

IPBES template for the 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.

Name and contact details of individual submitting requests/inputs/suggestions:

Date of submission: August 2018

Submission from: IPBES member: _____

Observer allowed enhanced participation in line with decision IPBES-5/4:

MEA(s): _____

United Nations body: _____

Expert on, and holder of, indigenous and local knowledge: _____

Other Stakeholder(s): José Brilha _____

Please provide the following information for any request and, where relevant, for any inputs and suggestions (additional attachments can also be submitted):

Request/input/suggestion:

Information to accompany requests submitted to the Platform (see also Decision IPBES-1/3 Procedure for receiving and prioritizing requests put to the Platform):	
1.	<p>Relevance to the objective, functions and work programme of IPBES:</p> <p><i>Since the dawn of humankind the survival of humans has been dependent on the stock of natural resources available within planet Earth, the so-called “natural capital”. Natural capital includes renewable and non-renewable resources of both abiotic (e.g. minerals, rocks, soils, topography, i.e. geodiversity) and biotic nature (plants, animals, fungi and micro-organisms, i.e. biodiversity). These resources are finite and for this reason are under increasing pressure due to the growth of the human population and the rise in demand to support all the needs of society. Society needs to fully realize that all these finite resources need to be much better managed in order to guarantee the well-being of present and future generations. The United Nations has understood the big challenge facing us and has defined 17 Sustainable Development Goals to be implemented by 2030. Many of these goals are directly related with the need to properly manage the benefits we obtain from natural capital, the so-called “ecosystem services”, which include regulating, provisioning, supporting, and cultural benefits (MEA, 2005). The complexity of the problems we face imply the need for an holistic vision of nature. But here we encounter a major flaw for our major institutions and policies: whereas “natural capital” includes abiotic nature, “ecosystem services” do not. For example, the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES) has organized a Global Assessment aiming to critically “assess the state of knowledge on past, present and possible future trends in multi-scale interactions between people and nature, taking into consideration different disciplines, worldviews and knowledge systems.” However, IPBES has deliberately excluded the non-living components of nature from this major study. There is a Convention on Biological Diversity but no similar initiative for geological diversity and the entire EU nature conservation strategy is exclusively based on two bio-centred Directives (Birds and</i></p>

	<i>Habitats). It is about time to put right this unbalanced vision of Nature's Contribution to People (NCP) if we really want to guarantee a prosperous future for the next generations.</i>
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: <i>Urgent</i>
3.	Relevance of the requested action in addressing specific policies or processes: <i>See text in bullet No 1.</i>
4.	Geographic scope of the requested action, as well as issues to be covered by such action: <i>Global scope.</i>
5.	Anticipated level of complexity of the issues to be addressed by the requested action: <i>Not so complex. It is just needed a decision by policy makers.</i>
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: <i>Check references in bullet No 7.</i>
7.	Availability of scientific literature and expertise for IPBES to undertake the requested action: <i>Some examples:</i> <i>Brilha J., Gray M., Pereira D.I., Pereira P. (2018) – Geodiversity: An integrative review as a contribution to the sustainable management of the whole of nature. Environmental Science & Policy, 86, 19–28.</i> <i>Gill, J.C., 2017. Geology and the Sustainable Development Goals. Episodes 40(1), 70–76.</i> <i>Gordon, J.E., Barron, H.F., 2013. The role of geodiversity in delivering ecosystem services and benefits in Scotland. Scottish Journal of Geology 49 (1), 41–58.</i> <i>Gordon, J.E., Barron, H.F., Hansom, J.D., Thomas, M.F., 2012. Engaging with geodiversity – why it matters. Proceedings of the Geologists' Association 123 (1), 1–6.</i> <i>Gray, M., 2011. Other nature: geodiversity and geosystem services. Environmental Conservation, 38, 271–274.</i> <i>Gray, M., 2012. Valuing geodiversity in an “ecosystem services” context. Scottish Geographical Journal, 128, 177–194.</i> <i>Gray, M. 2013. Geodiversity: valuing and conserving abiotic nature. 2nd ed. Wiley Blackwell, Chichester, UK.</i> <i>Gray, M., Gordon, J. E., Brown, E. J., 2013. Geodiversity and the ecosystem approach: the contribution of geoscience in delivering integrated environmental management. Proceedings of the Geologists' Association 124 (4), 659–673.</i> <i>Hjort, J., Heikkinen, K., Luoto, M., 2012. Inclusion of explicit measures of geodiversity improve biodiversity models in a boreal landscape. Biodiversity Conservation 21, 3487–3506.</i> <i>Hjort, J., Gordon, J.E., Gray, M., Malcolm, L. Hunter, Jr., 2015. Why geodiversity matters in valuing nature's stage. Conservation Biology 29 (3), 630–639.</i> <i>Jačková, K., Romportl, D., 2008. The relationship between geodiversity and habitat richness in Šumava. National Park and Křivoklátsko Pla (Czech Republic): a quantitative analysis approach. Journal of Landscape Ecology 1, 23–38.</i>

	<p><i>Parks, K.E. and Mulligan, M. 2010 On the relationship between a resource base measure of geodiversity and broad scale biodiversity patterns. Biodiversity Conservation, 19, 2751-2766.</i></p> <p><i>Räsänen, A., Kuitunen, M., Hjort, J., Vaso, A., Kuitunen, T., Lensu, A., 2016. The role of landscape, topography, and geodiversity in explaining vascular plant species richness in a fragmented landscape. Boreal Environment Research 21, 53–70.</i></p> <p><i>Tukiainen, H., Bailey, J.J., Field, R., Kangas, K., Hjort, J., 2016. Combining geodiversity with climate and topography to account for threatened species richness. Conservation Biology 31 (2), 364–375.</i></p> <p><i>Van der Meulen, E.S., Braat, L.C., Brils, J.M., 2016. Abiotic flows should be inherent part of ecosystem services. Ecosystem Services 19, 1–5.</i></p> <p><i>Van Ree, C.C.D.F., Beukering, P.J.H., 2016. Geosystem services: a concept in support of sustainable development of the subsurface. Ecosystem Services 20, 30–36.</i></p> <p><i>Van Ree, C.C.D.F., van Beukering, P.J.H., Bokestijn, J. 2017 Geosystem services: A hidden link in ecosystem management. Ecosystem Services, 26, 58-69.</i></p>
8.	<p>Scale of the potential impacts, and potential beneficiaries of the requested action:</p> <p><i>Impacts would be expected worldwide and the whole humankind could benefit of this new approach.</i></p>
9.	<p>Requirements for financial and human resources, and potential duration of the requested action:</p> <p><i>It would be necessary to accept to include geoscientists (and their institutions) in the discussion.</i></p>
10.	<p>An identification of priorities within multiple requests submitted:</p>
11.	<p>Any other relevant information (including a list of any attachments provided):</p> <p><i>Please check our contribution that was sent under the scope of the IPBES Global Assessment.</i></p>