ENHANCING THE SCIENCE-POLICY INTERFACE ON BIODIVERSITY AND ECOSYSTEM SERVICES

IUCN's vision for an Intergovernmental and Multistakeholder Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES)

Convention on Biological Diversity
Fourteenth Meeting of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice (SBSTTA14, 10-21 May 2010, Nairobi, Kenya) and Third Meeting of the Ad-Hoc Open-Ended Working Group on Review of Implementation of the Convention (WGRI3, 24-28 May 2010, Nairobi, Kenya)

This paper lays out IUCN's vision for the function and form of IPBES that would deliver the most effective and improved science-policy interface on biodiversity and ecosystem services. The vision is the result of reflections on the discussions and negotiations to date, including at the first and second IPBES meetings, on actors in the policy process, and which allow for exchanges, co-evolution, and joint construction of knowledge

Four main conditions for an effective science-policy interface can be identified:

a) Building a **common and shared knowledge base** which effectively supports policy, including the promotion of policy-relevant multidisciplinary research and the appropriate integration of non-formal knowledge, observation and monitoring, indicators, models and scenarios, and assessments;

b) Providing for an **effective dialogue between science and policy** and other relevant stake- and knowledge-holders, including formal mechanisms of policy advice, processes of early warning and horizon scanning, communication and other aspects of effectively targeting decision makers;

c) Providing the fundamental capacity to enable **full engagement in the science-policy interface of all relevant stake- and knowledge-holders**, be it to build the common and shared knowledge base, to communicate more effectively, or to more effectively use the knowledge for policy action/implementation;

d) Increasing **synergy and coherence through coordination** of the different actors and activities and, in particular across scales, sectors and disciplines.

In practice, there exists no one-size-fits-all model for science-policy interface. These mechanisms can be very different in nature with some being more formal than others, or some being closer to scientific processes while others are closer to the political ones. They might also have different principle functions, e.g. in capacity building, coordination or advocacy, or operate at different stages of the policy process – early warning and

2) THE NEED FOR IPBES

4. Capacity building to enhance the science-policy interface and mainstream biodiversity and ecosystem services for human well-being:

In order to be most effective, IPBES would benefit considerably from building capacity to undertake policy-relevant science, to assess that science through scientific assessment, and to use information from such an assessment in the decision-making process. IPBES could carry out capacity building activities such as the production and promotion of training material on biodiversity and ecosystem service assessment, and providing opportunities for scientists and decision-makers from developing and developed countries to engage in science-policy processes. There will also be indirect capacity building opportunities provided by IPBES, through raising international awareness of policy-relevant science and options to deliver this into decision-making processes at national and international scales. Core capacity building functions of IPBES might include:

IPBES Governance

The main components of IPBES governance structure should be: the plenary, the executive body (or bureau), working groups and task forces, and the secretariat. If these bodies are appropriately constituted and mandated, then a separate Scientific Panel would be unnecessary. IPBES's governance structure will require an adequate and sustainable financial mechanism.

The **plenary of IPBES** should comprise governments (Member countries of the hosting organizations) and