
Meeting of the States Parties to the Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production and Stockpiling of Bacteriological (Biological) and Toxin Weapons and on Their Destruction

16 December 2015

English only

2015 Meeting

Geneva, 14-18 December 2015

Item 8 of the agenda

**Standing agenda item: Review of the developments
in the field of science and technology related
to the Convention**

Reviewing developments in science and technology: Examples of dedicated processes

Submitted by Switzerland

Introduction

1. In its working paper for the Meeting of Experts (BWC/MSP/2015/MX/WP.11), Switzerland laid out the rationale for a dedicated process to review relevant developments in science and technology (S&T). The working paper also described a number of parameters and considerations for such a dedicated body:

(a) **Process**, including how often the group meets, how it is connected to the relevant policy process, how its members are elected or nominated, whom are they representing when they participate, and how is the issue of appropriate geographic representation dealt with?

(b) **Scope**, including does the group primarily focus on identifying developments or considering their implications, who decides what it covers, and are any issues specifically excluded from its work?

(c) **Costs**, including the annual budget, are participation costs covered (and if so, by whom), is there a sponsorship programme, and what languages are used by the group/are meetings conducted in a single language to reduce interpretation and translation costs?

(d) **Guidance and coordination**, including who provides oversight of the group, who chairs it and where does the administrative support come from, and who, if anyone, speaks on behalf of the group?

(e) **Input**, including how external expertise is accessed, what limits are there on where input comes from, and what role do international and non-governmental organizations play? And

(f) **Reporting**, including does the group report directly to States Parties, or through another channel and to what end, can they make recommendations, is the report



factual or based on expert opinion, consensus-based or captures differing views, exhaustive or consolidated, intended for a technical or policy audience?

2. This paper reviews how different international processes deal with these issues. The processes covered include examples from:

(a) Other disarmament processes that have to deal with technical developments, such as:

- The Group of Governmental Experts of the High Contracting Parties to the Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons (CCW GGE) and its Meetings of Military and Technical Experts (CCW MMTE);
- The Scientific Advisory Board of the Organization for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons (OPCW SAB) and its Temporary Working Groups (OPCW TWG); and
- The United Nations Group of Governmental Experts on Developments in the Field of Information and Telecommunications in the Context of International Security (UN GGE).

(b) Non-disarmament-related international policy processes that contend with developments in the life sciences, such as:

- The Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD STTA) and its Ad Hoc Technical Expert Groups (CBD AHTEG);
- The EU science advisory mechanism (EU SAM);
- The International Panel on Climate Change (IPCC);
- The Specialist Commissions of the World Organization for Animal Health (OIE SC) and its Ad Hoc Groups of Experts (OIE AHG);
- The Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technological Advice of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC STA), and its Structured Expert Dialogue (UNFCCC SED);
- The Scientific and Technical Partnership of the United Nations Office for Disaster Risk Reduction (UNISDR STP) and its Scientific and Technical Advisory Group (UNISDR STAG);
- The United Nations Secretary-General's Scientific Advisory Board for sustainable development (UNSG SAB); as well as
- Advisory committees convened by the World Health Organization (WHO AC).

(c) Existing and proposed arrangements directly related to the work of the BWC, such as the Standing Agenda Item in the current intersessional work programme (BWC ISP SAI) and proposals made at the Seventh Review Conference.

3. An overview of all the science and technology review processes mentioned above is available online and upon request.

Process

4. Through the relevant BWC ISP SAI, States Parties have met twice a year to address developments in S&T. Many of the arrangements in place in other settings also meet once or twice a year. Some meet more regularly, for example the EU SAM is intended to meet four-six times per year. Others meet less regularly. Several processes, such as the Ad Hoc

Technical Expert Group Meetings of the CBD STTA, or WHO AC are convened as necessary.

5. During the current intersessional work programme, States Parties have devoted 1.5 days per year to issues around science and technology. Under half of the allotted time has been used to review relevant developments (an average of almost 4.5 hours per year), with the remainder devoted to other sub-topics, such as biorisk management and education and outreach. Noting differences in the mandates and scope of such reviews, considerably more time has been dedicated to science and technology issues in other fora. For example, the OPCW SAB meets for between 5-10 days per year and the UNFCCC STA meets for between 15 and 18 days per year. Several processes, such as the UNISDR STP, supplement the time they spend physically co-located with additional meetings via video or audio conferencing.

6. There is a clear division between technical and policy processes in many of the arrangements analysed. For example, the OIE SC forward their output to the International Committee at the organization's General Session, and the CBD STTA reports to the treaty's Conference of Parties, which then contextualise the technical discussion for a policy audience. In comparison, many of the delegations undertaking the S&T reviews during the BWC ISP SAI were comprised solely of policy experts, resulting in a blurring between technical and policy considerations.

7. During the BWC ISP SAI reviews of S&T were undertaken collectively by the 100+ States Parties participating in relevant meetings. In practice, this limited the potential for interactive debate and in identifying and exploring differences of opinion in the limited time available. In other processes, the constituency of the dedicated groups undertaking the review:

(a) Represent a state or organization – For example in the CCW GGE and CBD STTA, all States, international organizations or non-governmental organizations register their own delegations in accordance with the various rules of procedure;

(b) Participate in an individual capacity – In some cases—such as in the contexts of the CBD AHTEG and OPCW SAB—States nominate the pool of experts and the selection of specific individuals from the pool is undertaken by an official (such as the Director-General or Executive Secretary). In other instances, the experts are selected by the international organization itself, as is the case in both the WHO AC, UNFCCC SED, or UNISDR STAG; or

(c) Is a mixture of the other two approaches – For example, in the UN GGE a limited number of States are selected to participate. The States then nominate an individual expert to take part in the GGE.

8. Some groups, such as the CCW GGE, CBD STTA and UNISDR STP, were open-ended, thereby allowing participation of all interested bodies or experts. In cases where participation in the process for reviewing developments in S&T is limited to a certain number of bodies or experts, many of the processes reviewed took specific measures to ensure appropriate geographic representation. In some cases, such as for the UN GGE, OIE SC, CBD AHTEG, UNSG SAB, UNISDR STAG, and IPCC, such elements are included in the terms of reference. Many of these groups also addressed the need to ensure a gender balance amongst members. In the case of the UNFCCC STA, the terms of reference included an element ensuring geographic representation amongst office holders. The EU SAM also included a specific element for ensuring an age balance. In other cases, such as the OPCW SAB, membership is restricted to the nationals of States Parties.

Scope

9. Most of the processes reviewed focus on both (1) scientific and technical developments and (2) their implications. Similarly, all the S&T review proposals made at the last BWC review conference on this issue also envisage addressing both.

10. There were several models for determining what will be covered by a technical review:

(a) The process' policy body takes a decision in advance, based upon proposals made by States. The CBD AHTEG, CCW GGE, UNFCCC STA all operate in this manner;

(b) Groups develop their own strategic and work plans in their sphere of competence, which are then reviewed and approved by policy-making bodies, such as is the case of UNISDR STP;

(c) A policy body takes a decision as to the general direction of the review but the specific details are developed by group, as was the case for the UN GGEs and the CCW MMTE;

(d) States propose topics for a review, the groups develops a work plan which is then reviewed and approved by the policy making body, as was the case for the CBD STTA;

(e) Where a group reports to an official rather than a policy making body, in some instances the topics to be addressed are determined by that official, as is the case with the OPCW SAB. In other cases, the official makes proposals but the group itself determines the focus of the work, as is the case with the UNSG SAB.

11. In general, few specific limitations on the work of the group are included in their mandates. For example, the work of the IPCC is limited to providing factual scientific assessments.

Costs

12. Specific costs for expert bodies are difficult to obtain. Just as is the case with the BWC ISP SAI, the costs are often embedded within a larger budget. This makes estimating total costs challenging. Some processes provide partial information. At the maximal end of the spectrum, the 2015 OIE SC budget is EUR 10,500,000. The IPCC process costs between USD 6-9,000,000 per year. The annual budget for the CBD STTA in 2015 is USD 1,000,000, with a further USD 300,000 allotted for a meeting of an AHTEG. In comparison, the last time the CCW GGE met in 2011, the 15 days of its meetings were estimated to cost USD 676,800. At the minimal end of the spectrum, participation support for OPCW SAB is estimated at around USD 40-45,000 excluding costs associated with hosting the meeting as this is met by the OPCW.

13. Where processes set their budgets on an annual basis, the costs of expert bodies are included in annual costs such as for the CCW GGE. In several cases, such as for the CBD STTA and OPCW SAB, core funding is included in the regular budget for the organization or process and additional resources are made available on a voluntary basis. In some processes, such as for the IPCC, certain costs are borne by international organizations, including by hosting the body and seconding staff. Other costs are mitigated by in kind commitments by individual states, for example in undertaking to sponsor the participation of certain experts, or by hosting technical support units and meetings.

14. As has been the case throughout the BWC ISP SAI, where experts are part of official delegations, costs associated with their participation are the responsibility of the

relevant State or organization. For the BWC ISP SAI, dependent upon available resources, a limited sponsorship programme is available. In processes where the experts are participating as individuals – such as is the case for the OPCW SAB, EU SAM, and IPCC – participation costs are often covered. Honoraria or other payments on top of expenses are rarely paid. One exception is the EU SAM which pays experts a fixed rate for their time.

15. In several cases specific arrangements have been adopted to facilitate the participation of experts from developing countries, as is the case for the CBD AHTEG for example. In some cases, such as the CCW GGE, this occurs within a formal sponsorship programme, which can include procedures for prioritizing the use of available resources. In other cases, especially where experts are being invited by international organizations, such as the WHO AC, arrangements are more ad hoc but conform to institutional regulations.

16. In order to facilitate the widest possible participation in such processes, simultaneous interpretation has often been provided. For most processes embedded within the United Nations framework, such as the CBD STTA, UN GGE, and others, interpretation was provided into all official United Nations languages. In some cases, such as with the OPCW SAB interpretation is available upon request. As interpretation can represent a considerable cost for such groups, in some settings, working languages have been adopted. For example, the OIE SC operates in English but translates documents into all of its official languages. Temporary working groups established under the OPCW SAB and the UNFCCC SED have operated in English, as have technical meetings convened by the UNISDR STP.

Guidance and coordination

17. In the case of the BWC ISP SAI, States Parties have collectively provided oversight for the process. In other processes, an Executive Board or Bureau sometimes provides oversight, as is the case for the CBD STTA, IPCC and UNFCCC STA. In other cases, oversight is devolved to an appointed individual, such as the Presidents of each OIE SC, a Special Representative in the case of the UNISDR STP, or the Director-General in the case of the OPCW SAB and United Nations Secretary-General for the UNSG SAB.

18. The BWC ISP SAI sessions undertaking the S&T review have been chaired either by the annual BWC Chair or by a Vice-Chair. The reports capturing the work of these sessions have been developed under the responsibility of the annual Chair. In other processes, the chair has also been elected by States, such as is the case for the CBD STTA, OIE SC, and UNFCCC SED. In some cases, such as the CBD STTA, the responsibility of nominating a chair rotates through relevant regional groups. In other contexts, especially where experts are acting in an individual capacity, the chair has been elected from within the group, as is the case with the EU SAM. Some groups, such as the CCW MMTE have been chaired by experts from NGOs. In some cases, representatives from an international organization chair meetings they convene, as can be the case for the WHO AC.

19. The BWC ISU was founded in 2006 to support the intersessional work of the treaty. Adding the S&T review process to the intersessional work programme, changed the nature of that work from focusing only on policy issues to include certain technical work, for example producing background documents reviewing relevant developments. No specific technical resources were made available to the ISU on the assumption of this duty. The use of institution support is also common in other settings, for example the CCW ISU supports the CCW GGE, and the UNFCCC technical secretariat supports the work of the UNFCCC STA and the UNFCCC SED. In other cases, specific resources have been made available. For example, the OIE SC is supported by a Scientific and Technical Department within the organization and the OPCW draws upon a number of members of staff. In such cases,

supporting an expert group represents a proportion of their official duties. In other cases, dedicated support has been provided, as is the case for the secretariats supporting the UNSG SAB, UNISDR STP and IPCC as well as a new secretariat being created to support the work of the EU SAM.

20. Different S&T review processes have been represented in varying ways in a range of settings. For example, both group members and the OPCW Technical Secretariat have made contributions at BWC meetings on behalf of the OPCW SAB and OPCW TWGs. Elsewhere the mandates of the OIE SC and the CBD STTA allow them to represent their bodies at specialised conferences.

Input

21. As is the case with the BWC ISP SAI, international organizations often participate as observers, such as in the CBD STTA, OPCW SAB, and IPCC. In other cases, such as in the UNISDR STP, international organizations were able to participate fully in the process. On occasion – such as with the UNSG SAB – international organizations have been requested to delegate focal points for the process. In some processes restricted to States, such as for many of the GGEs convened by the United Nations General Assembly, relevant international organizations have been invited to provide informal briefings. In other cases, where participants are acting in an individual capacity, specific representatives from international organizations have been invited to participate in relevant work, for example in the OIE SC.

22. During the BWC ISP SAI, non-governmental experts were able to participate in a variety of ways. A limited number of external experts from academia and the private sector were invited to participate as Guests of the Chair. Other non-governmental organizations were able to address delegations in an informal session, participate in poster sessions and hold side events on the margins of official meetings. Both S&T review proposals made at the last review conference envisage a more direct role for industry, academia and the scientific community.

23. In other processes, different stances towards expertise outside of official delegations have been adopted. Full participation in some processes is effectively restricted to government experts, such as in the UN GGE. In other cases, such as the CCW GGE and its MMTE, relevant non-governmental organizations were able to participate in their own right. Some processes, such as the OIE SC, extend invitations to specific individuals based upon their expertise to participate in their work. Several of the other processes admitted external experts into their membership, such as for the EU SAM, UNISDR STP and IPCC. Others, such the OPCW SAB, OIE SC, and CBD STTA convened sub-groups (OPCW TWG, OIE AHG, and CBD AHTEG respectively) which included representatives from outside of government.

Reporting

24. Under the BWC ISP SAI, contributions from States, international organizations and Guests of the Meeting are included in an annex to the Report of the Meeting of Experts, which is conveyed to the Meeting of States Parties. The Meeting of States Parties in turn tries to identify relevant common understandings which it encapsulates in its own report. In 2016, the 8th Review Conference will review the reports of the annual Meetings of States Parties. In the past, review conferences have either endorsed or noted the contents of such reports.

25. Many of the other processes produce reports for comparable policy meetings. For example, the CBD STTA reports to its Conference of the Parties, the Presidents of the OIE SC report to the OIE Assembly, the CCW GGE reports to the Meetings of High Contracting Parties, and the UNFCCC STA reports to the Conference of the Parties. In some of the processes embedded within the wider United Nations framework the group's report is transmitted by the United Nations Secretary-General to the General Assembly, as the case for the UN GGE. In other cases, the relevant group reports to a responsible official, such as the Director-General for the OPCW SAB, or the United Nations Special Representative in the case of the UNISDR STAG. In the case of CBD AHTEG and the Assessment Report produced by the IPCC, the report is expected to be peer reviewed.

26. At present under the BWC ISP SAI, reports of Meeting of Experts are factual. The annex to the Report of the Meeting of Experts does include individual contributions, including those encapsulating the views and opinions of States Parties, international organizations and Guests of the Chair. The reports of the Meetings of States Parties, in addition to a procedural description of the work of the meeting, include a series of substantive common understandings, representing the shared views of States Parties on the areas reviewed. In most cases, reports from other processes are also largely factual – representing a common understanding amongst members of the group. Some, like the output of the OIE SC, and UNSG SAB, can include expert opinions, that might not either be shared amongst all other members. In other cases, final reports are factual but specific meeting reports include expert opinions, as is the case for the UNFCCC SED.

27. Most processes adopt consensus-based, policy-focused reports. In some cases where consensus cannot be reached, the report also reflects minority views, as is the case for the OPCW SAB. In some cases, such as the UNFCCC SED and the Assessment Report produced by the IPCC, the report is intended for a technical audience but a summary or key findings are developed for policy makers.

28. For the BWC ISP SAI, the Report of the Meeting of Experts is exhaustive, listing all relevant contributions in its annex. The Report of the Meeting of States Parties is consolidated, through the common understandings it contains. Most other processes also make use of consolidated reports.

29. So far the output from the BWC ISP SAI has not included policy recommendations or attempted to prioritize developments for further consideration. In almost all the other processes reviewed, the relevant groups do provide advice or make recommendations. For example, some, such as the UNISDR STP can provide advice to policy makers; the UNFCCC STA and the OIE SC can produce draft resolutions; and the UNSG SAB can identify priorities which should be supported or encouraged within or by the United Nations. A notable exception is the IPCC.

Conclusions and next steps

30. This review illustrates a range of different approaches already employed at the international level for expert-led processes. It highlights where practices currently employed by the BWC in its ISP SAI are similar to, or differ from, those used in other fora. Switzerland hopes that a better understanding of how these considerations and parameters are being addressed in other fora might assist in reaching a shared view on how best to develop arrangements under the BWC.

31. Switzerland believes that an agenda item on a dedicated process to review developments in science and technology should be included in the work of the Preparatory Committee of the Eighth Review Conference. Switzerland encourages other States Parties to identify the approaches and structures that offer the most appropriate solutions for the

BWC in advance of such discussions. Switzerland stands ready to work together with interested States Parties to develop a model for an effective and dedicated science and technology review process that could be adopted at the Eighth Review Conference.

Annex

Dedicated review processes

(in alphabetical order)

Other disarmament processes that have to deal with technical developments

Group of Governmental Experts of the High Contracting Parties to the Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons (CCW GGE) and its Meetings of Military and Technical Experts (CCW MTTE) – <http://bit.ly/1PnaCVw>

1. Process

(a) How often does the group meet? – Three times a year for approximately a week each. It does not have a standing mandate but is mandated by annual meetings as needs dictate. It met from 2002-2011;

(b) How is it connected to the relevant policy process? – It was established at the CCW's Second Review Conference in 2001 to explore a range of relevant issues. A number of separate mandates, with their own coordinators were agreed. The work of the GGE included reviewing relevant technical developments, such as improvements in relevant munitions. The GGW reports to the annual meetings of the High Contracting Parties to the Convention. The mandate of successive CCW GGEs has asserted that technical experts will support the group's work;

(c) How are its members elected or nominated? – States Parties, IOs, and relevant NGOs send their own delegations, which can include experts;

(d) Whom are they representing when they participate? – Participants represent the State or organization to which they are affiliated.

2. Scope

(a) Does the group primarily focus on identifying developments or considering their implications? – This can depend upon the specific mandate of the group but has usually included both identifying relevant developments and considering their implications;

(b) Who decides what it covers? – The annual meetings of the High Contracting Parties to the Convention agree upon the mandate for the CCW GGE;

(c) Are any issues specifically excluded from its work? – None to date.

3. Costs

(a) What is the annual budget? – Part of annual budget of the CCW (integrated into annual budget set it one year at a time). For example, the 15 days budgeted for 2011 (the last time the CCW GGE met) were estimated at USD 676,800;

(b) Are participation costs covered (and if so, by whom)? – Participation costs met by the individual States and organizations sending delegations;

(c) Is there a sponsorship programme? – There is a Sponsorship programme to support the participation of States Parties in CCW-related activities especially from ERW-affected and mine-affected countries that have limited resources. The Programme is financed by voluntary contributions and managed by a Steering Committee, which sets the operational modality and ensures the guidance of the day-to-day implementation of the

Sponsorship Programme. Technical management of the Programme is conducted by the Geneva International Center for Humanitarian Demining (GICHD);

(d) What languages are used by the group? – The GGE uses all the United Nations Official languages. Meetings of Military and Technical Experts have been conducted in a working language.

4. Guidance and coordination

(a) Who provides oversight of the group? – High Contracting Parties to the Convention on Certain Conventional Weapons, through their annual meeting;

(b) Who chairs it? – The preceding review conference appoints a Chairperson for the GGE. A delegate from a Non-Governmental Organization has chaired meetings of Military and Technical Experts;

(c) Where does the administrative support come from? – Administrative support is provided by the CCW ISU, supported by the United Nations Office for Disarmament Affairs;

(d) Who, if anyone, speaks on behalf of the group? – The CCW GGE has a Chair but has also had facilitators or Friends of the Chair for specific issues.

5. Input

(a) How is external expertise accessed? – Non-governmental organizations may designate representatives to attend public meetings of the CCW GGE and make available written contributions on matters on which they have a special competence, at their own cost. They are also to receive the documents of the Conference. Upon the invitation of the presiding officer of the plenary and subject to the approval of that body, representatives of such organizations may make oral statements on questions in which they have a special competence in plenary meetings;

(b) What limits are there on where input comes from? – No explicit limits;

(c) How is the issue of appropriate geographic representation dealt with? – The CCW GGE is open to all High Contracting Parties;

(d) What role do international and non-governmental organizations play? – International organizations and the ICRC are entitled to participate in the work of the CCW GGE as observers.

6. Reporting

(a) To whom does the group report and to what end? – The CCW GGE reports to the annual meetings of the High Contracting Parties to the Convention;

(b) Can they make recommendations? – The CCW GGE has made recommendations to the annual meetings of the High Contracting Parties to the Convention.

(c) Is the report factual or based on expert opinion? – The reports of the CCW GGE are factual; they do not represent expert opinion;

(d) Is the report consensus-based or captures differing views? – The reports of the CCW GGE are consensus-based;

(e) Is the report exhaustive or consolidated? – The reports of the CCW GGE are consolidated, in that they describe the work undertaken as opposed to attempting to capture all aspects of individual contributions;

(f) Is the report intended for a technical or policy audience? – As they are submitted to the annual meetings of the High Contracting Parties to the Convention, the reports of the CCW GGE are intended for a policy audience.

Scientific Advisory Board of the Organization for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons (OPCW SAB) and its Temporary Working Groups (OPCW TWG) – <https://www.opcw.org/about-opcw/subsidiary-bodies/scientific-advisory-board/>

7. Process

(a) How often does the group meet? – Once or twice a year, depending upon available resources. A single meeting is included in the budget and voluntary contributions enable additional meetings and the convening of sub groups;

(b) How is it connected to the relevant policy process? – Established to provide independent advice to the Director-General (DG) enabling the DG to render specialized advice in science and technology to Member States;

(c) How are its members elected or nominated? – 25 members of the OPCW SAB appointed as independent experts for a fixed term (3/6 years) by the OPCW DG from a list of nominees put forward by the States Parties;

(d) Whom are they representing when they participate? – The members of the Board serve in their individual capacity as independent experts.

8. Scope

(a) Does the group primarily focus on identifying developments or considering their implications? – The OPCW SAB focuses on both relevant developments in scientific and technological fields and their implication to the Chemical Weapons Convention;

(b) Who decides what it covers? – The DG of the OPCW;

(c) Are any issues specifically excluded from its work? – Substantial work resulting in dedicated reports comes from requests made by the DG but OPCW SAB members can consider other issues of relevance and discuss them during their meetings.

9. Costs

(a) What is the annual budget? – The costs involved in the OPCW SAB are linked to participation costs – providing flights and per diems for participants. This costs around USD 45,000 per meeting. The costs of hosting the meeting, including the room, interpretation, secretarial support, etc. are provided at no cost by the OPCW;

(b) Are participation costs covered (and if so, by whom)? – Participation costs of OPCW SAB members, and those participating as members of OPCW TWGs are covered by the OPCW;

(c) Is there a sponsorship programme? – No;

(d) What languages are used by the group? – The official languages of the OPCW SAB are the UNITED NATIONS Official Languages. The working language is English. Interpretation is provided upon request.

10. Guidance and coordination

(a) Who provides oversight of the group? – The OPCW SAB is overseen by the DG;

(b) Who chairs it? – The Chair is elected annually from within the OPCW SAB, by its members;

(c) Where does the administrative support come from? – The DG provides, through the Technical Secretariat, administrative and technical support for the preparation, organization and implementation of activities of the OPCW SAB. There is a Technical Secretariat staff member who serves as Secretary to OPCW SAB and a science policy adviser to support the group's work. Other staff can be brought in as necessary to support meetings. The same support is provided to the OPCW TWGs;

(d) Who, if anyone, speaks on behalf of the group? – In theory, the only specific requirement is that communications from the OPCW SAB to CWC States Parties occurs through the Technical Secretariat. All other communications need prior approval from the DG. The Technical Secretariat communicates on behalf of OPCW SAB, but the Chair and other SAB members directly brief CWC States Parties at events organized by the Technical Secretariat. Such events have included dedicated briefings to CWC States Parties, through the science for diplomats meetings, or other appropriate fora, such as the industry cluster, or even at BWC meetings.

11. Input

(a) How is external expertise accessed? – OPCW SAB members can include experts from research institutions, universities, chemical industry companies, defence and military organisations. The OPCW SAB can also convene OPCW TWGs which can involve invited external experts from a broader range of candidates, including members of relevant international scientific organisations, key scientific unions in the life sciences and international organisations (upon invitation). Guest speakers may be invited from time to time;

(b) What limits are there on where input comes from? – No explicit limits;

(c) How is the issue of appropriate geographic representation dealt with? – Appointments to the Board are required to represent a fair distribution of appointments from the regions. Only citizens of States Parties are eligible to serve as members of a working group;

(d) What role do international and non-governmental organizations play? International organizations may participate as observers, subject to approval, and can serve on working groups.

12. Reporting

(a) To whom does the group report and to what end? – The OPCW SAB provides the DG with a report of its activities, including an account of each meeting. The report includes the reports of any temporary working groups;

(b) Can they make recommendations? – The OPCW SAB can provide conclusions and recommendations. They are developed through a consensus process;

(c) Is the report factual or based on expert opinion? – If consensus on the conclusions and recommendations cannot be achieved, the report reflects any minority view(s), as appropriate;

(d) Is the report consensus-based or captures differing views? – The report of the OPCW SAB is adopted by consensus but if consensus on the conclusions and recommendations cannot be achieved, the report reflects any minority view(s), as appropriate;

(e) Is the report exhaustive or consolidated? – Consolidated – provides an overview of work of the group rather than an exhaustive listing;

(f) Is the report intended for a technical or policy audience? – As the group reports to the DG, to enable the provision of advice to States Parties, its reports are

ultimately destined for a policy audience. Substantive reports (whether from an OPCW TWG or a response to a request for advice) will contain more technical information. These reports have executive summaries for policy audiences.

United Nations Group of Governmental Experts on Developments in the Field of Information and Telecommunications in the Context of International Security (UN GGE) – <http://www.un.org/disarmament/topics/informationsecurity/>

13. Process

(a) How often does the group meet? – The most recent incarnation of this group met four times between July 2014 and June 2015, each for a week;

(b) How is it connected to the relevant policy process? – The UN GGE reports to the United Nations General Assembly;

(c) How are its members elected or nominated? – The United Nations Secretary-General appointed the UN GGE and so determined which States will participate. Participating States then nominate their own experts;

(d) Whom are they representing when they participate? – The experts participate in an individual capacity, although they still represent the views of their State.

14. Scope

(a) Does the group primarily focus on identifying developments or considering their implications? – The UN GGE studies existing and potential threats in the sphere of information security and possible cooperative measures to address them. It therefore focuses on both identifying relevant developments and considering their implications;

(b) Who decides what it covers? – The United Nations General Assembly sets the mandate of the UN GGE, which contained a number of broad areas to be explored. The specific plans for exploring these areas are developed by the group itself;

(c) Are any issues specifically excluded from its work? – None in the mandate.

15. Costs

(a) What is the annual budget? – The Fifth Committee of the United Nations General Assembly determined that USD 1,439,400 would be required for the UN GGE;

(b) Are participation costs covered (and if so, by whom)? – Participation costs for experts are included in the budget of the UN GGE;

(c) Is there a sponsorship programme? – No specific arrangements;

(d) What languages are used by the group? – The UN GGE used all the official languages of the United Nations.

16. Guidance and coordination

(a) Who provides oversight of the group? – An elected chair leads the work of the UN GGE, which reports to the United Nations Secretary-General. The United Nations Secretary-General transmits the report to the United Nations General Assembly;

(b) Who chairs it? – A Chair elected from the participating States;

(c) Where does the administrative support come from? – UNODA has provided substantive support to the UN GGE and has acted as the secretariat assisting in the preparation of reports;

(d) Who, if anyone, speaks on behalf of the group? – The Chair of the UN GGE.

17. Input

(a) How is external expertise accessed? – Much of the work of the UN GGE is undertaken by its own experts. Other relevant parts of the United Nations, such as the United Nations Institute for Disarmament Research, have provided substantive input and acted as consultants;

(b) What limits are there on where input comes from? – None are explicitly mentioned;

(c) How is the issue of appropriate geographic representation dealt with? – The Group is made up of 20 experts from participating states “on the basis of equitable geographical distribution”;

(d) What role do international and non-governmental organizations play? – The work of the UN GGE was restricted to its experts and no other organizations were involved. In other GGEs established by the Secretary-General international and non-governmental organizations have provided briefings. In certain cases, specific international organizations have participated in all meetings of the group.

18. Reporting

(a) To whom does the group report and to what end? – The UN GGE reports to the General Assembly with recommendations for members to “assess how they might be taken up for further development and implementation”;

(b) Can they make recommendations? – The UN GGE makes recommendations;

(c) Is the report factual or based on expert opinion? – The UN GGE reports are factual;

(d) Is the report consensus-based or captures differing views? – The UN GGE reports are consensus-based;

(e) Is the report exhaustive or consolidated? – The UN GGE reports are consolidated. For example, according to UNODA annual reports by governments are “too long to be included in the published report of the Secretary-General” and are made available on the UNODA website;

(f) Is the report intended for a technical or policy audience? – As the reports are transmitted by the United Nations Secretary-General to the General Assembly, they are destined for a policy audience.

Non-disarmament-related international policy processes that contend with developments in the life sciences

Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD STTA) and its Ad Hoc Technical Expert Groups (CBD AHTEG) – <https://www.cbd.int/sbstta/default.shtml>

19. Process

(a) How often does the group meet? – Meetings take place “as necessary” and sufficiently in advance of each regular meeting of the Conference of the Parties, for a duration to be determined by the Conference of the Parties. In practice, the CBD STTA has met almost every year, in most cases for a single five day meeting but in 2003 and 2005 for two meetings of the same duration.

(b) How is it connected to the relevant policy process? – It is a subsidiary body of the convention, mandated in the text of the treaty. It reports regularly to the Conference of the Parties.

(c) How are its members elected or nominated? – The CBD STTA is open to participation by all Parties and shall be multidisciplinary. It is comprised of government representatives competent in the relevant field of expertise. Parties identify their own focal point to facilitate communication.

(d) Whom are they representing when they participate? – Participants represent Parties.

20. Scope

(a) Does the group primarily focus on identifying developments or considering their implications? – The CBD STTA both identifies developments and considers their implications.

(b) Who decides what it covers? – Parties and relevant organizations are invited after each meeting of the Conference of the Parties to submit proposals on new and emerging issues relating to the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity. The CBD STTA prepares a proposal for the theme of its next meeting based on the priorities set in the programme of work of the Conference of the Parties. The theme is approved by the following Conference of the Parties.

(c) Are any issues specifically excluded from its work? – None to date.

21. Costs

(a) What is the annual budget? – The budget for the CBD STTA is integrated into the broader budget for the CBD, so it is difficult to determine the total cost, for example, including support from the CBD Secretariat. For 2015-2016, the budget for meetings of the STTA is USD 1,000,000 per year, with an additional USD 300,000 budgeted for a meeting of an AHTEG.

(b) Are participation costs covered (and if so, by whom)? – Parties self-fund. Voluntary funding is used to support the participation of experts from developing Parties and Parties with economies in transition in the work of CBD AHTEG.

(c) Is there a sponsorship programme? – There is a Special Voluntary Trust Fund for Facilitating Participation of Parties in the Convention Process. During 2015 and 2016, this has allocated USD 600,000 per year to the work of the CBD STTA.

(d) What languages are used by the group? – The official and working languages of the CBD STTA are those of the United Nations Organization – all its proceedings are carried out in all the working languages.

22. Guidance and coordination

(a) Who provides oversight of the group? – The CBD STTA is a subsidiary body of the convention, and as such is overseen by the Conference of the Parties. For practical purposes, the work of the CBD STTA is managed by a Bureau, comprised of a Chair and nine Vice-Chairs, one of whom acts as Rapporteur. Bureau members are elected for a two-year term.

(b) Who chairs it? – The Chair of the CBD STTA is decided by the Conference of the Parties, for a two-year term.

(c) Where does the administrative support come from? – Administrative support is provided by the Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity.

(d) Who, if anyone, speaks on behalf of the group? – The Bureau of the CBD STTA can hold meetings with equivalent bodies of other relevant biodiversity-related conventions, institutions and processes. In addition, the Chair of the CBD STTA, or other member of the Bureau authorized by the Chair, may represent the group at meetings of the scientific bodies of such groups.

23. Input

(a) How is external expertise accessed? – The scientific and technical contribution of non-governmental organizations to the fulfilment of the mandate of the CBD STTA is strongly encouraged. Under the Rules of Procedure, any body or agency, whether governmental or non-governmental, qualified in relevant fields can inform the Secretariat of its wish to be represented. Such organizations can participate as observers unless at least one third of the Parties present at the meeting object. Such observers may, upon invitation of the President, participate without the right to vote in the proceedings of any meeting in matters of direct concern to the body or agency they represent unless at least one third of the Parties present at the meeting object. With the agreement of the Conference of the Parties, the CBD STTA can also form AHTEGs on specific priority issues on the programme of work of the Conference of the Parties. Such a group is made up of up to 15 individual experts nominated by the Parties and selected by the Executive Secretary. The Executive Secretary can also add a limited number of experts from relevant organizations, depending on the subject matter (not to exceed the number of experts from Parties).

(b) What limits are there on where input comes from? – The organizations must be directly relevant and over two-third of Parties present at the meeting must not object.

(c) How is the issue of appropriate geographic representation dealt with? – The CBD STTA is open to all Parties and a voluntary fund provides support for developing Parties and Parties with economies in transition. The selection of experts for the CBD AHTEG pays due regard to geographical representation, gender balance and to the special conditions of developing countries, in particular the least-developed and small island developing States, and countries with economies in transition.

(d) What role do international and non-governmental organizations play? International organizations and non-governmental organizations can all act as observers in official meetings. Upon meeting certain conditions and upon invitation of the President, these organizations can participate without the right to vote in the proceedings of any meeting in matters of direct concern to the body or agency. Experts from such bodies can also become members of CBD AHTEG.

24. Reporting

(a) To whom does the group report and to what end? – The CBD STTA reports to the Conference of the Parties. The reports of CBD AHTEG are expected to be peer reviewed;

(b) Can they make recommendations? – The CBD makes recommendations to the Conference of the Parties;

(c) Is the report factual or based on expert opinion? – The CBD STTA report is largely factual, but does include the opinions of experts that briefed it;

(d) Is the report consensus-based or captures differing views? – The report of the CBD STTA represents a consensus view of its members;

(e) Is the report exhaustive or consolidated? – The reports are consolidated, in so far as they provide a summary of the individual contributions;

(f) Is the report intended for a technical or policy audience? – The CBD STTA reports to the Conference of the Parties, and so is intended for a policy audience.

European Union science advisory mechanism (EU SAM) –
<http://ec.europa.eu/research/sam/>

25. Process

(a) How often does the group meet? – Established in June 2015, the SAM will meet between 4-6 times a year. It may also be convened for additional ad-hoc meetings when urgent advice is needed;

(b) How is it connected to the relevant policy process? – Its aim is to support the EU Commission with high quality, timely and independent scientific advice for its policy-making activities and contribute to the quality of EU legislation. The EU Commission can consult the group at any time on any policy field, defining the time span in which advice is needed. The Commissioner for Research, Science and Innovation will formulate the request for advice to the group and shall transmit advice from the group to the Commission;

(c) How are its members elected or nominated? – The 7 member High Level Group of Scientific Advisors were nominated through an open call for nominations and selected on the basis of recommendations by an independent identification committee;

(d) Whom are they representing when they participate? – The High Level Group scientific advisors serve in an independent capacity.

26. Scope

(a) Does the group primarily focus on identifying developments or considering their implications? – The EU SAM addresses both developments and implications. The EU SAM provides timely, independent, high level scientific advice to meet needs across all policy areas. The advice provided by the group identifies the most important and relevant evidence and empirical findings from any scientific field that can support decision making on the specified policy issues;

(b) Who decides what it covers? – The European Commission, through the Commissioner for Research, Science and Innovation, determines what issues the EU SAM will address;

(c) Are any issues specifically excluded from its work? – None.

27. Costs

(a) What is the annual budget? – Unclear at present but all expenses related to the function of the group shall be covered by a budget line of the Horizon 2020 administrative expenditure and shall be under the responsibility of the Director-General of DG Research and Innovation;

(b) Are participation costs covered (and if so, by whom)? – Travel and subsistence expenses incurred by participants in the activities of the group will be reimbursed by the EU Commission in line with standard institutional policies. A special allowance for the group's members and invited experts, (beyond reimbursement of expenses) is also provided – EUR 450 for each full day and EUR 225 for part of a day. The members of the group can be asked by the Commission to devote up to 40 working days (including meetings and remote work) per year to these tasks days. In the case of the chairperson and deputy chair-person, the maximum number is 60 working days;

(c) Is there a sponsorship programme? – No specific programme;

(d) What languages are used by the group? – The group will operate in the official languages of the European Union.

28. Guidance and coordination

(a) Who provides oversight of the group? – The Commissioner for Research, Science and Innovation;

(b) Who chairs it? – The Group will designate, on an annual basis, a chairperson and deputy chairperson;

(c) Where does the administrative support come from? – An EU SAM secretariat is hosted in the European Commission’s Directorate General for Research and Innovation. Its mission is to support the overall work of the EU SAM High Level Group and to facilitate their interaction with the EU policymaking process;

(d) Who, if anyone, speaks on behalf of the group? – The Chairperson of the group, including advising the EU Commission to consult the group on a specific policy issue.

29. Input

(a) How is external expertise accessed? – The EU Commission’s representative may invite experts with specific competence in a subject on the agenda to take part in the work of the group. More broadly, the objective of the Scientific Advice Mechanism is to ensure that the Commission has access to the best possible scientific advice, independent of institutional or political interests. It will bring together evidence and insight from different disciplines and approaches. A grant of EUR 6 million for European networks of academies and learned societies is included in the 2016 work programme for Horizon 2020. The grant will support academies to collaborate across Europe in providing science advice for policy;

(b) What limits are there on where input comes from? – No limits identified;

(c) How is the issue of appropriate geographic representation dealt with? – Membership of the High Level Group of Scientific Advisors does not seem to be limited to EU nationals: “It may be valuable to the group to include members who have gained experience in more than one country and members from outside the European Union”. Furthermore, the selection process for members includes paying due respect to the balance of qualities amongst the women and men who make it up, and that members collectively reflect the breadth of the research community across Europe. Consideration shall also be given to younger next-generation leaders;

(d) What role do international and non-governmental organizations play? – Presumably, their expertise could be invited by the EU Commissions representative to take part in specific work of the group.

30. Reporting

(a) To whom does the group report and to what end? – The EU SAM will report to the Commissioner for Research, Science and Innovation, who transmits the advice to the EU Commission;

(b) Can they make recommendations? – The EU SAM can make recommendations for improving the overall interaction between Commission policy-making processes and independent scientific advice.

(c) Is the report factual or based on expert opinion? – The group is yet to report;

(d) Is the report consensus-based or captures differing views? – The group is yet to report;

- (e) Is the report exhaustive or consolidated? – The group is yet to report;
- (f) Is the report intended for a technical or policy audience? – The reports of the EU SAM are destined for the EU Commission, so they will be used by a policy audience.

International Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) – <http://www.ipcc.ch/>

31. Process

(a) How often does the group meet? – The IPCC provides policymakers with regular assessments of the scientific basis of climate change, its impacts and future risks, and options for adaptation and mitigation. It produces a major review, an Assessment Report roughly every five years. It meets in plenary approximately once a year. Working groups meet approximately once a year for about 4 days, supplemented by additional regional meetings and thematic meetings on cross cutting themes, convened as necessary. Task Groups established under the Working Groups meet 1-2 times a year for about 3 days;

(b) How is it connected to the relevant policy process? – The IPCC plenary is the decision making body. It has established a number of Working Groups to deal with specific issues and a task force to develop and refine a reporting methodology. Task Groups work on specific issues, such as the Task Group on Data and Scenario Support for Impact and Climate Analysis which reports to the Working Group on Climate Change Impacts, Adaptation and Vulnerability;

(c) How are its members elected or nominated? – The IPCC plenary and its working groups are open to all United Nations Member States. The IPCC Bureau is elected from Member States. For the Assessment Reports, the composition of the group of Coordinating Lead Authors (CLAs) and Lead Authors (LAs) for a chapter, a report or its summary is decided by the IPCC Bureau;

(d) Whom are they representing when they participate? – At the IPCC plenary and the working groups meet at the level of government representatives for all member countries. Authors and reviewers are acting in a personal capacity.

32. Scope

(a) Does the group primarily focus on identifying developments or considering their implications? – The IPCC uses different Working Groups to cover different aspects. For example, Working Group I deals with “The Physical Science Basis of Climate Change”, Working Group II with “Climate Change Impacts, Adaptation and Vulnerability” and Working Group III with “Mitigation of Climate Change”;

(b) Who decides what it covers? –The IPCC produces a comprehensive assessment of the science related to climate change. The structure and format of that reviews is decided by Member States in the IPCC plenary. Each of the Working Groups is responsible for developing its own contribution to the Assessment Report. Day-to-day decision-making is made by the individual Working Group Bureaus. In 2013, the IPCC established a task force to consider future work options following the completion of the current reporting cycle in 2015;

(c) Are any issues specifically excluded from its work? – The IPCC is careful to limit its activities to providing factual scientific assessments – as its website asserts, its work is “policy-relevant and yet policy-neutral, never policy-prescriptive”.

33. Costs

(a) What is the annual budget? – Costs are about USD 5 million p/a on normal years and USD 9 million in years launching Assessment Reports. The IPCC is funded by regular contributions from its parent organizations WMO and UNEP, and voluntary

contributions from its member countries and the UNFCCC into a Trust Fund. The WMO also hosts the IPCC Secretariat, and the WMO and UNEP provide one senior staff member each for the IPCC Secretariat. Governments provide further substantial in-kind support for activities of the IPCC, in particular by hosting Technical Support Units, supporting the participation of experts from their respective countries in IPCC activities, and by hosting meetings;

(b) Are participation costs covered (and if so, by whom)? – Participating Member States and Observers cover their own costs. Invited experts at Working Groups have their participation costs covered;

(c) Is there a sponsorship programme? – The Trust Fund, administered by WMO & UNEP, supports IPCC activities, in particular the participation of developing country experts in the IPCC;

(d) What languages are used by the group? – The IPCC uses the official languages of the United Nations.

34. Guidance and coordination

(a) Who provides oversight of the group? – Ultimate oversight lies with Member States through the plenary sessions. On a day-to-day basis oversight is provided by the IPCC Bureau, which is comprised of the IPCC Chair, three IPCC Vice Chairs, Co-Chairs of the three Working Groups and the Task Force on National Greenhouse Gas Inventories and the members of the Working Group Bureaus. There is a four-stage review process for the Assessment Report: a review of First Order Drafts of the Working Group Reports is undertaken by relevant experts; a review of Second Order Drafts of the Working Group Reports and the Summary for Policy Makers is collectively undertaken by experts and Member States; Member States review the Summary for Policy Makers; and the individual Working Groups consider their report and adopt them. They are then considered and adopted by the IPCC at a plenary meeting;

(b) Who chairs it? – There are Chairs for the Plenary and the Working Groups, nominated by Member States in the Plenary. Each working group is also responsible for contributing a report, developed by external expert authors, to the comprehensive assessment;

(c) Where does the administrative support come from? – There is a dedicated Secretariat for the IPCC, hosted by the WMO in Geneva. Each Working Group is supported by a dedicated Technical Support Unit, which is hosted by different States, which cover all the associated costs;

(d) Who, if anyone, speaks on behalf of the group? – Information not available.

35. Input

(a) How is external expertise accessed? Experts from WMO and United Nations Member countries or international, intergovernmental or nongovernmental organisations may be invited in their own right to contribute to the work of the IPCC Working Groups and Task Forces. Governments should be informed in advance of invitations extended to experts from their countries and they may nominate additional experts. In practice, hundreds of experts are involved on a voluntary basis in the preparation of IPCC reports. Coordinating Lead Authors and Lead Authors for IPCC reports are selected by the relevant Working Group/Task Force Bureau, under general guidance provided by the Session of the Working Group from among experts listed by governments and participating organizations, and other experts known through their publications and works. More than 830 Authors and Review Editors from over 80 countries were selected to form the Author teams that produced the Fifth Assessment Report. They in turn drew on the work of over 1,000

Contributing Authors and about 2,000 expert reviewers who provided over 140,000 review comments;

(b) What limits are there on where input comes from? – Information not available;

(c) How is the issue of appropriate geographic representation dealt with? – When the IPCC Bureau develops and agrees the list of authors, review editors and expert reviewers it takes into account the balance of expertise, geographical coverage and gender;

(d) What role do international and non-governmental organizations play? International organizations and relevant NGOs can become observers at the IPCC and contribute to the work of the Plenary and Working Groups.

36. Reporting

(a) To whom does the group report and to what end? – The IPCC produces a major review, an Assessment Report roughly every five years. This provides policymakers with regular assessments of the scientific basis of climate change, its impacts and future risks, and options for adaptation and mitigation;

(b) Can they make recommendations? – The IPCC is careful to limit its activities to providing factual scientific assessments – as its website asserts, its work is “policy-relevant and yet policy-neutral, never policy-prescriptive”;

(c) Is the report factual or based on expert opinion? – The IPCC Assessment Report is factual;

(d) Is the report consensus-based or captures differing views? – The IPCC Assessment Report is consensus-based;

(e) Is the report exhaustive or consolidated? – The IPCC Assessment Report is exhaustive – laying out the scientific evidence reviewed by the process;

(f) Is the report intended for a technical or policy audience? – The IPCC Assessment Report is intended for a technical audience. A specific Summary for Policy Makers is also produced.

Specialist Commissions of the World Organization for Animal Health (OIE SC) and its Ad Hoc Groups of Experts- <http://www.oie.int/about-us/wo/commissions-master/>

37. Process

(a) How often does the group meet? – At least twice a year between the General Sessions of the OIE World Assembly of Delegates. A special meeting may be organised immediately prior to the annual session of the OIE General Assembly;

(b) How is it connected to the relevant policy process? – Each Commission examines its mandated issues and revises the standards in the relevant Codes and Manuals for consideration by the OIE Member Countries. These draft texts are presented in the reports of the Commission meetings at which time the OIE Member Countries have the opportunity to comment and provide additional revisions. These comments and suggested changes from OIE Member Countries, if supported by sound scientific information, will be taken into account and draft standards may be revised accordingly. All revised draft standards are submitted to the OIE World Assembly of Delegates for ratification and adoption at the General Session. Ratified standards are then incorporated into the relevant OIE publications;

(c) How are its members elected or nominated? – Each OIE SC consists of a Bureau (composed of a President and two Vice-Presidents) and three other members. For

each Specialist Commission, the World Assembly of Delegates elects the members of a Specialist Commission, taking into account the need for a geographically balanced representation, and the need for relevant expertise. At the Regional Commission level, the country delegates of that region put forth and agree to the experts that will represent them on the various commissions. The elections for the Commissions are held every three years, with the last elections held in May 2015;

(d) Whom are they representing when they participate? – Members of the OIE SC are representing a region. There are five geographical regions representing the OIE membership – Africa, the Americas, Asia, Far East and Oceania, Europe, and the Middle East.

38. Scope

(a) Does the group primarily focus on identifying developments or considering their implications? – Each Commission has varying mandates covering specific areas of work and use current scientific information to study problems and develop and revise OIE's international standards as well as to address scientific and technical issues raised by Members. In these activities they take into account developments and their implications;

(b) Who decides what it covers? – The Members of the OIE decide what is covered. OIE SCs develop strategic and work plans and draft resolutions;

(c) Are any issues specifically excluded from its work? – None to date. The OIE SCs operate within the parameters of the Members needs and the overall mandate of the OIE. If it is outside of the scope of the mandate, the standards in the Codes or the Manuals, it is generally not included unless there is direction from the Membership and the Council of the OIE.

39. Costs

(a) What is the annual budget? – In the published report of the 83rd General Session the budget for 2015 is EUR 10.5 million;

(b) Are participation costs covered (and if so, by whom)? – The costs of participating in the OIE SC are covered by the OIE's annual budget;

(c) Is there a sponsorship programme? – There is no relevant sponsorship programme as participation costs for members are covered;

(d) What languages are used by the group? – The OIE has three official languages (EN, FR, ES), the meetings are conducted in English and the reports are translated into the other two official languages.

40. Guidance and coordination

(a) Who provides oversight of the group? – Presidents of each OIE SC at an operational level, overseen by the OIE Council. The Council meets at least twice a year in Paris to examine technical and administrative matters and, in particular, the working programme and the proposed budget to be presented to the Assembly;

(b) Who chairs it? – Each OIE SC has a bureau comprised of a President, two Vice-Presidents and a Secretary-General;

(c) Where does the administrative support come from? – The OIE Scientific and Technical Department provides substantive support, The OIE Central Bureau assist the Secretary General of the OIE SC in recording meetings and preparing reports, notably by providing secretarial support, word-processing equipment and translation services;

(d) Who, if anyone, speaks on behalf of the group? – All formal correspondence between the Commission and outside individuals or bodies shall be issued through the

office of the DG. In practice, OIE SC have been represented by their President. Their mandates include representing the OIE at scientific and specialised conferences upon the request of the DG.

41. Input

(a) How is external expertise accessed? – Where appropriate, specialists from national/regional/international organisations and from OIE collaborating centres and reference laboratories, designated by the DG, shall attend certain parts of meetings of the Commission and of the Bureau for topics relating to their field of competence. They are also expected to hold specialist conferences, usually no less than every 3 years, which can include input from a much wider range of experts. They also identify issues that require in-depth review and propose, to the DG, the composition and terms of reference of experts or Ad hoc Groups of experts convened specifically to study such issues, and if necessary, participate in the work of these Groups;

(b) What limits are there on where input comes from? – No explicit limits;

(c) How is the issue of appropriate geographic representation dealt with? – The World Assembly of Delegates elects members taking into account the need for a geographically balanced representation, and the need for relevant expertise;

(d) What role do international and non-governmental organizations play? – Specialists designated by the Director General from national, regional, or international organisations or from OIE Reference Centres, shall attend certain parts of meetings of the Specialist Commissions or of the Bureaux for topics relating to their fields of competence.

42. Reporting

(a) To whom does the group report and to what end? – After each meeting, the OIE SCs provides the DG with a report on the proceedings of the meeting, a draft of a work programme and the proposed dates for the next meeting. The Presidents of the OIE SCs report annually to the OIE General Assembly on the activities of the respective Commissions and the draft of the relevant resolutions, standards, guidelines or other recommendations for adoption. The reports include the accepted reports from relevant OIE Working Groups and ad hoc Groups. The OIE does not solicit comments on these reports other than from Delegates, but will not refuse comments from organisations with an interest in the OIE's work, as they often represent a very useful source of information;

(b) Can they make recommendations? – OIE SCs make recommendations and provide draft resolutions;

(c) Is the report factual or based on expert opinion? – Draft resolutions are drawn up based on expert opinion and scientific fact;

(d) Is the report consensus-based or captures differing views? – The reports are agreed by consensus;

(e) Is the report exhaustive or consolidated? – The reports are consolidated, providing outline of the work undertaken and any relevant draft resolutions;

(f) Is the report intended for a technical or policy audience? – The report is intended for the country delegates for review and eventual adoption of the revised standards. The delegates are expected to implement the standards in their respective countries.

Subsidiary Body for Scientific and Technological Advice of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC STA) and its Structured Expert Dialogue (UNFCCC SED) – <http://unfccc.int/bodies/body/6399.php> -- http://unfccc.int/science/workstreams/the_2013-2015_review/items/7521.php

43. Process

(a) How often does the group meet? – Over the last 5 years, the UNFCCC STA has met twice a year, usually with one two-week session and one one-week session. The UNFCCC SED met 4 times between 2013-2015;

(b) How is it connected to the relevant policy process? – The UNFCCC STA is a subsidiary body of the Conference of the Parties. It is included in the text of the UNFCCC. The UNFCCC STA and a second Subsidiary Body on Implementation convened the UNFCCC SED, pursuant to a mandate from the Conference of Parties. It undertook a review of materials associated with the Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. The UNFCCC SED was comprised of regular scientific workshops and expert meetings and with the participation of Parties and experts, particularly from the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change;

(c) How are its members elected or nominated? – The UNFCCC STA is open to participation by all Parties and is multidisciplinary. Workshops held as part of the UNFCCC SED were open to all Parties and observers;

(d) Whom are they representing when they participate? – The UNFCCC STA is comprised of government representatives competent in the relevant field of expertise. During the UNFCCC SED, participants were also representing the State or organisation through which they were registered.

44. Scope

(a) Does the group primarily focus on identifying developments or considering their implications? – The UNFCCC STA addresses both developments and their implications. Its mandate includes, for example: providing assessments of the state of scientific knowledge relating to climate change and its effects; as well as preparing scientific assessments on the effects of measures taken in the implementation of the Convention. The UNFCCC STA plays an important role as the link between the scientific information provided by expert sources such as the IPCC on the one hand, and the policy-oriented needs of the Conference of the Parties on the other hand. The UNFCCC also addressed both issues, for example, its first session aimed to increase the understanding of existing scientific knowledge and explore how this knowledge could be used to address the themes of the review;

(b) Who decides what it covers? – The main functions of the UNFCCC STA are enshrined within the mandate included in the text of the treaty. The specific issues to be included on its agenda are determined by the Conference of the Parties. The mandate for the UNFCCC was decided by the Conference of the Parties. The UNFCCC SED itself, through the work of its two co-facilitators, developed the specific programme of work;

(c) Are any issues specifically excluded from its work? – None.

45. Costs

(a) What is the annual budget? – Incorporated into annual budget of UNFCCC;

(b) Are participation costs covered (and if so, by whom)? – Delegations to the UNFCCC STA and the UNFCCC SED participate at their own cost;

(c) Is there a sponsorship programme? – The mandate for the UNFCCC SED included a provision for the provision of adequate funding for the participation and

representation of eligible developing country Parties in all phases of the review and in all activities, meetings, workshops and sessions of the review process;

(d) What languages are used by the group? – The UNFCCC STA and UNFCCC SED operate in all the official United Nations languages.

46. Guidance and coordination

(a) Who provides oversight of the group? – The UNFCCC reports to the Conference of the Parties. A bureau, comprised of a Chair, Vice-Chair and Rapporteur, all nominated by Parties manages the day-to-day running of meetings of the UNFCCC STA. The Co-facilitators of the UNFCCC SED, working closely with the UNFCCC STA, managed its day-to-day running but ultimately reported to the Conference of the Parties;

(b) Who chairs it? –The Conference of Parties appoints the Chair of the UNFCCC STA, based on a nomination by a Party. The UNFCCC SED was chaired by two Co-facilitators, also both nominated by Parties;

(c) Where does the administrative support come from? – As a permanent Subsidiary Body of the UNFCCC, a Technical Secretariat provides organizational and management support including conference and documentation services;

(d) Who, if anyone, speaks on behalf of the group? – The Chair for the UNFCCC STA and the Co-facilitators for the UNFCCC SED.

47. Input

(a) How is external expertise accessed? – For the UNFCCC STA any body or agency, whether national or international, governmental or non-governmental, which is qualified in matters covered by the Convention, and which has informed the secretariat of its wish to be represented at a session of the Conference of the Parties as an observer, may be so admitted unless at least one third of the Parties present object. The same rules applied for the UNFCCC SED but in addition, a number of experts had the opportunity to brief the group. In addition, participants outside the conference venue were able to both watch the event online via webcast and provide reactions, views or questions as input to the discussion via Twitter;

(b) What limits are there on where input comes from? – None were described;

(c) How is the issue of appropriate geographic representation dealt with? – The Chairmen, Vice-Chairmen and Rapporteurs of such subsidiary bodies are elected with due regard to the principle of equitable geographical representation and shall not serve for more than two consecutive terms of one year. The selection process for the two Co-facilitators for the UNFCCC SED also ensured that both developed and developing countries were represented;

(d) What role do international and non-governmental organizations play? – The United Nations, its specialized agencies, any international entity or entities entrusted by the Conference of the Parties with the operation of the financial mechanism, and the International Atomic Energy Agency, as well as any State member thereof or observers thereto not Party to the UNFCCC, could be represented as observers at sessions of both the UNFCCC STA and UNFCCC SED. Such observers could, upon invitation of the President, participate without the right to vote in the proceedings of any session, unless at least one third of the Parties present at the session object. Any body or agency, whether national or international, governmental or nongovernmental, which is qualified in matters covered by the Convention and which has informed the secretariat of its wish to be represented at a session of the Conference of the Parties as an observer may be so admitted unless at least one third of the Parties present at the session object. Such observers may, upon invitation of the President, participate without the right to vote in the proceedings of any session in

matters of direct concern to the body or agency they represent, unless at least one third of the Parties present at the session object.

48. Reporting

(a) To whom does the group report and to what end? – The UNFCCC STA reports to the Conference of Parties, to report on its work in pursuit of the objectives detailed for it. The UNFCCC SED Co-facilitators also reported to the Conference of the Parties;

(b) Can they make recommendations? – The UNFCCC STA can make recommendations and drafts resolutions for consideration by the Conference of the Parties;

(c) Is the report factual or based on expert opinion? – The UNFCCC STA produces a factual report;

(d) Is the report consensus-based or captures differing views? – The UNFCCC STA produces a consensus-based report;

(e) Is the report exhaustive or consolidated? – The UNFCCC STA produces a consolidated report, providing an overview of its work;

(f) Is the report intended for a technical or policy audience? – Both the reports of the UNFCCC STA and the UNFCCC SED were provided to the Conference of the Parties, and were therefore intended for a policy audience.

Scientific and Technical Partnership of the United Nations Office for Disaster Risk Reduction (UNISDR STP) and its Scientific and Technical Advisory Group (UNISDR STAG) – <http://www.unisdr.org/partners/academia-research>

49. Process

(a) How often does the group meet? – A plenary session of all members of the UNISDR STP is convened every two years, coinciding with the Global Platform for Disaster Risk Reduction. Members are also expected to meet at the respective Regional Platforms to review activities and outputs of the Partnership and to promote collaboration among members. The UNISDR STAG provides direction and guide the work of the S&T partnership and meets face to face at least once a year and holds regular telephone or video conferences as frequently as the work program necessitates. Meetings of Technical Working Groups created to complete concrete activities or products in the UNISDR STP's work plan meet as necessary;

(b) How is it connected to the relevant policy process? – The UNISDR STP was created in pursuit of the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015-2030, adopted at the Third United Nations World Conference on Disaster Risk Reduction held in Sendai Japan on March 2015;

(c) How are its members elected or nominated? – The UNISDR STP is comprised of major scientific and technical institutes or organisations, research centres, networks and platforms, and United Nations science-based organizations working on the different disciplines of advancing science and technology for disaster risk reduction. An open call was used to identify interested partners. Selection was made by UNISDR supported by STAG, based on expertise and capacity to develop and provide science, technology or tools for disaster risk reduction, as well as the commitment to the UNISDR STP's activities to contribute to the implementation of the Sendai Framework. Membership of the UNISDR STAG was open to partners in the UNISDR STP. An open call was used to identify interested institutions. The UNISDR Secretariat selected the UNISDR STAG members, based on demonstrated level of commitment, technical expertise, involvement in capacity development activities, and reflecting the regional diversity;

(d) Whom are they representing when they participate? – Experts represent their affiliated institution in both UNISDR STP and the UNISDR STAG.

50. Scope

(a) Does the group primarily focus on identifying developments or considering their implications? – The UNISDR STP focuses heavily on both. The scope and function of the partnership includes identifying research and technology gaps and making recommendations for research priority areas in disaster risk reduction. The UNISDR STAG also deals with both identifying developments and addressing their implications. For example, the mandate of the partnership includes both: identifying key scientific information, knowledge and case studies needed for policymakers and practitioners; and contributing to and implementing policies in collaboration with various stakeholders in the different areas;

(b) Who decides what it covers? – Five broad areas of work are included in the UNISDR STP mandate, as drawn from the Sendai Framework. UNISDR is drawing up a roadmap for the work of the partnership, which will be discussed and endorsed at the UNISDR Science and Technology Conference on the Implementation of the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015-2030, due to be held in Geneva, Switzerland in January 2016;

(c) Are any issues specifically excluded from its work? – Information not available.

51. Costs

(a) What is the annual budget? – Information not available;

(b) Are participation costs covered (and if so, by whom)? – Limited information on the rules under which the future meetings of UNISDR STP will operate is available. For the S&T Conference being held in 2016 to adopt a roadmap for the partnership's work, all travel expenses and visa applications are the responsibility of each participant;

(c) Is there a sponsorship programme? – Limited information on the rules under which the future meetings of UNISDR STP will operate is available;

(d) What languages are used by the group? – Limited information on the rules under which the future meetings of UNISDR STP will operate is available. For the S&T Conference being held in 2016 to adopt a roadmap for the partnership's work, the working language will be English and no simultaneous interpretation is being provided.

52. Guidance and coordination

(a) Who provides oversight of the group? – The Special Representative of the United Nations Secretary-General for Disaster Risk Reduction and Head of the UNISDR oversees the activities of UNISDR STP, the UNISDR STAG, and its Secretariat to ensure compliance with this Terms of Reference and the Sendai Framework for Disaster Risk Reduction 2015-2030;

(b) Who chairs it? – Presumably, the Special Representative of the United Nations Secretary-General for Disaster Risk Reduction and Head of the UNISDR (or their representative) will chair plenary meetings of the partnership. The UNISDR STAG has a Chair and a Vice-Chair elected by members of the group to serve for one term of two years;

(c) Where does the administrative support come from? – A dedicated Secretariat for the UNISDR STP is being created and will be hosted by UNISDR;

(d) Who, if anyone, speaks on behalf of the group? – The Special Representative of the United Nations Secretary-General for Disaster Risk Reduction and Head of the UNISDR.

53. Input

(a) How is external expertise accessed? – The UNISDR STP is open to all relevant institutions. To expand the potential for participation further, UNISDR STP will also accept Associated Members, which, where appropriate, will be invited to join the meetings of UNISDR STAG and the working groups to bring additional institutional or technical expertise in support of the work;

(b) What limits are there on where input comes from? – None discussed;

(c) How is the issue of appropriate geographic representation dealt with? The UNISDR STP is open to all relevant institutions. Geographic representation is one factor used to determine the membership of the UNISDR STAG. Technical Working Groups are also to be composed by members of UNISDR STP and will be balanced geographically, and by gender and age;

(d) What role do international and non-governmental organizations play? – They can be full members of the UNISDR STP and can be represented on the UNISDR STAG.

54. Reporting

(a) To whom does the group report and to what end? – The UNISDR STP supports the work of the Sendai Framework and contributes to the Global Platform for Disaster Risk Reduction. The UNISDR STAG reports to the UNISDR STP and the Special Representative of the United Nations Secretary-General for Disaster Risk Reduction. Technical Working Groups report to the UNISDR STAG;

(b) Can they make recommendations? – Both the UNISDR STP and UNISDR STAG are mandated to provide advice and recommendations;

(c) Is the report factual or based on expert opinion? – Information not available;

(d) Is the report consensus-based or captures differing views? – Information not available;

(e) Is the report exhaustive or consolidated? – Information not available;

(f) Is the report intended for a technical or policy audience? – Information not available.

United Nations Secretary-General's Scientific Advisory Board on Sustainable Development (UNSG SAB) – <http://en.unesco.org/un-sab/>

55. Process

(a) How often does the group meet? – The Board is expected to meet twice a year. If so decided by the Board, sub-committees on specific topics could be established, with a variable frequency of their meetings, which could take place mainly by tele- or video-conference. A dedicated and secure web-based communication platform has been set up to supplement e-mail exchanges and ensure the sharing of information among the Board members and the designated focal points of the United Nations organizations concerned;

(b) How is it connected to the relevant policy process? – The UNSG SAB provides advice to the United Nations Secretary-General and the Executive Heads of United Nations organizations. The UNSG SAB was created in response to the report of the United Nations Secretary-General's High-level Panel on Global Sustainability, Resilient People, Resilient Planet: A future worth choosing, of 30 January 2012;

(c) How are its members elected or nominated? – The United Nations Secretary-General appoints members to the UNSG SAB. The UNSG SAB is an international panel composed of approximately 20 eminent scientists representing the main disciplines, systems and sectors related to the multiple dimensions of science for sustainable development;

(d) Whom are they representing when they participate? – Board members are appointed in their personal capacity, and not as representatives of their respective States or of any other entities with which they may be affiliated. They are expected to proffer their advice on a strictly independent basis and to not seek or accept instructions from Governments or other external authorities.

56. Scope

(a) Does the group primarily focus on identifying developments or considering their implications? – They address both. Their mandate includes: strengthening the linkage between science and policy; ensuring that up-to-date and rigorous science is appropriately reflected in high-level policy discussions within the United Nations system; offering advice, in cooperation and consultation with the United Nations agencies concerned, on how the many organizations in the United Nations system with a science, technology, engineering and humanities mission in the area of sustainability can work together more effectively, avoid mission creep and overlap, and curb counter-productive competition; offering recommendations to the Secretary-General on priorities related to science for sustainable development that should be supported or encouraged within or by the United Nations system, including for the post-2015 development process; carrying out relevant intellectual work including providing advice to the United Nations Secretary-General on up-to-date scientific issues relevant to sustainable development, including advice on “assessments and digests around concepts as ‘planetary boundaries’, ‘tipping points’ and ‘environmental thresholds’...”, as indicated in Recommendation 51 of the report of the GSP. This will allow the Secretary-General to articulate scientific issues which have attracted widespread attention in contemporary affairs; identifying knowledge gaps that could be addressed outside the United Nations system by either national or international research programs, e.g., the emerging ‘Future Earth’ programme; identifying specific assessment needs that could be addressed by ongoing assessments (e.g., IPCC or the IPBES) or new assessments activities to be developed within the United Nations system; advising on issues related to the public visibility and understanding of science; offering insight on democratic global governance, focussed on sustainability and the responsible and ethical development of science; and any other matter as may be assigned by the United Nations Secretary-General;

(b) Who decides what it covers? – The Board members determine the Agenda of meetings of the UNSG SAB with proposals coming from the United Nations Secretary-General, and, as appropriate, from executive heads of United Nations organizations and/or their designated focal points to the UNSG SAB;

(c) Are any issues specifically excluded from its work? – None identified.

57. Costs

(a) What is the annual budget? – Information not available;

(b) Are participation costs covered (and if so, by whom)? – All travel, accommodation and related expenses of members connected with participation in UNSG SAB meetings are borne by the Secretariat of the Board, host countries or host organisations;

(c) Is there a sponsorship programme? – No specific mechanism;

(d) What languages are used by the group? – Information not available.

58. Guidance and coordination

(a) Who provides oversight of the group? – The UNSG SAB reports to the United Nations Secretary-General but operates on a day-to-day basis with the Director-General of UNESCO as Chairperson (or proposing alternative arrangements for chairing the proceedings);

(b) Who chairs it? – The first meeting of the UNSG SAB was chaired by the United Nations Secretary-General, for subsequent meetings the Director-General of UNESCO has acted as Chairperson (or can propose alternative arrangements for chairing the proceedings);

(c) Where does the administrative support come from? – A Secretariat designated by the Director-General of UNESCO provides technical support to the establishment and functioning of the UNSG SAB. In particular, the Secretariat assists in preparation of reports, recommendations and related documents, and in coordinating public information services, and provides other technical services as needed. The Secretariat ensures the sharing of information as well as consultation and coordination with the Office of the United Nations Secretary-General and relevant United Nations organizations, through their designated focal points;

(d) Who, if anyone, speaks on behalf of the group? – Information not available.

59. Input

(a) How is external expertise accessed? – Representatives of the United Nations and its specialized agencies, representatives of the scientific boards of the multilateral environmental conventions, chairpersons of the scientific organizations, scientists from the private sector, and other highly qualified experts may be invited by the UNSG SAB to address it on matters within their competence;

(b) What limits are there on where input comes from? – None specified;

(c) How is the issue of appropriate geographic representation dealt with? – The selection of members took into account: a high-level expertise in one or many fields of natural, social and human sciences, and engineering in relation to sustainable development; expertise in the following other areas: strengthening the science-policy interface, United Nations governance of science, R&D in the private sector, science communication; geographical region; and gender;

(d) What role do international and non-governmental organizations play? – United Nations organizations that are engaged in pursuing scientific activities were invited to designate focal points to follow the work of the Board and to assure coordinated follow-up where required. Such focal points can be invited to participate in meetings of the Board in the role of Observers. In addition, representatives of the United Nations and its specialized agencies, representatives of the scientific boards of the multilateral environmental conventions, chairpersons of the scientific organizations, scientists from the private sector, and other highly qualified experts may be invited by the UNSG SAB to address it on matters within their competence.

60. Reporting

(a) To whom does the group report and to what end? – Following each meeting, a written report on the discussions and conclusions will be provided to the United Nations Secretary-General;

(b) Can they make recommendations? – The UNSG SAB can make recommendations, including offering recommendations to the Secretary-General on

priorities related to science for sustainable development that should be supported or encouraged within or by the United Nations system, including for the post-2015 development process;

(c) Is the report factual or based on expert opinion? – The reports are largely factual but do include expert opinions;

(d) Is the report consensus-based or captures differing views? – The reports are consensus-based;

(e) Is the report exhaustive or consolidated? – The reports are consolidated – providing a summary of the work of the UNSG SAB;

(f) Is the report intended for a technical or policy audience? – The report is intended for a policy audience.

Advisory committees convened by the World Health Organization (WHO AC) – see for example: http://www.who.int/medicines/ebola-treatment/data-sharing_phe/en/

61. Process

(a) How often does the group meet? – On demand, to cover a specific topic;

(b) How is it connected to the relevant policy process? – The reports are submitted to the appropriate Assistant Director-General. Generally, they will be convened to accomplish a specific task associated with a given work line;

(c) How are its members elected or nominated? – Individual experts are invited by WHO;

(d) Whom are they representing when they participate? – Experts participate in an individual capacity but may transmit views or insights from institutions or governments.

62. Scope

(a) Does the group primarily focus on identifying developments or considering their implications? – Dependent upon the intent of the specific meeting but could include both identifying developments and considering the implications;

(b) Who decides what it covers? – The meeting will have a specific purpose, linked to a work stream within the organization but the specifics of the meeting will be developed by WHO in consultation with partners;

(c) Are any issues specifically excluded from its work? – Dependent upon the purpose of the meeting, the administrative mechanism used to establish it and the mandate of the specific line of work.

63. Costs

(a) What is the annual budget? – Funds are found on a case-by-case basis, when existing resources are not available or sufficient, or if the meeting is not deemed a specific priority, external resources are commonly used;

(b) Are participation costs covered (and if so, by whom)? – Participants from developing countries, academia or members of WHO Committees (etc.) are funded. Many government representatives cannot accept sponsorship. No support is provided to commercial entities;

(c) Is there a sponsorship programme? – Not a dedicated sponsorship programme. Participation support is provided in line with WHO policy on funding expert travel;

(d) What languages are used by the group? – Technical meetings will adopt a single working language. Translation and interpretation will be provided on a case-by-case basis as required.

64. Guidance and coordination

(a) Who provides oversight of the group? – These committees are overseen by WHO. They are included in the standard work of the organization, which in turn is reported to and overseen by Member States;

(b) Who chairs it? – The meeting will be chaired either by an appropriate member of WHO or an eminent participant;

(c) Where does the administrative support come from? – WHO staff and consultants provide administrative support;

(d) Who, if anyone, speaks on behalf of the group? – These meetings are commonly stand-alone events or processes. The work of the meeting and any output is captured in its reports. WHO staff may input material from the meeting into relevant processes and discussions in other settings. Participants might do likewise, dependent upon the specific constraints agreed at a given meeting.

65. Input

(a) How is external expertise accessed? – These meetings are convened specifically to seek expert input from outside the organization. As a result, most of the participants will be drawn from expert institutions;

(b) What limits are there on where input comes from? – Participation by commercial entities, or those with a potential conflict of interest, is carefully managed;

(c) How is the issue of appropriate geographic representation dealt with? – It is one of the factors considered when identifying relevant experts to invite;

(d) What role do international and non-governmental organizations play? – Where the work of a specific meeting is of direct relevance to another IO, relevant experts can be invited to participate on a case-by-case basis.

66. Reporting

(a) To whom does the group report and to what end? – The report of the group is transmitted to participants, is fed into relevant WHO work streams, and is provided to relevant senior WHO staff. Generally, these meetings are convened with a specific task to accomplish; the report captures the necessary outcomes and is fed directly into relevant activities;

(b) Can they make recommendations? – This will depend upon the specific purpose of the meeting and exactly how it was convened. Participants with potential conflicts of interest are not permitted to take part in making recommendations;

(c) Is the report factual or based on expert opinion? – Dependent upon the specific meeting, but will commonly be factual;

(d) Is the report consensus-based or captures differing views? – The report will often reflect the ‘take-home’ messages identified by WHO and may be reviewed by participants;

(e) Is the report exhaustive or consolidated? – Reports are often consolidated – only a summary of discussions and views will be captured;

(f) Is the report intended for a technical or policy audience? – This depends upon the intent of the meeting and the type of report generated. In general, the meeting will have

been tasked with accomplishing a specific technical task, commonly associated with a policy goal.

Proposals made at the BWC Seventh Review Conference

Structured and systematic review, proposal at the Seventh Review Conference by India (BWC/CONF.VII/WP.3)

67. Process

(a) How often does the group meet? – Twice a year – through agenda items during the Meeting of Experts and Meeting of States Parties;

(b) How is it connected to the relevant policy process? – Fully integrated into the formal intersessional work programme. Results considered by the Meeting of States Parties, which transmits any common understandings to the five-yearly review conferences;

(c) How are its members elected or nominated? – The process would be open to all States Parties. Participation will be in accordance with the rules of procedure. Delegations are therefore a national decision. International organizations and States not Party can observe;

(d) Whom are they representing when they participate? – As formal meetings of the BWC, experts will be formal members of official delegations and represent them throughout the meetings.

68. Scope

(a) Does the group primarily focus on identifying developments or considering their implications? – Both – implications specifically included in the proposal at both expert level and for Meetings of States Parties;

(b) Who decides what it covers? – States Parties – a list of specific topics would be determined in advance by the review conference;

(c) Are any issues specifically excluded from its work? – Not discussed.

69. Costs

(a) What is the annual budget? – Not specified – but integrated into the costs of existing meetings;

(b) Are participation costs covered (and if so, by whom)? – Not discussed;

(c) Is there a sponsorship programme? – No formal sponsorship programme existed in the BWC when the proposal was made. No specific mention of a sponsorship programme is contained in the proposal;

(d) What languages are used by the group? – Not discussed but presumably the same as for the rest of the Meeting of Experts and Meeting of States Parties.

70. Guidance and coordination

(a) Who provides oversight of the group? – All States Parties, collectively. All meetings reviewing S&T and discussing the outputs of the reviews, setting the mandate, or considering further efforts are all official meetings of the BWC and so are open to all States Parties;

(b) Who chairs it? – Not specifically discussed, but presumably there is no specific chair for the S&T review and it is part of the duties of the annual BWC chair;

(c) Where does the administrative support come from? – Not specifically discussed but presumably from the BWC ISU, supported by UN ODA;

(d) Who, if anyone, speaks on behalf of the group? – Not specifically addressed but presumably, in the absence of a competing specific mandate, the Chair (or in their stead a Vice-Chair) could represent the processes.

71. Input

(a) How is external expertise accessed? – The Meeting of Experts may be structured so as to facilitate the broadest possible contribution of industry, academia and the scientific community;

(b) What limits are there on where input comes from? – Not discussed;

(c) How is the issue of appropriate geographic representation dealt with? – The process would be open to all States Parties;

(d) What role do international and non-governmental organizations play? – In accordance with the established Rules of Procedure for BWC meetings. One of the proposed topics is “developments in other multilateral organizations such as WHO, OIE, FAO and IPPC which are of relevance to the Convention” – which suggests a role is envisaged for these organizations;

72. Reporting

(a) To whom does the group report and to what end? – Reports of such meetings containing review of S&T developments, assessment of their implications to the Convention and recommendations, could be discussed and forwarded by the Meeting of State Parties to the next Review Conference, which shall consider such reports in accordance with Article XII of the Convention and take appropriate decisions;

(b) Can they make recommendations? – Yes (see above);

(c) Is the report factual or based on expert opinion? – The mandate for the report of the Meeting of Experts is to produce a factual report. No specific mention was made to amending this mandate;

(d) Is the report consensus-based or captures differing views? – Not discussed;

(e) Is the report exhaustive or consolidated? – Not discussed;

(f) Is the report intended for a technical or policy audience? – The Reports of the Meetings of Experts will be considered by the Meetings of States Parties, which in turn will be considered by the next review conference. As a result, all the reports are destined for a policy audience.

BWC S&T Working Group, proposal at the Seventh Review Conference by Australia, Japan and New Zealand (BWC/CONF.VII/WP.13)

73. Process

(a) How often does the group meet? – Once annually as part of the Meeting of Experts;

(b) How is it connected to the relevant policy process? – The Working Group would be a subsidiary body of the Meeting of Experts, and the annual Meeting of States Parties would consider its work;

(c) How are its members elected or nominated? – Not discussed but presumably it is open to all States Parties;

(d) Whom are they representing when they participate? – As the Working Group would be a subsidiary body of the Meeting of Experts, participants would be representing the relevant State or organization.

74. Scope

(a) Does the group primarily focus on identifying developments or considering their implications? – International scientific organizations would identify and review relevant developments in written and oral contributions to the Working Group. States Parties, through the working group, would then consider the implications;

(b) Who decides what it covers? – Each BWC Meeting of States Parties (MSP) would identify one or more S&T topics to be reviewed in the following year;

(c) Are any issues specifically excluded from its work? – Not discussed;

75. Costs

(a) What is the annual budget? – Not discussed;

(b) Are participation costs covered (and if so, by whom)? – Not discussed;

(c) Is there a sponsorship programme? – No formal sponsorship programme existed in the BWC when the proposal was made. No specific mention of a sponsorship programme is contained in the proposal;

(d) What languages are used by the group? – Not discussed but presumably the same as for the rest of the Meeting of Experts.

76. Guidance and coordination

(a) Who provides oversight of the group? – BWC States parties through the Meeting of States Parties. At an operational level, a review conference would appoint a Facilitator for the Working Group for the duration of the intersessional work programme;

(b) Who chairs it? – The Facilitator would presumably Chair the Working Group;

(c) Where does the administrative support come from? – Not discussed but presumably from the BWC ISU, supported by UNODA;

(d) Who, if anyone, speaks on behalf of the group? – The Facilitator would presumably be able to represent the Working Group as necessary.

77. Input

(a) How is external expertise accessed? – The Meeting of States Parties would invite independent international scientific organizations, including IAP: Global Network of Science Academies, to prepare factual reviews of topic(s), with input from national academies of science and scientific unions in the life sciences. Representatives from such bodies would discuss their factual reviews of topic(s) with States Parties during sessions of the S&T Working Group at the subsequent Meeting of Experts;

(b) What limits are there on where input comes from? – Not discussed;

(c) How is the issue of appropriate geographic representation dealt with? – The Working Group would be open to all States Parties;

(d) What role do international and non-governmental organizations play? – Relevant organizations would be requested to review the chosen areas of science and technology. Specific individuals would then be invited to brief the Working Group. Presumably, the Rules of Procedure for the rest of the Meeting of Experts would also apply

to the Working Group (so International organizations would be entitled to request observer status);

78. Reporting

(a) To whom does the group report and to what end? – The Facilitator would report to the Meeting of States Parties for States to consider any action required. The next review conference would review any actions taken;

(b) Can they make recommendations? – Not discussed;

(c) Is the report factual or based on expert opinion? – The Facilitator would produce a factual report;

(d) Is the report consensus-based or captures differing views? – The Working Group’s report would include the views of States Parties’ experts but not necessarily consensus;

(e) Is the report exhaustive or consolidated? – The report would be consolidated, providing an overview of the groups work;

(f) Is the report intended for a technical or policy audience? – As the Facilitator would be reporting to the Meeting of States Parties, the report would be destined for a policy audience.
