

**CONVENTION ON
BIOLOGICAL
DIVERSITY**

Distr.
GENERAL

UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/6/9/Add.1
8 January 2001

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

SUBSIDIARY BODY ON SCIENTIFIC, TECHNICAL AND
TECHNOLOGICAL ADVICE

Sixth meeting

Montreal, 12-16 March 2001

Item 5.1 of the provisional agenda*

SCIENTIFIC ASSESSMENTS

Development of methodologies and identification of pilot studies

Note by the Executive Secretary

Addendum

**REPORT OF THE BRAINSTORMING MEETING ON SCIENTIFIC
ASSESSMENT, OSLO, 17-19 NOVEMBER 1999**

Note by the Executive Secretary

1. The Executive Secretary is circulating herewith, for the consideration of the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice under item 5.1 of the provisional agenda for its sixth meeting, the report of the report of the report of the brainstorming meeting on scientific assessment that was held in Oslo from 17 to 19 November 1999.
2. This report was initially circulated, in English only, as an information document for the fifth meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention. By paragraph 28 of its decision V/20, the Conference of the Parties noted the report and referred it to the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice for consideration and, where appropriate, use in its work.

* UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/6/1.

/...

REPORT OF THE BRAINSTORMING MEETING ON
SCIENTIFIC ASSESSMENT

Oslo, 17 - 19 November 1999

1. OPENING OF THE MEETING

1. The Meeting was opened by Mr. Hamdallah Zedan, Executive Secretary of the Convention on Biological Diversity who briefly introduced the issue of scientific assessment within the framework of the Convention. He also thanked the Government of Norway for hosting and co-sponsoring the meeting.

2. Mr. Ivar Baste, Deputy Director General of the Ministry of Environment welcomed the participants on behalf of the Government of Norway.

3. Mr. Peter Johan Schei, Director of International Negotiations, Directorate for Nature Management of Norway was unanimously elected chairman for the Session.

4. The provisional agenda for the meeting was approved as attached in annex I.

5. The list of participants is attached in annex II.

2. REVIEW OF RELEVANT DECISIONS OF THE CONFERENCE OF
PARTIES AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE SUBSIDIARY
BODY ON SCIENTIFIC, TECHNICAL AND TECHNOLOGICAL
ADVICE (SBSTTA)

6. The Convention on Biological Diversity, in its preamble, recognizes "the general lack of information and knowledge regarding biological diversity and of the urgent need to develop scientific, technical, and institutional capacities to provide the basic understanding upon which to plan and implement appropriate measures". Article 25 requests the SBSTTA, inter alia, to "provide scientific and technical assessments of the status of biological diversity" and "prepare scientific and technical assessments on the effects of types of measures taken in accordance with the provisions of this Convention".

7. Several decisions of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention (see annex III below) and recommendations from the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice (SBSTTA) and the Inter-Sessional Meeting on the Operation of the Convention (ISOC) relevant to scientific and technical assessment and peer-reviewing, also address the assessment need for the Convention on Biological Diversity.

3. LESSONS LEARNED FROM PREVIOUS ASSESSMENTS AND
PEER REVIEW MECHANISMS

8. Presentations on the experiences of scientific assessments within the IPCC and the Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer were given by representatives of these programmes.

9. Assessment activities within the Global International Waters Assessment (GIWA), the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment, the Global Biodiversity Assessment, CITES, IUCN, and Australian National Land and Water Audit were also presented by participants familiar with these initiatives.

4. ELEMENTS FOR A DRAFT PROPOSAL ON A SCIENTIFIC
ASSESSMENT PROCESS WITHIN THE CONVENTION ON
BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY

10. Since the Convention on Biological Diversity came into force in December 1993, it has focused on the implementation of its three basic objectives namely the conservation of biological diversity, the sustainable use of its components and the fair and equitable sharing of benefits arising from the use of genetic resources. The Convention is hence the first global, comprehensive agreement to address all aspects of biological diversity: genetic resources, species and ecosystems. It recognizes for the first time that the conservation of biological diversity is a "common concern of humankind" and an integral part of sustainable development. The Convention also addresses for the first time matters related to equity and shared responsibility.

11. The Convention addresses biodiversity issues in six thematic areas (inland waters, marine/coastal, agro-biodiversity, forest, drylands, and mountains), as well as cross-cutting issues such as access and benefit-sharing, the ecosystem approach, alien species, Global Taxonomy Initiative and indicators.

12. A lot of information has already been gathered on biodiversity issues in international projects and through national inventories and research projects. However, information needs to be accessible; comparable; and regularly updated to constitute a reliable basis for policy decisions and actions taken by the Parties to the Convention. This is presently not the case and therefore there is a need for an assessment process which is continuously ongoing; transparent; independent; and scientifically and politically credible. Moreover, much of the existing data are not comparable across continents or are inadequate to answer assessment questions at the global or regional scale. A credible and scientifically-based global biodiversity assessment will necessarily involve the scientific community not only to consolidate and assess existing data but also to generate, on a timely basis, the necessary new data to answer the questions posed by the Convention.

13. The meeting identified the need to address the following main issues to develop the scientific-assessment process under the Convention on Biological Diversity:

- (a) Needs and scope of assessments;
- (b) Assessments within the framework and operations of the Convention on Biological Diversity;
- (c) Linkages with relevant existing and planned assessments;
- (d) Joint assessments;
- (e) Involvement of the scientific community;

- (f) Assessment process and mechanisms;
- (g) Financing.

Needs and scope of assessment

14. There are multiple needs for assessments within the Convention, including regular in-depth status and trends assessments within thematic areas and cross-cutting issues, comprehensive assessments from time to time, and assessments of the effectiveness of measures taken at regional and national level (which are already part of SBSTTA's mandate). There may also be need for technology assessments and assessment of the impact of specific issues (e.g. trade, alien species, biotechnology, etc) on biodiversity.

15. The assessment process within the Convention should be commissioned and managed by SBSTTA and be linked to the work-programme. The activities under the Convention, such as existing work programmes, the Global Biodiversity Outlook (GBO), and national reports may need to be adapted in order to be able to take full advantage of the assessment process. The results from the assessments would also help formulate future work programmes within the Convention.

16. The aim and purpose of assessments must be precise and clear, and the findings must be policy-relevant but not policy-prescriptive. The objectives of the assessment are to:

- (a) Review the current state of, and gaps in, knowledge on critical policy-relevant scientific issues;
- (b) Outline scenarios and consequences of various policy options in terms of, inter alia, trade-offs between different values of biodiversity; and,
- (c) Draw attention to those issues where scientists have reached a consensus of view and those where uncertainty has led to conflicting view points and therefore need further research.

Assessments within the framework and operations of the Convention on Biological Diversity

17. Article 25 of the Convention on Biological Diversity has already mandated SBSTTA with two specific assessment responsibilities and the Conference of the Parties has already endorsed the general advice of SBSTTA on some aspects of this issue (decision III/10). SBSTTA recommendation IV/1 B further addresses the issue of peer review and scientific assessment.

18. The need for an authorizing environment for a CBD assessment and ownership was stressed. The SBSTTA and ISOC recommendations constitute a good basis for a decision by the Conference of the Parties that would give SBSTTA the authority and flexibility to carry out any necessary assessments in the future.

19. The existing structures, such as the ad hoc technical expert groups, liaison groups, expert panels, roster of experts, the Secretariat of the Convention and its clearing house mechanism (CHM), and the financial mechanism could be used in carrying out the assessment process. It was

noted that, at its fifth meeting, SBSTTA was to consider a note by the Executive Secretary on ad hoc technical expert groups: terms of reference, and roster of experts and proposal on a uniform methodology for their use (UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/5/15). In order to carry forward the assessment process, a proposal to establish a steering mechanism to function as a Scientific Assessments Panel should be presented to the Conference of the Parties at its fifth meeting.

20. The Scientific Assessments Panel and the implementation of the assessment process should be designed to guarantee a scientifically independent and credible assessment process, striving for the highest possible quality.

21. The roster of experts should be used to the extent possible in the assessment process, but the selection of experts should not be limited to those included in the roster.

22. The clearing-house mechanism should be used to help identify experts that could participate in the assessments and to facilitate exchange of relevant information, peer review of documents and dissemination of results. The clearing-house mechanism should be used to promote international scientific and technical cooperation in support of assessments under the Convention on Biological Diversity, including the overcoming of language barriers.

23. Every assessment should identify gaps in knowledge and joint scientific and technological cooperation ventures that would promote the implementation of the Convention.

Linkages with relevant existing and planned assessments

24. There are several assessments, monitoring programmes, and projects which potentially could provide input to the assessment process under the Convention. An inventory of existing assessments, including their relevance to the Convention is needed. This inventory will build on recent surveys carried out.

25. It is important to identify which assessment needs of the Convention on Biological Diversity can be met by existing initiatives and how they can be expanded to better meet those needs. The mechanisms for collaborating with ongoing initiatives such as providing lead authors, responsibilities for chapters, participation in steering committees, necessary buy-in and acceptance by the Convention on Biological Diversity, quality assurance, etc., should be developed in rules of procedure.

26. The areas that are of importance for the Convention on Biological Diversity but not presently covered by ongoing activities (gaps) should be identified.

27. The co-sponsoring of assessments or participation in joint assessments with several authorizing authorities may need the approval from the Conference of the Parties.

Joint assessments

28. Some assessments, like the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment and others, may be designed and established in partnership with other

institutions where assessment needs are complementary and to address inter-linkages among issues.

29. The process and mechanism used for joint assessments should meet the criteria established for assessments established within the Convention, recognizing that the governance of the process will be shared with other institutions.

30. Likewise, assessments may be required on specific topics and issues linked to other environmental conventions and related international agreements, and could be carried out jointly or in close consultation with their respective secretariats and relevant bodies. Such an initiative is the ongoing follow-up to the first Interlinkages Assessment report entitled "Protecting our Planet - Securing our Future: Linking Global Environmental Issues to Basic Human Needs".

Involvement of the scientific community

31. The involvement of the scientific community is crucial. The scientific community should engage itself both in the decision-making process under the Convention and in that way become part of the authorizing environment for the assessment process, as well as in the elaboration of the assessments themselves, including the gathering of new data and the consolidation of existing data. The assessment process is conducted to create an arena for the interaction between the scientific community and policy makers. The Convention, through SBSTTA and its other bodies, should develop mechanisms to engage the scientific community to adapt its research programs to meet the needs of the Convention, including the gathering of standardized and comparable new data to answer the questions posed by the SBSTTA under its assessment framework.

32. The experiences to mobilize the scientific community within the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) and the Montreal Protocol could be used also within the assessment process for the Convention.

33. The assessment process should be designed to allow for scientific independence.

The assessment process and mechanisms

34. An outline for a possible structure for the assessment process is presented in annex IV below. The proposed structure would ensure the authorizing environment, scientific independence, and quality control by extensive peer review. Regarding the approval and acceptance of the assessment findings, there are two possible options that differ in their levels of scientific independence and political ownership:

(a) Option 1: The Executive Summary of the assessments containing main policy relevant findings would be presented to SBSTTA for consideration and action. This option would avoid a potentially lengthy approval process, but would not have the full governmental endorsement. The SBSTTA recommendations would draw on the findings of the executive summary;

(b) Option 2: The executive summary would be presented to SBSTTA for approval. This process would close the loop between the governmental authorizing environment for the assessment process, the scientific independence, and the ownership, endorsement and political commitment to the findings of the assessment. However, because the same body that would

make policy recommendations drawing on the findings would also be negotiating the findings themselves, the negotiation of the findings would become the de facto negotiation of the policy recommendations thereby diminishing the scientific independence of the findings.

35. It was recommended to develop an assessment strategy for SBSTTA, including the need for assessments within the Convention, relation to ongoing activities (within and outside the Convention), mechanisms for collaboration with other initiatives and mechanisms to engage the scientific community, to be presented to the Conference of the Parties at its fifth meeting (see annex V below).

36. Also, in addition to the assessment strategy, rules of procedures based on the IPCC procedures for the preparation, review, acceptance, adoption, approval and publication of IPCC reports should be developed and presented to the Conference of the Parties at its fifth meeting. A first draft is attached in annex VI below.

Financing

37. The strategic assessment framework needs to identify the financial needs for the assessment process under the Convention on Biological Diversity. Funding may be easier to obtain for comprehensive assessments than for repeated in-depth assessments of specific topics. Funding may come from:

- (a) Trust Fund for the Convention on Biological Diversity;
- (b) The Global Environment Facility (GEF);
- (c) Support from Parties who buy into the assessment process and who would contribute in kind (institutions, staff, etc.) and money.

38. A forum for interaction with science funding agencies should be established to promote funding in areas relevant to the need of the assessment process, as well as the work programmes of the Convention.

39. Cost-efficiency should be sought by participating in joint assessment initiatives.

5. CLOSURE

40. In closing, the Chairman thanked the participants for their valuable contributions and active participation in the discussions.

41. The Executive Secretary of the Convention on Biological Diversity thanked the Government of Norway for the excellent facilities provided for the meeting. He also thanked the participants for dedicating their time and provide their very valuable inputs to assist the Secretariat to bring the assessment process forward.

42. The Chairman closed the meeting on Friday, 19 November 1999 at 1 p.m.

Annex I

AGENDA

1. Opening
2. Review of relevant decisions of the Conference of the Parties and recommendations of SBSTTA
3. Lessons learned from previous assessments and peer review mechanisms
4. Elements for a draft proposal
5. Closure

Annex II

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

Mr. Rueben Olembo
Former Deputy Executive Director
UNEP
Nairobi - KENYA
Tel: 254-2-568-695
Fax: 254-2-562-949

Prof. Abdul Habid Zakri
Deputy Vice Chancellor
University of Malaysia
43600 UKM Bangi, Selangor
Darul Ehsan - MALAYSIA
Tel: 603-825-343
Fax: 603-825-6484
E-mail: zakri@pkriscc.cc.ukm.my

Dr. Braulio Dias
Director, Biodiversity and Genetic Resources
Ministry of Environment
Esplanada dos Ministerios
Bloco B, Sala 653
Brasilia, DF 70068-900 - BRAZIL
Tel: 55-61-317-1120
Fax: 55-61-323-7936
E-mail: bfsdias@mma.gov.br

Mr. David Brackett
Director General, Canadian Wildlife Services
Environment Canada
Place Vincent Massey, 3rd Floor
351 St. Joseph Boulevard
Hull, Qc K1A 0H3-CANADA
Tel: 819-997-1301
Fax: 819-953-7177
E-mail: david.bracket@ec.gc.ca

Mr. Gabor Nechay
Senior Counselor
Ministry for Environment
Kolto u. 21
1121 Budapest - HUNGARY
Tel: 361-395-6857
Fax: 361-395-7458
E-mail: nechay.gabor@ktmdom2.ktm.hu

Dr Walter Reid
World Resource Institute
731 N. 79th St.
Seattle, WA98103 - USA
Tel: 206-782-7963
Fax: 206-782-5682
Email: waltreid@attglobal.net

Mr. Robert Watson
Chairman IPCC
The World Bank Group
Washington D.C. USA
Tel: 202-473-6965
Fax: 202-477-0565
E-mail: rwatson@worldbank.org

Mr. Nelson Sabogal
Programme Officer, Secretariat for the Vienna
Convention and the Montreal Protocol
UNEP
P.O. Box 30552
Nairobi - KENYA

Tel: 254-2-623-856
Fax: 254-2-623-913
E-mail: nelson.sabogal@unep.org

Mr. Jorge Illueca
Asst. Executive Director, Division of
International Conventions
UNEP
P.O. Box 30552
Nairobi - KENYA

Tel: 254-2-624-011
Fax: 254-2-624-300
E-mail: jorge.illueca@unep.org

Dr. Peter Bridgewater
Director, Division of Ecological Sciences
UNESCO
1 rue Miollis, 75732 Paris
Cedex 15 - FRANCE

Tel: 331-4568-4067
Fax: 331-4568-5804
E-mail: p.bridgewater@unesco.org

Dr. Cristian Samper
Director General, Instituto Alexander
Van Humboldt
Ministry of the Environment
Calle 37 No. 8-40, Piso 1
Bogota - COLOMBIA

Tel: 57-8-732--0791
Fax: 57-8-732-0792
E-mail: christian@openway.com.co

Mr. Ulf Svensson
Deputy Assistant Under Secretary
Ministry of Foreign Affairs
SE- 103 39 Stockholm - SWEDEN

Tel: 46-8-405-4319
Fax: 46-8-723-1176
E-mail: ulf.svensson@foreign.ministry.se

Mr Peter Johan Schei
Director, International Negotiations
Directorate for Nature Management
Tungasletta 2,
N-485 Trondheim - NORWAY

Tel: 47-7358-0500
Fax: 47-7358-0501
E-mail: peter-johan.schei@dirnat.no

Mr. Ivar A. Baste
Deputy Director General
Ministry of Environment
P.O. Box 8013 DEP
N-0030 Oslo - NORWAY

Tel: 47-2224-6068
Fax: 47-2224-2756
E-mail: iab@md.dep.no

Finn Kateras
Head of International Division
Directorate for Nature Management
Tungasletta 2,
N-7485 Trondheim - NORWAY

Tel: 47-7358-0830
Fax: 47-7358-0501
E-mail: finn.kateras@dirnat.no

Ove Hokstad
Ministry of Environment
P.O. Box 8013 DEP
N-0030 Oslo - NORWAY

Tel: 47-2224-5834
Fax: 47-2224-2756
E-mail: oho@md.dep.no

Mr. Hamdallah Zedan
Executive Secretary
Convention on Biological
Diversity
393 St. Jacques Street, Suite 300
Montreal, Quebec, H2Y 1N9
CANADA

Tel: 514-287-7002
Fax: 514-288-6588
E-mail: hamdallah.zedan@biodiv.org

Anders Alm
Environmental Affairs Officer
Convention on
Biological Diversity
393 St. Jacques Street, Suite 300
Montreal, Quebec, H2Y 1N9 -
CANADA

Tel: 514-287-7050
Fax: 514-288-6588
E-mail: anders.alm@biodiv.org


Annex III

LIST OF COP DECISIONS REGARDING ASSESSMENT

DECISION	MANDATE
I/9	Medium-term programme of work of the Conference of the Parties
II/2	Publication and distribution of scientific and technical information
II/5	Consideration of the need for and modalities of a protocol for the safe transfer, handling and use of living modified organisms
II/9	Forest and biological diversity
II/10	Conservation and sustainable use of marine and coastal biological diversity
II/18	Medium-term programme of work of the Conference of the Parties for 1996-1997
II/20	Financing of and budget of the convention
III/5	Additional guidance to the financial mechanism
III/10	Identification, monitoring and assessment
III/11	Conservation and sustainable use of agricultural biological diversity
III/12	Programme of work for terrestrial biological diversity: forest biological diversity
III/13	Future programme of work for terrestrial biological diversity: dryland, mountain and inland water ecosystems.
III/19	Special session of the General Assembly to review implementation of Agenda 21
III/22	Medium-term programme of work 1996-1997
IV/1	Report and recommendations of the third meeting of the SBSTTA and instructions to be by the COP to the SBSTTA
IV/4	Status and trends of the biological diversity of inland water ecosystems and options for conservation and sustainable use
IV/5, section I	Programme of work on marine and coastal biological diversity, annex, operational objective 1.3
IV/6	Agricultural biological diversity
IV/7	Forest biological diversity
IV/10	Measures for implementing the Convention on Biological Diversity
IV/13	Additional guidance to the financial mechanism

Annex IV

DRAFT OUTLINE FOR CBD ASSESSMENT PROCESS



* For joint assessments, the SAP in collaboration with other partners

** See paragraph 34 of the report of the brainstorming meeting.

Annex V

SCIENTIFIC ASSESSMENTS WITHIN THE CONVENTION ON BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY: A
PROPOSED STRATEGY

I. GENERAL CONSIDERATIONS

A. Purpose

1. Since the Convention on Biological Diversity came into force in December 1993, it has focused on the implementation of its three basic objectives namely the conservation of biological diversity, the sustainable use of its components and the fair and equitable sharing of benefits arising from the use of genetic resources. The Convention is hence the first global, comprehensive agreement to address all aspects of biological diversity: genetic resources, species and ecosystems. It recognizes for the first time that the conservation of biological diversity is a "common concern of humankind" and an integral part of sustainable development. The Convention also addresses for the first time matters related to equity and shared responsibility.

2. We know too little of the current state and future prospects of goods and services that biodiversity is expected to provide to humankind, hence many uncertainties remain when these resources are inevitably subjected to intense development pressures with their conflicting goals and in the face of rapid global change. A sustained programme of assessments will enable the Convention to:

(a) Have at its disposal sets of scientifically reliable information on status and trends; scenarios; and response options;

(b) Authoritatively establish uncertainties and gaps and thus better determining needs for more information through research efforts;

(c) Narrow differences of opinion, minimize controversies and thus move the convention forward through setting priorities and establishing attainable management targets; and

(d) Review progress in implementation and generate/inform future project development and medium plans of the Convention on Biological Diversity.

B. Characteristics

3. Assessments, though desirable as scientific exercises, are not an end in themselves but a means to improve societal interaction with natural systems that provide goods and services for enhanced human development. Consequently, a whole gamut of society should be interested in, and be involved in assessment processes. Apart from political will, biodiversity assessments will need to mobilize and galvanize a wide range of participation: scientists, scientific and technological institutions, the private sector, non-governmental organizations, and the public at large, including local communities who are the custodians of the greatest portion of global biodiversity. The results of the assessment must be easily accessible to all these diverse groups to enable them to make informed decisions.

4. Consequently, any assessments commissioned under the Convention on Biological Diversity or carried out on its behalf must exhibit several characteristics, including:

- (a) Be fully international, thus needing to be intergovernmentally sanctioned;
- (b) Engage a wide spectrum of societal interest;
- (c) Be transparent;
- (d) Be based on scientific principles;
- (d) Be based on existing knowledge and authoritatively unearth knowledge gaps;
- (e) Be focused;
- (f) Be cost-effective;
- (g) Be management- or policy-oriented;
- (h) Be delivered in a timely manner;
- (i) Contribute to capacity-building, development and enhancement of institutions and promote scientific cooperation;
- (j) Be conducted within a set of agreed procedures, rules, and framework
- (k) Avoid duplication (See also SBSTTA recommendation II/2).

II. SCOPE OF ASSESSMENTS: STRATEGIC ASSESSMENT FRAMEWORKS

5. To receive world-wide political and scientific credibility, assessments need a broad-based authorization. The Conference of the Parties can issue such an authorization. However, Article 25 of the Convention on Biological Diversity has already mandated SBSTTA with two specific assessment responsibilities, and the Conference of the Parties, in its decision III/10, has already endorsed the general advice of SBSTTA on some aspects of this issue.

6. Based on the information available through completed and ongoing activities, the need for new activities required must be carefully considered, specifying the purpose of the assessment, expected outputs, and relation to other completed, ongoing and/or planned initiatives.

7. Efforts can be directed towards a comprehensive assessment; assessment of a limited scope on a specific theme or issue; combining with others to agree on procedures for harmonizing and capturing synergies between completed and ongoing assessments by buying in added value; or simply contracting a system partner to deliver the required assessment. Paragraph 4 above provides a checklist of some of the characteristics SBSTTA may use in determining the quality of assessments and some of which must also be embedded in other assessments it wishes to associate with.

8. In the different thematic areas, the knowledge of biological diversity varies greatly among Parties to the Convention, and the need for assessments have been highlighted in the programmes of work for inland waters, marine and coastal, agrobiodiversity, forest and drylands. Moreover, the work programme on indicators of biological diversity is being developed based on the need of a tool for assessing status and threats to biodiversity. In particular, much of the work programme calls for further

assessment of ecosystem structure/composition functional biodiversity which provides services at ecosystem level.

9. The programme of work for inland waters requires an assessment of the status and trends of the biological diversity and options for conservation and sustainable use. It also calls for a review of methodologies for assessment of biological diversity as pertaining to inland water ecosystems.

10. The implementation of the Jakarta Mandate on Marine and Coastal Biodiversity requires several assessment exercises, like to develop guidelines for ecosystem evaluation and assessment, paying attention to the need to identify and select indicators, including social and abiotic indicators, that distinguish between natural and human-induced effects, effects of stock enhancement, etc.

11. The work programme on forest biological diversity requires case-studies on the ecosystem approach, a comprehensive analysis of the ways in which human activities influence forest biological diversity, and methodology to advance the elaboration of criteria and indicators for forest biological diversity. The provision of a comprehensive analysis of the status and trends of the world's agricultural biodiversity has been identified as a priority element for a programme of work on agricultural biodiversity.

12. A liaison group convened by the Convention secretariat on biological diversity of dryland, Mediterranean, arid, semi-arid, grassland and savannah ecosystems identified assessment of the state of dryland biodiversity and the pressure on it as a key element for a programme of work

13. Some of the assessment needs of these work programmes can be met in part by ongoing assessments being undertaken by other bodies. The third IPCC assessment report will include information on the potential impacts of climate change on biodiversity in all ecosystems and the IPCC Special Assessment on Land Use, Land Use Change and Forestry will assess the state of knowledge regarding land use management and the carbon cycle. The Global International Waters Assessment will include an assessment of conditions and trends of biodiversity in international waters, including transboundary freshwater ecosystems. However, from the standpoint of the Convention on Biological Diversity, these ongoing assessments cover only a small portion of the needs. In particular, significant gaps exist with regards to assessments that would provide comprehensive information on the status and trends of biodiversity in terrestrial ecosystems, on the sustainable use of biodiversity in all ecosystems, on the impacts of technologies and intellectual property rights on biodiversity, and on the effectiveness of benefit sharing mechanisms established to implement the Convention.

14. With these considerations in mind, and for the period 2000-2006, the Conference of the Parties may wish to authorize the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice to commence the following assessments:

(a) One or more assessment on thematic issues already agreed by the Conference of Parties for which SBSTTA feels in-depth evaluation might be essential (thematic assessments);

(b) One assessment with consideration of biodiversity within the broader context of other environmental issues/concerns (e.g. the proposed Millennium Ecosystem Assessment) (comprehensive/integrated assessments);

(c) One assessment joining the interest of the Convention on Biological Diversity with those of other agreed international agreements and processes (assessment of interlinkages);

(d) A small number of rapid assessments on questions or other issues which the conference of parties might revert to sbstta for advice (special issue assessments);

15. At its sixth meeting, the Conference of the Parties will be required to approve the second strategic assessment framework, covering the period 2006-2012, thus establishing rolling strategic assessment plans and triggering the assessment cycle. The feasibility of following the two-track approach suggested by SBSTTA (see SBSTTA recommendation II/1) should be explored so as to integrate regional, national, and local components and catalyse more widespread use of assessments.

III. THE ASSESSMENT PROCESS AND MECHANISM

A. Mobilizing existing structures within the Convention on Biological Diversity

16. The Conference of the Parties at its fourth meeting and SBSTTA, as well as the Inter-Sessional Meeting on the Operations of the Convention have set in motion several processes that all have a direct bearing on the operation of the Convention, and it is important to indicate how these various initiatives structures can be rationalized and streamlined in order to service the assessment process.

17. In its recommendation IV/1 B, SBSTTA addressed the issue of peer review and scientific assessment for the Convention on Biological Diversity and invited the Executive Secretary, within the proposal referred to in paragraph 2 of the recommendation, to consider:

(a) How any mechanism would relate to rosters of experts, the ad hoc technical expert groups and the liaison groups;

(b) The relationship between any proposed assessment and existing assessments of relevance;

(c) Developing guidelines on the responsibilities and selection of lead authors, contributors and expert reviewers, as well as procedures for the approval of a variety of types of reports, which draw upon the contributions and experts of Parties;

(d) Using existing facilities, for example, technology centres, universities and relevant organizations and processes;

(e) Ensuring access to appropriately qualified individuals suitable for producing reports that can be used by the Subsidiary Body;

(f) Making a commitment to invest time and resources in the maintenance, continuation and advancement of the assessment;

(g) Seeking support by government authorities and institutions for personnel involved in the assessment.

17. The above points address some issues taken into consideration in the mechanisms and procedures to produce an assessment, which are proposed for approval by the Conference of the Parties in paragraph 14. Other elements in the operational procedures are dealt with in the recommendations of SBSTTA to the Conference of the Parties.

B. The assessment process and mechanism

18. A lot of information on biodiversity has already been gathered in international projects and programmes and through national inventories and research projects. However, information needs to be accessible, comparable, and updated to constitute a reliable basis for different assessment purposes. The activities under the Convention on Biological Diversity, such as the existing work programmes, the Global Biodiversity Outlook, and the national reports may need to be streamlined in accordance with the requirements of the assessment process.

19. The existing structures, such as the technical expert groups, liaison groups, expert panels, roster of experts, the Secretariat of the Convention, the clearing house mechanism, and the financial mechanism could be used to carry out the assessment process. It was noted that, at its fifth meeting SBSTTA would consider a note by the Executive Secretary on ad hoc technical expert groups: terms of reference, and roster of experts and proposal on a uniform methodology for their use (UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/5/15). In order to carry forward the assessment process a proposal to establish a steering mechanism to function as a Scientific Assessments Panel on Biological Diversity should be presented to the Conference of the Parties at its fifth meeting.

20. The Scientific Assessments Panel and the implementation of the assessment process should be designed to guarantee a scientifically independent and credible assessment process, striving for the highest possible quality.

21. The roster of experts should be used to the extent possible in the assessment process, but the selection of experts should not be limited to those included in the roster.

22. The clearing-house mechanism should be used to identify experts that could participate in the assessments, facilitate exchange of relevant information, peer review of documents and dissemination of results. Its use in this way could greatly assist in breaking down language barriers and unleashing domestic and local potentials.

23. Every assessment should identify gaps in knowledge and joint scientific and technological cooperation ventures that would promote the implementation of the Convention.

24. To ensure that assessments under the Convention on Biological Diversity incorporate the characteristics identified in paragraph 4 above, the outline included in annex IV is recommended as the assessment process for the Convention. This process will be further improved by protocol derived by suitably modifying the IPCC procedures for the preparation, review, acceptance, adoption, approval, and publication of reports (see

annex VI below). The implementation of the full cycle will guarantee quality products.

IV. FUNDING

25. Other major international science assessments such as the Global Biodiversity Assessment and the IPCC assessments have been conducted over 3-4 year periods with budgets of US\$ 5 million to US\$ 20 million, and with important contributions of time and expertise from the research community. The Global Inland Waters Assessment is projected to cost US\$ 15 million over a four-year period. IPCC and Ozone assessments have built in budgetary mechanisms to assure the involvement of the developing country entities, and the Convention on Biological Diversity may need to learn from this experience.

26. The strategic assessment framework needs to identify the financial needs for the assessment process under the Convention on Biological Diversity. Funding may be easier to obtain for comprehensive assessments than for repeated in-depth assessments of specific topics.

27. Funding may come from:

- (a) The Trust Fund for the Convention on Biological Diversity;
- (b) The Global Environment Facility;
- (c) Support from Parties that buy into the assessment process and would contribute in kind (institutions, staff, etc) and cash.

28. A forum for interaction with science-funding agencies should be established to promote funding in areas relevant to the needs of the assessment process, as well as the work programmes of the Convention.

29. Cost-efficiency should be sought by participating in joint assessment initiatives.

Annex VI

DRAFT PROCEDURES FOR THE PREPARATION, REVIEW, ACCEPTANCE, ADOPTION,
APPROVAL AND PUBLICATION OF CDB ASSESSMENT REPORTS

CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTION
2. DEFINITIONS
3. ASSESSMENT MATERIAL FOR THE CONVENTION ON BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY
4. ASSESSMENT REPORTS, SYNTHESIS REPORTS, SPECIAL REPORTS AND METHODOLOGY GUIDELINES
 - 4.1 Reports accepted by working groups
 - 4.1.1 Compilation of lists of coordinating lead authors, lead authors, contributing authors, expert reviewers, review editors and government focal points
 - 4.1.2 Selection of authors
 - 4.1.3 Preparation of the draft report
 - 4.1.4 Review
 - 4.1.4.1 First review (by experts)
 - 4.1.4.2 Second review (by Governments and Experts)
 - 4.1.5 Preparation of final draft report
 - 4.2 Approval and acceptance of executive summaries
 - 4.3 Reports approved and/or adopted by the Panel
 - 4.3.1 The synthesis report
5. TECHNICAL PAPERS
6. SUPPORTING MATERIAL FROM THE CONVENTION ON BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY
 - 6.1 Workshops and expert meetings
 - 6.2 Co-sponsored workshops and expert meetings
- Appendix 1. TASKS AND RESPONSIBILITIES FOR LEAD AUTHORS, COORDINATING LEAD AUTHORS, EXPERT REVIEWERS AND REVIEW EDITORS OF REPORTS ISSUED UNDER THE CONVENTION ON BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY AND GOVERNMENT FOCAL POINTS
- Appendix 2. STRATEGY FOR USING NON-PUBLISHED/NON-PEER-REVIEWED SOURCES IN CBD REPORTS.

1. INTRODUCTION

1. The present draft document contains the procedures for the preparation, review, acceptance, adoption, approval, and publication of CBD assessment reports and other material.

2. DEFINITIONS

2. The definitions of the terms used in this document are as follows:

"The Biodiversity Scientific Assessments Panel" is the steering mechanism for the assessment process to be established by the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice. "Acceptance" of assessment reports signifies that the material has not been subject to line-by-line discussion and agreement, but nevertheless presents a comprehensive, objective and balanced view of the subject matter.

"Adoption" of assessment reports is a process of endorsement section by section (and not line by line) reserved for the longer report of the synthesis report as described in section 4.3 below.

"Approval" of assessment executive summaries signifies that the material has been subjected to detailed, line-by-line discussion and agreement.

"Assessment reports" are published materials composed of the full scientific, technical and technological assessment of biological diversity, produced by the working groups of the assessment process. Each of the volumes may be composed of two or more sections including: (a) an executive summary (b) an optional technical summary and (c) individual chapters and their executive summary as and when needed.

"Methodology guidelines" provide practical guidelines for the preparation of, for example, biodiversity inventories.

"Reports" refer to the main assessment materials for the Convention on Biological Diversity (including assessments, synthesis and special reports and their executive summaries, and methodology guidelines).

"Session of a working group" refers to a series of meetings at the plenary level of the governmental representatives to a working group of the assessment process.

"Session of the Panel " refers to a series of meetings at the plenary level of the governmental representatives to the Scientific Assessments Panel established by SBSTTA.

"Special report" is an assessment of a specific issue and generally follows the same structure as a volume of an assessment report.

"Executive summary" is a component of a report, such as an assessment, special or synthesis report, which provides a policy-relevant but policy-neutral summary of that report.

"Supporting material" consists of published material, workshop proceedings and material from expert meetings that are either commissioned or supported by the Convention on Biological Diversity.

"Synthesis reports" synthesize and integrate materials contained within the assessment reports and special reports and are written in a non-technical style suitable for policy makers and address a broad-range of policy-relevant but policy-neutral questions. They are composed of two sections as follows: (a) an executive summary; and (b) a longer report.

"Technical papers" are based on the material already in the assessment reports and special reports and are prepared on topics for which an objective international scientific/technical perspective is deemed essential.

3. ASSESSMENT MATERIAL FOR THE CONVENTION ON BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY

3. There are three main classes of assessment materials for the Convention on Biological Diversity, each of which is defined in section 2 above:

(a) Assessment reports (which include assessments, synthesis and special reports and their executive summaries and methodology guidelines);

(b) Technical papers;

(c) Supporting materials.

4. The different classes of material are subject as appropriate to different levels of formal endorsement. These levels are described in terms of acceptance, adoption and approval as defined in section 2 above.

5. The different levels of endorsement for the different classes of assessment material are as follows:

(a) In general, assessment reports are accepted by the appropriate working group and their executive summaries are prepared and approved by the appropriate working groups (section 4.1). Executive summaries are subsequently accepted by the Scientific Assessments Panel (section 4.2). The Scientific Assessments Panel may also accept and/or approve reports not prepared by a Working Group. In the case of the synthesis report the Panel adopts the underlying report, section by section, and approves the executive summary (section 4.3);

(b) Technical papers are not accepted, approved or adopted by the working groups or the Panel;

(c) Supporting materials are not accepted, approved or adopted (section 6).

4. ASSESSMENT REPORTS, SYNTHESIS REPORTS, SPECIAL REPORTS AND METHODOLOGY GUIDELINES

6. The review process generally takes place in three stages: expert review of assessment reports, government/expert review of assessment reports, and government review of the executive summaries and/or the synthesis report. Working group co-chairs should aim to avoid (or at least minimize) the overlap of government review periods for different assessment reports and with sessions of the Conference of Parties of the Convention on Biological Diversity and its subsidiary bodies.

7. Expert review should normally be eight weeks, but not less than six weeks, except to the extent decided by the Scientific Assessments Panel.

Government and government/expert reviews should not be less than eight weeks, except to the extent decided by the Scientific Assessments Panel.

8. All written expert and government and government-review comments will be made available to reviewers on request during the review process and will be retained in an open archive in a location determined by the Secretariat of the Convention on completion of the report, for a period of at least five years.

4.1. Reports accepted by working groups

9. Reports presented for acceptance at sessions of the working groups are the full scientific, technical and socio-economic assessment reports of the working groups, special reports and methodology guidelines.

10. The subject-matter of these reports shall conform to the terms of reference of the relevant working groups and to the work plan approved by the Scientific Assessments Panel.

11. Reports to be accepted by the working groups will undergo expert and government/expert reviews. The purpose of these reviews is to ensure that the reports present a comprehensive, objective, and balanced view of the areas they cover. While the large volume and technical detail of this material places practical limitations upon the extent to which changes to these reports will normally be made at sessions of working groups, "acceptance" signifies the view of the working group that this purpose has been achieved. The content of the authored chapters is the responsibility of the lead authors, subject to working group acceptance. Changes (other than grammatical or minor editorial changes) made after acceptance by the working group shall be those necessary to ensure consistency with the executive summary. These changes shall be identified by the lead authors in writing and made available to the Panel at the time it is asked to accept the executive summary.

12. Reports accepted by working groups should be formally and prominently described on the front and other introductory covers as:

"A report accepted by Working Group X but not approved in detail."

13. It is essential that working group work programmes allow enough time in their schedules, according to procedures, for a full review by experts and Governments and for the working group's acceptance. The working group co-chairs are responsible for implementing the work programme and ensuring that proper review of the material occurs in a timely manner.

14. To ensure proper preparation and review, the following steps should be followed:

1. Compilation of lists of coordinating lead authors, lead authors, contributing authors, expert reviewers, review editors and government focal points;
2. Selection of authors;
3. Preparation of the draft report;
4. Review;

- (a) First review (by experts);
 - (b) Second review (by Governments and experts).
5. Preparation of the final draft report.
 6. Acceptance of the report at a session of the appropriate working group.
- 4.1.1. Compilation of lists of coordinating lead authors, lead authors, contributing authors, expert reviewers, review editors and government focal points

15. At the request of working group co-chairs, through the Convention Secretariat, Governments, and participating organizations, the working group should identify appropriate experts for each area in the report who can act as potential coordinating lead authors, lead authors, contributing authors, expert reviewers or review editors. To facilitate the identification of experts and later review by Governments, Governments should also designate their respective focal points. Members of the Scientific Assessments Panel should contribute where necessary to identifying appropriate coordinating lead authors, lead authors, contributing authors, expert reviewers, and review editors in cooperation with the government focal points within their region to ensure an appropriate representation of experts from developing and developed countries and countries with economies in transition. These should be assembled into lists available to all Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity and maintained by the Convention Secretariat. The tasks and responsibilities of coordinating lead authors, lead authors, contributing authors, expert reviewers, review editors and government focal points are outlined in appendix 1 below.

4.1.2. Selection of lead authors

16. Coordinating lead authors and lead authors are selected by the Scientific Assessments Panel, under general guidance and review provided by the session of the working group, from those experts cited in the lists provided by Governments and participating organizations, and other experts as appropriate, known through their publications and works. The composition of the group of coordinating lead authors and lead authors for a section or chapter of a report shall reflect the need to aim for a range of views, expertise and geographical representation (ensuring appropriate representation of experts from developing and developed countries and countries with economies in transition). There should be at least one and normally two or more from developing countries. The coordinating lead authors and lead authors may enlist other experts as contributing authors to assist with the work.

17. At the earliest opportunity, the Convention Secretariat should inform all Governments and participating organizations of the identity of the coordinating lead authors and lead authors for different chapters and indicate the general content area that the person will contribute to the chapter.

4.1.3. Preparation of the draft report

18. Preparation of the first draft of a report should be undertaken by coordinating lead authors and lead authors. Experts who wish to contribute

material for consideration in the first draft should submit it directly to the lead authors. Contributions should be supported as far as possible with references from peer-reviewed and the internationally available literature, and with pre-prints of any unpublished material cited. Clear indications of how to access the latter should be included in the contributions. For material available in electronic format only, the location where such material may be accessed should be cited.

19. Lead authors will work on the basis of these contributions, the peer-reviewed and internationally available literature, including manuscripts that can be made available in pre-print form and selected non-peer-reviewed literature according to appendix 2 and CBD supporting material (see section 6). Material which is not published but which is available to experts and reviewers may be included provided that its inclusion is fully justified in the context of the assessment process for the Convention on Biological Diversity (see appendix 2).

20. In preparing the first draft, and at subsequent stages of revision after review, lead authors should clearly identify disparate views for which there is significant scientific or technical support, together with the relevant arguments.

21. Technical summaries provided by the working groups will be prepared under the leadership of the working group chair.

4.1.4. Review

22. Three principles governing the review should be borne in mind. First, the best possible scientific and technical advice should be included so that the assessment reports represent the latest scientific, technical and socio-economic findings and are as comprehensive as possible. Secondly, a wide circulation process, ensuring representation of independent experts from developing and developed countries and countries with economies in transition should aim to involve as many experts as possible in the assessment process under the Convention on Biological Diversity. Thirdly, the review process should be objective, open and transparent.

23. To help ensure that reports provide a balanced and complete assessment of current information, each working group should normally select two review editors per chapter (including the executive summaries) and per technical summary of each report. Review editors should normally consist of a member of the working group and an independent expert based on the lists provided by Governments and participating organizations. Review editors should not be involved in the preparation or review of material for which they are an editor. In selecting review editors, the working group should select from developed and developing countries and from countries with economies in transition, and should aim for a balanced representation of scientific, technical, and socio-economic views.

4.1.4.1. First review (by experts)

24. First draft reports should be circulated by the working group co-chairs for review by experts selected by the working group and, in addition, those on the lists provided by Governments and participating organizations, noting the need to aim for a range of views, expertise, and geographical representation. The review circulation should include:

(a) Experts who have significant expertise and/or publications in particular areas covered by the report;

(b) Experts nominated by Governments as coordinating lead authors, lead authors, contributing authors or expert reviewers as included in lists maintained by the Convention Secretariat;

(c) Expert reviewers nominated by appropriate organizations.

25. The first draft reports should be sent to Government focal points, for information, along with a list of those to whom the report has been sent for review in that country.

26. The working group co-chairs should make available to reviewers on request during the review process specific material referenced in the document being reviewed that is not available in the international published literature.

27. Expert reviewers should provide the comments to the appropriate lead authors through the relevant working group co-chairs with a copy, if required, to their government focal point.

28. Coordinating lead authors, in consultation with the review editors and in coordination with the respective working group co-chairs and the Convention Secretariat, are encouraged to supplement the draft revision process by organizing a wider meeting with principal contributing authors and expert reviewers, if time and funding permit, in order to pay special attention to particular points of assessment or areas of major differences.

4.1.4.2. Second review (by Governments and experts)

29. A revised draft should be distributed, by the appropriate working groups or through the Convention Secretariat, to Governments through the designated government focal points, and to all the coordinating lead authors, lead authors and contributing authors and expert reviewers.

30. Governments should send one integrated set of comments for each working group report to the appropriate working group through their government focal points.

31. Non-government reviewers should send their further comments to the appropriate working group with a copy to their appropriate government focal point.

4.1.5. Preparation of the final draft report

32. Preparation of a final draft report taking into account government and expert comments for submission to a session of a working group for acceptance should be undertaken by coordinating lead authors and lead authors in consultation with the review editors. If necessary, and timing and funding permit, a wider meeting with principal contributing authors and expert and government reviewers is encouraged in order to pay special attention to particular points of assessment or areas of major differences. It is important that reports describe different (possibly controversial) scientific, technical, and socio-economic views on a subject, particularly if they are relevant to the policy debate. The final draft should credit all coordinating lead authors, lead authors, contributing authors,

reviewers and review editors by name and affiliation (at the end of the report).

4.2. Approval and acceptance of executive summaries

33. Summary sections of reports approved by the working groups and accepted by the Scientific Assessments Panel will principally be the executive summaries, prepared by the respective working groups of their full scientific, technical and socio-economic assessments, and executive summaries of special reports prepared by the working groups. The executive summaries should be subject to simultaneous review by both experts and governments and to a final line-by-line approval by a session of the appropriate working group. Responsibility for preparing first drafts and revised drafts of executive summaries lies with the respective working group co-chairs. The executive summaries should be prepared concurrently with the preparation of the main working group reports.

33. Approval of the executive summary at the session of the working group, signifies that it is consistent with the factual material contained in the full scientific, technical and socio-economic assessment or special report accepted by the working group. Coordinating lead authors may be asked to provide technical assistance in ensuring that consistency has been achieved. These executive summaries should be formally and prominently described as:

"A report of Working Group X of the Scientific Assessments Panel."

34. For an executive summary approved by a working group to be endorsed as a assessment report, it must be accepted at a session of the Scientific Assessments Panel. Because the working group approval process is open to all Governments, working group approval of an executive summary means that the Scientific Assessments Panel cannot change it. However, it is necessary for the Panel to review the report at a session, note any substantial disagreements, and formally accept it.

4.3 Reports approved and/or adopted by the Scientific Assessments Panel

35. Reports approved and/or adopted by the Scientific Assessments Panel will be the synthesis report of the working group assessment reports and other reports as decided by the Scientific Assessments Panel, whereby section 4.2 applies mutatis mutandis.

4.3.1. The synthesis report

36. The Synthesis Report will synthesize and integrate materials contained within the assessment reports and special reports and should be written in a non-technical style suitable for policy makers and address a broad-range of policy-relevant but policy-neutral questions approved by the Panel. The synthesis report is composed of two sections as follows: (a) an executive summary and (b) a longer report. The Scientific Assessments Panel will appoint a writing team, noting the need to aim for a range of views, expertise and geographical representation.

37. An approval and adoption procedure will allow the Scientific Assessments Panel in plenary to approve the executive summary line by line and to ensure that the executive summary and the longer report of the synthesis report are consistent, and the synthesis report is consistent

with the underlying working group assessment reports and special reports from which the information has been synthesised and integrated.

- Step 1: The longer report and the executive summary of the synthesis report are prepared by the writing team.
- Step 2: The longer report and the executive summary of the synthesis report undergo simultaneous expert/government review.
- Step 3: The longer report and the executive summary of the synthesis report are then revised by lead authors, with the assistance of the review editors.
- Step 4: The revised drafts of the longer report and the executive summary of the synthesis report are submitted to Governments and participating organizations eight weeks before the session of the Scientific Assessments Panel.
- Step 5: The longer report and the executive summary of the synthesis report are both tabled for discussion in plenary meetings of the Scientific Assessments Panel:
- * The Scientific Assessments Panel in plenary meetings will first provisionally approve the executive summary line by line.
 - * The Scientific Assessments Panel in plenary meetings will review and adopt the longer report of the synthesis report, section by section, i.e. roughly one page or less at a time. The review and adoption process for the longer report of the synthesis report should be accomplished in the following manner:
 - When changes in the longer report of the synthesis report are required either to conform it to the executive summary or to ensure consistency with the underlying working group assessment reports, the Panel and authors will note where changes are required in the longer report of the synthesis report to ensure consistency in tone and content. The authors of the longer report of the synthesis report will then make changes in the longer report of the synthesis report. Those members of the Scientific Assessments Panel who are not authors will act as review editors to ensure that these documents are consistent and follow the directions of the Scientific Assessments Panel in plenary meetings;
 - The longer report of the synthesis report is then brought back to the Scientific Assessments Panel in plenary meetings for the review and adoption of the revised sections, section by section. If inconsistencies are still identified by the Scientific Assessments Panel, the longer report of the synthesis report is further refined by the authors with the assistance of the review editors for review and adoption by the Scientific Assessments Panel. This process is conducted section by section, not line by line.
 - * The final text of the longer report of the synthesis report will be adopted and approved by the Panel in plenary meetings.

38. The report consisting of the longer report and the executive summary of the synthesis report is a report of the Convention on Biological Diversity and should be formally and prominently described as:

"An assessment report of the Convention on Biological Diversity."

5. TECHNICAL PAPERS

39. CBD technical papers are prepared on topics for which an objective, international scientific/technical perspective is deemed essential. They:

(a) Are based on the material already in the assessment reports and special reports;

(b) Are initiated: (i) in response to a formal request from the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity or its subsidiary bodies ; or (ii) as decided by the Scientific Assessments Panel;

(c) Are prepared by a team of lead authors, including a coordinating lead author, selected by the working group, in accordance with the provisions of sections 4.1.1 and 4.1.2 above for the selection of lead authors and coordinating lead authors;

(d) Are submitted in draft form for simultaneous expert and government review with circulation to expert reviewers in accordance with section 4.1.4.1 at least four weeks before the comments are due;

(e) Are revised by the lead authors based upon the comments received in the step above;

(f) Are submitted for final government review at least four weeks before the comments are due;

(g) Are finalized by the lead authors, in consultation with the Scientific Assessments Panel which functions in the role of an Editorial Board, based on the comments received; and,

(h) If necessary, as determined by the Scientific Assessments Panel, would include in a footnote differing views, based on comments made during final government review, not otherwise adequately reflected in the paper.

40. The technical papers must reflect the balance and objectivity of those reports and support and/or explain the conclusions contained in those reports.

41. Information in the technical papers should be referenced as far as possible to the sub-section of the relevant assessment reports and related material.

42. Such technical papers are then made available to the Conference of the Parties or its subsidiary bodies, in response to its request, and thereafter publicly. If initiated by the Scientific Assessments Panel, technical papers are made available publicly. In either case, technical papers of the Convention on Biological Diversity prominently should state in the beginning:

"This is a Technical Paper of the Convention on Biological Diversity assessment process prepared in response to a (request from a body of the Convention on Biological Diversity)/(decision of the Scientific Assessments Panel). The material herein has undergone expert and government review but has not been considered by the Scientific Assessments Panel for formal acceptance or approval."

6. CBD SUPPORTING MATERIAL

43. Supporting material consists of: (i) published reports and proceedings from workshops and expert meetings within the scope of the Convention work programme that have recognition under the Convention; and (ii) material commissioned by working groups in support of the assessment process which a body under the Convention decides should have wide dissemination. Procedures for the recognition of workshops and expert meetings are given in sections 6.1 and 6.2 below.

44. Arrangements for publication of supporting material should be agreed as part of the process of SBSTTA recognition or commissioned by working groups to prepare specific supporting material. All supporting material should be formally and prominently described on the front and other introductory covers as:

"Supporting material prepared for consideration by the assessment process under the Convention on Biological Diversity. This supporting material has not been subject to formal review processes."

6.1. Workshops and expert meetings

45. Convention assessment workshops and expert meetings are those that have been agreed upon in advance by a SBSTTA assessment working group or by the Scientific Assessments Panel as useful or necessary for the completion of the working group's work plan or a task of the Convention. Only such activities may be designated as "CBD assessment" workshops or expert meetings. Their funding should include full and complete provision for participation of experts from developing countries and countries with economies in transition.

46. The proceedings of CBD assessment workshops and expert meetings should normally be published summarising the range of views presented at the meeting. Such proceedings should:

- Include a full list of participants;
- Indicate when and by whom they were prepared;
- Indicate whether and by whom they were reviewed prior to publication;
- Acknowledge all sources of funding and other support;
- Indicate prominently at the beginning of the document that the activity was held pursuant to a decision of the relevant Working Group or the Scientific Assessments Panel but that such decision does not imply Working Group or Panel endorsement or approval of the proceedings or any recommendations or conclusions contained therein.

6.2. Co-sponsored workshops and expert meetings

47. CBD co-sponsorship may be extended to other workshops or expert meetings if the Scientific Assessments Panel, as well as the co-chairs of the relevant working group, determine in advance that the activity will be useful to the work of the CBD assessment. CBD co-sponsorship of such an activity does not convey any obligation by the CBD to provide financial or

other support. In considering whether to extend CBD co-sponsorship, the following factors should be taken into account:

- whether full funding for the activity will be available from sources other than the CBD;
- Whether the activity will be open to government experts as well as experts from non-governmental organizations participating in the work of the CBD;
- Whether provision will be made for participation of experts from developing countries and countries with economies in transition;
- Whether the proceedings will be published and made available to the CBD in a time frame relevant to its work;
- Whether the proceedings will:
 - . Include a full list of participants;
 - . Indicate when and by whom they were prepared;
 - . Indicate whether and by whom they were reviewed prior to publication;
 - . Specify all sources of funding and other support;
 - . Prominently display the following disclaimer at the beginning of the document:

"CBD co-sponsorship does not imply CBD endorsement or approval of these proceedings or any recommendations or conclusions contained herein. Neither the papers presented at the workshop/expert meeting nor the report of its proceedings have been subjected to CBD review."

Appendix 1

TASKS AND RESPONSIBILITIES FOR LEAD AUTHORS, COORDINATING LEAD AUTHORS,
CONTRIBUTING AUTHORS, EXPERT REVIEWERS AND REVIEW EDITORS OF ASSESSMENT
REPORTS AND GOVERNMENT FOCAL POINTS

1. LEAD AUTHORS

Function: To be responsible for the production of designated sections addressing items of the work programme on the basis of the best scientific, technical and socio-economic information available.

Comment: Lead authors will typically work as small groups which have responsibility for ensuring that the various components of their sections are brought together on time, are of uniformly high quality and conform to any overall standards of style set for the document as a whole.

The task of lead authors is a demanding one and in recognition of this the names of lead authors will appear prominently in the final report.

The essence of the lead authors' task is synthesis of material drawn from available literature as defined in section 4.1.3. Lead authors, in conjunction with review editors, are also required to take account of expert and government review comments when revising text. Lead authors may not necessarily write original text themselves, but they must have the proven ability to develop text that is scientifically, technically and technologically, as well as socio-economically sound and that faithfully represents, to the extent that this is possible, contributions by a wide variety of experts. The ability to work to deadlines is also a necessary practical requirement.

Lead authors are required to record in the Report views which cannot be reconciled with a consensus view but which are nonetheless scientifically or technically valid.

Lead authors may convene meetings with contributing authors, as appropriate, in the preparations of their sections or to discuss expert or government review comments and to suggest any workshops or expert meetings in their relevant areas to the working group co-chairs. The names of all lead authors will be acknowledged in the reports.

2. COORDINATING LEAD AUTHORS

Function: To take overall responsibility for coordinating major sections of a report

Comment: Coordinating lead authors will be lead authors with the added responsibility of ensuring that major sections of the report are completed to a high standard, are collated and delivered to the working group co-chairs in a timely manner and conform to any overall standards of style set for the document.

Coordinating lead authors will play a leading role in ensuring that any cross-cutting scientific or technical issues which may involve several sections of a report are addressed in a complete and coherent manner and reflect the latest information available.

The skills and resources required of coordinating lead authors are those required of lead authors with the additional organizational skills needed to coordinate a section of a report.

The names of all coordinating lead authors will be acknowledged in the reports.

3. CONTRIBUTING AUTHORS

Function: To prepare technical information in the form of text, graphs or data for assimilation by the lead authors into the draft section.

Comment: Input from a wide range of contributors is a key element in the success of CBD assessments, and the names of all contributors will be acknowledged in the reports. Contributions are sometimes solicited by lead authors but unprompted contributions are encouraged.

Contributions should be supported as far as possible with references from the peer-reviewed and the internationally-available literature, and with pre-prints of any unpublished material cited; clear indications of how to access the latter should be included in the contributions. For material available in electronic format only, the location where such material may be accessed should be cited.

Contributed material may be edited, merged and if necessary, amended, in the course of developing the overall draft text.

4. EXPERT REVIEWERS

Function: To comment on the accuracy and completeness of the scientific/technical/socio-economic content and the overall scientific/technical/socio-economic balance of the drafts.

Comment: Expert reviewers will comment on the text according to their own knowledge and experience. They may be nominated by Governments, national and international organizations, working group, lead authors and contributing authors.

5. REVIEW EDITORS

Function: Review editors will assist the working group in identifying reviewers for the expert review process, ensure that all substantive expert and government review comments are afforded appropriate consideration, advise lead authors on how to handle contentious/controversial issues and ensure genuine

controversies are reflected adequately in the text of the report.

Comment: There will be one or two review editors per chapter (including their executive summaries) and per technical summary.

In order to carry out these tasks, review editors will need to have a broad understanding of the wider scientific and technical issues being addressed. The workload will be particularly heavy during the final stages of the report preparation. This includes attending those meetings where writing teams are considering the results of the two review rounds. Review editors are not actively engaged in drafting reports and cannot serve as reviewers of those chapters of which they are authors. Review editors can be members of a working group or outside experts agreed by the working group.

Although responsibility for the final text remains with the lead authors, review editors will need to ensure that where significant differences of opinion on scientific issues remain, such differences are described in an annex to the report.

Review editors must submit a written report to the working group sessions and where appropriate, will be requested to attend sessions of the working group and of the Scientific Assessments Panel to communicate their findings from the review process and to assist in finalizing the executive summary and synthesis reports.

The names of all review editors will be acknowledged in the reports.

6. GOVERNMENT FOCAL POINTS

Function: To prepare and update the list of national experts as required to help implement the CBD assessment work programme, and to arrange the provision of integrated comments on the accuracy and completeness of the scientific and/or technical content and the overall scientific and/or technical balance of the drafts.

Comment: Government review will typically be carried out within and between a number of departments and ministries.

For administrative convenience, each government and participating organization should designate one focal point for all CBD assessment activities, provide full information¹ on this Focal Point to the Convention Secretariat and notify the Secretariat of any changes in this information. The focal point should liaise with the Convention Secretariat regarding the logistics of the review process(es). Of particular importance is the full exchange of information.

[Footnote 1: Name, address, telephone, fax and e-mail]

Appendix 2

PROCEDURE FOR USING NON-PUBLISHED/NON-PEER-REVIEWED
SOURCES IN ASSESSMENT REPORTS

Because it is increasingly apparent that materials relevant to Assessment Reports, in particular, scientific information in developing countries, traditional knowledge, information in different languages, information about the experience and practice of the private sector, are found in sources that have not been published or peer-reviewed (e.g. grey literature, industry journals, internal organizational publications, non-peer reviewed reports or working papers of research institutions, proceedings of workshops etc.), the following additional procedures are provided. These have been designed to make all references used in assessment reports easily accessible and to ensure that the assessment process remains open and transparent.

1. Responsibilities of coordinating, lead and contributing authors

Authors who wish to include information from a non-published/non-peer-reviewed source are requested to:

- a. Critically assess any source that they wish to include. Each chapter team should review the quality and validity of each source before incorporating results from the source into an Assessment report.
- b. Send the following materials to the Working Group Co-Chairs that is coordinating the report:
 - One copy of each unpublished source to be used in the Assessment report
 - The following information for each source:
 - Title
 - Author(s)
 - Name of journal or other publication in which it appears, if applicable
 - Information on the availability of underlying data to the public
 - English-language executive summary or abstract, if the source is written in a non-English language
 - Names and contact information for 1-2 people who can be contacted for more information about the source.

2. Responsibilities of the review editors

The Review Editors will ensure that these sources are selected and used in a consistent manner across the report.

3. Responsibilities of the working group co-chairs

The working group co-chairs coordinating the report will (a) collect and index the sources received from authors, as well as the accompanying information received about each source and (b) send copies of unpublished sources to reviewers who request them during the review process.

4. Responsibilities of the Convention Secretariat

The Convention Secretariat will: (a) store the complete sets of indexed, non-published sources for each assessment report not prepared by a Working Group; (b) send copies of non-published sources to reviewers who request them.

5. Treatment in assessment reports

Non-peer-reviewed sources will be listed in the reference sections of assessment reports. These will be integrated with references for the peer-reviewed sources. These will be integrated with references to the peer reviewed sources stating how the material can be accessed, but will be followed by a statement that they are not published.
