



**Plenary of the Intergovernmental Science-Policy
Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services
Fifth session**

Bonn, Germany, 7–10 March 2017

Items 6 (d), (e) and (f) of the provisional agenda*

**Work programme of the Platform: methodological
assessment regarding the diverse conceptualization of
multiple values of nature and its benefits; thematic
assessment on invasive alien species; thematic assessment
on the sustainable use of biodiversity**

Considerations pertaining to the undertaking of two thematic assessments and one methodological assessment (deliverables 3 (b) (ii), 3 (b) (iii) and 3 (d))

Note by the secretariat

Introduction

1. In decision IPBES-4/1, the Plenary of the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES) approved the scoping report for a thematic assessment of invasive alien species and their control, set out in annex III to the decision, and the scoping report on the methodological assessment regarding diverse conceptualization of multiple values of nature and its benefits, set out in annex VI to the decision, and decided to consider the undertaking of those assessments at its fifth session.
2. In the same decision, the Plenary requested the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel, in consultation with the Bureau, to undertake a further scoping of the thematic assessment of the sustainable use of biodiversity in accordance with the procedures for the preparation of the Platform's deliverables. The revised scoping report for a thematic assessment of the sustainable use of biodiversity (IPBES/5/7) is before the Plenary for its approval and to facilitate its consideration of the undertaking of the assessment.
3. At its fifth session, the Plenary will be invited to consider the undertaking of the three above-mentioned assessments. The present note provides background information regarding the duration timing and order of launching of the three assessments, as well as financial considerations.

I. Considerations regarding duration, timing and order of launching of assessments

4. The Bureau suggests that the methodological assessment of diverse conceptualization of multiple values of nature and its benefits, which was originally envisaged to be performed over a two-year period, instead be performed over a three-year period. This suggestion, based on lessons learned from the two completed assessments, is intended to allow enough time for the required work. With this change, each of the three assessments under consideration would be undertaken over a three-year period.

* IPBES/5/1/Rev.1.

5. In deciding about the undertaking of any new assessment, the Plenary may want to take note of the potential need for one additional staff member at the secretariat should the launch of more than one new assessment be decided for 2017 or 2018 (see IPBES/5/10).
6. In terms of the timing of the three assessments, the Plenary may wish to consider staggering their launch and/or moving some or all of them to the next work programme. Even assuming the availability of funding, starting three new assessments at a similar time would undoubtedly lead in the coming years to an unacceptable overload for all involved, including saturation of the capacity of Governments to nominate experts for, provide comments on and consider these assessments at future Plenary sessions, while continuing to contribute to the six ongoing assessments; saturation of the capacity of the community of experts to respond to the calls of the Plenary and deliver the requisite work; and a significant challenge for members of the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel and the Bureau in overseeing and guiding the work of IPBES.
7. The methodological assessments of the first work programme of IPBES were planned to start early in the implementation of the programme in order to inform and support the other assessments and other work of IPBES. The Plenary may therefore wish to consider launching the methodological assessment of diverse conceptualization of multiple values of nature and its benefits first. This assessment would benefit from the work of the expert group on values established in response to decision IPBES-4/1. The technical support unit, already in place at the Institute for Ecosystems and Sustainability Research at the National Autonomous University of Mexico for the purpose of supporting the expert group, could also provide support to the methodological assessment, thus ensuring its quick and efficient launch.
8. If the Plenary decides not to launch any new assessments in 2017 or 2018, it may wish to discuss the three above-mentioned assessments in the context of the development of its second work programme.

II. Financial considerations

9. The cost of each of the three assessments would be similar.
10. At its fourth session, the Plenary took note of the proposed budget for 2018 and 2019, which included an indicative amount of \$800,000 for each of the assessments on values and on invasive alien species, and no funding for the assessment on the sustainable use of biodiversity. Such an amount would allow for the participation of only 50 experts – or about six experts per chapter – which is considered too few, and would not allow for a fully inclusive second author meeting to be convened as described in subparagraph 11 (b) below.
11. Based on lessons learned, the Bureau suggests increasing the budget for each of the three assessments to \$997,000 for the following reasons:
 - (a) Eight experts per chapter is considered a minimum to allow for sufficient diversity of expertise and views in each chapter and sharing of the heavy workload among experts;
 - (b) The convening of three fully inclusive author meetings with lead authors in attendance, rather than only two such meetings, is seen as a key criterion for success in order to ensure the full integration and involvement of lead authors during the three-year process;
 - (c) Keeping the technical support units open for a minimum of three months after the closure of the session of the fifth session of the Plenary, rather than until the closure of the fifth session, as is currently budgeted, is also seen as key to ensuring that the assessment report is finalized and comments thereon are posted on the IPBES website; to coordinating the drafting and submission of the relevant publications; and to carrying out other dissemination and outreach activities.
12. A generic budget, applicable to any of these three assessments, is presented in the following table. The generic budget is based on the above-mentioned considerations and the following assumptions:
 - (a) Each assessment will be carried out over a period of three years;
 - (b) Each assessment will include three fully inclusive author meetings with the lead authors in attendance at each of those meetings;
 - (c) Each assessment will include a total of 62 experts (2 co-chairs, 12 coordinating lead authors, 36 lead authors and 12 review editors) or about 8 experts per chapter, of which 75 per cent will be supported by the trust fund.

III. Suggested action by the Plenary

13. The Plenary may wish to consider:

(a) The duration of and budget for the two thematic assessments and the methodological assessment (deliverables 3 (b) (ii), 3 (b) (iii) and 3 (d));

(b) The timing of the launch of each of the three assessments, including the possibility of considering them in the context of the development of a second IPBES work programme.

Estimated cost of an assessment

<i>Year</i>	<i>Cost item</i>	<i>Assumptions</i>	<i>Estimated costs (in United States dollars)</i>
Year 1	Management meeting for assessment (with co-chairs, secretariat, the technical support unit, and Multidisciplinary Expert Panel and Bureau members)	Venue costs (1/2 week, six participants, in Bonn) Travel and daily subsistence allowance (4 × \$3,750)	0 15 000
	First author meeting (participants: 2 co-chairs, 12 coordinating lead authors, 36 lead authors and 6 dedicated Multidisciplinary Expert Panel and Bureau members)	Venue costs (corresponding to 75 per cent, to be complemented with 25 per cent in kind); 56 participants (42 supported) Travel and daily subsistence allowance (42 × \$3,750)	18 750 157 500
	Technical support	One full-time equivalent Professional position, travel costs and overhead (to be matched by an in-kind offer of an equivalent value)	75 000
	Total year 1:		266 250
Year 2	Second author meeting (participants: 2 co-chairs, 12 coordinating lead authors, 36 lead authors, 12 review editors and 6 dedicated Multidisciplinary Expert Panel and Bureau members)	Venue costs (corresponding to 75 per cent, to be complemented with 25 per cent in kind); 68 participants (51 supported) Travel and daily subsistence allowance (51 × \$3,750)	20 000 191 250
	Technical support	One full-time equivalent Professional position, travel costs and overhead (to be matched by an in-kind offer of an equivalent value)	75 000
	Total year 2:		286 250
Year 3	Third author meeting (participants: 2 co-chairs, 12 coordinating lead authors, 36 lead authors, 12 review editors, and 6 dedicated Multidisciplinary Expert Panel and Bureau members)	Venue costs (corresponding to 75 per cent, to be complemented with 25 per cent in kind); 68 participants (51 supported) Travel and daily subsistence allowance (51 × \$3,750)	20 000 191 250
	Technical support	One full-time equivalent Professional position, travel costs and overhead (to be matched by an in-kind offer of an equivalent value)	75 000
	Dissemination and outreach		50 000
	Total year 3:		336 250

<i>Year</i>	<i>Cost item</i>	<i>Assumptions</i>	<i>Estimated costs (in United States dollars)</i>
Year 4 (assessment launch and post- launch activities)	Participation of 8 experts, including 2 co-chairs and 6 coordinating lead authors or lead authors in the eighth session of the Plenary	8 participants (6 supported) Travel and daily subsistence allowance (6 × \$3,750)	22 500
	Technical support (for 3 months after launch of the assessment report at Plenary)	One full-time equivalent Professional position, travel costs and overhead (to be matched by an in-kind offer of an equivalent value)	18 750
	Dissemination and outreach		67 000
	Total year 4:		108 250
Total			997 000