as

observers.” “69. Observers to IRP biannual meetings may contribute to the discussions but will not participate in decision-making processes of the IRP.”

(b) **Roles of strategic partners:** “65. IRP Strategic Partners contribute to the work of the IRP in accordance with the principles included in paragraph 4 of these procedures. They provide **support in the development and dissemination of IRP publications, enhancing its policy and academic impact, and creating synergies with other relevant stakeholders**, among others.”

(c) **Roles in relation to the work programme:** “73(a). **Scoping Exercise and Work Programme.** A strategic planning exercise is conducted by the IRP every 4 years to define the strategy and priority areas of the IRP. As part of this exercise, public consultations may be organized to capture **views from external public or private stakeholders**. [...]”

(d) **Roles in relation to the development of assessments:**

“73(d). **External Expert Review Process.** After approval of the First draft, the Review Editor and Expert Reviewers are appointed and the external expert review process is carried out [...] Expert Reviewers are external experts tasked to review and comment on the accuracy and completeness of the scientific assessment. [...]”

74. Global Assessment on Natural Resources Use and Management: Scoping exercise and Work Programme. Panel Co-Chairs convene a **scoping** meeting with Panel and Steering Committee members as well as external experts as needed, to discuss potential focus, content, structure and work plan, and to **appoint the Lead Author(s) and Working Group members** of the Global Assessment on Natural Resources Use and Management. [...]”

78. Scoping exercise and Work Programme. A Thematic Study and Assessment may be proposed at any moment by an IRP member. The Secretariat may organize a scoping meeting if deemed necessary for the development of the Terms of References.

82. Scoping exercise and Work Programme. A Rapid Study and Assessment may be proposed at any moment by an IRP member. The Secretariat may organize a scoping meeting if deemed necessary for the development of the Terms of References.

Approaches to relationships with stakeholders

28. In addition to the aforementioned admission of observers and seeking inputs from stakeholders with regard to the work programme and the development of assessment (i.e., Approach 1 outlined in working document UNEP/SPP-CWP/OEWG.2/5), IRP establishes strategic partnerships with selected stakeholders as defined in the [Policies and Procedures of the International Resource Panel](#) (IRP-PP-2016) (i.e., Approach 2 outlined in working document UNEP/SPP-CWP/OEWG.2/5).

(a) “63. IRP strategic partners are those entities that are active and qualified in the topics covered by the IRP. They may include UN agencies (other than the United Nations Environment Programme), international, regional and national organizations, intergovernmental bodies, non-governmental organizations, private and public institutions, business and industry associations, research centers, universities, foundations, science-policy platforms, among others.”

(b) “64. IRP Strategic Partners are selected through the following process: (a) Members of the Panel, Steering Committee and Secretariat may recommend candidates. Eligible parties as per paragraph 63 of these procedures may also submit their application. (b) The Secretariat, in consultation with Panel and Steering Committee Co-Chairs, reviews and approves the strategic partnership requests.”

(c) “66. IRP Strategic Partners may be invited by the Panel and Steering Committee Co-Chairs to participate in biannual meetings but will not participate in decision-making processes of the IRP.”

(d) “67. The Secretariat will inform Steering Committee and Panel members about IRP Strategic Partners and their contribution.”

Global Environment Outlook (GEO) process

Stakeholders' roles in the interface

29. Roles of stakeholders in the GEO process are described in the [Intergovernmental and Expert-led Scientific Assessment Procedures](#) as follows:

- (a) **Participate as observers at the ad hoc open-ended meeting:** “Any accredited observer of UNEA who is qualified in matters covered by the authorizing body, and which has informed the Secretariat of its wish to be represented at the meetings, may participate as an observer. Experts deemed relevant to the GEO process may also attend.”
- (b) “[The Intergovernmental and Multi-stakeholder Advisory Group (IMAG)] will provide policy guidance for the functions undertaken by the Executive Director as directed by UNEA, including: (i) **providing advice** to experts and the Secretariat in the drafting of the **scope** of GEO assessments; (ii) **provide advice in conducting nomination and selection processes for external experts** who will contribute to the [GEO] process [...]; (iii) **providing advice on the identification of intergovernmentally defined needs and terms for the provision of support for capacity-building, knowledge generation and support for policymaking** [...] and **the provision of support services for addressing those needs**, in partnership with relevant institutions as appropriate; (iv) **providing advice on the development of a flexible, multi-year workplan** and time-bound budget [...]; and (v) interacting with assessment authors and the Multi-disciplinary Expert Scientific Advisory Group (MESAG) in **ensuring reliable and relevant advice** is provided to the Executive Director throughout the GEO process.
- (c) “[MESAG] will undertake the following functions [...]: (i) **oversee the scientific integrity of the entire [GEO] process, provide scientific oversight and advice on the selection** of authors, fellows and review editors and represent the [GEO] process at key science events; (ii) **develop recommendations to promote approaches** that help ensure the scientific credibility of GEO as a robust and rigorous assessment based on scientifically accepted methods and analysis from multiple sources, including grey literature, Indigenous and local knowledge and citizen science and science published in other languages than English; (iii) **provide validation of the GEO process by issuing a final opinion** to UNEP’s Chief Scientist on the overall scientific credibility to each GEO process; (iv) **develop recommendations** to help ensure the conceptual, analytical and scientific consistency and rigour **in the development and implementation of the multi-year work plan and programme of activities** [...]”
- (d) Technical support units (TSUs): “could be provided by partner institutions outside UNEP in support of **specified time-bound expert driven tasks**. TSUs would work under contract with the nominating Member State and under the supervision of the UNEP Secretariat. TSUs would provide in-kind support to the process but could also receive agreed financial support. Nomination and selection of institutions would follow these procedures and standardized terms.”
- (e) Collaborating Centres: “could also partner with the Secretariat to **support various enabling functions such as capacity building, knowledge generation and support for policymaking**. These centres will also provide **expert support needed that may not be available within the Secretariat (e.g., translations, identifying emerging issues, outreach, providing regionally relevant data)**. Nomination and selection of institutions would follow these procedures and standardized terms of operation, likely defined in an MOU with UNEP.”
- (f) **Roles in relation to work programme:** “At the request of UNEA, the Executive Director may at regular intervals initiate the following process for receiving requests and undertaking prioritization and planning of additional GEO functions: (i) The Secretariat invites submissions from Member States, experts and stakeholders on requests for environmental issues to be assessed or undertaken as part of the GEO process”; (ii) The Secretariat administers [...] consultations [...] with Member States, experts and stakeholders to facilitate submissions and prioritisations [...]”.
- (g) **Roles in relation to the scoping and design of GEO comprehensive and thematic assessments:** “[...] The process involves the preparation of a first draft scoping document to be considered by a [...] scoping workshop with the experts selected by the Executive

Director, with the advice of the IMAG. The draft scoping document is then submitted to Member States and stakeholders for review.”

(h) **Roles in relation to the nomination and selection of experts:**

- a. “8.2 Selection of coordinating lead authors, lead authors, fellows, and review editors

The Executive Director [...] will request nominations from Member States, expert institutions and individuals to present names of experts [...]

- b. “8.3 Nomination and selection processes for task forces, advisory groups and workshops

When appropriate, the Executive Director [...] will request nominations from Member States, expert institutions and individuals to present names of experts to participate in task forces, advisory groups and workshops. [...]

(i) **Roles in relation to the preparation of comprehensive and thematic assessments:**

- a. “9.1(b) Review of first order draft report. The first order draft of the report is peer reviewed by experts in an open and transparent process using established peer review guidelines. [...]

- b. “9.1(d) The second order and subsequent drafts of the assessment report and the first order and subsequent drafts of the summary for policymakers are reviewed by both Governments and experts in an open and transparent process. [...]

30. Roles described in the [Tasks and Responsibilities of Experts and Focal Points](#):

- (a) “To prepare and update the list of national experts required to assist in the implementation of the GEO’s work programme, and to arrange for the provision of integrated comments on the accuracy and completeness of the scientific, technical and/or socioeconomic content and the overall balance between scientific, technical and/or socioeconomic aspects of the drafts.”

Approaches to relationships with stakeholders

31. As listed above, GEO has integrated relationships with stakeholders in its institutional arrangements, rules of procedure and work-related processes and procedures for certain roles that stakeholders may take (i.e., Approach 1 outlined in working document UNEP/SPP-CWP/OEWG.2/5).

32. As described in the [Intergovernmental and Expert-led Scientific Assessment Procedures](#):

- (a) **IMAG:** “The members of IMAG may be nominated by Member States, members of specialized agencies, and UNEP-accredited Major Groups and Stakeholders. [...] The Executive Director will appoint a limited number of geographic, disciplinary and gender balanced representatives of Member States, members of specialized agencies and stakeholder.”

- (b) **MESAG:** “The members of the MESAG may be nominated by Member States, members of specialized agencies, UNEP-accredited Major Groups and Stakeholders, specialized institutions and groups of assessment experts. [...] Members of the MESAG will act in their individual capacity and serve for the length of a GEO assessment cycle.”

33. As described in [Tasks and Responsibilities of Experts and Focal Points](#): “Government review will typically be carried out among a number of departments and ministries. For administrative convenience, each Government and stakeholder should designate one **focal point** for all GEO activities.”

34. In addition, stakeholders have the opportunity to establish **technical support units** (TSU) or become **collaborating centres** to support GEO’s work, a form of strategic partnerships (i.e., Approach 2 outlined in working document UNEP/SPP-CWP/OEWG.2/5).

- (a) Technical support units (TSUs): “could be provided by partner institutions outside UNEP in support of specified time-bound expert driven tasks. TSUs would work under contract with the nominating Member State and under the supervision of the UNEP Secretariat. TSUs would provide in-kind support to the process but could also receive agreed

financial support. Nomination and selection of institutions would follow these procedures and standardized terms.”

(b) Collaborating Centres: “could also partner with the Secretariat to support various enabling functions such as capacity building, knowledge generation and support for policymaking. These centres will also provide expert support needed that may not be available within the Secretariat (e.g., translations, identifying emerging issues, outreach, providing regionally relevant data). Nomination and selection of institutions would follow these procedures and standardized terms of operation, likely defined in an MOU with UNEP.”

35. Furthermore, GEO follows the general UNEP rules of procedure for engaging stakeholder groups, e.g., see in [Handbook for Stakeholder Engagement at the United Nations Environment Programme](#) (UNEP):

(a) GEO applies the nine Major Groups approach (as outlined in [Agenda 21](#)), recognizing the following categories of stakeholders, represented by not-for-profit, non-governmental organizations: farmers, women, scientific and technological community, children and youth, Indigenous Peoples and their communities, workers and trade unions, business and industry, non-governmental organizations, and local authorities.

(b) “Recognizing that since Agenda 21, the stakeholder landscape has become more diverse and in line with paragraph 43 of “[The Future We Want](#)”, UNEP cooperates also with non-governmental organizations that are not covered by the nine Major Groups, including foundations. For accreditation purposes these are however requested to accredit themselves under the NGO Major Group or under another of the nine Major Groups that is closest to their area of activity.”

(c) “While private sector associations that are registered as NGOs are covered under the Business and Industry Major Group, UNEP’s cooperation with individual companies is not covered under this Handbook. In 2017, UNEP has established a dedicated Private Sector Unit responsible of engaging private sector entities into the work of UNEP.”

Technology and Economic Assessment Panel (TEAP) of the Montreal Protocol

Stakeholders’ roles in the interface

36. **Participate as observers** as defined in [Decision XXIV/8](#): Terms of Reference, Code of Conduct and Disclosure and Conflict of Interest Guidelines for the Technology and Economic Assessment Panel and its Technical Options Committees and Temporary Subsidiary Bodies:

(a) “3.4 Observers: No observers will be permitted at TEAP, TOC or TSB meetings. However, anyone can present information to the TEAP/TOCs/TSBs with prior notice and can be heard personally if the TEAP/TOCs/TSBs consider it necessary.”

(b) “4.4 Comment by public: Any member of the public can comment to the co-chairs of the TOCs and TSBs with regard to their reports and they must respond as early as possible. If there is no response, these comments can be sent to the TEAP co-chairs for consideration by TEAP.”

Arctic Monitoring & Assessment Programme (AMAP)

Stakeholders’ roles in the interface

37. **Participate as observers** as described in [Arctic Council Observer Manual for Subsidiary Bodies](#):

(a) “**4.3 Observers:** Observer status in the Arctic Council is open to: (a) non-Arctic States; (b) inter-governmental and inter-parliamentary organizations, global and regional; (c) non-governmental organizations that the Council determines can contribute to its work. [...]”

(b) “**4.5 Invited guests and other experts:** Where the Arctic States participating in a subsidiary body agree, the chair of the body may invite any person or organization that can contribute expertise and is able to contribute to the work of that body to participate in specific

meetings. These persons or organizations do not have observer status, and subsidiary bodies should thus decide on the necessity of a given expert on a meeting-by-meeting basis.”

(c) “The primary role of Observers is to observe the work of the Arctic Council. Furthermore, Observers are encouraged to **continue to make relevant contributions through their engagement primarily at the level of Working Groups.**”

(d) “Observers may **propose projects** through an Arctic State or a Permanent Participant but the total **financial contributions** from all Observers to any given project may not exceed the financing from Arctic States, unless otherwise decided by the Senior Arctic Officials.”

(e) “Observers are invited to contribute to the body of work of Arctic Council subsidiary bodies through: a. **Project proposals**, through an Arctic State or a Permanent Participant in a collaborative manner; b. **Views expressed on projects under development**, including Working Group work plans; c. **In-kind contributions** to existing and developing projects, such as expert involvement and support; d. **Financial contributions** to existing and developing projects, such as direct project funding (not to exceed the financing from Arctic States, unless otherwise decided by the Senior Arctic Officials) in a transparent manner; e. **Hosting of project-specific, expert-level workshops or gatherings**, as approved by the Senior Arctic Officials on a case-by-case basis.”

Approaches to relationships with stakeholders

38. As listed in the previous section, AMAP has integrated relationships with stakeholders in its institutional arrangements and rules of procedure for certain roles that stakeholders may take (i.e., Approach 1 outlined in working document UNEP/SPP-CWP/OEWG.2/5).

Lessons learned from the effectiveness evaluation

39. Lessons captured in the [External Review of the AMAP Strategy](#):

(a) “Several characteristics of the AMAP process were identified that contribute to widespread recognition of and respect for its products. These include: a. A consistent history of focusing on issues relevant to Arctic residents; b. **Actively involving Arctic residents in elements of AMAP assessments**; c. Addressing issues comprehensively, using assessment teams drawn from within and outside of Arctic countries; d. Ensuring that all included and referenced data and reports meet the highest standards of technical quality and reliability based on documented quality assurance and control protocols, laboratory inter-comparison practices, and peer review; e. **Publishing its products in forms and formats relevant for a wide spectrum of stakeholders**; and f. **Maintaining operational flexibility as a mechanism to undertake and complete multi-partner projects.**”

(b) “As awareness of Arctic change and pollution increases (at least in part as a consequence of past AMAP activities), many organizations begin to produce their own reports and assessments. Often these organizations desire and assume collaboration with AMAP. This convergence of attention generally results in the same relatively small pool of experts being solicited for multiple overlapping studies. The current attention to short-lived climate forcers by several separate groups, each hoping to produce a prompt and high-quality assessment, demonstrates the acute problem: **without coordination, global and regional demand for expertise outstrips the community available or, more seriously, exceeds the community willingness to participate.** At the same time, as Arctic assessments increasingly require integration of “western science” and traditional knowledge, **the vision of Arctic peoples fully participating**, through AMAP, to develop Arctic solutions to Arctic issues remains, at best, **only partially realized, at least in part due to inadequate funding.**”

(c) “It will need to maintain and support its expert teams and to invigorate its processes and products with younger recruits. Heightened collaboration, with traditional and new contributors, partners, sponsors and stakeholders, will draw on AMAP’s existing strengths while also presenting new challenges.”

(d) “Over the same time period we expect that the Arctic hydrocarbon industry will and should become an increasingly utilized source of data, expertise, and advice, as well as a partner in both studies and assessments.”

(e) “At present, AMAP outreach and communication occurs mostly through and associated with its specific products, largely through a mixture of product-specific, sponsor-

generated, or nationally coordinated plans and mechanisms. [...] This [external review] panel welcomes the development of a directed and deliberate education and outreach plan as part of the AMAP Strategic Plan. The panel foresees a need for increasing activities in communication with Arctic communities, in the fields of formal and informal education, and in conveying Arctic urgencies, each discussed briefly below. An enhanced AMAP communication program should resonate with and serve well the Arctic Council. **Enhanced communications will require but also highlight and benefit the extensive partnerships and collaborations expected above.**”

(f) “An increasing need is foreseen for informed discussion among AMAP, its partners, and Arctic communities during the initiation of AMAP projects, during implementation, and as a condition of successful completion. Arctic residents and their regional and pan-Arctic organizations represent an essential partner in these communication activities. Communication activities and practices stimulated by IPY [the International Polar Year] and the regular production of clear fact sheets in many local languages may represent useful examples. Most of the community monitoring activities listed above use networks, web sites and newsletters to communicate among partners across many communities – they also represent useful and ongoing communication mechanisms.”

(g) “This panel foresees an increasing need for better linkages between AMAP activities and products and Arctic educational institutions, with the University of the Arctic as a primary and obvious partner. Teacher networks stimulated by IPY, within but also crossing between North America and Europe, provide models for Arctic to Arctic and Arctic to world educational exchanges.”

Science-Policy Interface of the United Nations to Combat Desertification (UNCCD SPI)

Stakeholders’ roles in the interface

40. **Participate as observers and additional roles** as described in the [Terms of Reference of the Science-Policy Interface](#) (2017):

(a) “15. **Observers of the SPI from United Nations and other international organizations.** In addition to contributing to the science-policy work of the SPI, these observers serve a unique and vital role in: **Promoting networking and cooperation** to avoid duplication of activities, and harness synergies; **Identifying scientific knowledge requirements** of policy-makers and land managers, and the stakeholders they serve; **Ensuring that the SPI is regularly and fully apprised of relevant developments in the science-policy domain** of the organization they represent; **Contributing to disseminate and encourage the uptake** of the outputs of the SPI work; **Mobilizing scientific and technical expertise** to contribute to the implementation of the SPI work programme and to participate in the peer review of SPI reports, as appropriate.”

(b) “16. **Observers of the SPI from Civil Society Organizations (CSOs).** In addition to contributing to the science-policy work of the SPI, these observers serve a unique and vital role in: **Identifying scientific knowledge requirements** of CSOs, and through them, land users, with particular attention to the most vulnerable; **Ensuring that the SPI is regularly and fully apprised of developments that are relevant to the science-policy realm** with respect to CSOs and that should be considered in the work of the SPI; **Contributing to disseminate and encourage the uptake** of the outputs of the SPI work; **Mobilizing scientific and technical expertise** to contribute to the implementation of the SPI work programme and to participate in the peer review of SPI reports, as appropriate.”

(c) “17. **Co-leadership roles.** All SPI members and observers can serve as a **co-Lead responsible for coordinating the work** in response to objectives and coordination activities included in the SPI work programme for each biennium. [...]”

(d) “19. Members and observers for the SPI have the responsibility to [...] b. **Contribute directly to delivering the work programme** of the SPI [...]; c. Advise the SPI and its co-chairs on technical matters; d. Maintain the reputation of the SPI and support its products [...] g. **Encourage scientific exchange with scientists** from their regions and/or domains on SPI activities”

Approaches to relationships with stakeholders

41. As stated above, UNCCD SPI has integrated relationships with stakeholders in its institutional arrangements and rules of procedure for certain roles that stakeholders may take as observers (i.e., Approach 1 outlined in working document UNEP/SPP-CWP/OEWG.2/5).

Lessons learned from the effectiveness evaluation

42. Lessons captured in the [Assessment of the UNCCD Science-Policy Interface](#) (May 2017):
- (a) “The **connections with the larger scientific community** are gained by establishing responsive partnerships on an ad hoc basis, depending on the topic, such as through current development of special sessions in conferences or special issues of journals.”
 - (b) “**Recommendation 2. Interaction between the SPI and the IPBES, and SPI and the IPCC** [...] could be **enhanced by more formalized links and collaborations modes**. [...]”
 - (c) “A category of ‘**temporary observers**’ could be added to allow the participation, on an ad hoc basis, of members of other scientific bodies (IPCC, IPBES, etc). They could attend specific meetings on topics where collaboration with them and their bodies is desirable and where efforts need to avoid duplication of activities, and harness synergies.”
 - (d) “**Recommendation 5. SPI should continue engaging partners to support its substantive work**. [...] the production of background documents that require greater efforts will require some kind of externalisation. This is the case for objective 2 of the current work programme where the SPI commissioned an institution to develop the main report, which they will then convert into a policy brief.”

World Health Organization (WHO)

Stakeholders’ roles in the interface

43. Roles described in the [WHO Handbook for Guideline⁴ Development, 2nd edition](#):
- (a) “Clinical and public health guidelines are produced by many organizations, including national agencies, intergovernmental organizations and specialist medical societies. From time to time it may be appropriate for WHO to collaborate with these groups to produce a **joint guideline**.”
 - (b) “WHO develops guidelines whenever Member States, WHO country offices, external experts or other stakeholders **ask for guidance** on a clinical or public health problem or policy area.”
 - (c) When developing WHO guidelines, four groups need to be established: the steering group; the GDG [guideline development group]; the external review group; and the systematic review team.
 - a. “The **external review group** is composed of persons interested in the subject of the guideline as well as individuals who will be affected by the recommendations (often referred to as “stakeholders”). Thus, the external review group may include technical experts, end-users, programme managers, advocacy groups and individuals affected by the condition addressed in the guideline, among other stakeholders. [...] Members of the external review group can be asked to participate in different stages of the guideline development process, depending on the nature of the topic and the needs of the steering group. The external review group may review the guideline’s scope and key questions [...] in the early stages of the guideline development process, and the final guideline document at the end. When the external review group reviews the final guideline, its role is to identify any errors or missing data and to comment on clarity, setting-specific issues, and implications for implementation – not to change the recommendations formulated by the GDG.”

⁴ A WHO guideline is any document developed by the World Health Organization containing recommendations for clinical practice or public health policy.

- b. Other individuals and groups involved in guideline development: the guideline methodologist; consultants with additional technical expertise; **observers at the meeting of the guideline development group**; designated writer/editor.
- c. Observers at the meeting of the guideline development group: “Stakeholders such as nongovernmental organizations, advocacy groups, funders, target audiences, and service-users may be invited to send a member or representative to GDG meetings. **Their role is to observe, although the meeting chair may ask them for information or opinion.** They do not participate in the formulation of recommendations.”
- (d) **“The funder(s) of a guideline can play no role in the guideline development process and should not influence the recommendations.** Private funders, including industry or foundations, may wish to observe GDG meetings, but they must not contribute in any way to the systematic review and evidence appraisal process, and, most particularly, to the formulation of recommendations. Governmental and intergovernmental agencies [...] may fund and/or partner in guideline development. Employees of such funders or partners cannot be members of the GDG but should be included in the steering group. An employee of a governmental or United Nations organization who provides specified voluntary funding to support development of the guideline should not be a member of the GDG. However, if the membership of such a person is considered essential in light of the expertise required within the GDG, then this dual relationship must be identified as a conflict of interest and managed accordingly.”
- (e) **“Dissemination** involves making guidelines accessible, advertising their availability and distributing them widely. [...] The extent of mandatory free distribution depends on the type of publication but can include depository libraries, school of public health, schools of medicine, WHO country offices and missions in Geneva.”
- (f) **“Implementation** of a guideline should be taken into account right from the beginning of the guideline development. Implementation is generally the responsibility of national or subnational groups, which explains why their participation in guideline development is critical.”
44. Roles described in the [Emerging Trends and Technologies: a Horizon Scanning for Global Public Health](#) (2022):
- (a) Phase I: Recruitment of contributors and issues: “[...] Our aim was to identify a diverse group of experts balanced by discipline, geographical distribution and gender. We explicitly ensured that the participants met these criteria, as discipline, age, cultural background and gender are effective proxies for **diverse perspectives**, which ensures broad issues and improves the quality of deliberation. [...] We began by approaching individuals known to the organizers and then used a “snowballing” technique, whereby these diverse individuals with wide networks were asked to **recommend other relevant experts**. Further candidates were identified in a brief literature review. [...] The contributors **drew on a broad network of experts in proposing topics**. [...]”
- (b) Phase II: Scoring and refining: “[...] The contributors were given the long list of identified topics and asked to allocate a score of 1–100 to each issue to reflect its impact and its plausibility. They were also asked to **comment on each issue** and indicate whether they had already heard of it. [...]”
- (c) Phase III: Deliberation and aggregation: “[...] Before the discussions, each participant was asked to explore at least two issues on the shortlist other than those they had proposed. Thus, every issue was examined by at least three participants who had done background research – the two researchers and the proposer. [...] The online discussion forum lasted 2 weeks (8–27 February 2021), during which the participants critically discussed the issues and their merits. [...]”
- (d) Conclusions: “[...] To understand the complex and dynamic opportunities and challenges facing global health an iterative process with an expanded range of participants, stakeholders and perspectives is required, as well as a deeper engagement with the identified issues. [...]”

Approaches to relationships with stakeholders

45. The [WHO Handbook for Guideline Development, 2nd edition](#) details relationships with stakeholders in its work-related processes and procedures for certain roles that stakeholders may take (i.e., Approach 1 outlined in working document UNEP/SPP-CWP/OEWG.2/5).
- (a) “Members of the GDG participate in the guideline development process and at meetings as individuals and not as representatives of the institutions or organizations with which they are affiliated.”
 - (b) GDG – Representatives of groups most affected: “Individuals who are likely to be affected by the intervention(s) or approach(es) under consideration in the guideline – or their representatives – bring invaluable perspectives to the guideline development process. They can help to ensure that the guideline reflects the needs of its intended beneficiaries and can be effectively implemented, and they can assist the GDG in understanding the impact of the recommendations in real life. [...] Many countries have **nongovernmental organizations whose members may be able to participate in the GDG in an individual capacity, or attend meetings as observers on behalf of their organization.**”
 - (c) **The external review group:** “The steering group and GDG can suggest names or issue an open call for interested persons and organizations. [...] If important perspectives and stakeholders are missing from the GDG, these should be represented in the external review group. [...]”

Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD)

Stakeholders’ roles in the interface

46. Roles described on the [website](#) of the OECD’s Environment, Health and Safety (EHS) Programme:
- (a) “**Many projects are carried out with other international organisations** which represent non-member countries. A co-ordinating mechanism through the Inter-Organisational Programme on the Sound Management of Chemicals (IOMC) ensures that duplication is avoided.”
 - (b) “The CBC [Chemicals and Biotechnology Committee] recognises the valuable contribution that non-governmental organisations make to EHS issues and attaches great importance to working with them. Representatives of environmental NGOs, business, and trade unions participate as **invited experts** in the CBC and subsidiary bodies, and in a range of activities under the CBC, including **various expert meetings, conferences, workshops, etc.**”
47. Roles described on the [eChemPortal](#) website:
- (a) “eChemPortal provides free public access to information on chemical properties and direct links to collections of information prepared for government chemical programmes at national, regional, and international levels. Access to information on existing chemicals, new industrial chemicals, pesticides and biocides is provided. eChemPortal also makes available national/regional classification results according to national / regional hazard classification schemes or according to the Globally Harmonized System of Classification and Labelling of Chemicals (GHS). In addition, eChemPortal provides also exposure and use information on chemicals.”
 - (b) “The Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) is responsible for the development and maintenance of eChemPortal, and eChemPortal is **hosted by the European Chemicals Agency (ECHA). The data sources accessed through eChemPortal are maintained by and remain the responsibility of the organisations that create them.** The data and information stored in each data source are the responsibility of the data owner. Participating data sources are responsible for ensuring links from eChemPortal to their local data sources are updated.”
48. Roles described on the Adverse Outcome Pathway Wiki ([AOP-Wiki](#)):

- (a) “This wiki is **hosted** by the [Society for the Advancement of Adverse Outcome Pathways \(SAAOP\)](#) and **serves as one component** of a larger [OECD-sponsored AOP Knowledge Base \(AOP-KB\)](#) effort.”
- (b) “This wiki represents a joint effort between the [European Commission - DG Joint Research Centre \(JRC\)](#) and [U.S Environmental Protection Agency \(EPA\)](#). This serves as one component of a larger [OECD-sponsored AOP Knowledge Base](#) effort and represents the central repository for all AOPs developed as part of the OECD AOP Development Effort by the Extended Advisory Group on Molecular Screening and Toxicogenomics. The other major components of this knowledgebase are [Effectopedia](#), produced by the [Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development \(OECD\)](#), the [AOP Xplorer](#), produced by the [US Army Corps of Engineers - Engineering Research and Development Center](#), and the Intermediate Effects DB produced by the JRC.”
- (c) “From its inception, the SAAOP has coordinated activities with the OECD Extended Advisory Group on Molecular Screening and Toxicogenomics (EAGMST). The EAGMST and SAAOP issued a [statement](#) in June of 2016 describing the relationship between the SAAOP and the OECD EAGMST, which clarifies development, maintenance and oversight of AOP Wiki. Briefly, the SAAOP allows a less formal process for gaining access to the AOP Wiki; AOP developers who are not yet ready to submit formal projects to the OECD may apply for access through the SAAOP.”

Approaches to relationships with stakeholders

49. As described in the Manual for the Guidance of Chairs of Subsidiary Bodies of the Organisation, OECD has integrated relationships with stakeholders in its institutional arrangements and rules of procedure for certain roles that stakeholders may take (i.e., Approach 1 outlined in working document UNEP/SPP-CWP/OEWG.2/5):
- (a) II. Participants in sessions, b) **representatives of non-Members**: “In accordance with Article 12, Rule 8 and Council Resolution C(2004)132/FINAL, a non-Member may be invited to participate directly in the official sessions of subsidiary bodies”. Such participation may include as *Ad hoc observer* and *Regular observer*. It further distinguishes between intergovernmental organizations, experts and non-governmental organizations (NGOs).
- (b) Different approaches to expert participation include: (i) “**Member represented by an expert**: Exceptionally, a Member may decide to be represented by an expert who is not a government official [...] This expert is deemed to speak on behalf of the government of the country that he/she represents. (ii) **Non-Member invited as expert**: While a representative of a non-Member may be invited exceptionally as an expert under Rule 10 b), the Council noted that it would be more appropriate to apply the Council Resolution on non-Member participation and that this possibility should be used only in a limited manner. (iii) **International organisation invited as expert**: when an international organisation needs to be consulted rapidly and in the absence of a Council Resolution or agreement governing mutual relations, Rule 10 b) provides a simplified procedure for inviting a representative from this organisation, including as an expert, without prior discussion in the Council [...]”
- (c) Different approaches to NGO participation include: (i) “the Secretary-General may, when requested by BIAC [Business and Industry Advisory Committee] and/or TUAC [Trade Union Advisory Committee] or on his/her own initiative, arrange for an exchange of views at a meeting convened and arranged by the Liaison Committee with international non-governmental organisations [...]”; (ii) “when a subsidiary body considers it desirable to consult BIAC and/or TUAC, or vice versa, the Secretary-General may, after ascertaining the opinion of the Chair of the subsidiary body in question, convene a special meeting between the representatives of BIAC and/or TUAC and the bureau of the body [...]”; (iii) “When a subsidiary body considers it desirable that BIAC and/or TUAC be consulted as experts by taking part in all or part of one of its sessions to examine a given question, its Chair consults the Secretary-General who, if he/she considers the request justified [...] sends out an invitation”; (iv) “It is therefore up to individual committees, which know their constituencies and the NGOs they have to deal with, to first determine the bodies they wish to consult and on what basis”; and (v) “a subsidiary body may decide to invite an independent expert. Interventions of such an expert will be deemed to be made in his/her personal capacity.”
- (d) As described on the [website](#) of the OECD’s EHS Programme: “Industry participation in the CBC activities is organised by the Business and Industry Advisory Committee to the

OECD (BIAC), while trade union representation is organised by the Trade Union Advisory Committee to the OECD (TUAC). The participation of environmental NGOs across the OECD is co-ordinated by the European Environmental Bureau (EEB). The International Council for Animal Protection in OECD Programmes (ICAPO) participates as invited experts in meetings where issues relating to animal welfare are discussed.”

Strategic Approach to International Chemicals Management (SAICM)

Stakeholders' roles in the interface

50. Roles described in the [Overarching Policy Strategy](#) (2006):
- (a) “Para 17g: [The objectives of the Strategic Approach with regard to capacity-building and technical cooperation are] to encourage stakeholders to **develop and promote programmes on chemical safety and scientific research and analysis and to assist with capacity-building programmes in developing countries and countries with economies in transition.**”
 - (b) “Para 19b: Enhancing industry partnerships and financial and technical participation in the implementation of Strategic Approach objectives, including by inviting **industry** [...] to **review and strengthen current voluntary industry initiatives** to address the considerable challenges associated with the implementation of Strategic Approach objectives; to **develop new initiatives**, including in partnership with foundations, academia and non-governmental organizations, for the implementation of Strategic Approach objectives; to **provide resources, including in-kind contributions**, for the implementation of Strategic Approach objectives, continuing and building upon its initiatives on good corporate social and environmental responsibility.”
 - (c) “Para 19f: Inviting Governments and other stakeholders to **provide resources** to enable the secretariat of the Strategic Approach to fulfil the tasks set out in paragraph 28.”
 - (d) “Para 22: Implementation of the Strategic Approach could begin with an enabling phase to build necessary capacity, as appropriate, to develop, with relevant stakeholder participation, a national Strategic Approach implementation plan ... In parallel, intergovernmental organizations, international financial institutions and private actors are encouraged to **support these activities** and to consider the development of their own action plans as appropriate. Partnership among stakeholders should be pursued in support of implementation.”
51. Roles described in the [Strategy for Strengthening the Engagement of the Health Sector in the Implementation of the Strategic Approach to International Chemicals Management](#) (2012):
- (a) “The health sector is concerned with the impacts of all chemicals on human health irrespective of the economic sector involved (such as industry, agriculture or mining) and the point in the life cycle at which exposure takes place (production, use or disposal). The health sector can also contribute to sound chemicals management in its own **health-care activities** in order to prevent environmental, occupational and public health problems arising as a result of such activities.”
 - (b) “**The key roles and responsibilities for the health sector** in sound chemicals management can be summarized as: (i) preventing and managing chemical emergencies, including by providing medical treatment for those affected; (ii) gathering clinical and research evidence about chemical risks and informing decision makers and the public; (iii) working with other sectors to advocate action on chemicals and safer alternatives; (iv) raising awareness of chemicals safety with special emphasis on protecting vulnerable populations; (v) Assessing the impact of chemicals management policies through monitoring and evaluation, including biomonitoring and health surveillance; (vi) sharing knowledge and participating in international mechanisms to solve chemicals-related problems.”
 - (c) “[...] there is room for the sector to play a stronger role in advocating action on chemicals and safer alternatives, including through implementation of and compliance with legal instruments, standards and policies. [...] Given the position of trust held by doctors,

nurses and other community health workers, the health-sector workforce is central to **credible communications with the public.**”

(d) “[...] engagement may be seen as a continuum along which individuals or groups move from a basic awareness to personal, professional and institutional involvement and actions. The highest level of multisectoral engagement may be characterized as joint action and decision-making with other Strategic Approach stakeholders. In general terms, partnerships, alliances and joint plans of action often emanate from such a level of engagement.”

Approaches to relationships with stakeholders

52. SAICM has integrated relationships with stakeholders in its institutional arrangements and rules of procedure (i.e., Approach 1 outlined in working document UNEP/SPP-CWP/OEWG.2/5). As described in the [Overarching Policy Strategy](#), para 28, several functions to be performed by the secretariat are related to relationships with stakeholders, including: (i) to facilitate meetings and intersessional work of the Conference, as well as regional meetings, with maximum multi-stakeholder participation; (ii) to promote the establishment and maintenance of a network of Strategic Approach stakeholders at the national, regional and, in the case of intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations, international levels; (iii) to facilitate the development and dissemination of guidance materials to support implementation of the Strategic Approach by stakeholders; (iv) to provide guidance to stakeholders in the initiation of project proposals; (v) to ensure that recommendations from the Conference are conveyed to relevant global and regional organizations and institutions; (vi) to promote the exchange of relevant scientific and technical information; and (vii) to establish and maintain a working relationship with participating organizations of IOMC in order to draw upon their sectoral expertise.”

Lessons learned from the effectiveness evaluation

53. Lessons captured in the [Independent Evaluation of the Strategic Approach from 2006 – 2015](#):

(a) “The NGO focal points support the implementation of SAICM at the national level. Civil society and health and labour sector and scientific sector NGOs play an important role in the implementation of SAICM through their work [...].”

(b) “Much of the success of SAICM in contributing to this intermediate goal depended upon the NFPs. The structure of SAICM was such that it is through the NFPs that the SAICM agenda was promoted and taken forward at the national level. Their role was to bring together all stakeholders, encouraging buy-in and mobilizing resources. Through this networking NFPs were expected to support the preparation of national strategic plans and to support the integration of the sustainable management of chemicals and waste at the regional level.”

(c) “Integration across sectors is a key factor to achieving the 2020 goal. Greater capacity and increased representation of the health, agriculture, finance and industrial sectors within government national and regional focal points will support efforts to mainstream the sound management of chemicals across government departments. Within non-government stakeholders, continued efforts to communicate with and reach out to downstream business and industries as well as civil society.”

(d) “Building capacity and skills of NFPs to engage with all stakeholders, government, civil society and business, raising the profile of the NFP role and allocating adequate resources, will enhance SAICM’s effectiveness at contributing to the intermediate goals of strengthened capacity, technical knowledge and political will to implement SAICM.”