

IUCN Report of the 3rd Intergovernmental and Multistakeholder Meeting on IPBES - The Intergovernmental Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services -

7-11 June 2010, Busan, Republic of Korea

Twenty Second Summary

- *The IPBES-3 meeting agreed to establish a new science-policy platform on biodiversity and ecosystem services, but the actual process of doing so will likely involve a Resolution at the 65th Session of the UN General Assembly later this year, and subsequent decisions by governing bodies of hosting UN organizations during next year.*
- *IPBES will be established as an intergovernmental mechanism, focusing on the needs of governments, although inputs and suggestions on the work programme will also be considered from civil society, who will be able to participate as observers in the plenary.*
- *IPBES will have a strong focus on comprehensive and thematic assessments at global, regional and sub-regional scale, and on capacity building on the science-policy interface.*
- *Many of the details of the process and procedures, work plan, and structure of IPBES secretariat and working groups will be decided at the first IPBES plenary, likely to be convened later in 2011.*
- *Although IPBES will be established as an intergovernmental mechanism, there will be significant opportunities for IUCN to contribute to the work programme of IPBES, including as a knowledge provider on biodiversity and ecosystem services, to the governance of IPBES, including through contributing to the IPBES plenary discussions, and through offering to host a part of any distributed secretariat. In addition, a potential key function for IUCN is in facilitating and coordinating multistakeholder input to IPBES, and in supporting IPBES to meet the needs of multistakeholder decision-makers.*

1. Background

IPBES-3 was the third intergovernmental and multistakeholder meeting to consider the establishment of IPBES. The first two meetings, (November 2008 in Putrajaya, and October 2009 in Nairobi) had identified the needs for strengthening the science-policy interface, including the strengthening of existing processes and institutions, and the possibility of establishing a new mechanism. IPBES-3 was convened specifically in response to a decision of the UNEP Governing Council (February 2010), with the mandate to negotiate and reach agreement on whether or not to establish a new mechanism.

IPBES-3 built on the information available for the previous two meetings, including principally the IPBES “Gap Analysis”, which identified the needs for a new mechanism. In addition, numerous information documents were made available for IPBES-3 in response to requests from governments for such information. These included information on the assessment landscape, on biodiversity and ecosystem services indicators, on the procedures of the IPCC, on ongoing capacity development activities related to biodiversity and ecosystem services, on options and criteria for selecting the secretariat, an indicative budget, and the outcomes of the regional consultations held in Africa, Latin America and the Caribbean, North America, Central Asia, and Central and Eastern Europe.

The main working document for IPBES-3 was an options paper: “*Options for improving the science-policy interface for biodiversity and ecosystem services*”, which formed the basis of negotiations at the meeting.¹ The working document contained options around 6 considerations, including on the functions, legal status, governance, secretariat, and funding modality for IPBES.

¹ For all meeting documents, see www.ipbes.net/3rd-meeting-on-ipbes/3rd-ipbes-meeting-documents

2. Organization and overview of the meeting

The meeting was chaired by Mr. Kim Chan-woo (Republic of Korea), with the active involvement of Robert Watson (UK), as one of the vice chairs (and in function also as co-chair of the meeting). Other vice-chairs were also elected: Alfred Oteng Yeboah (Ghana), Linus Spencer Thomas (Grenada) and Dusan Ognjanovic (Serbia). All formal sessions were in plenary, although various informal contact groups were convened during the week on contentious issues. A drafting group was also established to draft the structure of the “Outcome document”, although there was strong resistance to this group working on any text.

The agenda focused on the six considerations outlined in the working document:

- Consideration 1: Options for strengthening the science-policy interface on biodiversity and ecosystem services (ie should an IPBES be established, or not?)
- Consideration 2: Processes that IPBES should support
- Consideration 3: Functions of IPBES
- Consideration 4: Legal status and governance of IPBES
- Consideration 5: Options for the secretariat of IPBES
- Consideration 6: Options for funding IPBES

The considerations were negotiated in a “single undertaking approach”, whereby nothing was decided individually until everything was decided. Negotiations and provisional agreement was reached on considerations 2-6 before coming back at the end of the meeting to make the final decision as to whether or not establish a new mechanism. In addition to negotiating agreement for each of the above considerations, the meeting also negotiated a set of principles on which the new platform should work. The outcomes of both the principles and agreed option for each consideration were compiled into the “Busan Outcome” document.

3. Key Issues in the Negotiations:

Consideration 2, on the processes that a new platform should support: There was wide agreement that governments (including through the biodiversity and ecosystem services related MEAs) will be the main “*demandeurs*” or constituents which may request information from by the platform. There were more diverging views on the role of UN agencies and other organizations, including NGOs and the private sector, as *demandeurs*. The final decision was that only governments would be in a position to request information of IPBES, although “inputs and suggestions” will be taken into account from UN bodies and other stakeholders “as appropriate”, and that all decisions on work programme and priority requests will be taken by the intergovernmental plenary body.

Consideration 3, on the functions of IPBES: It was agreed that IPBES would have four main functions, of which the focus would be on assessments and on capacity building. The other two functions, of catalyzing knowledge generation and of supporting policy formulation were considered to be important, but it was agreed that IPBES would not itself engage in new research, or in policy development. Key issues in the discussions of the four areas were as follows:

Identify and prioritize knowledge gaps: Although there was consensus that IPBES should not carry out new research, there were diverging views on the role of the platform in convening a forum for dialogue between policy makers, the scientific community, and donors to catalyze efforts to generate knowledge.

Undertake regular and timely assessment: There was consensus that IPBES assessments should be at scales above those of national level, and that they should include thematic assessment, however there were different opinions on the possibility of undertaking assessments on emerging issues. Agreed language was found around assessing “new topics identified by science and as approved by the plenary.”

Support Policy formulation and implementation: It was agreed that IPBES should not be policy prescriptive, but rather focus on providing policy-relevant information, and also on identifying useful tools and methods that could be used by policy makers to strengthen the science-policy interface at national levels. These might include methods for undertaking assessments, developing scenarios, valuing ecosystem services etc.

Build capacity for science-policy interface: Although there was consensus that capacity needs to be built to strengthen the science-policy interface, there was a range of opinions about the extent to which capacity building should be undertaken by IPBES. It was agreed that IPBES should not be a financial mechanism for capacity building, but that the highest priority needs for capacity building relating to IPBES activities would be funded through IPBES, and in a manner similar to the forum for knowledge generation, that a dialogue would be provided by IPBES to facilitate donor support to capacity building needs.

Consideration 4, on the legal basis and governance of IPBES: There was a strong consensus around establishing the platform as an independent intergovernmental body only, administered by one or more existing UN bodies. Support for IPBES being established as a subsidiary body of an existing organization was extremely limited, despite strong earlier support for such an arrangement from some countries, and there was no support from governments for IPBES being established as a multistakeholder platform, despite the arguments and justifications put forward by IUCN.

Governance and decision-making structure of the new platform:

Plenary: There was strong consensus for the plenary to be composed of governments, but to be also open to UN agencies and other stakeholders as observers. It was eventually agreed that decisions will generally be based on a consensus approach of governments, but also that all such rules and procedures will be established by the plenary at its first meeting.

Executive body: Positions were evenly split between the two options of having one IPBES Board, or having an executive body with a separate scientific advisory body. The meeting ran out of time to resolve this divergence, which will be picked up on again at the first plenary meeting of IPBES.

Chair: After considering the options of having two co-chairs or one chair, the meeting decided that there will be one chair and 4 vice-chairs, to be selected in a manner that would ensure balanced regional representation.

Consideration 5, on the Secretariat: There was insufficient time at the meeting to make progress on the character or process for selection of the secretariat, although interventions on the secretariat emphasized the need for a transparent process to be developed for secretariat selection, and during closing statements, offers were received to host a part of the secretariat from Norway, Kenya, Republic of Korea and “various countries in the EU”. The selection of secretariat will be considered at the first meeting of the IPBES plenary, and the meantime, UNEP was requested to continue support to the IPBES process, in collaboration with UNESCO, FAO, and UNDP.

Consideration 6, on funding: Negotiations on funding were tightly linked to the issue of capacity building, with both considerations agreed in tandem. The package proposed was for a commitment to fund capacity building activities, and then an agreement for funding to IPBES to be of a voluntary nature, rather than through prescribed contributions from governments. There is also an expectation that funding contributions will be made from other donors, including foundations and the private sector. A trust fund will be established to receive all voluntary contributions, which will then be allocated by the plenary.

Summary of Busan decisions:

Consideration	Decision taken by IPBES-3
Consideration 1: Options for strengthening the science-policy interface on biodiversity and ecosystem services	IPBES should be established to strengthen the science-policy interface for biodiversity and ecosystem services for the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity, long-term human well-being and sustainable development
Consideration 2: Processes that IPBES should support	Focusing on the needs of governments, IPBES should respond to requests from Governments, including those conveyed to it by multilateral environmental agreements. Inputs and suggestions will also be welcomed and taken into account from UN bodies and other relevant stakeholders.
Consideration 3: Functions of IPBES	IPBES will: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Identify and prioritize knowledge gaps and catalyze efforts to generate new knowledge through dialogues, but will not itself undertake new research. 2. Perform regular assessments on knowledge of biodiversity and ecosystem services at global, regional and sub-regional scales, and on thematic issues and new topics (emerging issues). 3. Support policy formulation and implementation to identify relevant tools and methods, and where necessary catalyze their development. 4. Prioritize capacity building needs and then provide and call for financial and other support for the highest priority needs related to its activities.
Consideration 4: Legal status and governance of IPBES	IPBES will be established as an independent intergovernmental body, administered by one of more UN bodies. The plenary of IPBES will be open to all Member States of the UN. Decisions will be taken by consensus. Other stakeholders will participate in the plenary as observers.
Consideration 5: Options for the secretariat of IPBES	No decision taken during IPBES-3.
Consideration 6: Options for funding IPBES	A core trust fund will be established, to receive voluntary contributions from Governments and other donors.

Hosting/administering IPBES by UN agencies

Controversy surrounded the issue of explicitly mentioning the UN agencies and programmes that have expressed interest in hosting IPBES (ie FAO, UNEP and UNESCO) and those that have been involved to a lesser degree, but would none the less be extremely relevant to IPBES (ie UNDP). The final agreement was to include all four UN bodies in the preamble of the Busan outcome document, and the meeting highlighted UNDP as an important organization to participate in IPBES, given its important role in capacity building.

Principles: a set of 11 principles were proposed to guide the work and operation of IPBES. The following contentious issues arose during discussions of the principles:

- The nature of the collaboration with existing entities
- The process for use and sharing of data and information, including on traditional knowledge
- The relationship to the multilateral environmental agreements and their mandates
- The need for appropriate balance in geographical, interdisciplinary and gender contributions.

Next steps to establish IPBES: Although the IPBES-3 meeting agreed to establish IPBES, the mechanism has not yet been established. There was considerable controversy around the way forward to IPBES being established, including the role of the UN General Assembly, and the role of the governing bodies of the various hosting UN bodies. It was eventually agreed, consistent with the decision of the February 2010 UNEP Governing Council, that the UN General Assembly would be invited to consider the outcomes of the IPBES-3 meeting, and to take appropriate actions for the establishment of IPBES. The meeting also recommended that UNEP would continue to facilitate implementation of the IPBES process, in collaboration with UNESCO, FAO and UNDP, until such time as a permanent IPBES secretariat is established.

4. Implications of IPBES-3 and follow up from IUCN

The IPBES-3 meeting resulted in achieving a significant element of the first objective of IUCN's strategy on IPBES, for the establishment of a new mechanism. However, the lack of multistakeholder involvement in IPBES' governance and as information requestors /"demandeurs" falls short of IUCN's vision for IPBES as a multistakeholder mechanism. Decisions taken during IPBES-3 on the governance and legal status of IPBES rule out the possibility that IUCN could offer to co-host IPBES, as per the IUCN Council Decision. However, the IPBES plenary will be open to the active participation of observers, with an opportunity for IUCN to contribute to plenary discussions and priority setting on the IPBES work programme.

There also remains the opportunity for IUCN to offer to host a part of a distributed secretariat for IPBES, to support for example a particular element of the work programme or working group, or to facilitate the involvement of multiple institutional stakeholders in the implementation of the IPBES work programme (see also below). In addition to contributing to the plenary and possible secretariat functions, two other key functions are likely to form the main avenues for IUCN to contribute to IPBES:

Providing IUCN's knowledge to IPBES: The largest contribution of IUCN to IPBES will likely be through the provision of knowledge and expertise for use in the assessments, capacity building and other areas of the IPBES work plan. All of IUCN's scientific knowledge products, and its scientific expertise on biodiversity and ecosystem services in the Commissions and Secretariat will be of value to implementing the IPBES work programme. In an analogous manner to the IPCC, all contributions of expertise to IPBES will be voluntary. However, IPBES will offer a considerable opportunity for increasing the visibility of IUCN knowledge, and in informing key IUCN audiences.

Facilitating multistakeholder engagement in IPBES: With the scope of IPBES now determined as an intergovernmental mechanism, there is considerable opportunity for IUCN, working with partners in the scientific and business communities to identify and facilitate appropriate engagement of non-governmental actors in the development and implementation of IPBES. Such support to the process would build on work already undertaken by IUCN, ICSU/DIVERSITAS, and the World Business Council for Sustainable Development, and provide further clarity on the potential role and function of non-governmental actors in IPBES. This might include developing draft elements of the rules and procedures of IPBES that relate to the engagement of multiple stakeholders, and would also include the ongoing communications of the progress and opportunities afforded by IPBES for stakeholders in various sectors and communities.

Other key issues for IUCN to consider further and to develop specific strategies for include:

- a. The role of IUCN in supporting IPBES discussions and the resolution to be considered during UNGA,
- b. The role of IUCN in supporting preparations for the 1st meeting of IPBES Plenary, including discussion with ICSU/DIVERSITAS/IHDP and other stakeholders on important elements of the rules of procedure from the perspective of the scientific community, private sector and broader multistakeholder community.
- c. Communications from IUCN on the outcomes and implications of the Busan meeting for the IUCN constituency.

ANNEXES:

Annex I: Busan Outcome document

Annex II: IUCN position on IPBES-3 Considerations

Annex III: IUCN Opening statement to IPBES-3

Annex IV: IUCN Closing media statement



**United Nations
Environment
Programme**



Distr.: General
11 June 2010

English only

**Third ad hoc intergovernmental and multi-stakeholder
meeting on an intergovernmental science-policy platform
on biodiversity and ecosystem services**
Busan, Republic of Korea, 7–11 June 2010

Busan outcome

Note by the secretariat

The annex to the present note contains conclusions and recommendations concerning an intergovernmental science-policy platform on biodiversity and ecosystem services. They are presented without formal editing.

Annex

Busan outcome

Conclusions and recommendations concerning an intergovernmental science-policy platform on biodiversity and ecosystem services

The representatives of Governments to the third ad hoc intergovernmental and multi-stakeholder meeting on an intergovernmental science-policy platform on biodiversity and ecosystem services, convened in Busan, Republic of Korea, from 7 to 11 June 2010:

1. Recall the Governing Council decision SS.XI/3 of 26 February 2010 which requested the Executive Director of UNEP to convene, in June 2010, a third and final ad hoc intergovernmental and multi-stakeholder meeting to negotiate and reach agreement on whether to establish an intergovernmental science-policy platform on biodiversity and ecosystem services and further requested the Executive Director to transmit, on behalf of the Governing Council, the outcomes of and necessary documentation from the third and final meeting to the General Assembly at its sixty-fifth session for consideration during the high-level segment on biological diversity in September 2010 and thereafter;
2. Note the outcomes of the first and the second ad hoc intergovernmental and multi-stakeholder meetings on an intergovernmental science-policy platform on biodiversity and ecosystem services, held in Putrajaya, Malaysia, from 10 to 12 November 2008, and in Nairobi, Kenya, from 5 to 9 October 2009, respectively;
3. Acknowledge the importance of terrestrial, marine and coastal, and inland waters biodiversity and ecosystem services which, while critically important for sustainable development and current and future human well-being, particularly for poverty eradication, are currently experiencing significant loss; that the science-policy interface on biodiversity and ecosystem services must be strengthened at all levels; the importance of ensuring the highest quality and independence of the science made available; and the importance to enhance cooperation with relevant UN bodies and build capacity to mainstream biodiversity and ecosystem services;
4. Welcome the expressions of interest to support an IPBES by UNEP, UNESCO and FAO and encourage further consideration of their role by their respective governing bodies.
5. Note the interest of UNDP in IPBES, and their important role in capacity building within the UN system.
6. Having now reached agreement, as requested by the UNEP Governing Council Special Session through its decision SS.XI/3 on whether to establish an intergovernmental science policy platform on biodiversity and ecosystem services (IPBES), we conclude that an intergovernmental science policy platform for biodiversity and ecosystem services should be established to strengthen the science policy interface for biodiversity and ecosystem services for

the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity, long term human well being and sustainable development, as follows:

- (a) Focusing on government needs and based on priorities established by the plenary, IPBES should respond to 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 should welcome 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 should also encourage and take into account, as appropriate, inputs and suggestions made by relevant stakeholders, such as other intergovernmental organizations, international and regional scientific organizations, environment trust funds, non-governmental organizations and the private sector. To facilitate this, and to ensure that the work programme of IPBES is focussed and efficient, a process to receive and prioritize requests should be established by the plenary;
- (b) The new platform should identify and prioritize key scientific information needed for policymakers at appropriate scales and to catalyse efforts to generate new knowledge by dialogues with key scientific organizations, policy makers and funding organizations, but should not directly undertake new research;
- (c) The new platform should perform regular and timely assessments of knowledge on biodiversity and ecosystem services and their interlinkages, which should include comprehensive global, regional and, as necessary, sub-regional assessments and thematic issues at appropriate scales and new topics identified by science and as decided upon by the plenary. These assessments must be scientifically credible, independent and peer-reviewed, including identifying uncertainties, and there should be a clear transparent process for sharing and incorporating relevant data. The new platform should maintain a catalogue of relevant assessments, identify the need for regional and sub-regional assessments and help to catalyse support for subregional and national assessments, as appropriate;
- (d) The new platform should support policy formulation and implementation by identifying policy-relevant tools and methodologies, such as those arising from assessments, to enable decision makers to gain access to those tools and methodologies, and where necessary to promote and catalyse their further development;
- (e) The new platform should prioritize key capacity-building needs to improve the science-policy interface at appropriate levels and then provide and call for financial and other support for the highest priority needs, related directly to its activities, as decided by the plenary, and catalyse financing for such capacity building activities by providing a forum with conventional and potential funders;
- (f) The new platform should be established as an independent intergovernmental body administered by one or more existing United Nations organizations, agencies, funds and programmes;

(h) The plenary, which is the decision making body of the IPBES, should be open to participation by all member states of the United Nations and regional economic integration organizations. Intergovernmental organizations and other relevant stakeholders should participate in the plenary as observers, in accordance with the rules of procedure established by the plenary. Through its rules of procedure, the plenary should in general take decisions by consensus by government representatives.

(i) One Chair and four vice-chairs, ensuring geographic balance to be nominated and selected by Governments who are members of the plenary. Criteria and nomination process and length of service to be decided by the Plenary;

(j) A core trust fund to be allocated by the Plenary should be established to receive voluntary contributions from Governments, United Nations bodies, GEF, other intergovernmental organizations and other stakeholders, such as the private sector and foundations;

7.

In carrying out its work an IPBES should::

- a) Collaborate with existing initiatives on biodiversity and ecosystem services, including multilateral environment agreements and United Nations bodies, and networks of scientists and knowledge holders, to address gaps and build upon their work, while avoiding duplication.
- b) Be scientifically independent and ensure credibility, relevance and legitimacy through peer review of its work and transparency in its decision making processes;
- c) Use clear, transparent and scientifically credible processes for the exchange, sharing and use of data, information and technologies from all relevant sources, including non peer-reviewed literature, as appropriate;
- d) Recognize and respect the contribution of indigenous and local knowledge to the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity and ecosystems.
- e) Provide policy relevant information but should not provide policy prescriptive advice mindful of the respective mandates of the Multilateral Environmental Agreements;
- f) Integrate capacity-building into all relevant aspects of its work according to priorities decided by its plenary;
- g) Recognize the unique biodiversity and scientific knowledge thereof within and among different regions, and also recognize the need for full and effective participation of developing countries as well as balanced regional representation and participation in its structure and work;
- h) Take an inter- and multi-disciplinary approach that incorporates all relevant disciplines including social and natural sciences;
- i) Recognize the need for gender equity in all relevant aspects of its work;
- j) Address terrestrial, marine and inland water biodiversity and ecosystem services and their interactions.
- k) Ensure full use of national, sub-regional and regional assessments and knowledge, as appropriate;

The efficiency and effectiveness of the IPBES will be independently reviewed and evaluated on a periodic basis as decided by the plenary, and adjustments will be made as necessary.

8. Recommend that the 65th Session of the General Assembly be invited to consider the conclusions of the present meeting and take appropriate action for the establishment of an IPBES. Recommends that the UNEP Governing Council invites UNEP, in cooperation with UNESCO, FAO and UNDP, continue to facilitate any ensuing process of implementing the IPBES until such time that a secretariat is established.

Consideration	IUCN's preferred option for an effective and efficient science-policy interface:
<p>Consideration 1: Strengthening the science-policy interface on biodiversity and ecosystem services.</p>	<p>Create a new Intergovernmental and Multistakeholder Platform that does not duplicate existing processes, and in addition strengthen and improve coordination between existing structures (Option 3, expanded). <i>A new mechanism is needed to best meet the needs expressed by the IPBES Gap Analysis. A multistakeholder platform is essential to ensure legitimacy and independence of the process, and to contribute to guidance and decision-making on the full set of functions of the platform.</i></p>
<p>Consideration 2: Which processes IPBES should support.</p>	<p>Focusing on the needs of governments, but addressing also the needs of multistakeholder decision-makers, IPBES responds to requests from biodiversity, ecosystem services, and development-related MEAs, UN Agencies, relevant IGOs and other organizations that are represented on the IPBES Plenary (Option 4, with restrictions). <i>Meeting the needs of UN agencies, IGOs and other stakeholders is essential to ensure that the information on ecosystem services is made available to the biodiversity and development communities beyond the biodiversity MEAs. For regional activities, this might include for example regional environmental agreements and development banks. Restricting the ability to make requests to IPBES by those MEAs, UN, IGO and organizations represented on the plenary allows the process to be manageable.</i></p>
<p>Consideration 3: The function and work programme of IPBES.</p>	<p>Generation of Knowledge: IPBES identifies and prioritizes information gaps, and facilitates a dialogue to catalyze the generation of new policy-relevant knowledge (Option 2). Knowledge Assessment: IPBES conducts regular and timely assessments including global and regional scales as well as thematic issues. IPBES provides a horizon scanning and early warning function, and also facilitates integration of assessments across regions and scales, for example by developing common metrics and approaches (Option 1, expanded). Supporting policy: IPBES identifies tools and methods to make use of assessment findings, and works with other institutions to apply those tools (Option 1). Capacity Building: IPBES identifies and prioritizes key capacity building needs, provides financing and technical support to support the highest needs, and catalyzes funding for other needs. (Option 2 expanded). <i>These options enable IPBES to be an efficient and focused mechanism, whilst allowing and catalyzing value-added and supportive activities to be identified by IPBES and then taken up by existing processes and institutions.</i></p>
<p>Consideration 4: The legal basis, governance and decision-making structure of IPBES.</p>	<p>Legal Status: IPBES is established by the UNGA as an intergovernmental and multistakeholder body, and is distinct from existing organizations, but linked to one or more international organizations, including through the provision of a distributed secretariat. (Co-) host organizations should be selected after a transparent call for nominations and tender process (Hybrid of options 1 and 2). Plenary modality: The Plenary is open to all States, and also UN agencies, IGOs and relevant stakeholders on invitation by the plenary. Multistakeholder votes do not exceed those of governments. Clear criteria for selecting relevant stakeholders in the Plenary need to be adopted. (Option 2). Plenary chair: The Plenary is co-chaired, by a policy maker and a scientist (Option 4). Decision-making authority: IPBES has a single Bureau, with a strong composition of scientific expertise (Option 1). Bureau: The Bureau has government and multistakeholder representatives from the IPBES Plenary. Multistakeholder votes do not exceed those of governments. As with the plenary, multistakeholder votes do not exceed those of governments (Option 3). <i>These options ensure that IPBES operates as a cost-effective and efficient mechanism, as well as ensure its transparency, legitimacy and independency.</i></p>
<p>Consideration 5: The IPBES Secretariat.</p>	<p>The Secretariat is distributed, hosted by a limited number of UN, IGO and/or other relevant and interested organizations. It is established at the first meeting of the IPBES Plenary, after a transparent call for nominations and tender process (New option and process). <i>Proposals should be solicited for consideration at the first IPBES Plenary. This will ensure a full understanding of the benefits of various organizations to host a part of the secretariat, and a transparent process.</i></p>
<p>Consideration 6: Funding IPBES.</p>	<p>IPBES is funded through a trust fund with prescribed contributions from governments plus voluntary contributions from other funders (Option 2). <i>Sustainable and predictable financing is essential for the effective functioning of IPBES.</i></p>



IUCN statement to opening of IPBES-3 meeting, Busan, 7th June

Thank you Mr Chairman

IUCN is pleased to be a part of the 3rd Intergovernmental and Multistakeholder meeting on an IPBES, and extends our thanks to UNEP and the Hosts, the Republic of Korea for their excellent organization for the preparations of the meeting this week. As mentioned by the Minister, IUCN looks forward to holding its World Conservation Congress here in Republic of Korea in 2012.

It is clear to IUCN that the task ahead of us all this week is to determine the need for, the function of, and thereafter the form of a new mechanism that would meet the identified needs from the IPBES Gap Analysis, and deliver the most effective and improved science-policy interface on biodiversity, ecosystem services, and human well-being. Such discussions must build on the previous two IPBES meetings, and background documents, but also on the wider experience from other processes, such as the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC), the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment (MA), and the recent Assessment of Assessments (AoA) process considering options for regular assessment of the marine environment.

Last year, the AoA completed the task of considering the lessons learned from the design, development and delivery of around 4000 individual assessments related to the coastal and marine environment, and the findings of the group of experts provide an enormous body of extremely useful information for consideration during this meeting.

We have been giving a great deal of thought in IUCN to the various issues to be discussed this week, and have consulted widely with our membership on the perspectives, especially those of the multistakeholder community, relating to the agenda ahead of us - in particular on the most appropriate means to ensure that a new mechanism is relevant, legitimate and credible to the range of government and other decision-makers in environment and development sectors, and that any new mechanism has an appropriate niche and relationship with the work of ongoing initiatives and institutions.

Under the chairmanship of the IUCN President, Ashok Khosla, the IUCN Council met last week for its 74th session. The Council welcomed IUCN's role to date in supporting the IPBES discussions, and requested the IUCN Director General to support and promote the establishment of IPBES as an intergovernmental *and multistakeholder* platform, and to offer IUCN's support to contribute to its work programme, its structure, and its governance, as appropriate.

IUCN strongly supports the statement made by Korea Business Council for Sustainable Development (KBCSD) on behalf of the World Business Council for Sustainable Development (WBCSD), and as part of the multistakeholder representation at the meeting this week, we look forward to contributing to many of

the discussion items ahead of us, and wish us all well with the deliberations in the days ahead.

Thank you.

Go-ahead for Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services

Busan, Republic of Korea, 11 June 2010

After a week of intense negotiations, governments have agreed to establish a new mechanism, which will strengthen the dialogue between the scientific community and policymakers on biodiversity and ecosystem services. The so-called “IPBES” - the Intergovernmental Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services - will be a leading body in making scientifically sound and relevant information available to support more informed decisions on how biodiversity and ecosystem services are conserved and used around the world.

At a meeting in Busan, Republic of Korea, governments agreed on principles for the operation of IPBES, including that it must be independent, scientifically credible, relevant and legitimate. Key functions agreed for IPBES include conducting regular assessments on existing knowledge about biodiversity and ecosystem services, encouraging new research to fill gaps in information, ensuring credible scientific advice is available for use in policy processes, and strengthening technical capacity.

IPBES will respond to the knowledge needs of governments, as well as those expressed through the multilateral environmental agreements, including the Convention on Biological Diversity. Non-government stakeholders will also be encouraged to contribute, by providing knowledge, and by suggesting needs and issues to be addressed. However, IPBES itself will be established as a strictly intergovernmental body, with other stakeholders involved only as observers in the decision making and governance structure.

“IUCN is delighted that the decision has finally been taken to establish IPBES, and looks forward to contributing to its knowledge base and operations,” says **Julia Marton-Lefèvre, IUCN Director General**. *“Non-government organizations are instrumental in conserving and sustainably using biodiversity and ecosystem services”* **Julia Marton-Lefèvre** continues. *“Although an opportunity to be established as a fully multistakeholder platform was not taken up, IPBES will be an extremely useful body to ensure that the best information is made available to all decision-makers in governments and elsewhere.”*

The fact that the deliberations were very intense at times during the meeting suggests that governments see value in the new mechanism, and consider its effective establishment as very important. Decisions taken in Busan will be forwarded to the 65th session of the United Nations General Assembly to be held later this year in New York, at which point it is anticipated that a Resolution will be passed to officially establish IPBES. Building on support for IPBES for the last two years, and the processes that led to IPBES before that, IUCN now looks forward to contributing to the next operational phase to set up and implement the platform, through providing its worldwide expertise and knowledge services.

Further information can be found at www.iucn.org/ipbes and at the official website for IPBES: www.ipbes.org
Read UNEP Press release [here](#)