

**Global biodiversity mechanisms:
a thematic review of recent developments and future evidence needs**

Strand Palace Hotel, London 20th May 2009

MEA Presentations

Science-policy interface
Andy Stott, Director of Science, JNCC

May 2009

Visit: <http://www.jncc.gov.uk/MEA-event>



Science-policy interface

Andrew Stott

Director of Science

JNCC

andrew.stott@jncc.gov.uk

How can we improve the impact of science on policy development and implementation at global levels?

How we got to where we are – and where next!

Biodiversity – science and governance

‘... together with immediate action, we must deepen our knowledge on biodiversity and establish premises recognised by all scientists, so that the international community can shoulder its responsibility.

Since 1988, the IPCC has brought about a scientific consensus on the reality and significance of global warming.

We need a similar type of mechanism for biodiversity. I hereby call on all scientists to join forces in order to set up a world-wide network of experts...’

Jacques Chirac, Paris, January 2005




Convergence or chaos?

- Millennium Ecosystem Assessment
- International mechanism consultation
- Conventions
- Intergovernmental platform?

Millennium Ecosystem Assessment

- Reports published in 2005
- CBD COP8 (Decision VIII/9):
 - *noted* the main findings of the biodiversity synthesis report;
 - *decided* to consider the findings in the implementation and future reviews of CBD work programmes;
 - *urged* Parties to increase support for and co-ordinate research on ecosystem services;
 - *encouraged* Parties to conduct national and other sub-global assessments; and,
 - *decided* to consider at COP9 options for improving availability of scientific information and advice to SBSTTA



Millennium Ecosystem Assessment - Evaluation

Evaluations completed in 2007
concluded:

- Lack of significant direct impact on policy
- Lack tools/models to be used by policy-makers
- Further research to fill knowledge gaps
- Sub-global assessments not fully developed
- Lack of awareness amongst key stakeholders



MA Follow-up Strategy

- Launched in May 2008 (at CBD COP9)
- Main elements
 - Build the knowledge base
 - Promote research and sub-global assessments
 - Integrate MA ecosystem approach into decision-making
 - Outreach and dissemination of findings, concepts and tools
 - Explore needs and options for a 2nd global assessment
- MA Follow-up Implementation and Advisory Groups established – UNEP/UNDP lead

International Mechanism of Scientific Expertise on Biodiversity (IMoSEB)

- Consultation process Feb 2006 – Nov 2007
- 6 regional consultation meetings
- Multi-stakeholder participation, including some governments



CONSULTATIVE PROCESS TOWARDS AN
IMoSEB

IMoSEB – Needs to improve interface between science and policy

- Need for independent scientific expertise
 - » Scientific information to support Conventions
 - » Emerging global threats and horizon scanning
 - » Knowledge for local/national decision-making
- Need for more capacity
 - » Mobilisation of scientific expertise for local and national capacity building
 - » Improved sub-global ecosystem assessments
- Need for improved communication
 - » Enhanced understanding and application of science
 - » Improved access to peer reviewed scientific results
 - » Evidence gaps which require further scientific work

IMoSEB – Recommendations



Further and urgent consideration of the establishment of a means, and enhancement of existing institutions to provide an objective source of information about biodiversity, ecosystem services and human well-being, more specifically to:

- » Promote regular global and sub-global assessments;
- » Undertake special studies on emerging issues;
- » Obtain scientific information on biodiversity- related emergencies;
- » develop capacity to undertake assessments;
- » promote more effective communication.





The Conference of the Parties (decision IX/15):

- *acknowledged* the MA follow-up strategy and *invited* Parties and *requested* Exec Sec to contribute to its implementation;
- *noted* of the outcomes of the IMoSEB consultation;
- *noted* the need for improved scientific information relevant to CBD and other biodiversity-related conventions with a view to strengthening SBSTTA and *welcomed* agreement by UNEP to convene **an open-ended intergovernmental multi-stakeholder meeting to consider establishing an efficient science-policy interface on biodiversity, ecosystem services and human well-being.**



The Conference of the Parties (decision IX/29):

- *Requested* the Exec Sec to notify Parties of a deadline for submission of proposed topics;
- *Requested* SBSTTA to review and discuss proposals for emerging issues and identify new and emerging issues and **elaborate a scientific and technical analysis with options for action** for consideration by COP;




Intergovernmental Platform for Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services

First intergovernmental and multi-stakeholder meeting in Putrajaya, Malaysia in November 2008

78 countries and 25 organisations expressed views without reaching agreement

- Need to improve science-policy interface
- Many existing national and international interfaces
- Independent platform should complement existing bodies, network of networks?
- Role to compile, synthesise and assess existing scientific knowledge
- Need for capacity building in developing countries



Chairs recommendations:

- Continue to explore mechanisms to improve science-policy interface for:
 - Early warning
 - Multiple-scale assessments
 - Policy information
 - Capacity development
- Undertake analysis of gaps in existing mechanisms
- Request UNEP Exec Sec to convene a 2nd intergovernmental meeting



IPBES – Preliminary Gap Analysis

UNEP-WCMC commissioned to prepared a preliminary gap analysis

- Use of science by policy advisory processes
 - Science advisory bodies of MEAs and other intergovernmental process
 - Existing co-ordination mechanisms – international and national
- Assessment processes
 - MA, GEO, GBO, GFRA etc
 - IPCC, IAAKSSD
 - Indicators
 - Models and scenarios
- Emerging issues
- Capacity building

25th session of UNEP Governing Council in February 2009 decided:

- to complete the full gap analysis
- convene a 2nd intergovernmental and multi-stakeholder meeting on IPBES (5-9 October 2009)
- UNEP consultation closed on 15th May


www.ipbes.net/en/index.aspx

G8 Siracusa Charter April 2009

- Continue process of exploring mechanisms to improve the science-policy interface – re-affirming commitment;
- Supporting co-operation between countries and international organisations to further global monitoring of biodiversity;
- Achieving reliable, comparable and interoperable data on biodiversity and wide use of advanced technologies;
- Research and capacity building on biodiversity and ecosystem services.


EPBRS – Network of Knowledge

- European Platform on Biodiversity Research Strategy (EPBRS) concept note on ‘network of knowledge’
- Workshop in Brussels on 6th May
- Contribution to EU discussion on IPBES
- Anticipated FP7 Call for a European NoK




IPBES network of knowledge option (EPBRS)

IPBES expert panel option



To re-cap - a brief history....



IPBES next steps

- Completion and review of gap analysis
- Development of options, costs
- Agreement of EU position
- 2nd IPBES meeting October 2009
- 3rd IPBES meeting ??????
- Report to special session on biodiversity at 65th UN General Assembly
- CBD COP10

Your comments

- Are there significant shortcomings in the way that science informs policy (at national, European and international level)? Or how policy requirements influence science investment?
- How might these be addressed?
- Is there a need for a new intergovernmental platform on biodiversity and ecosystem services (IPBES)?