

Submission of requests, inputs and suggestions on short-term priorities and longer term strategic needs that require attention and action by IPBES as part of its future work programme

Government of Japan

I . Implementation of a global assessment

1. Relevance to the objective, functions and work programme of IPBES:
It is relevant to “Assessments” of the four functions of IPBES
2. Urgency of action by IPBES in the light of the imminence of the risks caused by the issues to be addressed by such action:
As it would assess the achievement of the global framework towards 2030, including SDGs and the 2020 global biodiversity framework, and provide important scientific information for development of framework after 2030, it should be implemented and completed by 2028 (but no later than the first half of year 2029).
3. Relevance of the requested action in addressing specific policies or processes:
It is relevant to all the policies and processes related to biodiversity, as well as the assessment of the achievement of the global framework towards 2030 and the important scientific information for development of framework after 2030.
4. Geographic scope of the requested action, as well as issues to be covered by such action:
Geographic scope : global
Issues :
 - 1) Considering tight fiscal situation of IPBES, we suggest that regional and subregional assessments be implemented in an integrated manner with the global assessment. It should however also be noted that initiative or ownership of the member states undertaking regional and subregional assessments is secured, such as by establishing regional hubs.
 - 2) Considering tight fiscal situation of IPBES, we suggest that assessment of issues at the nexus of food, water, health and energy and so on, be implemented as a part of the global assessment. Moreover, when it is implemented, trade-offs among these areas and synergies should be analyzed, and related policy options regarding sustainable production and consumption, pollution and urbanization should be considered as well.
5. Anticipated level of complexity of the issues to be addressed by the requested action:
When regional assessments and global assessment are formulated in an integrated manner, work for the formulation could be much more complicated without effective and efficient integration of these assessments.

6. 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 IPBES is best suited to take action:

The regional assessment (2018) and the (first) global assessment (to be completed in 2019) by IPBES can be referenced as a precedent. IPBES should implement global assessment regularly and report its result.

Overlap with similar assessments and analyses by CBD, such as future GBOs, should be minimized and synergies maximized.

7. Availability of scientific literature and expertise for IPBES to undertake the requested action:

The IPCC Sixth Assessment Report to be finalized in 2021 would probably be useful. In addition, the updated information of science literatures in regional assessments and the first global assessment would be available. It may be possible to invite the experts participating in them for this assessment.

Furthermore, Open SDG Data Hub (United Nations Statistics Division) organizes the achievement status of SDGs and provides the data.

Open SDG Data Hub

<http://www.sdg.org/>

8. Scale of the potential impacts, and potential beneficiaries of the requested action:

As the assessment is global and comprehensive, it has an impact on the world. It is beneficial to all the people of the Parties to CBD in light of its contribution to the assessment and the development of global framework.

9. Requirements for financial and human resources, and potential duration of the requested action:

If regional and global assessments are integrated into a single assessment, it can be implemented more efficiently than the four regional assessments and the global assessment, which were implemented separately. The working period for preparation of this assessment report should be extended to 4-5 years.

10. An identification of priorities within multiple requests submitted:

The first priority

11. Any other relevant information (including a list of any attachments provided):

None

II. Implementation of a methodological assessment on the effectiveness of policy measures and policy support tools for the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity, and improvement of the policy support catalogue

1. Relevance to the objective, functions and work programme of IPBES:
It is relevant to “Assessments” and “policymaking support” of the four functions of IPBES
2. Urgency of action by IPBES in the light of the imminence of the risks caused by the issues to be addressed by such action:
The work for improvement of “Catalogue of policy support tools and methodologies” prepared in the first work programme 4(c) should be accelerated. The effectiveness of policy measures and policy support tools have not yet been sufficiently verified in assessments by IPBES. We believe that both assessing the effectiveness of policy support tools and methodologies and improving contents of the catalogue are important for societal implementation of all tools and deliverables of IPBES.
3. Relevance of the requested action in addressing specific policies or processes:
It is useful to all the policies related to conservation of biodiversity.
4. Geographic scope of the requested action, as well as issues to be covered by such action:
Analysis at national or sub-national level is most valuable for policymakers. However, regional level could also be useful in light of multi-national cooperation.
5. Anticipated level of complexity of the issues to be addressed by the requested action:
It is necessary to collect and arrange documents published by each government as well as scientific literature. We think level of complexity is not very high due to specialization in policy-related issues.
6. 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 IPBES is best suited to take action:
Information about policy measures in the assessment which has been (will be) completed in the first work programme can be utilized. Furthermore, official government websites and national biodiversity strategy and action plan of CBD are also useful. While IPBES is a science-policy platform, deliverables related to policy are still not enough, therefore, we believe it should be implemented.
7. Availability of scientific literature and expertise for IPBES to undertake the requested action:
The availability of scientific literature of which the effectiveness has already been assessed is unknown. We believe it will be possible to utilize the experts who have participated in deliverables of IPBES to date and related networks.

8. Scale of the potential impacts, and potential beneficiaries of the requested action:
If effectiveness of policy measures which are implemented in accordance with a characteristic of each country or region and of policy measures which have universality is clearly shown, application of policy measures by national governments will be promoted and implemented in early phase, which will result in swift action for the conservation of biodiversity.
9. Requirements for financial and human resources, and potential duration of the requested action:
The same scale of financial and human resources as the one in the first work programme is required. Working period for assessment should be extended to three years, which is longer than two years in the previous programme. Work for the catalogue should be implemented in a flexible manner according to its financial and human resources.
10. An identification of priorities within multiple requests submitted:
the second priority
11. Any other relevant information (including a list of any attachments provided):
None

III. Implementation of an assessment on the indicators to evaluate the potential positive and negative impacts of business sectors on biodiversity and ecosystem services

<p>1. Relevance to the objective, functions and work programme of IPBES: It is relevant to “Assessments” of the four functions of IPBES.</p> <p>2. Urgency of action by IPBES in the light of the imminence of the risks caused by the issues to be addressed by such action: As impacts of business sectors on biodiversity and ecosystem services have already been notable, it is important to urgently formulate respective indicators which can quantify an impact of each industry.</p> <p>3. Relevance of the requested action in addressing specific policies or processes: None</p> <p>4. Geographic scope of the requested action, as well as issues to be covered by such action: It should be global. It is required to clearly point out that there are impacts of business sectors on even geographically distant regions through tele-coupling. Also, it is necessary to analyse types of impacts of business sectors on biodiversity and available indicators in each industry, and potential issues when private companies adopt impact assessments based on this assessment.</p> <p>5. Anticipated level of complexity of the issues to be addressed by the requested action: It is necessary to consider the scope of confidential information, such as information for investors, to be dealt with. If only published papers are utilized basically, whether or not the assessments can be implemented without overemphasizing any particular industry is unknown.</p> <p>6. 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 IPBES is best suited to take action: The United Nations Environment Programme World Conservation Monitoring Centre (UNEP-WCMC) report: “Biodiversity Indicators for Extractive Companies. An Assessment of Needs, Current Practices and Potential Indicator Models” (2017) could be useful reference. "Biodiversity Indicators for Extractive Companies. An Assessment of Needs, Current Practices and Potential Indicator Models" https://www.unep-wcmc.org/resources-and-data/biodiversity-indicators-for-extractive-companies</p> <p>7. Availability of scientific literature and expertise for IPBES to undertake the requested action: Not aware</p>
--

8. Scale of the potential impacts, and potential beneficiaries of the requested action:
When the indicators are utilized as investment evaluation criteria for ESG investing, it can be possible to globally promote sustainable production and consumption. It is beneficial to investors directly, and to all the people indirectly through sustainable production and consumption.
9. Requirements for financial and human resources, and potential duration of the requested action:
The same scale of financial and human resources as the one of the assessment of methodologies in the first work programme is required. If enough information, such as published literature, is available, it should be urgently implemented for a period of two years.
10. An identification of priorities within multiple requests submitted:
The third priority
11. Any other relevant information (including a list of any attachments provided):
None