



Environmental Regulation and Information Centre Ltd | www.eric-group.co.uk

Second Step of the Inter-Sessional Future Shape Process

Professor Robert Lee
Lori Frater
ERIC Ltd

Our Instructions

- Following ISWGoFS meeting on 1/2 July:
 - Develop scoring and weighting systems to analyse the **activities** identified by ISWGoFS
 - Cost and group these **activities**
- Following teleconference on 5 August:
 - Grouping of these activities to be based on four **options**:
 - Concentration
 - Decentralization
 - Ideal
 - Low cost

Methodology: Scoring

- Score each **activity** within the four **options**
- Score each activity by reference to impact on CMS structures in terms of the following elements:
 - (a) Legal
 - (b) Financial
 - (c) Institutional
- Score each activity by reference to impact on CMS outcomes in terms of the following elements:
 - (d) Conservation
 - (e) Integration
 - (f) Synergies

Methodology: Calculation

- Broadly high scores for impacts (a) to (c) are likely to be negative (e.g. significant legal reform; major institutional re-structuring)
- In contrast high scores for impacts (d) to (f) are likely to be positive (e.g. major improvement in conservation status; efficiencies gained through synergetic effects)
- This allows a formula to be employed:
 - $[(d) + (e) + (f)] - [(a) + (b) + (c)]$

Outcomes for Each Option

- Concentration:
 - Low positive impact BUT timescale issues very significant and may be more easily achievable
- Decentralization:
 - High positive impact BUT this may indicate the influence of the integration/synergy factors and downplay difficulties of these
- Ideal:
 - Low/medium positive impact BECAUSE positive impacts offset by high costs
- Low cost:
 - High positive impact BUT poor on integration and 'quick fix' with less long term influence

Criticisms

- Assignment of activities to options:
 - Activities table allows activities to be assigned to one or more options
- Large elements of subjectivity:
 - Inherent in attaching scores but re-adjustments possible on an activity basis
 - Evening out across activities to give broad lead
- Greater focus on institutional issues needed:
 - Results from instructions; more work for phase III?
- Combinations (e.g. of concentration and decentralization) may be more useful:
 - Results should not be seen as normative
 - Scoring does not negate the need for choices to be made
 - Annex VIII breaks down individual activities to allow re-grouping

Phase III

- Phase III commences
- December 2010

Draft Submission

- Draft submitted to Working Group / CMS
- March-April 2011

Eric

- Responses Returned to Eric and fed into Report
- April-May 2011

Report to StC

- Phase III Report to Standing Committee
- May 2011

StC Response

- Standing Committee Return Comments
- July 2011

Eric

- StC Comments fed into Report
- July 2011

Translation

- Report Translated
- August 2011

PHASE III Report

- Available to Parties
- September 2011

COP 10

- CONFERENCE OF THE PARTIES
- NOVEMBER 2011

The Next Phase

- Time is quite pressing
- Mandate in Resolution suggests 3 options
- Activity scores can be easily re-calibrated
- Activities can form basis of regrouping
- Variables of cost and concentration remain
- We await further instructions...