UNITED NATIONS

UNEP

Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations

BES

IPBES/5/11

Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services

Distr.: General
19 December 2016

Original: English

Plenary of the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services
Fifth session
Bonn, Germany, 7–10 March 2017
Item 8 of the provisional agenda*****

Review of the Platform

Procedure for the review of the effectiveness of the administrative and scientific functions of the Platform (deliverable 4 (e))

Note by the secretariat

Introduction

1. As part of the first work programme of IPBES, the Plenary, in decision IPBES-2/5, mandated a review of the effectiveness of the administrative and scientific functions of IPBES (deliverable 4 (e)), with the aim of informing action by the Plenary related to the implementation of the first work programme and the development of a second work programme. In the same decision, the Plenary requested the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel, in consultation with the Bureau, to develop a procedure for the review of the effectiveness of the administrative and scientific functions of IPBES.

2. In response to that decision, the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel prepared draft terms of reference for the midterm and final reviews of the effectiveness of IPBES, which were submitted to the Plenary at its fourth session, as document IPBES/4/16. The Plenary, in decision IPBES-4/1, section VII, welcomed the proposal, but decided to eliminate the midterm review and perform only an end-of-work-programme review. In the same decision, the Plenary invited Governments and stakeholders to provide further views on the draft terms of reference for the end-of-work-programme review set out in annex VII to that decision, taking into account the need to integrate the internal and external elements of the review. The Plenary requested the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel, in consultation with the Bureau, to further refine the scope and terms of reference of that review, in the light of the aforementioned inputs, for consideration by the Plenary at its fifth session.

3. Governments and stakeholders were invited to provide comments on the draft terms of reference set out in annex VII to decision IPBES-4/1 from 27 April to 24 June 2016. Comments were received from the Netherlands on behalf of the European Union and its Member States and the United States of America. Comments were also submitted by the German Network-Forum for Biodiversity Research and by Shreemati Nathibai Damodar Thackersey (SNDT) Women's University in Mumbai, India.

4. The Multidisciplinary Expert Panel and the Bureau considered these comments in revising the terms of reference. The revised terms of reference are introduced in section I below and reproduced in the annex to the present document. Section II outlines suggested actions for the Plenary. The appendix to the annex contains a draft questionnaire for use in the review process.

* IPBES/5/1/Rev.1.

I. Procedure for the review of IPBES at the end of its first work programme

5. In decision IPBES-4/1, section VII, the Plenary clarified that the review should take the form of an end-of-work-programme exercise and highlighted the need to integrate its internal and external elements. Accordingly, the revised terms of reference for the review (see the annex below) specify that the results of the review will be presented to the Plenary at its seventh session (May 2019), when the first work programme of IPBES is scheduled to end and Plenary would be expected to consider the adoption of a second work programme. A report on progress and interim results of the review would be presented to the Plenary at its sixth session (March 2018).

6. The Bureau and the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel have selected an internal team, comprising the Chair of IPBES, a member of the Bureau, a co-chair and two members of the Panel and the Executive Secretary. The team has, in consultation with the Bureau and Panel, prepared a draft questionnaire to facilitate the review of IPBES (as set out in the appendix to the annex), which is structured around the six areas that the review will evaluate (see annex, para. 3). The Plenary may wish to consider, adjust and approve these questions. It is proposed that this questionnaire be used for both the internal and external elements of the review, in order to facilitate the integration of these elements as requested by the Plenary.

7. For the internal part of the review, the questionnaire could be distributed to past and present members of the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel and the Bureau; to the secretariat, including its technical support units; to members of IPBES task forces and experts of groups other than assessment groups; and to co-chairs and coordinating lead authors of completed and ongoing IPBES assessments. The internal team could use the results to prepare a report from an internal perspective. In order to integrate the internal and external elements of the review, the report could be presented to the Plenary at its sixth session and be circulated to the review panel (described in the next paragraph) as an input to the overall review process.

8. The external part of the review could be conducted by a **review panel** of no more than 10 reviewers with a balanced composition of representatives of Governments, scientists, and representatives of non-governmental organizations.[1] Members could be selected by a **selection committee** or by the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel and Bureau on the basis of nominations made in response to a call from the Chair of IPBES, and using agreed criteria (see para. 9 of the annex).

9. The Plenary may wish to consider the following two options for coordinating the external part of the review:

(a) *Option 1*: The first option would entail the selection of an **external professional organization** that would coordinate the review, working under the guidance of the review panel and on the basis of the approved questionnaire. The external professional organization would be selected by the selection committee or by the Bureau and the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel in response to a call for expressions of interest by the Chair of IPBES, using agreed criteria (see annex, para. 9). The Plenary may wish to note that it could be difficult to attract such a professional organization with the budget suggested for the review. The 2008 version of the *UNEP Evaluation Manual*[2] recommended an evaluation and review budget of between 2 and 5 per cent of overall project costs ($840,000–$2,100,000 in the case of IPBES). The four-month review of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) conducted by the InterAcademy Council cost $950,000.[3] The low budget initially suggested may impede the ability of IPBES to attract a suitably qualified organization to conduct the review. The Bureau and Multidisciplinary Expert Panel therefore propose that the Plenary consider option 2 below;

(b) *Option 2*: The second option would differ from the first option in that the review would be coordinated by an **administrative officer** who could be based at the IPBES secretariat.

10. Draft terms of reference reflecting these options are set out in the annex.

[1] Alternatively, the external professional organization proposed in option 1 might be invited to make a proposal on a review panel, to be submitted to the Bureau and Multidisciplinary Expert Panel for approval.

[2] The manual is being revised. The revised version will be available at: http://web.unep.org/evaluation/unep-evaluation-manual-1.

[3] InterAcademy Council, *Climate Change Assessments: Review of the Processes and Procedures of the IPCC*, 2010, available at: http://reviewipcc.interacademycouncil.net/report.html.

II. Suggested action

11. The Plenary may wish to consider the information provided in the present note with a view to approving the draft terms of reference set out in the annex and the questionnaire set out in the appendix to the annex.

Annex

Terms of reference for the review of IPBES at the end of its first work programme

I. Timing and type of review

1. A single independent review will be made of IPBES at the end of its first work programme (hereinafter referred to as "the review"). The results of the review will be considered by the Plenary at its seventh session, in May 2019. A report on progress in the review process and interim results will be made available for the information of Plenary at its sixth session. The review will integrate an internal and an external element.

II. Objectives and expected outputs of the review

2. The objective of the review is to inform the development of a second work programme for IPBES with lessons learned from the implementation of the first work programme and recommendations that will enable the Platform to strengthen implementation of its four functions and, ultimately, its effectiveness as a science-policy interface.

3. The review will evaluate the effectiveness of IPBES as a science-policy interface. In particular, the review will analyse IPBES with regard to its effectiveness, efficiency and relevance, as measured against its objectives, operating principles, four functions and administrative and scientific functions, as set out in the report of the second session of the plenary meeting to determine the future Platform's modalities and institutional arrangements (document UNEP/IPBES.MI/2/9). It will also evaluate the efficiency of the delivery of the work programme and established support structures, as governed by the rules of procedure (see decision IPBES-1/1, annex), the procedures for the preparation of IPBES deliverables (see decision IPBES-3/3, annex I), and other relevant decisions by the IPBES Plenary. The review will evaluate:

(a) Implementation of the four functions of IPBES;

(b) Application of the operating principles of IPBES;

(c) Effectiveness of the procedures for the development of IPBES deliverables, including the policy on conflict of interest and its implementation procedures;

(d) Effectiveness of the institutional arrangements of IPBES, including the Plenary, the Bureau, the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel and the secretariat, including technical support units, the United Nations collaborative partnership arrangement and other arrangements with strategic partners, and their interactions and procedures;

(e) Effectiveness of the IPBES task forces and expert groups, including the management of their work and the level of commitment of members;

(f) Effectiveness of the budgetary and fiscal rules, arrangements and practices.

4. The review will result in a report on the performance of IPBES with regard to the dimensions listed in paragraph 3 above. The report will include recommendations on how best to implement the second work programme of IPBES. In particular, it will include, as necessary, recommendations regarding the amendment of existing institutional arrangements, including procedures and structures, to support implementation of the second work programme.

III. Institutional structure of the review

A. Internal element

5. The Bureau and the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel have designated an internal review team comprising the IPBES Chair, a member of the Bureau, a co-chair and two members of the Panel, and the Executive Secretary, which will coordinate the internal review and, working in consultation with the Bureau and Panel, develop a report which summarizes the findings of the internal review.

B. External element

6. The review will be conducted by a review panel and coordinated by a competent external professional organization (option 1), or an administrative officer (option 2). It will be based on the questionnaire set out in the appendix to the present annex.

7. The review panel will comprise no more than 10 reviewers with a balanced composition of government representatives, scientists and representatives of non-governmental organizations.[1] It will be selected in response to a call from the IPBES Chair, and using agreed criteria (as listed in para. 9 below), by:

(a) The Multidisciplinary Expert Panel and Bureau; or

(b) A selection committee which will be appointed by the Plenary, at its fifth session, based on nominations by each United Nations region of one member of the committee.

8. The review will be coordinated by:

(a) *Option 1*: an external professional organization selected by the selection committee or by the Bureau and the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel in response to a call for expressions of interest by the Chair of IPBES; or

(b) *Option 2*: an administrative officer, to be recruited, who will be based at the IPBES secretariat.

9. The selection of the external professional organization, and of members of the review panel, will be guided by the following criteria:

(a) Relevant qualifications of the organization and the reviewers to conduct institutional reviews at the global level;

(b) Demonstrated track record of the organization and the reviewers in working with science-policy interfaces, and in understanding the roles and functions of a global environmental assessment process in general and of IPBES in particular.

IV. Methodology

A. Internal element

10. The internal element consists of a self-assessment based on the questionnaire contained in the appendix. The questionnaire will be distributed to former and current members of the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel and the Bureau; the secretariat, including the technical support units; members of IPBES task forces; and co-chairs and coordinating lead authors of completed and ongoing IPBES assessments. On the basis of the results of the questionnaire, the internal review team (see para. 5 above) will prepare, in consultation with all members of the Bureau and Multidisciplinary Expert Panel, a report from an internal perspective. The report will be presented for the information of the Plenary at its sixth session, and will serve as an input to the overall review process.

B. External element

11. The methods to be used by the reviewers are to include:

(a) The review of relevant documents and literature produced by IPBES and relevant expert and stakeholder communities;

(b) The use, as a basis for the review, of the Plenary-approved questionnaire set out in the appendix to this annex, tailored as appropriate and soliciting the views of relevant actors and stakeholders on issues to be reviewed. An external organization (option 1) or an administrative officer based at the secretariat headquarters (option 2) will support the review panel in the collation and analysis of responses to the questionnaire.

12. Where useful, methods could also include:

(a) Interviews with key informants, including with members of the Bureau and the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel, the secretariat and technical support units, experts involved in the

[1] Alternatively, if option 1 is selected, the external professional organization (para. 9 of the present note) could be invited to make a proposal on a review panel, to be submitted to the Bureau and Multidisciplinary Expert Panel for approval.

work of IPBES, the United Nations collaborative partner agencies, other strategic partners, Governments and stakeholders;

(b) Focus group discussions, held on site, where resources permit, or by teleconference, on particular issues relating to IPBES, such as institutional arrangements of IPBES, the policy relevance of IPBES, or the IPBES approach to indigenous and local knowledge systems. These discussions could involve a representative range of members of the Bureau and the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel, the secretariat (including relevant technical support units), experts involved in the work of the Platform, the United Nations collaborative partner agencies, other strategic partners, Governments and stakeholders;

(c) Direct observation during key meetings of the Platform in 2017 and 2018, including meetings of the Plenary, the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel and the Bureau and task force and assessment expert group meetings.

13. The Multidisciplinary Expert Panel, the Bureau and the secretariat, including its technical support units, will support the review panel by providing information on administrative and operational aspects for preparation of the deliverables of IPBES.

14. The review panel will prepare a report to the Plenary based on the results of the questionnaire and considering the report prepared by the internal review team. The report will include recommendations as outlined in paragraph 4.

V. Budget

15. The requested budget of $200,070 will cover the following costs:

(a) Technical and administrative support for the review is estimated at $126,320, based on half of the cost per year of a professional position at the P-2 level in the United Nations system ($126,320), for a two-year period, starting shortly after the fifth session of the Plenary, and ending shortly after its seventh session. This amount could be either allocated to the external professional organization to cover its administrative costs, in the case of option 1, or, in option 2, to the trust fund, for hiring a consultant;

(b) It is assumed that the members of the review panel will provide their services on a pro-bono basis;

(c) Travel support and a daily subsistence allowance will be provided to reviewers from all regions at the following rate: $3,750 per person per meeting. The members of the panel are expected to have one initial and one final meeting, which, to save costs, will be held back-to-back with two meetings of the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel and the Bureau, which the panel would be invited to observe. A subset of the panel would also attend the sixth session of the Plenary to observe and conduct interviews (five members), and its seventh session, to present the outcome of the report (two members). The schedule is as follows:

(i) Initial meeting held back-to-back with the ninth meetings of the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel and Bureau (mid-2017);

(ii) Ninth and twelfth meetings of the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel and Bureau (mid-2017 and late 2018), to observe and conduct interviews;

(iii) Sixth session of the IPBES Plenary (March 2018), to observe and conduct interviews;

(iv) Final meeting held back-to-back with the twelfth meetings of the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel and the Bureau;

(v) Seventh session of the IPBES Plenary (May 2019);

(d) Focus group meetings have not been included in this budget. One such meeting, if held back to back with an already scheduled meeting, such as, for example, the sixth session of the Plenary, would only entail a daily subsistence allowance for up to 20 experts.

16. The projected costs are summarized in the following table and amount to $200,070.

Item	*Cost in United States dollars*
Administrative support	126 320
Travel support plus daily subsistence allowance to 10 people to attend two meetings of the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel and the Bureau, with back-to-back initial and final meetings	37 500
Travel support plus daily subsistence allowance for five reviewers to attend the sixth session of the Plenary, and two reviewers to attend the seventh session of the Plenary	26 250
Daily subsistence allowance for up to 20 experts attending a focus group meeting held back-to-back with the sixth session of the Plenary	10 000
Honorariums for reviewers	Not included
Total	**200 070**

Appendix

Draft questionnaire for the review of IPBES at the end of its first work programme

1. This questionnaire, submitted to the Plenary for approval, would form the basis for the internal and external parts of the review. The questions are structured according to the six areas (sections I–VI) to be reviewed, as listed in paragraphs 3 (a) to 3 (f) of section II of the annex above, on the objectives and expected outputs of the review.

2. Respondents would be asked to identify themselves as belonging to a specific predefined category (for example, Government, non-governmental organization, multilateral environmental agreement, United Nations agency, scientist involved in IPBES, scientist not involved in IPBES, member of the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel or the Bureau, member of a task force, etc.) so that responses could be analysed in terms of the various categories of stakeholders.

3. Each question would be supplemented by the following subquestion in order to elicit additional suggestions from respondents: "What are the weaknesses or gaps and how could the situation be improved?"

Section I: How well are the functions of IPBES being implemented?

Question 1: Was the process used to receive and prioritize requests satisfactory?

(a) Were the call for requests and the mechanism proposed by the IPBES secretariat for responding to the call clear and efficient?

(b) Did you hold an internal consultation before responding to the call for requests?

(c) Are you satisfied with the way the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel processed the requests and presented a prioritized list to the Plenary?

(d) Would you say that the list of the deliverables in the work programme, which stems from the requests, meets the needs of the stakeholders and is policy-relevant?

Question 2: How well is IPBES performing regular and timely assessments of knowledge on biodiversity and ecosystem services and their interlinkages that support the science-policy interface?

(a) Are the IPBES assessments contributing to the science-policy interface in a manner that ensures legitimacy, relevance and credibility?

(b) Is the assessment scoping process working well?

(c) Is the process for the nomination and selection of authors (co-chairs, coordinating lead authors, lead authors, review editors) working well?

(d) Is the peer-review mechanism working properly?

- Are Governments providing adequate inputs and comments?
- Are experts providing adequate inputs and comments?

(e) Do IPBES assessments properly identify confidence limits?

(f) Are the summaries for policymakers being written in an appropriate style that is not too technical to be understood by a wide range of audiences and stakeholders?

(g) Do the summaries for policymakers address the policy-relevant issues without being policy-prescriptive?

(h) Are the lengths of the summaries for policymakers appropriate?

(i) Do the assessments incorporate all relevant data and knowledge?

(j) Do the assessments address the policy needs, particularly at regional and subregional scales?

(k) Do the assessments address terrestrial, marine and inland water biodiversity and ecosystem services and their interactions in a balanced manner?

(l) Do the assessments appropriately use national, subregional and regional assessments and knowledge?

(m) Do the assessments recognize, respect, adequately address and incorporate indigenous and local knowledge?

(n) Have the assessments produced to date appropriately identified options for policymaking?

(o) Does the pollination assessment meet the standards to be expected of an IPBES product?

(p) Does the scenario assessment meet the standards to be expected of an IPBES product?

Question 3: Does IPBES identify and provide policy-relevant tools and methodologies, arising in particular from its assessments, to support policy formulation?

(a) Have the assessments produced to date appropriately identified policy-relevant tools and methodologies?

(b) Have deliverables other than assessments appropriately identified and provided policy-relevant tools and methodologies?

(c) Given that the catalogue of policy support tools is at an early stage of development, is the catalogue user-friendly and appropriately structured to support policy formulation?

(d) Are there any other ways and means of further enhancing efforts by IPBES to deliver on this function?

Question 4: Is IPBES performing its capacity-building function properly?

(a) Is IPBES effectively matching the priority capacity-building needs identified by the Plenary with resources by catalysing financial and in-kind support?

(b) How successful has the capacity-building forum been and how can it be strengthened?

(c) Is IPBES effectively developing the capacities needed to implement its work programme?

(d) Is the pilot fellowship programme working well? Is the nomination and selection process working well?

(e) Are the pilot training activities based on existing guidance material supporting the implementation of the work programme in an effective manner?

(f) What other avenues are needed to further catalyse and leverage funding for capacity-building?

Question 5: Is IPBES performing its knowledge and data function properly?

(a) Does IPBES use clear, transparent and scientifically credible processes for the exchange, sharing and use of data, information and technologies from all relevant sources, including non-peer-reviewed literature?

(b) Is the process used to manage the data and information used in assessments in a sustainable way adequate?

(c) Is the process used to identify policy-relevant knowledge gaps and to promote, prioritize and catalyse the generation of new knowledge adequate?

Section II: Are the operating principles of IPBES being put into practice?

Question 6: Is IPBES collaborating adequately with existing initiatives?

Is IPBES adequately collaborating with existing initiatives on biodiversity and ecosystem services, including multilateral environmental agreements, United Nations bodies and networks of scientists and knowledge holders?

Question 7: Is IPBES incorporating indigenous and local knowledge adequately?

(a) Does IPBES recognize, respect and adequately address indigenous and local knowledge in its work?

(b) Given that the work of IPBES on indigenous and local knowledge is still at a pilot stage, are the processes for working with indigenous and local knowledge in IPBES activities appropriate?

Question 8: Are geographical, disciplinary and gender balances appropriate in the work of IPBES?

(a) Has IPBES achieved appropriate regional representation and participation in its structure and work?

(b) Has IPBES taken an appropriate interdisciplinary and multidisciplinary approach that incorporates all relevant disciplines, including social and natural sciences, in all its activities?

(c) Has IPBES achieved appropriate gender balance in all relevant aspects of its work?

Question 9: Is IPBES delivering policy-relevant results?

(a) Have the completed IPBES assessments been policy-relevant?

- Was the pollination assessment sufficiently policy-relevant?
- Is the scenarios assessment providing useful guidance to other IPBES assessments and, beyond these, to a broader community of scientists, funding agencies, policy support practitioners and policymakers wishing to make use of scenarios and models to inform decision-making on the local to global scales?

(b) Are other IPBES deliverables and products policy-relevant?

(c) Have IPBES processes supported the policy relevance of deliverables?

- Was the scoping process conducive to the preparation of policy-relevant deliverables?
- Was the composition of expert groups conducive to the preparation of policy-relevant deliverables?

Section III: Are the procedures for developing deliverables effective?

Question 10: Is IPBES communication adequate?

Is IPBES communicating and reaching out in a satisfactory manner?

Question 11: Is IPBES following its rules of procedure?

Are IPBES rules and procedures being followed, including with regard to conflict of interests?

Question 12: Has IPBES developed appropriate partnerships?

Have partnership arrangements been developed for the conduct of IPBES activities and are they being properly implemented?

Section IV: Are institutional arrangements (Plenary, Bureau, Multidisciplinary Expert Panel and secretariat) effective?

Question 13: How well is the Plenary functioning?

(a) Is the documentation presented to the Plenary allowing it to play its role in an effective manner?

(b) Is the decision-making by the Plenary conducive to effective implementation by the secretariat, the Bureau and the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel?

(c) Are the sessions of the Plenary organized and conducted in an effective manner?

(d) Is the Plenary properly advised on coordination between IPBES and other relevant institutions?

Question 14: How well is the Bureau functioning?

(a) Are members of IPBES and regional groups properly supported by their respective Bureau members?

(b) Has the Bureau effectively followed up on requests addressed to it by the Plenary in its decisions?

(c) Has the Bureau effectively conducted its roles related to chairing and contributing to task forces and expert groups?

(d) Has the Bureau properly discharged its administrative functions of:

- Overseeing communications and outreach activities?
- Reviewing progress in the implementation of Plenary decisions?
- Monitoring the secretariat's performance?
- Organizing and conducting the sessions of the Plenary?
- Reviewing observance of the platform's rules of procedure?
- Reviewing the management of resources and observance of financial rules?
- Advising the plenary on coordination between IPBES and other relevant institutions?
- Identifying donors and developing partnership arrangements?

Question 15: How well is the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel functioning?

(a) Is the Plenary properly advised by the Panel on scientific and technical aspects of the IPBES programme of work?

(b) Has the Panel effectively followed up on requests addressed to it by the Plenary in its decisions?

(c) Has the Panel effectively fulfilled its roles related to chairing and contributing to task forces and expert groups?

(d) Is the Panel providing adequate advice and assistance on technical and scientific communication matters?

(e) Is the peer-review process properly managed and does it ensure the highest levels of scientific quality, independence and credibility for all products delivered by IPBES at all stages of the process?

(f) Are the scientific community and other knowledge holders properly engaged with the IPBES work programme, given the need for different disciplines and types of knowledge, gender balance, and effective contribution and participation by experts from developing countries?

(g) Is there enough scientific and technical coordination among structures set up under IPBES?

Question 16: How well is the secretariat functioning?

(a) Is the documentation of high quality and delivered on time?

(b) Are sessions of the Plenary, meetings of the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel and Bureau and other technical meetings well organized?

(c) Has the secretariat effectively followed up on requests addressed to it by the Plenary in its decisions?

(d) Is the secretariat providing adequate support for the delivery of the work programme according to the decisions of the Plenary?

(e) Are the size, composition and set-up of the secretariat, including its technical support units, appropriate given the responsibilities and challenges arising in implementation of the work programme?

(f) Has the system of technical support units worked well?

(g) Is the interaction between the various bodies of IPBES functioning well?

Section V: How effective are the task forces and expert groups?

Question 17: How well are the task forces and expert groups fulfilling their terms of reference as mandated by the Plenary?

(a) How effective are the task forces and the expert groups in the following areas:

- Indigenous and local knowledge?
- Capacity-building?
- Data and knowledge?

- Values?
- Scenarios and models of biodiversity and ecosystem services?
- Policy-support tools?

(b) Is there appropriate interaction between the task forces and expert groups?

Section VI: Effectiveness of budgetary management and fiscal rules

Question 18: Are resources properly managed and financial rules observed? Are requirements for reporting to donors and to the Plenary met?

(a) Are financial resources properly managed and financial rules observed?

(b) Are the budget documents presented to Plenary adequate?

(c) Have donors been appropriately identified?

(d) With regard to financial support:

- What are the incentives for and barriers to the provision of financial support?
- What could be done to increase the provision and use of financial support?

(e) With regard to in-kind offers:

- Does IPBES effectively mobilize and use the potential of in-kind offers?
- What are the incentives for and barriers to the provision of in-kind support?
- What could be done to increase the provision and use of in-kind support?

(f) With regard to the involvement of third parties:

- Does IPBES effectively mobilize and use the leveraging potential of promoting and catalysing activities and impact through third parties, such as strategic partners?
- What are the incentives for and barriers to the provision of activities and impact through third parties?
- What could be done to increase the promotion and catalysis of activities and impact through third parties, such as strategic partners?