

Reviewer Name	Chapter / SPM	From Page (start)	From Line (start)	To Page (end)	To Line (end)	Comment	Response
Binaya Raj Shivakoti	General	0	0	0	0	APR includes a lot of general statements, definitions, and references with global scope (not necessarily APR focused). Some of the statements are duplication from already existing UN publication and are not direct fit to IPBES scope	Thank you. We have hopefully improved this in the last iteration where we have focused on including subregional synthesis.
Government of Japan	General	0	0	0	0	Data gaps exist throughout the draft assessment report. For improvement of the current and future reports, data gaps, especially those on contents that have very limited scientific reports (e.g. EcoDRR, incentives and mainstreaming but not limited to these), should clearly state the existence of the data gaps in the report and possibly on the SPM as well.	Thank you. We have aimed to make this more explicit in the last iteration.
IPBES Knowledge and Data Task Force (KD TF)/ Task Group on Indicators (TGI)	General	0	0	0	0	This review provides feedback from the IPBES Knowledge and Data Task Force (KD TF) / Task Group on Indicators (TGI) on the use of IPBES core indicators in your assessment. We see potential for inclusion of additional core indicators and for the more consistent use of the standardized visuals provided. For information on core indicators potentially relevant to a given chapter, please see http://www.ipbes.net/indicators (or see the tab named, "core indicators" in this spreadsheet) and check the indicator trend graphs shared by your TSU. For the trends of IPBES core indicator, standardized visualizations should be used as much as possible to ensure the consistency between and within the assessments. The KD TF/TGI aim to follow up with specific recommendations in the near future. In the meantime, do not hesitate to reach out to them through your TSU or the KD TF TSU (ipbes.kdtsu@gmail.com).	Thank you. We have incorporated the useful materials provided by the task force and task group on indicators across various chapters.
IPBES NFP - Australia	General	0	0	0	0	In addition to our specific comments on the SPM and individual chapters, we also have some more general feedback below. We hope this feedback will be considered in the final drafting process to produce a comprehensive final paper, thus ensuring relevance and usefulness for a range of decision makers. Australia appreciates this is a second order draft and notes along with major final editing to ensure consistency of acronyms and references for example. 1. There is a lack of clear guidelines and recommendations for policymakers, particularly in the Summary for Policy Makers which is where we would expect to see them. What is really needed is a quick and easy guide to help a range of decision makers develop and implement policies which reflect the latest scientific data which this report should include. o The SPM is a summary of the Executive Summaries of each chapter. Rather than a summary of key findings the SPM needs to cover in brief what is the state of the environment in the APR, what could it look like in the future and what are the actions that could be taken for the region. Presenting the information in its current format is not helpful to those who cannot read the document in full due to insufficient technical expertise or time constraints.	Thank you for this important feedback. We have considerably revised the SPM based on the inputs received and the guidance of the MEP and Bureau.
IPBES NFP - Australia	General	0	0	0	0	2. The case studies in the report are not detailed enough in their current state to be broadly applicable, with little information on their outcomes, methods, and successes. o Case studies are frequently repeated across the chapters. More examples including possible applications in different landscapes/areas/political environments would be useful as well as the case studies effectiveness, implementation and any lessons learned.	We have aimed to improve on the case studies in the last iteration.

Reviewer Name	Chapter / SPM	From Page (start)	From Line (start)	To Page (end)	To Line (end)	Comment	Response
IPBES NFP - Australia	General	0	0	0	0	<p>3. Lack of consistency throughout the report's chapters, including definitions used for essential concepts.</p> <p>o For example, terminology with 'bio' in front should be referenced accordingly. Definitions exist for these terms and concepts in other international documents such as biocultural (CBD) and biosphere (UNESCO) where these definitions exist they should be referenced as such and if they are new concepts they must be referenced.</p>	Thank you, they have been referenced and included in the glossary.
IPBES NFP - Australia	General	0	0	0	0	<p>4. The use throughout the report of references which are significantly dated or not consistent throughout the chapters. This makes the assessment appear to have a lack of a clear methodologies which seek to establish the quality and clarity of the evidence base used to make claims throughout the report.</p> <p>o Cross referencing across chapters needs to be fully considered. The statistics or information is conveyed differently across the chapters despite it discussing the same topic or issue. For example, the references to MEAs should be as per their official name and referenced consistently throughout. References to other things such as the Aichi Biodiversity Targets and the Fifth Global Biodiversity Outlook are referenced inconsistently.</p>	Thank you, we have cross-checked to the extent possible.
Pham Ngoc Bao	General	0	0	0	0	-Many repetitions and inconsistencies (words) are found in the report. Significant re-structuring (within and across the chapters) and editing are necessary.	Thank you, this has been addressed in the last iteration.
Ramsar Convention Secretariat	General	0	0	0	0	We recommend that as in the regional assessments for Africa and the Americas, the area of Ramsar Sites, wetlands protected under the Ramsar Convention as internationally important by sub-region, be included in this assessment as an indicator. See: https://rsis.ramsar.org/	Thank you, this has been included in chapter 3 and 4.
The Biodiversity Indicators Partnership (BIP)	General	0	0	0	0	We would recommend that the IPBES Core Indicator 'Protected area coverage of Key Biodiversity Areas' is used in this assessment. Indicator information is available from the IPBES Indicator portal and the BIP website www.bipindicators.net . This indicator can be disaggregated/made available for this region, more information on this is available from the Indicator Focal point Ed Lewis (email: Edward.lewis@unep-wcmc.org)	This has been added in chapter 3.
The Biodiversity Indicators Partnership (BIP)	General	0	0	0	0	We would recommend that the IPBES Core Indicator 'Percentage of Undernourished People' is used in this assessment. Indicator information is available from the IPBES Indicator portal and the BIP website www.bipindicators.net . This indicator can be disaggregated/made available for this region, more information on this is available from the Indicator Focal point Carlo Cafiero (email: Carlo.Cafiero@fao.org)	We could not find an appropriate place to incorporate this.
The Biodiversity Indicators Partnership (BIP)	General	0	0	0	0	We would recommend that the IPBES Highlighted Indicator 'The Wildlife Picture Index (disaggregated by protected area)' is used in this assessment. Indicator information is available from the IPBES Indicator portal and the BIP website www.bipindicators.net . This indicator can be disaggregated/made available for this region, more information on this is available from the Indicator Focal point Jorge Ahumada (email: jahumada@conservation.org).	This index works only in some parts of the region

Reviewer Name	Chapter / SPM	From Page (start)	From Line (start)	To Page (end)	To Line (end)	Comment	Response
The Biodiversity Indicators Partnership (BIP)	General	0	0	0	0	We would recommend that the IPBES Highlighted Indicator 'Wetland Extent Trend Index' is used in this assessment. Indicator information is available from the IPBES Indicator portal and the BIP website www.bipindicators.net . This indicator can be disaggregated/made available for this region, more information on this is available from the Indicator Focal point Sarah Darrah (email: Sarah.Darrah@unep-wcmc.org)	This was addressed in chapter 3.
The Biodiversity Indicators Partnership (BIP)	General	0	0	0	0	We would recommend that the IPBES Highlighted Indicator 'Trends in invasive alien species vertebrate eradications' is used in this assessment. Indicator information is available from the IPBES Indicator portal and the BIP website www.bipindicators.net . This indicator can be disaggregated/made available for this region, more information on this is available from the Indicator Focal point Shyama Pagad (email: s.pagad@auckland.ac.nz)	We could not find an appropriate place to incorporate this.
The Biodiversity Indicators Partnership (BIP)	General	0	0	0	0	We would recommend that the IPBES Highlighted Indicator RAMSAR areas is used in this assessment. Indicator information is available from the IPBES Indicator portal and the BIP website www.bipindicators.net . This indicator can be disaggregated/made available for this region, more information on this is available from the Indicator Focal point Maria Rivera (email: RIVERA@ramsar.org)	This was addressed in chapter 3.
The Biodiversity Indicators Partnership (BIP)	General	0	0	0	0	We would recommend that the IPBES Highlighted Indicator 'Number of countries with national instruments on biodiversity relevant tradable permit schemes' is used in this assessment. Indicator information is available from the IPBES Indicator portal and the BIP website www.bipindicators.net . These indicators are country-specific, so they can be disaggregated by countries in your region. However, given the incomplete country coverage, any regional aggregates cannot be taken to represent the entire region. Currently we have data on about 58 countries. [Just to note, we also have information on countries with biodiversity-relevant taxes in place]. More information on this is available from the Indicator Focal point Katia Karousakis (email: Katia.KAROUSAKIS@oecd.org)	The data was not available in a form that could be used for the assessment.
The Biodiversity Indicators Partnership (BIP)	General	0	0	0	0	We would recommend that the IPBES Highlighted Indicator 'Trends in potentially harmful elements of government support to agriculture (produced support estimates)' is used in this assessment. Indicator information is available from the IPBES Indicator portal and the BIP website www.bipindicators.net . This indicator is available for the OECD as a whole and has not been disaggregated as such. The original data on (total) government support to agriculture is available on the OECD website by country. More information on this is available from the Indicator Focal point Katia Karousakis (email: Katia.KAROUSAKIS@oecd.org)	The data was not available in a form that could be used for the assessment.
The Biodiversity Indicators Partnership (BIP)	General	0	0	0	0	We would recommend that the IPBES Highlighted Indicator 'Better Life Index' is used in this assessment. Indicator information is available from the IPBES Indicator portal and the BIP website www.bipindicators.net . The data is available for only 38 countries and therefore it would be difficult to be used regionally the way IPBES has classified these. More information on this is available from the Indicator Focal point Katia Karousakis (email: Katia.KAROUSAKIS@oecd.org)	The data was not available in a form that could be used for the assessment.

Reviewer Name	Chapter / SPM	From Page (start)	From Line (start)	To Page (end)	To Line (end)	Comment	Response
The Biodiversity Indicators Partnership (BIP)	General	0	0	0	0	We would recommend that the IPBES Highlighted Indicator 'Protected area coverage of terrestrial, marine and freshwater ecoregions' is used in this assessment. Indicator information is available from the IPBES Indicator portal and the BIP website www.bipindicators.net. This indicator can be disaggregated/made available for this region, more information on this is available from the Indicator Focal point Ed Lewis (email: Edward.Lewis@unep-wcmc.org)	This was addressed in chapter 3.
The Biodiversity Indicators Partnership (BIP)	General	0	0	0	0	We would recommend that the IPBES Highlighted Indicator 'Growth in species occurrence records accessible through GBIF' is used in this assessment. Indicator information is available from the IPBES Indicator portal and the BIP website www.bipindicators.net. This indicator can be disaggregated/made available for this region, more information on this is available from the Indicator Focal point Tim Hirsch (email: 'thirsch@gbif.org')	We could not find an appropriate place to incorporate this.
The Biodiversity Indicators Partnership (BIP)	General	0	0	0	0	We would recommend that the IPBES Highlighted Indicator 'Trends in the numbers of invasive alien species introduction events' is used in this assessment. Indicator information is available from the IPBES Indicator portal and the BIP website www.bipindicators.net. This indicator can be disaggregated/made available for this region, more information on this is available from the Indicator Focal point Shyama Pagad (email: s.pagad@auckland.ac.nz)	This was addressed in chapter 4.
The Biodiversity Indicators Partnership (BIP)	General	0	0	0	0	We would recommend that the IPBES Highlighted Indicator 'Number of countries that have adopted legislative, administrative and policy frameworks to ensure fair and equitable sharing of benefits' is used in this assessment. Indicator information is available from the IPBES Indicator portal and the BIP website www.bipindicators.net. This indicator can be disaggregated/made available for this region, more information on this is available from the Indicator Focal point Robert Hoft (email: robert.hoft@cbd.int)	We could not obtain the data in a form that was usable for the assessment.
The Biodiversity Indicators Partnership (BIP)	General	0	0	0	0	We would recommend that the IPBES Highlighted Indicator 'Information provided through the financial reporting framework, adopted by decision XII/3' is used in this assessment. Indicator information is available from the IPBES Indicator portal and the BIP website www.bipindicators.net. This indicator can be disaggregated/made available for this region, more information on this is available from the Indicator Focal point Robert Hoft (email: robert.hoft@cbd.int)	We could not obtain the data in a form that was usable for the assessment.
The Biodiversity Indicators Partnership (BIP)	General	0	0	0	0	We would recommend that the IPBES Highlighted Indicator 'Number of world natural heritage sites per country per year' is used in this assessment. Indicator information is available from the IPBES Indicator portal and the BIP website www.bipindicators.net. This indicator can be disaggregated/made available for this region, more information on this is available from the Indicator Focal point Douglas Nakashima (email: D.Nakashima@unesco.org)	We could not find an appropriate place to incorporate this.
The Biodiversity Indicators Partnership (BIP)	General	0	0	0	0	We would recommend that the Indicator 'Trends in Loss of Reactive Nitrogen to the Environment' is used in this assessment. Indicator information is available from the BIP website www.bipindicators.net. This indicator can be disaggregated/made available for this region, more information on this is available from the Indicator Focal point Albert Bleeker (email: Albert.Bleeker@pbl.nl).	We could not find an appropriate place to incorporate this.

Reviewer Name	Chapter / SPM	From Page (start)	From Line (start)	To Page (end)	To Line (end)	Comment	Response
The Biodiversity Indicators Partnership (BIP)	General	0	0	0	0	We would recommend that the Indicator 'Ocean Health Index' is used in this assessment. Indicator information is available from the BIP website www.bipindicators.net. This indicator can be disaggregated/made available for this region, more information on this is available from the Indicator Focal point Benjamin Halpern (email: halpern@nceas.ucsb.edu)	We could not find an appropriate place to incorporate this.
The Biodiversity Indicators Partnership (BIP)	General	0	0	0	0	We would recommend that the Indicator 'Cumulative Human Impacts on Marine Ecosystems' is used in this assessment. Indicator information is available from the BIP website www.bipindicators.net. This indicator can be disaggregated/made available for this region, more information on this is available from the Indicator Focal point Benjamin Halpern (email: halpern@nceas.ucsb.edu)	We could not find an appropriate place to incorporate this.
The Biodiversity Indicators Partnership (BIP)	General	0	0	0	0	We would recommend that the Indicator 'Proportion of countries adopting relevant national legislation and adequately resourcing the prevention or control of invasive alien species' is used in this assessment. Indicator information is available from the BIP website www.bipindicators.net. This indicator can be disaggregated/made available for this region, more information on this is available from the Indicator Focal point Shyama Pagad (email: s.pagad@auckland.ac.nz)	This has been addressed in chapter 4.
The Biodiversity Indicators Partnership (BIP)	General	0	0	0	0	We would recommend that the Indicator 'Biodiversity Barometer' is used in this assessment. Indicator information is available from the BIP website www.bipindicators.net. This indicator can be disaggregated/made available for this region, more information on this is available from the Indicator Focal point Rik Kutsch Lojenga (email: rik@ethicalbiotrader.org)	We could not find an appropriate place to incorporate this.
The Biodiversity Indicators Partnership (BIP)	General	0	0	0	0	We would recommend that the Indicator 'Red List Index (impacts of utilisation)' is used in this assessment. Indicator information is available from the BIP website www.bipindicators.net. This indicator can be disaggregated/made available for this region, more information on this is available from the Indicator Focal point Tom De-Meulenaer (email: Tom.DE-MEULENAER@cites.org)	This has been added in chapter 3.
The Biodiversity Indicators Partnership (BIP)	General	0	0	0	0	We would recommend that the Indicator 'Water Quality Index for Biodiversity' is used in this assessment. Indicator information is available from the BIP website www.bipindicators.net. This indicator can be disaggregated/made available for this region, more information on this is available from the Indicator Focal point Hartwig Kremer (email: hartwig.kremer@unep.org)	This has been addressed in chapter 4.
The Biodiversity Indicators Partnership (BIP)	General	0	0	0	0	We would recommend that the Indicator 'Number of Parties to the CBD that have deposited the instrument of ratification, acceptance, approval or accession of the Nagoya Protocol' is used in this assessment. Indicator information is available from the BIP website www.bipindicators.net. This indicator can be disaggregated/made available for this region, more information on this is available from the Indicator Focal point Beatriz Gomez (email: 'beatriz.gomez@cbd.int')	This has been added in chapter 6.
Kwan-Sung Song (NFP Korea)	Ch.1	0	0	0	0	It is recommended to add consistent guidelines on how to reflect multiple values and cultural diversity within the region and analyze different elements comprehensively which could affect its biodiversity and ecosystem services.	Thank you for the comment - we were not sure whether the guidelines are for inclusion in the text or in general.
Shuli Niu	Ch.1	0	0	0	0	Fig 1.2, 1.3, 1.5, 1.13 are not cited in the text of the paper	Thank you, we have formatted this.

Reviewer Name	Chapter / SPM	From Page (start)	From Line (start)	To Page (end)	To Line (end)	Comment	Response
Thomas Brooks	Ch.1	0	0	0	0	The IPBES definition of "biodiversity" includes "ecosystems" (see e.g. http://www.ipbes.net/sites/default/files/downloads/IPBES_2_INF_2_Add.1.pdf ; also Pollination assessment p481, and Africa assessment SOD Chapter 1, Page 5, Lines 142-145). So, avoid use of phrases like "biodiversity and ecosystems", which is a tautology and unnecessary repetition. Instead, either a) if the intent is to refer to "ecosystems" a specific level of ecological organisation, then delete "biodiversity", b) if the intent is to refer to "biodiversity" generally, delete "ecosystems", or c) replace "biodiversity" with something like "genetic diversity, species, and ecosystems". Examples that need correcting include Page 4 (Lines 127 & 139), Page 5 (Lines 168 & 187), Page 6 (Lines 218 & 253), Page 25 (Line 819), Page 27 (Line 928), Page 28 (Line 960, first line on "Nature" in Box 1.1), Page 31 (Line 1036)	Thank you for the thorough review.
Thomas Brooks	Ch.1	1	61	1	61	Good use of biodiversity hotspots information - retain	Thank you.
Thomas Brooks	Ch.1	1	66	1	67	Good use of biodiversity hotspots and megadiversity countries information - retain	Thank you.
Margarita N. Lavides	Ch.1	3	59	3	65	Using open and close parentheses as in "(well established)" and "(established but incomplete)" is not only awkward but put vague meaning particularly to the long and winding second sentence. I suggest the following: The Asia Pacific Region (APR) is well-established as an eco-geographically and bioculturally one of the most globally diverse and rich regions. It has comparatively higher number of endemic species and global biodiversity hotspots than any other region. However, there is limited evidence to support that its sustainable management can help the world's most populous region improve its food, water, energy and environmental security leading to better quality of life.	Thank you for the suggestion. We have followed the formatting and practice of past and ongoing IPBES assessments.
Siri Quade	Ch.1	3	62	3	62	"world's most populous and poor region" -> In terms of lowest GDP per capita and the list of Least Developed Countries (LDCs), the World's poorest region is in Africa	Thank you. We have revised this.
Siri Quade	Ch.1	3	63	3	65	Is Indonesia the closest? Possibly it is the Philippines or Japan in Asia (or Guam actually). Possibly replacing "Indonesia" with "Japan", like that: "The region has the most contrasting geography from the highest Himalayan Mountain ranges to the deepest ocean floors (near Japan)."	Thank you. We have not incorporated this here as it is a synthesis.
Margarita N. Lavides	Ch.1	3	66	3	66	While we can 'boast' of having many 'mega diverse countries' and a 'large number of extremely diverse coastal/marine eco systems' but having many 'global biodiversity hotspots' is not something to 'boast' about because of the highly threatened factor element in that latter phrase. Therefore, I suggest: to replace 'boasts' with 'houses' or 'hosts'.	Thank you. We have revised the executive summary to align with the updates of the main chapter text.
Nakul Chettri	Ch.1	3	66	3	68	There are 36 hotspots now and it should be consistently used in all chapters and SPM	Thank you. We have revised this.
Margarita N. Lavides	Ch.1	3	70	3	71	For the same reason as above, I suggest the following: It is well-established that APR has comparatively higher terrestrial and marine biodiversity than any other region in the world.	Thank you for the suggestion. We have followed the formatting and practice of past and ongoing IPBES assessments.
Siri Quade	Ch.1	3	70	3	71	"The APR has comparatively higher terrestrial and marine biodiversity than any other region in the world" -> I think this is not true (Amazonas?) so would suggest change to "The APR has comparatively one of the highest terrestrial and marine biodiversity in the world"	Thank you. We have revised the executive summary to align with the updates of the main chapter text.
Nakul Chettri	Ch.1	3	70	3	86	This section does not talk about the Himalayas and is associated species including Snow Leopard. India and China are also part of the Megadiverse countries which as not related in this para.	Thank you. We have revised the executive summary to align with the updates of the main chapter text.

Reviewer Name	Chapter / SPM	From Page (start)	From Line (start)	To Page (end)	To Line (end)	Comment	Response
CMS	Ch.1	3	78	3	78	Consider including some consideration on the importance of the region for migratory species, e.g. "Furthermore the region is of vital importance for migrating species. These include marine species, like e.g. sharks, marine turtles, whales and dolphins but also birds, which use three main flyways - routes followed by migratory birds on their journeys between their breeding and wintering places - the West Pacific Flyway, East-Asian Australasian Flyway, and the Central Asian Flyway. About 200 bird species and hundreds of thousands of birds use this migration path every year." (Bird-related information from BirdLife Int)	Thank you. We have revised the executive summary to align with the updates of the main chapter text.
Wang Changyong	Ch.1	3	78	3	78	delete the reference "(Jenkins & Van Houtan, 2016)"	Thank you. This has been done.
Joanne Perry NZ Focal point	Ch.1	3	79	3	79	include the example of NZ kiwi and Tuatara as highly endemic species.	Thank you. We have revised the executive summary to align with the updates of the main chapter text.
Joanne Perry NZ Focal point	Ch.1	3	81	3	81	insert NZ after Australia	Thank you. We have revised the executive summary to align with the updates of the main chapter text.
Shamik Chakraborty	Ch.1	3	81	3	81	should be indigenously managed	Thank you. We have revised the executive summary to align with the updates of the main chapter text.
Shuli Niu	Ch.1	3	81	3	82	Austrilia is not an island. It is not appropriate to put it in the island group	Thank you. We have revised the executive summary to align with the updates of the main chapter text.
Margarita N. Lavides	Ch.1	3	82	3	82	Ecosystem is another level of biodiversity as much as genetic, species or taxonomic biodiversity and functional trait biodiversity. Therefore, I suggest the following: Collectively, these unique biodiversity at all levels (i.e. genes, species/taxa, functional traits, ecosystems) contribute directly..... (NCPs).	Thank you. We have revised the executive summary to align with the updates of the main chapter text.
Shamik Chakraborty	Ch.1	3	88	3	88	For more on biocultural diversity, works of Maffi can be cited (although line 484 cites Maffi once but another may be cited): Lusia Maffi and Ellen Woodley. 2010. Biocultural diversity conservation: A global sourcebook. Earthscan: London	Thank you. We have revised the executive summary to align with the updates of the main chapter text.
Shuli Niu	Ch.1	3	88	3	89	add "region" between diverse and containing. Replace "management" with "managed"	Thank you. We have revised the executive summary to align with the updates of the main chapter text.
Margarita N. Lavides	Ch.1	3	88	3	92	Beyond grammar, this comment is concerned with the the confusing message of this long and winding sentence. There fore, I suggest the following: The APR is, bio-culturally, the most diverse containing indigenously managed unique landscapes. Globally, it includes some of the most extensive geographic areas of indigenous lands which are home to the globally largest population of indigenous people at 70% of the 370 million indigenous people. Most of them have distinct traditions, languages, knowledge and practices and often allow harmonious living with Nature.	Thank you. We have revised the executive summary to align with the updates of the main chapter text.
Nakul Chettri	Ch.1	3	88	3	102	This section does not talk about the rich ethnic diversity with more than 1000 living languages with rich culture of the Himalayas.	Thank you. We have revised the executive summary to align with the updates of the main chapter text.

Reviewer Name	Chapter / SPM	From Page (start)	From Line (start)	To Page (end)	To Line (end)	Comment	Response
Shuli Niu	Ch.1	3	90	3	90	put"," before every " respectively"	Thank you. We have revised the executive summary to align with the updates of the main chapter text.
Margarita N. Lavides	Ch.1	3	96	3	96	Add 'fisheries' as in:knowledge(ILK) in agricultural, forestry, fisheries and freshwater systems, among others.	Thank you. We have revised the executive summary to align with the updates of the main chapter text.
Shuli Niu	Ch.1	3	98	3	98	"a compenation of " is redundant with "integrated"	Thank you. We have revised the executive summary to align with the updates of the main chapter text.
Shamik Chakraborty	Ch.1	3	102	3	102	due for what? Could be addaed a bit more information	Thank you. We have revised the executive summary to align with the updates of the main chapter text.
Margarita N. Lavides	Ch.1	3	104	3	105	I suggest the following: The APR is the most populous region of the world at 59% of total global population and contains the largest share at 44.0% of the global poor.	Thank you. We have revised the executive summary to align with the updates of the main chapter text.
Henry Scheyvens	Ch.1	4	19	4	19	Not only forests and grasslands, but also wetlands and mangroves. See later chapters for discussion on this.	Thank you. We have revised the executive summary to align with the updates of the main chapter text.
Henry Scheyvens	Ch.1	4	29	4	30	Mixing up drivers with effects of drivers. Deforestation and land degradation are effects/outcomes of anthropogenic activities, e.g. clearance for agriculture, unsustainable agricultural practices.	Thank you. We have revised the executive summary to align with the updates of the main chapter text.
Margarita N. Lavides	Ch.1	4	106	4	107	I suggest the following: ...and contains relatively low per capita forest and agricultural land at 37% and 30% respectively of the global total.	Thank you. We have revised the executive summary to align with the updates of the main chapter text.
Joanne Perry NZ Focal point	Ch.1	4	106	4	119	This section needs to be more specific as to the area of AP that it is referring to rather than make sweeping statement. For example many of the statements relating to high economic growth, agricultural land expansion and infrastructure expansion does not necessarily apply to Small island states, particularly in the pacific.	Thank you. We have revised the executive summary to align with the updates of the main chapter text.
Margarita N. Lavides	Ch.1	4	111	4	111	I suggest the following:number of people living below the poverty line at more than 330 million or 44.0% of the global share.	Thank you. We have revised this in line with the updates of the main chapter text.
Margarita N. Lavides	Ch.1	4	112	4	113	I suggest the following: The region as a whole has maintained very high economic growth rates at 7.6% compared to 3.4% for the rest of the world during 1990-2010.	Thank you. We have revised this in line with the updates of the main chapter text.
Margarita N. Lavides	Ch.1	4	114	4	115	I suggest the following:APR has been the highest among all global nations at 6.0% in 1970-2007 against 1.0% globally. The region is undergoing one of the fastest urbanization rates at 2.0-3.0% per year, driving rapid infrastructure expansion (e.g. roads).	Thank you. We have revised this in line with the updates of the main chapter text.
Margarita N. Lavides	Ch.1	4	123	4	125	Again, putting '(Established but incomplete) put so much vague meaning to the sentence. I suggest the following: There is limited evidence but good agreement that most of the critically important biodiversity areas and biodiversity hotspots in the APR are increasingly threatened and vulnerable to a combination of anthropogenic and natural drivers of change.	Thank you for the suggestion. We have followed the formatting and practice of past and ongoing IPBES assessments.

Reviewer Name	Chapter / SPM	From Page (start)	From Line (start)	To Page (end)	To Line (end)	Comment	Response
Thomas Brooks	Ch.1	4	123	4	125	Good use of biodiversity hotspots information. This could be coded as "well established", given that biodiversity hotspots are highly threatened by definition (see Myers et al. 2000 Nature etc). Change "critically important biodiversity area" to the standard term "key biodiversity area" (see http://www.keybiodiversityareas.org/home).	Thank you for the suggestion. We have retained the phrasing as it is more descriptive.
Tatsuya Horikiri	Ch.1	4	128	4	128	It may be better to insert "being" after "considered", to clearly suggest that the degradation and fragmentation are still on-going, resulting from "changing" status and situation .	Thank you. We have revised the executive summary to align with the updates of the main chapter text.
Shuli Niu	Ch.1	4	132	4	133	what are the "traditional drivers"? If you mean the anthropogenic drivers you mentioned, and " these" before "traditional drivers"	This is no longer used.
Shuli Niu	Ch.1	4	134	4	134	change "area" to "are". it is a typo	This is no longer used.
Shuli Niu	Ch.1	4	136	4	136	change "due primarily to" to "primarily due to"	This has been corrected
Margarita N. Lavides	Ch.1	4	139	4	139	The same reason as above to remove '(Established but incomplete)'. I suggest the following: There is limited evidence but good agreement that direct drivers of ecosystem, biodiversity and NCPs undergo change and/or incur loss.....variability.	Thank you for the suggestion. We have followed the formatting and practice of past and ongoing IPBES assessments.
Shuli Niu	Ch.1	4	141	4	141	insert "and" between "land use" and "land cover"	This has been corrected
Thomas Brooks	Ch.1	4	143	4	143	Change "productive" (which all ecosystems are) to "production".	This is no longer used.
Margarita N. Lavides	Ch.1	4	186	80	2643	Notes to authors: I realized at this point that the use of the following: (Well-established); (Established but incomplete); (Established but inconclusive) are all over the document. If I correct every other sentence for that, I would not finish APR Regional Assessment for review. Therefore, I suggest to authors to limit from using these vague, confusing and contradicting phrases i.e. established but inconclusive??. especially when the sentence is a compound one. The reader is left confused with which one is established and which one is inconclusive. Also at which context it is established or inconclusive, spatially? temporally? or for which element in the sentence? Its also distracting for readers. I understand these 'phrases' are IPBES' but if its going to be used especially heavily in this document, it has be ensured that at the beginning these phrases are well-explained and defined. I came across these 'phrases' since the first sentence of Chapter 1 page 3 but only in page 36 under Communication of Uncertainty was the meaning of the 'phrases defined. There are also a number of grammar errors which external expert reviewers were guided not to comment on but which errors affect the intended message of each sentence and or paragraph. For example, missing 'as' ; 'to' etc. in between main words. There are also misspelled words.	Thank you for the suggestion. We have followed the formatting and practice of past and ongoing IPBES assessments. The annex of the SPM also contains explanation on the confidence terms.
Margarita N. Lavides	Ch.1	4	197	4	200	The literature in marine conservation, fisheries and management is replete with examples of the importance of addressing underlying drivers such as persistent poverty and overpopulation. This is particularly so that coastal small scale fishers are considered the poorest and fishing the 'employer of last resort'. Therefore, I suggest to include this insight supported by literature.	Thank you. We have revised this in line with the updates of the main chapter text.
Joanne Perry NZ Focal point	Ch.1	5	159	5	159	insert after weak governance systems "in some regions/countries". As there are many countries with strong governance systems.	Thank you. We have revised the executive summary to align with the updates of the main chapter text.

Reviewer Name	Chapter / SPM	From Page (start)	From Line (start)	To Page (end)	To Line (end)	Comment	Response
Tatsuya Horikiri	Ch.1	5	161	5	161	It may be better to begin with such word as "Incogitant" before "Trade and commerce liberalisation", in order not to deny blindly the benefit of trade and commerce liberalisation to people's well-being.	Thank you. We have revised the executive summary to align with the updates of the main chapter text.
Shuli Niu	Ch.1	5	163	5	163	what does "BES" stands for? This is the first time you mentioned it in the paper, spell it out	We have removed this from the executive summary.
NFP of China	Ch.1	5	165	5	165	We suggest not to mention the names of specific countries in the SPM; "globalization" is a universal problem, not just exists in India and China, the specific response to the problem see the comment on line 1578.	Thank you. We have tried to follow this in the executive summary.
Nakul Chettri	Ch.1	5	174	5	174	ABT is better known as Aichi Targets (AT). So should be used consistently.	We have consistently used Aichi Biodiversity Targets
CMS	Ch.1	5	181	5	184	The sentence "important to meet the requirements of most of the relevant Multilateral Environmental Agreements such as the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) and the Convention to Combat Desertification (CCD)." provides an incomplete list. We would suggest to either remove all or mention them all, at least the global ones, including the Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals(CMS)"	Thank you. We have revised the executive summary to align with the updates of the main chapter text.
Henry Scheyvens	Ch.1	6	21	6	23	"the APR mainly as a result of the countries being signatory to global and regional multilateral environmental agreements (MEAs)". Note that in some countries community- based forestry is a national programme (not a pilot programme) and that the development of community-based forest management policies and national support programmes such as in Nepal, India and the Philippines were not particularly driven by MEAs. For more information, see "Decentralisation and State-Sponsored Community Forestry in Asia: Seven Country Studies of Transitions in Forest Governance, Contemporary Forest Management and the Prospects for Communities to Contribute to and Benefit from Sustainable Forest Management", Editor: Henry SCHEYVENS Kimihiko HYAKUMURA Yoshiki SEKI, Copyright: Institute for Global Environmental Strategies 2007-03	Thank you. We have revised the executive summary to align with the updates of the main chapter text.
Tatsuya Horikiri	Ch.1	6	212	6	216	Although we have the word "green," one could be confused that EbA and EbM are "economic intervention". REDD+ is surely a kind of EbM with financial/economic incentives but EbM itself is broader in concept and approach and could better be mentioned differently, not as a kind of "economic intervention".	Thank you. We have revised the executive summary to align with the updates of the main chapter text.
Wang Changyong	Ch.1	6	225	6	225	delete the reference "(Agrawal, Chhatre, & Hardin, 2008)"	Thank you. This has been done.
Wang Changyong	Ch.1	6	233	6	234	delete the refernece "(Agrawal 233 et al., 2008)"	Thank you. This has been done.
Shuli Niu	Ch.1	6	241	6	241	change"interconnectedness" to "interconnected"	Thank you. We have revised the executive summary to align with the updates of the main chapter text.
Shamik Chakraborty	Ch.1	6	244	6	244	CES should be SES ?	This is no longer in the executive summary.

Reviewer Name	Chapter / SPM	From Page (start)	From Line (start)	To Page (end)	To Line (end)	Comment	Response
Margarita N. Lavides	Ch.1	6	253	6	254	The use of the term 'biotic composition' is vague. Did the authors mean 'genetic' composition only? or 'taxonomic' composition only? Or both?	This is no longer used.
Shamik Chakraborty	Ch.1	7	261	7	261	shoul be increasingly	Thank you. We have revised the executive summary to align with the updates of the main chapter text.
Shuli Niu	Ch.1	7	261	7	261	change "Usable" to "useful"	Thank you. We have revised the executive summary to align with the updates of the main chapter text.
Shuli Niu	Ch.1	7	262	7	264	"They lack..." and "...are lacking" are redundant and spoil the structure of the sentence	Thank you. We have revised this.
Margarita N. Lavides	Ch.1	7	266	7	268	This sentence is vague. Instead of 'facing', did the authors mean 'lacking'?	This is no longer used.
Wang Changyong	Ch.1	8	272	8	272	It may be better to use "physical geograph profile to replace "Extent and geographical richness"	Thank you for the suggestion. We prefer to use existing section title as it conveys better the storyline of this chapter
Harald Pauli	Ch.1	8	276	8	276	East Asia' would be more suitable than 'North East Asia'. North and North East Asia is treated in the ECA assessment (although this is not reflected in the title). Further, in chapter 3, for example, the term 'East Asia' is more often used than 'North East Asia'.	We have stuck with the IPBES classificaton, so this change was not made.
Tian Yu	Ch.1	8	280	8	280	Delete "most"	"Most" was retained and sentence modified and referred to section substantiating this.
Siri Quade	Ch.1	8	288	8	288	"deepest ocean floor near Indonesia" -> Like in first comment, Indonesia seems not to be the closest land to Mariana Trench but Guam. As Guam is US-territory, Philippines or Japan would be the closest Asian country.	Thank you. We have changed it to Marianas Islands.
IPBES Secretariat/TSU	Ch.1	8	291	8	292	Figure 1. 1 - Please use a version of the map that covers Hawaii	Hawaii is now added on map.
Shuli Niu	Ch.1	8	294	8	294	what is "geographical system", do you mean ecosystem?	Changed to ecosystems
Shuli Niu	Ch.1	9	305	9	306	it does not have predicate, not a full sentence	Thank you. We have revised it into a full sentence.
Shuli Niu	Ch.1	9	309	9	309	"HKH"? Spell it out since it is the first you mention it	HKH is now fully spelled out.
Shuli Niu	Ch.1	9	324	9	324	"hearths of", do you mean "hearts of"	Hearth is the right word. We added the Chinese name for the yellow River, and added Ganges River.
Siri Quade	Ch.1	9	341	9	341	Footnote 1 sounds like macro- and microalgae are the important food source, whereas importance of seagrass as food source gets lost. Possibly add something like: "Seagrass beds are important feeding grounds for thousands of species around the world, and they support this diverse food web in three different ways. Some organisms—primarily large grazers like manatees, dugongs, green sea turtles and geese—eat the living leaves directly, and seagrass forms a major component of their diets." (Source: http://ocean.si.edu/seagrass-and-seagrass-beds)	Paragraph modified and footnote deleted.

Reviewer Name	Chapter / SPM	From Page (start)	From Line (start)	To Page (end)	To Line (end)	Comment	Response
Pham Ngoc Bao	Ch.1	10	345	10	345	Should mention the Greater Mekong River Basin as a whole (in stead of only Lancang Jiang), stretching from southern China through Myanmar, Laos, Thailand, Cambodia, and Vietnam. The region is home to about 300 million people from different ethnic groups. (See: Pham Ngoc BAO, Bijon Kumer MITRA, Tetsuo KUYAMA (2017). Integrated Approach for Sustainable Hydropower Development in the Mekong River Basin. Environment and Natural Resources Research, 7(1), pp.60-74....for further information)	Cannot find reference in the suggested paper to 300 million people or ethnic group. Have deleted reference to Langkang Jiang.
Shuli Niu	Ch.1	10	345	10	345	Table 1. 1 (Yangtze): "These habitats are under pressure due to conversion for other human uses, introduction of invasive species" change conversion for to "conversion to" and replace ", " with "and"	This has now been changed.
Shuli Niu	Ch.1	10	345	10	345	Table 1. 1 (Amur-Argun River): delete"," after "such as tigers"	This has now been changed.
Shuli Niu	Ch.1	10	345	10	345	Table 1. 1 (Mekong): "less dependent on the river " Less comparing to what?	This is now been changed and clarified
Wang Changyong	Ch.1	10	345	10	345	In Table1.1, There is almost no information about cultural diversity. So suggest to replace "for biological and cultural diversity" with "for BES" which also have cultural service.	This has now been changed.
Wang Changyong	Ch.1	10	345	10	345	Nanjing replaced by Chongqing	Portion between Nanjing and Chongging are not part of the highly urbanised "megacity"
Dr. Antonia Corinthia Crisanta Naz	Ch.1	10	345	11	345	Table 1.1- Major river systems in the APR and their role for biological and cultural diversity. The countries where the rivers traverse should be mentioned. For exmple, for Mekong River, please check out the Mekong River Commission website that states that the Mekong River traverses through six countries: China, Myanmar, Thailand, Lao PDR, Cambodia, and Viet Nam. Please check if you will use the length of the Mekong River as 4,350 km as stated in the Table or 4,909 km as stated in http://www.mrcmekong.org/mekong-basin/ . Also, please check whether to use 795,000 km2 as the drainage area of Mekong River as stated in the MRC website or 810,000 km2 as stated in Table 1.1.	Done and have moved the Mekong River up in the table.
David Bickford	Ch.1	10	345	11	346	In Table 1.1, please add Sepik and Fly rivers from New Guinea. These are huge rivers and vitally important to people and biodiversity	We have not added this in table but have added in text to point out the importance of rivers on islands
Nakul Chettri	Ch.1	11	58	11	59	There are 36 hotspots now and it should be consistently used in all chapters and SPM	Thank you, this has been changed throughout the chapter
Wang Changyong	Ch.1	11	356	11	357	suggest to provide general information at the level of plants, animals, crops and domestical animals in the table form about 7 mega-biodiversity countries in APR	We have added a footnote on what determines a megadiverse country
Thomas Brooks	Ch.1	11	357	11	359	Good use of biodiversity hotspots and megadiversity countries information - retain	Thank you.
Joanne Perry NZ Focal point	Ch.1	11	362	11	362	insert NZ example of kiwi and Tuatara as noted above	This has been done! Kia ora
Stuart Butchart	Ch.1	11	368	11	368	IBAs are identified because of their importance for birds, not their richness in diversity. See http://datazone.birdlife.org/site/ibacriteria .	This is now clarified
Thomas Brooks	Ch.1	11	368	11	369	Good use of Important Bird & Biodiversity Areas information (also Page 71, Line 2559, Table S2) - retain. Add link to http://datazone.birdlife.org/site/search . Correct "rich in bird diversity" to "important for bird biodiversity".	Thank you.

Reviewer Name	Chapter / SPM	From Page (start)	From Line (start)	To Page (end)	To Line (end)	Comment	Response
Margarita N. Lavidés	Ch.1	11	373	12	381	The papers of Carpenter et al 2005 and Sanciangco et al 2013 should be included in this part and which information should be reconciled with the sentence describing species richness peaking in the coral triangle of SEA. Also, the highest diversity peaks in Central Philippines not Southern Philippines based on Carpenter et al 2005.	This is now done
Shamik Chakraborty	Ch.1	11	377	11	379	references should be provided for these data. Use ibid where needed	This is now done
Brian Mac Sharry	Ch.1	11	481	11	481	Protected areas are not "registered" by IUCN or UNEP-WCC but made available in the WDPA	This has been revised.
Brian Mac Sharry	Ch.1	11	481	11	481	Why select only sites with an IUCN management category I-VI?	Apologies, but we were not able to find out what this referred to?
Shuli Niu	Ch.1	12	390	13	391	"protected areas is constantly increasing in the APR at an estimated 13.7% for terrestrial system (global average is 15.4%)" 13.7% is a rates per year? Or on what temporal scale	This has been rewritten and supported with a citation.
Shuli Niu	Ch.1	13	392	13	396	You example only support the biodiversity is threatened, not INCREASINGLY threatened	Agreed and we have changed the wording.
Thomas Brooks	Ch.1	13	393	13	399	Good use of biodiversity hotspots information, including Table 1.2 - retain	Thank you.
Margarita N. Lavidés	Ch.1	13	404	13	407	I suggest the following should be included as an example of country level local extinction: For example, patterns of reef fish disappearances in the Philippines showed 59 fish names at risk of local extinction including large species such as bumphead parrotfish, giant grouper and humphead wrasse with as much as 88% decline in catch per unit effort since the 1950s, due to overexploitation and other key drivers (Lavidés et al 2010; Lavidés et al 2016). Further, coral reefs in several parts of the APR.....(Table 1.3).	We wish not to enter in so much detail. This derails the point made in this part of the text adding too much context-specific information.
Thomas Brooks	Ch.1	13	422	13	422	Use specific citations to support the claims for the different taxonomic groups here. For plants the best citation is probably Joppa et al. (2013) Science.	Thank you, we have done this.
Thomas Brooks	Ch.1	13	422	13	422	Use specific citations to support the claims for the different taxonomic groups here. For mammals, the appropriate citation is Schipper et al. (2004) Science.	Thank you, we have done this.
Thomas Brooks	Ch.1	13	422	13	422	Use specific citations to support the claims for the different taxonomic groups here. For birds, the most appropriate citation is Stattersfield et al. (1998) Endemic Bird Areas of the World. BirdLife International, Cambridge, UK. See also http://datazone.birdlife.org/ebas	Thank you, we have done this.
Thomas Brooks	Ch.1	13	422	13	422	Use specific citations to support the claims for the different taxonomic groups here. For reptiles, the appropriate citation is Bohm et al. (2013) Biological Conservation.	Thank you, we have done this.
Thomas Brooks	Ch.1	13	422	13	422	Use specific citations to support the claims for the different taxonomic groups here. For amphibians, the appropriate citation is Stuart et al. (2008) Science.	Thank you, we have done this.
Shuli Niu	Ch.1	13	423	13	426	what are the less well known group? For example...?	We have preferred not to go into too much detail.
Margarita N. Lavidés	Ch.1	14	428	14	429	A more recent version of Reefs at Risk may be consulted: Burke L, Reyter K, Spalding M, Perry A. Reefs at risk revisited. Washington D.C.: World Resources Institute; 2012.	Thank you, we have done this.
Siri Quade	Ch.1	14	428	14	429	"Table 1. 3 Status of Coral Reefs globally in 2008." -> possibly newer data available? UN ROAP having a Coral Reef Programme and perhaps can provide newer data (Mr Jerker Tamelander)	Done, please see above

Reviewer Name	Chapter / SPM	From Page (start)	From Line (start)	To Page (end)	To Line (end)	Comment	Response
Siri Quade	Ch.1	15	452	15	454	Missing explanation for X- and Y- axis? (X-Axis pretty clear though that it is years but with y-axis not obvious)	We changed the figure. Now the y-axis is explained
Binaya Raj Shivakoti	Ch.1	15	454	15	454	Figure 1.4 on urbanization, that could be easily accessed from UN statistics, does not necessarily need to be included	We decided to keep the figure to better illustrate trends in text, but also in Section 1.4.4
Shuli Niu	Ch.1	15	469	15	470	Do you have reference for the unemployment issue?	Reference added (ILO, 2013)
Shamik Chakraborty	Ch.1	17	495	17	495	M should be deleted from M. Kharki for in text citation	Thank you, we have done this.
Shamik Chakraborty	Ch.1	17	503	18	546	relatively few examples of cultural interaction with the nature. As IPBES uses SES/ CSES approach it will be better to give more weightage on the real world examples on this. At the moment the APR chapters have more weightage on the biophysical part. This makes the balance a bit skewed. Also SES argument should be well distributed in the text especially as ES is an anthropocentric notion	We make a cross-reference to Chapter 2 that has multiple such examples. Chapter 1 briefly introduced the issue. We think it is enough in its current length.
India NFP	Ch.1	17	508	17	511	May add Apatani fish-paddy cultivation in Arunachal Pradesh in India, as another traditional example.	Added and referenced.
Margarita N. Lavidis	Ch.1	18	539	18	543	The sentence seemed to have missed a word like 'lack' and should remove the word 'the' between 'communities' and 'access to' in Line 540.	Thank you, we have done this.
MDFortes	Ch.1	18	548	21	669	Where do the emergent threats of the 21st century come in? See UNEP	Apologies, we could not understand the comment. We use the direct drivers of ecosystem change as per the IPBES conceptual framework and the structure of this report. We now omit the UNEP citation as it is related only to small islands and instead we cross-reference other sections of the report.
Shuli Niu	Ch.1	18	550	18	550	"As discussed in Section 1.1.3 the rich biological richness of the APR is under threat.". I believe you discuss biodiversity in section 1.1.2	Thank you, we have corrected this.
Nirmal S. K. Harsh	Ch.1	18	550	18	554	I feel that indiscriminate developmental activities is also one of the many factors for the threat perception to the biodiversity as habitat loss is inevitable. (may add few lines here)	This sentence enumerates the direct drivers of biodiversity loss discussed in this report. Development activities are discussed a bit later in this section though.
MDFortes	Ch.1	18	554	18	554	In some cases, both synergistic and antagonistic effects	Thank you. The point has been made in a footnote.
MDFortes	Ch.1	19	568	19	568	2013, not 2014	Correction made. Thanks for pointing this out.
Wang Changyong	Ch.1	19	569	19	569	It seems to me that the 2014 tropical cyclone caused a huge biodiversity loss is difficult to understand. What biodiversity?	Thank you. The sentence has been revised and cited further.
MDFortes	Ch.1	19	569	19	570	Should read: "caused huge biodiversity loss in wider areas of Micronesia including Palau and killed an estimated 2,300 people in the Philippines". This is to consider priorities first.	Sentence revised as per previous comment.

Reviewer Name	Chapter / SPM	From Page (start)	From Line (start)	To Page (end)	To Line (end)	Comment	Response
Binaya Raj Shivakoti	Ch.1	19	581	19	581	Table 1.4, only disaster in AP sounds relevant not global. Better to have a table with detail breakdown of disaster types and impacts in AP	We have a dedicated AP table in Appendix. We feel that for length constraints it makes more sense to keep this reduced table in main text to show the higher prevalence in AP compared to the global.
CMS	Ch.1	20	606	20	606	Suggest to delete "possibly" as evidence has been shown e.g. in Fitzherbert et al. (2008) in chapter 'species composition and abundance'.	Thank you, we have revised this.
Henry Scheyvens	Ch.1	20	606	20	610	Propose that "possibly" can be removed (should be easy to find references to support the statement). Also, maybe should be "carbon sequestration and storage" as GHGs are being released from stores by conversion of peatland.	Thank you, we have revised this.
CMS	Ch.1	20	608	20	608	Rubber plantations could be included here as well, as both, rubber and oil plantations, are heavily impacting species abundance and diversity, in particular affecting birds, among those migratory ones. According to BirdLife "In one study in southern Thailand, 60% of the 128 forest bird species recorded were not found outside lowland forest." (http://datazone.birdlife.org/sowb/casestudy/many-forest-birds-cannot-survive-in-oil-palm-and-rubber-plantations)	Thank you. The sentence has been revised to include rubber.
Government of Japan	Ch.1	20	616	20	618	No legend is found in the figure, even though there are both green and brown areas in the figure.	Legend added.
Binaya Raj Shivakoti	Ch.1	20	618	20	618	Figure1.7, better to shown only AP map in better resolution	The map is now used at a better resolution.
Binaya Raj Shivakoti	Ch.1	21	628	21	628	Not clear (need elaboration) on how groundwater extraction and urbanization/industrialization leads to land degradation. Rapid urban and industrial growth usually cause conversion of land	These words are now removed to make the sentence lighter. They were secondary mechanisms so explaining them would have increased size without adding value to the paragraph.
NFP of China	Ch.1	21	643	21	643	McKinsey's report quotes an article on marine waste in <i>SCIENCE</i> , which are inconsistent with the issues reflected in the draft. Besides, the data may be incorrect; we recommend deleting this sentence.	We now cite the paper from Science and change the formulation of the sentence to convey the uncertainty. Methodology of paper seems correct and is an important element of the literature so it is retained.

Reviewer Name	Chapter / SPM	From Page (start)	From Line (start)	To Page (end)	To Line (end)	Comment	Response
Dr. Antonia Corinthia Crisanta Naz	Ch.1	21	643	21	645	Please clarify the statement, "Currently just 5 Asian countries (China, India, Thailand, Vietnam and the Philippines) are responsive for 60% of the plastic dumped in the world's seas (Ocean Conservancy and McKinsey, 2015) ." I checked out "Stemming the Tide: Land-based strategies for a plastic- free ocean" (Ocean Conservancy and McKinsey, 2015) and the word "responsive" means, "responsible." I suggest that the specific seas or oceans affected by the 5 countries should be mentioned, otherwise, the statement implies that these 5 countries are the major sources of plastic pollution of all the oceans and seas in the world, which, is not true. If the specific seas or oceans are not mentioned, then I suggest that the statement be deleted since it puts the 5 countries in a very bad light. Furthermore, the statement is based on a study and not on official statistics from the governments of the 5 countries.	Please see response to previous comment.
Margarita N. Lavidés	Ch.1	21	643	21	645	The word 'responsive' in Line 644 should be replaced with 'responsible'.	This sentence was revised to reflect this and the following 3 comments
Shuli Niu	Ch.1	21	644	21	644	replace "responsive" with "responsible"	This sentence was revised to reflect this and the following 3 comments
Margarita N. Lavidés	Ch.1	21	647	21	659	This paragraph tackles overexploitation of different species with economic value as another important threat to biodiversity in the APR. But none in this paragraph is a brief description of overfishing in APR. At least a brief description of status of overfishing in major fishing grounds of APR may be included. The works of Sea Around Us of University of British Columbia and or Nereus Program of Nippon Foundation can be excellent sources of literature.	Good point. We have added a paragraph on overfishing, citing it appropriately.
MDFortes	Ch.1	22	678	22	678	Should read: "when developing urban infrastructure, coastal resorts, rural roads....".	Thank you. The sentence has been revised.
MDFortes	Ch.1	22	687	22	688	Add to last line: "This key challenge is tied up with the region's inability to and/or ineffectiveness in linking science to policy and practice."	Thank you. The sentence has been revised but not exactly as suggested here.
Wang Changyong	Ch.1	22	691	22	691	insert "and trends" after the word "status"	Thank you, the addition has been made.
Wang Changyong	Ch.1	22	695	22	695	Suggest to cite and summary key information mentioned in the part of rationale and the "regional/subregional assessments will address the following policy-relevant questions" from document: Decision IPBES-3/1 Annex III (advance version) GENERIC SCOPING REPORT FOR THE REGIONAL AND SUBREGIONAL ASSESSMENTS OF BIODIVERSITY AND ECOSYSTEM SERVICES	These sentences cannot change as they reflect the five key policy questions of the regional assessment
Henry Scheyvens	Ch.1	22	695	22	702	Shouldn't there also be a point about identifying effective strategies to counter the drivers of BES loss? Note on p23 "Ideally the APRA will also support national stakeholders to develop and reform more inclusive and implementable policies. This will be achieved, among others, by identifying practical management options and tools, and develop best practices for catalysing effective conservation and sustainable management of BES."	These sentences cannot change as they reflect the five key policy questions of the regional assessment

Reviewer Name	Chapter / SPM	From Page (start)	From Line (start)	To Page (end)	To Line (end)	Comment	Response
Prakash Nelliyat	Ch.1	22	695	22	702	Significance of Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (BES) in reducing poverty and granting livelihood security for the poor and socially vulnerable communities in APR might be one of the rationale for the assessment.	These sentences cannot change as they reflect the five key policy questions of the regional assessment. This point is now made two paragraphs above. We do not add it in bulletpoints as these have been set through deliberation within APRA
MDFortes	Ch.1	22	699	22	700	Add to last line: "...and trends of BES to make predictions or forecasts in aid of legislations with respect to...".	These sentences cannot change as they reflect the five key policy questions of the regional assessment
Wang Changyong	Ch.1	22	704	23	730	The text from line 704-730 is structural, rather than about rationale and have somewhat reduplication with Section 1.5:1.5 Structure of the Asia-Pacific Regional Assessment. So suggest to delete the line 704-730	We have kept this text as it outlines the structure of the chapter and what it adds in APRA. Section 1.5 brought up by the reviewer discusses the structure of the APRA and not of the chapter, so there is no duplication.
CMS	Ch.1	22	720	22	720	Consider adding "Strategic Plan on Migratory Species 2015-2023" under the bullet "Biodiversity"	Addition made
Margarita N. Lavidés	Ch.1	23	736	23	736	The words 'stock take' should be 'take stock'.	This sentence has been revised using the standard definition of the Assessment provided by the IPBES Secretariat
Shuli Niu	Ch.1	23	736	23	736	what is "stock take"	This sentence has been revised using the standard definition of the Assessment provided by the IPBES Secretariat
MDFortes	Ch.1	23	752	23	752	Would be more meaningful and appropriate if we expand the "science-policy" interface to "science-policy-practice" interface.	To be consistent with IPBES terminology we have retained the term "Science-policy" interface
Margarita N. Lavidés	Ch.1	23	765	23	771	There is no mention whether legitimate web-based information were also included beyond peer reviewed and grey publications. I suggest the specific sources e.g. SCOPUS etc. and forms e.g. web, print and other brief details should be included here.	SCOPUS is a search engine to access mainly peer-reviewed literature. We do not believe that the format (electronic/print) would add something (several journals have electronic and print version).
Wang Changyong	Ch.1	23	765	23	771	suggest to delete the line 765-731 or combine with the section of methodology, which are relevant to the assessment methodology described in later section.	Point well taken. We moved this paragraph in Section 1.3.4
IPBES Secretariat/TSU	Ch.1	24	773	24	804	Main Audience - Authors may wish to consider mentioning explicitly "United Nations entities and multilateral environmental agreements" as primary targets in addition to IPBES member government agencies. Please refer to the Standard Text suggested on the "Categories of users of the assessment" for potential text to be added to this section.	Addition made. Portions of the IPBES standard text are now included.

Reviewer Name	Chapter / SPM	From Page (start)	From Line (start)	To Page (end)	To Line (end)	Comment	Response
Margarita N. Lavidés	Ch.1	24	782	24	787	There is no mention of fisheries sector in the main audience of APRA. Being a worker who sees both the side of marine conservation and fisheries. I think there should be a pro active efforts from both sides to be inclusive of each other if both are aiming for sustainable life and source of livelihoods below water as in SDG14.	Policy-making institutions related to fisheries are now mentioned.
Thomas Brooks	Ch.1	24	789	24	794	It would be worth adding explicit mention of IUCN here, given the Union's substantial presence in the region (see https://www.iucn.org/regions/asia).	IUCN is mentioned in Box S1 in Appendix.
Pham Ngoc Bao	Ch.1	25	820	25	820	"interlinkages amongst food,...." in stead of "interplay..."	Thank you, we have corrected this.
Thomas Brooks	Ch.1	25	822	25	823	Good use of IUCN Red List information - retain.	Thank you.
Prakash Nellyat	Ch.1	26	888	26	895	The statements on "multiple values associated with nature and living in harmony with nature is widely observed in the APR" required some explanation.	We refer now to Section 1.3.5 that discusses into greater length
Sandra Diaz	Ch.1	27	924	29	961	Please see attached (in Word) an update on the standard text for chapter 1 with regards to the conceptual framework. In this update, the figure has been updated to include NCP instead of NBP. There have also been some small textual changes which should be reflected in the final version of the regional assessment.	Text has been replaced with the text provided by IPBES Secretariat
Sandra Diaz	Ch.1	27	934	27	934	Figure 1.8 should be replaced with the latest figure of the IPBES Conceptual Framework as found in the attached Word document.	Figure has been replaced with the figure provided by IPBES Secretariat
IPBES Secretariat/TSU	Ch.1	27	934	27	935	Figure 1. 8 - Please update the figure with the one provided in the Standard Text for the Conceptual Framework which applies the NCP terminology	Figure has been replaced with the figure provided by IPBES Secretariat
IPBES Secretariat/TSU	Ch.1	27	937	28	951	Please update the text using the latest Standard Text for the Conceptual Framework	Text has been replaced with the text provided by IPBES Secretariat
Shuli Niu	Ch.1	28	949	28	949	"because due to"???? Redundant and wired wording. Delete"because"	Text has been replaced with the text provided by IPBES Secretariat
Shuli Niu	Ch.1	28	960	28	960	NCP? Since you define NCP as all the "BENEFITS" humanity obtains from nature, why NCP have positive and "NEGATIVE" effects on the quality of life of humans?	Text has been replaced with the text provided by IPBES Secretariat
Faith	Ch.1	28	960	29	961	960 box1.1 re " Nature's contribution to people (NCP) or ecosystem services" delete "or ecosystem services" as this wrongly equates it with NCPs; NCP 18 for example is not an ecosystem service	Text has been replaced with the text provided by IPBES Secretariat
IPBES Secretariat/TSU	Ch.1	28	960	29	961	Box 1. 1 - Please update the text using the latest Standard Text for the Conceptual Framework	Text has been replaced with the text provided by IPBES Secretariat
Faith	Ch.1	29	962	29	963	this wrongly equates ecosystem services with NCPs; NCP 18 for example is not an ecosystem service	Text has been replaced with the text provided by IPBES Secretariat

Reviewer Name	Chapter / SPM	From Page (start)	From Line (start)	To Page (end)	To Line (end)	Comment	Response
Margarita N. Lavidés	Ch.1	29	994	29	998	I think one of the reasons why there is so much divide between environmental and conservation sector and extractive industries like mining for example is that we tend to be exclusive to biotic components only and exclude abiotic components like fossil fuels, deep aquifers, underground minerals, winds tides which in fact provide Ecosystem Services and provides Nature's Contribution to People. And yet we in the environment and conservation sector claim that we should be in harmony with nature and ecosystems. Meanwhile, nature and ecosystems consists of both biotic and abiotic components. We are so excited and passionate about socio-ecological systems yet within the bounds of what we call 'Nature', 'ecological', 'ecosystems' is a wide divide between what is greatly affecting each other, the biotic and abiotic components and the sectors working for in each of them. We claim to be cross sectoral and cross disciplinary yet those of us working within the bounds of 'Nature' are fragmented. I do not mean to change IPBES CF at this point but if we are truly to aim to achieve great gains in biodiversity conservation and sustainable development, the great divide between sectors within the 'Nature'/'ecological' realm should be reduced if not removed. This comment may not only apply to this Chapter but for the APR, other regions and IPBES in general.	IPBES conceptual framework is standardised for all the assessments and work programme
Prakash Nelliya	Ch.1	30	1002	30	1005	"..... It reflects more than a decade of progress in interdisciplinary thinking including the increasing contribution of the social sciences". This fact is extremely important as the drivers which hamper biodiversity are primarily anthropogenic.	Text has been replaced with the text provided by IPBES Secretariat
IPBES Secretariat/TSU	Ch.1	30	1011	30	1011	"Table S 4 in Appendix provides the IPBES classification of NCP." --> the Table S 4 is not on the NCP but rather on the IPBES core indicators. Should authors wish to provide the NCP categories in an appendix, please use the table showing the 18 categories in the Standard Text on "Nature's Contributions to People".	Thank you, we have corrected this. We will not add the NCP categories. We cite this in the indicator part
Khishigbayar Jamiyansharav	Ch.1	30	1012	30	1013	Figure 1.9 - Overall this picture looks bad. Arrows should not cross the words. I did not understand why there have to be two arrows in one line: from cultural ES to nature's gift box and from nature's gifts to nature's gifts box. Resize the boxes so that words did not cut weird.	This figure is now omitted as per suggestion of the IPBES Secretariat

Reviewer Name	Chapter / SPM	From Page (start)	From Line (start)	To Page (end)	To Line (end)	Comment	Response
IPBES Secretariat/TSU	Ch.1	31	1048	31	1049	Table 1. 5 - Please update the Units of Analysis to the 17 categories of the "IPBES terrestrial and aquatic units of analysis" provided in the most recent Standard Text for regional Chapter 1s: 1 Tropical and subtropical dry and humid forests 2 Temperate and boreal forests, and woodlands 3 Mediterranean forests, woodlands and scrub 4 Tundra and High Mountain habitats 5 Tropical and subtropical savannas and grasslands 6 Temperate Grasslands 7 Drylands and Deserts 8 Wetlands – peatlands, mires, bogs 9 Urban/Semi-urban 10 Cultivated areas (incl. cropping, intensive livestock farming etc.) 11 Cryosphere 12 Aquaculture areas 13 Inland surface waters and water bodies/freshwater 14 Shelf ecosystems (neritic and intertidal/littoral zone) 15 Open ocean pelagic systems 16 Deep-sea 17 Coastal areas intensively and multiply used by humans	We adopted the current classification during the third order meeting in Tokyo. As per IPBES guidance regional assessments were allowed to devise a Unit of Analysis that can be region specific as long as it reflected the 17 generic categories of the "IPBES terrestrial and aquatic unit of analysis" As shown in Table 1.5 (last column), this classification achieves that, so we have retained it.
Harald Pauli	Ch.1	32	1050	32	1051	Table 1.6: 'alpine meadows' belong to Unit 4: 'Tundra and Mountain Grasslands (only high elevation grasslands)' rather than to units 5-6	Please see answer to previous comment
Joanne Perry NZ Focal point	Ch.1	33	1054	33	1054	inland water systems square. Need to include seeps and springs in the categorisation of water systems	Please see answer to previous comment
Wang Changyong	Ch.1	33	1060	33	1060	In section 1.3.4, it may be necessary to point out the question about cited papers timeliness though all the authors attempt to use up to date literatures based of their availability	This point is now made in Section 1.3.7 that discusses the limitations of this assessment
CMS	Ch.1	34	1101	34	1101	possibly "covered by the IUCN Red List, CMS and CITES."	Thank you. CMS has been added in the sentence.
Prakash Nelliyat	Ch.1	34	1101	35	1122	"Multiple values of nature and its benefits to people and the valuation ..." This approach may connect with the 'Benefits Transfer' methodology for valuation of ecosystem and biodiversity.	Benefit transfer is one approach quite extensively used in the economic valuation of ES. The multiple value perspective of IPBES (see Pascual et al., 2017) makes the case for a more inclusive value system. This point has not been revised.
IPBES Secretariat/TSU	Ch.1	34	1106	35	1122	Please consider updating the paragraph on diverse values using the newest version of the Standard Text on the "IPBES treatment of values and valuation"	We have added a new box item about the IPBES value framework published by Pascual et al., 2017

Reviewer Name	Chapter / SPM	From Page (start)	From Line (start)	To Page (end)	To Line (end)	Comment	Response
Prakash Nelliyat	Ch.1	35	1124	36	1168	"APRA draws information from different knowledge systems such as ILK and Western scientific knowledge.....". Is it worthwhile to mentioned TKDL in India?	TKDL is not mentioned here as it is a repository and not a knowledge system. We mention TKDL as an avenue for data collection.
Siri Quade	Ch.1	35	1126	35	1126	Without judging on either system, as much value there is in tradional knowledge I suggest not calling all different systems 'evidence-based' as done here because "The extent to which this form of evidence [as in ILK] may be termed reliable is questionable as it is difficult to generalize knowledge between cultures, however its strength lies in its validity.", so 'knowledge-based' perhaps fitting better to ILK. Or it could possibly be made clearer that what is meant here is a combined approached of all systems and not either/or.	We now use the wording "knowledge-based" as suggested
Thomas Brooks	Ch.1	35	1148	35	1148	Delete "Western"; science is a knowledge system used around the world. Also Line 1157.	We use consistently now in text the term modern science
Joanne Perry NZ Focal point	Ch.1	35	1161	35	1161	there appears to be some words either missing or misplace ie" IPBES has appointment of experts" is not correct.	This sentence was revised
IPBES Secretariat/TSU	Ch.1	36	1172	37	1198	1.3.6 Communication of uncertainty - Please consider updating the text and graphic with that provided in the Standard Text on Confidence Terms	Text has been replaced with the text provided by IPBES Secretariat
Khishigbayar Jamiyansharav	Ch.1	36	1189	36	1190	Figure 1.10 - There is no definition of the strengh of shading the figure. I would expect strengh of shading corresponds to the high but it is opposite in this picture.	Shading is explained now in the caption of the figure. The Figure is standardised across the IPBES assessments
Wang Changyong	Ch.1	37	1200	37	1200	suggest to consider the coverage of the scitific referances used fo the assessment, most of which is cited from the published international papers with English . This will inevitably weaken the contributions of the papers with local languages.	This point is now made in text
MDFortes	Ch.1	37	1200	38	1258	The scope of the assessment necessitates acknowledgment of the role of statistics since it "...provides tools to link together the component elements along with their uncertainties for a thorough ecosystem services assessment, and should be an integral part of this developing inter-disciplinary research area" (Smith et al. 2011, The role of statistics in the analysis of ecosystem services. Environmetrics 2011 22: 608–617)	We mention statistics in Section 1.3.4 where we discss the methodology. This part discsses gaps and limitations so it is not the appropriate place to highlight the role of statistics
Wang Changyong	Ch.1	38	1260	38	1260	suggest to insert the word developmental between "governance and contexts" to cover text descriptions under section 1.4.4: blobalization, liberalization and urbanization.	This has been added.
Thomas Brooks	Ch.1	38	1272	38	1272	"Global policy discourse on human impacts to the environment began in the 1960s" - this is not correct. IUCN was established in 1948 (https://www.iucn.org/about), and quite a few institutions undertaking such discourse globally were established considerably earlier.	This has been corrected
Siri Quade	Ch.1	39	1313	39	1314	"Collectively these global MEAs aim at addressing global environmental issues affecting the entire humanity " - possibly delete the bold part as 1.it sounds too emotional and 2. not correct as it affects all animals, not just humans.	Thank you, we have revised this.
CMS	Ch.1	39	1316	39	1316	suggest to refer to "conservation" rather than "protection"	Thank you, we have revised this.
CMS	Ch.1	39	1316	39	1316	"aquatic" does include "marine", so we would suggest to either delete "marine", or delete "aquatic" and add "freshwater" to "marine".	Thank you, we have revised this.
Thomas Brooks	Ch.1	39	1319	39	1319	Add establishment of IUCN in 1948 into Table 1.8.	Added in Table 1.8

Reviewer Name	Chapter / SPM	From Page (start)	From Line (start)	To Page (end)	To Line (end)	Comment	Response
CMS	Ch.1	39	1319	40	1320	suggest to revise text in the table about CMS to "CMS boosts and coordinates conservation efforts on terrestrial, marine and avian migratory species throughout their migratory range."	Thank you, we have revised this.
Tatsuya Horikiri	Ch.1	42	1352	42	1371	It may be necessary to mention about USA withdrawal from the Paris Agreement and its possible implication, for the content to become most up-to-date.	As this is a recent event and we do not know the possible outcomes we prefer not to add this point and speculate.
Margarita N. Lavidés	Ch.1	42	1383	42	1383	An example of meaning of acronym here MA (Millenium Ecosystem Assessment) has been defined only here in page42. Meanwhile, I have been coming across MA in the previous 10-15 pages without any indication of what MA means. I suggest a List of Acronym and meaning of each should be included in the front pages of the document. Also, there has been a number of other acronyms repeatedly used but varies in the timing of defining the meaning of acronym. Some were defined in the first mention, others in the second mention.	We define now MA the first time it is mentioned. There will be a list of acronyms for the assessment.
Government of Japan	Ch.1	44	1416	44	1416	(Regarding APAP section) APAP is not based in Japan but co-chaired by Japan and IUCN ARO. In addition, the Country Membership and Associate Membership is differentiated under the Partnership Document, which was endorsed at the 2nd Steering Committee. Therefore, we would like to suggest to amend as follows: "Asia Protected Areas Partnership (APAP) APAP brings together national institutions from 12 Asian countries. It was formally launched at the IUCN World Parks Congress in 2014. The Partnership aims to promote collaboration, co-operation and sharing of best practices and innovative solutions for Asia's protected areas. APAP, co-chaired by Japan and IUCN ARO, offers Country Membership and Associate Membership (relevant institutions, NGOs etc.). It supports capacity building, training and knowledge exchange among its members. For detail visit: http://www.asiaprotectedareaspartnership.org/ ".	Thank you, we have done this. The text is revised accordingly
Government of Japan	Ch.1	45	1451	47	1487	The section 1.4.3 seems to frequently cite UNEP-WCMC (2016), which is a mid-term review of progress towards the Aichi Biodiversity Targets, and even Figure 1.12 is also a copy from the same document. However, the current assessment is supposed to be used for the global assessment of the IPBES, and the global assessment will be the basis for the Global Biodiversity Outlook 5, which will be a final review of progress towards the targets. Thus, describing the progress towards the targets by just citing the mid-term review may not be appropriate in the current AP assessment. Alternatively, the progress should be described based on scientific and latest data. Otherwise, the assessment cannot generate additional values than the mid-term review by UNEP-WCMC.	This section is now omitted and integrated in the previous section. Chapter 6 covers the progress so we refer to it.
Government of Japan	Ch.1	45	1458	46	1459	Rather than using the relatively old figure, Table SPM 2 in pg 17 of SPM should instead be used after it is completed.	Please see previous comment.
Tatsuya Horikiri	Ch.1	46	1463	46	1487	It may be better to briefly mention progress in other regions to indicate that all regions are equally but at the same time differently struggling to fully achieve the Aichi Targets.	Please see previous comment.
Henry Scheyvens	Ch.1	47	1490	47	1490	A definition of globalisation is needed. You can find one in Chapter 4.	We have changed the wording. We add a definition from Chapter 4 as a footnote
Siri Quade	Ch.1	47	1504	47	1505	"The rise of China, India and Australia as global economic and political powers can be considered as one of the most transformative outcomes of globalization". Possibly consider changing? (too general?)	Section 1.4.4 has been revised considerably to reduce text and tighten message.

Reviewer Name	Chapter / SPM	From Page (start)	From Line (start)	To Page (end)	To Line (end)	Comment	Response
Margarita N. Lavidés	Ch.1	48	1545	48	1545	The sentence is cut off unfinished with the last word 'extensive', leaving the reader wondering if the next word should be 'forests'.	Section 1.4.4 has been revised considerably to reduce text and tighten message.
IPBES NFP - Australia	Ch.1	48	1566	48	1569	This statement implies GMOs spread rather than are released in strict controlled environments?	Section 1.4.4 has been revised considerably to reduce text and tighten message.
NFP of China	Ch.1	48	1578	48	1578	In this global supply chain, China is only a producer. Demand for wooden products in Europe, the United States and other developed countries is the real driving force. So it is economic globalization rather than China and India that causes the problem.	Section 1.4.4 has been revised considerably to reduce text and tighten message.
Henry Scheyvens	Ch.1	48	1579	48	1584	The issue is not just unsustainable trade in timber, it is also trade in agricultural products from converted forest land; note that India and China are now the world's largest importers and consumers of palm oil. See: Scheyvens, H. (2015). Sustainable management of natural forests in the Asia-Pacific region: Implications of regional economic integration and measures to avoid potential environmental harm. In Greening Integration in Asia: How Regional Integration Can Benefit People and the Environment, IGES White Paper 5, 2015. https://pub.iges.or.jp/pub/sustainable-management-natural-forests-asia	Section 1.4.4 has been revised considerably to reduce text and tighten message.
The Biodiversity Indicators Partnership (BIP)	Ch.1	49	1619	49	1619	I'm still unclear on how the 'area-weighted' numbers in this plot are calculated. As such I can't confirm their accuracy. Outside of that, I still don't understand why the 'Africa' region in these plots has virtually no BC and no EF. In the raw NFA 2016 data in data year 2012, Africa BC was about 33% of the 'Americas', which is not close to being reflected here. The plot for EF and BC should also avoid treating the USSR breakup with a smooth curve. I can't tell which countries are included in which groups, but pre- and post-1991 seem better dealt with their own smoothed curves rather than a total one.	Section 1.4.4 has been revised considerably to reduce text and tighten message.
Tatsuya Horikiri	Ch.1	50	1625	46	1625	Inconsistency in referring to Aichi Biodiversity Targets (ABT). Here you use Aichi Targets, without biodiversity.	We now use consistently within the Chapter: Aichi Biodiversity Targets
NFP of China	Ch.1	51	1671	51	1671	Chaotic logical relationship, no practical significance. we recommend delete	Section 1.4.4 has been revised considerably to reduce text and tighten message.
Binaya Raj Shivakoti	Ch.1	51	1688	51	1884	1.4.5.1 Challenges, whole section is not directly linked to biodiversity/ecosystem issues and does not add much value to the discussion. Better to refine and if not much information available to cut down the size.	This section has been changed considerably. Now section is better linked to biodiversity
Prakash Nelliyat	Ch.1	51	1688	54	1826	It is needed to consider the following aspect also in this discussion: Need for inter-ministerial co-operation and mainstreaming biodiversity in to the developmental plan, programme and strategies.	This is briefly mentioned, but is better reflected in chapter 6
Wang Changyong	Ch.1	51	1690	51	1690	suggest to add some descriptions about lack of capacity in using new information technology to identify, monitor and conserve biodiversity. Also, because of slowdown of economic growth, The donation from the developed countries to conservation efforts in APR is experiencing sharp decrease.	The entire section has been revised. This comment has been addressed.

Reviewer Name	Chapter / SPM	From Page (start)	From Line (start)	To Page (end)	To Line (end)	Comment	Response
Binaya Raj Shivakoti	Ch.1	51	1698	51	1698	"financial difficulty faced by public sector", need better explanation to support his statement	This point is clarified now
Harald Pauli	Ch.1	51	1703	51	1710	suggest to include the following, e.g., after '...their domain (Section 1.1.2).': 'Support for building a young generation of taxonomy experts is urgently demanded and not only essential for filling knowledge gaps, but also for establishing and/or maintaining existing monitoring sites for assessing trends in biodiversity changes.'	Text has been added accordingly and reference to opportunity section and to discuss with chapter 6
Binaya Raj Shivakoti	Ch.1	52	1711	52	1711	"Ecosystem-based" watershed management, need reference or elaboration on how this is different from watershed management which also includes ecosystem	This point has now been changed.
Henry Scheyvens	Ch.1	52	1722	52	1725	Can support this statement with: "Promoting the Landscape Approach in Asia-Pacific Developing Countries: Key Concepts and Ways Forward" Number 37 Series: IGES Policy Brief Author: Henry SCHEYVENS Rajib SHAW Isao ENDO Jintana KAWASAKI Pham NGOC BAO Binaya Raj SHIVAKOTI Hiromitsu SAMEJIMA Bijon Kumer MITRA Yasuo TAKAHASHI Copyright: Institute for Global Environmental Strategies 2017-05 https://pub.iges.or.jp/pub/promoting-landscape-approach-asia-pacific	We have used a different reference.
Shuli Niu	Ch.1	52	1742	52	1743	does not have a subject	Thank you, subject matter has been addressed
Henry Scheyvens	Ch.1	53	1809	53	1810	Major challenges for implementing multistakeholder approaches include building the capacities of ILK holders to participate in such processes and ensuring that the approaches are comfortable for them.	Thank you, the point has been made
Henry Scheyvens	Ch.1	54	1840	54	1840	REDD+ is a type of PES (can write "REDD+ and other PES")	This part has been revised
Henry Scheyvens	Ch.1	54	1846	54	1858	Could also mention the 5 million ha reforestation program in Vietnam.	We decided not to mention this point, as we think the existing content is sufficient.
Margarita N. Lavides	Ch.1	55	1879	55	1880	There should be period at the end of sentence ending with the word 'habitats. Then the next sentence should read: New products were developed providing more income generating opportunities (Singh, 2006)	Thank you, the point has been addressed.
Thomas Brooks	Ch.1	73	2611	74	2612	Good use of the indicators of Protected Area coverage of Key Biodiversity Areas, and of the Red List Index, here.	Thank you.
Thomas Brooks	Ch.1	78	2638	78	2640	Mentions of "IUCN" in Box S1 and of "International Union for Conservation of Nature" in Box S2 are appropriate - retain	Thank you.