

Operating Principles Governing the Work of the Panel Request for Written Submissions from Member States and Relevant Stakeholders

Member states, during the resumed first session of the Open-ended Working Group (OEWG1.2), requested the Secretariat of the OEWG to solicit written submissions from Member States and relevant stakeholders regarding the operating principles governing the work of the panel.

In support of this request, the Secretariat conducted a webinar (on 26 April 2023) dedicated to the issue of operating principles. In advance of the webinar, the Secretariat released a background document which provides a comparative overview of operating principles of relevant, existing science-policy panels (IPCC, IPBES, IRP and GEO). The recording of the webinar can be found on [this website](#), when available, and the background document is available at [this link](#)).

A variety of potential operating principles are presented below, based on the analysis performed for this [background document](#). The following questions in no way attempt to rank or preclude consideration of the operating principles of the future SPP, rather, they draw from the agreed text of Resolution 5/8 and other existing, relevant science-policy bodies, as well as the discussions at the OEWG. You may also suggest relevant potential operating principles that have not been identified yet.

Member States are invited to provide submissions through their respective national focal points (list of focal points available [at this link](#)). Non-government stakeholders are invited to submit their submissions on behalf of their organization or group. You are invited to respond to all or some of the questions below. Once complete, please submit this filled document to SPP-CWP@un.org. All submissions will be uploaded online and will inform a working document to be considered at OEWG 2.

Contact information

What is your name/surname?

Džejna Milaković-Ramadani

What is your country?

Bosnia and Herzegovina

What is your title?

Mrs; Head of Chemicals and Biocides Department

What is your email address?

d.milakovic-ramadani@mzs.vladars.net; dzejna.milak@gmail.com

Who are you submitting on behalf of?

Governmental institutions

The following elements are included in Resolution 5/8. Please indicate by clicking on the box(es) where you believe these elements should be included (i.e., operating principles, rules of procedure, guidelines, or other relevant documents, or if they are not relevant). Some key terms have been grouped together for the purpose of this tabular analysis, there is inevitably some overlap across principles.

	Operating Principle	Rules of Procedure	Guidelines	Other	Not relevant
CREDIBILITY					
Robustness/Rigour	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Integrity/Objectivity / Independence/Impartiality/ Lack of Bias (avoiding conflicts of interest)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Interdisciplinary / Multidisciplinary / Balance of disciplines	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
RELEVANCE/SALIENCE					
Policy-relevant (and not policy prescriptive)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
LEGITIMACY					
Inclusivity/Balance	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
-- indigenous inclusivity	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
-- geographic balance	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
-- regional balance	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
-- gender balance	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
-- balance of disciplines (see also Credibility/Interdisciplinary...)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
CROSS-CUTTING THEMES					
Transparency	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Flexibility	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Coordination (without duplication) / Complementarity	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Cost-Effectiveness	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Please provide any relevant comments on your choices above:

Since operating principles shape/guide the work and flag the SPP's key values, having in mind why are we establishing this panel and taking into account very useful examples of other panels/platforms we support the above listed suggestions as checked in the table.

We support the idea to list operating principles in clear simple language without complicated long sentences. These principles will be further elaborated in the Rules of Procedures (as we suggested in the above table). For a few we have listed that a guideline should be prepared (unless it is well elaborated within the Rules of Procedure).

Integrity/Objectivity / Independence/Impartiality/ Lack of Bias (avoiding conflicts of interest), Inclusivity/Balance, Transparency, Flexibility and Cost Effectiveness should be reflected in the Rules of Procedure. Inclusion of collaborating centres/strategic partners/observers that contribute to the work of SPP in accordance with SPP operating principles (eg. 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 and others) should also be considered. A guideline on their accreditation and participation should be publically available as well as nomination procedure (eg. 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).

We support that the panel is policy relevant but not policy prescriptive, mindful to multilateral environmental agreements/chemicals and health related policies. Clear explanation is needed on how to support this principle in the work of the panel.

Please note that with SPP we need to be clear what is considered as a request for assessment within SPP scope/mandate since we need to avoid duplications with other platforms/panels (eg. *IRP – from its Steering Committee as well as from intergovernmental bodies including the United Nations Environment Assembly, the UN High-Level Political Forum on Sustainable Development and other institutions as deemed relevant and appropriate by the Steering Committee.*

IPBES - requests from Governments, including those conveyed to it by multilateral environmental agreements related to biodiversity and ecosystem services as determined by their respective governing bodies. The Plenary welcomes inputs and suggestions from, and the participation of, United Nations bodies related to biodiversity and ecosystem services as determined by their respective governing bodies. The Plenary also encourages and takes into account, as appropriate, inputs and suggestions made by relevant stakeholders.)

We support avoiding conflicts of interest since the SPP should be independent, collaborative, transparent, objective.

The following table includes other elements that may be considered. Please indicate by clicking on the box(es) where you believe these elements should be included (i.e., operating principles, rules of procedure, guidelines, or other relevant documents, or if they are not relevant). It is also possible to add additional potential operating principles to be considered.

OTHER	Operating Principle	Rules of Procedure	Guidelines	Other	Not relevant
Promotion of innovation	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Comprehensive, holistic, or integrative approach	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Consensus based approach	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Providing accessible outputs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Others [please add]					
Collaborative, transparent, accessible	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Scientifically independent/evidence based	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Definitions/terminology	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Outreach/awareness raising	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Capacity building	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Categories of assessments	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Work programme/prioritization	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Please provide any relevant comments on your choices above:

As with previous choices (Table 1) we support the offered in the Table 2 as operating principles that should be presented in the work of the panel and elaborated in the Rules of Procedure. For a few we selected an option that an additional clear guidelines should be in place.

We have added the following for consideration. Collaborative, scientifically independent/evidence based, transparent, accessible.

Data on health and environment are accessible by Member States and relevant stakeholders to support policymaking, decision-making and strengthening of the science-policy interface. This way SPP promotes innovative solutions and serves as a basis for further research and development.

It needs to be clear how SPP will identify and prioritize assessments/actions/ key scientific information needed for policymakers and how/within which platform will it generate new knowledge on health and environment and deliver new information that supports eg. circular economy/green economy/innovations (among others). How will it identify policy relevant tools/methodologies? Should we set main categories of assessments as in some other panels/platforms? (e.g. GEO’s Assessment of confidence (qualitative and quantitative) – to know if the findings are inconclusive/virtually certain and how to address possible errors. IRP is very detailed on categories of assessments). Which tools will be incorporated into the assessment process for sharing evidence based data and knowledge? *We suggest a guidance document on these matters to be considered.*

We find GEO's outreach and awareness raising to be a good practice that can be implemented with SPP, since it serves to “spread the word” in a language that is comprehensive to most. Outreach events at specific meetings, awareness-raising educational materials delivered by virtual means, science-policy seminars delivered for Member States/relevant stakeholders will help in understanding of the implications of the SPP findings.

Please provide your written submission in the space below:

We need to clearly link SPP with SAICM - Beyond 2020. Full use of national, subregional and regional assessments and knowledge needs to be ensured, capacity building integrated in the SPP work, and youth is included in the process.

In order to perform at its best, the panel needs to be independent and must maintain integrity – e.g. maybe we can consider IRP’s principle “The amount of contributions received from private sources must not exceed the amount of contributions received from public sources per year”. We support the idea that conflict of interest and disputes should be elaborated in the Rules of Procedure.

Rules of Procedure should reflect capacity building. A guideline in place on capacity building is a good tool. Youth and scientist from different regions should get a chance to join the panel. Capacity building also needs to take into account balance as a principle (e.g. IPBES integrates capacity-building into all relevant aspects of its work according to priorities decided by the Plenary).

Working programme (flexible/multi year work plan?), time bound budget need to be elaborated in the Rules of Procedure as well as reporting (preparation, review). We find IRP’s strategic planning exercise a valuable tool (*it 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. As a result of this exercise, the Secretariat, based on inputs from the Panel and Steering Committee and public consultations will develop a Work Programme with the strategic direction, priority areas and description of potential scientific studies and assessments of the IRP in the corresponding cycle*).