



**Intergovernmental Science-Policy  
Platform on Biodiversity and  
Ecosystem Services**

Distr.: General  
8 June 2023  
English only

---

**Plenary of the Intergovernmental Science-Policy  
Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services  
Tenth session**

Bonn, Germany, 28 August–2 September 2023  
Item 10 of the provisional agenda\*

**Requests, input and suggestions for additional elements  
of the rolling work programme of the Platform up to  
2030**

**Overview of requests, input and suggestions for additional  
elements of the rolling work programme of the Platform  
up to 2030**

**Note by the secretariat**

The annex to the present note supplements document IPBES/10/10 on the prioritization of requests, input and suggestions for additional elements of the rolling work programme of the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES) up to 2030, submitted by Governments and other stakeholders in response to a call issued by the secretariat in notification EM/2022/38 of 14 September 2022, with a deadline of 1 January 2023, extended to 24 February 2023. The annex, which is presented without formal editing, sets out a summary of the submissions received, and of how the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel and the Bureau propose to address them in the IPBES rolling work programme up to 2030.

---

\* IPBES/10/1.

**Annex\*****Overview of requests, input and suggestions for additional elements of the rolling work programme of the Platform up to 2030**

The first four columns of this table provide a summary of the key characteristics each submission as received. The full submissions can be found on the IPBES website at [www.ipbes.net/requests-received-ipbes-work-programme](http://www.ipbes.net/requests-received-ipbes-work-programme). The last column of this table summarises how each submission has been dealt with in document IPBES/10/10. The following abbreviations are used in the table:

ACCOBAMS	Agreement on the Conservation of Cetaceans of the Black Sea, Mediterranean Sea and Contiguous Atlantic Area
AHTEG	Ad Hoc Technical Expert Group
AMAP	Arctic Monitoring and Assessment Programme
ASCOBANS	Agreement on the Conservation of Small Cetaceans of the Baltic, North East Atlantic, Irish and North Seas
BBNJ	Marine Biodiversity of Areas Beyond National Jurisdiction
BIOFIN	Biodiversity Finance Initiative
BRS Conventions	Basel, Rotterdam and Stockholm Conventions
CAFF	Conservation of Arctic Flora and Fauna
CBD	Convention on Biological Diversity
CCAMLR	Commission for the Conservation of Antarctic Marine Living Resources
CEDAW	Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women
CITES	Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora
CMS	Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals
COP	Conference of the Parties
ES	Ecosystem Service
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
FPIC	Free, Prior and Informed Consent
GBO	Global Biodiversity Outlook
GEO	Global Environment Outlook
GEO BON	Group on Earth Observations Biodiversity Observation Network
GMOs	Genetically Modified Organisms
HELCOM	Baltic Marine Environment Protection Commission (Helsinki Commission)
ILK	Indigenous and local knowledge
IMO	International Maritime Organization
IOC	Intergovernmental Oceanographic Commission of UNESCO
IPCC	Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change
IPLC	Indigenous Peoples and local communities
ISA	International Seabed Authority
IUCN	International Union for Conservation of Nature
IWC	International Whaling Commission
Kunming-Montreal GBF	Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework
LCA	Life-cycle assessment
MEAs	Multilateral Environmental Agreements
NAMMCO	North Atlantic Marine Mammal Commission
NbS	Nature-based Solutions
NBSAPs	National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans

\* The annex has not been formally edited.

NCP	Nature's contribution to people
NFP	National focal point
OECD	Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development
OECMs	Other effective area-based conservation measures
OSPAR	Convention for the Protection of the Marine Environment of the North-East Atlantic
PAME	Protection of the Arctic Marine Environment
RAMSAR	Ramsar Convention on Wetlands of International Importance Especially as Waterfowl Habitat
RFMOs	Regional fisheries management organisations
SDGs	Sustainable Development Goals
TSU	Technical support unit
UNCCD	United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification
UNEA	United Nations Environment Assembly
UNEP-WCMC	UN Environment Programme World Conservation Monitoring Centre
UNESCO	United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
UNSD	United Nations Statistics Division
WOA	World Ocean Atlas

Country	Intervention requested	<b>Scientific and Policy Relevance</b> <i><sup>1</sup>Relevance to IPBES (a), urgency (b), policy relevance (c), geographic scope (d), evidence of a need for this work (f), impacts and beneficiaries (h)</i>	<b>Implications for work programme and resource requirements</b> <i>complexity (e), availability of information (g), financial and human resource requirements (i), priority level in case of multiple requests (j)</i>	<b>Indication on how request was addressed</b>
<b>Requests by Multilateral Environmental Agreements</b>				
CBD (1)	<i>Second global assessment on biodiversity and ecosystem services</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposed assessment directly addresses issues of primary interest to the Platform and is highly policy relevant.</li> <li>• The timing of the proposed assessment is aligned with the anticipated needs of the Convention to review implementation of the Kunming-Montreal GBF and prepare for a potential follow up to the framework.</li> <li>• Directly related to the Kunming-Montreal GBF under the CBD and the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development.</li> <li>• Global, with due regard to regional differences.</li> <li>• The proposed assessment builds upon the first IPBES Global Assessment and other deliverables of the Platform. It would address gaps identified in the first Assessment as well as new topics from the Kunming-Montreal GBF. The broad expertise available and the robust processes of the Platform make IPBES best suited.</li> <li>• The assessment will provide the evidence basis for global policy on biodiversity and inform implementation of the Kunming-Montreal GBF by all Parties and actors.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Highly complex. Addressing all areas of the IPBES conceptual framework.</li> <li>• There is a wealth of literature and expertise, as well as indigenous and local knowledge to undertake the assessment in addition to that listed under (f).</li> <li>• Expected to be similar to the first Assessment as well as the regional assessments. Hence a four-year process envisaged, once scoping completed.</li> <li>• Priority of the CBD COP Decision 15/19 representing 196 Parties including nearly all members of IPBES.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Priority 1:</b> second global assessment on biodiversity and ecosystem services.</p> <p>Deliverable 1(e) and dedicated activities within deliverables of objectives 2 to 5.</p>

<sup>1</sup> In prioritizing the submissions received, the Multidisciplinary Expert Panel and the Bureau used all ten criteria listed in paragraph 7 of decision IPBES-1/3, paying particular attention to scientific and policy relevance as per the criteria summarized in the third column ((a) Relevance to the objective, functions and work programme of the Platform; (b) Urgency of action by the Platform in the light of the imminence of the risks caused by the issues to be addressed by such action; (c) Relevance of the requested action in addressing specific policies or processes; (d) Geographic scope of the requested action, as well as issues to be covered by such action; (f) Previous work and existing initiatives of a similar nature and evidence of remaining gaps, such as the absence or limited availability of information and tools to address the issues, and reasons why the Platform is best suited to take action; and (h) Scale of the impacts and potential beneficiaries of the requested action); as well as to implications for the work programme and for resource requirements, as per the criteria summarized in the fourth column ((e) Anticipated level of complexity of the issues to be addressed by the requested action; (g) Availability of scientific literature and expertise for the Platform to undertake the requested action; (i) Requirements for financial and human resources, and potential duration of the requested action; and (j) Identification of priorities within multiple requests submitted).

Country	Intervention requested	<b>Scientific and Policy Relevance</b> <i><sup>1</sup>Relevance to IPBES (a), urgency (b), policy relevance (c), geographic scope (d), evidence of a need for this work (f), impacts and beneficiaries (h)</i>	<b>Implications for work programme and resource requirements</b> <i>complexity (e), availability of information (g), financial and human resource requirements (i), priority level in case of multiple requests (j)</i>	<b>Indication on how request was addressed</b>
CBD (2)	<p><b><i>A fast-track assessment on integrated biodiversity-inclusive spatial planning and ecological connectivity considering such elements as land- and sea-use change and restoration.</i></b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposed assessment addresses one of the key drivers of biodiversity loss identified by the Platform and responds directly to needs of Kunming-Montreal GBF and indirectly to needs of other MEAs.</li> <li>• A fast-track approach is needed to provide the information as soon as possible to help Parties and other actors reach a number of targets of the Kunming-Montreal GBF.</li> <li>• Directly related to the Kunming-Montreal GBF under the CBD, with high relevance to Targets 1, 2 and 3, and the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development.</li> <li>• Global, including terrestrial, inland water and marine areas, with due regard to the need for flexibility to meet differing national circumstances.</li> <li>• The proposed assessment would address a clear gap in information available to Parties and actors. It would draw upon existing methodologies and experience in land and sea use planning and increase coherence between methodologies on these topics. It would also build upon other deliverables of the Platform including the land degradation and restoration assessment. The broad expertise available, global scope and the robust processes of the platform make IPBES best suited.</li> <li>• The assessment will enable effective action to address one of the key direct drivers of biodiversity loss as well as support planning across biodiversity related goals and targets and directly support implementation of the Kunming-Montreal GBF by all Parties and actors. The assessment would have benefits for more holistic, biodiversity-inclusive decision-making across sectors.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Complex. Addresses an area of public policy at the interface of competing interests, additionally, terrestrial and marine spatial planning are often discussed separately.</li> <li>• There is widespread but potentially disparate information and expertise, available as well as indigenous and local knowledge to undertake the assessment.</li> <li>• A fast-track two-year process envisaged.</li> <li>• Priority of the CBD COP Decision 15/19 representing 196 Parties including nearly all members of IPBES.</li> </ul>	<p><u>Priority 3</u>: spatial planning and ecological connectivity.</p> <p>Deliverable 1(g) and dedicated activities within deliverables of objectives 2 to 5.</p>

Country	Intervention requested	<b>Scientific and Policy Relevance</b> <i><sup>1</sup>Relevance to IPBES (a), urgency (b), policy relevance (c), geographic scope (d), evidence of a need for this work (f), impacts and beneficiaries (h)</i>	<b>Implications for work programme and resource requirements</b> <i>complexity (e), availability of information (g), financial and human resource requirements (i), priority level in case of multiple requests (j)</i>	<b>Indication on how request was addressed</b>
CBD (3)	<i>A fast-track assessment on monitoring biodiversity and ecosystem services and tracking progress towards the goals and targets of the Kunming-Montreal GBF and on baselines for assessing biodiversity loss.</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposed assessment would directly support national and global efforts to monitor progress towards the Kunming-Montreal GBF.</li> <li>• A fast-track approach is needed to provide the information as soon as possible to help Parties and other actors monitor the implementation of the Kunming-Montreal GBF.</li> <li>• Directly related to the Kunming-Montreal GBF, and its associated monitoring framework, under the CBD and the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development.</li> <li>• Global, with due regard to the need for flexibility to meet differing national circumstances.</li> <li>• The proposed assessment would increase coherence in information available to Parties and actors. It would draw upon existing methodologies and experience in biodiversity monitoring, including processes initiated and undertaken under the CBD. The broad expertise available, global scope and the robust processes of the platform make IPBES best suited.</li> <li>• The assessment will enable effective action by all Parties and actors to effectively monitor implementation of the Kunming-Montreal GBF and biodiversity more generally. It would build on and contribute to work undertaken or initiated by the CBD and the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Complex. Evaluates opportunities for the development of national biodiversity reporting, monitoring and assessment systems, including underlying biodiversity observation data and other data needed to monitor the framework, including from remote sensing, community-based monitoring and citizen science. Priority would be given to the needs to operationalize the headline indicators. This would build on a broad range of expertise, including from the biodiversity indicators partnership, the GEO BON and the UNSD.</li> <li>• There is widespread but potentially disparate information and expertise available, including indigenous and local knowledge and expertise, to undertake the assessment.</li> <li>• A fast-track two-year process envisaged.</li> <li>• Priority of the CBD COP Decision 15/19 representing 196 Parties including nearly all members of IPBES.</li> </ul>	<p><u>Priority 2</u>: monitoring biodiversity and ecosystem services.</p> <p>Deliverable 1(f) and dedicated activities within deliverables of objectives 2 to 5.</p>

Country	Intervention requested	<b>Scientific and Policy Relevance</b> <i><sup>1</sup>Relevance to IPBES (a), urgency (b), policy relevance (c), geographic scope (d), evidence of a need for this work (f), impacts and beneficiaries (h)</i>	<b>Implications for work programme and resource requirements</b> <i>complexity (e), availability of information (g), financial and human resource requirements (i), priority level in case of multiple requests (j)</i>	<b>Indication on how request was addressed</b>
CBD (4)	<i>A fast-track assessment on the impacts of pollution on biodiversity and approaches to avoid, reduce and mitigate such impacts.</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposed assessment addresses one of the key drivers of biodiversity loss identified by the Platform and responds directly to needs of one MEA and indirectly to others.</li> <li>• A fast-track approach is needed to provide the information as soon as possible to help Parties and other actors reach a number of targets of the Kunming-Montreal GBF.</li> <li>• Directly related to the Kunming-Montreal GBF under the CBD and the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development Goals.</li> <li>• Global, with due regard to the need for flexibility to meet differing national circumstances.</li> <li>• The proposed assessment would address a clear gap in information available to Parties and actors. It would draw upon existing data on pollution. It would also bring together information from other processes addressing specific pollutants in an integrated manner. The broad expertise available, global scope and the robust processes of the Platform make IPBES best suited. The work would be undertaken in a manner to complement any work pursued under the proposed Science-Policy Panel to contribute further to the sound management of chemicals and waste and to prevent pollution.</li> <li>• The assessment will enable effective action to address one of the key direct drivers of biodiversity loss and directly support implementation of the Kunming-Montreal GBF by all Parties and actors.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Complex. Such an assessment would include approaches for the identification of the main sources of pollution that impact biodiversity and ecosystem services and of ways to avoid, reduce and mitigate such impacts. The assessment would focus on those sources of pollution that have the greatest impacts on biodiversity, including their cumulative and synergistic effects, that are not being addressed through other processes.</li> <li>• There is widespread but potentially disparate information and expertise available, as well as indigenous and local knowledge, to undertake the assessment.</li> <li>• A fast-track two-year process envisaged.</li> <li>• Priority of the CBD COP Decision 15/19 representing 196 Parties including nearly all members of IPBES.</li> </ul>	Not prioritized.

Country	Intervention requested	<p align="center"><b>Scientific and Policy Relevance</b></p> <p><i><sup>1</sup>Relevance to IPBES (a), urgency (b), policy relevance (c), geographic scope (d), evidence of a need for this work (f), impacts and beneficiaries (h)</i></p>	<p align="center"><b>Implications for work programme and resource requirements</b></p> <p><i>complexity (e), availability of information (g), financial and human resource requirements (i), priority level in case of multiple requests (j)</i></p>	<p align="center"><b>Indication on how request was addressed</b></p>
CBD (5)	<p><b><i>A fast-track assessment on Living Well in balance and harmony with nature and living in harmony with Mother Earth.</i></b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposed assessment addresses the understanding of “Living well in balance and harmony with Mother Earth”, as established in the IPBES conceptual framework. The topic is relevant to advance a holistic understanding of different worldviews and knowledge systems, as methods to achieve harmonic relationships between societies and nature.</li> <li>• A fast track will facilitate the inclusion of outcomes of the assessment into the implementation processes of the Kunming-Montreal GBF.</li> <li>• The assessment will contribute to understanding the IPBES conceptual framework, the implementation of the Kunming-Montreal GBF, and contribute to attaining the 2050 vision of living in harmony with nature from the CBD.</li> <li>• The proposed assessment has a global scope.</li> <li>• The assessment will build on other IPBES initiatives including the assessment of the diverse values and valuation of nature.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Complex. Such an assessment would require the analysis of diverse worldviews, approaches, practices, and knowledge systems, in particular those of indigenous peoples and local communities. The assessment would focus on how Living Well in balance and harmony with nature and living in harmony with Mother Earth interact with the objectives of the Kunming-Montreal GBF and the Sustainable Development Goals.</li> <li>• Availability of information to be determined.</li> <li>• A fast-track two-year process envisaged.</li> <li>• Priority of the CBD COP Decision 15/19 representing 196 Parties including nearly all members of IPBES.</li> </ul>	<p><u>Priority 1</u>: second global assessment on biodiversity and ecosystem services.</p> <p>This request could be addresses as a component of deliverable 1(e) and dedicated activities within deliverables of objectives 2 to 5.</p>
<b><i>Requests by Governments and observers that are allowed enhanced participation in accordance with decision IPBES-5/4</i></b>				
Bolivia (Plurinational State of)	<p><b><i>A fast-track assessment on Living Well in balance and harmony with nature and living in harmony with Mother Earth.</i></b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The assessment will contribute to the achievement of the Kunming-Montreal GBF and the development of the IPBES Nature Futures Framework.</li> <li>• This is an urgent IPBES task in order to have a comprehensive and holistic understanding of cosmocentric worldviews and knowledge systems, as well as the ways and means to implement harmonic relationships between peoples, Mother Earth, and nature, based on diverse knowledge systems. This would avoid a bias in the implementation of the IPBES conceptual framework and its findings.</li> <li>• At this time is relevant to start a fast-track assessment since the assessment topic is included in the IPBES conceptual framework and the Nature Futures Framework and it is considered one of the ways to achieve a just and sustainable future for humanity and Mother Earth. It will also help to undertake "Mother Earth-centric actions" approved by the Kunming-Montreal GBF. The assessment will inform the current process of the "Earth Assembly", under the United</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Complex, as the assessment implies moving from anthropocentric worldviews and values to cosmobiocentric ones.</li> <li>• There is important scientific literature on philosophies of good living addressed by the IPBES values assessment, and other material including the programme of Harmony with Nature of the United Nations.</li> <li>• The requirements of financial and human resources are similar to those used for previous assessments. A fast-track two-year process is envisaged.</li> <li>• The assessment should be prioritized in order to keep a balance in IPBES as it is the only request from CBD COP-15 dealing with other knowledge systems and bringing together social and natural sciences.</li> </ul>	<p><u>Priority 1</u>: second global assessment on biodiversity and ecosystem services.</p> <p>This request could be addresses as a component of deliverable 1(e) and dedicated activities within deliverables of objectives 2 to 5.</p>

Country	Intervention requested	<b>Scientific and Policy Relevance</b> <i><sup>1</sup>Relevance to IPBES (a), urgency (b), policy relevance (c), geographic scope (d), evidence of a need for this work (f), impacts and beneficiaries (h)</i>	<b>Implications for work programme and resource requirements</b> <i>complexity (e), availability of information (g), financial and human resource requirements (i), priority level in case of multiple requests (j)</i>	<b>Indication on how request was addressed</b>
		<p>Nations General Assembly, to consider ecocentric approaches in multilateralism and the sustainable development agenda.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The requested assessment has a global scope.</li> <li>• This assessment will be based on the findings of the IPBES Values Assessment.</li> <li>• All the relevant actors included in the IPBES process will benefit from the assessment since it will contribute to a better understanding of one of the knowledge systems that are at the core of the IPBES processes and its conceptual framework.</li> </ul>		
France (1)	<p><b><i>Thematic assessment of nature-based solutions and ecosystem services in light of a changing climate.</i></b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• NbS can help to restore degraded ecosystems, promote biodiversity conservation, and enhance ecosystem services. These actions, in turn, can help to achieve the SDGs and improve human well-being. However, there are still controversies regarding the implementation of NbS.</li> <li>• There is a clear need for characterising the best available evidence on NbS, their efficacy and efficiency, and clarifying their potential to respond to biodiversity and climate challenges. This is an urgent issue since, in terms of adaptation strategies, investment in NbS “green infrastructures” are often in competition with traditional, “grey infrastructures”. In that regard, NbS could therefore be an interesting option to reduce the risk of maladaptation.</li> <li>• This assessment would improve global understanding of NbS, and how their impact is likely to evolve in light of climate change. It aims to directly influence all policies deploying NbS.</li> <li>• The evaluation should be global in scope.</li> <li>• Controversies have arisen around the concept of NbS, including concerns over "greenwashing" practices, such as large-scale tree plantations for carbon sequestration that can negatively impact biodiversity and local communities. A science-based review of NbS is essential to address these concerns and ensure that NbS interventions are designed and implemented in a sustainable and equitable manner.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Medium complexity, given the large body of existing initiatives and literature on the issue.</li> <li>• A large body of literature has been produced on the topic of NbS, covering theoretical as well as implementation aspects.</li> <li>• Resources required: To be determined.</li> <li>• Level of priority: second.</li> </ul>	<p>This request could be addressed as part of a future thematic fast-track assessment on biodiversity and climate change, with the exact topic of the assessment to be determined at a future session of the Plenary.</p>

Country	Intervention requested	<b>Scientific and Policy Relevance</b> <i><sup>1</sup>Relevance to IPBES (a), urgency (b), policy relevance (c), geographic scope (d), evidence of a need for this work (f), impacts and beneficiaries (h)</i>	<b>Implications for work programme and resource requirements</b> <i>complexity (e), availability of information (g), financial and human resource requirements (i), priority level in case of multiple requests (j)</i>	<b>Indication on how request was addressed</b>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The scale of the assessment would be global, as would be its impact.</li> </ul>		
France (2)	<p><i>Assessment of multiple values and ecosystem services of forests in the context of climate change and biodiversity loss</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The assessment would contribute to the IPBES objectives of assessing knowledge, building capacity, strengthening the knowledge foundations, and supporting policy. It could also enable the platform to enhance its collaboration with the IPCC.</li> <li>Deforestation is one of the major causes of biodiversity destruction and is considered a major feedback loop accelerating climate change by the IPCC. The assessment would support decision-makers to better understand the opportunities, impacts and barriers to the “rewilding” approach as well as the deployment of NbS.</li> <li>This assessment would improve global understanding on the multiple values of forests and their contributions to people, as well as the tools to measure and value them. It would contribute to the Kunming-Montreal GBF, commitments from the UNFCCC COP-27, the New York Declaration on Forests, and the EU Forest Strategy for 2030.</li> <li>Geographic scope: global, including regional and sub-regional analysis, and a focus on the three main tropical forests basins (Amazonia, Congo, and Indonesia).</li> <li>The assessment would build on previous IPBES assessments, among others, the IPBES Assessment Report on the Sustainable Use of Wild Species, the IPBES Assessment Report of Land Degradation and Restoration, and the IPBES Workshop Report on Biodiversity and Pandemics.</li> <li>Countries with large forest cover would especially benefit from it.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Overlap with the FAO Global Forest Resource Assessment 2020 should be avoided. Unfilled knowledge gaps identified in the IPBES Assessment Report on the Sustainable Use of Wild Species could represent an obstacle.</li> <li>Global publications on forests and ecosystem services have been steadily increasing. Among them, only a small number directly concerns carbon sequestration by forests, suggesting a high availability of scientific literature on other services provided by forests worldwide.</li> <li>Requirements: To be determined.</li> <li>Level of priority: first.</li> </ul>	<p>This request could be addressed as part of a future thematic fast-track assessment on biodiversity and climate change, with the exact topic of the assessment to be determined at a future session of the Plenary.</p>

Country	Intervention requested	<b>Scientific and Policy Relevance</b> <i><sup>1</sup>Relevance to IPBES (a), urgency (b), policy relevance (c), geographic scope (d), evidence of a need for this work (f), impacts and beneficiaries (h)</i>	<b>Implications for work programme and resource requirements</b> <i>complexity (e), availability of information (g), financial and human resource requirements (i), priority level in case of multiple requests (j)</i>	<b>Indication on how request was addressed</b>
France (3)	<b>Workshop on incentives, including subsidies, which are harmful to biodiversity (organised jointly with OECD).</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Kunming-Montreal GBF, in its target 18, proposes to identify by 2025 incentives, including subsidies, that are harmful to biodiversity. The OECD has gained expertise in this topic, focusing its work on identifying and addressing these harmful incentives. IPBES could complement this work by contributing to a better understanding of their impacts on biodiversity and ecosystem services.</li> <li>It is estimated that the global amount of biodiversity harmful incentives ranges from \$500 billion to \$1800 billion yearly, depending on the data source and the number of sectors considered. However, only a very limited number of countries have already undertaken a national-level analytical study. One of the main reasons for this slow progress is the lack of solid knowledge on the impacts of the different types of incentives and subsidies on biodiversity.</li> <li>This workshop would improve global understanding of the incentives that are harmful to biodiversity and would contribute to the global discussion on their definition.</li> <li>The workshop would be global in scope.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>While there is existing work on the issue, there are still challenges around the quantification and qualification of what is a negative subsidy, as the information largely relies on national accounting and analysis of public spending. It also remains a sensitive issue given the potential socio-economic impact of eliminating negative subsidies.</li> <li>The literature on the topic is gradually increasing over time. Studies generally cover the agriculture, fisheries, water, energy and transport sectors.</li> <li>Given its expertise in the understanding of the interaction between biodiversity, ecosystem services and human activities, IPBES could greatly contribute close some of these knowledge gaps.</li> <li>Level of priority: third.</li> </ul>	Not prioritized.
Norway, on behalf of Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Norway, and Sweden	<b>Assessment covering the full range of marine ecosystems.</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The request is highly relevant to the overall objective, functions, and operational principles of the Platform.</li> <li>According to the IPBES Global Assessment on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services, marine ecosystems, from coastal to deep sea, now show the influence of human activities, with coastal marine ecosystems showing both large historical losses in terms of extent and condition as well as rapid ongoing declines. Over 40 per cent of the ocean area was strongly affected by multiple drivers in 2008, and 66 per cent was experiencing increasing cumulative impacts in 2014.</li> <li>The assessment will contribute to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>UN Decade of Ocean Science for Sustainable Development (2021-2030);</li> <li>UN Decade on Ecosystem Restoration 2021-2030;</li> <li>Kunming-Montreal GBF;</li> <li>SDGs – particularly SDG 14;</li> <li>Ongoing work on a new international agreement on BBNJ;</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Complex. The interaction between drivers of change of marine biodiversity and the ecological complexity means that management should be based on an ecosystem approach, involving many different stakeholders, knowledge systems and cultures. IPBES' interdisciplinary and inclusive assessment methods will provide an important knowledge base for such policies.</li> <li>There is a rich body of scientific publications in the field, reports from regional and global multilateral environmental agreements, fishery management bodies, etc.</li> <li>There are several options for an IPBES assessment on marine ecosystems. The topic could be considered for a fast-track assessment, which would be conducted</li> </ul>	<p><u>Priority 1</u>: second global assessment on biodiversity and ecosystem services.</p> <p>This request could be addressed as a component of deliverable 1(e) and dedicated activities within deliverables of objectives 2 to 5.</p>

Country	Intervention requested	<b>Scientific and Policy Relevance</b> <i><sup>1</sup>Relevance to IPBES (a), urgency (b), policy relevance (c), geographic scope (d), evidence of a need for this work (f), impacts and beneficiaries (h)</i>	<b>Implications for work programme and resource requirements</b> <i>complexity (e), availability of information (g), financial and human resource requirements (i), priority level in case of multiple requests (j)</i>	<b>Indication on how request was addressed</b>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– IWC, CMS and CITES; and</li> <li>– Regional processes for Europe and other regions, including, HELCOM, OSPAR and RFMOs; EU biodiversity strategy; the EU Marine Strategy Framework Directive; CCAMLR, Arctic Council and relevant working groups e.g. (AMAP, CAFF and PAME); and ASCOBANS, ACCOBAMS, NAMMCO.</li> <li>• An assessment on marine ecosystems should cover the open ocean, coastal areas, tidal zones and seabed (ocean sediments). The assessment should be global, however, where possible also include considerations on a regional/sub-regional level to be relevant for national management of, for example, coastal zones.</li> <li>• The assessment will be based on existing global and regional assessments, scientific literature, and other relevant knowledge sources. Several knowledge assessments on these issues exist (e.g., GBO, WOA, IPCC, IUCN Red List). In addition, coastal biodiversity assessments are available for several countries. There is also available scientific literature (see point e) for comment on coverage), both data and metadata, and other knowledge sources such as mapping, surveillance, reports etc.</li> <li>• The assessment will strengthen the knowledge base relevant to several of the sustainable development goals, and provide information to national marine biodiversity management authorities and numerous stakeholders and IPLCs in marine regions.</li> </ul>	<p>according to section 3.2 of the IPBES Procedures for the preparation of Platform deliverables. This would allow for the completion of the assessment in time for inclusion in the next global IPBES assessment report.</p>	
Spain	<i><b>Fast-track assessment on ecological connectivity.</b></i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proposed assessment will contribute to filling the gaps regarding Aichi Target 11 and its qualitative aspect on connectivity among protected areas and OECMs identified by the first IPBES Global Assessment. It will also contribute to the planification, implementation and monitoring of the Kunming-Montreal GBF.</li> <li>• A fast-track assessment is needed to provide guidance and information as soon as possible to help Parties to design appropriate national targets, measures, and actions in the process of updating their National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans in response to the Kunming-Montreal GBF.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Complex, as ecological connectivity is difficult to measure and there are several dimensions of ecological connectivity that are needed to be addressed.</li> <li>• Scientific literature is available, as it is referred to in the IPBES Global Assessment. Nevertheless, a comprehensive revision is needed to bring together the whole knowledge, with the view to apply it to specific demands on ecological</li> </ul>	<p><u>Priority 3</u>: spatial planning and ecological connectivity.</p> <p>Deliverable 1(g) and dedicated activities within deliverables of objectives 2 to 5.</p>

Country	Intervention requested	<b>Scientific and Policy Relevance</b> <i><sup>1</sup>Relevance to IPBES (a), urgency (b), policy relevance (c), geographic scope (d), evidence of a need for this work (f), impacts and beneficiaries (h)</i>	<b>Implications for work programme and resource requirements</b> <i>complexity (e), availability of information (g), financial and human resource requirements (i), priority level in case of multiple requests (j)</i>	<b>Indication on how request was addressed</b>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The assessment on ecological connectivity can significantly contribute to the successful achievement of Goal A and Targets 2, 3, 4, 6, and 12 of the Kunming-Montreal GBF.</li> <li>Global scope, including terrestrial and inland water, and coastal and marine areas. The approach should take into consideration the needs of the goals and targets of the Kunming-Montreal GBF.</li> <li>The assessment should build on initiatives and processes of the Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals, the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification, and the World Heritage Centre of UNESCO.</li> <li>The assessment will provide options and guidance for policymakers on updating the NBSAPs, taking into account the goals and targets of the Kunming-Montreal GBF. Beyond Goal A, Targets 1, 2, 3, 4, 6 and 12, the assessment on ecological connectivity will contribute to targets 14 and 15 on mainstreaming biodiversity, contributing to making ecological connectivity relevant to sectors like agriculture, forestry, aquaculture, infrastructure, mining, and energy, among others.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>connectivity to plan and implement at the national level.</li> <li>A fast-track assessment starting right after IPBES-10 would be needed for the assessment to be most relevant for successful planning and implementing of updated NBSAPs.</li> </ul>	
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland (1)	<b><i>Second global assessment of biodiversity and ecosystem services.</i></b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Relevant to the IPBES objective of Assessing Knowledge, Strengthening the Knowledge Foundations, and Supporting Policy. Valuable for the implementation and review of the Kunming-Montreal GBF, other MEAs and national policymaking.</li> <li>Should be complete no later than 2028 to be most valuable for Kunming-Montreal GBF, and to support the development of the follow-up framework in 2030.</li> <li>It should support the CBD and its Protocols. It should also provide evidence to guide international policymaking under other MEAs, namely the CBD, UNFCCC, the UNCCD, CMS, CITES and UNEA and help guide the final review of SDGs. It would also provide an authoritative evidence base for national and sub-national policymaking.</li> <li>Geographic scope: global.</li> <li>IPBES is best suited to carry out the second global assessment as it has the experience of having completed the Global Assessment, as well as numerous highly regarded</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This assessment will address complex issues that are of similar magnitude to those covered in the first global assessment.</li> <li>There is a breadth of evidence available for much of the requested work in this submission, that has grown since the first IPBES global assessment.</li> <li>The financial requirements are based on the first global assessment report. Given that there may be more regional dimensions included within the second global assessment than the first, without the preceding regional assessments, it is possible costs will be higher, and the duration longer.</li> <li>This first global assessment took 3.5 years, and it is likely that the second will take a similar quantity of time.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Priority 1:</b> second global assessment on biodiversity and ecosystem services.</p> <p>Deliverable 1(e) and dedicated activities within deliverables of objectives 2 to 5.</p>

Country	Intervention requested	<b>Scientific and Policy Relevance</b> <i><sup>1</sup>Relevance to IPBES (a), urgency (b), policy relevance (c), geographic scope (d), evidence of a need for this work (f), impacts and beneficiaries (h)</i>	<b>Implications for work programme and resource requirements</b> <i>complexity (e), availability of information (g), financial and human resource requirements (i), priority level in case of multiple requests (j)</i>	<b>Indication on how request was addressed</b>
		<p>assessments since it was formed. It has the necessary processes in place, and its high regard attracts the best experts to take part. Finally, the international negotiation of IPBES assessments means that the assessments are considered highly robust within international and national policy processes.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The second global assessment will be an essential authoritative voice on the latest status, trends, projections and recommended policy actions for biodiversity and nature's contribution to people. This will help inform a variety of multilateral processes, including the final review of the UN sustainable development goals and the CBD global biodiversity framework and the establishment of the post-2030 frameworks.</li> <li>• We feel the timeline for our requested assessments would be of most value if they are completed by the following years: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– The methodological assessment on the management of land and sea use - 2026</li> <li>– The methodological assessment on monitoring biodiversity and ecosystem services, and nature's contribution to people - 2027</li> <li>– The second global assessment- 2028</li> <li>– The thematic assessment on pollution, its impacts on biodiversity and approaches to avoid, reduce and mitigate impacts – 2029</li> <li>– The thematic assessment on gender and biodiversity – 2030</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The second global assessment is of most importance for IPBES to carry out from these requests and we feel that to be most valuable it should be complete by 2028.</li> </ul>	
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland (2)	<b><i>Methodological assessment on management of land and sea use, including to enhance ecological connectivity</i></b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Relevant to the IPBES objective of Assessing Knowledge and Supporting Policy, targets 1-3 and 8-12 of the global biodiversity framework, as well as national targets.</li> <li>• This assessment is the most urgent of these within the timeframe, and should be completed by 2026, to help inform the implementation and review of the progress of Goal A and targets 1-3 of the Kunming-Montreal GBF and other relevant initiatives, such as the UN Decade on Ecosystem Restoration, and guide actions for implementation ahead of the end of the decade.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Complex due to the strong interlinkages between management and spatial planning actions, that have to date not been explicitly explored in detail. The synergies and trade-offs also vary regionally.</li> <li>• There are numerous published studies on management and spatial planning approaches and their contribution to delivery outcomes for biodiversity and nature's contribution to people. This assessment should bring this work together</li> </ul>	<p><b>Priority 3:</b> spatial planning and ecological connectivity.</p> <p>Deliverable 1(g) and dedicated activities within deliverables of objectives 2 to 5.</p>

Country	Intervention requested	<b>Scientific and Policy Relevance</b> <i><sup>1</sup>Relevance to IPBES (a), urgency (b), policy relevance (c), geographic scope (d), evidence of a need for this work (f), impacts and beneficiaries (h)</i>	<b>Implications for work programme and resource requirements</b> <i>complexity (e), availability of information (g), financial and human resource requirements (i), priority level in case of multiple requests (j)</i>	<b>Indication on how request was addressed</b>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This assessment should address this key driver by assessing the variety of policy mechanisms related to biodiversity-inclusive management of land and sea, as well as spatial planning. For restoration, this includes the UN Decade on Restoration and the UNCCD, the CBD, the Bonn Challenge and the Global Restoration initiative. For protected area designations and management, this should include the CBD, Ramsar and the World Heritage. The synergies of using spatial planning and other effective management processes should be considered with reference to the achievement of the UN sustainable development goals.</li> <li>• This assessment should also support decision-makers by assessing forms of planning and management that are not necessarily purely spatial, such as through the assessment of the effectiveness of high seas management (regional fisheries management organizations etc.).</li> <li>• As ecological connectivity is a key concern for migratory species, this assessment will be highly valuable for CMS, and relevant national policies in this area. Connectivity is also a key element of Goal A and targets 2-4 of the global biodiversity framework and will likely enable the delivery of other key outcomes, such as target 8, as well as effective conservation of species.</li> <li>• This assessment will primarily be relevant to the IPBES objective of Assessing Knowledge and Strengthening the Knowledge Foundations, as would assess the global literature on management and spatial planning approaches for achieving goals related to biodiversity and ecosystem services. It would also be critical for the objective of Supporting Policy, as will be highly valuable for the implementation and review of the global biodiversity framework as well as the work of other MEAs and national policymaking.</li> <li>• As is outlined above, this assessment will benefit a number of MEAs. This assessment will also likely cover the implications of protecting/restoring biodiversity for food and water security, building on the nexus assessment, as such it will be of relevance to the sustainable development agenda. By taking into account perspectives from varying countries</li> </ul>	<p>to identify the best management and spatial planning approaches for delivering the global biodiversity framework, considering a variety of contexts, and pathways to get there.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The financial requirements are based on the cost estimates of conducting and preparing for previous fast-track assessments. The total costs ranged from US\$ 800,000 to 1.1 million, including venue costs and travel for meetings, as well as technical support and dissemination and outreach.</li> <li>• It is likely that the assessment will take 2-2.5 years given that there are a number of approaches, that are often interlinked, trade-offs and positive outcomes of these, including ecological connectivity.</li> <li>• The UK feels that this assessment should be prioritised within the timeframe available, ideally by 2026, in order to help inform the review of the progress of Goal A and targets 1-3 of the Kunming-Montreal framework and other relevant initiatives, such as the UN decade on restoration and ratchet up implementation ahead of the end of the decade.</li> </ul>	

Country	Intervention requested	<b>Scientific and Policy Relevance</b> <i><sup>1</sup>Relevance to IPBES (a), urgency (b), policy relevance (c), geographic scope (d), evidence of a need for this work (f), impacts and beneficiaries (h)</i>	<b>Implications for work programme and resource requirements</b> <i>complexity (e), availability of information (g), financial and human resource requirements (i), priority level in case of multiple requests (j)</i>	<b>Indication on how request was addressed</b>
		throughout the preparation of this assessment, it will also be able to guide decision-makers at the regional, national and local levels towards effective and biodiversity-inclusive management and spatial planning.		
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland (3)	<b><i>Thematic assessment on pollution, its impact on biodiversity and approaches to avoid, reduce and mitigate impacts.</i></b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The pollution assessment will be a critical component of the IPBES work programme, in particular Assessing Knowledge, Strengthening the Knowledge Foundations and Supporting Policy, as will be highly valuable for the implementation and review of target 7 of the Kunming-Montreal GBF as well as the work of other MEAs and national policymaking.</li> <li>• It would ideally be complete by 2029 in order to feed into the CBD submission of national reports in 2029. This assessment could therefore be used to help with implementation and monitoring for the 2029 reporting process as well as the negotiations of the subsequent target on pollution in the post-2030 global biodiversity framework. This timing would also allow preparations for this assessment to be informed by the initial work of the science-policy panel for chemicals, waste and pollution or potentially allow collaborative working between the two panels on this issue.</li> <li>• During negotiations of this target at COP15, there were many concerns raised around the impact of reduced agrochemical use on food security, so the implications of mitigation of agrochemicals (including pesticides and fertilisers) should also be considered. A variety of mitigation measures are suitable for the pollution types identified, and these should include NbS, noting the significant role that certain ecosystems, such as wetlands, can play in controlling and filtering chemical pollution and wastewater.</li> <li>• This assessment would be highly valuable to inform the work of the BRS Conventions, including the monitoring of hazardous chemicals for biodiversity, such as Persistent Organic Pollutants. It will also support the UNEA resolution to end plastic pollution. It will be valuable for decision-makers at all scales, enabling decision-makers to make evidence-based policy decisions at the local, national and international levels.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Complex due to the range of pollutants and pollution types and ecosystems impacted as well as the potential for mixture toxicity (which is often not well understood). This complexity could be limited by prioritising the scope by ecosystem, source and type of pollution, and should be guided by target 7 of the Kunming-Montreal GBF.</li> <li>• The GEO 6 and the IPBES Global Assessment highlighted pollution as a critical driver of biodiversity loss. However, further assessments outlining the types of pollution and their varying impacts on biodiversity, as well as mitigation approaches, are lacking.</li> <li>• The financial requirements are based on the cost estimates of conducting and preparing for previous thematic fast-track assessments.</li> <li>• It is likely that the assessment will take 2-2.5 years.</li> <li>• The assessment on pollution could come later in the work programme and be completed by 2029. This would allow preparations for this assessment to be informed by the initial work of the science-policy panel for chemicals, waste and pollution or potentially allow collaborative working between the two panels on this issue.</li> </ul>	Not prioritized.

Country	Intervention requested	<b>Scientific and Policy Relevance</b> <i><sup>1</sup>Relevance to IPBES (a), urgency (b), policy relevance (c), geographic scope (d), evidence of a need for this work (f), impacts and beneficiaries (h)</i>	<b>Implications for work programme and resource requirements</b> <i>complexity (e), availability of information (g), financial and human resource requirements (i), priority level in case of multiple requests (j)</i>	<b>Indication on how request was addressed</b>
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland (4)	<b><i>Methodological assessment on monitoring biodiversity and ecosystem services, and nature's contribution to people.</i></b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It will primarily contribute to the IPBES objective of Assessing Knowledge. It will be valuable for reviewing and assessing the impact of the Kunming-Montreal GBF and informing the monitoring framework of the post-2030 GBF, thus supporting the IPBES objective of Supporting Policy.</li> <li>• The assessment on monitoring would be most useful in 2026. It will then be able to be informed by global and regional efforts related to the monitoring framework and its indicators of the Kunming-Montreal GBF. Completion in 2026 would also allow this assessment to be used to inform the post-2030 GBF and the post-2030 sustainable development agenda.</li> <li>• It is crucial that this assessment builds on the work to develop and review indicators across disciplines by MEAs (e.g., the SDGs, the CBD, Ramsar, UNCCD, CMS and CITES) as well as regional/global centres and organisations of expertise (e.g., UNEP-WCMC, Kew Gardens, OECD and BIOFIN).</li> <li>• IPBES is best suited to carry out this assessment, as it has experience carrying out methodological assessments that are closely linked to global frameworks.</li> <li>• This assessment would be highly beneficial for informing the design, negotiation, and implementation of the post-2030 monitoring framework of the global biodiversity framework of the CBD. It would enable all Parties to have an overview of the methodology for monitoring the critical elements of the framework, the outstanding gaps in indicators, recommended approaches for linking national and global monitoring and capacity-related challenges that need to be addressed and assist national reporting processes.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• High complexity due to the number of indicators that could be considered. The scope could be reduced by focusing on the methodology for calculating and validating indicators, with a focus on indicator types that are less well-developed.</li> <li>• There is a great quantity of published evidence on indicators. These are at the global scale (noted in GEO6 and the Global Assessment), as well as national and local scales.</li> <li>• The financial requirements are based on previous methodological assessments.</li> <li>• It is likely that this assessment will take at least 2 years, given the number of indicator groups that could be covered.</li> <li>• This assessment would be most useful in 2027, given monitoring remains a critical challenge that can hinder progress. This timing would allow it to build on initiatives such as the AHTEG on indicators of the CBD, the UNEP-WCMC and the Global Knowledge Biodiversity Centre.</li> </ul>	<p><u>Priority 2</u>: monitoring biodiversity and ecosystem services.</p> <p>Deliverable 1(f) and dedicated activities within deliverables of objectives 2 to 5.</p>

Country	Intervention requested	<b>Scientific and Policy Relevance</b> <i><sup>1</sup>Relevance to IPBES (a), urgency (b), policy relevance (c), geographic scope (d), evidence of a need for this work (f), impacts and beneficiaries (h)</i>	<b>Implications for work programme and resource requirements</b> <i>complexity (e), availability of information (g), financial and human resource requirements (i), priority level in case of multiple requests (j)</i>	<b>Indication on how request was addressed</b>
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland (5)	<b><i>Thematic assessment on gender and biodiversity</i></b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Primarily relevant to the IPBES objective of Assessing Knowledge. It would also help the IPBES objective to Strengthen the Knowledge Foundations.</li> <li>It could be the last to take place within the work programme to 2030, to ensure that there is ample time to address the evidence gap in this area, and to inform the design and implementation of the post-2030 SDGs and GBF.</li> <li>It should cover both the global north and the global south, including a variety of regions and ecosystems. It should focus on the most vulnerable women and girls, considering the intersectionality with other key issues e.g., race, age, indigeneity and religion, for example. Regions where women and girls are most reliant on biodiversity, and would be most affected by biodiversity loss, should be prioritised.</li> <li>It could be used to inform and underpin gender action plans in a number of MEAs, as well as regional and national governments and the private sector. The prominence of the issues around gender and biodiversity has increased in recent years e.g., with the G7 and G20, where Ministerials on this issue have taken place. It would be used to inform the monitoring and implementation of targets 22 and 23 of the Kunming-Montreal GBF.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Complex elements due to the number of ecosystems and regions covered. It could be reduced by focusing on the most vulnerable groups of women and girls, that are most reliant on biodiversity.</li> <li>There are several key knowledge gaps. Request for IPBES to invite the scientific community to fill those gaps ahead of the assessment.</li> <li>The financial requirements are based on previous thematic fast-track assessments.</li> <li>It is likely that the assessment will take 1.5-2 years.</li> <li>It could be the last assessment to take place within the work programme to 2030.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Priority 1:</b> second global assessment on biodiversity and ecosystem services.</p> <p>This request could be addresses as a component of deliverable 1(e) and dedicated activities within deliverables of objectives 2 to 5.</p>
United States of America (1)	<b><i>Assessment on corridor connectivity, landscape mosaics, spatial patterns, and planning</i></b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increasingly, decisions on how best to sustain and conserve biodiversity and ecosystem services are made across fragmented and varied landscape mosaics. This request would provide valuable guidance on how to effectively conserve nature and nature's contributions to people across spatial and temporal scales. This information is urgently needed to inform landscape planning and prioritization to meet recent ambitious conservation targets.</li> <li>The IPBES Global Assessment identified land and sea use change as the biggest driver of biodiversity loss globally. It is therefore critical to understand how to improve landscape connectivity and spatial planning, as well as how to manage biodiversity across the already fragmented habitats. Considering recent domestic and international efforts to implement ambitious conservation targets by 2030, this assessment is timely and immediately actionable.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Medium to high complexity considering the inherent complexity of heterogeneous and fragmented landscapes, the range of organismal complexity (from genes to biogeographic realms), and the multi-disciplinary nature of conservation planning for connectivity.</li> <li>Literature and expertise for this synthesis are readily available. Given the quantity and diversity of landscape planning tools, an authoritative synthesis of this information and expertise is needed.</li> <li>This assessment could be conducted as a fast-track assessment.</li> <li>Level of priority: first.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Priority 3:</b> spatial planning and ecological connectivity.</p> <p>Deliverable 1(g) and dedicated activities within deliverables of objectives 2 to 5.</p>

Country	Intervention requested	<b>Scientific and Policy Relevance</b> <i><sup>1</sup>Relevance to IPBES (a), urgency (b), policy relevance (c), geographic scope (d), evidence of a need for this work (f), impacts and beneficiaries (h)</i>	<b>Implications for work programme and resource requirements</b> <i>complexity (e), availability of information (g), financial and human resource requirements (i), priority level in case of multiple requests (j)</i>	<b>Indication on how request was addressed</b>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This assessment can inform actions to achieve the goals and targets of the recently adopted Kunming-Montreal GBF and in particular targets 1, 2, and 3. This assessment would also be directly relevant to other biodiversity-related conventions such as the CMS.</li> <li>• Geographic scope: across local, regional, and global spatial scales and varied temporal scales. Consideration of linkages among ecological realms (e.g., terrestrial-aquatic) is a high priority for this assessment.</li> <li>• Minor linkages may be present between this assessment and the ongoing Nexus Assessment. It would provide actionable guidance from an internationally respected source on processes and efforts to meet ambitious conservation targets across varied landscapes and scales.</li> <li>• The impacts and beneficiaries of this assessment will be commensurate with the wide scales encompassed, including local, regional, national, and international stakeholders.</li> </ul>		
United States of America (2)	<b>Assessment on restoration and nature-based solutions</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• NbS are a fundamental pillar of addressing the biodiversity crisis. Practitioners need a focused assessment providing the best scientific information on actionable restoration practices that leverage NbS for conserving functional ecosystems effectively and efficiently. An IPBES assessment identifying potential NbS that conserve biodiversity, maintain the many social benefits of nature's contributions to people, and provide the foundation of climate adaptation would greatly aid conservation practitioners.</li> <li>• Considering recent domestic and international efforts to implement ambitious conservation targets by 2030, this assessment is timely and immediately actionable. Moreover, there is a strong desire to leverage restoration and NbS for climate adaptation practices that benefit biodiversity and nature's contributions to people.</li> <li>• This assessment can inform actions to achieve the goals and targets of the recently adopted Kunming-Montreal GBF and in particular targets 2, 1, and 3. It would also be directly relevant to other biodiversity-related conventions such as the UNFCCC and the UNCCD.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The coupled socio-ecological system and heterogeneous multi-scale spaces, combined with the multi-disciplinary nature of conservation planning across subnational, national, and international governance structures increase the level of complexity for this assessment to Moderate or High.</li> <li>• Literature and expertise for this synthesis are readily available. Given the quantity and diversity of NbS and landscape restoration tools, an authoritative synthesis of this information and expertise is badly needed.</li> <li>• This assessment could be conducted as a fast-track assessment.</li> <li>• Level of priority: second.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Priority 3:</b> spatial planning and ecological connectivity.</p> <p>This request could be addresses as a component of deliverable 1(g) and dedicated activities within deliverables of objectives 2 to 5.</p>

Country	Intervention requested	<p align="center"><b>Scientific and Policy Relevance</b></p> <p><i><sup>1</sup>Relevance to IPBES (a), urgency (b), policy relevance (c), geographic scope (d), evidence of a need for this work (f), impacts and beneficiaries (h)</i></p>	<p align="center"><b>Implications for work programme and resource requirements</b></p> <p><i>complexity (e), availability of information (g), financial and human resource requirements (i), priority level in case of multiple requests (j)</i></p>	<p align="center"><b>Indication on how request was addressed</b></p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Geographic scope: across local, regional, and global spatial scales and varied temporal scales (years to decades).</li> <li>• Linkages may be present between this assessment and a previous IPBES Assessment on Land Degradation and Restoration; however, a new standalone assessment on these topics including a focus on NbS would provide up-to-date and actionable guidance on processes and efforts to meet ambitious conservation targets using modern techniques. There also may be some very minor overlap with the ongoing Transformative Change Assessment.</li> <li>• The impacts and beneficiaries of this assessment will be commensurate with the wide scales encompassed by this assessment. We envision local, regional, national, and international stakeholders benefiting from this assessment.</li> </ul>		
United States of America (3)	<p><b><i>Methodological Assessment on Vulnerability Assessments for Nature’s Contributions to People</i></b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Vulnerability assessments are an indispensable tool for assessing risk from a wide variety of threats, including climate change. Climate change vulnerability indexes have generally focused on protecting species or communities. We propose an assessment that would review the scientific literature and develop a transferable framework for conducting vulnerability assessments on nature’s contributions to people (NCP). This would constitute a move from characterizing NCP to understanding how to assess the vulnerability of these services to climate change, which then informs adaptation/resilience planning. The focus on standardizing vulnerability assessments for the conservation of ES falls squarely under the mission of IPBES.</li> <li>• We consider this assessment urgent. NCP are vulnerable to a range of threats, including climate change. Developing standards and frameworks for completing NCP vulnerability assessments is critical to planning for sustainability given our dependence on NCP.</li> <li>• In the U.S. this assessment would have direct applications under the Clean Air and Clean Water Acts. Furthermore, it would directly inform our agricultural and aquaculture sectors. More broadly, this assessment can inform actions to achieve the goals and targets of the recently adopted</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The anticipated level of complexity is relatively low for this methodological assessment.</li> <li>• Literature and expertise for this synthesis are readily available.</li> <li>• This assessment could be conducted as a fast-track assessment.</li> <li>• Level of priority: third.</li> </ul>	<p><b>Priority 2:</b> monitoring biodiversity and ecosystem services.</p> <p>This request could be addresses as a component of deliverable 1(f) and dedicated activities within deliverables of objectives 2 to 5.</p>

Country	Intervention requested	<b>Scientific and Policy Relevance</b> <i><sup>1</sup>Relevance to IPBES (a), urgency (b), policy relevance (c), geographic scope (d), evidence of a need for this work (f), impacts and beneficiaries (h)</i>	<b>Implications for work programme and resource requirements</b> <i>complexity (e), availability of information (g), financial and human resource requirements (i), priority level in case of multiple requests (j)</i>	<b>Indication on how request was addressed</b>
		<p>Kunming-Montreal GBF, and in particular Goal B and targets 9, 10, and 11.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Geographic scope: a methodological approach that can be applied at various scales.</li> <li>• The UN System of International Environmental-Economic Accounting has done a lot of valuable work in ES valuation and would be a good partner for this. However, limited work has been done on developing and coordinating ES vulnerability assessment standards specifically as they relate to actionable policies for mitigating the effects of climate and biodiversity crises.</li> <li>• The assessment would impact ES vulnerability assessments on a variety of scales. A broad range of stakeholders would benefit from having these standards and frameworks in place.</li> </ul>		
United States of America (4)	<b><i>Assessing Knowledge Gaps for Planning and Investing in Climate-Ready Marine Fisheries and Marine Protected Areas</i></b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Despite this importance, assessments providing vital information for conservation efforts in the marine and coastal realms have trailed those of terrestrial systems. An IPBES assessment on this topic would provide valuable guidance on how to effectively establish marine protected areas and sustainable fisheries in the face of climate change. Specifically, this assessment would investigate and synthesize knowledge gaps inhibiting planning and investment in climate-ready fisheries and marine protected areas designed to adapt to climate change.</li> <li>• The IPBES Global Assessment identified direct exploitation and land and sea use change as the biggest drivers of marine biodiversity loss globally. It is therefore urgent to identify knowledge gaps preventing effective management of marine biodiversity and ecosystem services.</li> <li>• The U.S. has committed to setting aside 30% of its lands and waters for the conservation of nature. This assessment will help identify barriers to planning and investing in adaptively managed marine protected areas. Moreover, this assessment can inform actions to achieve the goals and targets of the Kunming-Montreal GBF, in particular targets 1, 2, and 3, as well as target 9. This assessment would also be directly relevant to RFMOs. Furthermore, this assessment would</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The level of complexity for this assessment would be relatively high. Considering the inherent complexity of marine and coastal landscapes, the range of stakeholder groups, organismal complexity (from genes to biogeographic realms), and the multi-disciplinary nature of conservation planning across subnational, national, and international scales.</li> <li>• Literature and expertise for this synthesis are available. Given the breadth of biodiversity and ecosystem services provided by oceans and coasts, an authoritative synthesis of this information and expertise is badly needed.</li> <li>• This assessment could be conducted as a fast-track assessment.</li> <li>• Level of priority: fourth.</li> </ul>	<p><u>Priority 3</u>: spatial planning and ecological connectivity.</p> <p>This request could be addresses as a component of deliverable 1(g) and dedicated activities within deliverables of objectives 2 to 5.</p>

Country	Intervention requested	<b>Scientific and Policy Relevance</b> <i><sup>1</sup>Relevance to IPBES (a), urgency (b), policy relevance (c), geographic scope (d), evidence of a need for this work (f), impacts and beneficiaries (h)</i>	<b>Implications for work programme and resource requirements</b> <i>complexity (e), availability of information (g), financial and human resource requirements (i), priority level in case of multiple requests (j)</i>	<b>Indication on how request was addressed</b>
		<p>serve partner organizations within the UN, including UNESCO, IOC, and the BBNJ.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Geographic scope: local, national, and intergovernmental level to inform planning and prioritization for effective management and conservation actions. This assessment could consider the best adaptive management practices for a range of strategies (ranging from extractive fisheries and no-take marine protected areas) under changing climate conditions.</li> <li>• There has been some focus on marine biodiversity and ecosystem services in the previous IPBES Global Assessment; however, a targeted assessment of the barriers to investment and planning for sustainable marine fisheries and marine protected areas has not been undertaken. Actionable policies that mitigate the effects of biodiversity crises and ensure sustainable activities from marine industries are needed. This is timely given the ongoing work at RFMO and within the UN IOC and BBNJ. Some minor linkages also may be present between this assessment and the ongoing Nexus and Transformative Change Assessments.</li> <li>• The impacts and beneficiaries of this assessment will be commensurate with the wide scales encompassed by this assessment. We envision local, regional, national, and international stakeholders benefiting from this assessment.</li> </ul>		
European Union (1)	<i>A fast-track assessment on integrated biodiversity-inclusive spatial planning and ecological connectivity considering such elements as land- and sea-use change and restoration</i>	<p>General comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The assessments might include aspects such as evidence for the achievement of targets of the Kunming-Montreal GBF at the global level based on analysis of global data/indicators, and considering interactions/overlaps/conflicts between targets; methodologies to assess whether Parties contributions to global goals and targets are adequate; evidence of progress towards 2050 goals and projections of trends of indicators towards 2050 and beyond; review of evidence regarding options to address areas of underperformance, possible actions and evidence to support further intermediate targets (2040); synergies/trade-offs between goals/targets of SDGs and other MEAs (Paris</li> </ul>		<p><u>Priority 3</u>: spatial planning and ecological connectivity.</p> <p>Deliverable 1(g) and dedicated activities within deliverables of objectives 2 to 5.</p>
European Union (2)	<i>A fast-track assessment on monitoring biodiversity and ecosystem services and tracking progress towards the goals and targets of the post-2020 global</i>			<p><u>Priority 2</u>: monitoring biodiversity and ecosystem services.</p> <p>Deliverable 1(f) and dedicated activities</p>

Country	Intervention requested	<b>Scientific and Policy Relevance</b> <i><sup>1</sup>Relevance to IPBES (a), urgency (b), policy relevance (c), geographic scope (d), evidence of a need for this work (f), impacts and beneficiaries (h)</i>	<b>Implications for work programme and resource requirements</b> <i>complexity (e), availability of information (g), financial and human resource requirements (i), priority level in case of multiple requests (j)</i>	<b>Indication on how request was addressed</b>
	<i><b>biodiversity framework and on baselines for assessing biodiversity loss</b></i>	Agreement, UN Decade of Restoration, UNCCD etc.); data management, indicators, and modelling approaches.		within deliverables of objectives 2 to 5.
European Union (3)	<i><b>A fast-track assessment on the impacts of pollution on biodiversity and approaches to avoid, reduce and mitigate such impacts</b></i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The assessments could take different formats, such as integrated into the second global assessment, as fast-track assessments, or in any other adequate form.</li> <li>• All functions of IPBES should be adequately considered and even increased in the rolling work programme up to 2030, in particular on policy support and strengthening the knowledge foundations.</li> <li>• The benefits of policy support and strengthening the knowledge foundations have not been fully realized in the past but are indispensable to make the generation of knowledge and capacity building successful. The concrete nature of their work will need to be defined in conjunction with the work on knowledge generation, to support the ability of science and research funding organizations to generate input and of policy bodies to be able to take up the relevant knowledge of the products and processes IPBES is generating.</li> </ul>		Not prioritized.

Stakeholder	Intervention requested	<p align="center"><b>Scientific and Policy Relevance</b></p> <p align="center"><i><sup>1</sup>Relevance to IPBES (a), urgency (b), policy relevance (c), geographic scope (d), evidence of a need for this work (f), impacts and beneficiaries (h)</i></p>	<p align="center"><b>Implications for work programme and resource requirements</b></p> <p align="center"><i>complexity (e), availability of information (g), financial and human resource requirements (i), priority level in case of multiple requests (j)</i></p>	<p align="center"><b>Indication on how request was addressed</b></p>
<b>Inputs and suggestion by relevant stakeholders</b>				
Alliance for Freshwater Life	<b>Updating communication to include freshwater / inland waters as a distinct realm and to elaborate an IPBES Assessment report on freshwater.</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Improved communication about the freshwater realm is important for the achievement of SDGs 6, 15 and 14, and the objectives of the Paris Agreement.</li> <li>Understanding interlinkages among biodiversity in freshwater systems is urgently needed to appreciate the associations for the supply of water and food to improve human well-being and mitigate climate change effects. Given the high decline of freshwater biodiversity, an assessment is urgent and timely.</li> <li>It would highlight gaps of knowledge and support raising awareness and action, also contributing to the Ramsar Convention on Wetlands.</li> <li>Geographic scope: global.</li> <li>Explicit consideration of the freshwater realm is expected to strengthen the science-policy interface for biodiversity and ecosystem services for the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity, long-term human well-being and sustainable development.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Low complexity. Changing freshwater communication would be simple to implement. For an assessment report, the procedures are clear and established.</li> <li>Freshwater-related networks could offer literature and expertise.</li> </ul>	This request could be addressed as part of objective 5 – communicating and engaging.
Centre Scientifique de Monaco	<b>Assess how nature can be considered as a natural capital and included in the wealth (balance sheets) of the countries and help to achieve the SDGs (debt-nature swaps).</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The development of carbon markets and carbon offsets needs science-based information to inform implementation and avoid greenwashing.</li> <li>Carbon removal has been highlighted in IPCC reports, in the UNFCCC COP-26, and it will be important in UNFCCC COP-27.</li> <li>Global scope.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Complex because it needs a multidisciplinary team capable to integrate expertise in natural science, economics, and finance.</li> </ul>	<p><u>Priority 1</u>: second global assessment on biodiversity and ecosystem services.</p> <p>This request could be addresses as a component of deliverable 1(e) and dedicated activities within deliverables of objectives 2 to 5.</p>

Stakeholder	Intervention requested	<p align="center"><b>Scientific and Policy Relevance</b></p> <p align="center"><i><sup>1</sup>Relevance to IPBES (a), urgency (b), policy relevance (c), geographic scope (d), evidence of a need for this work (f), impacts and beneficiaries (h)</i></p>	<p align="center"><b>Implications for work programme and resource requirements</b></p> <p align="center"><i>complexity (e), availability of information (g), financial and human resource requirements (i), priority level in case of multiple requests (j)</i></p>	<p align="center"><b>Indication on how request was addressed</b></p>
French Foundation for Research on Biodiversity (FRB) (1)	<b><i>Thematic assessment on pollution.</i></b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The IPBES land degradation assessment, the recent assessment on the sustainable use of wild species, the upcoming assessment on invasive alien species and the recent joint report with IPCC on biodiversity and climate change all directly focus on those drivers of biodiversity loss. However, there is a missing assessment on pollution, even though it is qualified as the third most important driver affecting biodiversity and ecosystem services worldwide.</li> <li>Directly relevant to Target 7 of the Kunming-Montreal GBF.</li> <li>Geographic scope: global.</li> <li>This assessment, also requested by CBD Parties, could be done in collaboration with the Science-policy panel requested by the United Nations Environment Assembly to contribute further to the sound management of chemicals and waste and to prevent pollution (UNEP/EA.5/Res.8).</li> <li>As the issue is worldwide, the beneficiaries of such assessment would also be worldwide.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The complexity of this evaluation would be low.</li> <li>There is extensive literature on the subject of assessing pollution in the environment, but less on its impacts on biodiversity at the ecosystem level. However, this academic field is growing fast.</li> <li>A four-year process is envisaged.</li> <li>This topic must be addressed as a priority by IPBES. If this proposal is not retained, it would be essential that the 2nd global assessment addresses more pollution issues.</li> </ul>	Not prioritized.
French Foundation for Research on Biodiversity (FRB) (2)	<b><i>Thematic assessment to show the causal link between the expansion of industrialized agriculture and the decline of biodiversity.</i></b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Reducing conservation to an increase in natural areas is not consistent with current trends in biodiversity. Peasant agriculture and varied landscapes have already shown their ability to maintain acceptable biodiversity levels. The IPBES can help synthesize this knowledge for the political world.</li> <li>This assessment could give politicians a clear picture of the links between industrial agriculture and biodiversity, encouraging them to implement regulations and financial aid. It would enhance the value of agricultural products resulting from cultivation that moves away from industrial techniques, enhancing education, peer support and green aid.</li> <li>Geographic scope: global with due regard to national circumstances.</li> <li>Some parts of the problem are well known. On the one hand, the factors leading to the decline in biodiversity, and the pace of this decline. Remains to be better understood. The role of IPBES would be to highlight the gaps in these issues.</li> <li>It will have direct effects at the national level, including the reduction in the quantities of toxic substances spread, lower consumption of water, and savings on fossil fuels, among</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Complex as it requires clarification of the economic and industrial issues at stake, and a re-learning of how to manage crops and livestock with fewer inputs and less engineering.</li> <li>The scientific literature looks extensively at the value of nature reserves, focusing on emblematic species, and on the need for humans to be in touch with nature. Incidentally, it touches upon the value of ecosystem services.</li> <li>A four-year process is envisaged.</li> <li>This topic must be addressed as a priority by IPBES. If this proposal is not retained, it would be essential that the 2nd global assessment addresses more industrial agriculture issues.</li> </ul>	<p><u>Priority 1:</u> second global assessment on biodiversity and ecosystem services.</p> <p>This request could be addresses as a component of deliverable 1(e) and dedicated activities within deliverables of objectives 2 to 5.</p>

Stakeholder	Intervention requested	<b>Scientific and Policy Relevance</b> <i><sup>1</sup>Relevance to IPBES (a), urgency (b), policy relevance (c), geographic scope (d), evidence of a need for this work (f), impacts and beneficiaries (h)</i>	<b>Implications for work programme and resource requirements</b> <i>complexity (e), availability of information (g), financial and human resource requirements (i), priority level in case of multiple requests (j)</i>	<b>Indication on how request was addressed</b>
		<p>others. At the international scale, it would mean the introduction of standards at borders – as with the carbon tax on imports and the control of products from freshly deforested areas – protecting biodiversity (pesticides, GMOs, etc.) and restoring our food autonomy.</p>		
<p>French Foundation for Research on Biodiversity (FRB) (3)</p>	<p><b><i>Thematic assessment on Biodiversity and Taxation</i></b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This is part of the identification of IPBES direct and indirect drivers of change.</li> <li>• One of the key points of Kunming-Montreal GBF is the phasing out of harmful subsidies for biodiversity (USD 500 billion per year by 2030).</li> <li>• The mobilisation of resources, particularly financial resources, for the preservation and conservation of biodiversity is urgent if we want to meet global objectives and challenges. Investments in conservation are counterproductive if harmful subsidies continue to exist. The identification of these harmful subsidies could while waiting for their definitive abolition, be used for conservation.</li> <li>• This assessment will increase knowledge on the subject, and thus facilitate the implementation of the recommendations of international bodies (IPBES, CBD) concerning the removal of harmful subsidies. It can serve as a basis and guide governments in establishing their own national policies on the matter.</li> <li>• Geographic scope: global with a comparative approach, including good practices.</li> <li>• IPBES is best placed to carry out this assessment as it is an international platform, able to mobilise researchers and experts from all over the world more easily, able to coordinate the work, and able to analyse and compare the results in order to obtain a global vision and not only on a national scale.</li> <li>• It will benefit public policies as more knowledge will facilitate trade-offs and decision-making regarding harmful subsidies.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Complex, it can be difficult to assess or quantify the direct or indirect impact of expenditure on biodiversity. Most of the data are rather estimates. In addition, some subsidies are politically complex to challenge or remove.</li> <li>• A four-year assessment is envisioned.</li> <li>• This topic must be addressed as a priority by IPBES. If this proposal is not retained, it would be essential that the 2nd global assessment addresses more harmful subsidy issues.</li> </ul>	<p><u>Priority 1</u>: second global assessment on biodiversity and ecosystem services.</p> <p>This request could be addressed as a component of deliverable 1(e) and dedicated activities within deliverables of objectives 2 to 5.</p>

Stakeholder	Intervention requested	<b>Scientific and Policy Relevance</b> <i><sup>1</sup>Relevance to IPBES (a), urgency (b), policy relevance (c), geographic scope (d), evidence of a need for this work (f), impacts and beneficiaries (h)</i>	<b>Implications for work programme and resource requirements</b> <i>complexity (e), availability of information (g), financial and human resource requirements (i), priority level in case of multiple requests (j)</i>	<b>Indication on how request was addressed</b>
French Foundation for Research on Biodiversity (FRB) (4)	<b><i>Thematic evaluation on urban plans, architecture, and social and environmental pressures on biodiversity</i></b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The assessment concerning “city and biodiversity” would enlighten impacts and links between different cultural choices, habits, and traditions, on biodiversity levels. The review can also clarify hidden impacts urban people aren’t aware of. Considering CBD/COP/DEC/15/19, this evaluation could fit within the a), c), and d) requests.</li> <li>• Urbanization and artificialization are processes very difficult to come back or minimize, afterwards. Giving elements to policymakers or people in charge of urban development as soon as possible could avoid environmental and social mistakes and anticipate needs for 2050.</li> <li>• Considering countries with a high level of urban planification and regulation, and countries without the same level, the study could enhance the biodiversity consideration in planification of the first ones and help to guide the other ones to include biodiversity issues, by guidance, in their fast-growing process.</li> <li>• Geographic scope: global, including urban areas, and their natural or agricultural dependencies.</li> <li>• There are studies linking biodiversity, nature in the city, urban forms, urban biodiversity corridors, mental health, zoonoses, climate risks, etc., on which an IPBES evaluation could focus, to summarize information/guidelines not only for the use of those in charge of urban planning programs, renovation policies or urban planning but also for the use of architects in the context of building design.</li> <li>• The aim of the study is to anticipate biodiversity issues due to the growing number of urban area inhabitants, to enumerate nature-based solutions to adapt cities to climate change and to propose different types of possibilities for better development, regarding the scientific present knowledge.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Average level of complexity: a large number of studies and grey literature exists, but links between social and biodiversity issues, density and biodiversity footprint need to be clarified.</li> <li>• There is a substantial amount of grey literature and sector guidance, from urban mapping, building design, and building material LCA.</li> <li>• A four-year assessment is envisioned.</li> <li>• This topic must be addressed as a priority by IPBES. If this proposal is not retained, it would be essential that the 2nd global assessment addresses more urban planification issues.</li> </ul>	<p><u>Priority 1</u>: second global assessment on biodiversity and ecosystem services.</p> <p>This request could be addresses as a component of deliverable 1(e) and dedicated activities within deliverables of objectives 2 to 5.</p>

Stakeholder	Intervention requested	<p align="center"><b>Scientific and Policy Relevance</b></p> <p align="center"><i><sup>1</sup>Relevance to IPBES (a), urgency (b), policy relevance (c), geographic scope (d), evidence of a need for this work (f), impacts and beneficiaries (h)</i></p>	<p align="center"><b>Implications for work programme and resource requirements</b></p> <p align="center"><i>complexity (e), availability of information (g), financial and human resource requirements (i), priority level in case of multiple requests (j)</i></p>	<p align="center"><b>Indication on how request was addressed</b></p>
<p>French Foundation for Research on Biodiversity (FRB) (5)</p>	<p><b><i>Methodological evaluation on ethno-socio-economic confrontation of the models of evaluation of biodiversity and ecosystems and of the associated economic tools</i></b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Contribution to the scientific and social role of IPBES.</li> <li>• Urgency is justified because it will orient methodologies and approaches to the living, human and non-human, including the crucial role of traditional knowledge.</li> <li>• The assessment can inform guidelines and best practices documents.</li> <li>• Geographic scope: global with due respect to regional and local contexts.</li> <li>• The assessment would facilitate a renewed focus on the link between science and economics thanks to ethnographic, philosophic, and sociological approaches.</li> <li>• The potential impact may concern policymakers, urban developers, urbanism agencies, architects, inhabitants, building material providers, non-humans, and biodiversity generally speaking.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There is no global assessment of knowledge on this subject. The assessment would contribute to CBD COP Decision 15.19, including requests a), c), and d).</li> <li>• There is scientific literature on this subject. It remains to be seen whether the quantity of publications available is sufficient to carry out an evaluation on a global scale.</li> <li>• A four-year assessment is envisioned.</li> <li>• This topic must be addressed as a priority. If this proposal is not retained, it would be essential that the second global assessment addresses more change of paradigm issues.</li> </ul>	<p><u>Priority 1:</u> second global assessment on biodiversity and ecosystem services.</p> <p>This request could be addressed as a component of deliverable 1(e) and dedicated activities within deliverables of objectives 2 to 5.</p>
<p>French Foundation for Research on Biodiversity (FRB) (6)</p>	<p><b><i>Conceptual and methodological assessment on equity and biodiversity</i></b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This proposal would contribute to the IPBES mission to assess knowledge, guide decision-making, and support transformations.</li> <li>• Focus on how the three pillars of the CBD (conservation, sustainable use and equity) are implemented on the ground, including inclusive participation of IPLC and gender-related dimensions of conservation action.</li> <li>• As underlined by the CBD COP-15, it is a critical issue with particular attention to civil society (IPLC, youth, women, etc.).</li> <li>• The results of this assessment would benefit all governments around the world, but also stakeholders in society, businesses, local populations, and citizens.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• High level of complexity because it requires understanding the various systems of rights, including human rights, animal rights, and rights of nature.</li> <li>• There is scientific literature on this subject. It remains to be seen whether the quantity of publications available is sufficient to carry out an evaluation on a global scale.</li> <li>• A four-year assessment is envisioned.</li> <li>• This topic must be addressed as a priority by IPBES. If this proposal is not retained, it would be essential that the second global assessment addresses more equity issues.</li> </ul>	<p><u>Priority 1:</u> second global assessment on biodiversity and ecosystem services.</p> <p>This request could be addressed as a component of deliverable 1(e) and dedicated activities within deliverables of objectives 2 to 5.</p>

Stakeholder	Intervention requested	<b>Scientific and Policy Relevance</b> <i><sup>1</sup>Relevance to IPBES (a), urgency (b), policy relevance (c), geographic scope (d), evidence of a need for this work (f), impacts and beneficiaries (h)</i>	<b>Implications for work programme and resource requirements</b> <i>complexity (e), availability of information (g), financial and human resource requirements (i), priority level in case of multiple requests (j)</i>	<b>Indication on how request was addressed</b>
French Foundation for Research on Biodiversity (FRB) (7)	<b><i>Fast-track methodological assessment on biodiversity conservation</i></b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This proposal corresponds to the IPBES mission to assess knowledge of tools for policymakers.</li> <li>• The tendency to focus on the proportion of land and sea to be protected in order to preserve biodiversity obscures more fundamental questions: how conservation is done, by whom and with what outcomes. These questions are crucial for effective biodiversity conservation.</li> <li>• IPBES members would be the main beneficiaries of this assessment.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Medium level of complexity: this assessment would need more practitioners than academics to write it.</li> <li>• A lot of existing literature on the subject.</li> <li>• A four-year assessment is envisioned.</li> </ul>	<p><u>Priority 3</u>: spatial planning and ecological connectivity.</p> <p>This request could be addresses as a component of deliverable 1(g) and dedicated activities within deliverables of objectives 2 to 5.</p>
French Foundation for Research on Biodiversity (FRB) (8)	<b><i>Thematic assessment of the state of knowledge on marine biodiversity (preservation and conservation status)</i></b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Marine ecosystems provide many societal benefits, ranging from carbon cycling, primary production and oxygen production, energy supply, climate regulation, and mineral and biological resources, to leisure and recreation in attractive coastal environments. In this context, it becomes urgent to better assess marine biodiversity and ecosystems, to strengthen the links between IPBES and ongoing initiatives on oceans.</li> <li>• The IPCC Special Report on Ocean and Cryosphere highlighted the increase in the ocean's temperature, the increase in this warming rate, the increase in stratification, and the decrease in pH (ocean acidification) and oxygen content These ongoing changes have negative impacts on food provisioning, tourism, the economy and human health.</li> <li>• This report would provide input to the regional conventions: Barcelona, OPSAR, Nairobi, Noumea and Apia, Cartagena, Antarctic Marine Living Resources, Montego Bay, BBNJ, CITES, CMS, CBD, UNFCCC, those concerning cetaceans, the International Marine Organization, and those dealing with pollution and plastics.</li> <li>• Geographic scope: global including regional analysis.</li> <li>• Better sustainable use of the ocean, to be able to use its resources on a longer time scale and to better assess its carbon sink role.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A lot of research is carried out on the ocean (public, private, military), and local knowledge also exists throughout the world.</li> <li>• A four-year assessment is envisioned.</li> </ul>	<p><u>Priority 1</u>: second global assessment on biodiversity and ecosystem services.</p> <p>This request could be addresses as a component of deliverable 1(e) and dedicated activities within deliverables of objectives 2 to 5.</p>

Stakeholder	Intervention requested	<p align="center"><b>Scientific and Policy Relevance</b></p> <p align="center"><i><sup>1</sup>Relevance to IPBES (a), urgency (b), policy relevance (c), geographic scope (d), evidence of a need for this work (f), impacts and beneficiaries (h)</i></p>	<p align="center"><b>Implications for work programme and resource requirements</b></p> <p align="center"><i>complexity (e), availability of information (g), financial and human resource requirements (i), priority level in case of multiple requests (j)</i></p>	<p align="center"><b>Indication on how request was addressed</b></p>
<p>French Foundation for Research on Biodiversity (FRB) (9)</p>	<p><b><i>Disclose the process for becoming an author, fellow or reviewer</i></b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Geographical balance is still a big issue in IPBES assessments.</li> <li>• Importance of representing all geographical areas and types of knowledge.</li> <li>• Suggestions:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Leaflets in English presenting how to be an author in IPBES assessment or a reviewer and why people should do it.</li> <li>– Presentations downloadable on IPBES website to present IPBES and how to get involved in assessment as an author, a fellow or a reviewer.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Low level of complexity.</li> </ul>	<p>This request could be addressed as part of Objective 5 – communicating and engaging.</p>
<p>French Foundation for Research on Biodiversity (FRB) (10)</p>	<p><b><i>Improve the assessment process</i></b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Suggestion for the first author meeting to be later in the process when the team of authors is more set up and they had a few online meetings. We would like to suggest 1 additional full-time TSU member per assessment in order to allow better in-depth coordination and support at the chapter level.</li> <li>• IPBES assessments are being requested to be done in very short timeframes. If people want a quick assessment of excellence, IPBES members will need to take into consideration (1) more funds for TSUs in order to support the experts (and take care of the TSU mental health), and (2) review the assessment process (authors meetings, external review).</li> </ul>	<p>Low level of complexity.</p>	<p>Overarching comment regarding funding.</p>
<p>French Foundation for Research on Biodiversity (FRB) (11)</p>	<p><b><i>Support synthesis research</i></b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Synthesis research is important to assess biodiversity and ecosystem services. IPBES could work with the several existing synthesis centres on biodiversity to:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Promote coordination between synthesis centres and the researchers working with them;</li> <li>– Facilitate engagement of experts in the production and review of assessments;</li> <li>– Making the gaps identified in IPBES assessments available to synthesis centres and encouraging them to open calls for proposals on those specific knowledge gaps.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		<p>This request could be addressed as part of objective 3(a) – advancing work on knowledge and data.</p>

Stakeholder	Intervention requested	<b>Scientific and Policy Relevance</b> <i><sup>1</sup>Relevance to IPBES (a), urgency (b), policy relevance (c), geographic scope (d), evidence of a need for this work (f), impacts and beneficiaries (h)</i>	<b>Implications for work programme and resource requirements</b> <i>complexity (e), availability of information (g), financial and human resource requirements (i), priority level in case of multiple requests (j)</i>	<b>Indication on how request was addressed</b>
French Foundation for Research on Biodiversity (FRB) (12)	<b>Reinforcing Impact Tracking Database</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Need to show the impact of IPBES on 1) convincing experts to take part in it and 2) convincing governments of taking into account IPBES recommendations.</li> <li>• The Impact Tracking Database is important to show decision-makers what they can do with IPBES assessments and to encourage experts to get involved with IPBES.</li> <li>• There should therefore be more work to feed Impact Tracking Database by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Sending regular emails to ask members to feed it;</li> <li>– Having someone in the IPBES secretariat tracking the impacts.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>		This request could be addressed as part of objective 5 – communicating and engaging.
IPLCs, Indigenous Knowledge and Peoples Networks, Society for Wetland Biodiversity Conservation Nepal, Federation of Kirant Indigenous Associations	<b>To assess world views and diversity of customary laws and regulate bio cultural protocols of IPLCs for biodiversity and ecosystems conservation</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Working on the national level to establish a framework on customary systems to regulate biocultural community protocols taking into account FPIC and the full effective participation of IPLCs at all levels.</li> <li>• Priorities: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Diverse customary laws, biocultural diversity and biodiversity associated ILK;</li> <li>– Institutions and governance systems;</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Linkages of Mother Nature and Earth for biodiversity and ecosystems services</li> </ul>		<p><u>Priority 1</u>: second global assessment on biodiversity and ecosystem services.</p> <p>This request could be addresses as a component of deliverable 1(e) and dedicated activities within deliverables of objectives 2 to 5.</p>
One Ocean Hub	<b>Global assessment on biodiversity- and ecosystem services-dependent human rights</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The legal and governance aspects of the different dimensions of human well-being dependent on biodiversity and diverse human vulnerabilities affected by biodiversity loss have been poorly considered until now in the work of IPBES.</li> <li>• Very urgent to ensure that non-biodiversity experts, authorities and NGOs integrate biodiversity in their work on human rights, internationally and nationally.</li> <li>• Most UN human rights bodies are now addressing the environment to some extent, but they tend to focus on climate change. It is essential to provide a clearer understanding of the implications of their work for biodiversity.</li> <li>• Geographic scope: Global.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This will require involving international human rights experts and international biodiversity lawyers in leading the assessment and facilitating a dialogue with a wide range of natural and social scientists with them to ensure a full understanding of available evidence.</li> <li>• Expertise across natural, legal, and social sciences is required. The scientific literature on biodiversity and human rights is limited.</li> </ul>	<p><u>Priority 1</u>: second global assessment on biodiversity and ecosystem services.</p> <p>This request could be addresses as a component of deliverable 1(e) and dedicated activities within deliverables of objectives 2 to 5.</p>

Stakeholder	Intervention requested	<p align="center"><b>Scientific and Policy Relevance</b></p> <p><i><sup>1</sup>Relevance to IPBES (a), urgency (b), policy relevance (c), geographic scope (d), evidence of a need for this work (f), impacts and beneficiaries (h)</i></p>	<p align="center"><b>Implications for work programme and resource requirements</b></p> <p><i>complexity (e), availability of information (g), financial and human resource requirements (i), priority level in case of multiple requests (j)</i></p>	<p align="center"><b>Indication on how request was addressed</b></p>
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The scale of potential impacts: local (national) to regional to global. Beneficiaries: parties and stakeholders to international human rights treaties and MEAs, as well as the new BBNJ agreement.</li> </ul>		
Somali Youth Development Foundation	<i>To engage Somali youth and enhance policy and plans through advocacy.</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>To ensure more resources are allocated to assess contaminated areas and engage youth.</li> </ul>		Overarching comment regarding funding.
University of Cape Town	<i>Assessment of the implications of ocean data and knowledge gaps in relation to marine biodiversity and its interactions with terrestrial and other aquatic biodiversity, identifying solutions for the Kunming-Montreal GBF.</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Strengthening the marine realm in current and future assessments is highly relevant to the IPBES Programme of Work.</li> <li>Timing is crucial to contribute to the Ocean Decade (2021-2030).</li> <li>Marine-specific issues, indicators, quantifications and policy-relevant information are lagging behind that available and collated for terrestrial systems.</li> <li>Highly relevant with respect to the following negotiations and treaties:               <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>BBNJ</li> <li>Future ocean-based climate action under the Paris Agreement</li> <li>The UN Ocean Decade</li> <li>Regional Seas Agreements</li> </ul> </li> <li>Geographic scope: global with attention to regional and national priorities.</li> <li>The scale of potential impacts: local (national) to regional to global. Beneficiaries: parties and stakeholders to BBNJ agreement; parties and stakeholders to the Paris Agreement, parties and stakeholders to regional seas agreements; parties and stakeholders to other international ocean governance bodies whose decisions have impacts on biodiversity (ISA, IMO, CITES, CMS, etc).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Complex and diverse issues to be addressed, including ecosystem-level, multiple stressors and pathways of change.</li> <li>Large bodies of marine information are available and there is rich expertise available that can be drawn upon.</li> <li>Duration: to start after the Transformative Change and Nexus Assessments have concluded, and finish by 2029 to contribute to the culmination of the Ocean Decade activities in 2030.</li> </ul>	<p><u>Priority 1</u>: second global assessment on biodiversity and ecosystem services.</p> <p>This request could be addresses as a component of deliverable 1(e) and dedicated activities within deliverables of objectives 2 to 5.</p>

Stakeholder	Intervention requested	<p align="center"><b>Scientific and Policy Relevance</b></p> <p align="center"><i><sup>1</sup>Relevance to IPBES (a), urgency (b), policy relevance (c), geographic scope (d), evidence of a need for this work (f), impacts and beneficiaries (h)</i></p>	<p align="center"><b>Implications for work programme and resource requirements</b></p> <p align="center"><i>complexity (e), availability of information (g), financial and human resource requirements (i), priority level in case of multiple requests (j)</i></p>	<p align="center"><b>Indication on how request was addressed</b></p>
University of São Paulo / International Academy of Science, Health & Ecology	<b>Analyse present paradigms of growth, power, wealth, work, and freedom embedded into the political, technological, economic, and educational institutions and on new strategies do deal with them.</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Promote and undertake research to improve the capacities of policymakers in analysing and managing policies to address issues of climate change, environment, natural resource management, science, technology and innovation, transitioning to low-carbon, and inclusive green and blue economy.</li> <li>Support the formulation and implementation of sensitive policies in the areas responsible for climate change, green and blue economy, natural resources management, science, technology, and innovation in support of the key drivers of sustainable structural transformation.</li> <li>Advocate policy-relevant research and analysis to inform the formulation and implementation of policies to foster a blue and green economy, encompassing relevant actors, the media, the academy, and different stakeholders.</li> <li>Support member States in addressing challenges of climate change in key sectors and putting in place appropriate plans and mechanisms, encompassing priorities, policies, and strategies.</li> <li>Geographic scope: Global.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Complex, including new ways to define the problems and the instruments to deal with them.</li> </ul>	<p><u>Priority 1:</u> second global assessment on biodiversity and ecosystem services.</p> <p>This request could be addresses as a component of deliverable 1(e) and dedicated activities within deliverables of objectives 2 to 5.</p>
Women's Caucus of the Convention on Biological Diversity	<b>Assessment on women and biodiversity conservation and ecosystem management</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The proposed report is relevant to fill an essential and long-standing knowledge gap in biodiversity and ecosystem functions and services, as well as to strive for sustainable biodiversity use and ecosystem management with a gender-responsive approach. This aligns with the Kunming – Montreal GBF and with the SDGs, specifically SDG 14, and SDG 15.</li> <li>Following the adoption of the Kunming - Montreal GBF, which includes gender-responsive implementation targets (i.e., 22 and 23), as well as the adoption of the Post-2020 Gender Plan of Action, there is an urgent need for knowledge on the status of women and biodiversity, as well as identifying policies and actions to address the existing knowledge gaps.</li> <li>It will have implications for a wide range of local, national, regional, and global policies, including the SDGs, the Kunming-Montreal GBF, and the CBD Gender Plan of Action. UNEA Resolution 4/17 “Resolution on Promoting</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The anticipated level of complexity is medium since there is a critical knowledge base, yet also gaps concerning women and biodiversity.</li> <li>There is a wide variety of academic and non-academic literature that can serve as a basis for the proposed assessment. There are several local, national or regional studies, under different perspectives and organised by sub-sector or themes linked to biodiversity conservation and ecosystem management. Additionally, the UNCBD Women’s Caucus collectively has comprehensive expertise and can contribute with relevant literature, contacts, and insights in the corresponding assessment drafts’ revision processes.</li> </ul>	<p><u>Priority 1:</u> second global assessment on biodiversity and ecosystem services.</p> <p>This request could be addresses as a component of deliverable 1(e) and dedicated activities within deliverables of objectives 2 to 5.</p>

Stakeholder	Intervention requested	<p align="center"><b>Scientific and Policy Relevance</b></p> <p align="center"><i><sup>1</sup>Relevance to IPBES (a), urgency (b), policy relevance (c), geographic scope (d), evidence of a need for this work (f), impacts and beneficiaries (h)</i></p>	<p align="center"><b>Implications for work programme and resource requirements</b></p> <p align="center"><i>complexity (e), availability of information (g), financial and human resource requirements (i), priority level in case of multiple requests (j)</i></p>	<p align="center"><b>Indication on how request was addressed</b></p>
		<p>gender equality, and the human rights and empowerment of women and girls in environmental governance”, elements of the CEDAW, and the UN General Resolution 76/300 on “The human right to a clean, healthy and sustainable environment”.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Geographic scope: global, taking into account regional specificities that result from cultural as well as ecosystem diversity, including the many forms of ecosystem management practised by women.</li> <li>• Even if there are a couple of inspiring initiatives from SCBD, there are no comprehensive and up-to-date initiatives with a global scope on the interlinkages between women, biodiversity, and ecosystem management. In this context, IPBES is best suited to producing the assessment based on its transdisciplinary approach, integrating different knowledge systems, and ensuring balanced and inclusive geographic representation.</li> <li>• The proposed assessment's relevance and impacts are multi-scale, multi-sectorial, and multi-actor. Among the many beneficiaries, the crucial ones are women, particularly those from IPLCs, who remain invisible despite advances in recognising their roles.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Human resources would include a group of experts from various regions financially supported by their respective institutions.</li> <li>• Funding would be required for FPIC. It is expected that the entire procedure would take up to three years.</li> </ul>	