

External review of the second order draft of the land degradation and restoration assessment
1 May - 26 June 2017
Chapter 1

Reviewer Name	Chapter / SPM	From Page (start)	From Line (start)	To Page (end)	To Line (end)	Comment	Response (Chapter 1)
Li Qingfeng	All Chapters					Overall comments for the Book: 1,there seems too many repetitions in different chapters and sections for the subject matters of definitions, descriptions and explanations, etc., of "land degradation and restoration". Although they are necessary for each individual Chapters, it seems a little bit redundancy if appearing in the same book. 2, The economical (cost-benefit) analyses, as well as the ecological assessments, behind the "Successful stories", should be strengthened, if the stories are more convincing, in particular, if the success is backed with big "projects".	Agree, redundant text on LDR definition and approach has been taken out in discussion with other CLAs. The final report has been streamlined as much as possible.
Germany	All Chapters					We urgently request the chapter authors to ensure that all facts and figures contained in the chapters are accurately cited and adequately referenced with up-to-date sources. We also encourage chapter authors to cross-check, whether the same facts and figures on a specific theme are being used throughout the assessment.	Agree, consistency between chapters has been checked in the final report.
Germany	All Chapters					Please ensure that in all chapters information and case-studies are provided from all regions.	We made a particular effort to include examples and case studies from all world regions in the final report, supported by the expertise within the group of authors, and a thorough review of the available literature.
Germany	All Chapters					We kindly request the co-chairs and chapter authors to ensure that the key findings emerging from each chapter are captured in the key messages of the SPM.	The SPM has been revised based on the updated key findings from the chapters.
Germany	All Chapters					Please include the concept on 'planetary boundaries' in your discussions.	The concept of planetary boundaries is discussed in several chapters of the assessment.
Germany	All Chapters					Ensure that terminologies are used consistently throughout all chapters.	This has been addressed.
Germany	All Chapters					It is appreciated that each chapter starts with an "executive summary" Please ensure that all Figures/Tables have a high resolution quality. A glossary should be included that provides definitions/explanations of the frequently used terms. Each chapter should also start with a list of acronyms/abbreviations used in the chapter. In some Figures and Tables colours have been used to outline status and trends in a regions or a country. It would be very helpful if the same colour is used for a country/region throughout a chapter and preferably throughout all 8 chapters. The term 'NCP' should be used consistently and with the exact wording provided in IPBES-5/1.	All of these elements have been ensured for the final draft of the report, for all chapters.
Germany	All Chapters					Ensure that definitions, facts, figures and trends outlined in the 8 chapters e.g. on the spatial extent of land degradation / the spatial extent of wetland / water / soil / urbanisation / deforestation / wild fires / conflict, etc... are consistent across all chapters.	The consistency between the different chapters has been reviewed by the chairs and the TSU.
Germany	All Chapters					It is also not clear whether there is consistency between the chapters, what role agricultural lands have in the land degradation theme? Are they considered per se to be degraded sites or are they transformed lands, whose productivity can be negatively affected through severe exploitation? Clarification required.	The discussion on the role of agricultural lands in regards with degradation was addressed within the discussion on baseline, in chapter 1.
Germany	All Chapters					We strongly encourage the authors to check, whether information on certain issues has already been provided in one of the previous chapters of the assessment report. If this is the case, then it would be useful to avoid redundancies and rather consider cross-referencing between chapters. Sometimes the impression arose that there was no exchange between the authors of the different chapters.	The cross-referencing between chapters has been addressed at the 3rd authors' meeting in July 2017.
Germany	All Chapters					We strongly encourage the chapter authors to ensure that their key findings are reflected in the key messages of the summary for policymakers.	The consistency between the key messages of Chapter 3 and the content of the SPM referring to Chapter 3 has been checked.
Germany	All Chapters					We encourage the authors to spell out the acronyms when they are introduced for the first time in the text.	This has been checked

Germany	All Chapters				All reference lists need to be rechecked regarding completeness, spelling and they also need to be structured in a similar style.	This has been done, with the support of the TSU
Thomas Brooks	All Chapters				Congratulations to all authors for their great efforts towards delivery of this SOD	Thank you!
Thomas Brooks	All Chapters				In many places, the report uses language like "biodiversity and ecosystem functions and services". I recommend deleting the "functions and" throughout. This would be consistent with a) the wording and intent of widely-accepted definitions of biodiversity (eg CBD, IPBES itself) that encompass all levels and types of genetic, species, and ecosystem diversity (see eg Noss 1990 Conserv Biol), and b) the IPBES conceptual framework, which i) includes composition, structure, and function of genetic, species, and ecosystem diversity in its "Nature/Mother Earth" component while ii) including ecosystem services/nature's gifts in its "Nature's Contributions to People" component.	We agree with the comment and the definition of biodiversity. However, we worked with the terminology provided in the LDR scoping document which included: "Degraded land is defined as land in a state that results from persistent decline or loss of biodiversity, ecosystem functions and services...."
Astrid Hilgers	All Chapters				On the definition of landdegradation: Agreement on baselines is a essential to set verifiable targets and track progress towards these targets. A natural state baseline, although it has some problems to solve, offers a fair and unambiguous reference to compare current and future state and trends. However, land degradation is a multidimensional issue, concerning the change in and trade offs between soil variables, vegetation, biodiversity components, water characteristics and many ecosystem functions and services. Consequently assessing any deviation from the natural state baseline of one or more of these factors as 'degradation' would result in the entire world being degraded. In this approach land degradation would lose its political utility. An alternative approach would be to map and quantify these changes compared to the natural state baseline without judging as 'degradation', and consider these changes as trade-offs, often unintentionally, from a particular use of the land such as forestry, cropland or housing. Whether these changes and trade offs are accepted or not and can be considered as degradation belongs to the political domain, not the scientific. This approach creates a strict distinction between measuring and assessing factual changes and the judgment whether it is acceptable or not, clarifying the different roles of science and politics, and taking away the barriers to fulfill their tasks properly.	Thank you for your detailed comment on this. This is now addressed under the definition of the baseline.
Astrid Hilgers	All Chapters				The assesment, in specific the SPM and chapters 2 and 3, seem to be biased towards conservation agriculture as a solution, while a wider range of sustainable landmanagement practices and other response options should be considered. Chapter 6 provides this wider range of options.	We now give a more balanced vision of different agricultural practices at chapter 3 level.
Astrid Hilgers	All Chapters				more attention should be payed to the role that the private sector could pay, in the SPM and trouhgout the document. References p.e.1. Levashova 2011 Opportunities and challenges for private sector entrepreneurship and investment in biodiversity, ecosystem services and nature conservation, Opportunities and challenges for private sector entrepreneurship and investment in biodiversity, ecosystem services and nature conservation. 2. jenkins, Scherr and Inbar 2012 Markets for Biodiversity Services: Potential Roles and Challenges Journal Environment: Science and Policy for Sustainable Development 3. buisness for sustainabl;e landscapes, an action agenda, Scherr at all 2017, published by ecoagriculture partners and IUCN. 4. Scaling Up Investment & Finance for Integrated Landscape Management: Challenges & Innovations, Shames at all 2013, published by ecoagricultes partners 5. Finance for One Planet, leenders and Bor 2016 www.rvo.nl/CoP_FIN 6. scaling up investments in ecosystem restoration, policy brief netherlands assesment agency , sewell, Bouman, van der esch 2016 http://www.pbl.nl/sites/default/files/cms/publicaties/pbl-2016-scaling-up-investments-in-ecosystem-restoration_2088.pdf 7.Outcome Statement – Global Landscapes Forum: The Investment Case 2016 http://www.landscapes.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/06/GLF-London-Outcomes-v02.pdf	Thank you for these references. These have been found particularly pertinent at Ch2 level and have been added in sections 2.2.2.3 and 2.2.3.2.
Astrid Hilgers	All Chapters				the term NCP should be explained in the spm and in teh beginning of the document	NCP has been defined in the Glossary and explained in the Preface of the whole report.

Finnish Government	All Chapters				<p>addressed in the LDR Assessment. However, there is obvious overlap and redundancy as well as some conflicting information between different parts of the assessment on the issue. In the SPM the key message B1 is related to the issue of baselines and it is well elaborated in the second part of the SPM with some text, a figure and a box. The issues covered are clearly referenced to the Chapter 2 where many of the statements are further elaborated and the issue is also well covered in the Executive Summary of Chapter 2. This is appropriate as according to the Scoping Document for the LDR Assessment the chapter 2 is requested to deal with concepts.</p> <p>The overlap and some conflicting messages can be found from chapters 1 and 4. While the nature of Chapter 1 is clearly introductory and as such treating the issue of baselines could be well justified, the messages it conveys relative to the SPM and Chapter 2 are conflicting. In the Executive Summary of chapter 1 the last point reads: "Degradation and restoration are both concepts which require a baseline to be measured (unresolved)". (Box 1.1). The types of baselines which can be used are briefly discussed here, and elaborated in chapter 2." Here the confidence term 'unresolved' is contradictory to the very clear statement in the B1 of the SPM: "[Land degradation] is scientifically measurable (well established). Land degradation can only be measured in comparison to a baseline,...". It seems the confidence statement in the Ch 1 Executive Summary may be incorrect. It is hardly unresolved that a baseline is needed to measure amount of degradation or restoration.</p> <p>Somewhat similar statement is found in the Executive Summary of Chapter 4: "Land degradation takes place in both natural vegetation and on previously transformed land, so choice of an appropriate baseline against which to assess change is important (unresolved)". Again, the choice of confidence term may be incorrect. The statement is that appropriate baseline is important and this is likely to be well established.</p> <p>In the scoping document Chapter 4 is requested to deal with status and trends of degradation and restoration. Because status and trends need to be rooted on some baseline to be meaningful (as was discussed just above) the treatment of baselines might be justified also in chapter 4. However, it is clear that the baseline aspects covered in chapter 4 are already covered in the SPM key message B1 and referenced to chapter 2 rather than chapter 4. Much of the text in chapter 4 is similar (i.e. partly same) to the text in the SPM as well as in the Chapter 2 and thus it seems that replicating the text in Chapter 4 is redundant. To avoid confusion and repetition the section 4.1.2.3 and the related key message in the Executive Summary of Chapter 4 should be deleted and replaced with a simple reference to the SPM and/or to Chapter 2.</p> <p>Finally, in Chapter 1 there is also a box on establishing baselines (Box 1.1). While again some of the text seems to be the same as what is used in SPM and Ch2 there are also clearly deviating elements not used in other parts of the Assessment. After reading the SPM and relevant sections of Chapter 2, the box in Chapter 1 appears largely overlapping, somewhat contradicting and much</p>	Thank you for your detailed comment on this. We had a lengthy discussion about the issue, and the baseline discussion has been clarified in the SPM of the whole LDRA and in the Box of Chapter 1
Finnish Government	All Chapters				<p>C6. The word instrumental responses used in SPM, Ch 6 and 8 is kind of confusing. Legal responses are considered to be "enabling responses" not in the category of "instrumental responses". This distinction is problematic as legal instruments are also instrumental responses. I would rather say that well functioning legal and governance systems are enabling responses, while specific legal instruments such as environmental impact assessments, legal standards etc are instrumental responses.</p>	These comments are relevant to CH6 and Ch8, not directly to Ch3. These comments have been taken into account by Ch6 and 8 respectively.
Caroline van Leenders	All Chapters				<p>I've been working in the financial sector since 2014. I've run a Community of Practice of 15 financial institutions on natural capital in The Netherlands and wrote the eBook Finance For One Planet with lessons and 12 stories from their practice. I'm now involved in helping DG Environment of the EC with moderating a Community of Practice of financials on biodiversity. See http://ec.europa.eu/environment/biodiversity/business/assets/pdf/mission-statement_en.pdf and I'm working on the start of a CoP FIs and sustainable Landscapes in Africa. I see more and more FIs interspersed in biodiversity and investing with a landscape approach. I think it is high time to make financial flows more visible and include private finance more. If you want any details please contact me!</p>	Agree, role of financial sector is important. It has been addressed in the final report, especially in Chapter 6 and 8 (in accordance with the scope). In chapter 5, we also included the discussion on different valuations of ecosystem services.
Virginia Meléndez Ramírez	All Chapters				<p>All the Chapter could start with an introduction and end with the conclusions, you could standardize the chapters + Several images in some chapters can not be seen well</p>	Agree. The formatting has been ensured for the final draft.
Pavlos Tyrologou and María José Rubial from the Panel of Experts on Soil Protection of the European Federation of Geologists (PESP-EFG)	All Chapters				<p>Most of the document is ecology and agricultural orientated but there is a fair amount of water (surface and ground) and mining so there is some geology discussed but not in depth. We also miss a deeper assessment on the contribution of heavy industry in land contamination and degradation and the legal and political instruments in place (or maybe missing) to prevent the land degradation and promote its protection (i.e.: environmental liability directive and/or others)</p>	The final report has been nuanced. The drivers (including the role of heavy industry in land degradation) are addressed in Ch3 and 4 in detail.
IPBES Knowledge and Data Task Force (KD TF)/ Task Group on Indicators (TGI)	All Chapters				<p>This review provides feedback from the IPBES Knowledge and Data Task Force (KD TF) / Task Group on Indicators (TGI) on the use of IPBES core indicators in your assessment. We see potential for inclusion of additional core indicators and for the more consistent use of the standardized visuals provided. For information on core indicators potentially relevant to a given chapter, please see http://www.ipbes.net/indicators (or see the tab named, "core indicators" in this spreadsheet) and check the indicator trend graphs shared by your TSU. For the trends of IPBES core indicator, standardized visualizations should be used as much as possible to ensure the consistency between and within the assessments. The KD TF/TGI aim to follow up with specific recommendations in the near future. In the meantime, do not hesitate to reach out to them through your TSU or the KD TF TSU (ipbes.kdtsu@gmail.com).</p>	Relevant core indicators have been used in relevant chapters (especially Ch3, 4, 5 and 6) . This comments is not relevant to Ch1.

U.S. government	All Chapters				The role of biodiversity and functioning ecosystems appears to only be seen through a human lens and one that is directly connected to a specific area. Loss of biodiversity and ecosystem function in one area may affect downstream or far removed ecosystems - land degradation in one area may have huge affect in other areas both for biodiversity and ecosystem function (think migratory birds). The document should have a greater focus on the role of land degradation on a wider set of ecosystem functions than currently apparent.	The topic is dealt with under "Long distance impacts and their legal implications" (2.2.1.3.) The intrinsic value of nature and biodiversity is discussed in Chapter 5. Chapter 1 look at success criteria from various elements, please refer to Table 1.1
José Romero	All Chapters				General: in this report, the two concepts of "land" and "soil" seem to be interchangeable. It would be useful to define both terms in a glossary attached to this report. The definition of both terms should take into account and explain differences and nuances about "what is above ground" and "what is below ground" for land and soil.	The land/soil definition has been reintegrated to Ch2, section 2.2.1.3, last subsection. The definition of land degradation is in Chapter, but only in the sense that it was given to us by the scoping document and which we used throughout the whole assessment
José Romero	All Chapters				General: in this report, the concept of "trade-off" is used in a rather negative sense, while generally a trade-off is a situation reached for the satisfaction of divergent views and interests, which is considered to be a positive solution. We wonder if this rather negative use of trade-off in the report would be correctly translated in the other non-English languages. For example, in French, we would rather think of a happy outcome when a trade-off (e.g. a compromise, a good deal) is done in front of irreconcilable antagonisms. If the use in this report is more in a negative sense, then why not qualify trade-offs as e.g. "harmful". We hope that the English speakers authors understand our point and find a way out to address it in English as well as in the other non-English languages.	We assessed our use of trade-off in the chapter with scrutiny and made sure that it is neither positively nor negatively commented
José Romero	All Chapters				General: the use of the uncertainty statements in the Key Messages should follow some logics: either only in the headings, or everywhere in the paragraphs, or not at all in this section, etc. Currently, it is not clear what the rule is and which parts of the statements are accompanied with which uncertainty statement (e.g. if it is in the heading, then the whole paragraph has the same level of uncertainty?).	Agree, confidence statements should be consistent. This has been ensured for the final report.
Australia NFP	All Chapters				There is a lack of clear guidelines and recommendations for policymakers, particularly in the Summary for Policy Makers which is where we would expect to see them. What is really needed is a quick and easy guide to help a range of decision makers develop and implement policies which reflect the latest scientific data which this report should include. o For example, page 3 of Chapter 1, the Executive Summary of the Chapter, claims that the paper, as an assessment of land degradation and restoration, will evaluate, summarize and present the latest evidence to guide decisions. From our reading of the SPM and chapters, there appears to be little guidance for policymakers and decision makers on how to use the latest evidence to develop policy options.	Agree, clear policy guidance on WHAT (package of) measures would support conservation of BES and which don't (chapt 3, 4, 5 and 7) and HOW these measures could be implemented in an effective and efficient manner (instruments, governance in chapt 6 and 8) are still lacking. Chapt 7 provides a set of measures in its Key Messages. These elements have been added to the SPM
Australia NFP	All Chapters				The case studies in the report are not detailed enough in their current state to be broadly applicable, with little information on their outcomes, methods, and successes. o Case studies are frequently repeated across the chapters. More examples including possible applications in different landscapes/areas/political environments would be useful as well as the case studies effectiveness, implementation and any lessons learned. An understanding of the criteria used to rate each case study would be very useful.	Chapter 1 provides a methodology for case study selection. The case studies are no longer replicated throughout the report and are more diverse in nature.
Australia NFP	All Chapters				Lack of consistency throughout the report's chapters, including definitions used for essential concepts. o The report uses a definition of land degradation different to that used by the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification (UNCCD), the premiere international body overseeing global efforts to address land degradation, desertification and drought. For example, on Page 3 of Chapter 1, in the Executive Summary, the UNCCD definition of land is used, however the UNCCD definition of land degradation is not used in the report. References to the UNCCD would be useful, along with adopting its definitions/glossary for concepts like land degradation, land restoration, etc.	Agree, the UNCCD definition of LD should be mentioned. However, the definition of land degradation for LDRA was set out and approved by IPBES Plenary, and can not be changed.

Australia NFP	All Chapters					The use throughout the report of references which are significantly dated or not consistent throughout the chapters. This makes the assessment appear to have a lack of a clear methodologies which seek to establish the quality and clarity of the evidence base used to make claims throughout the report. o A specific example of both inconsistency in referencing and use of outdated sources occurs on pages 95 and 96 of Chapter 4, and page 38 of Chapter 3. In Chapter 4, the report uses a 2005 Global Forest Resource Assessment to make claims about the extent of forest cover in a number of countries, including Australia. Yet, in Chapter 3, the report uses a much more recent Global Forest Resource Assessment, from 2015, to look at trends in forest cover decline. If there's no way to use the most recent studies/iterations of reports to support claims in the Report, then the reason for using an older report should be made clear.	
Juan Comerma	Ch.1	General				Besides the IPBS Conceptual framework which helps to understand the complexity of land degradation, we should look for an Operational Framework that helps to Evaluate specific cases, evaluating the severity of degradation and the restoration measures. It could be somewhat similar to the framework for land evaluation that FAO has developed for rainfed, irrigated, forestry, etc.	This has been developed in chapter 1 in association with the content of all other chapters
Mahmood Yekeh Yazdandoost	Ch.1	General				Land degradation and human health, and the policies evolved are interlinked in multi-dimension processes;	Thank you , this has been incorporated into chapter 1
Mahmood Yekeh Yazdandoost	Ch.1	General				Human population health to a large extent is determined by land degradation and restoration activities;	Thank you for this comment, we included the relationship between human health and land degradation and restoration activities
Mahmood Yekeh Yazdandoost	Ch.1	General				Access to natural green space increases biological productivity with benefits to public health;	This is covered in other chapters (see for example Chapter 5 and 6)
Mahmood Yekeh Yazdandoost	Ch.1	General				Significant changes to natural land engineering cause disruption in ecosystem sustainability with impact on indigenous community health;	This is covered in Chapter 1
Mahmood Yekeh Yazdandoost	Ch.1	General				Benefits of integrating land restoration into sectoral plans and strategies;	Thank you this is covered within the operating framework developed in Chapter 1
Mahmood Yekeh Yazdandoost	Ch.1	General				Opportunities in engaging local communities and business sectors on land restoration; and	Thank you this is covered within the operating framework developed in Chapter 1
Mahmood Yekeh Yazdandoost	Ch.1	General				Encouraging the socio-ecological unit part of governance in land restoration program	Thank you this was included within the operating framework
Emmanuelle Quillérou	Ch.1	General				Generally speaking, there are too many acronyms which hinder reading and understanding (ILK, LDRA, CF, LDRA, MEP, NCP, NPI, LDS, KLC...). Presumably, the point is for your report to be read and understood by people working in different fields and from very different disciplinary background. Using acronyms creates a "club" culture which goes against what you are trying to achieve with these reports (ie make knowledge mainstream which is by definition the exact opposite of a small old boys' club which is exclusive rather than inclusive). To give an example, MEP to me is automatically a Member of the European Parliament and NOT a multidisciplinary expert panel. The same acronyms used to refer to very different things in different contexts could create more confusion than clarity for the decision-makers you are targeting. Aside from institutions such as FAO, IUCN, UNEP etc, and one or two acronyms max that are used 2 or 3 times per page on average, I would recommend to remove the acronyms throughout all chapters of the report, especially since length will not increase by much overall. In-text references to IUCN sometimes use the acronym, sometimes its full name - needs harmonising.	Acronyms was reduced, a list of acronyms was developed and attached as an annex to report, and the rest of the acronyms at Chapter 1 level were significantly reduced, to the bare minimum
Pat Brereton	Ch.1	General				Some sense of 'local' concerns/issues should be used to frame these global agendas	Thank you this has been included across the whole chapter
Douglas, Diane	Ch.1	General				Solid introduction to the document. Excellent examples of programs initiated to rehabilitate landscapes in diverse regions, with unique social, cultural, political and environmental challenges.	Thank you for your positive comment

UNCCD SPI	Ch.1	General				<p>1. "Land degradation" should be properly defined at the start of the chapter, in addition to "degraded land". See our previous comment on the definition of land degradation adopted by the report</p> <p>2. When "land degradation" is defined, its definition as "processes that drive the decline or loss of biodiversity, ecosystem functions and services...." will appear odd to many scientists. We appreciate that this definition may have been officially approved by IPBES, but confusing "drivers" with the measurable decline in the status of ecosystems and soil (and in related natural processes) that constitutes land degradation does not appear sound to us.</p> <p>3. We do not think that it is good strategically to devote so much space to talking about how to restore degraded land or avoid land degradation before the causes and extent of land degradation have been properly described. This is "putting the cart before the horse".</p> <p>4. Although the section on "Guiding Instruments" is scientifically robust, it seems to miss the point that land degradation is often invisible to policy instruments, in contrast to the more conventional land transformation.</p>	Thank you for your comments, we updated the section on definitions to take into account all external review feedback and to show the definitions that were provided to us by the scoping document. We included the importance of understanding the impacts of land degradation at the policy level (please see Table 1.1)
Steve Prince	Ch.1	General				<p>This Chapter starts with an organizational review (UNCCD, Rio,CBD,SDGs, IPBES...), then a brief rehearsal of some statistics used to advance the notion of degradation (without indication of the qualifications needed) and, finally, a statement of the philosophy of IPBES (which needs to be rewritten since its meaning is not very clear). The Assessment is supposed to deal with degradation and restoration but the degradation component has rather little discussion beyond definitions. This top-down, organizational introduction, while normal in the many reports on the topic, is likely only to be of value to a very small set of readers interested in the bureaucracy. Would it not be better to start with a set of verified examples of degradation (to partner the "Success Stories" in sect 1.3, leaving the organizational context to a footnote, or box?</p>	We will rearrange the chapter and include a preface covering the organisational information
Javier Ernesto Cortés Suárez	Ch.1	1	2	1	3	<p>The title and chapter content should be focused not in avoiding land degradation but on managing it, considering that in some cases it is very difficult to actually escape completely from this situation taking into account the number of pressures and constraints of an specific ecosystem.</p>	Thank you for the comment we have been provided with a Chapter title and its content by the scoping document by the IPBES Plenary and have aligned the chapter with the scoping document, Please see IPBES-3/18 decision 3/1 Annex VIII
Cristobal Diaz	Ch.1	3	40	3	41	<p>To add: This is the first comprehensive global assessment of land and ecosystems degradation and associated restoration and rehabilitation</p>	It is consistent with the scoping document which is not calling for an assessment of land and ecosystems degradation, since land includes ecosystems (see definitions). Please see IPBES-3/18 decision 3/1 Annex VIII
Nestor T. Baguion	Ch.1	3	40	3	43	<p>This is the first comprehensive global assessment of land degradation and associated restoration and rehabilitation. In this sense, assessment means a structured, evidence-based, multi-authored, highly-reviewed process by which knowledge in both scientific and other domains is evaluated, summarized and presented for guidance of decisions... The aforementioned sentence may be improved by continuing.... that would transform global human behavior to embrace ecological order (e.g., stopping, or if needed, reversal of land degradation and biodiversity losses).</p>	It is unclear what is intended by "ecological order"....The scope of the assessment has been clearly defined by the IPBES Plenary
Patrick Ken Kalonde	Ch.1	4	40	4	47	<p>There is need for structured and evidence based and highly reviewed process by which knowledge has to be evaluated. Involving experts from all parts of the world</p>	Thank you this was included
Carolina ZQ	Ch.1	3	42	3	42	<p>"other domains" should be more specific. Wich other domains? Mention this domains in the text.</p>	This was expanded upon and clarified
Eila Gendig	Ch.1	3	48	3	49	<p>wording is misleading and unclear - "Defining land degradation.... able to be implemented..."</p>	This was reworded and has now improved the understandings of meanings
Finnish Government	Ch.1	3	48	3	58	<p>In chapter 2 of the assessment the definitions provided in this key message appear to be scrutinised. A pointer to Ch2 should be included to the key messages in addition to the already existing pointers in the actual text of Ch1.</p>	Pointers were included across the chapter to the appropriate linkages in other chapters

Nestor T. Baguinon	Ch.1	3	48	3	58	<p>First sentence: Degraded land is a state of land which results from the persistent decline or loss in biodiversity, ecosystem functions or services that cannot fully recover unaided within decadal time scales.</p> <p>Second sentence: Continued clear-cutting of forests or conversion of forests into slash and burn agriculture and its further retrogression into treeless grassland, among others, are two examples of anthropogenic actions that lead to irreversible losses of biodiversity and ecosystem functions or services. In the first sentence, biodiversity loss precedes degraded land, but in the second sentence land degradation precedes biodiversity loss. I choose the second sentence as the logical one. Other anthropogenic actions leading to loss in biodiversity and ecosystem services are others, e.g. open-pit mining, built-up areas, urbanization, etc. There are those who consider oil palm plantations, mahogany plantations and recently agroforestry that are wholly or partly composed of alien tree species as forest restoration and rehabilitation, but biogeographers/ecologist disagree calling the action or phenomenon as cases of "ecological substitution and bioinvasion at the ecosystem level". I call them "green deserts" because even if they are forest-like one misses the heterogenous noise of wildlife commonly heard in pristine natural forests. The old forestry paradigm defines forest as large tracts of land dominated by trees either artificial or natural (gray paradigm). Truth is that, Natural ecosystems (P) and Man-made ecosystems (Q) are mutually exclusive in space, i.e. $P = 100 - Q$. They can be made complementary Yin and Yang style like the Ifugao rice terraces coupled to adjoining natural forest (Muyong+Payoh) so that across landscapes the two, black and white, complement each other but they are never gray. Unfortunately, forestry schools are still teaching students that planting alien tree species is "reforestation" and likewise its later derivative "agroforestry". We need to educate people globally about evolution, plant/animal taxonomy, ecology and biogeography in order to convince that the only scientific forest restoration and rehabilitation is the reintroduction of native flora/fauna following the locality's ecological succession patterns. With appropriate government economic incentives, same people could interconnect fragmented patches of natural forests with biodiversity corridors planted to native plant species while simultaneously complement said corridors Yin and Yang style with agroforestry (food security and climate change adaptation/mitigation).</p>	Where is the scientific evidence for this proposed statement? All case studies and information provided at Ch1 was based on peer-reviewed literature.
David González Jiménez	Ch.1	3	48	3	58	<p>This first line is not directly linked to the rest of the paragraph. Also, diverse definitions may also relate to different worldviews and values. How about also acknowledging this: 'It is a challenge to bring together diverse understandings of land degradation as they respond to diverse contexts some of which are more closely related to decision-making'</p>	This was acknowledged in our text at the appropriate place. With further clarification provided in Chapter 2 where this is extensively debated.
UNCCD SPI	Ch.1	3	50	3	62	<p>what does "(established but incomplete)" mean?</p>	Indeed it was removed
Germany	Ch.1	3	51	3	53	<p>Please check and align the wording of the definition of "degraded land" as provided in IPBES/3/18 (page 53). The definition should read: "degraded land" is defined as land in a state that results from persistent decline or loss of biodiversity and ecosystem functions and services that cannot fully recover unaided within decadal time scales."</p>	Fully agree, this has been clearly stated and aligned across chapters.
Pedro Mendoza	Ch.1	3	51	3	135	<p>It is not clear the use "decline"</p>	The word 'decline' is provided within the plenary scoping document definition. Decline is defined as "a gradual and continuous loss of quality or value"
Steve Prince	Ch.1		51		53	<p>This definition does not make it clear that "degradation" sensu IPBES is restricted to anthropogenic processes. A clear statement of the various meanings (i.e. typology) of "degradation" is surely essential right from the start. See Chapter 4. P. 13 (sect 4.1.2.1)</p>	Chapter 2 also covers this, we added a pointer to Chapter 4 as relevant.
Yildiz AUMEERUDDY-THOMAS	Ch.1	3	52	3	54	<p>"Restoration efforts that have best incorporated indigenous and local knowledge in their design and implementation have often shown the greatest success and long term sustainability". I find this statement insufficient because most importantly Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities lack primarily a recognition of their customary access to land and their governance system. The simple fact of incorporating their knowledge without simultaneously recognizing their rights to their territories and land will not solve the problem. I would change into: "indigenous and local knowledge as well as proper recognition of access rights to land and customary governance system..."</p>	This was included and is also well covered across Chapter 1

Lucía Almeida-Leñero	Ch.1	3	53	3	55	<p>The definition of both restoration and rehabilitation seem ambiguous to me. Restoration always will fall short in fully restoring biotic communities to its pre-degradation state. There will always exist constraints on the effectiveness of restoration. In that sense, is rehabilitation the same as restoration? Is rehabilitation a result of restoration? The difference is not clear. Rehabilitation can be defined as specific activities that aim to recover a specific element, set of elements or functions of an ecosystem so that it recovers part of its ecological integrity. Rehabilitation does not aim to recover the ecosystem to a pre-degradation state, thus cannot "fall short" in doing so. I would recommend not to use "fall short" but rather define rehabilitation as restoration activities that aim to restore and improve part of the biotic community and/or functions from a degraded state. See: (Bradshaw, 1997) where this subtle differences are addressed, or (Ovalle <i>et al.</i>, 1999) where rehabilitation meant to improve soil fertility, in (Aronson <i>et al.</i>, 1993) restoration seeks a complete or near complete return of a site (ecosystem) to a pre-existing state while rehabilitation seeks to repair damaged ecosystem functions or elements and settle on an alternative steady state or "simplified ecosystem" as an intermediate state between degradation and pre-degradation. In (Chazdon <i>et al.</i>, 2016) both terms differ in their process and end goals, which vary in the degree to which they are true to the pre-degradation state. The same authors consider rehabilitation emphasizes in functional aspects of recovery. More examples of this can be addressed. See: Bradshaw, A. D. (1997). What do we mean by restoration?. En K. M. Urbanska, et al. (Ed.), Restoration ecology and sustainable development (pp. 8-14). Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press</p> <p>Ovalle, C., Aronson, J., Del Pozo, A., & Avendan, J. (1999). Restoration and rehabilitation of mixed espinales in central Chile: 10-year report and appraisal. Aronson, J., Floret, C., Floc'h, E., Ovalle, C., & Pontanier, R. (1993). Restoration and rehabilitation of degraded ecosystems in arid and semi-arid lands. I. A View from the South. Restoration ecology, 1(1), 8-17.</p> <p>Chazdon, R. L., Brancalion, P. H., Laestadius, L., Bennett-Curry, A., Buckingham, K., Kumar, C., Moll-Rocek, J., Guimaraes-Vieira, I. C. & Wilson, S. J. (2016). When is a forest a forest? Forest concepts and definitions in the era of forest and landscape restoration. Ambio, 45(5), 538-550.</p>	<p>The definitions used are those provided by the Plenary of governments and within the scoping document for the land degradation and restoration assessment, and so these are the definitions applied for this Assessment. The literature you suggest has been reviewed and has been incorporated into Chapter 1.</p>
Javier Ernesto Cortés Suárez	Ch.1	3	53	3	54	<p>This definition should be writing from Restoration Ecology perspective which includes the participation of the people in the restoration process.</p>	<p>The definitions used are those provided by the Plenary of governments and within the scoping document for the land degradation and restoration assessment, and so these are the definitions applied for this Assessment. Incorporating the IPBES conceptual framework into this assessment, naturally includes the importance of people, which is enlarged upon within Chapter 1</p>
Javier Ernesto Cortés Suárez	Ch.1	3	54	3	55	<p>No area can be fully restored to its predegradation state. These is not realistic considering the dynamics of current change in degraded ecosystems and their degraded state. Actually rehabilitation from a ecological perspective try to recuperate an area on its ecosystem function but not with the same pre-degradation conditions. These should be reviewed.</p>	<p>The definitions used are those provided by the Plenary of governments and within the scoping document for the land degradation and restoration assessment, and so these are the definitions applied for this Assessment. The definitions do not state a restoration to its predegradation state. . Please see IPBES-3/18 decision 3/1 Annex VIII</p>
Virginia Meléndez Ramírez	Ch.1	3	54	3	55	<p>The definition of rehabilitation is unclear.</p>	<p>The definitions used are those provided by the Plenary of governments and within the scoping document for the land degradation and restoration assessment, and so these are the definitions applied for this Assessment. . Please see IPBES-3/18 decision 3/1 Annex VIII</p>
Steve Prince	Ch.1		55		57	<p>In the Scoping, freshwater is only considered when directly affected by land processes ("aquatic systems associated with these areas" - see also lines 184-5 below). It would be helpful to clarify that processes internal to the aquatic systems are excluded.</p>	<p>This was clarified for accuracy</p>
David González Jiménez	Ch.1	3	59	3	59	<p>Change indigenous and local knowledge communities for indigenous peoples and local communities</p>	<p>This was changed, thank you</p>
Diana Patricia Alvarado-Solano	Ch.1	3	60	3	60	<p>Replace "customary systems" for common systems or traditional systems, in this way it would be better understood by a broad audience.</p>	<p>This was clarified</p>
Steve Prince	Ch.1		60		61	<p>"..have in some cases been demonstrated ... " (i.e. not always)</p>	<p>This was clarified, and we used the word "many" cases</p>
Cristobal Diaz	Ch.1	3	61	3	61	<p>Replace systems by ecosystems in the following way: ...recover degraded ecosystems...</p>	<p>This was included</p>

Patrick Ken Kalonde	Ch.1	4	63	4	67	But how is this going to be done. Now this section being an executive summary, we would have provided a picture on how we propose of doing it better	The method used was included in the preface and also in the updated executive summary
Emmanuelle Quillérou	Ch.1	3	66	3	66	LDRA not defined before acronym is used	This was rectified
Carolina ZQ	Ch.1	3	66	3	67	Although, the "chapter relevant questions to ILK knowledge holders" may seem as a initial attempt to involve such actors in this assessment, It worries me that such questions may seem or end up being selective and biased. I would encourage to clarify in the text (where is relevant, maybe not in this chapter) the process in which such questions where selected for the ILK knowledge holders, and the whole process involving them.	This was included in the preface to Chapter 1
Eila Gendig	Ch.1	3	66			define "LDRA"	This was rectified
U.S. government	Ch.1	3	66	3	68	Please define "LDRA" (page 4, line 103) before its use.	This was rectified
Yildiz AUMEERUDDY-THOMAS	Ch.1	3	67	3	69	There is an accepted use within IPBES (including a task force on this subject) regarding "traditional knowledge" to call this "Indigenous and Local Knowledge". It would be better to use this terminology everywhere.	We used the terminology supplied/developed by the task force on Indigenous and Local Knowledge.
Cristobal Diaz	Ch.1	3	68	3	68	The point 1.2.2.1.2 is repeated	This was rectified thank you
Virginia Meléndez Ramírez	Ch.1	3	70	3	70	Is Rehabilitation or Restoration? See Line 594 page 19	Both terms were used at Line 594 page 13
Yildiz AUMEERUDDY-THOMAS	Ch.1	4	71	4	73	Poorer sections of the world populations represented by a category also recognized by IPBES i.e. Indigenous Peoples and Local Communities depend almost entirely upon natural medicines (plants, animals and fungi) for their health and have a very poor access to conventional health systems. Land degradation is therefore very likely to affect this very large section of the global population (65 % of the world population including all small scale farmers, indigenous peoples and a section of people in urban areas). This idea should be covered in this paragraph because it is not only a matter of contaminants and increase in pathogens, but also of common and already well-known diseases that still kill millions of people	This was included within Chapter 1
Eila Gendig	Ch.1	3	72			Reference to Figure 1.3; the descriptive text does not match the figure's content.	This was updated
U.S. government	Ch.1	4	78	6	177	The summary (page 3) is helpful but the information in this section is very important - uncertain if it can be expanded / more prominent in the summary.	Thank you for this feedback, this section was expanded to take into consideration review requests and comments
Virginia Meléndez Ramírez	Ch.1	4	79	4	79	you can see for new: http://dx.doi.org/10.5751/ES-08288-210134	This reference was included
Cristobal Diaz	Ch.1	4	79	4	80	To add: 1.1.1 Why is the Land and Ecosystems Degradation and Restoration Assessment important, different and new?	We used the terminology provided by IPBES plenary so are unable to add the word "ecosystem". This section was in the preface.
Yildiz AUMEERUDDY-THOMAS	Ch.1	4	79	4	80	I am surprised that you affirm that land degradation is rarely the direct cause of direct conflict: there are violent direct conflicts between mining activities (gold for example, fossil fuel) in Amazonia, Asia, and local communities. It also depends what you understand by violent direct conflicts: all displacements of populations that may seem "smooth" and not violent by large scale exploitations vis à vis IPLCs are for the latter a violent conflict. May be it would be useful to nuance and also discuss violent psychological effects (in addition to violent direct conflicts) and issues of rights that are not recognized... The issue of rights to land does not appear in this spm...This needs to be addressed somewhere... Governance and institutions incorporate rights, but this specific theme should be considered separately maybe in drivers...	Thank you for this point, this section is a general introduction . The points you mention were attended to in Section 1.2.2
Steve Prince	Ch.1		79		80	This Chapter starts with an organizational review (UNCCD, Rio,CBD,SDGs, IPBES...), then a brief rehearsal of some statistics used to advance the notion of degradation (without indication of the qualifications needed) and, finally, a statement of the philosophy of IPBES (which needs to be rewritten since its meaning is not very clear). This top-down, organizational introduction, while normal in the many reports on the topic, is likely only to be of value to a very small set of readers interested in the bureaucracy. See comments on line 1	These sections was placed into a Preface so that the Chapter 1 can focus on the new information gleaned from the assessment
Steve Prince	Ch.1		82		82	I understood that IPBES has decided to adopt the new phrase "Nature's Contributions to People" to replace "ecosystem services"	This is an evolving change and will not be applied for this assessment. This element was explained in the Preface to the Report.
U.S. government	Ch.1	4	83	4	83	Oceania and most small islands settings in the Caribbean, Western and South Pacific also struggle with the impacts of land degradation.	This was included

UNCCD secretariat	Ch.1	4	83	4	86	The statement is incorrect. The UNCCD recognized the desertification, land degradation and drought are problems of global dimension(nor regional concern) in that they affect all regions of the world and that joint action of the international community is needed to combat desertification and/or mitigate the effects of drought (see Preamble text of the Convention). The UNCCD contains Regional Annexes in order to provide guidelines and arrangements for the effective implementation of the Convention in the affected country Parties of the different regions in the light of its particular conditions	This was addressed in our text, thank you
Steve Prince	Ch.1		83		83	The recent concern over Sahel "desertification" started in the late 1970s (36yrs ago) but it was discussed by colonial observers at least 100 yrs ago (Hubert, H. (1920). Le dessèchement progressif en Afrique Occidentale. Comité d'Etudes Historiques et Scientifiques de l'Afrique Occidentale Française, 401.) and probably earlier in the mid-19th century.	This was added, thank you
Steve Prince	Ch.1		85		85	"starting in" - The "effectiveness" of UNCCD is controversial!	Thank you for your comment, at this point we included time lines only of actions
Katalin Török	Ch.1	4	90			A reference or link to the Sustainable Development Goals under the references would be necessary	A reference was included at Line 90,cited as UN General Assembly 2015
Patrick Ken Kalonde	Ch.1	5	90	4	95	Halting land degradation while promoting economic growth. Is it justifiable to say that land economic activities are a primary cause of land degradation	Thank you for your comment this was removed
Emmanuelle Quillérou	Ch.1	4	92	4	95	Both the number (40 billion) and reference (Pimentel et al. 1995) are incorrect. Cost of land degradation has been estimated at about \$42 thousand million per year in 1990 U.S. dollars. Source: Dregne, H. E., & Chou, N. (1992). Global desertification dimensions and costs. Degradation and Restoration of Arid Lands, 73 – 92. I have thoroughly checked this information for compilation of the ELD Initiative interim report in 2013 (eld-initiative.org > publications) of which I am a co-author (only trained economist part of the scientific coordination team at the time). The year of the monetary estimate should be specified so that the information provided is correct (money changes value over time for a range of different reasons).	Thank you for this additional information
U.S. government	Ch.1	4	92	4	95	The reference to estimates of cost of land degradation cites a dated FAO document. Could there be (1) a reference to the specific FAO document and/or (2) use of a more recent document? In addition, the current discussion of the dollar value and the effect on human well-being may alienate economists. Please revise.	We included the ELD initiative of 2015, estimates of the costs, and updated the correct reference. As IPBES is very much centred around human well being, we have maintained the reference to human well being
David González Jiménez	Ch.1	4	94	4	95	Estimated by the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) to be \$40 billion annually, with large but unknown costs to human well-being -> costs are not only monetary, negative on health, social cohesion, lost of management practices, etc are also costs to human well-being. Suggested citation - 'The food systems we inherit in the 21st century represent some of the greatest achievements of human civilization. Paradoxically, they also represent some of the greatest threats to our continued health and prosperity.' (IPES-Food. 2016. From uniformity to diversity: a paradigm shift from industrial agriculture to diversified agroecological systems. International Panel of Experts on Sustainable Food systems)	Thank you for this excellent reference and suggestion. This was incorporated
Eila Gendig	Ch.1	4	96	4	97	What is teh timeframe of the estimated losses? Annual? Decadal? Century?	Annually - this was added to the text and clarified
Emmanuelle Quillérou	Ch.1	4	97	4	97	(ELD, 2015) should read (ELD Initiative, 2015). Page numbers of where you found the information need to be specified as this is quite a big report (170 pages). Same as for a book.	Page number was added and citation updated
Emmanuelle Quillérou	Ch.1	4	98	4	98	Global Gross DOMESTIC Product in 2010 (one missing word in capital letters and you need to add the year of reference for these numbers to make any kind of sense in economics). More generally speaking, getting an economist as a co-author on all chapters (at least 1 and 2) to check on the economic perspective and numbers could be good to make sure you are not instrumentalising this science and its results too much. I'd be happy to contribute in that capacity if you wish.	Thank you these changes were made
David González Jiménez	Ch.1	4	98	4	99	Should they even be compared at all? The IPBES guide on values says not all values are comparable, especially if they were valued for different foci (e.g. Soil erosion and ecosystem services are different foci of value)	Thank you for this suggestion which was accepted

Patrick Ken Kalonde	Ch.1	5	99	5	100	This cost has been is always too abstract for non-experts to understand as such it cannot be easily understood by most of the decision makers.	Thank you for this comment, which is acknowledged, however we do need to include such figures
Mahmoud Awad Mekki	Ch.1		107		107	e.g should include some biological items	Thank you this was added
Steve Prince	Ch.1		117		119	Cite Diaz et al. 2015 as the source of Fig. 1.1 (Díaz, S., Demissew, S., Joly, C., Lonsdale, W. M., & Larigauderie, A. (2015). A Rosetta Stone for Nature's Benefits to People. PLoS Biol , 13(1). http://doi.org/doi:10.1371/journal.pbio.1002040).	This reference was included thank you
Steve Prince	Ch.1		117		119	Fig. 1.1 has the term "Mother Earth" : to most readers this will imply adherence to the metaphysical Gaia hypothesis. This unfortunate terminology was removed from the subsequent IPBES Deliverable 3(c) (Policy support tools and methodologies for scenario analysis and modeling of biodiversity and ecosystem services.) Would it not be better to use the later version, if not from a philosophical point of view, to maintain uniformity across IPBES publications? Otherwise it needs to be made clear, as it is in the 2nd Plenary and by Pascual et al. (2017), that these are terms included to link with "Similar conceptualizations in other knowledge systems" (P. 40, Report of the second session of the Plenary of the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services).	We are using the IPBES approved conceptual framework and the wording within it.
Steve Prince	Ch.1		117		119	This Assessment includes important component on degradation, yet this is not in the diagram. At least the legend should indicate where and what types of disruptions may occur.	This diagram is the IPBES approved conceptual framework and shows which chapters link to which sections of that framework, it is not designed to expand upon that
Marcus Zisenis	Ch.1	5	129	5	134	Concentrated land ownership and restricted use for local and indigenous people is a main reason in history for exploitation of people and nature with loss of biodiversity back to the colonial times and before, as well of international companies and limited land owners. Democratisation of natural resources is a repeatedly discussed issue which needs to be reflected also in this report, including proposed concrete measures. This global challenge cannot be only solved by biodiversity knowledge sharing, but equal decision-making on land use of biodiversity is needed. It should be made clear which concrete impacts and promotion of sustainable land use has this report to offer.	This is covered in a number of sections of this Chapter and also in other Chapters of the Assessment
Eila Gendig	Ch.1	5	129			Simplifying the use of the phrase "indigenous peoples" and moving to using "indigenous people" or "groups of indigenous people" would be appreciated.	We use the terminology approved by the IPBES task force, that is indigenous peoples and local communities
Patrick Ken Kalonde	Ch.1	5	133	5	135	I dont necessarily understand how the involvement of indigenous people by IPBES different from previous approaches of involving indigenous people	The are many ways in which it is different including guidance by an IPBES ILK Task force, we will clarify this in the preface and in other places within the chapter and across the assessment
Emmanuelle Quillérou	Ch.1	5	134	5	134	Participation depends on whether it is made possible by organisations but also on resources available internally to NGOs and other types of contributors. See McCormick, H. (2014) Participation of NGOs in Land Degradation Policy-Making in Uganda: Is Opportunity to Participate Enough? Major Research Paper for the Master of Arts in Globalization Studies and the Water Without Borders Collaborative Graduate Program in Water, Environment and Health, McMaster University and United Nations University Institute for Water, Environment and Health (UNU-INWEH). Available from: http://inweh.unu.edu/reports	Thank you for this comment, this was included
UNCCD SPI	Ch.1	5	135	5	135	space after "Chapter"	This was corrected thank you
Pedro Mendoza	Ch.1	5	135	5	135	To include in a rectangle "Urban Life"	I am unsure how this comment relates to this line number?
Steve Prince	Ch.1		135		141	Is this not more an intention for the future? It certainly is not a strong component of this LDRA. (See section 1.2.2.1.1 below)	This occurred following submission of the SOD for Review and responses were requested through the External Review, and in cases where this was not possible by return email. This has definitely been a strong component for the LDRA Assessment, incorporating the above process, also with an ILK Expert contributing ILK suggestions to all Chapters of the Assessment
Astrid Hilgers	Ch.1	6	142	6	149	Financial sector is missing in this section	This was included
Caroline van Leenders	Ch.1		142			Why us the private financial sector missing?	This was included

UNCCD SPI	Ch.1	6	146	6	148	This statement is contradicted by the first sentence in the par, which states that the audience is policy and decision makers whose work may affect or be affected by biodiversity or nature's contributions to people. Land productivity is not apparently relevant. Also contradicted by the view of LD which pervades chapter 2 as any deviation from the natural state.	Land productivity was added, in Chapter 1, we outline a number of different states in Box 1 and in the discussion on the topic, I believe Chapter 2 has been adjusted following the external review
UNCCD secretariat	Ch.1	6	146	6	149	The sentence made explicitly reference to people whose livelihood depends on lands currently degraded. It could be understood that the report is only relevant to degraded lands rather non-degraded but at risk because of mismanagement We would like to see a reference to people living in non-degraded lands that through implementation fo sustainable land management avoid , and reduce, land degradation.	Thank you, this addition was included
Katalin Török	Ch.1	6	147	6	148	"on keeping land in its most productive state" This statement seems to contradict to the definition of land degradation (page 4, 81-83), and suggests that the LD is defined as a loss in productive state (=capacity of production), the biodiversity aspect is lost. I suggest to refer to ecosystem services. Please consider e.g.: eutrophication can also result in degradation.	Thank you this was included
UNCCD SPI	Ch.1	6	150	6	150	Assessment with small 'a'.	Thank you this was corrected
Finnish Government	Ch.1	6	159	6	159	Based on the references in each of the chapters IPBES work analyses much more than just public domain information. Many scientific journals are behind pay-wall and not in public domain.	Thank you this was corrected by the addition of "latest scientific peer reveiwed literature"
Cristobal Diaz	Ch.1	6	160	6	160	To add: ...and processes of land and ecosystems degradation and the resulting consequences for people and biodiversity	Thank you this was added
Mahmood Yekeh Yazdandoost	Ch.1	6	162	6	164	Correct.	Thank you
UNCCD SPI	Ch.1	6	163	6	163	What does LADA stand for?	The full name was included and a reference
Steve Prince	Ch.1		163		164	The global trends given in LADA have been heavily criticized. If LADA is to be reinstated here, some defense is needed and the criticisms answered. May be better to delete. See comments in Ch 5, sect. 5.3.1.1., lines 819-824.	We were trying to show how IPBES is different to other land degradation assessments, to cover your concerns we will delete the end of the sentence
Emmanuelle Quillérou	Ch.1	6	165	6	177	You may want to state explicitly that values do not necessarily mean monetary ones.	Thank you, this was included
David González Jiménez	Ch.1	6	165	6	172	Also use the citation of the IPBES preliminary guide on values (IPBES/4/INF/13 2016) Link: http://www.ipbes.net/sites/default/files/downloads/IPBES-4-INF-13_EN.pdf	This was added
Steve Prince	Ch.1		173		173	Is this the approach that LDRA has taken? If so, how? It is easy to state, but how it can be undertaken is highly problematic. Rather than the bland statement, some indication of how it was achieved would take the LDRA beyond the simply stating the issue, then proceeding as usual!	No this has no relevance to LDRA , this is the IPBES approach; Pascual reference to support the statement
Emmanuelle Quillérou	Ch.1	5	117	5	117	I don't understand what the colours are meant to represent. I would remove them and put all text in back (aside from Chapter numbers in red which can stay in coulours) There are many frameworks for assessment of nature circulating right now which creates confusion in the decision-making world. It would be good to have some comparison at some point of the IPBES one with others.	This is the IPBES Conceptual Frameowrk to which all IPBES assessments work. The version in this document has been updated , further explanation has been added to the text to explain colours use dwithin the framework
Marcus Zisenis	Ch.1	7	178	7	201	I wonder that (natural) regeneration or re-establishment ability are not considered as many natural ecosystems cannot be restored due to isolation barriers of species nowadays or limited too cost intensive land property or other reasons. For instance, the natural structure of woodlands cannot be achieved by planting trees. Ruderal areas in inner cities are practically not available anymore when estate prices have risen.	These are implicitly considered but we now added explanatory text to say this
Finnish Government	Ch.1	7	182	7	183	This definition of land is very close if not identical to that of an ecosystem and its functioning. This parallel should be developed here.	Indeed we inserted further explanatory text on this
Diana Patricia Alvarado-Solano	Ch.1	7	184	7	185	The assessment includes the definition of wetland established by the Ramsar Convention? If is that the case, it should be explicit in this sentence, in this way the readers can have a integrative perspective of definitions that are used in international conservation initiatives and could related with the conceptual framework and the results of the present assessment.	This was explicitly included.
Miguel Taboada	Ch.1	7	188	7	193	I wonder to which extent irreversible soil damages such as soil erosion are taken into account in these definitions. Soil losses by water or wind erosion are generally related to losses in biodiversity and soil functions. However, I think that irreversible soil degradation (eg. soil erosion gullies) should be more explicit.	This was explicitly included

Pedro Mendoza	Ch.1	7	188	7	188	To include "consensus"	It is not clear what this comment means, the definition was adopted by consensus by the IPBES parties.
Emmanuelle Quillérou	Ch.1	7	191	7	193	Does the definition of land degradation apply to a given land use? Or is it applicable when land use changes from let's say pristine primary forest to agriculture? This is a commonly overlooked factor which is critical to identify explicitly if action is to be taken. Also, degradation lies in the eye of the beholder. Something that is degraded for an agricultural scientist may not be considered as degraded by an economist when alternative land use activities are considered. How narrow a perspective you are adopting should be made explicit in your document.	Contrary to the narrow definition adopted by UNCCD, the IPBES definition of land degradation is not related to single land use systems. It is referring to terrestrial ecosystems and their processes of degradation. In this sense agricultural systems are considered as degraded if there has been a loss of biodiversity. In any case a full discussion on worldviews and perceptions of land degradation is reported in chapter 2.
Steve Prince	Ch.1		191		191	This definition does not make it clear that "degradation" sensu IPBES is restricted to anthropogenic processes. A clear statement of the various meanings (i.e. typology) of "degradation" is surely essential right from the start. See Chapter 4. P. 13 (sect 4.1.2.1)	Sentence was added
Steve Prince	Ch.1		192		192	Maybe add a note that Ecosystem Service have been renamed "Natures Contributions to People"	Explanation was added
Lucía Almeida-Leñero	Ch.1	7	194	7	197	SAME COMMENT AS BEFORE (page 3 line 53-55): The definition of both restoration and rehabilitation seem ambiguous to me. Restoration always will fall short in fully restoring biotic communities to its pre-degradation state. There will always exist constraints on the effectiveness of restoration. In that sense, is rehabilitation the same as restoration? Is rehabilitation a result of restoration? The difference is not clear. Rehabilitation can be defined as specific activities that aim to recover a specific element, set of elements or functions of an ecosystem so that it recovers part of its ecological integrity. Rehabilitation does not aim to recover the ecosystem to a pre-degradation state, thus cannot "fall short" in doing so. I would recommend not to use "fall short" but rather define rehabilitation as restoration activities that aim to restore and improve part of the biotic community and/or functions from a degraded state. See: (Bradshaw, 1997) where this subtle differences are addressed, or (Ovalle et al., 1999) where rehabilitation meant to improve soil fertility, in (Aronson et al., 1993) restoration seeks a complete or near complete return of a site (ecosystem) to a pre-existing state while rehabilitation seeks to repair damaged ecosystem functions or elements and settle on an alternative steady state or "simplified ecosystem" as an intermediate state between degradation and pre-degradation. In (Chazdon et al., 2016) both terms differ in their process and end goals, which vary in the degree to which they are true to the pre-degradation state. The same authors consider rehabilitation emphasizes in functional aspects of recovery. More examples of this can be addressed. See: Bradshaw, A. D. (1997). What do we mean by restoration?. En K. M. Urbanska, et al. (Ed.), Restoration ecology and sustainable development (pp. 8-14). Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press Ovalle, C., Aronson, J., Del Pozo, A., & Avendan, J. (1999). Restoration and rehabilitation of mixed espinales in central Chile: 10-year report and appraisal. Aronson, J., Floret, C., Floc'h, E., Ovalle, C., & Pontanier, R. (1993). Restoration and rehabilitation of degraded ecosystems in arid and semi-arid lands. I. A View from the South. Restoration ecology, 1(1), 8-17. Chazdon, R. L., Brancalion, P. H., Laestadius, L., Bennett-Curry, A., Buckingham, K., Kumar, C., Moll-Rocek, J., Guimaraes-Vieira, I. C. & Wilson, S. J. (2016). When is a forest a forest? Forest concepts and definitions in the era of forest and landscape restoration. Ambio, 45(5), 538-550.	It is the definition adopted by the IPBES Plenary by Consensus of all parties and was accepted by the scoping study for this assessment
Germany	Ch.1	7	194	7	195	Please cross-check the wording provided for the definition of 'restoration' (very unclear) with the definition of 'restoration' provided in the SPM on page 3, line 51 (also unclear) in order to at least ensure consistency within the SOD. Ch. 2, page 11, lines 400-402 provides a very clear differentiation by the authors what restoration and rehabilitation are. This aligns with the clear definitions of restoration and restoration provided by the CBD: https://www.cbd.int/cepa/toolkit/2008/doc/CBD-Toolkit-Glossaries.pdf .	The wording is taken from the adopted scoping document by IPBES for the LDRA. Further explanatory text is available in Chapter 2 and is fully cross-referenced.. Consistency with the SPM has been assured.
Javier Ernesto Cortés Suárez	Ch.1	7	194	7	197	Check on previous comment. The term Recuperation Ecology should also be incorporated.	Do you mean Restoration Ecology sensu Society of Ecological Restoration (SER)?
Virginia Meléndez Ramírez	Ch.1	7	194	7	194	You could add a figure, similar to this figure...	Comment without any meaning...
Diana Patricia Alvarado-Solano	Ch.1	7	194	7	195	SER (Society of Ecological Restoration) defines Ecological Restoration as The process of assisting the recovery of an ecosystem that has been degraded, damaged, or destroyed. Even the two definitions are closely similar, the definition proposed by SER includes different levels of degradation. How these two concepts could be correlated in this actual assessment?	Reference and explanation was inserted.

Emmanuelle Quillérou	Ch.1	7	196	7	197	It would be good to outline that rehabilitation, albeit short of restoration, is still an improvement on the current state of land. It is not because it does not go the full way that it should not be considered!	It is repeatedly stated and fully explained in Chapter 2.
Finnish Government	Ch.1	7	199	7	201	it is stated that the different state are further elaborated in Chapter 2, but there is no discussion about index state in Ch 2.	We made a reference to Chapter 2 on this
UNCCD SPI	Ch.1	7	199	7	201	This terminology differs to that used in Ch2	The two Chapters now use the same terminology
Wilson Ramirez	Ch.1	8	207	8	208	Box 1.1 - Some of these concepts are well reviewed into the primer document of the Society for the Ecological Restoration, It key to include citation: https://nau.edu/uploadedFiles/Centers-Institutes/ERI/_Forms/Resources/ser-primer.pdf	A link was provided to the SER work where restoration is discussed the reference to be cited is McDonald et al., 2016
Carolina ZQ	Ch.1	8	207	8	208	The index state is said to be "the state in year 1992 give or take 2 years (ie 1991-2005)" it should be (ie 1991-1994)	This section was updated
Gardner	Ch.1	8	207	8	208	Box 1.1 Minor point: the parenthetical appears to be off in the sentence: "The Index state wherever possible is the state in year 1992 give or take 2 years (ie 1991-2005)."	We no longer refer to an index state
UNCCD SPI	Ch.1	8	207	8	208	point not clear: ... requires asking 'degraded or degraded relative to what?	Box 1.1 was reworked
UNCCD SPI	Ch.1	8	207	8	208	index state not mentioned in ch 2, 1992 not suggested as a reference. Could be equivalent to "time-bound historical baseline"	Box 1.1 was significantly reworked, please see the updated version
UNCCD SPI	Ch.1	8	207	8	208	Reference state: is called Time bound natural state baseline in ch 2	Box 1.1 was significantly reworked, please see the updated version
UNCCD SPI	Ch.1	8	207	8	208	Desired state is called target in ch 2	Box 1.1 was significantly reworked, please see the updated version
LI Changxiao	Ch.1	8	207	8	208	In "Index State", "... the state in the year 1992 give or take 2 years (ie 1991-2005)" should be corrected.	Box 1.1 was significantly reworked, please see the updated version
Steve Prince	Ch.1	8	207	8	208	Box Line 1 - This topic is also covered in Chapter 4 (Sect 4.1.2.3), since the Ch 4 Authors find the account here deficient in some respects.	Box 1.1 was significantly reworked, please see the updated version
Steve Prince	Ch.1	8	207	8	208	Box Line 11 - Correction: 1992+/- 2 = 1990-1994, not 1991-2005	Box 1.1 was significantly reworked, please see the updated version
Steve Prince	Ch.1	8	207	8	208	Box Line 11 - This restriction is unrealistic. It excludes a large number of relevant data sets, significant numbers of which date from the 1950's and there are many other valuable data that started later than 1992. It is also unnecessary in most assessments which are quite independent of each other.	Box 1.1 was significantly reworked, please see the updated version
Steve Prince	Ch.1	8	207	8	208	Box Line 13 - in some slow variables - there are plenty slower than 25yrs.	Box 1.1 was significantly reworked, please see the updated version
Steve Prince	Ch.1	8	207	8	208	l15:l17 - Policy-relevance is not dependent on the dates of meetings and conventions. One could say, "It is convenient since it coincides..."	Box 1.1 was significantly reworked, please see the updated version
Steve Prince	Ch.1	8	207	8	208	Line 19 - This is quite impractical. Some of the reasons are given in Chapter 4, Introduction (lines 493-525).	Box 1.1 was significantly reworked, please see the updated version
Steve Prince	Ch.1	8	207	8	208	Line 19 - "...recent and contemporary change...."	Box 1.1 was significantly reworked, please see the updated version
Steve Prince	Ch.1	8	207	8	208	Line 21 - ILK of the Holocene is a bit of a stretch! Delete.	Box 1.1 was significantly reworked, please see the updated version
Steve Prince	Ch.1	8	207	8	208	Line 23 to 25 - This is quite unrealistic. Saying "...allowing free selection of a recent reference state increases the possibility of deliberate bias and arguments..", is firstly pejorative and, secondly, "free selection" is not the reason multiple reference states are necessary - it is simply the state available in the data. Anything else is conjecture - why go for conjecture rather than the real results?	Box 1.1 was significantly reworked, please see the updated version
Steve Prince	Ch.1	8	207	8	208	Line 24 to 25 - Meaning unclear. A state cannot be equated with a topic box in the diagram.	Box 1.1 was significantly reworked, please see the updated version
Steve Prince	Ch.1	8	207	8	208	Line 25 to 30 - This is correct, but it contradicts the obvious interpretation of the first sentence of the same paragraph.	Box 1.1 was significantly reworked, please see the updated version
Steve Prince	Ch.1	8	207	8	208	Line 3 - Restored	Box 1.1 was significantly reworked, please see the updated version
Steve Prince	Ch.1	8	207	8	208	Line 31 to 32 - The meaning of "context dependence" of a "choice" should be elaborated. The "choice" could be conditioned by changes in the environmental conditions, previous and current human use, by culture, tradition etc.	Box 1.1 was significantly reworked, please see the updated version
Steve Prince	Ch.1	8	207	8	208	Line 34 to 35 - A state cannot be equated with a topic box in the diagram. Better, "Conceptually it is the state that maximizes Nature's Benefits to People"	Box 1.1 was significantly reworked, please see the updated version
Steve Prince	Ch.1	8	207	8	208	Line 37 - "...may change over time owing to both environmental and anthropogenic changes, and will...."	Box 1.1 was significantly reworked, please see the updated version
Steve Prince	Ch.1	8	207	8	208	Line 5 - Delete. The notion of a baseline is clear, but this qualifier ("time-based") adds a sense of something other than the obvious (and correct) meaning.	Box 1.1 was significantly reworked, please see the updated version

Steve Prince	Ch.1	8	207	8	208	Line 7 - Would it not be better to simply state the actual date of the data? Presumably 2013+/-2 is not meant to prohibit use of data before or after? And 5yrs is a considerable period, especially for short time-series, so the actual date is more informative.	Box 1.1 was significantly reworked, please see the updated version
Steve Prince	Ch.1	8	207	8	208	Line 7 to 8 - Clarify meaning	Box 1.1 was significantly reworked, please see the updated version
Steve Prince	Ch.1	8	207	8	208	Line 9 - This "state" is confusing since "Index" and "reference" (used next) generally mean the same thing. To be clear, something like "IPBES Uniform Reference Date" would be needed. But why reject data because they happen not to have a 1992 value? The most common problem is shortage of data, and none should be passed-over simply because there are no values for 1992+/- 2. Better to stick with the term "Reference state" and specify its actual date of measurement. If it intended to substitute the term "Index" omitting the actual date, accuracy was unnecessarily reduced.	Box 1.1 was significantly reworked, please see the updated version
Katalin Török	Ch.1	8	207	8	208	"or in practice be the same thing" I think this should be deleted as the current and index state cannot be the same.	Box 1.1 was significantly reworked, please see the updated version
Katalin Török	Ch.1	8	207	8	208	the asterisk is not referred to after Holocene	Box 1.1 was significantly reworked, please see the updated version
Cristobal Diaz	Ch.1	8	207	8	208	Line 32 Box 1.1 - To change chose for choose as: People choose to restore land,.....	Box 1.1 was significantly reworked, please see the updated version
David Le Maitre	Ch.1	8	207	8	208	Box 1.1 - Reference State. It is not clear from this description whether the anthropogenic loss of megafauna in Americas, Australia, new Zealand and many island systems has been taken into account. I realise that the evidence is not robust but my understanding is that the role of humans in this loss is accepted. This then suggests that reference state description should take this into explicitly account because of its impacts on animal-ecosystem interactions, particularly vegetation dynamics where many species are likely to have played key roles similar to elephants and other megafauna in Africa and ecosystem change could have been substantial	Box 1.1 was significantly reworked, please see the updated version
Joanne Perry NZ focal point	Ch.1	8	207	8	208	2nd para title Index state - third row down. Please check the dates, you state give or take two years i.e. 1991-2005 which seems to be either an error of a juxtaposition that is confusing.	Box 1.1 was significantly reworked, please see the updated version
Patrick Ken Kalonde	Ch.1	8	207	8	208	This is very important bearing that certain regions of the world do not have sufficient information about the state of land resources over the past decades. In such situation people who have been living in the area for quite a long period of time can be used as a reliable source of information. But this was not explicitly described here.	Box 1.1 was significantly reworked, please see the updated version
Steve Prince	Ch.1		208		208	"conducts" = "conducted"?	Thank you this was changed
Steve Prince	Ch.1		208		208	"..what were the tasks..."	Thank you this was changed
Steve Prince	Ch.1		213		213	delete "on relatively small..."	Thank you this was changed
Steve Prince	Ch.1		213		213	replace can with "could"	Thank you this was changed
Steve Prince	Ch.1		214		214	remove red stike through	I am unsure of the meaning of this comment
Steve Prince	Ch.1		214		214	"...who are listed, but did..."	Thank you this was changed
Steve Prince	Ch.1		215		215	replace approved with "selected"	Thank you this was changed
Steve Prince	Ch.1		215		215	replace "it is" with "was"	Thank you this was changed
Finnish Government	Ch.1	9	217			line 217 onwards and general: There should be a remark made on the change in terminology. During Plenary 5 it was discovered that the term benefits to people, that was approved by an earlier Plenary of IPBES as part of the framework, had been instructed to be changed to contributions to people. While such change may be desirable and justified, it should be made clear that it has happened. For example, in Figure 1.1 we still have benefits to people while in Figure 2.3 it has been replaced by contributions to people.	This was updated, along with wording in the text to explain these changes and the manner in which the Land Degardation and Restoration Assessment has dealt with such changes during the Assessment process. Changes in wording which occur relate to published documents
UNCCD SPI	Ch.1	9	222	9	230	it would be more helpful to the reader to provide this information to interpret the figure in the figure caption.	This was done and the text relating to the figure was placed with the figure
Steve Prince	Ch.1		222		230	This would be better in the Fig legend - as it is in the existing publications that use it.	This was done and the relevant text was located with the figure
Katalin Török	Ch.1	9	231			UNEP 2014 - not included in the references - is it correct to cite the Plenary of IPBES?	It was included and yes it is correct to cite Plenary of IPBES
Steve Prince	Ch.1		231		231	This reference is not given in the Bibliography.	this was added to the Bibliography
Emmanuelle Quillérou	Ch.1	9	233	9	233	typo to be revised: "given in (Diaz et al., 2015)".	This was corrected
David González Jiménez	Ch.1	9	243	9	243	It is not only difering values but different values which do not necessarily differ that it should take into account	This was corrected
Emmanuelle Quillérou	Ch.1	10	250	10	250	NCP not defined.	This was defined
David Le Maitre	Ch.1	10	250			NCP needs to be defined on 1st use	This was defined on its first use

David González Jiménez	Ch.1	10	250	10	250	NCP has not been used before, write the full name and acronym in brackets	This was defined on its first use including the acronym
U.S. government	Ch.1	10	254	10	264	The use of "well established" and other clarifiers is most helpful.	Thank you
Eila Gendig	Ch.1	10	260			Further research cannot always resolve low confidence in the results. Need acceptance that some questions cannot be answered conclusively.	If they cannot be answered conclusively IPBES accepts that further research may provide conclusive responses
UNCCD SPI	Ch.1	10	265			reword "restoration of land degradation" is surely not what you mean. Perhaps you mean reversal or land degradation?	This was corrected thank you
U.S. government	Ch.1	10	272	31	939	The presentation of the case studies and the use of a relative value for NCP works well. This chapter might be the correct spot to identify the limitations of our current use of NCPs, beyond a "score," as it is used here. There are real limitations in fully understanding ecosystem services-both in measuring (especially in the difficult areas of cultural/spiritual values) and in many of the production functions, which will allow us to evaluate alternatives and to project outcomes.	We included these limitations in both the preface and this Chapter, thank you for this very valid comment
Mahmood Yekeh Yazdandoost	Ch.1	11	276	11	284	Correct.	Thank you
Steve Prince	Ch.1		277		277	Delete "Chapter 1", replace with "presented in section 1.3."	Thank you, this was corrected
UNCCD SPI	Ch.1	11	287			the 3 points listed in circle 2 do not seem to fit under this title	This figure, wording and title were improved incorporating these comments
UNCCD SPI	Ch.1	11	287			Point not clear: Framework for guiding decisions to establish and identify success...	The figure and legend about the operating framework was updated as well as the explanations in the text for this section, which now clarifies and explains the approach in more detail
Emmanuelle Quillérou	Ch.1	11	287	11	287	Figure 1.3: too complex to make any kind of sense to me as it is represented. It combines directional impacts (red arrows) as well as intersections that are not specifically identified with separate labels. For example, what is the intersection between guiding instruments and biophysical condition? What does it represent? Putting everything in black and white could help you rework it so that it is more intelligible. Alternatively, I would remove the diagram entirely as I do not feel the representation is useful and use text instead.	The figure was simplified and greater explanation provided in the text and legend
Germany	Ch.1	11	287			Figure 1.3 - Shift subcategory 2.1 <i>Social and Cultural instruments</i> and subcategory 3.4 <i>Science and technological instruments</i> to Framework group 1 <i>Guiding Instruments</i> . Ensure consistency with Fig. 6.1, p. 9, Table 6.1, p. 11-12 ,and with listed Instruments in Chap. 8.	Social and cultural was included in guiding instruments, they were sub categories of 1.4, 1.5, 1.6, 1.7, to simplify the figure headings as much as possible the overlaps of the circles was used to demonstrate the overlaps of these instruments. We worked on the consistency across relevant sections in other chapters
UNCCD SPI	Ch.1	12	293			it should say Nature's NOT Natures	This was corrected thank you
LI Changxiao	Ch.1	12	298	12	300	More detailed information about the evaluation approach should be provided, especially regarding how to concretely score the successful cases.	Further expanded background exploratory information was included for the whole approach
Steve Prince	Ch.1		298		300	Note the arbitrary bases of these scores, dependent, as they are, on subjective assessments that cannot be uniform across all of the "stories".	The methodology for these scores was updated and explanations expanded to ensure the approach used is scientifically valid and repeatable
Katalin Török	Ch.1	12	299			not scored?	This was corrected thank you
Steve Prince	Ch.1		301		301	Given the clarion-call to ILK (e.g. lines 136-140), its absence here is strange, and reinforces the view that the importance given to ILK is more an aspiration, not an actual current application!	This has been included here
Astrid Hilgers	Ch.1	12	306	12	323	could include Business case / insights for finance of in section 1.2.2.1.1 examples at (http://peoplefoodandnature.org/)	Excellent, thank you for this I have added information here and I am sure there was other places throughout this Chapter where there was relevant information

						The have also demonstrated not to be succesful, especifcally because they are often in conflict with other worldviews and values, see Pascual 2016. The specific case of PES, for example which in Latin America 'providing an economic incentive for only one function of only one type of ecosystem will lead to extremely unbalanced outcomes as far as the many other values and functions of biodiversity is concerned. The main victims are the Indigenous peoples and local communities, including in particular women, who depend on those values and functions.' / also... 'Private markets have failed to assign prices to many ecosystem services that reflect the benefits those services provide to society as a whole.' Suggested literature Kroeger & Casey (2007) <i>An assessment of market-based approaches to providing ecosystem services on agricultural lands</i> . Ecological Economics	Thank you for this information this and the reference was included
David González Jiménez	Ch.1	12	306	12	323		
Mahmood Yekeh Yazdandoost	Ch.1	12	307	12	314	Correct.	Thank you
Caroline van Leenders	Ch.1		307			Insight of the work of the Platform Landscapes for People Food and Nature should be included. See http://peoplefoodandnature.org/publication/business-for-sustainable-landscapes/	Thank you, excellent this was included
Katalin Török	Ch.1	12	310			Wortley et al OR Wortley, Hero, & Howes, 2013 (not evident: 2 or 3 authors have to be liste? See page 12, 318: also 3 authors, cited as: Nkonya et al., 2016)	Thank you
Emmanuelle Quillérou	Ch.1	12	311	12	311	You could add a sentence to refer to the paper by Qadir et al below which explores a few options for land rehabilitation and/or mitigation of salt-induced land degradation for agriculture. It has both an agronomic and an economic perspective. Qadir, M., Quillérou, E., Nangia, V., Murtaza, G., Singh, M., Thomas, R.J., Drechsel, P., Noble, A.D. (2014) Economics of Salt-induced Land Degradation and Restoration. Natural Resources Forum, A United Nations Sustainable Development Journal, 38: 282–295.	This was added, thank you
Emmanuelle Quillérou	Ch.1	12	311	12	314	Typo in ELD Initiative reference (full stop before comma needs removing) - in more than one places. More importantly, I am not sure you have fully understood what the ELD initiative does. There are two separate strads to it. 1) The first one is an assessment of economic evidence available and formalising an approach to undertake structured assessments of possible land management improvements in terms of making them more ecologically <u>and</u> economically sustainable. Scientific coordination was provided by Richard Thomas and a team at UNU-INWHE Canada. The ELD Initiative does NOT provide incentives to lower or remove economic barriers, but there is some review of past successes in the reports to identify a few factors for success (ie adoption of more sustainable land management practices). There is a limited number of case studies commissioned by GIZ (with funding originally from BMZ) under the ELD Initiative label which may have some funding included but you would need to be more specific and mention the case study report explicitly so as not to mislead people on what the initiative is about. 2) the second one is a research strand with some case studies funded and coordinated through ZEF and the CGIAR system (von Braun & Nkonya). Funding was provided by BMZ in Germany. It is also under the ELD label but with very different teams and funding sources from the first strand, with communication between both strands. You however need to make it clear which of those two strands you are referring to and/or whether you are referring to assessments or case studies in your text.	Thank you for this information, the wording was clarified
Katalin Török	Ch.1	12	314		316	predicate missing (wording)	This was corrected thank you
Javier Ernesto Cortés Suárez	Ch.1	12	316	12	323	PES have been eventually succesful in different parts of the world. Nevertheless its aplication is relative according to the country, its legislation, among other factors. In this sense it would be better to ilustrate PES importance with diferente examples around the world and not only one. It is also important to show where the PES have failed and the solutions that have been incorporated.	Thank you this was included
Emmanuelle Quillérou	Ch.1	12	317	12	319	In addition to Nkonya et al, you could cite the following paper by Sengalama and Quillérou which aims to assess feasibility of a PES scheme in Uganda with downstream water users paying for upstream farming practices that are more sustainable and that allow for higher downstream water levels. Sengalama, T., Quillérou, E. (2016) Paying for water in Uganda: is paying upstream land users a possible solution? The Solutions Journal, Special issue on "Sustainable Land Solutions", September-October, 64-73.	Thank you this was included
UNCCD SPI	Ch.1	12	322			it should say indigenou NOT Indigneous	This was corrected thank you

Eila Gendig	Ch.1	12	325	13	353	Legal instruments can only be as good as the control of compliance and potential prosecution that follows.	This was added thank you
Emmanuelle Quillérou	Ch.1	13	328	13	355	In terms of South Africa requirements, you could look up and cite the following paper: McNeill, T, Quillérou, E (2016) Making money after mining: farming on rehabilitated open cast mines can lead to increased revenues – but it needs to be maintained. The Solutions Journal, Special issue on “Sustainable Land Solutions”, September-October, 74-79. This paper also shows that depending on how rehabilitation is undertaken, revenues may be lower or higher than before mining (no inclusion of costs because of cost data not being available).	Thank you, this was included
Eila Gendig	Ch.1	13	328			Mentioning the state of Sao Paulo for legally established restoration goals and compulsory restoration targets, when illegal logging and displacement of indigenous groups is a major issue in Brazil, seems to be a poor example.	Thank you we will modify this statement
Wilson Ramirez	Ch.1	13	328	13	335	We can include here a recent paper in Restoration Ecology, where some policy aspects in Latin America are reviewed. The reference is: Meli, P., F. F. Herrera, F. Melo, S. Pinto, N. Aguirre, K. Musálem, C. Minaverry, W. Ramirez, and P. H. S. Brancalion. 2016. Four approaches to guide ecological restoration in Latin America. Restoration Ecology:1–8.	Thank you great to have some information about Latin American, this was included
Li Changxiao	Ch.1	13	329	13	329	Please add "and" before "the Western Australia State Leagal".	This was corrected thank you
Gardner	Ch.1	13	333	13	335	If you want to highlight failures more broadly beyond mangroves, you may wish to consider adding NRC (2001) https://www.nap.edu/catalog/10134/compensating-for-wetland-losses-under-the-clean-water-act which also notes the need for specificity in performance standards for restoration.	Thank you this was included
Sandhya Chandrasekharan	Ch.1	13	336	13	353	In the grey area between "formal law" and "indigenous law" it would be good to reflect on how forces of modernisation have diluted the latter, been not so effective with implementing the former, and how therefore semi-institutionalised common property arrangements (which are neither recognised by law, nor are strictly traditional, in that they may operate in a new locale/ under new ecological constraint etc) are (a) brought about (b) are successful as well as face challenges.	This was included
Patrick Ken Kalonde	Ch.1	13	336	13	345	Quite true indeed, but there is still need to shed more light on how this can be done on colonial disputed land as it is the case in Zimbabwe and Southern part of Malawi. In all these regions the locals have different view on land tenure regimes.	This was included
Katalin Török	Ch.1	12	339			Hall "R" not necessary	This was corrected thank you
Katalin Török	Ch.1	12	339			existS	This was corrected thank you
Eila Gendig	Ch.1	13	346	13	353	Customary law and indigenous practices are not always a recipe for success and better land use practices. There are several examples of indigenous groups having caused local species extinctions or severely changed environments by their customary practices. However we do recognise that there is significant value in utilising the wisdom and knowledge of ILK holders who have been on the land for generations and who have intergenerational observational knowledge relevant to the issues at hand.	Thank you this was included
Javier Ernesto Cortés Suárez	Ch.1	13	346	13	353	These should have more examples from around the world that allow to visualize the importance on how indigenous law contribute to sustainable land management. How is the assessment articulated with the ILO Convention (n° 169)?	The reference Hall et al in this section, refers to examples from 10 countries, the countries have been included in the text. We included the ILO Convention N. 169
Mahmoud Awad Mekki	Ch.1		346		346	It would be more appropriate to use customary law rather than traditional law	Thank you
Cristobal Diaz	Ch.1	13	350	13	351	To add: Negative changes which occur in ecosystem components,.....	This was added thank you
Katalin Török	Ch.1	13	350			ref. Not standard: Guilfoyle, Mitchell, 2015	This was corrected thank you
Gardner	Ch.1	13	355	13	358	Recommend adding the Ramsar Convention Strategic Plan 2016-2024, which also has provisions regarding (wet)land degradation: http://www.ramsar.org/sites/default/files/documents/library/4th_strategic_plan_2016_2024_e.pdf	Thank you this was added
Amadou Camara	Ch.1	13	358	13	363	It is important to include the Land Degradation Neutrality Target Setting Programme as an ongoing activity of the UNCCD	This was included
Katalin Török	Ch.1	13	358			Montanarella & LOBOS 2015	this was added thank you

Wilson Ramirez	Ch.1	13	363	13	363	We can mention here the Latin American initiative of 20*20, restoring 20 million ha in Latin America until 2020, guided by WRI, with a strong influence in political agenda: http://www.wri.org/our-work/project/initiative-20x20	Thank you, this was included
Arora	Ch.1	13	364	14	381	The reference to the Sendai framework for DRR is appropriate although it may highlight the key initiative on eco-drr (Ecosystem based) approaches that will have a direct relation to LDR. The section 30 n <i>To strengthen the sustainable use and management of ecosystems and implement integrated environmental and natural resource management approaches that incorporate disaster risk reduction; therefore may also be included.</i>	Thank you the ecosystem approach is important this was included, as well as the section 30n
Abisha Mapendembe	Ch.1	13	365		365	Please reword "...reducing services provided by ecosystems". Still in the same line replace the word "priorities" with "prioritise"	Thank you the corections was made
Li Changxiao	Ch.1	13	365	13	365	Please change "priorities" to "prioritizes".	This was changed thank you
Katalin Török	Ch.1	13	365			prioritizes	This was changed thank you
Sandhya Chandrasekharan	Ch.1	14	371	14	374	also good to mention land use transformation in general with regard to urban planning. Regular urbanisation needs to be more ecosystem aware and accountable.	This has been incorporated thank you
Eila Gendig	Ch.1	14	379	14	381	These 3 lines seem out of place and do not align with the paragraph's header.	This was reworded
Katalin Török	Ch.1	14	386	14	387	Please check names: Guilfoyle, D R, Mitchell and R Hill	This was corrected thank you
Eila Gendig	Ch.1	14	389			should read "LDR outcomes", as an assessment (LDRA) should be neutral and neither successful nor unsuccessful	As this section is based around approaches with the potential to achieve successful actions and outcomes we left this word in place
Mahmood Yekeh Yazdandoost	Ch.1	14	390	14	397	Correct.	Thank you
Lucía Almeida-Leñero	Ch.1	14	398	14	402	This statement seems to me somewhat biased ... In cases where there is secure land tenure, it is possible to implement restoration or rehabilitation projects with greater ease etc. However, the way in which it is written in the text, seems to suggest that to avoid degradation or to be able to carry out restoration it is necessary that these lands have owner. There are many sites or ecosystems without owners or public nature that should also be subject to restoration if necessary without implying that they have to be privatized. That is, why promote ownership of these areas that in cases must be "free" or "all." It seems to me a way of fomenting and justifying the acquisition of lands by actors who have the economic resources to obtain them (independently of the intention). One of the causes of land degradation in Mexico (fragmentation, etc.) is precisely because of the type of Community ownership and little defined, which has generated many conflicts, etc. It should be clarified or commented that in many cases the type of land tenure has created conflicts and have been associated with degradation. Privatization / land distribution is also part of the problem of degradation. And it is only beneficial when the owners are ascribed to initiatives to restore or not to exploit said lands. The statement as written in the document leaves the possibility open to justify the acquisition of land for perverse or individualistic purposes.	Thank you; additional information was provided to clarify the meaning
Suneetha Mazhenchery Subramanian	Ch.1	14	402	14	402	FOA?? Is this FAO?	This was corrected thank you
David Le Maitre	Ch.1	14	402			FOA = FAO	This was corrected thank you
Ju Zhengshan	Ch.1	14	402	14	402	"FOA" may be an error for "FAO"	This was corrected thank you
Li Changxiao	Ch.1	14	402	14	402	Please change "FOA" to "FAO".	This was corrected thank you
UNCCD SPI	Ch.1	14	404		408	This paragraph needs re-writing; SDG indicator 15.3.1 does not address land tenure as written here. 15.3.1. is about Proportion of land that is degraded over total land area	This was corrected thank you
Katalin Török	Ch.1	14	405			What is IAEG-SDGs, 2016 ?	This was deleted and the correct reference inserted
Sandhya Chandrasekharan	Ch.1	15	416	15	431	The discussion on good governance structures would be more comprehensive and acknowledging of developing country realities if a discussion on old style Public Administration v/s New Institutionalism and multi-stakeholder governance is reflected here (as against 'active multiple stakeholders' as being separate from governance). Lines 418-420 are not to be assumed as "universal", and theory that is more reflective of empirical reality would be appreciable.	Thank you this was considered in the revision
Javier Ernesto Cortés Suárez	Ch.1	15	416	15	430	Good governance should be establish not only considering Governance as the way to accord objectives from all the actors in a territory, but also considering Governability as the way to sustainable management of environmental, economic and social resources in order to accomplish a solid Government structure.	Thank you this was included
David Le Maitre	Ch.1	15	416	15	442	Both Good Governance and Active stakeholder involvement are needed, the descriptions to not make it clear enough that each in isolation is not sufficient for true success	This was made clearer to show they are all interrelated to relate to good governance

Mahmood Yekeh Yazdandoost	Ch.1	15	424	15	427	Correct.	Thank you
Li Changxiao	Ch.1	15	427	15	455	The format on citations of the references should be consistent, also throughout the document.	Thank you
Astrid Hilgers	Ch.1	15	431	15	442	Private finance is missed as stakeholder and thus in involvement regarding negative impact or positive investing	Thank you this was incorporated
Caroline van Leenders	Ch.1		431			the private financial sector is missing. Therefore the actions they are taking on accounting for their negative impact, but also understanding their dependencies and possibilities for positive impact is not taken into account. See also http://www.rvo.nl/sites/default/files/2016/10/Finance%20for%20one%20planet%202016%20-%20CoP%20Financial%20Institutions%20and%20Natural%20Capital.pdf	Thank you this was incorporated
Germany	Ch.1	15	437	15	442	Consider shifting the text passage on key success factors to the beginning of the chapter 1.2, very close under the topic "When is the avoidance or restoration of land degradation successful?", page 11, line 284, before Fig. 1.3.	Thank you this change was made
Li Changxiao	Ch.1	15	437	15	443	Please change "Natures Contributions to People" to "Nature's Contributions to People", and also, the same neglects in quite many places throughout the document.	This was corrected thank you
Sandhya Chandrasekharan	Ch.1	15	439	15	440	'(2) are compatible with economic mechanisms'? That requires being status-quoist as against perhaps effecting the change, through political processes, that will address detrimental economic mechanisms	Thank you this was updated
David González Jiménez	Ch.1	15	439	15	440	(2) are compatible with economic mechanisms - In fact it should be the other way around, economic mechanisms should be compatible with (1), (3) and (4). Suggestion, to present 1,3, and 4 and then... when related to economic mechanisms, these are compatible with all the above.	Thank you for this helpful suggestion
Germany	Ch.1	15	441			The issue of „Capacity Building“ is an important factor/criterion for successful land restoration and is identified as a key success factor. The significant importance of capacity building is underlined by other chapters (esp. Ch. 6/Ch. 8). Capacity building is not subsumed under one of the Framework group's Instruments (see Fig. 1.3 on page 11). Please check and add. (consistency check)	Thank you for this comment capacity building was added to all three sections
UNCCD SPI	Ch.1	15	443			interactions of what?	Wording was changed
Steve Prince	Ch.1		443			Many statements in this Section are too absolute (e.g. lines 484-5). They might be true in an ideal world, but in most cases they are conjectures. Some qualification of these statements ("can", "may", "in some cases have"...)	Thank you for the suggestion
Mahmood Yekeh Yazdandoost	Ch.1	15	445	15	453	Correct.	Thank you
Emmanuelle Quillérou	Ch.1	15	445	15	446	"To avoid land degradation, the Economics of Land Degradation Initiative (ELD) advocates removal of barriers which limit the inclusion of social and cultural attributes (ELD Initiative, 2015)" --> cultural and social attributes can be barriers to action. The ELD Initiative advocates for removal of cultural, environment, legal, social, and technical barriers (all of those, not just social and cultural) so that action can be taken to improve land management (NOT to avoid land degradation but rather to improve the current state of land).	Thank you, correction was made
Carolina ZQ	Ch.1	15	445	16	468	What happens when traditional knowledge systems and local communities are subject to immigration, emigration, marginalization, cultural contamination, and widespread decay that disables or impairs their traditional knowledge system, interests, and expectations. Is this being taken into account? These problems or situations should be mentioned in order to clarify that in order for their inclusion to contribute positively to the restoration, mechanisms of "restoration and social rehabilitation" must also be established, such as education, support, reappropriation of traditional values and cultural practices.	Thank you this was added
Sandhya Chandrasekharan	Ch.1	15	445	15	446	'removal of barriers which limit the inclusion of social and cultural attributes' makes it seem like the barriers are tangible things that can be removed through physical action. Hardly that - they are often attitudes/values/ power differentials. So an example would be helpful to make the point. It also needs to capture that 'tradition' also is in transition, rather than static/ preserved like a museum artefact	This was corrected
UNCCD SPI	Ch.1	15	446		447	makes sense, but how does it relate to the title of 1.2.2.2?	Additional words was added for clarification
UNCCD SPI	Ch.1	15	447		447	traditional practices into restoration and rehabilitation enhances	Thank you this has been added
Katalin Török	Ch.1	15	448	15	450	Please check the reference formats	This was corrected thank you
Sandhya Chandrasekharan	Ch.1	15	450	15	455	would be helpful to summarize and analyse these - are they representative of all types of countries - demographics, geography, political cultures, economic character, minority/majority dynamic, modernizing influences etc?	Such analyses are discussed further in Chapter 2
Katalin Török	Ch.1	15	453		454	Please check the reference formats	This was corrected thank you
Katalin Török	Ch.1	16	459			Kok et al 2016 missing from the Lit.	This was included in the literature

UNCCD SPI	Ch.1	16	463		463	IT SHOULD READ: protection, restoration and rehabilitation actions	This was corrected thank you
Katalin Török	Ch.1	16	465			citation format	Corrected thank you
David González Jiménez	Ch.1	16	470	16	479	Conflicts may also arise among diverse values, thus integrated valuation may also help recognize values of multiple stakeholders, their worldviews regarding land and its values, and bring them together in more successful decision making (See Pascual et al., 2017) also Fontaine et al., (2013) <i>Towards participatory integrated valuation and modelling of ecosystem services under land-use change</i> . Journal of Land Use Science	Thank you this was added
Katalin Török	Ch.1	16	473			3 authors to be named	This was corrected thank you
RANDRIANTSIZAFY Ignela Sahondra	Ch.1	16	476	16	479	"When high level corruption occurs between, for example, government officials, large foreign enterprises, police and military it was difficult to stop unsustainable land degradation, and rehabilitate areas unless it can be addressed and eliminated." The term "unsustainable" is not relevant in the context. Reader can understand that it is possible to have "sustainable land degradation" and to have "unsustainable land degradation". The sentence should be : "When high level corruption occurs between, for example, government officials, large foreign enterprises, police and military it was difficult to stop land degradation, and rehabilitate areas unless it can be addressed and eliminated."	This was corrected thank you
Katalin Török	Ch.1	16	478			to stop unsustainable land use instead of degradation OR to stop land degradation	This was corrected thank you
Katalin Török	Ch.1	16	482			format of citation	This was corrected thank you
Mahmood Yekeh Yazdandoost	Ch.1	16	484	16	486	Correct.	Thank you
Eila Gendig	Ch.1	16	484			The conflict is wider than just "Agriculture" vs. "biodiversity"; might be "commercial operations" vs. "biodiversity", or general "land use change"	These scenarios was added
Caroline van Leenders	Ch.1		484			Where is the landscape approach and the landscape initiatives? Seehttp://peoplefoodandnature.org/publication/landscape-partnerships-for-sustainable-development/	This was included
Steve Prince	Ch.1		484		484	This suggests it is always possible. Better "There are cases in which approaches..."	This was corrected thank you
UNCCD SPI	Ch.1	16	494		495	Reword for clarity	This was reworded
UNCCD SPI	Ch.1	16	496		497	point not clear: Environmental policy designed to appease land degradation, utilizing livelihood change...	This was reworded
Eila Gendig	Ch.1	17	502	17	510	IT should be noted that artificial solutions or man-made capital can assist and support the restoration of degraded land areas. They do have a purpose. Natural functions and solutions are not always feasible, adequate or sufficient.	Additional information was added here including the use of nature based solutions, mindful we are focussing on land degradation
Abisha Mapendembe	Ch.1	17	502	17	510	Here add a caveat that not all ecosystem services may be required at the same time. In some cases technological substitutes may be enough	Additional information was added here including the use of nature based solutions, mindful we are focussing on land degradation
David Le Maitre	Ch.1	17	506			there is a word missing between "capital" and "such" - so?	This was corrected thank you
Katalin Török	Ch.1	17	506			wording	This was corrected thank you
Sandhya Chandrasekharan	Ch.1	17	507	17	510	very important point. Relates to comment above. Some description would be useful	This was enhanced upon in biophysical section and other Chapters
Katalin Török	Ch.1	17	509		510	Wang et al - all 3 authors to be mentioned (I do not see the rule: 3 or just 2 authors should be cited?)	This was corrected thank you
Sandhya Chandrasekharan	Ch.1	17	512	17	517	Very important point. To be more useful in the the context of an IPBES report, would it be possible to substantiate this with a pictorial capture of how agriculture especially is driven by international and trade compulsions currently?	This was expanded upon including graphics in Chapter 3 and the SPM
Eila Gendig	Ch.1	17	512	17	514	This sentence (despite using "trade-offs") is in no way related to international interests and international trade interests.	It can well be related to international activities between neighbouring land based border countries
Eila Gendig	Ch.1	17	512	17	514	Trade-offs may be an important strategy to provide for an overall acceptable solution to land degradation problems. Might be worthwhile to elaborate on off-setting with positive benefits to society and biodiversity.	Offsetting is expanded upon in other chapters 3 and 4
Abisha Mapendembe	Ch.1	17	512	17	517	This give an impression that understanding of trade policy will solve key LDR issues. That is not the case .	This was clarified
UNCCD SPI	Ch.1	17	512		514	Reword for clarity	This was clarified
Sandhya Chandrasekharan	Ch.1	17	518	17	524	the Boteti example could be briefly shared to make the point clearer to the reader	A brief description was provided
Cristobal Diaz	Ch.1	17	519	17	520	To add: The understanding of wellbeing and what is a good quality of life was dependent on a complex mixture of values, cultures, traditions and other interrelationships; and in the same way of the point of view of person(s) that analyze these aspects.	This was added thank you

Astrid Hilgers	Ch.1	17	525	17	529	Next to public funds, private investments are needed	This was included thank you
David Le Maitre	Ch.1	17	525		529	The use of cost-benefit analyses is very debatable and controversial but the statement here does not reflect that at all; in fact literature on citizen-based natural resource management suggests that other values and barriers often drive human behaviour; having restoration targets and measurements of reduction in degradation is essential but values other than those amenable to CBA are often important for understand what is perceived as "success"; these values are often better captured in narratives, particularly those generated by people on the land; see Ch. 3 line 380 for a clear statement of the importance of non-monetary benefits	Thank you this was attended to
UNCCD SPI	Ch.1	17	525	17	529	It is more than 'cost benefit analysis'; this paragraph should be re-written and include 'life cycle analysis'; cost benefit analysis fails short of valuing social benefits. The paragraph should also include 'large scale rehabilitation' projects.	This was re written and life cycle analysis and large scale projects was included
U.S. government	Ch.1	17	525	17	529	Because CBA may be biased in their initial assumptions or counting, particularly where there are no prices or clear quantities of the market-transaction type, as with natural capital, biodiversity, and ecosystem services, the presumption that a CBA was done "correctly" from the IPBES point of view may not be the best choice to implicitly assume in this paragraph. . (This same concept is in Chap 2, Lines 188-195.) Softening the language as to the surety of the result may be a safer bet. Consider: "...Land Degradation, may better inform successful outcomes, providing an additional and cogent evidence base on which to measure success...."	Thank you for your suggestions, this was rewritten
Caroline van Leenders	Ch.1		525			Next to public funds, private finance is necessary. http://peoplefoodandnature.org/publication/scaling-up-investment-finance-for-integrated-landscape-management-challenges-innovations/	This was included thank you
David Le Maitre	Ch.1	17	530			Why only a section on biophysical conditions and none on social perceptions of those same biophysical conditions - often a key motivator	This was clarified, sections 1 and 2 are interlinked with the biophysical section, which is a part of Figure 1.3
UNCCD SPI	Ch.1	17	530		530	wrong heading level?	This was corrected thank you
UNCCD SPI	Ch.1	17	531		531	Point not clear: Successful inclusion of biophysical condition success factors ...	This was clarified
Katalin Török	Ch.1	17	533		534	wording	This was corrected thank you
Finnish Government	Ch.1	17	539			line 539 and elsewhere: There seems to be a subculture jargon developing with the use of acronym LDR. Here is an example of how the use of the acronym may lead to incoherent statements: what does it mean if we increase the land degradation efforts as this is what the D stands for in the acronym?	This was corrected thank you
Wilson Ramirez	Ch.1	18	548	18	559	Of major concern in Latin America and other regions, is the lack of accurate monitoring programs into restoration projects, I think that we can highlight monitoring as a key process into this paragraph. An interesting analysis have been developed by : Murcia, C., M. R. Guariguata, Á. Andrade, G. Ignacio, J. Aronson, E. M. Escobar, A. Etter, H. Flavio, and W. Ramirez. 2015. Challenges and prospects for scaling-up ecological restoration to meet international commitments : Colombia as a case study. Conservation Letters:1–21. and in Ehrenfeld, J. G. 2000. Defining the limits of restoration: The need for realistic goals. Restoration Ecology 8:2–9.	Thank you this has been included
UNCCD SPI	Ch.1	18	548		550	Vague, dense statement - not clear how this provides transparency.	This was rewritten
Katalin Török	Ch.1	18	551		552	wording	This was rewritten
Finnish Government	Ch.1	18	554	18	557	The success statements seem a bit overly optimistic and uncritical. There is evidence that implementation of the best available plans is not straight forward and even if we know what we should be doing we are not doing it (e.g. Game ET, Kareiva P, Possingham HP. 2013. Six Common Mistakes in Conservation Priority Setting. Conservation Biology 27: 480–485; Knight, AT, Cowling RM, Rouget M, Balmford A, Lombard AT, Campbell BM. 2008. Knowing But Not Doing: Selecting Priority Conservation Areas and the Research–Implementation Gap. Conservation Biology 22: 610–617. There are also other papers that can be cited when a revision of the text is conducted	This was addressed
Eila Gendig	Ch.1	18	557	18	559	Impacts from Climate Change are dramatic in many locations and a major factor to increased land degradation. Might require a paragraph of its own due to level of impact and global scope.	This was added briefly
Abisha Mapendembe	Ch.1	18	558	18	559	Here please provide evidence that Baselines are shifting at a relatively rapid pace.due to climate change	This was corrected thank you
Astrid Hilgers	Ch.1	18	560	18	571	A crucial paragraph, would like to see this conclusion in the SPM. If this is true, more attention to landscape approach should be payed in other chapters of the assesment.	This was considered for the SPM

Caroline van Leenders	Ch.1		560			a crucial paragraph, but the landscape approach is not followed-up enough through the rest of the document	Thank you, greater strength was included to this approach throughout the chapter
Mahmood Yekeh Yazdandoost	Ch.1	18	561	18	564	Correct.	Thank you
Javier Ernesto Cortés Suárez	Ch.1	18	561	18	564	This definition should include landscape-scale considering it as a natural or cultural ecosystem, or coverage unit, located in an area that interacts among its different elements.	A definition was provided incorporating these suggestions
Katalin Török	Ch.1	18	570			Include THE Pew Charitable Trust, otherwise citation cannot be found	This was corrected thank you
Suneetha Mazumder Subramanian	Ch.1	18	571	18	571	perhaps incorporate efforts of satoyama initiative here?	Thank you, this was included
Katalin Török	Ch.1	18	572			Some explanation why these are the most important key indicators should be added	These indicators were addressed across Chapters 3,4
UNCCD SPI	Ch.1	18	574		575	Are these the identified key indicators for the assessment? If so, this should be stated more clearly, with information about how these were measured.	these indicators were assessed across chapters 3, 4
UNCCD SPI	Ch.1	18	580		582	this applies in all situations. Does instruments mean technologies ?	Instruments refers to tools which are used to reach an end objective, and are not always technology
Katalin Török	Ch.1	18	581			Put comma: are considered, the choice	this was corrected thank you
Germany	Ch.1	13	585	30	937	When evaluating selected success stories in ch. 1.3, p. 19 ff. , Framework groups 1. Guiding instruments, 2. Nature's Contribution to People and 3. Biophysical Conditions (see Fig. 1.3., p. 11) are each evaluated with a maximum of 5 points. Thus, a project can be assessed with up to 15 points. Please give reference to a qualitative evaluation table for the allocation of values < 5 points for all Framework groups, otherwise the evaluation results of Success story 1 Lake Chilika, Odisha, India, p. 21, l. 645 (12 points); Success Story 2 Dune ecosystem rehabilitation after titanium mining, p. 22, l. 694 (9 points); Success Story 3 Indigenous fire management in the Kimberly region of North Western Australia, p. 25, l. 765 (12 points); Success story 4 Adoption of conservation tillage in Prairie Canada, p. 26, l. 814 (11 points); Success Story 5 Regreening the Sahel through tree regeneration, p. 28, l. 877 (12 points) and Success Story 6 The Brazilian Atlantic Forest, p. 30, l. 936 (8 points) are not comprehensible (intransparency). Further examples in other chapters do not follow the evaluation matrix of chapter 1 (inconsistency).	We updated, further explained, clarified and added to the transparency of the evaluation process. The methodology was expanded and explained further in the text, to demonstrate its scientific validity, this section now has a complete overall overview and can be validated in the text
Astrid Hilgers	Ch.1	17	585	31	937	General comment chapter one: the success stories do not give information on who carried out the restoration projects and what the financial scale was. Please provide this information.	We provided this information where available
Li Qingfeng	Ch.1	19	585	30	937	A overall comment for the Section "1.3 A selection of success cases": The cases selected for the Section are not very satisfactory. (1) as mentioned above, the "Success Story 3" is not appropriate, and should be excluded from the list;(2) there should be a "Success Story" addressing "Grassland/Rangeland" --- the largest ecosystem in the world, and also the most representative land form for "conflicting interests" of ecological benefit and agricultural (animal production) activities. The other "stories" are mainly concerned with small spots, the grassland/rangeland case should address the large-scaled land degradation and restoration. Missing of the grassland/rangeland issue was a fatal defect for the whole book.(3) The weak points for all the "Success Stories" lies in that the "conflicting interests" were overlooked, the local livelihood improvement were hidden. The most convincing story should be both successful in the ecological and economical aspects.	We believe all cases are important. We improved the wording where there may have been some poor clarification of the reduction in land degradation, we aimed to include long term projects which is an important way to measure success. We added two additional cases in line with your comments, which have been very useful, and we increased discussions about conflicts
Virginia Meléndez Ramírez	Ch.1	19	585	19	585	see three interesting cases more: Assessing_the_ITTO_Guidelines_on_forest_restoration_(Draft)-2.pdf	Thank you for pointing these out
Ju Zhengshan	Ch.1	19	585	30	937	There should be a brief introduction of all successful restoration projects, at least introduction about the types. It should be explained why we choose these six success stories.	This was clarified
Li Changxiao	Ch.1	19	585	30	937	Why the scored value is given like this for success of each story should be explained better. The six stories hereby should be able to compare with each other even though the context of each story has to be considered. Otherwise, this might confuse readers to some extent. For instance, the story 2 v.s. story 3, the scored value if compared between the two might not be so objective in terms of Guiding Instruments and NCPs, as the story 3 still releases a large number of greenhouse gases.	We updated the evaluation process, provided a detailed methodology of the evaluation and added more detail on how the values were obtained, providing comparisons across differing conditions. We provided more information to demonstrate the scientific validity of the process

Emmanuelle Quillérou	Ch.1	19	585	31	939	<p>Why is the WOCAT database not mentioned anywhere? I am very surprised, especially as the person collecting feedback is based at University of Bern too. Are the selected examples taken from the WOCAT database and/or included there?</p> <p>You may also want to include outcomes from the SUMAMAD project (replacement of goat farming by chicken farming in China, development of alternative livelihood activities such as mint growing in Tunisia etc). See more at: http://www.unesco.org/new/en/natural-sciences/environment/ecological-sciences/specific-ecosystems/drylands/sumamad/</p> <p>Also check policy brief from 2014: "Drylands - Sustaining Livelihoods and Conserving Ecosystem Services. A policy brief based on the Sustainable Management of Marginal Drylands (SUMAMAD) project (By Richard Thomas, Naomi Stewart, Thomas Schaaf, 2014)" available at http://www.unesco.org/new/en/natural-sciences/environment/ecological-sciences/specific-ecosystems/drylands/sumamad/publications/</p>	Thank you for this additional information. All was followed up and incorporated.
Eila Gendig	Ch.1	19	585	31	939	<p>All case studies are examples of changes to management and land use change because of catastrophic failures resulting from the pre-dominant system.</p> <p>To pick up what was discussed in chapter 6, as well as make a point on being pro-active, it would be good to include an example where the looming risk of land degradation was recognised early and communities / stakeholders worked on avoiding land degradation.</p>	We were specifically including long term cases, other chapters have provided additional case studies with a varying time scale.
Nestor T. Baguion	Ch.1	19	585	29	880	<p>There were six success stories. All had land degraded benchmarks that reflects different biome situations and after the project the situation improved in terms of biodiversity recovery, improvement of human well-being, inclusive socio-economic success that provides human security in the face of uncertain future given expected anthropogenic climate change. I would like to see such successful stories be replicated in the Philippines. An ideal project would be involving a landscape of a given municipality where benchmark satellite photograph shows spatial relation between man-made ecosystems (town, road network, village, farms, agroforestry, government reforestation composed of alien tree species, abandoned and uninhabited open grasslands, mining areas, etc.) versus natural forests (in patches at lowland elevations and larger patches towards higher elevation). Benchmark photo featuring fragmentation of natural forest can be basis of project challenge to stop "ecological anarchy" and convincing the local government to collectively work with constituents to reverse land degradation across the landscape by interconnecting natural forest fragments through the establishment of "biodiversity corridors" which could be coupled with stakeholders' "agroforestry" as economic incentives. Boundary separating "biodiversity corridors" and "agroforestry" on the ground is mapped and secured by the municipal government as "ecological covenant" and basis for local "ecological governance". Intergenerational Yin and Yang complementation was captured by time-series monitoring and serve as evidence for national and international accreditation qualifying the local "Agroforestry-Biodiversity Cooperative" for possible national and international recognition.</p>	We provided greater explanation of how this can be done within the chapter and I hope the Philippines will make use of this work to assist in the manner which you suggest

						In order for a project like the above will take off, an enabling environment specifically aimed at rectification of Philippine environmental education to restrict the forest concept only to "natural forest ecosystems" and together with other natural ecosystems (e.g. aquatic) constitute native Philippine biodiversity. Alien biota witting or unwittingly introduced are not part of the country's biodiversity. Malignant alien biota when they spread and push native species to the edge by competition are identified as bioinvasive alien species. In the above concept project, industrial forest plantation composed of native tree species only may be established as buffer strip separating the biodiversity corridor and the agroforestry. Alien tree species in the agroforestry compartment was carefully monitored in order to contain their seeds and prevent bioinvading the biodiversity corridor. It would be nice to see a biodiversity corridor starting at the mangrove and beach forest along the seashore at one extreme then towards higher elevation with the mossy forests at mountain summits at another extreme. New paradigm trained foresters can be of great help in tree identification and share the tree identification skills to stakeholders during training of stakeholders. The presence of a book (or database) featuring all native tree species equipped with their respective voucher specimen photograph was an advantage and this will enable indigenous knowledge like local vernacular name of the tree plus other ecological/economic information to be included through time. Converting such database book into APPS was even more useful because one retrieves required information using a very portable gadget. A similar book on alien or exotic tree species may also be published and also placed in APPS. With such APPS that features alien tree species, one can select which alien tree species are valuable yet environmentally benign for inclusion in agroforestry project.	This is an excellent suggestion and hope it can come to fruition
Nestor T. Baguion	Ch.1	19	585	29	880		
Astrid Hilgers	Ch.1	19	586	939	31	Little attention for (private) finance in the selection or description of these cases	a greater section on private finance was included in the chapter
UNCCD SPI	Ch.1	19	589	19	591	needs to justify why the case studies chosen did focus only on restoration and conservation and NOT on land rehabilitation. Success story 2 has the title ".... Ecosystem REHABILITATION after titanium	We clarified that both restoration and rehabilitation cases have been included
Osama Elsidig	Ch.1	19	595	31	939	Here we need a selection of a success case where desertification caused by unsustainable agricultural practises/expansion in low rainfall savannah or dryland areas in Africa where people are poor, rehabilitation and resoration actions are very difficult and expensive to achieve their intended goals to recover the lands to suitable level, of course below pre-degradation level. such success stories should also be stressed in the executive summary as gricultural expansion is one of the most causes of land degradation	We included two additional case studies both with a focus on low rainfall agriculture regions; the impact of agriculture on land degradation is expanded on in chapters 3,4,6,7,8
Sandhya Chandrasekharan	Ch.1	19	596			How appropriate is a lake example for land degradation? Also would be better to look at a case of successful restoration related to the most destructive activity in that country/region rather than something random. Eg: high input agriculture/mining/wetland transformed by urbanisation (Palikarnai Marsh in Chennai, India). That would bring all the elements of the IPBES_CF into the picture, as well as have visibility-buidling/ educational value	Our assessment scope includes wetlands, it is important for us to include a case study in this ecosystem which is influenced by land degradation in the catchment, this one has been very long term, which we were searching for our examples, and has had good livelihood outcomes and influenced policy makers, for that reason it is included, thank you for your other suggestion, we will investigate this example
Jyotirmoy Shankar Deb	Ch.1	19	596	31	939	Graphical representation may be used to show the changes of different parameters for annual, 5 years or 10 years span.	We considered a different representation,thank you.
Arora	Ch.1	19	599	19	600	Fig 1.4 Eichornia is wrongly spelt. It is also an invasive exotic species and hence cannot be indicated as a dominating floating vegetation. The emergent (thick) and emergent (thin) vegetation needs to be described. Colour codes used in the map are confusing.	We have used the correct spelling; in this case it is dominant
Eila Gendig	Ch.1	20	604		640	This case study highlights that there is a place for technology and man-made capital, as otherwise the re-connection to the ocean would not have happened. (see earlier comment related to page 17, lines 502-510.)	This is an example of technology combined with livelihood benefits and nature's response
Eila Gendig	Ch.1	20	605			0.2 mio = 200.000, which would be more conventional to number humans	This was corrected thank you
Eila Gendig	Ch.1	20	615			1702 MT in total for 13 years or still p.a.?	This is the amount at each year mentioned and was clarified
Eila Gendig	Ch.1	20	631			13.000 MT p.a.?	Per year was added
Katalin Török	Ch.1	20	640			citation format	This was corrected thank you

Dorothe Lütkemöller	Ch.1		645		645	Perhaps the very useful chapter 1.3 could become even more significant if the method for the evaluation of success could be explained shortly, because without background information on the procedure the evaluation results (for example 4/5) remain vague or doubtful.	We included a full section explaining the methodology used and its scientific validity
David Le Maitre	Ch.1	21	647		onwards	Success story 2. It is disappointing that the case study is presented as though it is only perceived as a success (although the fact that succession has become stuck for it is decades; there have been critiques that while there is a recovery of tree cover the system has become stuck in a Vachera (Acacia) Karoo stage and not progressing to the typical multi-species dune forest. This state is largely responsible for local communities not seeing the rehab as successful. Making such progress may require artificial manipulation or rethinking the initial planting to incorporate more species.	The study is not presented solely as a success: we are explicit about the fact that some parties see it as less-than-successful, and our scoring reflects that. It would be a mistake to present it as a failure: it is among the best-in-class examples of post-mining rehabilitation
Eila Gendig	Ch.1	21	654		656	Definition of a "dune" implies that it is a sand-based ecosystem with movement of its substrate and specifically adopted plant communities. Would forest-cover in these areas still allow for the classification as a "dune ecosystem"? Please explain.	Not all dunes remain mobile in the short term. This is known as a dune forest, because it is established on a dune substrate. Further information was provided in the text about these dunes
Eila Gendig	Ch.1	21	656		657	What is meant by "species of the maputa land centre of endemism"?	The centres of endemism of the world are named according to where they occur. This one is in Maputaland. 'A Centre of Endemism is an area in which the ranges of restricted-range species overlap, or a localised area which has a high occurrence of endemics.' [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Centres_of_endemism] E Van Wyk, GF Smith 2001 Regions of floristic endemism in Southern Africa: a review with emphasis on succulents. Umदाus press, Pretoria
Katalin Török	Ch.1	21	656		657	citation format	This was corrected thank you
Katalin Török	Ch.1	22	679			citation format	This was corrected thank you
Katalin Török	Ch.1	22	681		687	citation format	This was corrected thank you
Lucía Almeida-Leñero	Ch.1	22	689	22	693	All success cases seem to portray success cases of restoration of land degradation. Although, Example 1.3.2 Dune ecosystem rehabilitation after titanium mining, does not appear to be a straightforward case of success regarding social justice, local development and transparency. It is an interesting case to study and exemplifies some good practices, but it also is a good example of private/economic interests taking credit for restoration in exchange of validation of the mining activity. This industry may be taking advantage of local poverty (creating sources of employment) to continue an environmentally unsustainable practice. I would elaborate more in the example about this.	The fact that it is not a straightforward case is precisely why we included it. It is much more typical of the mixed and partly-successful outcomes that are typical of restoration efforts than some airbrushed, spin-doctored showcase example. This one had the advantage of lots of scientific study, including of its failures, to counterbalance the corporate PR. In that precise case, the soil is very oligotrophic. The high biodiversity results because of an adaptation of plants to very poor soil nutrient contents with a lack of oligo-elements such as Zn. It favours the development of a high richness of generally slow-growing plant species, associated with a diverse avifauna. Local people cannot have sustainable benefits by grazing or cultivating this land. The conflict between miners and local community is also politically exploited with low concerns with a fair deal between both parties and the biodiversity. The conversion of all dunes in a National park further North was the best answer and the biodiversity is preserved. Ecotourism is very successful in that area.
Eila Gendig	Ch.1	22	696			If only 2/5 of previous number of forest tree species return to the mined sites, a score of "4/5" for "biophysical condition" seems high	We are referring to the ecosystem returned not trees alone, as a diverse multi storied ecosystem is the aim and many other components of the ecosystem have been returned as explained in this paragraph
LI Qingfeng	Ch.1	23	699	25	766	The selection of the "Success Story 3: Indigenous fire management in the Kimberley Region of North Western Australia" as a case study for the "land Degradation and Restoration" is not so appropriate. The story may be suitable for the "climate Change" or other topics, but is less relevant to the "land degradation and restoration".	this is very much a case about land degradation and restoration and we will provide more information to explain this, the climate change side of the fire story is just an additional economic benefit which has occurred utilising traditional practices

Li Qingfeng	Ch.1	23	708	23	709	"Aboriginal people in the Kimberley Region of Western Australia, which covers 423,000 km2 (Figure 1.6), have been managing their country for more than 40,000 years ". Unbelievable!	Yes it is, hence why traditional knowledge is so important to avoid and manage land degradation
Katalin Török	Ch.1	24	714		717	citation format	This was corrected thank you
Katalin Török	Ch.1	24	738			Fig 3 - does not exist - or it is a reference to on in the literature?	Correct figure number was included thank you
Australia NFP	Ch.1	24	747	25	765	Propose following text change: <i>In northern Australia traditional fire management has proven to deliver as much as a 50 per cent reduction in wildfires, reduced emissions by 8 million tonnes, enriched biodiversity and generated more than \$85 million for indigenous communities.</i> "	Thank you, the text was changed
Katalin Török	Ch.1	25	763			put comma after biodiversity	This was corrected thank you
Eila Gendig	Ch.1	26	785			The long timeframe in this example means that no land owner currently farming on Prairie Canada lands can imagine the area's benefits to wellbeing from before large-scale agricultural developments. Also no indication of indigenous input to the new tillage system. Why is the score 4/5 for natures contribution to people? similarly, teh biophysical conditions has largely been heavily effected bu historical management practices and the current use of glyphosate - still scored at 4/5.	This was taken into consideration in the final revision of this case study. The use of glyphosate is extensively debated in chapter 4.2.4.2.2. . Scoring was lowered accordingly.
Katalin Török	Ch.1	26	811		813	Use on bracket; Hempel et al, 2015 missing from the literature	Reference was removed, anyway redundant
Dorothe Lütkemöller	Ch.1		814		814	Perhaps the very useful chapter 1.3 could become even more significant, if the method for the evaluation of success could be explained shortly, because without background information on the procedure the evaluation results (for example 4/5) remain vague or doubtful.	Thank you for this comment. We provided a full explanation of the method for evaluation and included its scientific validity
Eila Gendig	Ch.1	27	819			colour photographs available? - or further explanation of the pictures. Seems like the waterhole (lower centre of photograph in 1955) has disappeared in teh 2005 picture.	The earlier photos are old, and colour photography was not available. The full history of the images can be found in the supporting citation.
Steve Prince	Ch.1		819		880	The examples here are excellent and very appropriate to LDRA, however their application to the entire Sahel is quite misleading. The work cited is limited to relatively small parts Burkina Faso (<1% of the country) and Mali. Furthermore the approximately 3,000,000 km2 of the Sahel is far from uniform and so localized studies should only be applied very cautiously to the entire Sahel. This is a controversial topic. It therefore needs careful citations to support the statements made here that are contradicted elsewhere (See Behnke, R., & Mortimore, M. (2015). The End of Desertification? Disputing Environmental Change in the Drylands. Springer-Praxis Earth System Science Series.) Some appropriate citations are given at the end (lines 875- 878), but they should be placed earlier in the text to support the statements where they are made.	We don't make the claim that it applies to the whole Sahel, but the claim that it represents only 1% is unsubstantiated. We are aware that this is a controversial subject, which is why we covered it, and we think we have addressed both sides of the controversy fairly. We will include the citation given as well.
Katalin Török	Ch.1	28	834			Make sure, Giannini et al 2003 is correct - not all 3 authors should be cited?	This was corrected thank you
Katalin Török	Ch.1	28	836			citation format	This was corrected thank you
U.S. government	Ch.1	28	838	28	840	Interesting concept "dispersed tree agriculture" ; this has potential on crop and range and pasture as a unique NRCS conservation practice. It is variant of Silvopasture production but the trees are not necessarily intended for harvest.	Thank you for the comment
Steve Prince	Ch.1		839		846	This particular Reij et al. citation is a very slim base with which to support these statements (the report is not available at the web site given: it is available at http://cdm15738.contentdm.oclc.org/utils/getfile/collection/p15738coll2/id/26755/filename/26756.pdf). Here are 2 peer-reviewed papers that cover some of the original research: Reij, C., Tappan, G., & Belemvire, A. (2005). Changing land management practices and vegetation on the Central Plateau of Burkina Faso (1968–2002). <i>Journal of Arid Environments</i> , 63(3), 642–659. http://doi.org/10.1016/j.jaridenv.2005.03.010 and Herrmann, S. M., & Tappan, G. G. (2013). Vegetation impoverishment despite greening: A case study from central Senegal. <i>Journal of Arid Environments</i> , 90, 55–66. http://doi.org/10.1016/j.jaridenv.2012.10.020	Thank you, this was corrected and these citations incorporated.
Katalin Török	Ch.1	28	846			see the 3 author citation above: Reij et al., 2009	Thank you corrected
Steve Prince	Ch.1	28	851		855	needs citations. See comment on line 875- 878.	Changes were made thank you
Steve Prince	Ch.1	28	856		861	Citations needed. See comment on line 875- 878.	Changes were made thank you
Katalin Török	Ch.1	28	865		866	citation format	This was corrected thank you
Steve Prince	Ch.1		865		865	Delete "Assaf" before Antamba	This was corrected thank you
Steve Prince	Ch.1		866		866	Delete "A" before Antamba	This was corrected thank you
Pedro Mendoza	Ch.1	29	870	29	870	What species are?	Various, generally indigenous and local, this was added to the text
Eila Gendig	Ch.1	29	874			Please explain NBP	This was corrected, natures contributions to people

David Le Maitre	Ch.1	29	874			NBPs - please explain - is this nature's benefits to peoples?	This was corrected, natures contributions to people
Steve Prince	Ch.1		875		878	These points and the citations here should be moved to the preceding text to avoid the appearance of unsupported statements.	This was corrected thank you
Steve Prince	Ch.1		879		879	This use of universal (for all cases) metrics based on subjective judgment is new. It would be helpful to reference lines 298-300 here so the casual reader is directed to the explanation.	The approach, explanation and methodology was expanded upon and the methodology description was referenced to all the case studies
Katalin Török	Ch.1	29	892			erase one Brazil	Thank you this was corrected
Otávio Gadiani Ferrarini and Carlos Alberto de Mattos Scaramuzza	Ch.1	29	894	29	894	It is important to mention in a general form what are the new legal instruments established in 1988.	This was clarified
Dorothe Lütkemöller	Ch.1		897		879	Perhaps the very useful chapter 1.3 could become even more significant, if the method for the evaluation of success could be explained shortly, because without background information on the procedure the evaluation results (for example 4/5) remain vague or doubtful.	Thank you for this comment. We provided a full explanation of the method for evaluation and included its scientific validity
Eila Gendig	Ch.1	30	902			Is there inclusion of indigenous knowledge systems in the approach? Do the benefits transcend the additional jobs created (e.g. Flood protection, firewood, provision of traditional medicine, any changes to hydrological regimes)?	This project is still in its evolution however it does not seem to include indigenous input, which has been noted in the text
Katalin Török	Ch.1	30	906			Aguilar Brazilról szól??	Unsure of the meaning of this comment we cannot find this?
Katalin Török	Ch.1	30	915			citation format	Thank you this was corrected
Germany	Ch.1	30	916	30	917	Reference missing to the estimation of the potential job creation.	Reference was inserted Melo et al 2013
Katalin Török	Ch.1	30	925			missing from literature: McKenna 2010	Reference was inserted
Otávio Gadiani Ferrarini and Carlos Alberto de Mattos Scaramuzza	Ch.1	30	932	30	934	The sentence "This joint effort of more than 270 members from the 932 private sector, governments, NGOs and research organisations has changed how large-scale forest landscape restoration is practiced in the region" also appears on lines 909 to 911. Delete this sentence to avoid repetition.	Thank you the sentence was deleted
Katalin Török	Ch.1	30	932		934	this sentence is nearly the same as 909-911. Please reconsider	Thank you the sentence was deleted
Suneetha Mazhenchery Subramanian	Ch.1	31	936			The case studies from different socio-political and ecological contexts and their analysis is very good. It gives a flavour of the possibilities and opportunities to address LDR and further a simple enough tool to assess efficacy of efforts.	Thank you
Sandhya Chandrasekharan	Ch.1	31	936			chapter needs a concluding discussion	This was provided
Steve Prince	Ch.1		1094			Delete 171	This was deleted thank you
Katalin Török	Ch.1	37	1202			Check the names Kaufmann, D, A. K. and M. M. (2011	This was corrected thank you
Katalin Török	Ch.1	37	1220			Check for the ??n	This was corrected thank you