



OPEN ACCESS

APPROVED BY
Inkyoung Kim,
Bridgewater State University,
United States

*CORRESPONDENCE
Sara Velander
✉ svelander@uni-bonn.de

RECEIVED 04 March 2024
ACCEPTED 11 March 2024
PUBLISHED 21 March 2024

CITATION
Velander S and De Donà M (2024)
Corrigendum: Leveraging windows of
opportunity for expertise to matter in global
environmental governance: insights from the
United Nations Convention to Combat
Desertification.
Front. Clim. 6:1395927.
doi: 10.3389/fclim.2024.1395927

COPYRIGHT
© 2024 Velander and De Donà. This is an
open-access article distributed under the
terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution
License \(CC BY\)](#). The use, distribution or
reproduction in other forums is permitted,
provided the original author(s) and the
copyright owner(s) are credited and that the
original publication in this journal is cited, in
accordance with accepted academic
practice. No use, distribution or reproduction
is permitted which does not comply with
these terms.

Corrigendum: Leveraging windows of opportunity for expertise to matter in global environmental governance: insights from the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification

Sara Velander^{1,2*} and Matteo De Donà^{3,4}

¹Center for Development Research, University of Bonn, Bonn, Germany, ²Institute of Political Science, University of Münster, Münster, Germany, ³Department of Political Science, Lund University, Lund, Sweden, ⁴School of Global Studies, University of Gothenburg, Göteborg, Sweden

KEYWORDS

expertise, global environmental governance, institutional design, desertification, scientific knowledge, sustainable development, boundary work, influence

A Corrigendum on

[Leveraging windows of opportunity for expertise to matter in global environmental governance: insights from the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification](#)

by Velander, S., and De Donà, M. (2024). *Front. Clim* 5:1325030. doi: 10.3389/fclim.2023.1325030

In the published article, there was an error in Discussion, Paragraph 10 due to misinterpreting a claim from Akhtar-Schuster et al. (2022). The first sentence of Discussion, Paragraph 10 stated that “The advantages of a closer collaboration with the UNCCD secretariat and member states suggest that the proposal put forth by Akhtar-Schuster et al. (2022) to grant the SPI an independent, formal legal status, similar to the IPCC and IPBES, may not be the most ideal approach”. However Akhtar-Schuster et al. (2022) did not state that the UNCCD SPI should become formalized outside the convention and transformed into an independent expert group like the IPCC or IPBES, but found that “further formalization of the SPI’s status within the UNCCD is vital to improve its functions, undertake its work, and enable the UNCCD to maintain its global lead in providing knowledge and advice on combating desertification, land degradation and drought.” The sentence has therefore been updated to “The advantages of a closer collaboration with the UNCCD secretariat and member states suggest that granting the SPI an independent, legal status, similar to the IPCC and IPBES, may not be an ideal approach”. A correction has been made to Discussion, Paragraph 10 below:

The advantages of a closer collaboration with the UNCCD secretariat and member states suggest that granting the SPI an independent, legal status, similar to the IPCC and IPBES, may not be an ideal approach. This is because it could potentially result in expertise becoming excessively detached from policy, as highlighted in the study by De Donà and Linke (2023). However, we acknowledge that while the IPCC and IPBES are

independent from their associated Rio conventions, they continue to have strong impacts on global environmental policies through a scientific assessment process and, particularly, the development of a summary for policymakers, in which both intergovernmental expert groups are highly influenced by the policy side. Additionally, with the IPCC and IPBES generating assessments which are, by design, not policy-prescriptive, and covering the issues of biodiversity loss and climate change more comprehensively, they have a broader reach in their influence and audience. This contrasts with the UNCCD SPI in its institutional design of being firmly embodied in the UNCCD mechanism and, therefore, mandated to “translate relevant scientific findings and recommendations... into proposals to be considered by the CST for the consideration of the COP” (UNCCD Secretariat, 2017).

This results in a different type of output, typically topic-specific assessments almost exclusively catered to a policy audience.

The authors apologize for this error and state that this does not change the scientific conclusions of the article in any way. The original article has been updated.

Publisher's note

All claims expressed in this article are solely those of the authors and do not necessarily represent those of their affiliated organizations, or those of the publisher, the editors and the reviewers. Any product that may be evaluated in this article, or claim that may be made by its manufacturer, is not guaranteed or endorsed by the publisher.