

Draft questionnaire for the review of IPBES

41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65
66
67
68
69
70
71
72
73
74
75
76
77
78
79

Section I: Functions of IPBES

Issue 1: Process to receive and prioritize requests to design the first work programme

- (a) To what degree was the call for requests (by IPBES members, for designing the first work programme) and the mechanism proposed by the secretariat for responding to the call clear, transparent and efficient?
- (b) To what extent did you hold internal consultations before responding to the call for requests?
- (c) To what degree were you satisfied with the way the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel processed the requests and presented a prioritized list to the Plenary?
- (d) To what degree would you say that the list of the deliverables in the work programme, which stems from the requests and the subsequent Plenary decision, meets the needs of your country/organization and is policy-relevant?

Issue 2: Synergies between the four work elements

- (a) To what degree have the four elements of the work programme (capacity building, assessments, policy tools and methodologies, and stimulating new research) worked well together?

Issue 3: Assessments to support the science-policy interface

NB: Some of these questions will offer the option of giving a general response and/or of targeting a specific assessment.

- (a) To what degree have the IPBES assessments contributed to the science-policy interface in a manner that ensures:
 - legitimacy
 - relevance and
 - credibility
- (b) To what degree have the assessment scoping processes worked well?
- (c) To what degree have the processes for the nomination and selection of authors (co-chairs, coordinating lead authors, lead authors and review editors) worked well? Specifically, to what degree has the nomination process resulted in a balanced set of experts:
 - geographically
 - gender
 - disciplinary
- (d) If the answer to the question (c) is that the nomination processes are not resulting in a balanced set of experts, then an additional question is: why are the nomination processes not producing a balanced set of experts?
- (e) To what degree have the assessments followed the Plenary-approved scope?

- 80 (f) To what degree have the peer-review mechanisms worked?
81 • Have Governments provided adequate inputs and comments, and if not, why?
82 • Have experts provided adequate inputs and comments, and if not why?
83 (g) To what degree have the IPBES assessments properly identified confidence limits?
84 (h) To what degree have the summaries for policymakers been written in an appropriate style, that
85 is not too technical, to be understood by a wide range of audiences and stakeholders?
86 (i) To what degree have the summaries for policymakers addressed policy-relevant issues without
87 being policy-prescriptive?
88 (j) To what degree have the lengths of the summaries for policymakers been appropriate?
89 (k) To what degree have the assessments incorporated all relevant data and knowledge?
90 (l) To what degree have the assessments addressed policy needs, particularly at regional and sub-
91 regional scales?
92 (m) To what degree have the assessments addressed terrestrial, marine and inland water
93 biodiversity and nature's contributions to people/ecosystem services and their cross-cutting
94 interactions in a balanced and effective manner?
95 (n) To what degree have the assessments appropriately used national, sub-regional and regional
96 assessments and knowledge?
97 (o) To what degree have the assessments recognized, respected, and adequately addressed and
98 incorporated indigenous and local knowledge?
99 (p) To what degree have the assessments approved by the Plenary to date appropriately identified
100 options for policymaking?
101 (q) To what degree did the Pollination Assessment meet the standards to be expected of an IPBES
102 product?
103 (r) To what degree did the Scenarios and Modelling Assessment meet the standards to be expected
104 of an IPBES product?
105 (s) To what degree have the ongoing regional and land degradation and restoration assessments
106 been produced in a manner consistent with the agreed policies and procedures?
107 (t) To what degree have the Assessments approved by the Plenary to date been appropriately
108 disseminated to governments and other stakeholders
109

110 **Issue 4: Policy-relevant tools and methodologies**

- 111 (a) To what degree have the assessments, approved by the Plenary to date, appropriately identified
112 policy-relevant tools and methodologies?
113 (b) To what degree have deliverables, other than assessments, appropriately identified and
114 provided policy-relevant tools and methodologies, e.g., the policy tools and methodologies
115 catalogue?

- 116 (c) Acknowledging that the catalogue of policy support tools is at an early stage of development, to
117 what degree has the catalogue been user-friendly and appropriately structured to support policy
118 formulation?
- 119 (d) To what degree have the Policy-relevant tools and methodologies approved by the Plenary to
120 date been appropriately disseminated to governments and other stakeholders
- 121 (e) Are there any other ways and means of further enhancing efforts by IPBES to deliver on this
122 function?

123 **Issue 5: Capacity-building**

- 124 (a) To what degree has IPBES effectively matched IPBES funding for the priority capacity-building
125 needs identified by the Plenary, with other resources by catalysing financial and in-kind
126 support?
- 127 (b) To what degree has the capacity-building forum and related activities been successful and how
128 can they be further strengthened?
- 129 (c) To what degree has IPBES effectively developed the capacities needed to implement its work
130 programme?
- 131 (d) To what degree has the pilot fellowship programme worked?
- 132 (e) To what degree has the nomination and selection process for fellows worked?
- 133 (f) To what degree have the pilot training activities supported the implementation of the work
134 programme?
- 135 (g) To what degree have the capacity building activities involved indigenous and local knowledge
136 holders?
- 137 (h) What other avenues are needed to further catalyse and leverage funding for capacity-building?
138

139 **Issue 6: Knowledge and data**

- 140 (a) To what degree has IPBES used clear and transparent processes to identify and use existing data
141 sets held by partner organizations?
- 142 (b) To what degree has IPBES used scientifically credible processes to identify and use existing data
143 sets held by partner organizations?
- 144 (c) To what degree has IPBES identified a useful set of indicators for its assessments?
- 145 (d) To what degree have the processes used to manage the data and information used in
146 assessments been adequate?
- 147 (e) To what degree have the processes used to identify policy-relevant knowledge gaps and to
148 promote, prioritize and catalyse the generation of new knowledge been adequate?
- 149 (f) To what degree has the Knowledge, Information and Data Task Force provided, in time, the
150 necessary inputs to assessments (for example detailed maps of each of the 4 regions, units of
151 analyses, indicators, etc.)?
- 152 (g) To what degree has IPBES encompassed a plurality of epistemologies?
153

154 **Section II: Operating principles of IPBES**

155 **Issue 7: Indigenous and local knowledge**

- 156 (a) To what degree has IPBES recognized, respected and adequately addressed indigenous and local
157 knowledge in its work?
- 158 (b) Given that the work of IPBES on indigenous and local knowledge is still at a pilot stage, to what
159 degree have the processes for working with indigenous and local knowledge in IPBES activities
160 been appropriate?
- 161 (c) To what degree has IPBES developed new strategies and methodologies to adequately work
162 with indigenous and local knowledge?
163

164 **Issue 8: Geographical, disciplinary and gender balances in IPBES's activities**

- 165 (a) To what degree has IPBES achieved appropriate regional representation and participation in its
166 structure and work?
- 167 (a) if not why?
- 168 (b) To what degree has IPBES taken an appropriate interdisciplinary and multidisciplinary approach
169 that incorporates all relevant disciplines, including social and natural sciences, in all its
170 activities?
- 171 (a) if not why?
- 172 (c) To what degree has IPBES achieved appropriate gender balance in all relevant aspects of its
173 work?
- 174 (a) if not why?
175

176 **Issue 9: Useful and policy-relevant information**

- 177 (a) To what degree is the Pollination Assessment, especially its summary for policymakers,
178 sufficiently policy-relevant?
- 179 (b) To what extent has the Pollination Assessment generated a policy response at the national and
180 international levels?
- 181 (c) Does IPBES have mechanisms to follow the uptake of policy relevant evidence of an assessment,
182 at national and international levels?
- 183 (d) To what degree has the Scenarios and Modelling Assessment provided useful guidance to:
- 184 • other IPBES assessments?
- 185 • the broader community of scientists? and
- 186 • funding agencies, policy support practitioners and policymakers wishing to make use of
187 scenarios and models to inform decision-making on the local to global scales?
- 188 (e) To what degree do the following draft assessment reports appear to be providing policy-
189 relevant information:

- 190 • Land degradation and restoration?
- 191 • Americas regional assessment?
- 192 • Africa regional assessment?
- 193 • Europe and Central Asia regional assessment?
- 194 • Asia and the Pacific regional assessment?
- 195 (f) To what degree have other IPBES deliverables and products, e.g., the conceptual framework,
196 been policy-relevant?
- 197 (g) To what degree have IPBES processes supported the policy-relevance of deliverables?
- 198 • To what degree have the scoping processes been conducive to the preparation of policy-
199 relevant deliverables?
- 200 • To what degree has the composition of expert groups been conducive to the preparation of
201 policy-relevant deliverables?

202 **Section III: Procedures for developing deliverables**

203 **Issue 10: Conflict of Interest**

- 204 (a) To what degree has the committee on conflicts of interest been functioning well?
- 205 (b) To what degree have the principles guiding the examination of conflicts of interest been
206 appropriate?
- 207 (c) To what degree have the procedures for the implementation of the conflicts of interest policy
208 been appropriate?
- 209 (d) To what degree has the form for declaring conflicts of interest been appropriate?

210

211 **Issue 11: Partnerships**

- 212 (a) To what degree have appropriate partnership arrangements at global, regional and national
213 levels been developed for the conduct of IPBES activities, and properly implemented?
- 214 (a) If not why?
- 215 (b) To what degree has IPBES adequately collaborated with existing initiatives on biodiversity and
216 ecosystem services, including multilateral environmental agreements, United Nations bodies
217 and networks of scientists and knowledge holders?
- 218 (a) If not why?
- 219 (c) Has the branding policy of IPBES been adequate?
- 220 (a) If not why?

221

222

223 **Section IV: Functioning of the Plenary, Bureau, Multidisciplinary Expert Panel**
224 **and secretariat**

225 **Issue 12: Functioning of the Plenary**

- 226 (a) To what degree has the information and documentation presented to the Plenary enabled it to
227 play its role in an effective manner?
- 228 (b) To what degree has the decision-making by the Plenary been amenable to effective
229 implementation by the secretariat, the Bureau and the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel?
- 230 (c) To what degree have the sessions of the Plenary been organized and conducted in an effective
231 manner?
- 232 (d) To what degree has the Plenary been properly advised on coordination between IPBES and
233 other relevant institutions?

234 **Issue 13: Functioning of the Bureau**

- 235 (a) To what degree have members of IPBES and regional groups been supported by their respective
236 Bureau members?
- 237 (b) To what degree has the Bureau followed up on requests addressed to it by the Plenary in its
238 decisions?
- 239 (c) To what degree has the Bureau effectively conducted its roles related to chairing and
240 contributing to task forces, expert groups and assessment management committees?
- 241 (d) To what degree has the Bureau properly discharged its administrative functions of:
- 242 • Overseeing communications and outreach activities?
- 243 • Reviewing progress in the implementation of Plenary decisions?
- 244 • Monitoring the secretariat's performance?
- 245 • Organizing and conducting the sessions of the Plenary?
- 246 • Reviewing observance of the platform's rules of procedure?
- 247 • Reviewing the management of resources and observance of financial rules?
- 248 • Advising the plenary on coordination between IPBES and other relevant institutions?
- 249 • Identifying donors and developing partnership arrangements?
- 250 • Maintaining synergies with the MEP?
- 251 (e) To what degree are Bureau members fully engaged in Bureau activities (e.g., assessment
252 management committees, expert panels and task groups) and devoting the required 20% of
253 their time?

254

255 **Issue 14: Functioning of the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel**

- 256 (a) To what degree has the Plenary been properly advised by the Panel on scientific and technical
257 aspects of the IPBES programme of work?

- 258 (b) To what degree has the Panel effectively followed up on requests addressed to it by the Plenary
259 in its decisions?
- 260 (c) To what degree has the Panel effectively fulfilled its roles related to chairing and contributing to
261 task forces and expert groups?
- 262 (d) To what degree has the Panel provided adequate advice and assistance on technical and
263 scientific matters?
- 264 (e) To what degree has the peer-review process been properly managed and ensured the highest
265 levels of scientific quality, independence and credibility for all products delivered by IPBES at all
266 stages of the process?
- 267 (f) To what degree have the scientific community and other knowledge holders been properly
268 engaged with the IPBES work programme, given the need for different disciplines and types of
269 knowledge, gender balance, and effective contribution and participation by experts from
270 developing countries?
- 271 (g) To what degree has there been scientific and technical coordination among structures set up
272 under IPBES?
- 273 (h) To what degree are MEP members fully engaged in MEP activities (e.g., assessment
274 management committees, expert panels and task groups) and devoting the required 20% of
275 their time?

276

277 **Issue 15: Functioning of the secretariat**

- 278 (a) To what degree has the documentation been of high quality and delivered on time?
- 279 (b) To what degree have sessions of the Plenary, meetings of the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel and
280 Bureau and other technical meetings been well organized?
- 281 (c) To what degree has the secretariat effectively followed up on requests addressed to it by the
282 Plenary in its decisions?
- 283 (d) To what degree has the secretariat provided support for the delivery of the work programme
284 according to the decisions of the Plenary?
- 285 (e) To what degree has the size, composition and set-up of the secretariat, including its technical
286 support units, been appropriate given the responsibilities and challenges arising in
287 implementation of the work programme?
- 288 (f) To what degree has the system of technical support units worked?
- 289 (g) To what degree has integration among TSU themselves, and with the Secretariat headquarters
290 been effective?
- 291 (h) To what degree has the interaction between the various bodies of IPBES functioned?
- 292 (i) To what degree have the TSUs worked efficiently and effectively?

293 **Section V: Task forces and expert groups**

294 **Issue 16: Functioning of the task forces and expert groups**

- 295 (a) To what degree have the task forces and the expert groups been effective in the following areas:

- 296 • Supporting the assessments?
- 297 • Indigenous and local knowledge?
- 298 • Capacity-building?
- 299 • Data and knowledge?
- 300 • Values?
- 301 • Scenarios and models of biodiversity and ecosystem services?
- 302 • Policy-support tools?
- 303 (b) To what degree has there been effective interaction between the task forces, expert groups and
304 assessments?

305 **Section VI: Effectiveness of budgetary management and fiscal rules**

306 **Issue 17: Resource management, financial rules and reporting**

- 307 (a) To what degree have the financial resources been properly managed, i.e., used cost-effectively?
- 308 (b) To what degree have the financial rules been observed?
- 309 (c) To what degree have the budget documents been adequately presented to Plenary?
- 310 (d) To what degree have donors been appropriately identified, i.e., to what degree has the
311 fundraising strategy worked?
- 312 (e) With regard to financial support:
- 313 • What are the incentives for and barriers to the provision of financial support to IPBES?
- 314 • What should be done to increase financial support to IPBES?
- 315 (f) With regard to in-kind offers:
- 316 • To what degree has IPBES effectively mobilized and used the potential of in-kind offers?
- 317 • What are the incentives for and barriers to the provision of in-kind support to IPBES?
- 318 • What should be done to increase the provision of in-kind support to IPBES?
- 319 (g) With regard to the involvement of third parties:
- 320 • To what degree has IPBES effectively mobilized and used the leveraging potential of
321 promoting and catalysing activities and impact through third parties, such as strategic
322 partners?
- 323 • What are the incentives for and barriers to the provision of activities and impact through
324 third parties?
- 325 • What should be done to increase the promotion and catalysis of activities and impact
326 through third parties, such as strategic partners?
- 327 (h) To what degree has the allocation of the budget between the various deliverables been
328 optimal?

329 **Section VII Stakeholder engagement and Communication**

330 **Issue 18: Communication**

331 (a) To what degree has the IPBES Communication and Outreach Strategy been sufficient to support
332 the mission and work programme of the Platform?

333 (b) To what degree has the implementation of the Communication and Outreach Strategy been
334 effective in widening the reach and impact of IPBES's work?

335

336 **Issue 19: Stakeholder engagement**

337 (a) To what degree has the IPBES Stakeholder Engagement Strategy been sufficient to support the
338 mission and work programme of the Platform?

339 (b) To what degree has the implementation of the Stakeholder Engagement Strategy been effective
340 in widening the reach and impact of IPBES's work?