Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services

Distr.: General
9 April 2019

English only

Plenary of the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services
Seventh session
Paris, 29 April–4 May 2019
Item 9 of the provisional agenda*
Next work programme of the Platform

Overview of requests, inputs and suggestions regarding short-term priorities and longer-term strategic needs for the next work programme of the Platform

Note by the secretariat

The annex to the present note supplements document IPBES/7/6/Add.1 on the prioritization of requests, inputs and suggestions regarding short-term priorities and longer-term strategic needs for the next work programme of the Platform put to the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services. The annex, which is presented without formal editing, sets out a list of the requests, inputs and suggestions, with indications of how they have been addressed in the draft work programme of IPBES up to 2030 (IPBES/7/6, annex).

---

* IPBES/7/1/Rev.1.

Annex

Overview of requests, inputs and suggestions regarding short-term priorities and longer-term strategic needs for the next work programme of the Platform

The first four columns of this table provide key characteristics of each submission received. The full submissions can be found on the IPBES website at https://www.ipbes.net/requests-received-next-ipbes-work-programme. The last column of this table summarises how each submission has been dealt with in the draft work programme of IPBES up to 2030, set out in the annex to document IPBES/7/6. This table focuses on specific suggestions made regarding the work programme up to 2030. Remarks of a more general nature are summarised in document IPBES/7/6/Add.1 but not fully reproduced in this table. The following abbreviations are used in the table:

AU	African Union	NEOH	Network for Evaluation of One Health
BECCS	Bio-energy with carbon capture and storage	NINA	Norwegian Institute for Nature Research
CBD	Convention on Biological Diversity	OECD	Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development
CGIAR	Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research	SBSTTA	Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice
CITES	Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora	SEEA-EEA	System of Environmental-Economic Accounting-Experimental Ecosystem Accounting
COP	Conference of the Parties		
EAT	Stockholm Food Forum	SIDS	Small Island Developing States
EU	European Union	SDG	Sustainable Development Goal
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations	TEEB	The Economics of Ecosystems and Biodiversity
GBO	Global Biodiversity Outlook	UN	United Nations
GEF	Global Environment Facility	UNESCO	United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization
GEO	Global Environmental Outlook		
IAASTD	International Assessment of Agricultural Knowledge, Science and Technology for Development	UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
		UNEP-WCMC	United Nations Environment Programme World Conservation Monitoring Centre
ICLEI	International Council for Local Environmental Initiatives		
ICH	Intangible Cultural Heritage	UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
ICOET	International Conference on Ecology and Transportation		
ICRAF	World Agroforestry Centre	UNSD	United Nations Statistics Division
IDDRI	Institute for Sustainable Development and International Relations	WHO	World Health Organization
IGES	Institute for Global Environmental Strategies	WTO	World Trade Organization
IPCC	Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change	WWF	World Wide Fund for Nature
IUCN	International Union for Conservation of Nature		
IUNS	International Union of Nutritional Sciences		
MA	Millennium Ecosystem Assessment		
MEA	Multilateral Environmental Agreement		
NBSAP	National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plan		

Country	Intervention requested	Scientific and Policy Relevance [1]*Relevance to IPBES (a), urgency (b), policy relevance (c), geographic scope (d), evidence of a need for this work (f), impacts and beneficiaries (h)*	Implications for work programme and resource requirements *complexity (e), availability of information (g), financial and human resource requirements (i), priority level in case of multiple requests (j)*	Indication on how request was addressed
Requests by Multilateral Environmental Agreements				
Convention on Biological Diversity (1)	***Understand and assess the behavioural, social, economic, institutional, technical and technological determinants of transformational change, and how these may be deployed to achieve the 2050 Vision for Biodiversity***	• Request relevant to IPBES, and in particular to the box entitled "institutions, governance and other indirect drivers" which lays at the centre of its conceptual framework • More comprehensive and in-depth information is needed to better understand how these underlying factors impact on biodiversity; given this and the time required for biological systems to respond to changes, this action is of high urgency • Directly relevant to the work of the CBD, the anticipated agreement of a post-2020 global biodiversity framework and the SDGs • Geographic scope: global • Few initiatives on links between behavioural, social, economic, institutional technical and technological determinants of transformational change in relation to biodiversity	• High complexity as various socioeconomic issues need to be considered • A thematic assessment is requested • Duration: 2-3 years	Priority topic 2: Underlying causes of biodiversity loss and determinants of transformative change: Deliverable 1 (c) and dedicated activities within deliverables of objectives 2 to 5

---

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

Country	Intervention requested	Scientific and Policy Relevance [1]Relevance to IPBES (a), urgency (b), policy relevance (c), geographic scope (d), evidence of a need for this work (f), impacts and beneficiaries (h)	Implications for work programme and resource requirements complexity (e), availability of information (g), financial and human resource requirements (i), priority level in case of multiple requests (j)	Indication on how request was addressed
Convention on Biological Diversity (2)	*Develop a multi-disciplinary approach to understand the interactions of the direct and indirect drivers of biodiversity loss*	• Request relevant to IPBES function of supporting policy formulation, and to IPBES conceptual framework • Assessment of the interactions between the direct and indirect drivers of biodiversity loss and multidisciplinary approaches • Given the time required for biological systems to respond to changes and that various direct and indirect pressures are already affecting biodiversity in multiple ways, this action is of high urgency • A better understanding for more tailored and effective actions and policies for the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity. • Direct contribution to CBD and other related MEAs as well as the SDGs. • Geographic scope: global • Work has tended to look at these drivers in isolation.	• High complexity: consideration of information from multiple disciplines • Significant literature on direct/indirect drivers of biodiversity loss, but less on multidisciplinary approaches • Review of existing literature by a multi-disciplinary expert team. • Duration: 2-3 years.	Priority topic 2: Underlying causes of biodiversity loss and determinants of transformative change: Deliverable 1 (c); and dedicated activities within deliverables of objectives 2 to 5
Convention on Biological Diversity (3)	*Assess issues at the nexus of biodiversity, food and water, agriculture and health, nutrition and food security, forestry and fisheries*	• To enhance understanding of various sectoral issues affecting biodiversity and ecosystem services. • High urgency due to time required for biological systems to respond to changes; the need to mainstream biodiversity within and across sectors; the anticipated agreement on a post-2020 global biodiversity framework. • Highly relevant to the issue of mainstreaming biodiversity considerations across sectors; to the work of the CBD; to the attainment of the SDGs. • Geographic scope: global • No scientifically independent initiative has specifically explored these issues using a nexus approach in a comprehensive manner. Trade-offs between issues have not been explored comprehensively and policy options regarding sustainable production and consumption, pollution and urbanization, energy and climate, have not been drawn, taking into account the role of biodiversity and ecosystem	• High complexity: different sectors involved and need to synthesize and analyse this information in a coherent manner. • Each of the issues identified in the request have been extensively explored, but few on nexus assessments explicitly linked to biodiversity. • Review of existing literature. • Duration: 2-3 years.	Priority topic 1: Promoting biodiversity to achieve the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development: Deliverables 1 (a) and 1 (b); and dedicated activities within deliverables of objectives 2 to 5 NB: Similar requests were submitted by the European Union, UNESCO and the Norwegian Institute for Nature Research (NINA)

Country	Intervention requested	Scientific and Policy Relevance [1]Relevance to IPBES (a), urgency (b), policy relevance (c), geographic scope (d), evidence of a need for this work (f), impacts and beneficiaries (h)	Implications for work programme and resource requirements complexity (e), availability of information (g), financial and human resource requirements (i), priority level in case of multiple requests (j)	Indication on how request was addressed
Convention on Biological Diversity (4)	*Undertake methodological assessments on the effectiveness of various policy instruments and policy and planning support tools for understanding on how to achieve transformational change, and to characterize and quantify successful approaches and cases of the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity, and their impacts*	• Enhance the understanding of types of methods that can be used to assess the effectiveness of actions to help to address the current gap in policy research related to biodiversity. • High urgency as specific information on how evaluations are being carried out is limited and rarely include a critical analysis of effectiveness of measures to bring about the observed changes. • More detailed information on effectiveness evaluations could greatly benefit Parties of the CBD. • Large amount of literature related to assessing effectiveness of actions; organisations have developed guidance to assess effectiveness, but there is no independent scientific body specifically looking at this issue from a biodiversity perspective. • Geographic scope: global.	• Moderate complexity • Large amount of literature and guidance, but few systematic, comprehensive and objective reviews. • Review of existing literature. • Duration: 2-3 years.	Priority topic 2: Underlying causes of biodiversity loss and determinants of transformative change: Deliverable 4 (a) NB: Request supported by Norway, the European Union; UNESCO
Convention on Biological Diversity (5)	*Assess the potential positive and negative impacts of productive sectors and undertake a methodological assessment of the criteria, metrics and indicators of the impacts of productive sectors on biodiversity and ecosystem services as well as the benefits derived from biodiversity and ecosystem services*	• Productive sectors have a range of impacts on biodiversity. A better understanding of these impacts and more robust means of monitoring them are essential. • Measuring the impacts of the productive sectors on biodiversity is challenging; need for tools and methods to support this and to better enable business to reduce their negative impacts on biodiversity. • Directly relevant to the work of the Convention on Biological Diversity. • Various initiatives (e.g. by FAO) assessed the status, trends and impacts of fisheries, agricultural activities etc., but not focused on their impacts on biodiversity. • Geographic scope: global.	• High complexity given the need to consider information from various sectors and to relate this to criteria, metrics and indicators. • Abundance of literature and expertise on the productive sectors, but little information on how their impact can be measured and monitored. • Review of existing literature. • Duration: 2-3 years.	Priority topic 3: Measuring business impact and dependency on biodiversity and nature's contribution to people: Deliverable 1(d) and dedicated activities within deliverables of objectives 2 to 5 NB: Request supported by Japan, Norway and the European Union

Country	Intervention requested	Scientific and Policy Relevance [1]Relevance to IPBES (a), urgency (b), policy relevance (c), geographic scope (d), evidence of a need for this work (f), impacts and beneficiaries (h)	Implications for work programme and resource requirements complexity (e), availability of information (g), financial and human resource requirements (i), priority level in case of multiple requests (j)	Indication on how request was addressed
Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora	*Letter with information relating to the thematic assessment of the sustainable use of wild species* **Knowledge about the conservation status of species listed under CITES that are traded internationally, particularly in biodiversity-rich developing States, on a species-specific and range State-specific level, in addition to information and guidance to maintain the use of species at biologically sustainable levels**	• The on-going IPBES thematic assessment of the sustainable use of wild species could be very valuable in providing new insights for the implementation of the Convention.		The letter from CITES was communicated to the authors of the IPBES assessment of the sustainable use of wild species Topic 5: Pressures, status and trends concerning biodiversity and ecosystem services: This request could be addressed through an individual thematic assessment later in the work programme, or as a component of a future global assessment of biodiversity and ecosystem services.

Country	Intervention requested	Scientific and Policy Relevance [1]*Relevance to IPBES (a), urgency (b), policy relevance (c), geographic scope (d), evidence of a need for this work (f), impacts and beneficiaries (h)*	Implications for work programme and resource requirements *complexity (e), availability of information (g), financial and human resource requirements (i), priority level in case of multiple requests (j)*	Indication on how request was addressed
Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals and the Agreements thereto and Convention Concerning the Protection of the World Cultural and Natural Heritage	*Assessment on connectivity conservation*	• Request relevant to the overall objective of IPBES since connectivity conservation is a key element for the conservation of many components of biodiversity. • Assessing existing knowledge on conservation connectivity should allow to identify impacts and rectify harmful policies. • Relevant to policies at different scales concerning e.g. land use changes, climate change adaptation, infrastructure development, conservation areas, wildlife management, and others. • To support implementation of the post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework as Connectivity Conservation may be be integrated in the Framework. • There is a significant amount of scientific literature on connectivity, but a comprehensive review of existing literature on the subject is not available. • There are examples of initiatives (e.g. United Nations Environment Programme's Global Connectivity Conservation Project). • Global geographic scope, while connectivity has to be considered at appropriate scales, including regional, sub-regional and migratory range levels.	• Complex as knowledge on many aspects of connectivity is scattered and uneven. • Extensive scientific literature on connectivity in the field of environmental science. • Timeline: 2020.	Topic 4: Connectivity: MEP and Bureau suggest considering an assessment on connectivity for inclusion as part of the work programme at the time of the second call for requests, input and suggestions.
Ramsar Convention on Wetlands of International Importance especially as Waterfowl Habitat	*Thematic assessment on peatlands*	• Despite their great ecological role, peatlands are being degraded and lost at an alarming scale. • The urgency is high to prevent peatland deterioration and restore degraded and drained peatland areas and thereby biodiversity values and ecosystem services. • Need to compile and synthesise research on peatlands and to highlight research gaps as well as consequences and provide policy and management options. • Geographic scope: global.	• Complex but achievable. • There is a large number of studies and expertise to be drawn upon. • Similar resource requirements as for other comparable IPBES assessments. • Duration: 3 years.	Topic 5: Pressures, status and trends concerning biodiversity and ecosystem services: This request could be addressed through an individual thematic assessment later in the work programme, or as a component of a future global assessment of biodiversity and ecosystem services.

Country	Intervention requested	Scientific and Policy Relevance [1]Relevance to IPBES (a), urgency (b), policy relevance (c), geographic scope (d), evidence of a need for this work (f), impacts and beneficiaries (h)	Implications for work programme and resource requirements complexity (e), availability of information (g), financial and human resource requirements (i), priority level in case of multiple requests (j)	Indication on how request was addressed
United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification	***Assessment on connectivity***	• To contribute to efforts to capitalize on synergies among the MEAs and the pursuit of multiple benefits. • Connectivity is directly related to the resilience of socio-ecological systems and central to climate change adaptation. • The assessment would support country efforts to achieve land degradation neutrality (SDGs). • Considerable research on the multiple facets of connectivity, but few attempts to bring that research together in the form of an assessment; some multi-country and multi-organizational initiatives. • Geographic scope: global with utility at the national, sub-national levels.	• Complex as knowledge of the many aspects of connectivity is scattered and uneven, and research helping establish these linkages is relatively limited. • Extensive scientific literature on all of the multiple facets of connectivity. • Resource requirements depend on the approach that will be chosen to undertake the assessment. Timeline: 2020.	Topic 4: Connectivity: MEP and Bureau suggest considering an assessment on connectivity for inclusion as part of the work programme at the time of the second call for requests, input and suggestions.
Requests by Governments and observers that are allowed enhanced participation in accordance with decision IPBES-5/4				
Belgium	***Thematic assessments of nature/biodiversity – human health linkages***, taking into account the socio-ecological system, including plant & animal/wildlife health, based on an integrated One Health approach.	• Relevant to IPBES, including work from the European and Central Asia regional assessment's key messages regarding human health. • To assess health benefits and risks originating from nature and ecosystem functioning in an integrated manner. • Need to address this urgently, as the negative consequences of a disturbed nature – health interrelations are showing increasingly on a global level. • Need to build upon the "Biodiversity and Health State of Knowledge Review" report from WHO and CBD to assess evidence with confidence terms. • Geographic scope: regional or global (depending on availability of resources).	• High complexity as nature – health combine main scientific fields and the complexity of socio-economic aspects. • Relevant scientific fields are developing rapidly, producing a vast amount of valuable research. • Resource requirements: similar to the regional assessments.	Priority topic 1: Promoting biodiversity to achieve the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development: Deliverables 1 (a); and dedicated activities within deliverables of objectives 2 to 5

Country	Intervention requested	Scientific and Policy Relevance [1]Relevance to IPBES (a), urgency (b), policy relevance (c), geographic scope (d), evidence of a need for this work (f), impacts and beneficiaries (h)	Implications for work programme and resource requirements complexity (e), availability of information (g), financial and human resource requirements (i), priority level in case of multiple requests (j)	Indication on how request was addressed
Brazil (1)	*Assess and systematize information on impacts of climate change on biodiversity and ecosystems*	• High urgency as climate change impacts are occurring faster and in a more intense way than anticipated, posing new challenges to monitoring and adaptation efforts. • Systematization of existing knowledge on measured and modelled direct and indirect impacts of climate change on biodiversity and ecosystems distribution, as well as the consolidation and dissemination of spatial analysis on impacts of climate change on biome and ecosystems distribution can help countries to include climate change as a component of biodiversity conservation policies. • Regional and global and if possible biome geographic scope.	• Complexity of interactions between species of different ecosystems, of indirect effects of climate change on biodiversity, and climate feedbacks from impacts of climate change on biodiversity.	Priority topic 1: Promoting biodiversity to achieve the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development: Deliverables 1 (a) and 1 (b); and dedicated activities within deliverables of objectives 2 to 5
Brazil (2)	*Assessment of restoration and monitoring actions with the objective of establishing protocols that evaluate the effective gains for biodiversity conservation and the provision of ecosystem services.*	• Need to assess gain from restoration activities in terms of biodiversity, in addition to gain in terms of biomass. • Important to promote a global evaluation that aims to elaborate a protocol that could be adopted by the stakeholders. • Monitoring biodiversity in restoration actions can improve the allocation of resources used in projects and plans, prioritizing support for more effective initiatives. Such monitoring can also contribute to the evaluation of the implementation of the National Restoration Plans of the countries. • Global geographic scope	• Medium to high complexity: depends on number of criteria that will be considered; in some cases field monitoring.	Topic 5: Pressures, status and trends concerning biodiversity and ecosystem services: This request could be addressed through an individual thematic assessment later in the work programme, or as a component of a future global assessment of biodiversity and ecosystem services

Country	Intervention requested	Scientific and Policy Relevance [1]Relevance to IPBES (a), urgency (b), policy relevance (c), geographic scope (d), evidence of a need for this work (f), impacts and beneficiaries (h)	Implications for work programme and resource requirements *complexity (e), availability of information (g), financial and human resource requirements (i), priority level in case of multiple requests (j)*	Indication on how request was addressed
Brazil (3)	***Assessment of existing studies in the world about prioritization of areas for biodiversity and ecosystem services conservation, comparing different methodologies, results and impacts.***	• Many studies have identified priority areas for conservation, but several methodologies can be used to model this prioritization, with different results; and results of implementation of conservation actions suggested by these studies are still poorly monitored. • The identification of priority areas for conservation has the potential to increase the effectiveness of conservation actions, allocating financial resources to regions of greater biological importance and with greater possibilities of success in the suggested actions. • Global geographic scope.	• High complexity: high number of conservation targets to be considered; different conservation objectives and actions to be recommended; environmental and socio-cultural differences between the regions to be compared.	Topic 5: Pressures, status and trends concerning biodiversity and ecosystem services: This request could be addressed through an individual thematic assessment later in the work programme, or as a component of a future global assessment of biodiversity and ecosystem services
Brazil (4)	***Assess and systematize guidelines and better practices, define global and regional indicators and global standardized parameters and criteria to guide national accountability efforts of biodiversity and ecosystems services conservation impact assessment.***	• To support Governments in the design and prioritization of public policies for biodiversity and ecosystems conservation, to identify global and regional gaps in knowledge, to size the lacks and needs of financial resources aimed at this purpose, and improve communication of results to society in general. • It would foster several countries in the elaboration and implementation of similar efforts, improving communication of existing public policies results and refining future policies and measures. • Geographic scope: standards, indicators and guidelines could be elaborated for regional and global assessments.	• Guidelines for policy accountability of conservation efforts must consider the diverse distribution of species, and refer to existing knowledge and recent land use changes.	Topic 5: Pressures, status and trends concerning biodiversity and ecosystem services: This request could be addressed through an individual thematic assessment later in the work programme, or as a component of a future global assessment of biodiversity and ecosystem services

Country	Intervention requested	Scientific and Policy Relevance [1]Relevance to IPBES (a), urgency (b), policy relevance (c), geographic scope (d), evidence of a need for this work (f), impacts and beneficiaries (h)	Implications for work programme and resource requirements complexity (e), availability of information (g), financial and human resource requirements (i), priority level in case of multiple requests (j)	Indication on how request was addressed
Brazil (5)	*Assessment of community biodiversity protocols*	• This assessment would provide policymakers with objective scientific assessments about the state of knowledge on biodiversity and traditional knowledge governance on indigenous people and local communities' territories. • Information is needed in order to conserve biodiversity, and to safeguard traditional knowledge. • The Nagoya Protocol and CBD require prior informed consent for access to traditional knowledge and genetic resources and calls for support of community protocols. • Geographic scope: global but focusing on indigenous people and local communities' territories.	• The complexity level is about ensuring participation and involvement of indigenous people, local communities and other relevant stakeholders. • Resource requirements: scientists and support from local communities' organizations. • Duration: 2 years minimum.	Priority topic 2: Underlying causes of biodiversity loss and determinants of transformative change: Deliverables 1 (c) and 3 (b)
Brazil (6)	*Thematic evaluation of the ecosystems services offered by continental aquatic environments and aspects of the use of their biodiversity with emphasis on the fishing resources.*	• The biodiversity of continental aquatic ecosystems is under pressure from different drivers including climate change, and invasive alien species. • To know the causes, consequences and forms of remediation of the drivers of change that affect continental aquatic biodiversity is of vital importance for the conservation of its ecosystems services and its socioeconomic overflows. • Relevant to achieve Aichi Target 6. • Geographic scope: the evaluation should be divided regionally, by large international river basins.	• Resource requirements: the evaluation should consider at least two hydrological cycles, requiring two years or more, as a huge mobilization of different actors needed for this process.	Topic 5: Pressures, status and trends concerning biodiversity and ecosystem services: This request could be addressed through an individual thematic assessment later in the work programme, or as a component of a future global assessment of biodiversity and ecosystem services

Country	Intervention requested	Scientific and Policy Relevance [1]Relevance to IPBES (a), urgency (b), policy relevance (c), geographic scope (d), evidence of a need for this work (f), impacts and beneficiaries (h)	Implications for work programme and resource requirements complexity (e), availability of information (g), financial and human resource requirements (i), priority level in case of multiple requests (j)	Indication on how request was addressed
Brazil (7)	*Assess the state of biodiversity and the ecosystem services related with water, including studies on soil cover and water quality and quantity parameters.*	• Consolidating a state-of-the-art survey of studies that focus on the relationship between vegetation cover and water quality/quantity to develop indicators and strategies for vulnerable territories. • For countries rich in biodiversity and less economically developed, it is important to provide useful information for decision making and encourage investments in nature conservation; it is also important to communicate the benefits of ecosystem services, and to help prioritize actions aimed at restoring critical ecosystem services. • Geographic scope: Latin America.	• The complexity lies in the multivariate characteristics of each river basin. • Scattered publications on the measurement of ecosystem services provided by the national systems of protected areas.	Topic 5: Pressures, status and trends concerning biodiversity and ecosystem services: This request could be addressed through an individual thematic assessment later in the work programme, or as a component of a future global assessment of biodiversity and ecosystem services
China (1)	*Evaluating the impact of climate change on biodiversity.*	• Climate change is likely to become one of the most significant drivers of biodiversity loss by the end of the century. Climate change is already forcing biodiversity to adapt either through shifting habitat, changing life cycles, or the development of new physical traits. • Climate change and biodiversity are one of the key cross-cutting issues of the CBD - the work would contribute to Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011- 2020 and responded to the resolution of the decision of CBD COP 13. • IPCC, GEO and CBD have published reports on the issues, but the topic is broad and information on biodiversity and information services is limited. Increased collaboration with IPCC is needed. • Geographic scope: global and regional	• Activity with high level of complexity.	Priority topic 1: Promoting biodiversity to achieve the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development: Deliverables 1 (a) and 1 (b); and dedicated activities within deliverables of objectives 2 to 5

Country	Intervention requested	Scientific and Policy Relevance [1]Relevance to IPBES (a), urgency (b), policy relevance (c), geographic scope (d), evidence of a need for this work (f), impacts and beneficiaries (h)	Implications for work programme and resource requirements complexity (e), availability of information (g), financial and human resource requirements (i), priority level in case of multiple requests (j)	Indication on how request was addressed
China (2)	***Assessment of links between biodiversity and ecosystem conservation and poverty reduction / alleviation / prevention***.	• In the context that both biodiversity conservation and poverty reduction become political and societal goals in international society and countries, the link between biodiversity and poverty has been widely recognized by both academics and politicians. • The requested action addresses the needs of MEAs that are related to biodiversity and ecosystem services (for example: CBD Aichi Targets). • At international level, intergovernmental organizations, NGOs and universities have been working on biodiversity-poverty relevant research. At regional and national level, policies and practices to achieve biodiversity-development synergy are undertaken. • Geographic scope: global, regional and national scales.	• Activity with high level of complexity. • UNEP-WCMC, World Bank, and Wildlife Conservation Society published reports on relevant issues.	Priority topic 1: Promoting biodiversity to achieve the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development: Deliverable 1 (a); and dedicated activities within deliverables of objectives 2 to 5
China (3)	***Policy support tools and methodologies***	• This request is relevant to the capacity building and policy support functions of IPBES. • Policymakers have had a relatively straightforward understanding of the relevant status quo, but policymakers still have questions about how to deal with emerging problems. Policy tools and methods are not clear. Therefore, a guide of policy support tools and methodologies for decision making is exactly what policymakers need. • The requested action addresses a better achievement of the mainstreaming of biodiversity. • Geographic scope: national or regional.	• Medium complexity. • Large body of available literature.	Priority topic 1: Promoting biodiversity to achieve the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development: Deliverables 2 and 4 (a)
China (4)	***Capacity building*** Keep working on the rolling plan of capacity building; and assess synergy between biodiversity-related conventions	• There are decisions between the seven biodiversity-related Conventions. The requested action will promote the synergy of the seven Conventions, and improve the efficiency of their work. • The assessment of the effectiveness of the decisions regarding biodiversity would related to the global status of biodiversity conservation. • It will promote science support for policy, and help achieve long-term human well-being and sustainable development. • Geographic scope: the geographic scope of the requested action depends on the scope of the decisions.	• Activity with high level of complexity. • Decisions from the seven relevant conventions.	Objective 2: Building capacity

Country	Intervention requested	Scientific and Policy Relevance [1]Relevance to IPBES (a), urgency (b), policy relevance (c), geographic scope (d), evidence of a need for this work (f), impacts and beneficiaries (h)	Implications for work programme and resource requirements *complexity (e), availability of information (g), financial and human resource requirements (i), priority level in case of multiple requests (j)*	Indication on how request was addressed
Colombia (1)	***Selecting and applying indicators of ecosystem collapse for risk assessment***	• Control of the deforestation and illegal traffic of species; Management and sustainable use of the forest (include non-timber woods); focus on technology, biotechnology and bio-economy applications as a strategy for conservation and sustainable development. • Selecting and applying indicators of ecosystem collapse for risk assessments; improve policies to control deforestation and illegal traffic of species. • Absence or limited availability of information and tools to address the issues. • Geographic scope: hotspots in the Neotropical range, mostly rainforest.	• Complexity: relations between poverty, property, use and land degradation. • Several reports available.	Topic 5: Pressures, status and trends concerning biodiversity and ecosystem services: This request could be addressed through an individual thematic assessment later in the work programme, or as a component of a future global assessment of biodiversity and ecosystem services
Colombia (2)	***Biotic interactions for new environmental policies***	• Not enough attention is paid to interactions between the components of biodiversity, which can lead to unnecessary or inefficient efforts. • Understanding these interactions allows to identify ecological networks and are fundamental to understanding the functioning of ecosystem services. • Geographic scope: global, with regional specificities.	• High complexity	Topic 4: Connectivity: MEP and Bureau suggest considering an assessment on connectivity for inclusion as part of the work programme at the time of the second call for requests, input and suggestions.
European Union (1)	***Transformative changes***	• Transformative change is possibly one of the largest challenge human society must undergo to maintain and restore biodiversity and ecosystem services, in the next decade. This request is relevant to all four functions of IPBES. • All recent IPBES reports underline urgency and need to undertake transformative, systemic action. • The request covers all policies in particular on climate change adaptation and biological diversity, on food, housing, well-being policies, but also throughout social and economic policies. • Previous work: see IPBES and IPCC reports suggesting transformative change. • Geographic scope: global.	• High complexity: requires a systemic approach to tackle the indirect drivers and their interactions for loss of biodiversity and ecosystem services. • Information: see IPBES and IPCC reports. Literature on transformational changes. Research projects on transformation hubs.	Priority topic 2: Underlying causes of biodiversity loss and determinants of transformative change: Deliverable 1 (c) and 4 (a)

Country	Intervention requested	Scientific and Policy Relevance [1]Relevance to IPBES (a), urgency (b), policy relevance (c), geographic scope (d), evidence of a need for this work (f), impacts and beneficiaries (h)	Implications for work programme and resource requirements complexity (e), availability of information (g), financial and human resource requirements (i), priority level in case of multiple requests (j)	Indication on how request was addressed
European Union (2)	*The role of ecosystem-based approaches to tackle biodiversity and climate change*	• Ecosystem-based approaches and nature-based solutions provide opportunities for tackling both climate change and biodiversity loss and often deliver benefits for the wider environment, economic and social challenges. • The action is in line with the Paris agreement, the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, CBD, EU biodiversity agenda and the AU process on land degradation and restoration. • Initiatives exist at global level (e.g. Habitat III, Sendai Framework), at country level (e.g. Brazil's nature-based solution agenda), as well as multiple local initiatives. • Geographic scope: global.	• The level of complexity is medium, as the systemic approach to plan and implement ecosystem-based approaches requires complex ramifications. • This request requests work related to assessment, policy tools, capacity-building, communication, and knowledge generation • Duration: less than 3 years	<u>Priority topic 1:</u> Promoting biodiversity to achieve the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development: <u>Deliverables 1 (a), 1(b), 2, 3 (a), 4 (a), 4 (b), and 5(a)</u>
European Union (3)	*Marine Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services*	• The Marine Biodiversity and ecosystems services topic will be in line with the main objective of IPBES work programme 2020-2030. The work shall complement the 2nd World Ocean Assessment. • Although vital for economic and social wellbeing, many of the oceans and seas risk being irreversibly damaged by human activities and climate change. • Policies on the marine environment need to be integrated with those on climate change adaptation and biological diversity. They also need to be integrated with policies on the various sectors involved, such as agriculture, tourism, energy and transport. • Geographic scope: Global	• Global problems require global approaches to be effective. The scale of the problem requires well-concerted efforts.	<u>Topic 5: Pressures, status and trends concerning biodiversity and ecosystem services:</u> This request could be addressed through an individual thematic assessment later in the work programme, or as a component of a future global assessment of biodiversity and ecosystem services

Country	Intervention requested	Scientific and Policy Relevance [1]Relevance to IPBES (a), urgency (b), policy relevance (c), geographic scope (d), evidence of a need for this work (f), impacts and beneficiaries (h)	Implications for work programme and resource requirements complexity (e), availability of information (g), financial and human resource requirements (i), priority level in case of multiple requests (j)	Indication on how request was addressed
European Union (4)	**Assessment of impact of rhizosphere macro & micro biodiversity loss on the productivity and resilience of agri-food systems**	• This action can provide the basis for the evaluation / quantification of the economic benefits of soil biodiversity preservation for food and feed production systems and for carbon sequestration. • It is in line with the Paris agreement, as well as with the UN 2030 Agenda for sustainable development and the Aichi Targets. • More effective soil biodiversity monitoring and assessment strategies will produce new knowledge and more reliable scientific data and evidences to provide policy makers and end-users with critical information on how to better address soil fertility issues with relevant policies. • Geographic scope: global	• Information: FAO (Global Soil Partnership), Global Soil Biodiversity Initiative and World Soil Information.	Priority topic 1: Promoting biodiversity to achieve the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development: Deliverables 1 (a); and dedicated activities within deliverables of objectives 2 to 5
European Union (5)	**Assessment of biodiversity and cities**	• No rationale provided		Priority topic 1: Promoting biodiversity to achieve the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development: Deliverable 1 (a); and dedicated activities within deliverables of objectives 2 to 5
European Union (6)	**Models and scenarios related to biodiversity and climate change**	• Develop models and scenarios extending the Shared Socio-Economic Pathways (SSP) scenarios to show impacts on biodiversity • Develop new set of "nature's futures" scenarios, improving integrated assessments to better represent the ecological processes and biodiversity indicators needed to identify plausible pathways to achieve the goals		Priority topic 1: Promoting biodiversity to achieve the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development: Deliverables 1 (a) and 4 (b); Support to deliverable 4 (b) on scenarios across all topics

Country	Intervention requested	Scientific and Policy Relevance [1]Relevance to IPBES (a), urgency (b), policy relevance (c), geographic scope (d), evidence of a need for this work (f), impacts and beneficiaries (h)	Implications for work programme and resource requirements complexity (e), availability of information (g), financial and human resource requirements (i), priority level in case of multiple requests (j)	Indication on how request was addressed
Finland (1)	**Assessment of the most effective ways to enhance people's health and wellbeing and reduce national health costs through better contact with natural environments.**	• The requested assessment is of high relevance and urgency for IPBES. As most of the world's human populations are living in urban environments, the future of urban biodiversity and ecosystem services they provide are vital for people's well-being. • Through the better knowledge of health effects of bio-diverse environments there is also a very strong business case and job creation possibilities - the economic importance of the preventive role of nature to restrain diseases and reduce national health costs is largely unknown. • Previous work and existing initiatives: information is probably limited from several countries, so the assessment could be focused on those countries where sufficient information on best scientific knowledge and best practices exists. • Geographic scope: global.	• The complexity should be less than in the regional assessments as the geographical coverage is more limited. • There are research and expert networks for biodiversity and human health (e.g. in Europe, the "Coalition of the willing on biodiversity and human health").	Priority topic 1: Promoting biodiversity to achieve the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development: Deliverable 1 (a); and dedicated activities within deliverables of objectives 2 to 5
Finland (2)	**Assessment of urban biodiversity**	• Rapid urbanisation continues across the world, threatening ecosystem services. • The requested assessment is of high relevance and urgency for IPBES. As most of the world's population lives in cities, the future of urban biodiversity and ecosystem services is vital for their well-being. • Information is probably limited for many cities, so the assessment must be focussed on those cities from which sufficient information exists. • Geographic scope: urban/cities, global.	• The complexity should be less than in the regional assessments as the geographical coverage is more limited. • Information: there are networks of urban ecologists. Literature (incl. grey literature) exists as well as local knowledge.	Priority topic 1: Promoting biodiversity to achieve the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development: Deliverable 1 (a); and dedicated activities within deliverables of objectives 2 to 5

Country	Intervention requested	Scientific and Policy Relevance [1]*Relevance to IPBES (a), urgency (b), policy relevance (c), geographic scope (d), evidence of a need for this work (f), impacts and beneficiaries (h)*	Implications for work programme and resource requirements *complexity (e), availability of information (g), financial and human resource requirements (i), priority level in case of multiple requests (j)*	Indication on how request was addressed
Finland (3)	*Global assessment of blue carbon ecosystems*	• Blue carbon, i.e. the carbon stored in coastal and marine ecosystems, is an opportunity for climate change adaptation and mitigation. The function of costal ecosystems is intimately dependent on the biodiversity of these systems, but the link is not assessed. Blue carbon ecosystems also provide essential benefits for climate change adaptation. • Alongside tropical forests and peatlands, coastal ecosystems demonstrate how nature can be used to enhance climate change mitigation strategies and thus offer opportunities for countries to achieve their emissions reduction targets under the Paris Agreement. The three related EU directives indirectly concern blue carbon ecosystems; a better direct link is needed. • Previous work: e.g. IUCN Global Marine and Polar Programme, the Blue Carbon Initiative. • Geographic scope: global	• Several reviews, reports and scientific papers available, but reports and grey literature not compiled.	Priority topic 1: Promoting biodiversity to achieve the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development: Deliverable 1 (a); and dedicated activities within deliverables of objectives 2 to 5
Finland (4)	*Assessment of the fundamental relationship between biodiversity and ecosystem services*	• Understanding the fundamental relationship between biodiversity and ecosystem services forms part of IPBES mission. • This understanding should be obtained early in the life of IPBES. It has potential to be foundational for the platform. • Understanding the causal relationship between the two can support arguments to promote action to safeguard biodiversity. • Geographic scope: global (land and sea).	• There is plenty of literature but no overarching assessment.	Topic 5: Pressures, status and trends concerning biodiversity and ecosystem services: This request could be addressed through an individual thematic assessment later in the work programme, or as a component of a future global assessment of biodiversity and ecosystem services

Country	Intervention requested	Scientific and Policy Relevance [1]Relevance to IPBES (a), urgency (b), policy relevance (c), geographic scope (d), evidence of a need for this work (f), impacts and beneficiaries (h)	Implications for work programme and resource requirements complexity (e), availability of information (g), financial and human resource requirements (i), priority level in case of multiple requests (j)	Indication on how request was addressed
France (1)	*Assessment of the links between biodiversity and health*	• By highlighting the links between biodiversity, healthy ecosystems and human and animal health (following the One Health approach), IPBES would provide considerable support to policymakers to work towards better biodiversity conservation and improved well-being of the populations. • Given the very high level of emerging infectious diseases on the global health agenda, it is especially urgent to recognize this interaction between biodiversity loss and human health and to identify win-win strategies. • There is a wealth of scientific output on the subject which policymakers are not aware of, despite it being a strategic area of interest to the key area of public health. • Geographic scope: global	• This is a complex issue. Many factors are taken into account in both biodiversity and health studies. • There should be sufficient publications to allow IPBES to conduct an assessment. • Resource requirements: about 100 experts, half biodiversity specialists and half medical specialists. • Duration: 3-4 years. • Cost: about $2 million.	Priority topic 1: Promoting biodiversity to achieve the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development: Deliverable 1 (a); and dedicated activities within deliverables of objectives 2 to 5
France (2)	*Assessment of the links between food systems and biodiversity*	• A scientific assessment would pave the way for a more sustainable management of marine resources for food purposes and explore the environmental impacts of new forms of ecological aquaculture. • The issue of food in a broad sense is central because it defines the demand for surface area and for agricultural and sea products at a global level. The values attached to the different diets have a direct impact on biodiversity. • To improve the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity while meeting human food needs (One Health approach), policymakers need to make informed decisions. • High urgency: the trend must be reversed within ten years, otherwise the achievement of all the SDGs will be jeopardized. • Geographic scope: global	• The diversity of existing systems and practices will probably be the most difficult element to cover. • A large multidisciplinary body of literature exists including IPBES reports. • Resource requirements: 70 to 80 experts. • Duration: 3 years. • Cost: about $1.5 million. • Need for an expert group or technical support unit for tools and methodologies.	Priority topic 1: Promoting biodiversity to achieve the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development: Deliverable 1 (a); and dedicated activities within deliverables of objectives 2 to 5 (in particular activities related to deliverable 2 on capacity-building, and 4 (a) on policy support)

Country	Intervention requested	Scientific and Policy Relevance [1]*Relevance to IPBES (a), urgency (b), policy relevance (c), geographic scope (d), evidence of a need for this work (f), impacts and beneficiaries (h)*	Implications for work programme and resource requirements *complexity (e), availability of information (g), financial and human resource requirements (i), priority level in case of multiple requests (j)*	Indication on how request was addressed
France (3)	***Assessment of marine biodiversity and oceans' ecosystem services***	• The species, environments and ecology of the high seas are still very poorly understood and they risk being destroyed even before their potential, limitations and vulnerabilities are understood. • There is an urgent requirement for IPBES to address this issue in the absence of a global policy and legal framework to preserve ocean biodiversity. • IPBES could influence ongoing discussions on the international regulation of the use of resources in the high seas and help to achieve the climate change mitigation and adaptation targets. • The assessment directly addresses several Aichi Biodiversity Targets and the SDGs and is relevant to the UN Convention on the Law of the Sea and the Regional Seas Convention. • Many bodies of work, syntheses and analyses exist, but remain very technical, often subject-specific and reach a limited audience. International initiatives have addressed marine biodiversity, but IPBES provides a single conceptual framework. • Geographic scope: all of the world's oceans and seas.	• High complexity: some issues are already well known while others have significant gaps. • Existing work on deep-sea environments and fish stocks by e.g. CBD, FAO, IUCN, IPCC, Global Ocean Biodiversity Initiative. • Resource requirements for the full assessment: 70-80 experts. • Duration: 3 years. • Cost: about $1.5 million.	Topic 5: Pressures, status and trends concerning biodiversity and ecosystem services: This request could be addressed through an individual thematic assessment later in the work programme, or as a component of a future global assessment of biodiversity and ecosystem services.
France (4)	***Biodiversity and climate:*** ***a) Establish a strong partnership with the IPCC to jointly define the issues and messages to be conveyed*** ***b) Assess biodiversity, climate change and feedbacks*** ***c) Establish a task force on global environmental change scenarios and models***	• Despite the interdependence of climate and biodiversity change, the link between researchers, politicians and stakeholders working on the two issues is not sufficiently established, and IPBES as a science-policy interface can play a privileged role in bringing the topic of biodiversity to the fore, both as a "victim" of climate change and as a mitigation solution. • There is a very urgent need for IPBES to take a clear position on this matter because climate policies are advancing, sometimes at the expense of biodiversity and without any ameliorative effects of mitigating measures. • By addressing the matter early on, IPBES could significantly assist Governments in meeting their commitments under the Paris Agreement. • As climate change and biodiversity loss also jeopardize the success of all the SDGs, highlighting the links between these two global challenges will facilitate a move in the right direction for all the SDGs. • Geographic scope: global.	• IPBES would complement the IPCC approach by analysing biodiversity changes at the genetic and specific level, and by comprehensively exploring the opportunities offered by ecosystem-based solutions. • Information: a significant body of knowledge exists on the effects of climate change on biodiversity, but the study of feedbacks is largely unknown. • Resource requirements: around 100 experts. • Duration 3 years. • Costs: about $1.4 million. • Task force: about 30 people.	Priority topic 1: Promoting biodiversity to achieve the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development: Deliverables 1 (a) and 1 (b); and dedicated activities within deliverables of objectives 2 to 5 (in particular activities related to deliverable 4 (b) on scenarios and models)

Country	Intervention requested	Scientific and Policy Relevance [1]*Relevance to IPBES (a), urgency (b), policy relevance (c), geographic scope (d), evidence of a need for this work (f), impacts and beneficiaries (h)*	Implications for work programme and resource requirements *complexity (e), availability of information (g), financial and human resource requirements (i), priority level in case of multiple requests (j)*	Indication on how request was addressed
France (5)	***Biodiversity and international trade:*** ***Assessment of the impact of international trade on biodiversity***	• IPBES could make recommendations for future tool development where it identifies gaps or opportunities to use bilateral and multilateral international trade policies as drivers of biodiversity preservation. • No particular urgency, but by facilitating a better alignment of trade policies and biodiversity conservation policies, it would greatly improve the integration of biodiversity in all sectors. • Countries or organizations involved in international trade may be committed to preserving biodiversity, but lack the tools to harmonize their trade and environmental policies. In addition, biodiversity issues are rarely addressed in trade agreements, whether bilateral or multilateral. • Previous work: e.g. the OECD and IDDRI. International trade has often been mentioned in previous IPBES assessments as an indirect driver of change, but it has not been the subject of in-depth analysis. • Geographic scope: global	• Relative complexity: many existing publications may be relevant, however they have not necessarily been designed to answer the questions asked. • Resource requirements: a group of 70-80 experts. • Duration: 3 years. • Costs: about $1.5 million.	Priority topic 2: Underlying causes of biodiversity loss and determinants of transformative change: Deliverable 1 (c) and dedicated activities within deliverables of objectives 2 to 5 (in particular deliverables 2 on capacity-building)
France (6)	***Assessment of the situation of indigenous traditional populations that are directly dependent on biodiversity and ecosystem services***	• The ecosystem services provided by biodiversity in areas occupied by indigenous people are doubly important because they contribute to combating poverty and also to the sustainable management of this biodiversity. • High urgency as the natural environments sheltering traditional indigenous populations are disappearing at high speed. Indigenous people and the natural environments they maintain are increasingly affected by the onslaught of extractive industries (e.g. mining). • The synthesis would contribute to the SDGs, the Aichi Biodiversity Targets and to initiatives such as Indigenous and Community Conserved Areas. • A great deal of work exists on the links between the natural environments, patterns of use and population governance, but not in the field of ecology and biology. • Geographic scope: global	• Complexity: the diversity of cultures, environments, contexts, and the difficulty of integrating and assessing traditional knowledge; to distinguish between indigenous communities and local populations or local groups. • Duration: 2 years.	Topic 5: Pressures, status and trends concerning biodiversity and ecosystem services: This request could be addressed through an individual thematic assessment later in the work programme, or as a component of a future global assessment of biodiversity and ecosystem services.

Country	Intervention requested	Scientific and Policy Relevance [1]Relevance to IPBES (a), urgency (b), policy relevance (c), geographic scope (d), evidence of a need for this work (f), impacts and beneficiaries (h)	Implications for work programme and resource requirements complexity (e), availability of information (g), financial and human resource requirements (i), priority level in case of multiple requests (j)	Indication on how request was addressed
France (7)	*Assessment of the impacts of fragmentation on biodiversity at a global level*	• The various political and migration crises have led to the construction of walls and other physical barriers resulting in the continued fragmentation of ecosystems and significant biodiversity loss. • A synthesis by IPBES would bring together existing knowledge on this subject and draw the attention of policymakers to this major issue. It would raise awareness and provide them with tools to address biodiversity loss due to fragmentation. • High urgency: the increase in the world population is likely to lead to new migration crises resulting in the establishment of new infrastructure. • Geographic scope: global	• The difficulty may lie in global forward-looking scenarios. • Information: e.g. work by ICOET. Some causes related to fragmentation are well documented, while others are probably less so. • Resource requirements: about 50 experts. • Duration: 2 years.	Topic 4: Connectivity: MEP and Bureau suggest considering an assessment on connectivity for inclusion as part of the work programme at the time of the second call for requests, input and suggestions.
Japan (1)	*Global assessment of biodiversity and ecosystem services*	• It would assess the achievement of the 2030 Sustainable development agenda, and provide important scientific information for the development of a post 2030 framework. • It should be completed by 2028 (and no later than the first half of 2029). • Previous work: IPBES regional and global assessments. • IPBES should conduct global assessments regularly. • Overlap with work by CBD, such as future Global Biodiversity Outlooks, should be minimized and synergies maximized. • Geographic scope: global	• Information: the IPCC Sixth Assessment Report, IPBES assessments, and the Open SDG Data Hub. • Resource requirements: if regional and global assessments are integrated into a single assessment, it can be implemented more efficiently. • Duration: 4-5 years.	Topic 5: Pressures, status and trends concerning biodiversity and ecosystem services: MEP and Bureau suggest to give a high priority to a second global assessment, with an integrated regional component, which the Plenary could consider at its tenth session, in the context of a second call for requests
Japan (2)	*Methodological assessment of the effectiveness of policy measures and policy support tools for the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity, and improvement of the policy support catalogue*	• The effectiveness of policy measures and policy support tools have not yet been sufficiently verified in assessments by IPBES. • Assessing the effectiveness of policy support tools and methodologies and improving contents of the catalogue are important for societal implementation of all tools and deliverables of IPBES. • Geographic scope: analysis at national or sub-national level is most valuable for policymakers. However, regional level could also be useful in light of multi-national cooperation. • Previous work: information from the first work programme can be utilized. Furthermore, official Government websites and national biodiversity strategy and action plan of CBD are also useful.	• It is necessary to collect and arrange documents published by each Government as well as scientific literature. • Complexity not very high.	Objective 4: Supporting policy: Deliverable 4 (a)

Country	Intervention requested	Scientific and Policy Relevance [1]Relevance to IPBES (a), urgency (b), policy relevance (c), geographic scope (d), evidence of a need for this work (f), impacts and beneficiaries (h)	Implications for work programme and resource requirements *complexity (e), availability of information (g), financial and human resource requirements (i), priority level in case of multiple requests (j)*	Indication on how request was addressed
Japan (3)	*Assessment of the indicators to evaluate the potential positive and negative impacts of business sectors on biodiversity and ecosystem services*	• As impacts of business sectors on biodiversity and ecosystem services have already been notable, it is important to urgently formulate respective indicators that can quantify an impact of each industry. • Previous work: the UNEP-WCMC report: "Biodiversity Indicators for Extractive Companies. An Assessment of Needs, Current Practices and Potential Indicator Models". • Geographic scope: global	• Resource requirements: same as the one of the assessment of methodologies. Duration: approx. 2 years.	Priority topic 3: Measuring business impact and dependency on biodiversity and nature's contribution to people: Deliverable 1(d) and dedicated activities within deliverables of objectives 2 to 5
Mexico (1)	*Assessment of pollution impacts on biodiversity, ecosystem services and well-being*	• Pollution is one of the five drivers of biodiversity loss. IPBES already addressed three drivers (land degradation, as part of habitat loss, invasive species, and overexploitation, through sustainable use assessment, and it would be important to address this fourth one. • Data available on pollution are extremely scarce and there is a lack of connection on cause-effect policy, from productive sectors and biodiversity interactions including measures to address it in a practical fashion. • Pollution has been addressed in silos, whether by ecosystem (e.g. air, coastal, marine) or by type of pollutant (e.g. plastic, acid rain, coal), and the topic needs to be addressed with a holistic approach in terms of global impacts on biodiversity to provide multidisciplinary and cross-cutting options. • Geographic scope: global, regional, national and sub-national scope.	• The complexity of the assessment will depend on the scoping proposed by the experts and approved by the Plenary. • Resource requirements: similar to other thematic assessments.	Topic 5: Pressures, status and trends concerning biodiversity and ecosystem services: This request could be addressed through an individual thematic assessment later in the work programme, or as a component of a future global assessment of biodiversity and ecosystem services.

Country	Intervention requested	Scientific and Policy Relevance [1]Relevance to IPBES (a), urgency (b), policy relevance (c), geographic scope (d), evidence of a need for this work (f), impacts and beneficiaries (h)	Implications for work programme and resource requirements complexity (e), availability of information (g), financial and human resource requirements (i), priority level in case of multiple requests (j)	Indication on how request was addressed
Mexico (2)	*Task force on biodiversity mainstreaming and synergies*	• The active involvement of productive sectors in IPBES is crucial to achieve conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity. • There is a need to provide options for policy-making in productive sectors integrating considerations of biodiversity conservation and sustainable use to ensure the proper use of biodiversity not only for economic growth, but also for food security and social equity. • Biodiversity mainstreaming provides a framework to achieve the collaboration of diverse sectors and stakeholders. • The second work programme of IPBES needs a transversal and holistic approach that promotes quality of life in many dimensions • Previous work: biodiversity mainstreaming is being addressed by e.g. CBD and WTO and international organisations, but need for options for policy makers. • Geographic scope: global, national and sub-national scope.	• The level of complexity may be high considering that cross-sectoral coordination is required and that the concept of mainstreaming needs to be brought from the international discussions down to the sub-national level for effective internalization. • Valuable materials exist (e.g. publications and case studies). • Similar financial and human annual requirements as other task forces. • Duration: the second work programme.	Priority topic 3: Measuring business impact and dependency on biodiversity and nature's contribution to people: This request could be addressed by deliverable 1(d) and deliverables within objectives 2 to 5
Mexico (3)	*Task force on monitoring systems and generation of data on biodiversity and ecosystem services*	• Effective monitoring systems for biodiversity and ecosystem services need to be put in place in order to implement effective policies regarding biodiversity and ecosystem services. One example is the national biodiversity monitoring system pioneered by Mexico. • This would allow inclusion of information regarding biodiversity and ecosystem services in national accounting systems, which is hampering the progress of the System of Environmental-Economic Accounting-Experimental Ecosystem Accounting of the United Nations Statistics Division (SEEA-EEA). • Geographic scope: global and regional	• Establishing a task force should be easy, however, filling the gap with information is difficult and will need time • Information: meta-analysis, expert group, monitoring projects. • Resource requirements: meta-analysis, expert group, monitoring projects. • Duration: 1-5 years.	Topic 5: Pressures, status and trends concerning biodiversity and ecosystem services: This request could be addressed through an individual thematic assessment later in the work programme, or as a component of a future global assessment of biodiversity and ecosystem services. IPBES would not organise the collection of primary data but could assess what is available globally in terms of monitoring systems.

Country	Intervention requested	Scientific and Policy Relevance [1]Relevance to IPBES (a), urgency (b), policy relevance (c), geographic scope (d), evidence of a need for this work (f), impacts and beneficiaries (h)	Implications for work programme and resource requirements complexity (e), availability of information (g), financial and human resource requirements (i), priority level in case of multiple requests (j)	Indication on how request was addressed
New Zealand	*Policy support tools and mechanism for climate change adaptation and mitigation*	• Requesting IPBES to consider establishing a work stream on the development of policy support tools and mechanisms for sustainable and resilient mitigation and adaption to climate change and climate change impacts in its future work programme. • The proposal would develop appropriate policy support tools and mechanisms to improve concerted action on sustainable, resilient mitigation and adaptation, as well as ecological adaptation, to climate change. • The proposal would develop policy support tools and mechanisms that take into account the interlinkages between climate change, biodiversity, ecosystem services and human well-being, in particular. • Work would seek collaborate widely for gathering available expertise, realise efficiencies and implementation, e.g. with the IPCC, Ramsar, and other relevant bodies in science and policy areas. • There is a plethora of knowledge on climate change, its current and future impacts on biodiversity, ecosystems and ecosystem functions, ecosystem services, western and traditional societies. • Geographic scope: from the local to the global scale.	• High complexity due to the variation in the extent of climate change impacts at the local scale. • Impacts of climate change, options, risks and opportunities for mitigation and possible actions for adaptation have been researched extensively. • Resource requirements: Duration: medium-term project time frame of approximately 5-7 years. Similar scope as IPBES' recent regional assessments. • 100 experts • Costs: about $1 million.	Priority topic 1: Promoting biodiversity to achieve the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development: Deliverable 4 (a)

Country	Intervention requested	Scientific and Policy Relevance [1]Relevance to IPBES (a), urgency (b), policy relevance (c), geographic scope (d), evidence of a need for this work (f), impacts and beneficiaries (h)	Implications for work programme and resource requirements complexity (e), availability of information (g), financial and human resource requirements (i), priority level in case of multiple requests (j)	Indication on how request was addressed
Norway (1)	*Assessment of the biodiversity – climate nexus*	• A first sub-theme relates to the transition to a low carbon society, which will most likely lead to an increased use of biomass. There is a need for increased knowledge on how this will affect ecosystems and which mitigation measures may be relevant. • This topic is urgent as the phasing out of fossil energy will rapidly lead to an increased pressure on ecosystems that already are under pressure. • Geographic scope: all regions, however, the assessment will perhaps be particularly relevant for regions facing challenges of permanent deforestation and wetland drainage due to the production of bio fuels. • A second sub-theme relates to the impact of the methods to capture and store carbon on biodiversity (BECCS). • Thi theme is relevant as a cross-cutting issue for IPCC and IPBES. • An assessment of societal and environmental risks and opportunities is needed, including an analysis of recommended global and national regulations before carbon capture and storage are deployed on a large scale. • Geographic scope: global, national.	• This work will be of high complexity due to the need to consider both climate measures and biodiversity/ecosystem impacts in a way that the IPCC and IPBES has perhaps not done previously, and the need to consider literature that deals with the crosscutting nature of this issue, as there will probably be a majority of literature that deals with "either/or". • High complexity and will require a trans-disciplinary approach.	Priority topic 1: Promoting biodiversity to achieve the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development: Deliverables 1 (a) and 1 (b); and dedicated activities within deliverables of objectives 2 to 5
Norway (2)	*Assessment of the biodiversity – food security/agriculture nexus*	• Availability of food and nutrition, and equitability in access are major issues in a world with a growing population. • IPBES could assess several dimensions of the biodiversity/food security/agriculture complex, including production systems (intensive, extensive, agroecology); status of soil biodiversity; importance of genetic diversity in wild species, in the context of climate change; effectiveness of various policy instruments.	• Information: TEEB for Agriculture; IAASTD; IPBES-assessments of pollination and of land degradation and restoration.	Priority topic 1: Promoting biodiversity to achieve the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development: Deliverables 1 (a) and 1 (b); and dedicated activities within deliverables of objectives 2 to 5

Country	Intervention requested	Scientific and Policy Relevance [1]Relevance to IPBES (a), urgency (b), policy relevance (c), geographic scope (d), evidence of a need for this work (f), impacts and beneficiaries (h)	Implications for work programme and resource requirements complexity (e), availability of information (g), financial and human resource requirements (i), priority level in case of multiple requests (j)	Indication on how request was addressed
Norway (3)	*Assessment of climate change impact on marine ecosystems*	• Several assessments already exist (e.g. Global Biodiversity Outlook, World Ocean Assessment, IPCC) but there is a need to assess the impact that changes in oceanographic conditions due to climate change (e.g. temperature, current, saline levels) would have on biodiversity and ecosystems.		This would be addressed under Priority topic 1 (deliverables 1 (a), 1 (b) and dedicated activities within the deliverables of objectives 2 to 5 on topic 1), which would address biodiversity and climate change; and could also be addressed under topic 5.
South Africa (1)	*Assessments on the Nagoya Protocol (access and benefit-sharing in relation to digital sequencing)*	• Access and benefit sharing through the implementation of the Nagoya Protocol requires a baseline. • The action is therefore urgent as it will assist in collating and sharing information on indigenous knowledge systems as well as on impact on poverty eradication, and how resources are utilised on different scales. • Relevance: Nagoya Protocol and other access and benefit sharing legislation. • Geographic scope: national, regional and global scales.	• The issues to be addressed will be similar for most countries and frameworks that can come out of the action can be globally applied. • Different countries may have data available • Resource requirements: a group of experts across different regions.	Topic 5: Pressures, status and trends concerning biodiversity and ecosystem services: This request could be addressed through an individual thematic assessment later in the work programme, or as a component of a future global assessment of biodiversity and ecosystem services.
South Africa (2)	*Thematic assessment of cultural heritage conservation and sustainable use thereof*	• Cultural heritage is often ignored. • The action is therefore of relative urgency as it will assist in collating and sharing information regarding cultural heritage conservation and how it is utilised on different scales. • It is assumed that the available cultural heritage information is not adequate to demonstrate its value to society (beyond tourism and recreation). • There are no known concerted efforts to deal with the issues. • Geographic scope: national, regional and global scale.	• A panel of experts across different regions. • Different countries may have data available. • Resource requirements: a group of experts across different regions.	Topic 5: Pressures, status and trends concerning biodiversity and ecosystem services: This request could be addressed through an individual thematic assessment later in the work programme, or as a component of a future global assessment of biodiversity and ecosystem services

Country	Intervention requested	Scientific and Policy Relevance [1]Relevance to IPBES (a), urgency (b), policy relevance (c), geographic scope (d), evidence of a need for this work (f), impacts and beneficiaries (h)	Implications for work programme and resource requirements complexity (e), availability of information (g), financial and human resource requirements (i), priority level in case of multiple requests (j)	Indication on how request was addressed
South Africa (3)	*Thematic assessment of wildlife diseases and their control and strengthening capacity and tools*	• There is a need to consolidate resources that are available about the extent of wildlife diseases and their control. • Previous work: there is a need to consolidate the existing activities, identification of existing gaps and how these gaps could be addressed. • Geographic scope: national, regional and global scale.	• Resource requirements: a technical support unit.	Priority topic 1: Promoting biodiversity to achieve the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development: Deliverable 1 (a); and dedicated activities within deliverables of objectives 2 to 5
South Africa (4)	*Thematic assessment of vegetation and its monitoring*	• There is a need to consolidate timely and spatially explicit information about vegetation extent, quality and condition. The vegetation condition is important for determining stocking rates and carrying capacity of various ecosystems. This shall help in reduction of the land degradation and animal mortality. After the consolidation, it is important to develop a vegetation monitoring system. • Relevance: information about vegetation condition important for contributing to policies related to stocking rate / carrying capacity for both livestock and wild animals; forests and fires, etc. • At national level, various Government or programmes fund initiatives on vegetation assessments or monitoring; need to consolidate the activities, to identify existing gaps, and how they can be addressed. • Geographic scope: national and regional scale.	• The action shall require a review of existing activities pertaining to vegetation monitoring, identification of gaps and of initiatives required to address the gaps. The approach and tools shall involve the use of earth observation tools. • Duration: 3 years.	Topic 5: Pressures, status and trends concerning biodiversity and ecosystem services: This request could be addressed through an individual thematic assessment later in the work programme, or as a component of a future global assessment of biodiversity and ecosystem services

Country	Intervention requested	Scientific and Policy Relevance [1]Relevance to IPBES (a), urgency (b), policy relevance (c), geographic scope (d), evidence of a need for this work (f), impacts and beneficiaries (h)	Implications for work programme and resource requirements complexity (e), availability of information (g), financial and human resource requirements (i), priority level in case of multiple requests (j)	Indication on how request was addressed
South Africa (5)	***Thematic assessment of freshwater ecosystems, quality, quantity, monitoring, uses and strengthening capacity and tools***	• There is a need to sample, consolidate and analyse data to determine the current status of freshwater ecosystem in relation to its habitats, water quality, water flow and biodiversity (indigenous and alien). • Information about freshwater ecosystem condition is important for contributing to policies related to water services and catchments; food security; environment; and alien invasive species. • Previous work: the national aquatic ecosystem monitoring programmes of different Government departments. • Geographic scope: national, regional and global scale.	• Literature could be available from publications, research institutions and Government archives. • Duration: 3 years.	Topic 5: Pressures, status and trends concerning biodiversity and ecosystem services: This request could be addressed through an individual thematic assessment later in the work programme, or as a component of a future global assessment of biodiversity and ecosystem services
United Kingdom	***General remarks***	• Notes that earliest opportunity to start an assessment would be 2021. • Supports a longer-term strategic work programme with some flexibility to accommodate emerging needs. • Supports a closer alignment between IPBES expert groups and related work under other processes, agreements and institutions. • Anticipate need for a further global assessment aligned with the cycle of reporting the post 2020 biodiversity framework. • Interested in exploring options for developing the evidence base to support transformational change including the nexus of biodiversity, food, energy and health. • Ensure a more coherent approach to assessments undertaken by MEAs, UN agencies and platforms such as IPBES and IPCC.		Priority topic 2: Underlying causes of biodiversity loss: Deliverable 1 (c) Remarks taken into account in the development of the work programme up to 2030

Country	Intervention requested	Scientific and Policy Relevance [1]Relevance to IPBES (a), urgency (b), policy relevance (c), geographic scope (d), evidence of a need for this work (f), impacts and beneficiaries (h)	Implications for work programme and resource requirements complexity (e), availability of information (g), financial and human resource requirements (i), priority level in case of multiple requests (j)	Indication on how request was addressed
United Sates of America	*Thematic assessment of freshwater biodiversity services*	• The topic is highly relevant to policy and decision making as assessment of the major threats to freshwater biodiversity, impacts to nature's contributions to people provided, such as food and income security, and policy options to counteract or mitigate those threats will provide specific strategies for policy makers to enact given a certain threat or impact to freshwater biodiversity. • Freshwater biodiversity is also directly related to achievement of international policy goals, including Aichi Biodiversity Targets and SDGs. • Data limitations and capacity remain one of the largest gaps in addressing the issue of maintaining the contributions to people provided by freshwater biodiversity. Current limitations exist for truly valuing freshwater biodiversity. • Examples of existing initiatives: Freshwater Biodiversity Observation Network, BioFresh project and WaterFuture. • Geographic scope: global freshwater ecosystems.	• This assessment would have a fairly narrow focus as it will only cover freshwater ecosystems. This decreases the level of complexity slightly and can increase the relevance to policymaking. • A literature review to identify available data and best practices related to policy and management decisions to freshwater biodiversity. • Financial and human resources similar to that of the invasive species thematic assessment. • Duration: 2 years.	Topic 5: Pressures, status and trends concerning biodiversity and ecosystem services: This request could be addressed through an individual thematic assessment later in the work programme, or as a component of a future global assessment of biodiversity and ecosystem services
Inputs and suggestions by United Nations bodies				
FAO	*Overall remarks*	• Increase collaboration on the themes of soil biodiversity and biodiversity for food and agriculture. • Increase collaboration by identifying concrete areas of collaboration and increase the visibility of collaboration with the four United Nations partners of IPBES.		Priority topic 1: Promoting biodiversity to achieve the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development: Deliverable 1(a) Objective 5: Communicating and engaging
UNDP	*Overall remarks*	• Support from partners towards the IPBES capacity building rolling plan could be more formally integrated into the new work programme and communication with partners on such support be more open and proactive. • Coordination and synergy with other MEAs should be mainstreamed throughout all IPBES functions, not only at the assessment phase but also during policy support, capacity/knowledge building and communication / outreach phases so as to ensure the alignment of works, reduce cost and maximize the impacts. • The new work programme should elaborate on how different functions/areas of work and related policy relevant questions will contribute to realizing different SDGs and targets.		Objective 2: Building capacity Objective 5: Communicating and engaging

Country	Intervention requested	Scientific and Policy Relevance [1]*Relevance to IPBES (a), urgency (b), policy relevance (c), geographic scope (d), evidence of a need for this work (f), impacts and beneficiaries (h)*	Implications for work programme and resource requirements *complexity (e), availability of information (g), financial and human resource requirements (i), priority level in case of multiple requests (j)*	Indication on how request was addressed
United Nations Environment Programme	*Overall remarks*	• In order to increase the impact and uptake of existing IPBES assessments as well as those that will be prepared, technical papers and syntheses for specific audiences focused on their needs and interests could be developed. • It is important that IPBES retains the flexibility necessary in order to be able to respond to the post 2020 global biodiversity framework once it is agreed, and to provide the assessments and other activities that will support its implementation at all levels, including with different stakeholder groups. • For the future work programme, a change in perspective is advisable. We propose to move to the centre of the conceptual framework and initiate the thinking from the perspective of 'institutions and governance and other indirect drivers. This will allow IPBES to move the spotlight to the underlying causes of biodiversity loss and depletion of ecosystems and consequently solutions for addressing drivers.		Priority topic 1: deliverable 1 (b) Objective 5 Communicating and engaging Priority topic 2: Underlying causes of biodiversity loss and determinants of transformative change
United Nations Environment Programme (1)	*Assessment of the dependencies of specific sectors on biodiversity and ecosystem services*	• Increased understanding of the importance of biodiversity and ecosystem services for delivery in different sectors will increase efforts and options for ensuring the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity, including through strengthening the basis for mainstreaming. • This is directly relevant to efforts to address the SDGs and a post-2020 global biodiversity framework.		Priority topic 3: Measuring business impact and dependency on biodiversity and nature's contribution to people
United Nations Environment Programme (2)	*Nature as part of the solution to climate change*	• All four IPBES functions could be brought together in an integrated way to increase understanding of how nature-based solutions provide a valid basis for responding to climate change, and to share understanding of how and when those solutions can be applied. This could include both a thematic and a methodological assessment, and related activities in use of policy support tools and methodologies, communication and associated capacity building.		Priority topic 1: Promoting biodiversity to achieve the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development: Deliverable 1 (a); and dedicated activities within deliverables of objectives 2 to 5
United Nations Environment Programme (3)	*Assessment of the biodiversity implications of strengthened response to climate change*	• The IPCC special report on the impacts of global warming of 1.5° includes the potential for development and deployment of adaptation and mitigation responses, including options for implementing far-reaching and rapid change. Some of the likely options, including for example substantial increase in use of bio-energy, may have very significant implications for biodiversity and ecosystem services. Such options will need relatively rapid assessment to consider these implications and how they might be addressed.		Priority topic 1: Promoting biodiversity to achieve the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development: Deliverable 1 (b)

Country	Intervention requested	Scientific and Policy Relevance [1]*Relevance to IPBES (a), urgency (b), policy relevance (c), geographic scope (d), evidence of a need for this work (f), impacts and beneficiaries (h)*	Implications for work programme and resource requirements *complexity (e), availability of information (g), financial and human resource requirements (i), priority level in case of multiple requests (j)*	Indication on how request was addressed
United Nations Environment Programme (4)	***Methodological assessments on policy support tools***	• Methodological assessments on groups of different policy support tools and methodologies could help support members of the platform understand more fully the range of tools and methodologies and how they might be able to be applied. Such assessments would support the policy support function of IPBES. Findings and outputs of assessments can then be picked up by the capacity building function to improve access and capacity to use such tools and methodologies. Highlighted gaps can then inform the development of new policy support tools and methodologies.		Objective 2: Building capacity Objective 4: Supporting policy
United Nations Environment Programme (5)	***Ongoing evaluation of impact***	• Activities to review the impact of IPBES on different audiences should be built into the work programme. Such activities help in ensuring the target audiences are being reached, and in the right way, providing opportunities both for demonstrating the value added of IPBES and for learning lessons for future work. • This would also include elements of capacity building in order to increase understanding of impact, and the ways in which it is assessed.		Objective 5: Communicating and engaging Objective 6: Reviewing effectiveness
UNESCO	1. To undertake a review of lessons learned from the outcomes and impact of the assessments. 2. To undertake an assessment on ocean acidification and take in consideration changes of specific concern to the achievement of SDGs by Small Island Developing States. 3. To assess the biodiversity component of the behavioural, social, economic, institutional, technical and technological determinants of transformational change. 4. To assess the nexus of biodiversity, food and water, agriculture and health and nutrition. 5. To consider increasing the duration of assessments to increase the opportunity for face to face contact between stakeholders. 6. To work on scenarios and models to assess the transformational change required for implementing Agenda 2030. 7. To apply participatory and cross-scale scenario methods in order to enhance the relevance and use of scenarios. 8. To promote coherence between the scenarios and related assessments prepared in the context of biodiversity and climate change. 9. To develop a new narrative as regards biodiversity, to demonstrate that tools and solutions for achieving SDG 15 are also essential for goals related to e.g. climate change. 10. To address key gaps in methods for modelling the impacts of drivers and policy interventions on biodiversity and ecosystem services. 11. To undertake methodological assessments on the effectiveness of various policy instruments and policy and planning support tools. 12. To produce specific technical papers for specific audiences to increase uptake of the assessments. 13. To encourage governments, scientists and indigenous peoples to engage in dialogues and capacity building on how to contribute to IPBES assessments. 14. To provide training in biodiversity and ecosystem monitoring and assessment. 15. To encourage empowerment and participation of local communities, women and youth. 16. To engage in a methodological assessment of ILK in biodiversity research, monitoring and assessments. 17. To promote the coordinated development of existing portals to facilitate access to policy support tools and methodologies.		For 1: Objective 6 For 2: Topic 5 For 3: Priority topic 2, deliverable 1 (c) For 4: Priority topic 1, deliverable 1 (a) For 6 to 8, 10: Deliverable 4 (b) For 11: Objective 4 For 12: Deliverable 1 (b) For 13: Deliverables 3 (b) and 5(b) For 17: Deliverable 4 (a)

Country	Intervention requested	Scientific and Policy Relevance [1]Relevance to IPBES (a), urgency (b), policy relevance (c), geographic scope (d), evidence of a need for this work (f), impacts and beneficiaries (h)	Implications for work programme and resource requirements complexity (e), availability of information (g), financial and human resource requirements (i), priority level in case of multiple requests (j)	Indication on how request was addressed
Inputs and suggestions by relevant stakeholders				
African Model Forests Network (1)	*Ensure that the lack of information in the countries of Central, North and West Africa is bridged by introducing IPBES assessments in these regions (selected countries)*	• The purpose, functions and work programme of IPBES at the African level can only be effective if the evaluation is launched in all targeted African countries. • The extension of IPBES assessments to other African countries is urgent because it will provide more complete data than in previous assessments and encourages countries to protect biodiversity in their territories and ecosystems. • The extension of the IPBES assessment to all countries of Central, North and West Africa would be an innovative initiative. • Geographic scope: Central Africa, Nord Africa and West Africa.	• The extension of the IPBES assessment to all Central, North and West African countries will be quite complex because data are missing in many of these countries. • Resource requirements: scientific and technical support staff. Costs $1.3 million. • Duration 4 years.	Topic 5: Pressures, status and trends concerning biodiversity and ecosystem services: Objective 2: Building capacity
African Model Forests Network (2)	*Integration of the biodiversity of organisms (macro and micro) of soils into IPBES assessments*	• With the integration of the soil fauna in IPBES assessment, the work will have a global vision of global biodiversity and will be able to give new recommendations taking into account the contributions of these organisms to human well-being, the protection of ecosystems and the problems that may arise from their destruction. • The study of soil microorganisms is urgent because it could help increase agricultural production in a sustainable way, combat climate change and maintain the balance of ecosystems. • Geographic scope: Africa, Americas, Asia and the Pacific, Europe and Central Asia.	• The integration of soil fauna into the IPBES assessment is quite complex as it opens up a new perspective on the concept of biodiversity and goes beyond conventional frameworks. • A significant amount of soil fauna studies are available both globally and regionally. • Resource requirements: experts for the strengthening of scientific teams. • Cost: $2 million. • Duration: 5 years.	Topic 5: Pressures, status and trends concerning biodiversity and ecosystem services: This request could be addressed through an individual thematic assessment later in the work programme, or as a component of a future global assessment of biodiversity and ecosystem services

Country	Intervention requested	Scientific and Policy Relevance [1]*Relevance to IPBES (a), urgency (b), policy relevance (c), geographic scope (d), evidence of a need for this work (f), impacts and beneficiaries (h)*	Implications for work programme and resource requirements *complexity (e), availability of information (g), financial and human resource requirements (i), priority level in case of multiple requests (j)*	Indication on how request was addressed
Bioversity International, CGIAR and EAT	***Nexus topic on food, environment and health***	• Foods impact on human and environmental health is increasingly evident, yet its capacity to flip from principle driver of degradation, to primary means of resolving multiple global challenges offer a major opportunity for policy action. • IPBES is uniquely placed to tackle this challenge as it has as partners the primary UN agencies responsible for food (FAO), environmental protection (United Nations Environment Programme) and cultural identity (UNESCO). • There is significant global expertise regarding public health, agronomy, earth sciences and nutrition amongst other disciplines, but it is poorly integrated. • Geographic scope: global with regional/national distinction,	• Information: scientific literature is available, e.g. TEEBAgriFood study • Cost: $3.3 million • Duration: 2-3 years.	Priority topic 1: Promoting biodiversity to achieve the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development: Deliverable 1 (a)
European Association for the Conservation of Geological Heritage	***Geological diversity***	• IPBES should include geological diversity (abiotic components of nature) in its consideration of nature's contribution to people, in addition to biological diversity. • Geographic scope: global	• Scientific literature is available. • Geoscientists would need to be included	Topic 5: Pressures, status and trends concerning biodiversity and ecosystem services: Objective 1: assessing knowledge
European Land-use Institute	***Urbanization, biodiversity and ecosystem services***	• Gradients of biodiversity and ecosystem services from rural-peri-urban to urban areas should be considered by IPBES. • Previous work: several European studies on urban development and single studies on urban development pattern in the Americas and Africa. • Geographic scope: key metropolitan areas along the gradient from urban centres to rural areas would be requested for all relevant world regions.	• The level of complexity is high. • Information: a large number of smaller studies, but are mostly isolated and not well integrated. • Resource requirements: author team of 5-10 person. Duration 2 years.	Topic 5: Pressures, status and trends concerning biodiversity and ecosystem services: Objective 1: assessing knowledge

Country	Intervention requested	Scientific and Policy Relevance [1]*Relevance to IPBES (a), urgency (b), policy relevance (c), geographic scope (d), evidence of a need for this work (f), impacts and beneficiaries (h)*	Implications for work programme and resource requirements *complexity (e), availability of information (g), financial and human resource requirements (i), priority level in case of multiple requests (j)*	Indication on how request was addressed
Global Soil Biodiversity Initiative (1)	***Integration of the multiple disciplines of soil biodiversity science and the ecosystem services they provide into the broader context of reports and assessments of overall biodiversity***	• Soil biodiversity represents a major terrestrial biodiversity pool, supports key ecosystem services and is under pressure from human activities. • It is however not protected, like aboveground biodiversity, and should be better integrated into the work of IPBES. • The integration is regarded as urgent because soils and their biota are at risk globally. • Examples of previous work: the Global Soil Biodiversity Initiative and the Global Soil Biodiversity Atlas; multiple scientific societies embracing global soil biodiversity research. • Geographic scope: global	• Integration of knowledge from publications as well as from databases, universities etc. could add to the complexity. Integration of soil biodiversity into past assessments of aboveground biodiversity will be more complicated. • Research on soil biodiversity science has accelerated in the past 10 years with the advent of new technologies. And it has broadened to incorporate all peoples, and many earth system cycles.	<u>Topic 5:</u> Pressures, status and trends concerning biodiversity and ecosystem services: <u>Objective 1</u>: assessing knowledge
Global Soil Biodiversity Initiative (2)	***A global soil biodiversity assessment***	• To fill knowledge gaps in our understanding of the status of global soil biodiversity, biogeography, threats to soil biodiversity, and the services it provides; and to address conservation, restoration and sustainable use of soil biota. • The assessment will cross biome and geographic regions and integrate soil life and habitat rather than the current disciplinary approach of separating each group of taxa from the physical habitat, and the response of biota to global changes. • The absence of patterns and trends of soil biota in current and past assessments hampers the ability of society to recognize their importance and protect them. • Examples of previous work: IBPES Report on Land Degradation and Restoration, the Global Soil Biodiversity Initiative, GEF Tropical Soil Biology and Fertility Programme; and multiple scientific societies that are embracing global soil biodiversity research. • Geographic scope: global	• Research on soil biodiversity science has accelerated in the past 10 years with the advent of new technologies.	<u>Topic 5:</u> Pressures, status and trends concerning biodiversity and ecosystem services: <u>Objective 1</u>: assessing knowledge

Country	Intervention requested	Scientific and Policy Relevance [1]Relevance to IPBES (a), urgency (b), policy relevance (c), geographic scope (d), evidence of a need for this work (f), impacts and beneficiaries (h)	Implications for work programme and resource requirements complexity (e), availability of information (g), financial and human resource requirements (i), priority level in case of multiple requests (j)	Indication on how request was addressed
ICLEI Africa (1)	*Assessment of nature's benefits in African cities to support decision-making in the near-term*.	• This input relates to providing the tools to support decision-making that explicitly incorporate nature's benefits into cities. • Decision-makers need evidence for example of how greening supports the urban economy via, for example, improved air quality, or human health. • ICLEI has been involved across Africa on a project-basis, but strategic and programmatic support from IPBES could create the critical mass of interest, science, policy and practice needed to create a more sustainable track for nature's benefits in African cities. • Geographic scope: a selection of 'pilot' African cities.	• ICLEI already works directly with many African city leaders and officials. • Resource requirements: 3 to 5 years of support to urban ecosystem services assessments.	<u>Priority</u> <u>topic 1:</u> Promoting biodiversity to achieve the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development: <u>Deliverables 1 (a), 2, 4 (a)</u>
ICLEI Africa (2)	Two longer-term needs are identified. *(1) African cities are lacking in inventories and basic information about their urban biodiversity.* *(2) Related to the short-term request, a major gap (and opportunity) in African cities is to showcase nature's benefits through small-scale demonstration projects.*	• Improved species inventories would greatly support decision-making around conservation priorities and economic development opportunities such as eco-tourism. • Small scale demonstration projects would be powerful in rapidly growing African cities where conventional planning approaches (e.g. master planning) have been outstripped by informal development, calling for novel approaches.	• ICLEI already works directly with many African city leaders and officials; Resource requirements: at least 3 to 5 years of support to urban ecosystem services assessments.	The theme of this project is relevant to: <u>Priority</u> <u>topic 1:</u> Promoting biodiversity to achieve the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development: <u>Deliverables 1 (a);</u> <u>Objective 2: building</u> <u>capacity</u>
Institute of Geography, Russian Academy of Sciences	*Designing ecological corridors linking the Great Eurasian Natural Massive in Russia with natural and developed territories in Central and Western Europe for improving access of people to ecosystem services*	• The project aims to develop a basic scheme for the establishment of a transcontinental green infrastructure. • Previous work: e.g. Emerald/NATURA-2000, the Great Eurasian Natural Massive project and the Green Belt of Fenno-Scandia project. • Geographic scope: transcontinental. The Great Eurasian Natural Massive extends from the Pacific to Fenno-Scandia. It should be linked with natural and developed areas in Central and Western Europe.		The theme of this project is relevant to: <u>Topic 4: Connectivity</u>

Country	Intervention requested	Scientific and Policy Relevance [1]Relevance to IPBES (a), urgency (b), policy relevance (c), geographic scope (d), evidence of a need for this work (f), impacts and beneficiaries (h)	Implications for work programme and resource requirements complexity (e), availability of information (g), financial and human resource requirements (i), priority level in case of multiple requests (j)	Indication on how request was addressed
IGES	**General remarks**	• Minimise overlap between IPBES assessments: it is suggested to focus scarce financial and human resources on thematic and global assessments, rather than repeating regional assessments in future work programmes. • The full schedule of future assessments should be clarified and built into future work programmes. • A robust mechanism should be set up to encourage cross-scale integration in IPBES assessments particularly from smaller to larger scales. The Satoyama Initiative, established at CBD/COP-10 under the auspices of CBD and led by the Japanese Government, has developed a community of practitioners that would be capable of supporting such activities. • The processes to incorporate indigenous and local knowledge (ILK) into assessments should be strengthened by a thorough assessment of the first work programme. • It is suggested to make authorship dependent on authors' contributions. • It is suggested to have slightly longer Plenary sessions and a longer interval between sessions of the Plenary. • The uptake of assessment findings should more explicitly and formally be incorporated into assessment design.		
Institute for Sustainable Development and Research, India	**An assessment of marine biodiversity**	• Marine biodiversity conservation needs urgent attention to address the issues on coastal population livelihood. • Geographic scope: Asia and Africa should be given more focus because of their large populations.	• Duration: 12-18 months.	<u>Topic 5</u>: Pressures, status and trends concerning biodiversity and ecosystem services: <u>Objective 1</u>: assessing knowledge
International Network for Evaluation of One Health	**Assessment of nature / biodiversity – human health linkages**	• This assessment would take into account the socio-ecological system, including plant and animal/wildlife health, based on an integrated One Health approach. • This is urgent, as the negative consequences of a disturbed nature – health interrelation are showing increasingly on a global level. • Nature – health linkages are complex, developing with often unforeseen consequences, necessitating constant updating and synthesis of the knowledge base and of guidance for policy makers. • Previous work: Biodiversity & Health State of Knowledge Review by WHO & CBD; communities: NEOH and EcoHealth International. • Geographic scope: regional or global (depending on availability of resources).	• Resource requirements similar one regional assessment.	<u>Priority topic 1</u>: Promoting biodiversity to achieve the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development: <u>Deliverable 1 (a)</u>

Country	Intervention requested	Scientific and Policy Relevance [1]Relevance to IPBES (a), urgency (b), policy relevance (c), geographic scope (d), evidence of a need for this work (f), impacts and beneficiaries (h)	Implications for work programme and resource requirements complexity (e), availability of information (g), financial and human resource requirements (i), priority level in case of multiple requests (j)	Indication on how request was addressed
IUCN	**Focus on knowledge generation, support to policy, and capacity-building in future IPBES work programme**	• For its future work programme, IPBES should increase focus on knowledge generation, support to policy, and capacity building, and reduce focus on assessments. • Replication of regional assessments would not be a high priority for the future work programme. Rather, a focus on knowledge generation to fill the gaps revealed by these, support to policy application of their findings at national levels, and capacity building to advance their uptake would be desirable.	• Knowledge generation, policy support, and capacity building are all challenging, but extensive experience in advancing these exists through the IPBES membership and stakeholder community. • There is a burgeoning literature – and extensive practical experience and expertise – on knowledge generation, support to policy, and capacity building.	Objective 2: Building capacity Objective 3: Strengthening the knowledge foundations Objective 4: Supporting policy
IUCN Vulture Specialist Group	**Creation of a thematic expert panel on scavengers and scavenging within IPBES**	• Need for sectorial policies affecting livestock, game, fisheries and many other sectors with an impact on scavengers and scavenging. • The future work programme of IPBES should establish a permanent thematic expert panel on scavengers and scavenging in charge of coordinating all these tasks. • Scientific knowledge on the topic is still limited, and the knowledge available is not properly integrated into sectorial policies or directly ignored. • Previous work: most initiatives up to date focus on vultures - limited knowledge on most scavenging species. • Geographic scope: global	• Scientific literature on scavengers and scavenging is increasingly available; regional assessments available for some scavenger guilds.	Topic 5: Pressures, status and trends concerning biodiversity and ecosystem services: Objective 1: assessing knowledge

Country	Intervention requested	Scientific and Policy Relevance [1]Relevance to IPBES (a), urgency (b), policy relevance (c), geographic scope (d), evidence of a need for this work (f), impacts and beneficiaries (h)	Implications for work programme and resource requirements complexity (e), availability of information (g), financial and human resource requirements (i), priority level in case of multiple requests (j)	Indication on how request was addressed
International Union of Nutritional Sciences, Task Force on Sustainable Diets	***Addressing human nutrition and sustainable diets as ecosystem services***	• Strengthen the scientific base for policy support in the area of sustainable diets that have a positive impact on people's health and on the environment, particularly on traditional food systems of indigenous peoples. • Action is urgently needed to support changing consumption patterns towards more sustainable and healthy ones. • There is a significant body of data, but more and better information is needed on inventories and nutrient composition of food biodiversity from vulnerable ecosystems, characterisation of more agro-ecological zones for sustainable diets, validation of existing methods/tools/indicators, and development of new methods and metrics. • Geographic scope: from global to local.	• The issue is highly complex considering the range and breadth of the topic, but the components can be addressed independently or in clusters. • Growing body of scientific literature and scholarly monographs on sustainable diets.	Priority topic 1: Promoting biodiversity to achieve the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development: Deliverable 1 (a)
National Centre for Genetic Resources and Biotechnology, Nigeria	***Regional conservation of forest trees and shrubs in Africa***	• Focus would be on tree species of economic importance and/or which provide food and medicine. • Many of these tree species are endangered. • Previous work done for only one species in Nigeria by ICRAF. • Geographic scope: Africa		Objective 2: Building capacity

Country	Intervention requested	Scientific and Policy Relevance [1]Relevance to IPBES (a), urgency (b), policy relevance (c), geographic scope (d), evidence of a need for this work (f), impacts and beneficiaries (h)	Implications for work programme and resource requirements complexity (e), availability of information (g), financial and human resource requirements (i), priority level in case of multiple requests (j)	Indication on how request was addressed
Norwegian Institute for Nature Research (NINA)	**_General remarks_**	1. Considering the wider sustainable development agenda, future IPBES assessments should contribute to identifying ways to achieve co-benefits in the implementation of relevant SDGs. 2. In placing the second work programme in the context of the integrated Agenda 2030, IPBES assessments should have a continued focus on developing multi-disciplinary approaches, uniting natural sciences, law, economics, social sciences and humanities. 3. Future IPBES assessments should continue to identify relevant policy options for Governments, including which framework conditions are required to succeed. 4. In the second work programme of IPBES, emphasis should be made on the follow-up of the identification of knowledge gaps in completed assessments. 5. The identification of knowledge gaps should be further integrated into the capacity building work of the Platform. 6. In future IPBES assessments, greater efforts should be made in developing and agreeing on clear scoping documents. 7. Although the effort of the IPBES secretariat to support authors throughout the assessment process is much valued and appreciated, a further strengthening of the support functions of the secretariat is much needed. 8. Related to the above, safeguards could be put in place should one or more authors of an assessment be prevented to contribute as foreseen when nominated and selected.		Remarks taken into account in the development of the work programme up to 2030, and, in particular, of the following elements: Priority topic 1: Promoting biodiversity to achieve the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development Objective 2: Building capacity Objective 3: Strengthening the knowledge foundations Objective 4: Supporting policy
S. N. D. T. Women's University, India	**_Enhancing knowledge-skills of individuals working at the grass-root or community levels_**	• Build capacity for individuals working at the community level, with a focus on governing nature's use and sharing its benefits equitably.		Objective 2: Building capacity
WWF (1)	**_An IPBES / IPCC special report on biodiversity and climate change_**	• An assessment of the linkage between biodiversity change and climate change is urgently needed to inform the policy processes in the next decade 2021-2030. • Information on these linkages from the regional and the land degradation and restoration assessments should be aggregated in a special report which would provide a comprehensive overview of the situation. • High relevance in international and national climate policies as well as in national and international nature and biodiversity conservation policies and actions. • Geographic scope: global.	• The suggested report would address the complexity of the inter-linkages of the issues. • Information: IPBES assessments and relevant IPCC. reports. • Resource requirements: experts of the science-policy community of IPBES and IPCC. • Duration: 2 years.	Priority topic 1: Promoting biodiversity to achieve the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development: Deliverable 1 (b)

Country	Intervention requested	Scientific and Policy Relevance [1]Relevance to IPBES (a), urgency (b), policy relevance (c), geographic scope (d), evidence of a need for this work (f), impacts and beneficiaries (h)	Implications for work programme and resource requirements complexity (e), availability of information (g), financial and human resource requirements (i), priority level in case of multiple requests (j)	Indication on how request was addressed
WWF (2)	*Modelling the global socio-economic impacts of future changes in biodiversity and ecosystem services*	• More and better knowledge is required on the potential global socio-economic consequences of future environmental change. • High relevance in socio-economy and political processes. • There are significant gaps in knowledge to understand the linkages between social, economic, and ecological parameters. • Geographic scope: global	• Potential to combine and tailor existing models, tools and approaches. • To be performed by the IPBES 'scenarios and models' expert groups and other experts.	Objective 4: Supporting policy: Deliverable 4 (b)
WWF (3)	*A report on the role of sustainable agriculture in biodiversity conservation*	• Urgent actions are required in mitigating negative impacts of agricultural practices on biodiversity and in providing knowledge on the (potential) beneficiaries of agro-biodiversity for biodiversity conservation. • The report would be of great value in providing a credible state-of-the-art appraisal of the role of sustainable agriculture in biodiversity conservation. • Suggested report would build on the earlier work by IPBES assessments, including on pollination. • Geographic scope: global	• Low complexity as the report would need to avoid too much granularity and detail in order to give strong global messages. • Scientific literature is available; results of the pollinator assessment could also be used. • Resource requirements: relevant experts are available.	Priority topic 1: Promoting biodiversity to achieve the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development: Deliverable 1 (a)
WWF (4)	*Addressing the triple jeopardy of a growing population, climate change and biodiversity loss*	• Urgent analysis is needed of the trade-offs between feeding a growing population, keeping global warming below 1.5°C and restoring nature. • Existing analyses at best look at two issues and so miss the bigger picture – which could make the overall situation worse. • Geographic scope: global	• Complexity appears high when combining solutions of all three topics. • Literature is available, but the evidence is not compiled in a useful way to address policy maker.	Priority topic 1: Promoting biodiversity to achieve the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development: Deliverables 1 (a) and 1 (b)
Inputs and suggestions from ILK experts and holders				
ILK Expert: Angela Maria Moreno Barros	*Recovery of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of the Zenúes indigenous people*	• The proposed project seeks the recovery of the Intangible Cultural Heritage of the Zenúes indigenous people, associated with the management of water cycles, through the implementation of appropriate ancestral hydro technologies.		The theme of this project is relevant to: Topic 5: Pressures, status and trends concerning biodiversity and ecosystem services: Objective 1: Assessing knowledge

Country	Intervention requested	Scientific and Policy Relevance [1]Relevance to IPBES (a), urgency (b), policy relevance (c), geographic scope (d), evidence of a need for this work (f), impacts and beneficiaries (h)	Implications for work programme and resource requirements complexity (e), availability of information (g), financial and human resource requirements (i), priority level in case of multiple requests (j)	Indication on how request was addressed
ILK Expert: Rahul Goswami	*Convention on the Intangible Cultural Heritage in the Asia-Pacific region*	• A collaboration between IPBES and the UNESCO Convention on Intangible Cultural Heritage is proposed to develop closer ties between intangible cultural heritage and nature.		This suggestion is relevant to: Topic 5: Pressures, status and trends concerning biodiversity and ecosystem services: Objective 1: Assessing knowledge