

ID	Reviewer Name	Category	Affiliation	Chapter	From Page	From Line	To Page	To Line	Comments	Response
4	Brownlie, Susie	Individual	deVilliers Brownlie Associates	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	3	84	3	85	It is noted that there is little evidence of whether and how valuation is used in decision making. Decisions would presumably be taken at policy, plan, programme and project levels. Since Strategic Environmental Assessment at strategic level, and EIA at project level, are intended to inform decisions, it would be useful to gauge to what extent values/valuation has been used in these processes. Does IPBES have this information? (Also please see earlier comment on Chapter 2 pp95-96.) [I note that this topic is covered in Chapter 4]	This topic is indeed the focus of Chapter 4
5	Brownlie, Susie	Individual	deVilliers Brownlie Associates	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	65		65		Two 'REP' missing.	References were completed during the final edits of the chapter
6	Brownlie, Susie	Individual	deVilliers Brownlie Associates	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	65	1671	65	1671	It is noted that trade-offs remain poorly understood. Please refer to earlier comment on Chapter 2 with regard to sustainability assessment and trade-off rules. Paper / chapter in Sustainability Assessment book by Robert B Gibson (2017, Routledge, on the mitigation hierarchy and beyond: guiding appropriate biodiversity tradeoffs in assessments for sustainability, Chapter 12, Brownlie and Treweek, may be of interest? In none of the EIAs I have reviewed over the past few decades have tradeoffs between gains and losses been made explicit - this needs to	Good point. Trade-offs are inherently dealt with, and the actual trade-off in the sense of 'making a choice' between things where one can't have all, is a combination of what is included in the valuation (chapter 3), what is taken up in decisions (chapter 4) as well as intricate processes and political aspects dealt with in chapter 5.
104	Romarc Jannel	Individual		Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	19	478	20	500	And what about an explanation concerning the "role of early philosophers and natural historians in nature valuation" between Pliny the Elder and Humbold.	This text has is no longer in the chapter
172	Diana Ramirez	Organisation	Workshop - Red Socioecos / SUSMAI	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods					Three points not reflected in the SPM that are also present here are: 1. Valuation methods based on nature, 2. Specific tools to carry out the valuation, 3. Robustness, with the uncertainty associated with these valuation methods	These aspects are now explicitly dealt with in SPM
173	Diana Ramirez	Organisation	Workshop - Red Socioecos / SUSMAI	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods					In the summary and here there is not a clear message about the methodologies and the IPBES proposal to carry out the assessment. It would be important to clearly and specifically state what each method is for and see examples. Synthesize and integrate this knowledge into a proposal for public policy	The chapter does not provide a clear-cut recipe for each valuation context, nor a sharply defined operational space for each method. We clarify however, the principles, questions and choices which define the quality of valuation. This is as far as one can go at a global level. Examples are provided for more concrete contexts to demonstrate how these steps and principles can be applied in a concrete context.
174	Alan Valdés	Organisation	Workshop - Red Socioecos / SUSMAI	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods					In the introduction to the chapter that talks about the history of how nature has been evaluated, it begins with the Greeks, as if previous cultures did not value nature	The history section has been removed in restructuring, but while references to 40 AD (written history) and beyond are still there, we now acknowledge that societies have been aware and 'valuing' the wonders of nature before (section 3.1.3).
175	Alan Valdés	Organisation	Workshop - Red Socioecos / SUSMAI	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods					All the examples placed in the history of the valuation of nature are of men, regionalized to European contexts. But, there are studies done by women who contributed to the appreciation of nature. In the construction of a more plural synthesis, it is necessary to avoid making these contributions invisible.	We acknowledge the historical gender bias which we perpetuate when basing ourselves on published literature, reviews and meta-reviews. We haven't made a corrective review to uncover and emphasise women researcher's contributions.

176	Paola Ivanova Diaz	Organisation	Workshop - Red Socioecos / SUSMAI	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods					What is the intrinsic value of nature? This message would be more useful for decision makers to avoid being valued only in economic terms	Intrinsic value is now more clearly presented as opposing/complimenting instrumental and relational values.
177	Paola Ivannova Diaz	Organisation	Workshop - Red Socioecos / SUSMAI	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods					Table 3.4 has missing information for the subgroups	Table has been revised, yet choices regarding conciseness are made. Detailed explanations in text and table compliment each other and provide an as complete image as possible within our scope
178	Gustavo Pérez Verdin	Organisation	Workshop - Red Socioecos / SUSMAI	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods					What is the object of the chapter itself? There is no strong answer in the text. It is a review of all the methods and how they have been used, which are critical and interesting points to review in the future, and all this is in the scientific literature already published. Reviews of reviews, a lot of technicality and theoretical questions presented give an idea of the complexity of the existing economic valuation methods. The chapter mentions a lot about the perception of indigenous communities, it is said that they have not been considered, but it does	We have now more explicitly clarified the scope. The chapter has remained within its scope, and within the limitations of the time and resources given, as well as the limitation of providing global, general valuation principles and policy-relevant guidance rather than ready-made manuals and recipes.
179	Gustavo Pérez Verdin	Organisation	Workshop - Red Socioecos / SUSMAI	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods					Continuously in the document the concept of the contributions of nature is discussed in an indifferent way to ecosystem services. If IPBES is adopting this terminology, ecosystem services should be left out. It would be very important to homogenize the terminology throughout the entire document.	The IPBES terminology (NCP) is consistently used. However, when referring to existing ecosystem service literature, the correct term is used.
180	Gustavo Pérez Verdin	Organisation	Workshop - Red Socioecos / SUSMAI	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods					In the description of the methods there is a section that talks about indigenous knowledge. However, it is confusing if the methods are established separately to value indigenous and non-indigenous knowledge. In this case, the intrinsic values of nature do not change and the relational values may be different. The integration in the valuation methods and a proposal on the matter is lacking a bit.	There seems to be some confusion. The chapter discusses IPLC valuation and the contribution of ILK to that and to conventional valuations. We briefly discuss the issue of valuing ILK (i.e., referring to ILK as a product of human-nature processes that needs to be guarded or preserved), but this is not the core topic in IPLC valuation.
181	Gustavo Pérez Verdin	Organisation	Workshop - Red Socioecos / SUSMAI	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods					The identification of "hotspots" (areas rich in biodiversity and cultural issues), can help to conserve these areas	We cannot address this comment as in order to do so it should be related to a specific place in text
182	Maria Perevchtchikova	Organisation	Workshop - Red Socioecos / SUSMAI	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods					From the SPM and here it is not understood what message the chapter wants to give in terms of decision making. A very broad panorama of bibliographic analysis is presented, as a state of the art on existing economic valuation methods, but there is no integration proposal directed towards public policy.	We now have restructured the chapter towards this guidance.
183	Maria Perevchtchikova	Organisation	Workshop - Red Socioecos / SUSMAI	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods					The structure of the chapter is confusing, since each section has its own approach and a different bibliographic review (with different databases and applied methodologies). Without a guide / outline at the beginning of the chapter on the narrative of the sub-sections it is very confusing to read and it is not interpretable by non-academic actors. For systematic bibliographic reviews, no COHRAN manuals or the SALSA method are cited. For bibliographic reviews it is essential to take care of the syntax; In this case, the text almost does not put used	The chapter has been restructured, the different sources of evidence have been more transparently presented, and the language and academic bias have been clearly acknowledged.
184	Maria Perevchtchikova	Organisation	Workshop - Red Socioecos / SUSMAI	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods					In the methods part, only economic valuation methods are presented and there are no integrative methods, such as modeling based on dynamic systems or modeling based on agents.	Thanks for the comment, we added dynamics system modelling and participatory mapping

185	Maria Perevochtchikova	Organisation	Workshop - Red Socioecos / SUSMAI	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods					They are used without differentiating the terms of Ecosystem Services and NCP. A homogeneous conceptualization between the chapters with conceptual coherence would be important. In this sense, it is not clear what is the conceptual framework within which the report is located. Is it from IPBES socio-ecological systems, from NCP?	The IPBES terminology (NCP) is consistently used. However, when referring to existing ecosystem service literature, the correct term is used.
186	Maria Perevochtchikova	Organisation	Workshop - Red Socioecos / SUSMAI	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods					In the Methods part, experimental economics is not included, with game techniques that involve people with opinions, scenarios, etc. Nor is the ecological economy with the calculations of resource flows or ecological footprint. The worrying thing is that much of the replacement cost technique is shown, since it considers the exchange of a natural resource for an infrastructure and assumes that it is equivalent. On the other hand, the integrated valuation, with modeling based on agents and dynamic systems is not present	It is not correct that the mentioned methods have not been included. Experimental approaches is mentioned and integrated modelling has also been included. See section 3.2.2.
187	Maria Perevochtchikova	Organisation	Workshop - Red Socioecos / SUSMAI	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods					Closing each family of methods, it would be interesting to have homogeneous information in the form of tables with the same categories and a balance of its usefulness for political decisions. On the other hand, it is not clear how indigenous communities are incorporated into economic valuation of nature, only as a subject to extract information based on social perception?	Thank you for the comment. In the synthesis section - we have used uniform information (see Table 3.8. In the individual section we have organised the information to best illustrate the specific feature of the methods included.
188	Maria Perevochtchikova	Organisation	Workshop - Red Socioecos / SUSMAI	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods					Figure 3.3 has the years axis reversed	Thank you for your comment, this has been considered, all figures will be further edited for the printed version based on IPBES formats.
189	Maria Perevochtchikova	Organisation	Workshop - Red Socioecos / SUSMAI	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods					Figure 3.4 What is the scale? Normalized or of some count, it is not understood since it does not have conventional signs explaining this	Thank you for your comment, this has been considered, all figures will be further edited for the printed version based on IPBES formats.
190	Maria Perevochtchikova	Organisation	Workshop - Red Socioecos / SUSMAI	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods					In Table 3.4. In Modeling there is no mention of the ECOSER protocol as software, nor is there any mention of modeling based on dynamic systems. Participatory mapping with all its potential based on citizen science is not mentioned in Mapping either; which still has potential for Masuring	Thanks for the comment, we added dynamics system modelling and participatory mapping, but not the ECOSER protocol as, though we acknowledge its importance, we choose to limit the examples to a few
191	Maria Perevochtchikova	Organisation	Workshop - Red Socioecos / SUSMAI	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods					The economic valuation history at the beginning of the chapter can be displayed on a timeline graph	We haven't the space for another timeline. Good suggestion though. There is a timeline on valuation assessments added.
192	Maria Perevochtchikova	Organisation	Workshop - Red Socioecos / SUSMAI	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods					Multiple values are not incorporated into the explanation of the economic valuation methods of nature	Multiple/plural values are prominently dealt with, and now clearly include aspects pertinent to economic valuation methods.
193	Maria Perevochtchikova	Organisation	Workshop - Red Socioecos / SUSMAI	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods					Table 3.6 has indicated in Participatory approach cost "medium", but it should be "low"	Relative to secondary iformation-based (desktop) methods, the cost is medium

194	Maria Perevchtchikova	Organisation	Workshop - Red Socioecos / SUSMAI	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods					Figures 3.12, 3.15, 3.45 need to indicate the units of measurement on the axes	Thank you for your comment, this has been considered, all figures will be further edited for the printed version based on IPBES formats.
195	Maria Perevchtchikova	Organisation	Workshop - Red Socioecos / SUSMAI	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods					At the end, Table 3.11 and Figure 3.14 presenting "other" evaluations, what is its purpose? Would their results then be combined to make a common proposal directed towards public policy?	Thank you for the comment. The purpose is to get a sense of the level of assessment of valuation methods in past (major) assessments linked to biodiversity and ecosystem services. This will allow us to contextualise the work done in this chapter.
196	Maria Perevchtchikova	Organisation	Workshop - Red Socioecos / SUSMAI	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods					Figure 3.16 equals the terms of ecosystem services and NCP?	ES/NCP has been modified to ES or NCP, to clearly distinguish the two terms which are indeed not equivalent
197	Maria Perevchtchikova	Organisation	Workshop - Red Socioecos / SUSMAI	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods					In economic valuation of nature, the term ecosystem services is widely used and not NCP. How is this point intended to be addressed in the report?	The IPBES terminology (NCP) is consistently used. However, when referring to existing ecosystem service literature, the correct term is used.
198	Maria Perevchtchikova	Organisation	Workshop - Red Socioecos / SUSMAI	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods					Figure 3.22, 3.23 have no%	This is correct, however, absolute values (in %) are not as important as relative values represented by the different sizes of the pie' slices, hence we prefer to not include % to not blur the message and overload the picture visually
199	Maria Perevchtchikova	Organisation	Workshop - Red Socioecos / SUSMAI	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods					Figures 3.22-3.30 could go to an annex so as not to saturate the text	Thanks for your suggestion
200	Maria Perevchtchikova	Organisation	Workshop - Red Socioecos / SUSMAI	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods					Figure 3.31 has no% and is of low quality	This is correct, however, absolute values (in %) are not as important as relative values represented by the different sizes of the pie' slices, hence we prefer to not include % to not blur the message and overload the picture visually. Quality will be improved in final version
201	Maria Perevchtchikova	Organisation	Workshop - Red Socioecos / SUSMAI	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods					Figure 3.36 flip 90°, correct "nuber" by "number", put% on the axes	Thank you for your comment, this has been considered, all figures will be further edited for the printed version based on IPBES formats.
202	Maria Perevchtchikova	Organisation	Workshop - Red Socioecos / SUSMAI	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods					Figures 3.38 and 3.39 improve quality	Thank you for your comment, this has been considered, all figures will be further edited for the printed version based on IPBES formats.

203	Maria Perevochtchikova	Organisation	Workshop - Red Socioecos / SUSMAI	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods					Figures 3.40 and 3.41, 3.44 explain the meaning of "level"	Thanks you, we added explanations.
343	Jeroen Panis	Individual		Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	22	584	22	585	the references (both Daily and Costanza) are not correct	The section is no longer included in the chapter.
344	Jeroen Panis	Individual		Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	24	622	24	623	this sentence makes nog sense. The meaning of the part before and after the brackets are not conforming.	Agreed. We deleted this sentence for the sake of space.
345	Jeroen Panis	Individual		Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	24	631	24	631	de term "monism" has been dropped without any reference or explanation	We added an explanation for monism
346	Jeroen Panis	Individual		Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	25	660	25	660	"the value monism assumptions" example of excessive jargon use	Agreed, we deleted the jargon.
347	Jeroen Panis	Individual		Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	25	663	25	663	"to enable some relaxation of the commensurability assumption". This is gibberish. What does this even mean?	Agreed, we simplified the sentence.
348	Jeroen Panis	Individual		Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	29	757	29	757	reference missing	References were completed during the final edits of the chapter
349	Jeroen Panis	Individual		Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	44	1141	44	1142	"the three sustainable development dimensions", put in a reference to a part of the tekst explaining these, because you can't mean the 3 subcriteria of the subsequent paragraph using these words. Such glowing terms are not used for the other criteria.	to avoid misconception, we deleted references to the 3 sustianbility development pillars or dimensions.
350	Jeroen Panis	Individual		Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	49	1297	49	1297	remove the built point. This statement is not one of the criteria of which there are just 5.	We appreciate the comment. This sentence has been removed.

351	Jeroen Panis	Individual		Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	63	1648	63	1648	2nd bullet of Main characteristics of Participatory approaches: incoherent sentence	Thanks, "may be subjective" has been deleted
352	Jeroen Panis	Individual		Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	64	1650	64	1650	there are some unknown abbreviations used. You have to screen a separate table on an other page to guess their meaning. Every figure should be understandable on its own.	The acronyms and abreviations have been spelled out in text
353	Jeroen Panis	Individual		Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods					a lot of reference are missing in the tekst: (REF), (ref), (##)	We appreciate your comment, missing references have been attended in the final edits of the chapter.
354	Jeroen Panis	Individual		Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	66	1710	66	1710	restor = raster?	This has been corrected
355	Jeroen Panis	Individual		Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	77	2053	77	2053	explain: reflexivity and positionality	An explanation has been added.
356	Jeroen Panis	Individual		Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	78	2067	78	2067	NCs abbreviation not in list, interprataion issue (e.g. natural capital?)	NCs was corrected to NCP.
357	Jeroen Panis	Individual		Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	79	2119	79	2121	is this limited to just the negative impact of nature on health. If not it needs to be reworded to add the necessary nuance.	Thank you for the comment. A more complete overview of the methods to value the relationship between biodiversity (nature) and health has now been included in the chapter.
358	Jeroen Panis	Individual		Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	80	2132	80	2133	I do appreciate the importance, but is this a relevant example in this context? What is the impact of NCP on indoor air quality?	This has been updated with relevant example, i.e. economic benefits of biodiversity gain from the management of invasive species.
359	Jeroen Panis	Individual		Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	81	2145	81	2145	Are plenty of the drawbacks of the travel cost method and others not applicable to e.g. the recreational site choice method and time spend analysis? It seems that the drawbacks of a range of methods are not fleshed out compared to others. You might expect to have a more structured analysis of the pros and cons.	Due to the large number of specific methods that we refer to in the chapter, we are unable to provide the shortcomings of all of them. The drawbacks of methods are provided at the level of methods families. Methods in the same family tend to share many drawbacks.

360	Jeroen Panis	Individual		Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	87	2236	87	2236	MAUT/MAVT: unknown abbreviations	The acronyms and abbreviations have been spelled out in text
361	Jeroen Panis	Individual		Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	96	2541	96	2541	ANZ: unknown abbreviations	The acronyms have been spelled out in text
362	Jeroen Panis	Individual		Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	140	3239	141	3280	this is just some kind of outline of a text	This box has been expanded and refined.
363	Jeroen Panis	Individual		Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	145	3412	147	3485	this seems a meaningless paragraph. The need is unclear as the topic of the whole chapter is basically ecosystem services valuation. The content looks to be covered by parts of this chapter and others, even in the introductory parts.	This section details the specific role and contribution of the ecosystem services research field, in response to reviewer comments to clarify and acknowledge this explicitly. Indeed, this is implicitly covered throughout.
364	Jeroen Panis	Individual		Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	153	3604	153	3604	You are implying Aristotle lived in that era???	Thanks for pointing this possible interpretation. We deleted "since 50 and 70 AD" to avoid confusion
365	Jeroen Panis	Individual		Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	154	3638	154	3640	shouldn't power imbalances (especially in selection of participants and group discussions) be mentioned too?	Power imbalances have been acknowledged throughout.
366	Jeroen Panis	Individual		Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	155	3692	155	3692	what is being meant with "number sums"? Additions?	This sentence has been deleted.
371	Mostafa Madbouhi	Government	Morocco	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	116	2869			The map at the Figure 3.16 shows Morocco divided into two parts. Please, unify the colors to represent all the territory of Morocco including the non-colored part.	Thank you for your comment, this has been considered, all figures and maps will be further edited for the printed version based on IPBES formats.
377	Michael Bordt	Government	Fisheries and Oceans Canada (comments are my own)	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	137	3157	140	3238	The overview of the SEEA and SEEA EA is generally correct. However in implementation, we have gone beyond the manual and incorporated a broader range of values though engaging stakeholders and working in national contexts. See, for example, the UN ESCAP Diagnostic Tool for Environment Statistics, which guides countries through the process of developing such accounts: http://communities.unescap.org/environment-statistics/tools/diagnostic-tool	Thank you. For reasons of scope and place limitations, we had to ask the contributing authors to stick to the essentials and published/established facts. Some ongoing processes of interest in this moving field have therefore remained unmentioned.

431	Demian Willette	Individual	Loyola Marymount University	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	63	1647	63	1648	A suggested example tool to include for the 'Modeling' row is the i-Tree Suite of tools. i-Tree has been widely used in assessing the value of trees/forests in over 130 countries and is regularly cited in the literature. I provide a recent citation from the developers of the software package here: Nowak, D. J., Maco, S., Binkley, M. (2018). i-Tree: Global tools to assess tree benefits and risks to improve forest management. <i>Arboricultural Consultant</i> . 51 (4): 10-13., 51(4), 10-13. This particular reference also discusses various advantages and	i-Tree has been added to table 3.4
432	Demian Willette	Individual	Loyola Marymount University	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	79	2094	79	2094	Please consider the following reference that describes a behavior-based evaluation method specifically for observing play and recreation use (McKenzie, T.L., Cohen, D.A., Sehgal, A., Williamson, S. and Golinelli, D., 2006. System for Observing Play and Recreation in Communities (SOPARC): reliability and feasibility measures. <i>Journal of Physical Activity and Health</i> , 3(s1), pp.S208-S222.)	We have had to be very selective of the references used in the chapter; we did not incorporate this particular reference. The list of examples of "behaviour-based valuations that use non-monetary indicators" is sufficiently long and cannot be extended due to length limitations.
433	Demian Willette	Individual	Loyola Marymount University	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	80	2145	80	2145	Table 3.8 - I appreciate the inclusion of hedonic pricing method (amenity value) here and suggest the following recent and novel approach to this method using an iconic location (New York's Central Park) as a clever example of how the method has been applied, as well as a review of pros and cons to this particular method, which the authors term a 'Holistic' approach. Both the extraordinary value estimated of the provided ecosystem services of Central Park, as well as the discussed point that ES in urban areas warrant greater value than	Due to the large number of specific methods that we refer to in the chapter, we are unable to provide the shortcomings of all of them. The drawbacks of methods are provided at the level of methods families. Methods in the same family tend to share many drawbacks.
471	Alka Bharat	Individual	Maulana Azad National Institute of Technology, Bhopal (M.P.), India	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	6	148	6	148	As Head 3.4 Have 'Case studies' To give perspective view and the best practices	The comment is unclear.
472	Alka Bharat	Individual	Maulana Azad National Institute of Technology, Bhopal (M.P.), India	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	6	148	6	148	Have sub head ... 3.4.1 'Empirical'	The comment is unclear.
473	Alka Bharat	Individual	Maulana Azad National Institute of Technology, Bhopal (M.P.), India	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	6	148	6	148	Have sub head ... 3.4.2 'Structural'	The comment is unclear.
474	Alka Bharat	Individual	Maulana Azad National Institute of Technology, Bhopal (M.P.), India	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	6	148	6	148	Have sub head ... 3.4.3 'Technological'	The comment is unclear.
475	Alka Bharat	Individual	Maulana Azad National Institute of Technology, Bhopal (M.P.), India	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	6	179	6	179	Add Head 3.6 FAQs	The comment is unclear.
476	Alka Bharat	Individual	Maulana Azad National Institute of Technology, Bhopal (M.P.), India	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	107	2573	107	2574	Add a Fig. 3.10 ... 'Nature and Built/modified surface' dimension	This comment seems to be tagged to an incorrect figure. Figure 3.10 was only intended to demonstrate the distribution of the LK contributions across numerous attributes. We have not incorporated this suggestion.

477	Alka Bharat	Individual	Maulana Azad National Institute of Technology, Bhopal (M.P.), India	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	108	2589	109	2590	Adding a dimension of ...'modified Land cover' will add ground reality'	This suggestion was not incorporated; the topic being discussed is not about land cover.
478	Alka Bharat	Individual	Maulana Azad National Institute of Technology, Bhopal (M.P.), India	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	114	2666	115	2682	Add contents on gains and losses due to Land Management decisions and there consideration in 'what type of Values are assessed'	The requested additions do not seem to fit in this section
492	Gustavo Pérez Verdin	Organisation	Instituto Politécnico Nacional	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	22	555	22	557	Complete the sentence of lines 555-557. you could say something like this (before "Over the...": "Eventually, despite recognition of various types of errors, the NOAA panel accepted and recommended the application of contingent valuation for valuating losses of natural capital and could be used in litigations."	This sentence has been completed.
493	Gustavo Pérez Verdin	Organisation	Instituto Politécnico Nacional	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	22	567	22	567	Complete this sentence: "...and commonly used in many local and even regional studies"	We added 'in multiple studies at various scales'.
494	Gustavo Pérez Verdin	Organisation	Instituto Politécnico Nacional	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	23	595	23	595	"...made no sense...": I disagree with this statement. There are many studies that have found Costanza's results usable. We should recall that many criticisms to economic valuation start from the point of what is better: an estimated value (considering some uncertainties) or nothing. The theory suggests that all economic valuations of ES are estimations of nature. If you still consider the words "no sense" should stay, then include more authors who agreed with that. Yet, I still disagree with it.	Agreed. We deleted 'made 'no sense' and rephrased to state that 'some argued' this approach to be unsuitable for public policy advice.
495	Gustavo Pérez Verdin	Organisation	Instituto Politécnico Nacional	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	27	701	27	711	Lines 701-711 explain well why IPLC knowledge has been ignored. However, the reader could be benefited to learn the main arguments for which such knowledge is "underepresented". Could you elaborate a little bit on what those authors claim that kind of knowledge should be "disqualified"?	Box 3.7. Understanding "evidence" from IPLC epistemologies and Section 3.3.1.2 Recognition of diverse knowledges and worldviews elaborates further on this.
496	Gustavo Pérez Verdin	Organisation	Instituto Politécnico Nacional	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	33				Figure 3.4. Righ figure fonts are ineligible. Make them bigger. Also, explain clearly how the values in the outer circle were obtained.	This figure has been removed.
497	Gustavo Pérez Verdin	Organisation	Instituto Politécnico Nacional	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods					Since the beginning of the chapter, I was wondering what really is the purpose of this chapter? What is it contributing to? Why summarizing existing literature again? After all, literature is already there, is somehow easy to reach, and more important, it evolves over time. In answering these questions, in some circumstances make a little sense to have a review of reviews; this report would be read by people who may not have a chance to look the entire collection of works. But, wouldn't it better to focus on the future trends of economic valuation?	We have now more explicitly clarified the scope. The chapter has remained within its scope, and within the limitations of the time and resources given, as well as the limitation of providing global, general valuation principles and policy-relevant guidance rather than ready-made manuals and recipes.
498	Gustavo Pérez Verdin	Organisation	Instituto Politécnico Nacional	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	44				Figure 3.6. Rotate words clockwise: "purpose of valuation" and all those in pink and green colors	Thank you for your comment, this has been considered, all figures will be further edited for the printed version based on IPBES formats.

499	Gustavo Pérez Verdin	Organisation	Instituto Politécnico Nacional	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	67	1770	69	1805	Another problem associated with nature-based methods is the assumption that model inputs are often generalized for both small and large areas. For example, INVEST use a lot of default parameters that were designed for USA. Yet, they are used in other parts of the world (Mexico, South America). This is because there is not enough information to confirm or change model parameters.	Good point. This is also touched upon in the section on aggregation.
500	Gustavo Pérez Verdin	Organisation	Instituto Politécnico Nacional	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	77	2055	77	2057	We had an experience (Mexico) in which an ejido's assembly voted almost equally (51-49%, or 50-50%) for a set of alternatives. Clearly, there was no dominance of one alternative over the other (status quo). Therefore, decisions based on group deliberation could not be effective if they are not selected by a "large" majority.	While we agree, insignificant rankings of options can also result from methods using large samples or non-discussion based methods. We therefore made no changes to the text here.
501	Gustavo Pérez Verdin	Organisation	Instituto Politécnico Nacional	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods					If IPBES is adopting the NCP terminology, then avoid writing NCP/ecosystem services everywhere. Write a initial note saying that this report assumes no consequential differences between NCP and ecosystem services or that for the purpose of this report NCP terminology will be used instead of ES (something like that).	The IPBES terminology (NCP) is consistently used. However, when referring to existing ecosystem service literature, the correct term is used.
502	Gustavo Pérez Verdin	Organisation	Instituto Politécnico Nacional	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	87	2249	87		Another advantage of MCDM is that decisions can be separated by each group of stakeholder (i.e., landowners, government, forest managers, etc.) or for the entire group of participants. Discriminating each group decisions, allows reducing the uncertainty when there is no a clear dominance of a decision	Thanks for the suggestion, this advantage has been added to the text
503	Gustavo Pérez Verdin	Organisation	Instituto Politécnico Nacional	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	134	3034	134	3038	I agree on all topical reviews of section 3.3.4, except the benefit transfer topic. The benefit transfer methodology has been used for a long time and does not have the innovative, provocative property as the other six topics. It has been used for evaluating direct, indirect, and passive use values. I don't see the significance given to it, since many authors do classify it as another valuation method (Rosenberg & Loomis 2003; Rosenberg et al 2017).	Benefit transfers is not in the section on resources - as they are usually applied to reduce costs. The section includes new developments in the field.
504	Gustavo Pérez Verdin	Organisation	Instituto Politécnico Nacional	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	136	3094	136	3094	I don't think the citation (Samuelson, 1954) should go there. Even though Samuelson discusses how people respond to price parameters by signalling his/her preferences, is not clearly referring to stated preferences methods. Hypothetical bias has emerged from the application of these methods and, given the year of that citation, few or no studies had been conducted at that time. Use a more recent citation (there are many).	We have deleted the reference to avoid confusion
505	Gustavo Pérez Verdin	Organisation	Instituto Politécnico Nacional	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	140	3239			Section 3.3.4.3 is not finished yet.... It should be an interesting one	Positive feedback is appreciated.
506	Gustavo Pérez Verdin	Organisation	Instituto Politécnico Nacional	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	148	3481	148		Another challenge in ES valuation is the need to continue mapping hot spots highly rich in species diversity and economic, cultural value to strengthen the decision-making process (Eigenbrod et al., 2010). For example, the Forest Stewardship Council requires that for an area to be certified, landowners must identify high conservation value forests. These forest must have cultural, spiritual, economic values and for the benefit of future generations. Identifying these hotspots would help to formalize sort of umbrella projects for landscape conservation.	Many thanks for this comment. Although we fully agree with the fact that methodological challenges remain in ES valuation, and particularly within the aspect of value integration and hotspot mapping, we dont consider this to be a key challenge as the other three we list in this concluding section.
507	Gustavo Pérez Verdin	Organisation	Instituto Politécnico Nacional	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	159				Figure 3.38, Up, left chart. How did you categorize nature worldviews from the review? Some studies did not even know that kind of classification. Explain please!	This is explained in DMR. In this case, it was based on occurrence of key words associated with broad values linked to Life Value Frames

508	Gustavo Pérez Verdín	Organisation	Instituto Politécnico Nacional	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	4144	4146	4144		Choosing the right method?..... I agree, it depends on many things. But given the operationalization of this review and, based on the literature review and even based on the transparency and scope of this report, I was expecting that you would recommend the use of one method(s) in particular. You may be wrong or right, but it will help many to keep working on finding better ways for valuing nature. It will much easier for novel researchers to start from this point of knowledge than from zero. Four decades ago, the NOAA recommended the use of	We have now more explicitly clarified the scope. The chapter has remained within its scope, and within the limitations of the time and resources given, as well as the limitation of providing global, general valuation principles and policy-relevant guidance rather than ready-made manuals and recipes. We have gone as far as we could within the scope of this assessment, using a range of hypothetical examples. It was not possible to do this exercise for each specific application context.
514	Tanya O'Garra	Organisation	Middlesex University	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	74	1986	74	1989	This sentence is unclear and doesn't fit in this subsection, which is about the "purpose of valuation" using stated value methods, I suggest deleting, or rewriting for clarity.	Thanks for the comment. We have rephrased for clarity.
515	Tanya O'Garra	Organisation	Middlesex University	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	74	1986	74	1986	I suggest adding: "Due to their ability to capture non-use values, these approaches can be used to identify the premium that the public is willing to pay to avoid biodiversity losses (Nobel et al. 2020)".	Thanks for the suggestion which we have incorporated into the text.
516	Tanya O'Garra	Organisation	Middlesex University	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	0	0	0	0	Suggested added reference (see above): Nobel, A., Lizin, S., Brouwer, R., Bruns, S. B., Stern, D. I., & Malina, R. (2020). Are biodiversity losses valued differently when they are caused by human activities? A meta-analysis of the non-use valuation literature. Environmental Research Letters, 15(7), 073003.	We appreciate the comment, the reference is now included.
517	Tanya O'Garra	Organisation	Middlesex University	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	0				There is a missing literature in the review of stated value methods, in which time is used as a numeraire (i.e. "willingness to spend time") instead of money ("willingness to pay"). This is particularly relevant in cashless/subsistence-based economies, and is another potentially more 'fair' way of eliciting values. I am happy to provide more references, if needed, on top of those already suggested in my comments - and to review these if that is helpful.	This has been included.
518	Tanya O'Garra	Organisation	Middlesex University	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	75	1991	75	1992	Suggest adding "willingness to spend time" after "willingness to pay" in Column 3, top row, just after "Contingent valuation".	The text in brackets was removed in response to another comment; we have included text about time as a numeraire in the text.
519	Tanya O'Garra	Organisation	Middlesex University	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	76	2006	75	2006	As noted above, I suggest referring to the 'willingness to spend time' method as well. Suggested addition: "A more recent literature uses time as a numeraire (measure of value) rather than money. Time-based stated value approaches are typically used to capture values of individuals or communities in subsistence economies or those living in contexts with low levels of cash income, and who - as a result - have little money to contribute, but who positively value the good or service in question (O'Garra, 2009). These values may be converted to	We have included this suggestion under the heading 'individual based methods'
520	Tanya O'Garra	Organisation	Middlesex University	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	77	2034	77	2034	I suggest adding O'Garra (2009) and Casey et al (2008) to list of references, as these are two of the earliest studies using statement-based approaches to identify (non-use) bequest and existence values associated with ES provided by local resources to indigenous communities. Full references indicated in next comment.	Thanks for these references, which we have included.
521	Tanya O'Garra	Organisation	Middlesex University	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	0				Suggested ref #1) O'Garra, T. (2009). Bequest values for marine resources: how important for indigenous communities in less-developed economies?. Environmental and resource economics, 44(2), 179. Suggested ref #2) Casey JF, Kahn JR, Rivas AAF (2008) Willingness to accept compensation for the environmental risks of oil transport on the Amazon: a choice modeling experiment. Ecological Economics 67:552-559	We appreciate the comment, the reference is now included.

522	Nikolay Tzvetkov	Government	Bulgaria, Ministry of Environment and Water	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	137		140		The presented SEEA text regarding the history, concepts and definitions are correct. The text covering the UN System of Environmental Economic Accounting (SEEA) and the revised SEEA- EEA have direct relation with ecosystem accounting but these passages are for informational purposes only and don't have any methodological value. They present the summary of the challenges for ecosystem accounting especially that those are spatial data, and include biophysical and monetary accounting of ecosystem assets.	correct. we don't know what the suggestion of the reviewer is.
582	Allia Aleksanyan, Levon Aghasyan	Government	Ministry of Environment of the Republic of Armenia	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	1		255		Most of the figures, graphs are unattractive and small. I would suggest to change style and move to annexes	Thank you for your comment, this has been considered, all figures will be further edited for the printed version based on IPBES formats.
604	Ana María Gómez Aguayo	Individual		Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	86	2207	87		More information from multi-criteria analysis is needed, It can also serve to strengthen work networks (experts, activists, scientists, politicians). This technique even has the ability to provide information on regional policies and regional working groups. Prioritize indicators, prioritize states of eco-systems, prioritize the most vulnerable ecosystem services that require urgent attention. This methodology can be combined with stakeholder analysis, social mapping analysis and social network analysis, AHP is powerful. Some	While the comment is generally relevant, we are unable to expand this section which is already too long. We also feel that part of the suggestions are already accounted for in the current version of the text. In addition, the suggested reference is incomplete and could not be found (see also answer to the next comment)
605	Ana María Gómez Aguayo	Individual		Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	86	2207	87		Some authors indicate that multicriteria models are useful for prioritizing environmental attributes and functions (Munda, 1993; Leung & Cao 2001; Grassi et al. 2004; Linkov & Moberg, 2011, Saaty, 2001). During the last decade the use of multicriteria techniques applied to environmental assessments has increased (Huang et al, 2011). Nevertheless, only a few studies have applied AHP and ANP techniques in the domain of ecosystem services and coastal and marine ecosystem management (e.g. Chatterjee, 2015; Himes, 2007; Innes &	This comment is relevant but generally at a level of detail that we cannot reach given the lengths constraints related to this section. However, we have followed the reviewer's suggestion and added: Some authors indicate that multicriteria models are useful for prioritizing environmental attributes and functions (Munda, 1993; Leung & Cao 2001; Grassi et al. 2004; Linkov & Moberg, 2011, Saaty, 2001).
606	Ana María Gómez Aguayo	Individual		Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	87	2235			Inclusión of citations when mentioned ANP and AHP Saaty, T.L. Fundamentals of the Analytic Network Process — Dependence and 486 Feedback in Decision-Making with a Single Network. J. Syst. Sci. Syst. Eng. 2004, 13, 487 129–157, doi:10.1007/s11518-006-0158-y. 488 31. Saaty, T.L. Making and Validating Complex Decisions with the AHP/ANP. J. Syst. Sci. 489 Syst. Eng. 2005, 14, 1–36, doi:10.1007/s11518-006-0179-6.	Thanks for the suggestion, references have been added
631	Claudio Valdovinos	Individual	Universidad de Concepción, Chile	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	22	584	22	584	Do not forget to include Daily's reference.	Thank you for your comment the reference is now included in the text.
632	Claudio Valdovinos	Individual	Universidad de Concepción, Chile	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	29	757	29	757	Do not forget to include the missing reference.	We appreciate your comment, missing references have been attended in the final edits of the chapter.
633	Claudio Valdovinos	Individual	Universidad de Concepción, Chile	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	19	499	19	499	Do not forget to include the missing reference.	We appreciate your comment, missing references have been attended in the final edits of the chapter.
634	Claudio Valdovinos	Individual	Universidad de Concepción, Chile	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	28	738	28	738	Do not forget to include the missing reference.	We appreciate your comment, missing references have been attended in the final edits of the chapter.

635	Claudio Valdovinos	Individual	Universidad de Concepción, Chile	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	26	670	26	670	The axis in Figure 3.3 is inverted. It should start in 1997 and end in 2021.	We appreciate your comment. Figures have been edited accordingly
664	Theresa Satterfield	Organisation	University (of British Columbia)	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods					Again, terrific chapter overall	Thank you for your comment. The positive feedback is greatly appreciated by the chapter authors.
665	Theresa Satterfield	Organisation	University (of British Columbia)	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	86		90		The omission of structured decision making as a method is frankly odd, particularly as it's a value-based method. It exists in the company of but also as distinct from MAUT. And it addresses the primary 'constructed preferences' problem long noted in preference and valuation studies. The best references on this are: Gregory, R., Failing, L., Harstone, M., Long, G., McDaniels, T., & Ohlson, D. (2012). Structured decision making: a practical guide to environmental management choices. John Wiley & Sons. AND two applications for	Thank you for bringing the references to our attention. We have included the Gregory et al reference in the text on multicriteria decision aid as the methodology follows similar principles.
719	Ralf Döring	Individual	Johann Heinrich von Thünen Federal Research Institute for Rural Areas, Forestry and Fisheries, Germany	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	171	4086	173	4135	In my view an important discussion regarding the uptake of values in decision-making and/or other parts of this Chapter is missing. The selection of the discount rate in, for example, cost-benefit-analysis has a huge influence on future values of costs and benefits. We can have applied the best methods to value nature but in a cost-benefit-analysis high discount rates may disregard future benefits of preserving nature in favor of short-term high returns of destruction of ecosystem today. Burning down rainforest for short term benefits is then counting more	Discount rates are now discussed more prominently, in cost-benefit analysis, and in a broader sense in if and how valuations consider inter-generational distributional justice, and aggregation of values. It is clear that discount rates reflect the present versus future values, for those methods which apply (monetary) quantifications.
720	Ralf Döring	Individual	Johann Heinrich von Thünen Federal Research Institute for Rural Areas, Forestry and Fisheries, Germany	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	19	464	19	467	The 'integration' of land into capital led to recognition of nature also regarding non-material benefits. However, it also led to the dismissal of the specific characters of land: that it is limited, that how it used define future use potentials etc. In many countries land is just treated as an area to produce agricultural goods, ignoring more or less its role for preservation of biodiversity (see discussion on agricultural policy in the EU).	This text is no longer in the chapter
721	Ralf Döring	Individual	Johann Heinrich von Thünen Federal Research Institute for Rural Areas, Forestry and Fisheries, Germany	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	20	509	20	510	This is correct but land was still defined as the most important production factor as famines were still quite common (see Ireland in the middle of the 19th century).	This text is no longer in the chapter
722	Ralf Döring	Individual	Johann Heinrich von Thünen Federal Research Institute for Rural Areas, Forestry and Fisheries, Germany	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	20	512	20	512	Technological development (fertilizer) and plenty of available land in the US paved the way to see agriculture as just another form of 'capital investment' and land as a 'capital' similar to man-made capital (we could invest in land to improve production, etc.). As mentioned before this led to ignoring the specifics of land and that land is only possible to convert solar energy into something useful for us including in the long run the availability of energy (solar power).	This text is no longer in the chapter
723	Ralf Döring	Individual	Johann Heinrich von Thünen Federal Research Institute for Rural Areas, Forestry and Fisheries, Germany	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	27	698	27	700	I think this whole part is not addressing 'valuation'. It is just saying that knowledge is taken into account etc. There is often a total different understanding of what we call 'nature' from a western perspective. Why this is not reflected here and only general statements of inclusion provided?	This text is no longer in the chapter
724	Ralf Döring	Individual	Johann Heinrich von Thünen Federal Research Institute for Rural Areas, Forestry and Fisheries, Germany	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	29	771	29	771	This is not true in my mind as you basically describe the history of economic valuation and a few extra issues (like taking indigenous knowledge into account). I can't see much about other disciplines.	This text is no longer in the chapter

725	Ralf Döring	Individual	Johann Heinrich von Thünen Federal Research Institute for Rural Areas, Forestry and Fisheries, Germany	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	38	968	38	971	My feeling is, and I may be wrong, that there is not much in this literature review on very critical views of economic valuation. An example is the critic that economic valuation means the co-modification of 'nature' solely for economic purposes.	Thank you for your comment. We agree that the literature includes very critical research papers on economic valuation. However, the literature also includes very positive papers on the potential of economic valuation to protect biodiversity. Ch3 has the scope to review the pros and cons of methods themselves. We do this based on descriptions of what the methods are suitable for and their limitations and also review how they have been used in valuation studies. This has been the approach taken to balance the evidence in
726	Ralf Döring	Individual	Johann Heinrich von Thünen Federal Research Institute for Rural Areas, Forestry and Fisheries, Germany	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	90	2348	90	2349	This sentence for me assumes that a positive cost-benefit-ratio is automatically social desirable or feasible. It still can contradict nature conservation objectives.	Correct. Yet, if the relevant costs and benefits are included the evaluation can be justified. Also, the sentence refers to comparison between alternatives, which also could refer to alternatives which have the same impact on nature.
727	Ralf Döring	Individual	Johann Heinrich von Thünen Federal Research Institute for Rural Areas, Forestry and Fisheries, Germany	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	91	2363	91	2363	As mentioned in a previous comment the choice of the discount rate is very important how to value future costs and benefits. This needs to be discussed as the integration of economic values of nature's contributions to people/ecosystem services is not sufficient in many cases when applying a high discount rate basically ignoring future costs and benefits.	Discount rates are now discussed more prominently, in cost-benefit analysis, and in a broader sense in if and how valuations consider inter-generational distributional justice, and aggregation of values. It is clear that discount rates reflect the present versus future values, for those methods which apply (monetary) quantifications.
728	Ralf Döring	Individual	Johann Heinrich von Thünen Federal Research Institute for Rural Areas, Forestry and Fisheries, Germany	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	91	2366	91	2366	I would avoid the term price tag as many people think economic valuation is putting a price tag on something which is not true. The objective is to reveal, for example, values of people for ecosystem services.	Now changed to "monetary values" to use a more neutral wording.
729	Wouter Van Reeth	Individual	Research Institute for Nature and Forest	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	1	4	1	4	By reducing the definition of valuation to "a conscious, targeted and explicit undertaking..." you risk missing the institutional context in which valuation takes place, that often leads to valuation being done implicitly because of these institutional influences (e.g. learned behaviour, cultural patterns, ...); I would at least acknowledge here the fact that valuation is, in many decision-making contexts, often a partly implicit, intuitive undertaking; sometimes 'valuation methods' are just 'valuation practices' or 'valuation habits'	This is a key comment which we have clearly addressed, including at assessment level, by distinguishing 'valuing' from 'valuation' along these lines.
730	Wouter Van Reeth	Individual	Research Institute for Nature and Forest	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	3	65	3	68	not only to just 'improve decision-making' but also to rationalise or legitimize decisions that were taken for other reasons, and hence to achieve other goals than the ones mentioned in line 68	Agree, yet the choice is made to use 'improve decision making' as a broader shorthand for detailed purposes, which are detailed in that specific section. It's not possible to mention these nuances at each instance.
731	Wouter Van Reeth	Individual	Research Institute for Nature and Forest	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	4	90	4	91	Can you clarify what you mean by, or how you distinguish between, informative, decisive and technical stage?	explanations are added and reference is made to laurans et al in 3.2.1.2
732	Wouter Van Reeth	Individual	Research Institute for Nature and Forest	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	5	125	5	126	nice to see a cross-disciplinary classification of the valuation methods!	Thank you for your comment. The positive feedback is greatly appreciated by the chapter authors.
733	Wouter Van Reeth	Individual	Research Institute for Nature and Forest	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	6	147	6	147	In the left figure it is not really clear which elements of the ipbes-framework are captured by the green, red, blue & gray valuation families; in the right figure, avoid abbreviations in the names of the families	Thank you, figure on the left has been edited, and figure on the right has been removed.

734	Wouter Van Reeth	Individual	Research Institute for Nature and Forest	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	35	880	35	881	seems like a rather narrow set of search terms; would have been good for instance to include 'biological valuation' in the search, e.g. with to marine biological valuation methodology; also would have yielded the one used in Flanders;	This is the search terms used to identify review papers. Notice that in the review of applications of nature based valuation we use a much wider range of search terms to obtain wider coverage of application of methods in valuation studies. We have not had sufficient resources to redo the review of reviews.
735	Wouter Van Reeth	Individual	Research Institute for Nature and Forest	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	38	974	38	974	I would not rank CBA under integrated valuation methods as it deals only with economic values that can be monetized. Of other, non-economic values are included it is rather a multicriteria-analysis.	CBA is a much used method to include non-market values of biodiversity into economic decision-making. While we agree that it is a more restricted method and multi-criteria analysis can include a wider range of values, describing CBA under integrated valuation is still a logical place in Ch3. The purpose of doing a CBA for an environmental project is to integrate different types of impacts into a common framework. We have not included a new category of evaluation methods in the TOD.
736	Wouter Van Reeth	Individual	Research Institute for Nature and Forest	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	45	1166	45	1167	Economic valuation methods are indeed grounded in utilitarianism but they generally do not express the results as 'changes in utility'. On the contrary, the monetary measures represent an exchange value, and not so much a 'use value'. Rephrase as 'assess changes in economic, usually monetary value'.	We make a distinction between monetary valuation (some of which may represent exchange values), and economic valuation more broadly. No changes.
737	Wouter Van Reeth	Individual	Research Institute for Nature and Forest	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	46	1192	46	1201	Referring to Costanza & Opdam you define ecological sustainability as referring to ecological processes that deliver NCP. But in the subcriterion 'ecosystem condition' you write 'regardless of their use, services for or contribution to humans'. Either change the first definition or the definition of the subcriterion so that they match.	We use a range of categories under the headings of ecological sustainability. Therefore both services and ecological condition are included as different sub-categories. See DMR for details.
738	Wouter Van Reeth	Individual	Research Institute for Nature and Forest	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	46	1210	46	1210	In defining ecosystem capacity, I'd make a choice: either refer to potential delivery, or to actual delivery, but not to both at the same time.	Both actual and potential are important, also, both are not clearly defined in literature or distinguishable
739	Wouter Van Reeth	Individual	Research Institute for Nature and Forest	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	63	1647	63	1648	I would expect under the 'mapping' or 'direct measurement' methods group 'ecosystem mapping' or 'habitat mapping' being mentioned as one of the basic applications, both for biodiversity policy and as a basis for ecosystem services mapping and ecosystem extent accounts. The Flemish 'biological valuation map', but also similar map types in the Netherlands and the UK can serve as examples.	This is included now
740	Wouter Van Reeth	Individual	Research Institute for Nature and Forest	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	64	1649	64	1650	Inventories are often geo-referenced and used in mapping, so they should be positioned in the intersection of 'direct measurement' and 'mapping'.	indeed the two are connected: making the inventory would be direct, applying the map wouldn't
741	Wouter Van Reeth	Individual	Research Institute for Nature and Forest	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	65	1686	65	1697	I believe that the point that you're making here is that the biophysical scales (measured phenomenon) and the 'institutional scale' (at which decision-making and/or action takes place) do not match. Perhaps you could include that term.	Only partly, there is an aggregative issue with scaling, regardless the mismatch or match with social/institutional scales.
742	Wouter Van Reeth	Individual	Research Institute for Nature and Forest	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	69	1815	69	1815	"e.g. (Hegetschweiler et al., 2017...): if you want to give an example, better mention it briefly as its purpose is to clarify something. No reader is going to understand the example just by seeing a literature reference.	We fully agree with the comment. We have re-structured this whole section to provide examples from the systematic literature review we have conducted, so that it is more explicative for the reader. Because of space constraints, we have deleted this sentence with the references mentioned.

743	Wouter Van Reeth	Individual	Research Institute for Nature and Forest	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	75	1992	75	1992	The last limitation of the group based methods, i.e. "requires skilled facilitation to moderate discussions..." isn't really a limitation of this method. It's a requirement that can be applied to any method, e.g. 'skills in statistics', 'skills in survey-based methods', 'skills in recognizing habitats', 'skills in qualitative research methods', ... So I would drop this as a 'limitation' in the table, or add a similar one to all methods.	Thanks for this suggestion with which we agree. We have deleted the text.
744	Wouter Van Reeth	Individual	Research Institute for Nature and Forest	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	77	2030	77	2030	Do you refer to the utility of the method, or to the valuation outcome?	We refer to the valuation outcome. We rephrased the text accordingly
745	Wouter Van Reeth	Individual	Research Institute for Nature and Forest	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	90	2344	90	2344	Never "all" impacts: only those that can be expressed or converted in monetary terms. An also not for all of "the lifetime of the alternatives", because discounting usually results in almost completely disregarding the welfare effects which are more than a few decades in the future. With regard to issues like afforestation or the build-up of carbon in the soil, there is a serious mismatch between the temporal scale that is relevant from a biophysical-ecological point of view, and that which is relevant from a neo-classical economic point of view. As indicated	Indeed, we removed "all"
746	Wouter Van Reeth	Individual	Research Institute for Nature and Forest	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	104	2664	105	2665	The table in itself is interesting as a 'demonstration' of what IPLC-related valuation entails. Not being familiar with many of the aspects mentioned, it is hard to understand, let alone review, what is really meant by some of the terms used. But the allocation of the bullets (e.g. those in the column "What is assessed?") to the 4 method family seems a bit arbitrary.	We have maintained this table as it is one of the few ways that we can demonstrate how IPLC valuation can be conceptualized through the lenses of the methods families. The allocation to methods families is not arbitrary. It is based on the type of information used to understand values, which is the same way to have allocated non-IPLC methods to families also.
747	Wouter Van Reeth	Individual	Research Institute for Nature and Forest	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	107	2701	107	2701	It may be argued that 'historical value' is more a relational value, as it refers to a relationship between a society and the landscape or ecosystem in the past.	Indeed, it can be, but this can be said of almost all values - that they are all relational. We have maintained historical value as an intrinsic value for now.
748	Wouter Van Reeth	Individual	Research Institute for Nature and Forest	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	113	2827	115	2861	Since the aim is this section is to analyse how valuation methods were used 'in practice', why do you focus on academic and gray literature? It would have been useful to check legislation and/or question policy entities to see for instance which types of valuation are mandatory and for what they are used? In Flanders for instance the 'biological valuation map' (a illustration of the 'biophysical and biodiversity assessment' in Figure 3.15) is referred to in legislation, it is used in spatial policy, its categories are the basis for subsidies for nature	In the systematic review we focus on how valuation methods are used in applied studies and we do not just focus on theoretical descriptions of the methods. The use of valuation in real decision making processes is Ch4. This distinction is now more clear in the final versions of the chapters.
749	Wouter Van Reeth	Individual	Research Institute for Nature and Forest	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	122	2927	123	2927	It would improve clarity of the table to include some of the description of the three main table parts (indicators/preferences/costs) in the table itself, and not just at the bottom. Especially when you consult the document on screen. This goes also for the next tables on the following pages.	This section is no longer in the chapter but moved to the appendixes.
750	Wouter Van Reeth	Individual	Research Institute for Nature and Forest	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	129	2969	129	2970	Correct legend in graph 3.28: replace 'it is assessed' after white square by 'not assessed'. Also in following graphs.	This figure has been removed.
751	Wouter Van Reeth	Individual	Research Institute for Nature and Forest	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	133	3012	133	3012	NCA is not "a specific instrument" but rather a broad and heterogeneous field of practice & research. At country level it is at best a broad database, assembled through a variety of data & procedures reflecting a wide variety of monitoring and data collection practices. There is a movement to increase comparability across countries, but the variety is at this moment too big to really call it 'a standard'.	We agree. The sentence has been nuanced by adding: yet mobilized by a broad and heterogeneous field of practice and research

752	Wouter Van Reeth	Individual	Research Institute for Nature and Forest	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	139	3208	140	3238	Some challenges are not touched upon here, and could be elaborated further: (1) the need of accounting approaches to 'compartmentalize' biophysical assets, where in many policy programs, gradients, mosaics & dynamic changes are increasingly targeted; (2) the need of accounting approaches to come up with some standard, where for many policy applications tailor-made approaches based on participation & adaptation are required; and (3) the danger that accounts being used 'open up' to economic decision-making and	Agree with these challenges, and part of these polemics, insofar represented and well-established in literature, are taken up. However, these are more general concerns beyond accounting specifically, and evidence on (potential and risks of) the application of NCA is scarce to devote detailed analysis in this scope.
753	Wouter Van Reeth	Individual	Research Institute for Nature and Forest	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	146	3421	146	3424	The left graph in Figure 3.32 presents a constant growth rate since 2010-2011k, not an exponential growth rate.	Thanks for this remark. We have removed exponentially from the text.
754	Wouter Van Reeth	Individual	Research Institute for Nature and Forest	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	146	3429	146	3430	It's a rather trivial conclusion that the larger countries dominate the pie graph. But EU countries equal US (both 30%), and adding UK to EU (42% the exceed US and China by far. It would be interesting to plot the relationship between GDP (size of the economy) and the number of articles.	Thanks for pointing out to the magnitude of European research. We have added that to the text and we will consider the addition of the Figure, which we find useful, but that we will have to balance with other needs in the chapter.
755	Wouter Van Reeth	Individual	Research Institute for Nature and Forest	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	150	3530	150	3535	I really wonder to what extent this conclusion is true for the nature based valuations: in all Western-European countries nature conservation instruments (e.g. legal protection of vegetation types, designating protected areas, purchasing policy by governments, purchasing & management subsidies to conservation NGO or foresters, EU Natura 2000 implementation, EU Water Framework Directive, etcetera...) is based on nature-based valuation by natural scientists. Since this type of valuation is included in the assessment, I don't think	Agree with this observation, yet the statements refers to a lack of reporting and evaluating this uptake.
756	Wouter Van Reeth	Individual	Research Institute for Nature and Forest	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	155	3678	155	3679	I would rephrase this sentence: any so called 'technical method' actually represents some form of 'value articulating institution' that entails choices on what is valued, whose values are included, etc. (see Vatn). So methods are never 'just technical'. Possible rephrasing: "Integration involves a process or framework that synthesizes information for decision-making." (and drop the rest of that sentence).	Thanks for this useful suggestion, we have adapted the sentence accordingly
757	Wouter Van Reeth	Individual	Research Institute for Nature and Forest	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	158	3773	158	3774	Continuing on the comment on lines 3530-3535, also here (3773-3774) I would have expected intrinsic values to stand out as the value type most often used in valuation. Considering the amount of research on nature conservation referring to nature-based values from an intrinsic value point of view.	These numbers represent the valuation literature. In Nature-based valuation, intrinsic values are indeed the highest.
758	Wouter Van Reeth	Individual	Research Institute for Nature and Forest	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	166	3972	167	3984	Reading the text + the explanation under Figure 3.45, I find it difficult to really understand what is being meant with 'versatility' and how the Figure shows this. The bold text in lines 3972-3973 links versatility to valuation purposes. Line 3978-3979 says that the Figure shows something about the value-specificity. Is this related to valuation purposes, and which purposes does it refer to? The explanation under the figure says that versatility refers to the number of administrative, biophysical and social scales and habitat types targeted. Which seems	versatility is no longer a key concept of figure
759	Wouter Van Reeth	Individual	Research Institute for Nature and Forest	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	170	4070	170	4071	"calls for epistemological and ontological retrospection": you may want to clarify what you mean by this	This sentence has been removed.
760	Wouter Van Reeth	Individual	Research Institute for Nature and Forest	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	175	4189	175	4195	Divide this long sentence in pieces or present in bullets.	This sentence has been removed.

761	Wouter Van Reeth	Individual	Research Institute for Nature and Forest	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	176	4205	176	4205	relational 'ontology' in row 2 of columns 2-3 should probably be 'relational epistemology' and 'relational axiology'?	We appreciate your comment, this table has been simplified to better engage with the readers.
762	Wouter Van Reeth	Individual	Research Institute for Nature and Forest	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	177	4213	177	4214	There is a false distinction being made between 'discourses about scientific methods' and 'discussions that centre on power, ethics and social justice': in sociology, political science, public administration and policy science - to name but a few - power, ethics and justice have been part of the scientific discourse over the last century.	This sentence has been removed.
763	Wouter Van Reeth	Individual	Research Institute for Nature and Forest	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	178	4247	178	4247	'mainstreaming' is a term typically used to indicate that one policy domain affects others, e.g. mainstreaming biodiversity into spatial, agricultural and economic policy; what you refer to here is probably 'the uptake of valuation in decision-making' or 'better linking valuation with decision-making'	This sentence has been removed.
764	Wouter Van Reeth	Individual	Research Institute for Nature and Forest	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	178	4258	178	4258	"intended social and policy outcomes"	This sentence has been removed.
766	Louise Willemen	Individual	University of Twente	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	2	38	2	49	This is a clear list of questions. The order is not the most intuitive. I would expect Q2 to be second last, just before robustness & feasibility.	We agree this is debatable, yet based on diverging opinions, a choice was made and doesn't affect the content.
767	Louise Willemen	Individual	University of Twente	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	1	all	12	all	Could the Executive Summary be shortened? Currently 12 pages. For example; removing Line 50-60 (as these points are covered later), remove content page 1 (overlap with next).	the executive summary was rewritten
768	Louise Willemen	Individual	University of Twente	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	11	278			The message of Figure ES3.7 is unclear, and not contributing to the ExSum	figure not in new exec. summary
769	Louise Willemen	Individual	University of Twente	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	14	344	14	349	This paragraph is very clear and useful.	Positive feedback is appreciated.
770	Louise Willemen	Individual	University of Twente	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	15	251	15	272	This scoping part reads as repetition. Could you just refer to the Scoping doc (incl year) and remove all this?	removed

771	Louise Willemen	Individual	University of Twente	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	18	435	18	435	Related to my earlier comment; I think that these questions are indeed key, but I have difficulties following the current 'story line'. In Fig 3.2 How can "which value" be an outcome ? Isn't that the starting point (What to value), then find a method, which will have different pros and cons. The meaning of the arrows and circles in this figure is hard to grasp. And a suggestion. If you are using a numbered list of assessment questions, shows these number in the figure too (+ the meaning "AQ" in the caption; Or even better -and in line with the IPBES writing style- do	The introduction to the chapter and the scoping of the chapter has been carefully rewritten to clarify the story line.
772	Louise Willemen	Individual	University of Twente	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	2	53			"four valuation families" are not introduced here, so unclear what they are. Remove?	the executive summary was rewritten, issue solved
773	Louise Willemen	Individual	University of Twente	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	26	908	38	967	The search terms are informative, but I would not put them here in the main text (to help use recide the length of the chapter)	Fixed. Thanks for pointing this out
774	Louise Willemen	Individual	University of Twente	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	41	1056			Unclear to what selection is refered here.	This refers to the 3128 selected papers. "3128" as been added next to "selected" to clarify
775	Louise Willemen	Individual	University of Twente	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	41	1062			Why this fourth question? (I suppose you relabeled them?)	The text has now been adapted in the DMR, but yes we relabeled them.
776	Louise Willemen	Individual	University of Twente	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	56	1490			This table seems to summarize all key information for this section. I would start with this (and consider reducing the lengthy text). Could you include the sections in which all is presented, that would be helpful to navigate in this chapter	We agree and the text has been shortened and the more detailed sections have been placed in the DMR or in Annexes.
777	Louise Willemen	Individual	University of Twente	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	63	1647			Where would social media studies fit here? Why is RS/EO a mapping method and not a direct observation? (like mentioned in the text). Think here about direct land surface temperature or air quality measurements. A "mapping" is only possible with the other three approaches, so could be removed (maps are an output). Also the bullet point "helps in decision making" is only valid under a large number of conditions that you also indicate in your chapter. Also please cite the example tools.	This table has been changed substantially for better grouping of methods. Mapping and Spatial analysis is one group. Analysis of social media is considered a behaviour based approach, such as with Photo series analysis methods.
778	Louise Willemen	Individual	University of Twente	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	64	1651			Same here. Reconsider "mapping" category, the placement of RS/EO, and the social media methods to capture nature	The categories have been reconsidered and regrouped for clarity. See Table 3.5 in TOD
779	Louise Willemen	Individual	University of Twente	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	65	1691			This statement could be clarified. Suggested reference: Willemen 2020. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecoser.2020.101125	The suggested reference has been added

780	Louise Willemen	Individual	University of Twente	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	65	1691		1695	This long sentence is unclear. Could you rephrase? On temporal use/mismatch a suggestion reference: De Rio 202 https://www.mdpi.com/2072-4292/12/4/710	Thanks for the suggested reference. We have simplified the sentence and used an example from this study
781	Louise Willemen	Individual	University of Twente	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	68	1783			Make this table matching with 3.4	All the tables will be further edited for the printed version based on IPBES formats.
782	Louise Willemen	Individual	University of Twente	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	62	1616		1804	Section 3.3.1.1 seem to be in more draft state compared to others. I hope authors manage to improve the text and messages. Is this based on the literature review presented in the previous section or more an expert summary?	section was finalized and rewritten
783	Louise Willemen	Individual	University of Twente	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	67	1753			Consider using the work Schoter et al 2015 http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ecoser.2014.07.003	The reference could not be found
813	Rebecca Ford	Individual		Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	5	113	5	116	Approaches and methods from psychology (rating scales) are also used.	Psychology has been included in the list of disciplines
814	Rebecca Ford	Individual		Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	35	899	35	905	Statement based studies of values using psychometric scales seem relevant here, Anderson N, R. M. Ford, C. Nitschke, L.T. Bennett, K.J.H. Williams (2018) Core Values Underpin the Attributes of Forests that Matter to People, Forestry, 91, p629-640 Williams, K. J. H., R. M. Ford, A. Rawluk, (2018) Values of the public at risk of wildfire and its management, International Journal of Wildland Fire, 27 (10), p655-676 Rawluk, A., R. M. Ford, F. L. Neolaka, K. J. H. Williams, (2017) Public Values for Integration in Natural Disaster Management and	Such scales are useful for the assessment of broad values, but CH3 does not focus on broad values. Therefore, these scales were not included in the search terms.
815	Rebecca Ford	Individual		Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	169	4036	169	4038	Agree that there is little guidance on how to integrate values. Some relevant papers are Stewart, J., 2006. Value Conflict and Policy Change. Rev. Policy Res. 23, 183-195. Thacher, D., Rein, M., 2004. Managing Value Conflict in Public Policy. Governance: An International Journal of Policy, Administration, and Institutions 17, 457-486	Thanks for these. The section was thoroughly rewritten
817	Himangana Gupta	Organisation	United Nations University Institute for the Advanced Study of Sustainability (UNU-IAS)	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	27	698	27	699	This may be true, however, there was also large scale ignorance towards IPLCs that actually led to loss of traditional practices. While this is also evident from the following paragraph.	No action needed.
818	Himangana Gupta	Organisation	United Nations University Institute for the Advanced Study of Sustainability (UNU-IAS)	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	27	701	27	701	What is meant by 'external' researchers? There is no information about this in this chapter.	This has been changed to "non-IPLC researchers"

819	Himangana Gupta	Organisation	United Nations University Institute for the Advanced Study of Sustainability (UNU-IAS)	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	27	706	27	706	Please see if the word "non-indigenous" is needed here.	In order not to confuse this with IPLC researchers, we have maintained the wording.
820	Himangana Gupta	Organisation	United Nations University Institute for the Advanced Study of Sustainability (UNU-IAS)	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	28	736	28	739	There have been calls for including IPLC specific or inclusive indicators in the post 2020 GBF in the SBSTTA and SBI informal meetings of CBD.	Indeed, the GBF has emphasized this, but we are listing here examples of implemented cases of adopting IPLC indicators.
821	Himangana Gupta	Organisation	United Nations University Institute for the Advanced Study of Sustainability (UNU-IAS)	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	37	956	37	957	"non-monetary valuation" seems to be repeated in the search string.	Thanks for your comment. the repeated part is eliminated.
822	Himangana Gupta	Organisation	United Nations University Institute for the Advanced Study of Sustainability (UNU-IAS)	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	60	1589	60	1590	Does this mean that more than 50% contributed less than 50%?	The x-axis is confusing; it is not percentage of excerpts contributed, it is number of excerpts contributed. This Figure is no longer in the main text of the TOD now.
823	Himangana Gupta	Organisation	United Nations University Institute for the Advanced Study of Sustainability (UNU-IAS)	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	63	1647	63	1648	For Participatory approaches - Examples of tools - Resilience Indicators toolkit: https://i.unu.edu/media/ias.unu.edu-en/news/5339/Toolkit-for-Indicators-of-Resilience-in-SEPLs.pdf	While the toolkit suggested by the reviewer is generally relevant, it is much broader than participatory approaches, and also than this method family, hence we chose not to include it in the table
824	Himangana Gupta	Organisation	United Nations University Institute for the Advanced Study of Sustainability (UNU-IAS)	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	72	1907	72	1914	May mention somewhere that such approaches have the potential to capture intangible benefits or values.	Agreed. We have included this point.
825	Himangana Gupta	Organisation	United Nations University Institute for the Advanced Study of Sustainability (UNU-IAS)	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	98	2575	98	2575	What is exactly meant by indigenous scholars and how are they categorized as indigenous?	We are using the IPBES definition of indigenous peoples which is defined in the glossary of the Assessment and in Chapter 1, and refer to Indigenous scholars as individuals who identify as Indigenous Peoples and work in the knowledge generation space (research or academia). We do not think that a definition is needed.
826	Himangana Gupta	Organisation	United Nations University Institute for the Advanced Study of Sustainability (UNU-IAS)	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	110	2786	110	2786	HIMAP was not particularly focused on ecosystem service evaluation but was a broader report covering a little bit of it.	Thank you for the observation made. We will adopt it in the TOD.
827	Himangana Gupta	Organisation	United Nations University Institute for the Advanced Study of Sustainability (UNU-IAS)	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	110	2786	110	2786	May like to add IPCC Special report on land degradation if it has relevant sections.	Thank you for the suggestion, we have reviewed the report and it doesn't have any substantive analysis of valuation methods.

828	Himangana Gupta	Organisation	United Nations University Institute for the Advanced Study of Sustainability (UNU-IAS)	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	111	2788	112	2788	Row: Hindu Kush Himalayan regional assessment - This assessment was not specifically for biodiversity and ecosystem services, but covers a broad range of issues. However, it is an important report and can be referred to in another context.	Thank you for the observation made. We will adopt it in the TOD.
829	Himangana Gupta	Organisation	United Nations University Institute for the Advanced Study of Sustainability (UNU-IAS)	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	116	2875	116	2876	Combination is a good strategy to cover more parameters. However, valuation methods are context-specific and also depend on localization of indicators and stakeholder support.	Thank you for the comment. The dependence on context has been further elaborated in the TOD. In particular see the section on the range of socio-environmental contexts (3.2.1) and the section of relevance (3.3.1).
830	Himangana Gupta	Organisation	United Nations University Institute for the Advanced Study of Sustainability (UNU-IAS)	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	146	3425	146	3425	The data sources for total number of articles published and country of origin are different (WoS and scopus). There could be some discrepancy when using different sources.	This is a good point with which we agree. However, we haven't found any better published output based on the same source. Therefore, we think the best way forward is acknowledging the different sources for both graphics.
842	Robert Winthrop	Individual		Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	239		243		Annex 3.3 provides a useful compilation of valuation methods. Under "ES modelling and valuation" you list several applications for ecosystem services (ES) assessment, including ARIES, InVEST, and SolVES. There are many others available, which could usefully expand your list of applications. In a 2013 study Bagstad, Semmens, Waage, and Winthrop review 17 tools for ES assessment, using a common environmental data set and a common set of assessment tasks. We also include estimates by ES tool for the number of hours required to	Thank you for the suggestion, we have added this reference to Bagstad et al.
860	Steven M. Alexander	Government	Government of Canada	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	32	828	32	828	It would be great to link each type of approach to specific sections of the chapter. Perhaps this could be done via a parenthesis in the first column)	The overview has not been linked to the DMR.
861	Steven M. Alexander	Government	Government of Canada	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	32	828	32	828	This is a general comment for describing the methods and summarizing the approach for each systematic and scoping review that follow in this chapter. Including a ROSES Flow diagram - even if modified to be fit to purpose would provide a great visual to see how many results, what was excluded and what was included. https://www.roses-reporting.com/flow-diagram This would also help to align with emerging standards for systematic evidence synthesis	Thank you for your comment. The figure is stored in the Data Management Report IPBES_VA_3_1
959	Germany	Government	Germany	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods					General comment: IPBES Assessments should build upon the previous work that has already been conducted by IPBES earlier. In how far is this chapter based on information presented in the preliminary guide on diverse conceptualization of multiple values of nature and its benefits (Deliverable 3d)?	We have applied the value concepts adopted in plenary, including the preliminary guidelines, and the progress made in eg ECA assessment and global assessments. While the established and adopted concepts are the basis, we also incorporated new insights from the chapters in this assessment.
960	Germany	Government	Germany	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods					General comment: As defined by the scoping document for this assessment, an essential aim of this chapter is to highlight methods and approaches that allow for integration and bridging among valuation approaches. This aspect is of high interest to policy-makers and hence deserves more attention and visibility. Please strengthen this aspect of how different types of values can be integrated or even bridged and bring it to the attention of the reader.	Thanks, fully agree. This aspect has been emphasised in the new chapter structure and guidance.
961	Germany	Government	Germany	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods					General comment: Please ensure that full consideration is given to the detailed TEEB work on international and national level as well, for instance the detailed TEEB work in Germany https://www.ufz.de/teebde/index.php?en=43767 , also China / Russia have developed significant efforts. Specifically consider the study "The Value of Nature for Economy and Society."	TEEB is now more thoroughly considered, with a focus on how valuation methods are assessed or proposed

962	Germany	Government	Germany	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods					General comment: Research gaps and challenges yet to be overcome are identified in various subsections in this chapter. While these pieces of information are very much appreciated, we would encourage the authors to figure out a way to represent research gaps in a more comprehensive and systematic way.	This has been achieved, notably also in a cross-chapter assessment analysis
963	Germany	Government	Germany	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods					General comment on structure: The authors have presented methods and approaches from the more scientific perspective (so called more "conventional approaches") separate from information arising from the IPLC world. Is such a strict divide useful? What does it imply to policy-makers? How do we get these two distinct ways of going about valuation together? This way of presenting these two streams suggests that they are completely different from each other and might not be brought closer together. In reality, there are indeed efforts to include	We appreciate this comment and acknowledge that it represents one side to an ongoing discussion about whether to integrate these two knowledge systems or address them in parallel. We now have both approaches presented in the Chapter. We first try to understand IPLC valuation with the methods families lens, and in so doing, acknowledge the similarities AND the risks of doing so. We then use an IPLC framing, which provides new insights, and mostly how the western science approach is filled with assumptions that do not
964	Germany	Government	Germany	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods					General comment on figures: Please check all figures for an appropriate description of the x- and y axes.	Thank you for your comment, this has been considered, all figures will be further edited for the printed version based on IPBES formats.
965	Germany	Government	Germany	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	19	457	19	460	What are the implications? What does this mean for the following review and, in particular, the section on robustness?	For the review the implications have been that we have used a discipline neutral typology to compare and contrast valuation methods.
966	Germany	Government	Germany	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	29	768	29	783	It is very much appreciated to have a summary on the main outcomes of the previous discussion. In order to ensure better and faster uptake by the readers, we would suggest to place this at the beginning of the chapter. This will ensure that the most important take home messages of this section will deserve most attention and do not get lost	Thank you for this suggestion. The chapter has been substantially restructured; This particular text was dismantled and some of its parts were used earlier in the introduction to explain what the chapter is about.
967	Germany	Government	Germany	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	30	794	30	796	The issue of quality control of the diverse body of knowledge on valuation should be taken up more prominently in this introduction	Review of discussions of "quality" can be found in the section on Robustness in (3.3).
968	Germany	Government	Germany	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	33	840	33	844	Figure 3.4- right: is extremely difficult to understand. Since a couple of similar figures follow in this chapter, it would be worth to briefly explain the general idea behind this type of graphical representation	We have reduced the complexity of the figures throughout the chapter. The specified figure is no longer in the chapter.
969	Germany	Government	Germany	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	34	845	34	848	Though having read this explanation, it is still not clear to me what nature-based valuation means. Please extend the explanation or give examples	We have now provided synthesized and extended explanations of what we mean by each of the methods families and included examples of methods that fall within the four groups. Additionally, we've provided a table that permits comparing and contrasting across methods to better understand what distinguishes from one another.
970	Germany	Government	Germany	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	36	916	36	917	Add search string	To reduce the text length, all the search strings used in the Systematic reviews are included in the Data Management Reports.

971	Germany	Government	Germany	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	58	1541	58	1541	What is the purpose of having this meeting so late in the assessment process? Is it to validate findings of the assessment?	The timing fits the schedule of the Values Assessment, this round of comments helps validate the findings and enrich the content before the final submission of the assessment.
972	Germany	Government	Germany	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	77	2040	78	2093	What are the main limitations from the perspective of a decision-maker. This para should make those limitations more explicit, maybe even prioritize them.	We have listed power issues and reliability and validity problems as key limitations.
973	Germany	Government	Germany	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	80	2145	84	2145	Table 3.8.: There is a quite short list of key references for each approach. What determined a "key reference"? According to which criteria were they selected?	This is an important comment. The list was based on 'relevance' and 'example of application' rather than anything else. We agree that there could be other resources that are (more) relevant as well as of great applications.
974	Germany	Government	Germany	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	91	2359	91	2379	The sections on "limitations, gaps and challenges" as well as on "perspectives" for the respective approaches have the capacity to provide extremely useful information. We would encourage the authors to strengthen those sections for each of the approaches in the following by i) synthesizing and highlighting research gaps more systematically and ii) incorporating more systematically ways to overcome challenges and point to the recent research activities which may aim to do so.	Thanks! We have summarized and emphasized some of these aspects in the new structure and summary tables, and relevant information has trickled up to the SPM
975	Germany	Government	Germany	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	103	2646	103	2649	This raises the question whether it is then useful to apply the above developed framework in an IPLC-context? Is it then a truly useful overall framework?	We believe that it is useful; but we have provided an alternative framework for exploring valuation in IPLC contexts that is included in the TOD.
976	Germany	Government	Germany	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	104	2664	105	2666	Table 3.10. Though really a lot of information is presented in this table, we feel that this is still a helpful and very comprehensive overview.	Positive feedback is appreciated.
977	Germany	Government	Germany	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	110	2785	110	2786	what about the IPBES preliminary guide on valuation?	Thank you for the comment. The IPBES valuation guide is less relevant in our view while reviewing the previous assessment that have assessed the valuation methods. The guideline is good on providing insights on valuation methods but it is not a review of methods or some type of assessment of methods as well.
978	Germany	Government	Germany	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	148	3486	168	4004	It is very useful to summarize the findings in order to answer each of the chapters' main question. However, we still would like to suggest to add the "integration and bridging" of values more explicitly to the findings section. (see also general comment above)	Thanks, fully agree. This aspect has been emphasised in the new chapter structure and guidance.
979	Germany	Government	Germany	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	174	4165	174	4167	While this is definitely a very valid, important and well grounded proposal, it would be very useful if the authors could provide some options on how this could be set up in practical terms. Who and which communities should best be involved to work on such a standardization? Is this a suitable issue for further work of ipbes- e.g. in the context of the new working programm?	We have added a 'practical' section using some prototype examples, and these more general considerations/options have been added in the future outlook aspects of SPM.

1123	Nina Vik	Government	Norway	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	3	78	3	81	It could be useful to provide information about how often it would have been relevant/could improve valuation to include IPLC principles in the studies that are assessed.	This message has been rewritten and no longer contains the component being referred to here. Moreover, the suggestion to assess how often it would have been relevant to include IPLC would not have been possible to address since it was not part of the information we extracted from the 1500+ papers that were reviewed.
1124	Nina Vik	Government	Norway	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	5	131	5	133	Should integrated valuation be addressed separately from the other valuation techniques since it often can incorporate many of the other types of valuations. It would perhaps provide a more structured discussion when it is not directly compared to the other valuation techniques.	As we mention in text, there are specific methods used to synthesize information or to structure the process of valuation, by integrating or "bridging" outputs from one or more valuation methods. Adding this non-discrete category stems from the assessment scope on bridging and integration
1125	Nina Vik	Government	Norway	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	24	635	24	641	Should some of this explanation of "deliberative valuation" also be included in the SPM. This concept is not clearly explained in the SPM.	These concepts have now been clarified and disentangled better in SPM
1126	Nina Vik	Government	Norway	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	68	1793	68	1803	It is not easy to understand the difference between the parameters time and cost. I can see that these can be useful criteria, but can they be explained more clearly? The time it takes to perform a study is often directly tied to increased costs.	Valid comment, this sentence has been added at the beginning to clarify: While time and cost are generally correlated (i.e. the longer it takes to undertake a study, the more it costs), it is not always the case
1127	Nina Vik	Government	Norway	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	80		80		Tables like this gives a good and easy accessible overview of a lot of information	Positive feedback is appreciated.
1128	Nina Vik	Government	Norway	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	98		98		figure 3.10. This is a slightly confusing figure, that gives the impression that it can be read from the middle and out and that information in a given section of the circle is related e.g. all AF contributions comes from scholars with ILK experience holding the life frame "living as nature".	Figure 3.10 was only intended to demonstrate the distribution of the ILK contributions across numerous attributes. We have not incorporated this suggestion.
1129	Nina Vik	Government	Norway	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	106	2692	106	2692	is it correct to say that "the focus of valuing by IPLC is on [...]d good quality of life" if it is 0%?	You are absolutely right! This has been rewritten so that the low percentages are highlighted as rarely mentioned.
1130	Nina Vik	Government	Norway	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	107	2701	107	2707	it would have been interesting to compare this distribution of "what is valued" to a similar distribution for the more traditional valuation studies identified for this report	Indeed, it would have been, but we did not do this. There is such a large sample size difference between the "traditional" lit and the IPLC contributions, however, that whatever was revealed could not be considered as the actual representation.
1131	Nina Vik	Government	Norway	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	116	2875	116	2876	How are integrated methods, which one would imagine more often incorporate many valuation methods, incorporated in the results. Should this type of analyses be treated as a separate category?	Unclear about the question. Moreover, this section has been dismantled and some of its components have contributed to the section on Plurality in valuation (3.3.1)

1132	Nina Vik	Government	Norway	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	116	2875	116	2876	Is it possible to give more explanation on how valuations provide input for one another or are used to integrate results? This could be useful for the reader.	This is best explained in the description of the methods family 'integration methods' where we unpack the concept of integration.
1133	Nina Vik	Government	Norway	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	117		117		figure 3.17. It is a bit challenging to understand the figure. Is application the best label? It is difficult to understand exactly what "application" refers to.	The figures are no longer there, but we have provided a definition in the introduction of what we mean by valuation application, since we use this term several times across the chapter.
1134	Nina Vik	Government	Norway	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	126	2946	126	2946	This subchapter and the following subchapters might need a conclusion or a summary of findings to pull things together.	This subsection has been re-written as part of 3.2.1.2. "the reasons for valuation". With the improved flow of the text, we did not deem a summary paragraph necessary.
1153	Jeroen Panis, Catherine Debruyne, Catherine Généreux, Helen Michels, Wouter Van Reeth	Government	Belgium / Belgian Biodiversity Platform	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	0	0	0	0	A lot of references are missing throughout the text: (REF), (ref), (##), etc.	We appreciate your comment, missing references have been attended in the final edits of the chapter.
1154	Jeroen Panis, Catherine Debruyne, Catherine Généreux, Helen Michels, Wouter Van Reeth	Government	Belgium / Belgian Biodiversity Platform	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	1	4	1	4	By reducing the definition of valuation to "a conscious, targeted and explicit undertaking..." you risk missing the institutional context in which valuation takes place, that often leads to valuation being done implicitly because of these institutional influences (e.g. learned behaviour, cultural patterns, ...); I would at least acknowledge here the fact that valuation is, in many decision-making contexts, often a partly implicit, intuitive undertaking; sometimes 'valuation methods' are just 'valuation practices' or 'valuation habits'	This is a key comment which we have clearly addressed, including at assessment level, by distinguishing 'valuing' from 'valuation' along these lines.
1155	Jeroen Panis, Catherine Debruyne, Catherine Généreux, Helen Michels, Wouter Van Reeth	Government	Belgium / Belgian Biodiversity Platform	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	3	65	3	68	Not only to just 'improve decision-making' but also to rationalise or legitimize decisions that were taken for other reasons, and hence to achieve other goals than the ones mentioned in line 68	Agree, yet the choice is made to use 'improve decision making' as a broader shorthand for detailed purposes, which are detailed in that specific section. It's not possible to mention these nuances at each instance.
1156	Jeroen Panis, Catherine Debruyne, Catherine Généreux, Helen Michels, Wouter Van Reeth	Government	Belgium / Belgian Biodiversity Platform	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	4	90	4	91	Can you clarify what you mean by, or how you distinguish between, informative, decisive and technical stage?	explanations are added and reference is made to laurans et al in 3.2.1.2
1157	Jeroen Panis, Catherine Debruyne, Catherine Généreux, Helen Michels, Wouter Van Reeth	Government	Belgium / Belgian Biodiversity Platform	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	5	125	5	126	nice to see a cross-disciplinary classification of the valuation methods!	Positive feedback is appreciated.
1158	Jeroen Panis, Catherine Debruyne, Catherine Généreux, Helen Michels, Wouter Van Reeth	Government	Belgium / Belgian Biodiversity Platform	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	6	147	6	147	In the left figure it is not really clear which elements of the IPBES-framework are captured by the green, red, blue & gray valuation families; in the right figure, avoid abbreviations in the names of the families	Thank you, figure on the left has been edited, and figure on the right has been removed.

1159	Jeroen Panis, Catherine Debruyne, Catherine Génèreux, Helen Michels, Wouter Van Reeth	Government	Belgium / Belgian Biodiversity Platform	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	22	584	22	585	Complete the reference: Daily (ref) => Daily (1997)	We appreciate your comment, missing references have been attended in the final edits of the chapter.
1160	Jeroen Panis, Catherine Debruyne, Catherine Génèreux, Helen Michels, Wouter Van Reeth	Government	Belgium / Belgian Biodiversity Platform	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	24	622	24	623	There seem to be an issue with this sentence. The meanings of the part before and after the brackets are not consistent with each other.	Agreed. We deleted this sentence for the sake of space.
1161	Jeroen Panis, Catherine Debruyne, Catherine Génèreux, Helen Michels, Wouter Van Reeth	Government	Belgium / Belgian Biodiversity Platform	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	24	631	24	631	It would be good to reference or explain the term "monism".	We added an explanation for monism
1162	Jeroen Panis, Catherine Debruyne, Catherine Génèreux, Helen Michels, Wouter Van Reeth	Government	Belgium / Belgian Biodiversity Platform	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	25	660	25	660	"the value monism assumptions" is an example of excessive jargon use.	Agreed, we deleted the jargon.
1163	Jeroen Panis, Catherine Debruyne, Catherine Génèreux, Helen Michels, Wouter Van Reeth	Government	Belgium / Belgian Biodiversity Platform	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	25	663	25	663	"to enable some relaxation of the commensurability assumption" is somehow gibberish.... What does it mean?	Agreed, we simplified the sentence.
1164	Jeroen Panis, Catherine Debruyne, Catherine Génèreux, Helen Michels, Wouter Van Reeth	Government	Belgium / Belgian Biodiversity Platform	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	29	757	29	757	The reference is missing.	We appreciate your comment, missing references have been attended in the final edits of the chapter.
1165	Jeroen Panis, Catherine Debruyne, Catherine Génèreux, Helen Michels, Wouter Van Reeth	Government	Belgium / Belgian Biodiversity Platform	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	35	880	35	881	seems like a rather narrow set of search terms; would have been good for instance to include 'biological valuation' in the search, e.g. with to marine biological valuation methodology; also would have yielded the one used in Flanders;	This is the search terms used to identify review papers. Notice that in the review of applications of nature based valuation we use a much wider range of search terms to obtain wider coverage of application of methods in valuation studies. We have not had sufficient resources to redo the review of reviews.
1166	Jeroen Panis, Catherine Debruyne, Catherine Génèreux, Helen Michels, Wouter Van Reeth	Government	Belgium / Belgian Biodiversity Platform	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	38	974	38	974	I would not rank CBA under integrated valuation methods as it deals only with economic values that can be monetized. Of other, non-economic values are included it is rather a multicriteria-analysis.	The aim of CBA is to bring together various values in a structured synthesis towards decision making. These values can be derived from nature-based, statement-based and behaviour-based methods (albeit monetary), so per definition this is an integrative method.
1167	Jeroen Panis, Catherine Debruyne, Catherine Génèreux, Helen Michels, Wouter Van Reeth	Government	Belgium / Belgian Biodiversity Platform	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	44	1141	44	1142	"the three sustainable development dimensions" it would be useful to add a reference to the part of the text that explains these, because you can't mean the 3 subcriteria of the subsequent paragraph using these words. Such glowing terms are not used for the other criteria.	To avoid misconception, we deleted references to the 3 sustainability development pillars or dimensions.

1168	Jeroen Panis, Catherine Debruyne, Catherine Généreux, Helen Michels, Wouter Van Reeth	Government	Belgium / Belgian Biodiversity Platform	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	45	1166	45	1167	Economic valuation methods are indeed grounded in utilitarianism but they generally do not express the results as 'changes in utility'. On the contrary, the monetary measures represent an exchange value, and not so much a 'use value'. Rephrase as 'assess changes in economic, usually monetary value'.	We make a distinction between monetary valuation (some of which may represent exchange values), and economic valuation more broadly. No changes.
1169	Jeroen Panis, Catherine Debruyne, Catherine Généreux, Helen Michels, Wouter Van Reeth	Government	Belgium / Belgian Biodiversity Platform	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	46	1192	46	1201	Referring to Costanza & Opdam you define ecological sustainability as referring to ecological processes that deliver NCP. But in the subcriterion 'ecosystem condition' you write 'regardless of their use, services for or contribution to humans': Either change the first definition or the definition of the subcriterion so that they match.	We use a range of categories under the headings of ecological sustainability. Therefore both services and ecological condition are included as different sub-categories. See DMR for details.
1170	Jeroen Panis, Catherine Debruyne, Catherine Généreux, Helen Michels, Wouter Van Reeth	Government	Belgium / Belgian Biodiversity Platform	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	46	1210	46	1210	In defining ecosystem capacity, I'd make a choice: either refer to potential delivery, or to actual delivery, but not to both at the same time.	Both actual and potential are important, also, both are not clearly defined in literature or distinguishable
1171	Jeroen Panis, Catherine Debruyne, Catherine Généreux, Helen Michels, Wouter Van Reeth	Government	Belgium / Belgian Biodiversity Platform	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	49	1297	49	1297	The last bullet point can be removed: the statement is not one of the 5 aspects listed.	We do not agree. IPLC authorship has been scored in the systematic review. The text is no longer in the chapter.
1172	Jeroen Panis, Catherine Debruyne, Catherine Généreux, Helen Michels, Wouter Van Reeth	Government	Belgium / Belgian Biodiversity Platform	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	63	1647	63	1648	I would expect under the 'mapping' or 'direct measurement' methods group 'ecosystem mapping' or 'habitat mapping' being mentioned as one of the basic applications, both for biodiversity policy and as a basis for ecosystem services mapping and ecosystem extent accounts. The Flemish 'biological valuation map', but also similar map types in the Netherlands and the UK can serve as examples.	Thanks for this comment, ecosystem or habitat mapping has been added to the table
1173	Jeroen Panis, Catherine Debruyne, Catherine Généreux, Helen Michels, Wouter Van Reeth	Government	Belgium / Belgian Biodiversity Platform	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	63	1648	63	1648	Second bullet point of "Main characteristics" of "Participatory approaches": incoherent sentence.	Thanks, "may be subjective" has been deleted
1174	Jeroen Panis, Catherine Debruyne, Catherine Généreux, Helen Michels, Wouter Van Reeth	Government	Belgium / Belgian Biodiversity Platform	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	64	1649	64	1650	There are some unknown abbreviations in the figure; it would be useful to have the meaning described with the figure, so that the figure can be understood on its own.	The acronyms and abbreviations have been spelled out in text.
1175	Jeroen Panis, Catherine Debruyne, Catherine Généreux, Helen Michels, Wouter Van Reeth	Government	Belgium / Belgian Biodiversity Platform	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	64	1649	64	1650	Inventories are often geo-referenced and used in mapping, so they should be positioned in the intersection of 'direct measurement' and 'mapping'.	indeed the two are connected: making the inventory would be direct, applying the map wouldn't
1176	Jeroen Panis, Catherine Debruyne, Catherine Généreux, Helen Michels, Wouter Van Reeth	Government	Belgium / Belgian Biodiversity Platform	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	65	1686	65	1697	I believe that the point that you're making here is that the biophysical scales (measured phenomenon) and the 'institutional scale' (at which decision-making and/or action takes place) do not match. Perhaps you could include that term.	Only partly. there is an aggregative issue with scaling, regardless the mismatch or match with social/institutional scales.

1177	Jeroen Panis, Catherine Debruyne, Catherine Génèreux, Helen Michels, Wouter Van Reeth	Government	Belgium / Belgian Biodiversity Platform	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	66	1710	66	1710	"restor" should be "raster".	This has been corrected
1178	Jeroen Panis, Catherine Debruyne, Catherine Génèreux, Helen Michels, Wouter Van Reeth	Government	Belgium / Belgian Biodiversity Platform	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	69	1815	69	1815	"e.g. (Hegetschweiler et al., 2017...): if you want to give an example, better mention it briefly as its purpose is to clarify something. No reader is going to understand the example just by seeing a literature reference.	We fully agree with the comment. We have re-structured this whole section to provide examples from the systematic literature review we have conducted, so that it is more explicative for the reader. Because of space constrains, we have deleted this sentence with the references mentioned.
1179	Jeroen Panis, Catherine Debruyne, Catherine Génèreux, Helen Michels, Wouter Van Reeth	Government	Belgium / Belgian Biodiversity Platform	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	75	1992	75	1992	The last limitation of the group based methods, i.e. "requires skilled facilitation to moderate discussions..." isn't really a limitation of this method. It's a requirement that can be applied to any method, e.g. 'skills in statistics', 'skills in survey-based methods', 'skills in recognizing habitats', 'skills in qualitative research methods', So I would drop this as a 'limitation' in the table, or add a similar on to all methods.	Thanks for this suggestion with which we agree. We have deleted the text.
1180	Jeroen Panis, Catherine Debruyne, Catherine Génèreux, Helen Michels, Wouter Van Reeth	Government	Belgium / Belgian Biodiversity Platform	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	77	2030	77	2030	Do you refer to the utility of the method, or to the valuation outcome?	We refer to the valuation outcome. We rephrased the text accordingly
1181	Jeroen Panis, Catherine Debruyne, Catherine Génèreux, Helen Michels, Wouter Van Reeth	Government	Belgium / Belgian Biodiversity Platform	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	77	2053	77	2053	Add explanation of "reflexivity" and "positionality".	An explanation has been added.
1182	Jeroen Panis, Catherine Debruyne, Catherine Génèreux, Helen Michels, Wouter Van Reeth	Government	Belgium / Belgian Biodiversity Platform	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	78	2067	78	2067	Interpretation issue: what does "NC" stand for? ("natural capital"?). It doesn't appear in the abbreviations list...	NCS was corrected to NCP.
1183	Jeroen Panis, Catherine Debruyne, Catherine Génèreux, Helen Michels, Wouter Van Reeth	Government	Belgium / Belgian Biodiversity Platform	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	79	2119	79	2121	Is this limited to just the negative impacts of nature on health? If not, it needs to be reworded to add the necessary nuance.	Yes, the cost of illness refers particularly to the negative impacts; the positive impacts on health are addressed in the box on health valuation that has been added to the TOD.
1184	Jeroen Panis, Catherine Debruyne, Catherine Génèreux, Helen Michels, Wouter Van Reeth	Government	Belgium / Belgian Biodiversity Platform	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	80	2132	80	2133	Although the importance of the cook stove example is undeniable, is it relevant in this context? What is the impact of NCP on indoor air quality?	This has been corrected
1185	Jeroen Panis, Catherine Debruyne, Catherine Génèreux, Helen Michels, Wouter Van Reeth	Government	Belgium / Belgian Biodiversity Platform	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	81	2145	81	2145	Are plenty of the drawbacks of the travel cost method and others not applicable to, for example, the recreational site choice method and time spend analysis? It seems that the drawbacks of a range of methods are not fleshed out compared to the others. One would expect to have a more structured analysis of the pros and cons.	The section has been rewritten and pros and cons of methods are now more balanced. However as some methods have been more frequently used there is also more material on their strengths and weaknesses.

1186	Jeroen Panis, Catherine Debruyne, Catherine Généreux, Helen Michels, Wouter Van Reeth	Government	Belgium / Belgian Biodiversity Platform	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	87	2236	87	2236	MAUT/MAVT: explain these abbreviations	The acronyms have been spelled out in text
1187	Jeroen Panis, Catherine Debruyne, Catherine Généreux, Helen Michels, Wouter Van Reeth	Government	Belgium / Belgian Biodiversity Platform	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	90	2344	90	2344	Never "all" impacts: only those that can be expressed or converted in monetary terms. An also not for all of "the lifetime of the alternatives", because discounting usually results in almost completely disregarding the welfare effects which are more than a few decades in the future. With regard to issues like afforestation or the build-up of carbon in the soil, there is a serious mismatch between the temporal scale that is relevant from a biophysical-ecological point of view, and that which is relevant from a neo-classical economic point of view. As indicated	indeed, removed 'all'
1188	Jeroen Panis, Catherine Debruyne, Catherine Généreux, Helen Michels, Wouter Van Reeth	Government	Belgium / Belgian Biodiversity Platform	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	96	2541	96	2541	ANZ: explain this abbreviation	The acronyms have been spelled out in text
1189	Jeroen Panis, Catherine Debruyne, Catherine Généreux, Helen Michels, Wouter Van Reeth	Government	Belgium / Belgian Biodiversity Platform	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	104	2664	105	2665	The table in itself is interesting as a 'demonstration' of what IPLC-related valuation entails. Not being familiar with many of the aspects mentioned, it is hard to understand, let alone review, what is really meant by some of the terms used. But the allocation of the bullets (e.g. those in the column "What is assessed?") to the 4 method family seems a bit arbitrary.	This comment is a repeat of comment 1225 which has been addressed
1190	Jeroen Panis, Catherine Debruyne, Catherine Généreux, Helen Michels, Wouter Van Reeth	Government	Belgium / Belgian Biodiversity Platform	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	107	2701	107	2701	It may be argued that 'historical value' is more a relational value, as it refers to a relationship between a society and the landscape or ecosystem in the past.	This comment is a repeat of comment 1225 which has been addressed
1191	Jeroen Panis, Catherine Debruyne, Catherine Généreux, Helen Michels, Wouter Van Reeth	Government	Belgium / Belgian Biodiversity Platform	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	113	2827	115	2861	Since the aim is this section is to analyse how valuation methods were used 'in practice', why do you focus on academic and gray literature? It would have been useful to check legislation and/or question policy entities to see for instance which types of valuation are mandatory and for what they are used? In Flanders for instance the 'biological valuation map' (a illustration of the 'biophysical and biodiversity assessment' in Figure 3.15) is referred to in legislation, it is used in spatial policy, its categories are the basis for subsidies for nature	See response to review comment in line 141.
1192	Jeroen Panis, Catherine Debruyne, Catherine Généreux, Helen Michels, Wouter Van Reeth	Government	Belgium / Belgian Biodiversity Platform	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	122	2927	123	2927	It would improve clarity of the table to include some of the description of the three main table parts (indicators/preferences/costs) in the table itself, and not just at the bottom. Especially when you consult the document on screen. This goes also for the next tables on the following pages.	This section is no longer in the chapter but moved to the appendixes.
1193	Jeroen Panis, Catherine Debruyne, Catherine Généreux, Helen Michels, Wouter Van Reeth	Government	Belgium / Belgian Biodiversity Platform	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	129	2969	129	2970	Correct legend in graph 3.28: replace 'it is assessed' after white square by 'not assessed'. Also in following graphs.	The Figure is no longer in the chapter. All captions have been revised.
1194	Jeroen Panis, Catherine Debruyne, Catherine Généreux, Helen Michels, Wouter Van Reeth	Government	Belgium / Belgian Biodiversity Platform	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	133	3012	133	3012	NCA is not "a specific instrument" but rather a broad and heterogeneous field of practice & research. At country level it is at best a broad database, assembled through a variety of data & procedures reflecting a wide variety of monitoring and data collection practices. There is a movement to increase comparability across countries, but the variety is at this moment too big to really call it 'a standard'.	From the global, historical and broad perspective of valuation of nature, NCA is quite specific, applied approach. Also, (part of) NCA approaches have been adopted as (and are striving to be) a standard.

1195	Jeroen Panis, Catherine Debruyne, Catherine Généréux, Helen Michels, Wouter Van Reeth	Government	Belgium / Belgian Biodiversity Platform	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	139	3208	140	3238	Some challenges are not touched upon here, and could be elaborated further: (1) the need of accounting approaches to 'compartmentalize' biophysical assets, where in many policy programs, gradients, mosaics & dynamic changes are increasingly targeted; (2) the need of accounting approaches to come up with some standard, where for many policy applications tailor-made approaches based on participation & adaptation are required; and (3) the danger that accounts being used 'open up' to economic decision-making and	Agree with these challenges, and part of these polemics, insofar represented and well-established in literature, are taken up. However, these are more general concerns beyond accounting specifically, and evidence on (potential and risks of) the application of NCA is scarce to devote detailed analysis in this scope.
1196	Jeroen Panis, Catherine Debruyne, Catherine Généréux, Helen Michels, Wouter Van Reeth	Government	Belgium / Belgian Biodiversity Platform	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	140	3239	141	3280	This appears to be some kind of outline of a text.	This box has been expanded and refined.
1197	Jeroen Panis, Catherine Debruyne, Catherine Généréux, Helen Michels, Wouter Van Reeth	Government	Belgium / Belgian Biodiversity Platform	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	145	3412	147	3485	The meaning and need for this section is unclear as the topic of the whole chapter is basically ecosystem services valuation. The content looks to be covered by parts of this chapter and others, even in the introductory parts.	This section details the specific role and contribution of the ecosystem services research field, in response to reviewer comments to clarify and acknowledge this explicitly. Indeed, this is implicitly covered throughout.
1198	Jeroen Panis, Catherine Debruyne, Catherine Généréux, Helen Michels, Wouter Van Reeth	Government	Belgium / Belgian Biodiversity Platform	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	146	3421	146	3424	The left graph in Figure 3.32 presents a constant growth rate since 2010-2011k, not an exponential growth rate.	Thanks for this remark. We have removed exponentially from the text.
1199	Jeroen Panis, Catherine Debruyne, Catherine Généréux, Helen Michels, Wouter Van Reeth	Government	Belgium / Belgian Biodiversity Platform	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	146	3429	146	3430	It's a rather trivial conclusion that the larger countries dominate the pie graph. But EU countries equal US (both 30%), and adding UK to EU (42% the exceed US and China by far. It would be interesting to plot the relationship between GDP (size of the economy) and the number of articles.	Thanks for pointing out to the magnitude of european research. We have added that to the text and we will consider the addition of the Figure, which we find useful, but that we will have to balance with other needs in the chapter.
1200	Jeroen Panis, Catherine Debruyne, Catherine Généréux, Helen Michels, Wouter Van Reeth	Government	Belgium / Belgian Biodiversity Platform	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	150	3530	150	3535	I really wonder to what extent this conclusion is true for the nature based valuations: in all Western-European countries nature conservation instruments (e.g. legal protection of vegetation types, designating protected areas, purchasing policy by governments, purchasing & management subsidies to conservation NGO or foresters, EU Natura 2000 implementation, EU Water Framework Directive, etcetera...) is based on nature-based valuation by natural scientists. Since this type of valuation is included in the assessment, I don't think	Agree with this observation, yet the statements refers to a lack of reporting and evaluation of uptake of valuation.
1201	Jeroen Panis, Catherine Debruyne, Catherine Généréux, Helen Michels, Wouter Van Reeth	Government	Belgium / Belgian Biodiversity Platform	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	153	3604	153	3604	It seems to be implied that Aristotle lived in that era (50-70 AD), yet he lived in 300 BC.	Thanks for pointing this possible interpretation. We deleted "since 50 and 70 AD" to avoid confusion
1202	Jeroen Panis, Catherine Debruyne, Catherine Généréux, Helen Michels, Wouter Van Reeth	Government	Belgium / Belgian Biodiversity Platform	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	154	3638	154	3640	The power imbalances (especially in the selection of participants and group discussions) could be mentioned too.	Power imbalances have been acknowledged throughout.
1203	Jeroen Panis, Catherine Debruyne, Catherine Généréux, Helen Michels, Wouter Van Reeth	Government	Belgium / Belgian Biodiversity Platform	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	155	3678	155	3679	I would rephrase this sentence: any so called 'technical method' actually represents some form of 'value articulating institution' that entails choices on what is valued, whose values are included, etc. (see Vatn). So methods are never 'just technical'. Possible rephrasing: "Integration involves a process or framework that synthesizes information for decision-making." (and drop the rest of that sentence).	Thanks for this useful suggestion, we have adapted the sentence accordingly

1204	Jeroen Panis, Catherine Debruyne, Catherine Généréux, Helen Michels, Wouter Van Reeth	Government	Belgium / Belgian Biodiversity Platform	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	155	3692	155	3692	What is being meant with "number sums"? Additions?	sentence was altered, thanks
1205	Jeroen Panis, Catherine Debruyne, Catherine Généréux, Helen Michels, Wouter Van Reeth	Government	Belgium / Belgian Biodiversity Platform	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	158	3773	158	3774	Continuing on the comment on lines 3530-3535, also here (3773-3774) I would have expected intrinsic values to stand out as the value type most often used in valuation. Considering the amount of research on nature conservation referring to nature-based values from an intrinsic value point of view.	These numbers represent the valuation literature. In Nature-based valuation, intrinsic values are indeed the highest.
1206	Jeroen Panis, Catherine Debruyne, Catherine Généréux, Helen Michels, Wouter Van Reeth	Government	Belgium / Belgian Biodiversity Platform	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	166	3972	167	3984	Reading the text + the explanation under Figure 3.45, I find it difficult to really understand what is being meant with 'versatility' and how the Figure shows this. The bold text in lines 3972-3973 links versatility to valuation purposes. Line 3978-3979 says that the Figure shows something about the value-specificity. Is this related to valuation purposes, and which purposes does it refer to? The explanation under the figure says that versatility refers to the number of administrative, biophysical and social scales and habitat types targeted. Which seems	versatility is no longer a key concept of figure
1207	Jeroen Panis, Catherine Debruyne, Catherine Généréux, Helen Michels, Wouter Van Reeth	Government	Belgium / Belgian Biodiversity Platform	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	170	4070	170	4071	"calls for epistemological and ontological retrospection": you may want to clarify what you mean by this	This sentence has been removed.
1208	Jeroen Panis, Catherine Debruyne, Catherine Généréux, Helen Michels, Wouter Van Reeth	Government	Belgium / Belgian Biodiversity Platform	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	175	4189	175	4195	Divide this long sentence in pieces or present in bullets.	We appreciate your comment, the text has been modified.
1209	Jeroen Panis, Catherine Debruyne, Catherine Généréux, Helen Michels, Wouter Van Reeth	Government	Belgium / Belgian Biodiversity Platform	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	176	4205	176	4205	relational 'ontology' in row 2 of columns 2-3 should probably be 'relational epistemology' and 'relational axiology'?	This sentence has been removed.
1210	Jeroen Panis, Catherine Debruyne, Catherine Généréux, Helen Michels, Wouter Van Reeth	Government	Belgium / Belgian Biodiversity Platform	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	177	4213	177	4214	There is a false distinction being made between 'discourses about scientific methods' and 'discussions that centre on power, ethics and social justice': in sociology, political science, public administration and policy science - to name but a few - power, ethics and justice have been part of the scientific discourse over the last century.	This sentence has been removed.
1211	Jeroen Panis, Catherine Debruyne, Catherine Généréux, Helen Michels, Wouter Van Reeth	Government	Belgium / Belgian Biodiversity Platform	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	178	4247	178	4247	'mainstreaming' is a term typically used to indicate that one policy domain affects others, e.g. mainstreaming biodiversity into spatial, agricultural and economic policy'; what you refer to here is probably 'the uptake of valuation in decision-making' or 'better linking valuation with decision-making'	This sentence has been removed.
1212	Jeroen Panis, Catherine Debruyne, Catherine Généréux, Helen Michels, Wouter Van Reeth	Government	Belgium / Belgian Biodiversity Platform	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	178	4258	178	4258	"intended social and policy outcomes"	This sentence has been removed.

1238	The Danish IPBES Office	Organisation	The Danish IPBES Office	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	64	64			Figure 3.9: statistical models based on surveys of population, which combines spatial mapping and population behaviour/perceptions is not really captured here	The figure was removed in restructuring of the chapter
1239	The Danish IPBES Office	Organisation	The Danish IPBES Office	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods		1675		1680	this sentence is very long and convoluted - 'there is a debate...	Indeed the sentence is long, but we feel that it is the best way to present the two sides of the debate that the sentence is referring to, and that it does so adequately
1240	The Danish IPBES Office	Organisation	The Danish IPBES Office	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	65				Several references missing, but marked that references would be included	References were completed during the final edits of the chapter
1241	The Danish IPBES Office	Organisation	The Danish IPBES Office	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods		1865			why not list some of the prime examples of particularly well-conducted studies on ecosystem services - and what about biodiversity?	Rephrase adding biodiversity at the end of the sentence
1242	The Danish IPBES Office	Organisation	The Danish IPBES Office	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods		1885			here, there are examples used - would be good to have the same for all the above-mentioned methods	We added an example for photo-based methods. All other methods now also contain examples.
1243	The Danish IPBES Office	Organisation	The Danish IPBES Office	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods		1891			here the examples are listed with references- above examples (for other methods) are listed without ref examples, and for yet other methods without even mentioning the types of services. The text would benefit from a consistent use of examples and use of references.	In the TOD, we will address this consistently as long as useful to the reader and within space limitations.
1244	The Danish IPBES Office	Organisation	The Danish IPBES Office	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods		1913			here, there are arguments for what narrative research may obtain - I miss a similar description for the deliberative valuation - that can have wider impacts on people - potential for transformative experiences, learning etc.	Agree. Add. See next comment for REFs
1245	The Danish IPBES Office	Organisation	The Danish IPBES Office	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods		1932			Suggestion to include: Deliberative valuation has the opportunity for transformative learning (Sagoff, 2007). Expected results are increased validity of the resulting data (Bateman et al., 2008; MacMillan et al., 2006; Szabó, 2011), fewer protest answers (Lienhoop and MacMillan, 2007) and a valuation of public good that considers social equity and fairness (Sagoff, 1998; Wilson and Howarth, 2002).	Many thanks for the comment and suggested references. We have added new text and several of the suggested references to improve the description of deliberative valuation.
1246	The Danish IPBES Office	Organisation	The Danish IPBES Office	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods		1956			this stops quite abruptly ...sounds as if something is missing here...what is next after selecting ideas they feel are best?	We fully agree with this observation, thanks. Due to space constrains, we have rephrased the text to include the Reviewer's suggestion, but we do not provide further details on this specific technique.

1247	The Danish IPBES Office	Organisation	The Danish IPBES Office	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods		1980			The reference mentioned is not included in the reference list	Thanks for the comment. We have included the reference.
1248	The Danish IPBES Office	Organisation	The Danish IPBES Office	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	75				Table 3.7, first row: why this () included? it's the same for CE-1 would remove that as it's not explained for the other methods what type of value comes out	The text in brackets has been removed as suggested.
1249	The Danish IPBES Office	Organisation	The Danish IPBES Office	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods		2109			it can also be a competition between nature sites of different ecosystems - e.g. heath, forests, coastal sites, beaches - so nature recreation in general	Correct - small adjustment made in text to include this point.
1250	The Danish IPBES Office	Organisation	The Danish IPBES Office	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods		2115			very nice with an example - I miss the same for the other methods brought out - that will help people understand better the methods	Thank you. We have aimed to include examples where possible but have very limited space. Therefore, it has not been possible to do this though out the text.
1251	The Danish IPBES Office	Organisation	The Danish IPBES Office	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods		2122			good to also include an example of a negative value study	Thank you.
1252	The Danish IPBES Office	Organisation	The Danish IPBES Office	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	80		81		Table 3.8: there must be a lot more to exemplify in market methods as key reference, the one used is quite dated	A newer example is now included
1253	The Danish IPBES Office	Organisation	The Danish IPBES Office	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	80		81		Table 3.8 Travel cost method values the access to the site, not a change in quality. The text ought to be 'Valuation of access to nature areas'. No brackets needed in key reference cell	This is now corrected
1254	The Danish IPBES Office	Organisation	The Danish IPBES Office	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	80		81		Table 3.8: Recreational site choice method: same limitation as with TCM - differentiated costs/distances to make demand curve; also only for trips incurring costs (near-by visits by foot difficult to incorporate)	Thank you. This point has been included
1274	The Danish IPBES Office	Organisation	The Danish IPBES Office	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods					When limitations of the indirect observed behavior methods is mentioned, I miss mentioning of the limitations that lie in the assumption that the people, who's behavior is observed, are well-informed. In for example both travel cost methods and hedonic pricing methods, several studies point at the doubt of whether people know the consequences – especially of the alternatives to the chosen one. For example that people visit a given site out of habit – not because it is the best, or nature values that are first realized post-purchase of a house. If	Thank you. This is a good point and the assumption has now been stated more clearly.

1275	The Danish IPBES Office	Organisation	The Danish IPBES Office	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods					Also, I miss a reflection upon the importance of the researcher's choice of coding of data and comparison between which alternatives are chosen and potential hidden biases in this. I acknowledge it has drawn little attention in the environmental economic literature, but it is nevertheless an important limitation. And it has been addressed in other fields using the same methods, for example transportation economics.	Thank you we have included biases related to researchers representations of data but it is beyond the scope of the chapter to review this in detail.
1276	The Danish IPBES Office	Organisation	The Danish IPBES Office	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods					The cost for gazetting 75.000 ha forest solely for biodiversity purposes was assessed at 143 mio. kr. See link (Danish): https://www.skovforeningen.dk/nyhed/aftale-om-en-natur-og-biodiversitetspakke-paa-plads/?dsf=1614864628 . Based on this biodiversity and valuation study the 75.000 ha was gazetted (report in Danish attached Petersen et al.).	Thank you for the information. However this paper is too specific to be included in the overview of methods.
1278	The Danish IPBES Office	Organisation	The Danish IPBES Office	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods					Fig. 4. Distinguish between direct and indirect methods and what kind of data feed into the different valuation methods to illustrate that none are wrong but they are different.	Agree they are different approaches. Indirect and direct methods are distinguished in the Table and the explanation has now been improved.
1281	The Danish IPBES Office	Organisation	The Danish IPBES Office	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods					A reflection: Any serious political decision comprise a valuation!	indeed, however we distinguish valuation from valuing
1283	The Danish IPBES Office	Organisation	The Danish IPBES Office	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods		83		85	it is mentioned that there is little evidence documenting whether and how the outputs are used. How is this evidence assessed? This is further discussed in chapter 4, but it seems odd to base this judgement on uptake in scientific literature. Decision makers should be asked, and governmental reports should be included in the assessments,	This review comment relates to Ch4. Ch3 does not include review of uptake of valuation results a part from the use of benefit transfer methods. This is reported in a dedicated section 3.3.3
1332	Oleksandr Karasov	Organisation	University of Tartu, Estonia	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	152	3582	152	3583	X axis on Fig 3.36. contains a typo: Nuber instead of Number	Thank you for your comment, the figure has been removed.
1333	Oleksandr Karasov	Organisation	University of Tartu, Estonia	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	239	5849	239	5850	The big data subgroup may include the following exact names for the relevant methods: mobile positioning data analysis (see, e.g. Saluveer et al. 2020 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2020.102895), social media data analysis (instead of current photo-series data analysis as it involves a broad spectrum of data, not only photographs): natural language processing (sentiment analysis - see Hausmann et al., 2020 https://doi.org/10.1002/pan3.10130 ; topic modelling Karasov et al. 2020 https://doi.org/10.3390/land9050158), visitation analysis	Thank you for the suggestion, annex 3.3 has been modified accordingly
1334	Oleksandr Karasov	Organisation	University of Tartu, Estonia	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	81		81		Time spend analysis can be complemented with a digital solution to estimate the visitation rates over time - photo-user days, twitter-user-days, etc - Wood et al. 2013 https://doi.org/10.1038/srep02976), Hamstead et al 2019 https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compenurbysys.2018.01.007	Thanks for these suggestions, yet we have not been able to tackle this specific aspect within the given scope
1335	Oleksandr Karasov	Organisation	University of Tartu, Estonia	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	88	2283	88	2285	Multi-criteria decision analysis (MCDA) is widely implemented in GIS using overlay analysis (fuzzy and weighted overlay tools). Therefore, "Linking multi-criteria decision analysis to geographic information systems" was done long time ago and it is a common tool in spatial planning	Thanks for the suggestion, the sentence has been nuanced accordingly

1336	Oleksandr Karasov	Organisation	University of Tartu, Estonia	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	69	1804			Groups of methods do not include passive crowdsourcing (social media data analysis) that differs from participatory approaches as does not involve direct participation of respondents. Data, collected with passive crowdsourcing can be analysed with methods of digital anthropology and cultural analytics, GIS methods, natural language processing techniques, deep learning and computer vision, in addition to social science	In the process of restructuring, this table was removed. More importantly, however, the grouping was also rethought. Social media analysis is included in behaviour based methods.
1337	Oleksandr Karasov	Organisation	University of Tartu, Estonia	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	75	1991			Limitations of value stating methods include also a small scale of analysis, i.e. limited spatial coverage, high labour and time costs of conducting interviews and discussions, low replicability, mind biases of respondents	Thanks for the suggestion, which we have included. We have not included the time/labour cost, as we dont see that as a limitation (it would also apply to scenario modelling or other complex techniques).
1338	Oleksandr Karasov	Organisation	University of Tartu, Estonia	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	84	2145			Table includes photo-series analysis only with regard to social media data, but social media provide not only photographs to analyse - for example, also text (see Hausmann et al 2020, etc). Visitation-based methods (photo-user-days by Wood et al. 2013) do not analyse content of photographs at all. Therefore, photo-series analysis does not seem to be a general term, it covers only one aspect of social media data analysis. It would be better to use "location-based social media data analysis" instead of "photo-series analysis".	Not all the social media based methods are included in the table just examples. It is not feasible to mention all variations of methods.
1348	Nathalie Hilmi	Individual	Centre scientifique de Monaco	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	64	1661	64	1661	What is value-laden, please?	Value-laden means normative. As normative is mentioned just next to value-laden, we feel that it is ok to leave the text as such
1349	Nathalie Hilmi	Individual	Centre scientifique de Monaco	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	135	3063	135	3072	Even if we use market-values, we can consider them as minimum values if we cannot measure the monetary values of non-use value	Agree - the non use values are additional to the use values. We think this is clear from the text.
1350	Nathalie Hilmi	Individual	Centre scientifique de Monaco	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	140	3233	140	3238	Recently the SEEA framework has been adopted by the UN	Indeed, it has been partly adopted, however not the valuation approach
1391	Charity Nyelele	Individual	University of California, Irvine	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	2	52	2	55	Can the authors briefly state the four valuation method families as well as major findings in the summary papagraph. This will give readers an idea of what to expect in the subsequent paragraphs.	This is done, it is also in the SPM
1392	Charity Nyelele	Individual	University of California, Irvine	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	58	1537	58	1550	Is there a way of doing more ILK dialogues and ensuring that there is representation across different scales and contexts. Two dialogues are too few to meet the inclusion agenda stated in lines 1537-1539 as well as in getting meaningful contributions from different ILK-holders. The second aspect has to do with representation, the dialogues were held in France and Mexico, respectively. I recommend more dialogues be carried out with various ILK-holders in different continents, regions and countries for this section to have a meaningful impact.	Relevant regarding representation. Limitations of ILK Dialogues need to be recognized explicitly.
1393	Charity Nyelele	Individual	University of California, Irvine	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	58	1552	59	1580	While the authors caution that "results presented in Section 3.2.6 should not be generalized beyond the IPLC contexts that they describe", I suggest that the methodology used here be improved so that data used is drawn from a representative sample, enabling results obtained as well as conclusions drawn from the work to be generalized across different IPLC contexts. One way to do this is to make an open call for experts, rather than inviting a few experts (I worry this current approach also has bias as authors limit themselves to expert circles	The methodology suggested can not be implemented at this time. However, ILK team have discussed the need to clarify the methodology used and adjust the CA report to better reflect the CAs and IPLC methods.

1394	Charity Nyelele	Individual	University of California, Irvine	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	61	1593	61	1598	The authors state that 8 ILK dialogues were carried out yet 2 are presented in Section 3.2.5. Additionally, Section 3.2.3 (lines 1076 - 1080 specifically), mention that a total of 1500 papers were reviewed by the contributing authors across the five review topics and not the 10000 presented in this paragraph. I think more dialogues and expert consultations have to be done for the work to be described as a "thorough and inclusive account of the status of nature valuation methods to date".	We say that we reviewed a total 8 ILK Dialogue reports 2 of which were conducted for the Values Assessment AND the rest were by other previous IPBES assessments (e.g., Pollinator Assessment, Global Assessment and others).
1446	Mexico	Government	Mexico National Expert Workshop (NFP and experts)	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	0	0	0	0	The document seeks to be inclusive, but falls short of that objective, since it only mentions indigenous peoples, but leaves out other communities that may be directly affected (positively and negatively) by this relationship with nature, for example: urban populations, women, children, men, social strata, etc.	acknowledgment to limitations. Agree. A general disclaimer but specific notes when need in IPLC sessions.
1447	Mexico	Government	Mexico National Expert Workshop (NFP and experts)	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	0	0	0	0	Highlight which methodologies have the possibility of being gender or age sensitive.	It will be easier to answer what methodologies are not? the task will be to find any reliable reference on this issue.
1448	Mexico	Government	Mexico National Expert Workshop (NFP and experts)	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	0	0	0	0	Define by group diversity, gender, age groups.	Specific? I think it is a general comment. What section, pages, lines this comment is referring to?
1449	Mexico	Government	Mexico National Expert Workshop (NFP and experts)	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	0	0	0	0	In the section Appropriation of the valuation process by IPLC, include Art 7 of the Paris Agreement, in relation to the incorporation of indigenous knowledge and local knowledge systems	A useful comment. Has been added after 2007: ",the Paris Agreement 2016),"
1450	Mexico	Government	Mexico National Expert Workshop (NFP and experts)	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	0	0	0	0	Consider the negotiation process of the Post 2020 Global Biodiversity Framework and its further implementation.	we have not been able to tackle this additional aspect within the given scope
1451	Mexico	Government	Mexico National Expert Workshop (NFP and experts)	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	0	0	0	0	It is not reflecting on the individual, it is not visible as part of the concept.	We are sorry but we havent been able to identify to which lines in the text this specific comment referred to, and what was being asked.
1452	Mexico	Government	Mexico National Expert Workshop (NFP and experts)	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	0	0	0	0	Civil Society Organizations are not explicit or considered.	Unclear comment.
1453	Mexico	Government	Mexico National Expert Workshop (NFP and experts)	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	0	0	0	0	There is not enough documentation in terms of environmental justice regarding valuation.	we have not been able to tackle this additional aspect within the given scope

1454	Mexico	Government	Mexico National Expert Workshop (NFP and experts)	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	0	0	0	0	The definition of valuation only focuses on subjective values. The definition needs to be supplemented with measurable aspects.	Thanks, but this is not correct. It includes observations and measurements.
1455	Mexico	Government	Mexico National Expert Workshop (NFP and experts)	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	0	0	0	0	It is suggested to verify if the studies that address distributive justice occur in some countries with certain characteristics (e.g. developed vs. developing).	Good suggestion, yet not possible given the scope
1456	Mexico	Government	Mexico National Expert Workshop (NFP and experts)	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	0	0	0	0	In integration methodologies, incorporate methods with a systemic approach.	we have not been able to tackle this additional aspect within the given scope
1457	Mexico	Government	Mexico National Expert Workshop (NFP and experts)	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	0	0	0	0	It is suggested that there should be a clear difference between market values and cultural values.	Thanks, yet such a clear distinction is not there in literature, nor is it analytically useful.
1458	Mexico	Government	Mexico National Expert Workshop (NFP and experts)	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	0	0	0	0	Clarity on how to guide decision makers is needed.	Thanks! The chapter has been restructured around guidance much more explicitly
1459	Mexico	Government	Mexico National Expert Workshop (NFP and experts)	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	0	0	0	0	Point out the importance of the complexity of coastal systems, which are generally more dynamic than other systems, and the impact it has on valuation methods.	we have not been able to tackle this additional aspect within the given scope
1460	Mexico	Government	Mexico National Expert Workshop (NFP and experts)	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	0	0	0	0	Include a map that shows which methodologies have been used by countries mainly or in different valuation issues, and explain if they have been implemented or there has been feedback.	It has not been feasible to conduct a country level analysis. Furthermore, the data base includes valuation studies. We do not have information on how the valuation results might have been used.
1461	Mexico	Government	Mexico National Expert Workshop (NFP and experts)	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	0	0	0	0	Examples: International methodological recommendations: https://sea.un.org/ecosystem-accounting	We appreciate the comment, the reference is now included in the chapter.
1462	Mexico	Government	Mexico National Expert Workshop (NFP and experts)	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	0	0	0	0	Preparation of manuals on valuation systems.	We are sorry but we haven't been able to identify to which lines in the text this specific comment referred to, and what was being asked.

1463	Mexico	Government	Mexico National Expert Workshop (NFP and experts)	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	0	0	0	0	Coral reefs and mangroves are another example of complex temporal and spatial dynamics that may indicate the valuation that varies between actors at different scales in geographic context and time context. Specifically, a breeding site can be valued by a group only at one time of the year and the adults would enter a valuation in another space and time.	we have not been able to tackle this specific aspect within the given scope
1464	Mexico	Government	Mexico National Expert Workshop (NFP and experts)	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	0	0	0	0	The Federal Maritime Terrestrial Zone in Mexico is a good example of the actors that define the values of these highly complex systems from national to local.	we have not been able to tackle this specific aspect within the given scope
1465	Mexico	Government	Mexico National Expert Workshop (NFP and experts)	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	0	0	0	0	Provide more clarity on the issues of green economy and their possibilities of implementation.	we have not been able to tackle this specific aspect within the given scope
1466	Mexico	Government	Mexico National Expert Workshop (NFP and experts)	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	0	0	0	0	Is literature only reviewed in English? Does this allow the incorporation of other valuation methodologies and visions?	we have acknowledge the biases re. language and academic literature in our assessment, yet have succeeded in broadening the scope of what valuation is compared to earlier assessments
1467	Mexico	Government	Mexico National Expert Workshop (NFP and experts)	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	0	0	0	0	Although it is not the specific objective of this chapter, it would be interesting to include at some point the concept of circular economy, as a new economic model inspired by natural processes and an ally of the value of nature.	we have not been able to tackle this specific aspect within the given scope
1468	Mexico	Government	Mexico National Expert Workshop (NFP and experts)	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	0	0	0	0	The questions in the chapter represent a methodological guide to ground you to local schemes.	We are sorry but we haven't been able to identify to which lines in the text this specific comment referred to, and what was being asked.
1469	Mexico	Government	Mexico National Expert Workshop (NFP and experts)	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	28	735	28	735	In section 3.1. Will there be any mention of the negotiations to develop the post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework?	This is outside the scope of Ch3
1470	Mexico	Government	Mexico National Expert Workshop (NFP and experts)	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	28	735	28	736	Add Article 7 "Paris Agreement for Climate Change" (2015): "Parties acknowledge that adaptation action should follow a country-driven, gender-responsive, participatory and fully transparent approach, taking into consideration vulnerable groups, communities and ecosystems, and should be based on and guided by the best available science and, as appropriate, traditional knowledge, knowledge of indigenous peoples and local knowledge systems, with a view to integrating adaptation into relevant socioeconomic and	This is outside the scope of Ch3
1471	Mexico	Government	Mexico National Expert Workshop (NFP and experts)	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	74	1989	74	1989	Contingent valuation also makes it possible to determine whether changes in conservation are perceived in a similar way among women and men, and to establish the different interests and needs of the groups that use their resources. https://core.ac.uk/download/pdf/48034388.pdf	Thanks for the comment. We have added the suggested reference.

1472	Mexico	Government	Mexico National Expert Workshop (NFP and experts)	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	79	2107	79	2118	While considering the value that the traveler gives to nature, it would be of interest to know in advance the environmental costs of tourism activities, considering an approach of sustainable tourism that integrates with the forms of tourism development, management and activity that maintain the environmental, social and economic integrity, as well as the well-being of natural and cultural resources in perpetuity. Environmental cost management seeks the optimal use of natural resources, respect for the sociocultural identity of the receiving	Thanks for the comment. Such costs can be used in decision making related to nature. However, it is not clear how the comment relate to valuation methods and their applications.
1473	Mexico	Government	Mexico National Expert Workshop (NFP and experts)	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	99	2589	99	2589	Although the literature has been exhaustively reviewed by experts, this way of categorizing can still be considered with an epistemic approach away from the integrality of the relationship of indigenous peoples with nature, because number 3 cannot be a specific element but rather integral with others, EXAMPLE: In Chiapas in the community of Guaquitepec there is a Tzeltal organization called pal'uchen that is dedicated to coffee trade, however, the success of its constancy despite the ups and downs in coffee prices at the national level, is that the	This table serves as examples to help readers grasp what we mean by IPLC valuation. It is impossible to capture all the nuances of IPLCs. The title of the table has been changed so that it explicitly states that these are examples.
1474	Mexico	Government	Mexico National Expert Workshop (NFP and experts)	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	104	2665	104	2665	Threats and risks to nature and culturally important sites	We are sorry but it is not clear what is being asked in the comment.
1475	Mexico	Government	Mexico National Expert Workshop (NFP and experts)	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	140	3239	141	3280	It would be interesting to include the circular economy, which is regarded as a new, more environmentally efficient economic model. One of the main inspirations of this model is nature. Considering the holistic vision of sustainable development, all actions aimed at protecting, conserving and restoring nature will have a positive impact on the fight against climate change. The circular economy is an ally of nature's value as it seeks to build environmentally sustainable, less polluting, low-carbon value chains that respect the balance of natural	we have not been able to tackle this specific aspect within the given scope
1476	Mexico	Government	Mexico National Expert Workshop (NFP and experts)	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	178	4234	178	4258	In section 3.5.5. It would be very important for the report to highlight the usefulness of the valuation for the emerging Nature-based Solutions (NBS).	we have not been able to tackle this specific aspect within the given scope
1547	GYBN Mexico	Organisation	GYBN Mexico	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	63	1647	63	1649	Regarding "Nature-based methods subgroups" of "Participatory approaches", it could also be included: case studies, transect walks and time lines and trend and change analysis. Source: Chambers, Robert (July 1994). "The origins and practice of participatory rural appraisal" (PDF). World Development. 22 (7): 953–969. CiteSeerX 10.1.1.454.4672. doi:10.1016/0305-750X(94)90141-4.	We appreciate your comment, the reference is now included in the text.
1548	GYBN Mexico	Organisation	GYBN Mexico	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	19	478	21	524	Only men have been mentioned, to recognize and to visualize the women's contribution it is necessary to mention some of them.	We acknowledge the historical gender bias which we perpetuate when basing ourselves on published literature, reviews and meta-reviews. We haven't made a corrective review to uncover and emphasise women researcher's contributions.
1622	Ricardo Castro Díaz. Brasil. Universidad Federal de Río Grande	Individual	Workshop - ESP (LAC)	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods					Limitaciones de los métodos de valoración. Hacer énfasis en cuales son las limitaciones que existen en los métodos de valoración, cuales son los valores que se resaltan en cada método	This comment has been translated to english to be addressed by experts. You will find responses in the english version of the comment.
1623	Ana Gomez. España. Universidad Politécnica de Valencia	Individual	Workshop - ESP (LAC)	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods					Diservicios. Incluir de manera más amplia, el tema de los diservicios.	This comment has been translated to english to be addressed by experts. You will find responses in the english version of the comment.

1624	Ana Gomez. España. Universidad Politécnica de Valencia	Individual	Workshop - ESP (LAC)	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods				Barreras entre la valoración en medios marinos y terrestres. Métodos específicos para integrar a las comunidades en la valoración del medio marino. Evidenciar las barreras que tiene el ejercicio de la valoración Marina frente a la valoración en zonas terrestres, en especial por que no se hace evidente las limitaciones de los métodos. En cuanto a la valoración en medio marinos, no se cuenta con una metodología, por ejemplo, se puede hacer encuestas? cómo involucrar a la comunidad?. Sería interesante conocer experiencias de este tipo.	This comment has been translated to english to be addressed by experts. You will find responses in the english version of the comment.
1625	Ana Gomez. España. Universidad Politécnica de Valencia	Individual	Workshop - ESP (LAC)	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods				Moneda de referencia para presentar las valoraciones económicas. A la hora de monetizar, unificar los resultados en alguna moneda ¿Cuál es la moneda que siempre se utiliza? No hay consenso actual sobre la moneda de referencia para presentar los resultados de las valoraciones económicas.	This comment has been translated to english to be addressed by experts. You will find responses in the english version of the comment.
1626	Ana Gomez. España. Universidad Politécnica de Valencia	Individual	Workshop - ESP (LAC)	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	86		87	Resaltar que el método no solo es para tomar valores económicos sino además para tomar decisiones, realizar mappings y priorización en especial para servicios ecosistémicos identificados.	This comment has been translated to english to be addressed by experts. You will find responses in the english version of the comment.
1627	Janwar Moreno. Colombia. INVEMAR	Individual	Workshop - ESP (LAC)	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods				Cuentas ambientales nacionales. Familias de valoración. A nivel de Colombia se está tratando de hacer un ejercicio piloto con cuentas ambientales nacionales y valoración de servicios ecosistémicos marinos. Se requiere conocer la información que se encuentra a nivel de estudios en el país e identificar la valoración no solo montería. Existe la pregunta: ¿Qué elementos mínimos se pueden integrar en la valoración?. Existen diferentes objetivos, académicos, de política pública. Elementos mínimos para	This comment has been translated to english to be addressed by experts. You will find responses in the english version of the comment.
1628	Ana Gomez. España. Universidad Politécnica de Valencia	Individual	Workshop - ESP (LAC)	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods		2219	2224	Policy Makers. El capítulo da una base para los policy makers para que vean los temas que se trabajan.	This comment has been translated to english to be addressed by experts. You will find responses in the english version of the comment.
1629	Ana Gomez. España. Universidad Politécnica de Valencia	Individual	Workshop - ESP (LAC)	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods				Hay que ver las excepciones que existen, profundizar un poco más para que los policies makers puedan entender mejor el asunto del contexto	This comment has been translated to english to be addressed by experts. You will find responses in the english version of the comment.
1630	Juan Regino. Oaxaca. Universidad Politécnica de Oaxaca	Individual	Workshop - ESP (LAC)	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods				Mejor metodo de valoración según el contexto. El documento no logra exponer Cuál debería ser el mejor método de acuerdo al contexto, en el caso de la valoración hidrológica a veces la valoración de las cuencas cuando están en buen estado no se busca resaltar algún elemento que se asocia a la condición de conservación de la cuenca. Los tomadores de decisiones trabajan muchas veces con temas y áreas prioritizadas, los métodos deben responder a esas necesidades. Los contextos a veces no se relacionan con las necesidades de los tomadores de decisiones.	This comment has been translated to english to be addressed by experts. You will find responses in the english version of the comment.
1631	Juan Regino. Oaxaca. Universidad Politécnica de Oaxaca	Individual	Workshop - ESP (LAC)	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods				Mejor metodo de valoración según el contexto. Los métodos de elección discreta tienen una dificultad inherente a la parte estadística y se hace aún más complejo cuando se mezcla con métodos cualitativos.	This comment has been translated to english to be addressed by experts. You will find responses in the english version of the comment.
1632	Juan Regino. Oaxaca. Universidad Politécnica de Oaxaca	Individual	Workshop - ESP (LAC)	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods				No se si sea el objetivo del trabajo o lo dice implícitamente. Dos puntos. 1. La necesidad de la construcción de un framework de valoración económica donde los métodos de valoración de servicios ecosistémicos que muchos son de no mercado. No sólo se fundamentan desde la economía positivistas sino, se fundamenta desde los aportes de otras disciplinas como la economía ecológica, la social y colectivista. Con el fin de respaldar la pluralidad de métodos de valoración. 2. No se si deba incluirse unas líneas sobre los instrumentos	This comment has been translated to english to be addressed by experts. You will find responses in the english version of the comment.

1633	Ana Gomez. España. Universidad Politécnica de Valencia	Individual	Workshop - ESP (LAC)	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods					Contextos en la investigación. La presentación del contexto a veces es muy limitada por las mismas revistas, las revistas hacen énfasis en el tema de explicar el método	This comment has been translated to english to be addressed by experts. You will find responses in the english version of the comment.
1634	Daniela Avila. Mexico	Individual	Workshop - ESP (LAC)	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods					Escalas. Los métodos y los resultados cambian a la medida de la escala. Water World y Costing Nature pueden ser herramientas de bajo costo que podrían ayudar a los tomadores de decisiones. Se ha observado que los métodos de valoración cambian de acuerdo a las escalas del estudio.	This comment has been translated to english to be addressed by experts. You will find responses in the english version of the comment.
1635	Zolange Gonzáles. Bogota	Individual	Workshop - ESP (LAC)	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods					Contribuciones de la naturaleza no materiales (culturales). Sección 3.3.3.4 Que se pretende con la valoración. En la sección 3,3,4,5 valoración de servicios ecosistémicos culturales tienen diferentes métodos de valoración, sería interesante hacer un listado un método más utilizado para situar a las personas en relación al tema. Proponer un listado de métodos para los servicios culturales y aquellos que más se utilizan.	This comment has been translated to english to be addressed by experts. You will find responses in the english version of the comment.
1748	Ben Groom	Individual	Workshop - BIOECON Network	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods					The chapter could link to the discussion on land use and diseases to make a link with health issues and related values.	A new appendix on health valuation has been included in the TOD.
1749	Michaela Faccioli	Individual	Workshop - BIOECON Network	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods					The way that method families are classified is confusing. These families and why they have been classified in such ways should be clear from the beginning.	A justification and an introduction to the methods families have now been included in the introduction to the chapter.
1750	Ben Groom	Individual	Workshop - BIOECON Network	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods					Where would intergenerational issues fit in those method families?	Intergenerational issues do not fit in a particular methods. We have included aggregation of values (including over time) in the section on distributive justice in section 3.3.1.
1751	Ben Groom	Individual	Workshop - BIOECON Network	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods					Stated preferences seem to be portrayed in a negative way, but current work on their reliability shows otherwise. They should be presented in a more neutral way.	Both pros and cons of stated preference methods based on the reviews have been presented.
1752	Ben Groom	Individual	Workshop - BIOECON Network	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods					Health should be represented better (but also referring to the health of ecosystems and biodiversity) and this might also be highlighted as a gap for future work. In relation to this, health benefits and their distribution within and across generations might be relevant.	Health of ecosystems is a part of the nature based valuation methods and have been included in the chapter. See section 2.2
1775	Ben Groom	Individual	Workshop - BIOECON Network	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods					On the descriptive side of the analysis, i.e. where valuation methods are used and how often. I found the logic that some methods are used more than others (hegemonic economic values) means that the less used should be used more, I found this logic a little wanting.	Thank you for this comment. This is not our intention to argue that is a phenomenon is rare it should be increased. The logic is rather that if the strength of particular methods are highlighted but rarely put into practice, this is an important finding. In the final version of the chapter we have clarified this.

1776	Ben Balmford	Individual	Workshop - BIOECON Network	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods					Robin Naidoo has this paper that looks at the impact of protected areas on people's health: https://advances.sciencemag.org/content/5/4/eaav3006	Thank you for bringing this paper to our attention. Human Health-biodiversity interaction is now included in the chapter and the paper has been referenced.
1800	Michaela Faccioli	Individual	Workshop - BIOECON Network	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods					Health and mental health is missing and should be represented better, valuation on biodiversity by it self and how this contributes to values and well being needs to be developed further, also equity and benefits in this generation and other generations.	Health biodiversity interaction as a topic is now included in the chapter.
1804	Brooks Kaiser	Individual	Workshop - BIOECON Network	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods					Here are some overlooked pieces that reflect the way in which economists have engaged with different sources of value and tried to connect the science with policy in different natural resource management contexts ranging from Hawaii to the Arctic. The Assessment did not provide a nuanced account of how economic and other values can be brought together in a scientific and collaborative way to inform policy: Science and Policy Connectivity: Environmental Valuation and the Hawaiian Economy. The long-term research agendas	Thanks for these suggestions, yet we have not been able to tackle this specific aspect within the given scope
1808	Nick Hanley	Individual	Workshop - BIOECON Network	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods					Whole chapter: I felt the chapter was very anti-economics. For example, the discussion of CBA stresses the problems rather than the advantages of the method, and shows a flawed understanding of the approach	We have been very vigilant on this issue, and our author team consists of critical economists from different disciplinary backgrounds. We have performed another thorough cross-check for the TOD, and are confident all statements are backed by literature, balanced between different economic disciplines and schools, and not overly negative or positive on either method.
1809	Nick Hanley	Individual	Workshop - BIOECON Network	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	22				Page 22 More recent reviews of the use of SP in policy analysis, and of the state of the art, are:	The section is no longer in the chapter but the topic and the references can be found in the section on the reliability of SP
1810	Nick Hanley	Individual	Workshop - BIOECON Network	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods					Robert J. Johnston, Kevin J. Boyle, Wiktor (Vic) Adamowicz, Jeff Bennett, Roy Brouwer, Trudy Ann Cameron, W. Michael Hanemann, Nick Hanley, Mandy Ryan, Riccardo Scarpa, Roger Tourangeau, and Christian A. Vossler (2017) "Contemporary Guidance for Stated Preference Studies" Journal of the Association of Environmental and Resource Economists. 4 (2), 319-405.	We are sorry but we havent been able to identify what is being asked.
1811	Nick Hanley	Individual	Workshop - BIOECON Network	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods					And	We are sorry but we havent been able to identify what is being asked.
1812	Nick Hanley	Individual	Workshop - BIOECON Network	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods					Hanley N. and Czajkowski M. (2019) "The role of stated preference valuation methods in understanding choices and informing policy" Review of Environmental Economics and Policy, 13 (2), 248-266, 10.1093/reep/rez005	We are sorry but we havent been able to identify what is being asked.
1813	Nick Hanley	Individual	Workshop - BIOECON Network	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	24		25		Page 24-25: The section on deliberative valuation is unbalanced, in the sense that it talks about the advantages of this idea but not the problems. These include (i) biased sampling (ii) the fact that in undertaking the deliberative process, we change peoples' values so they no longer reflect those of the public (iii) are we measuring peoples' personal preferences in these exercise, or some kind of "citizen values" (iv) we typically end up with small samples sizes because this approach is super-expensive in terms of sampling costs. Also, given the very	The section is no longer in the chapter but the the pros and cons of deliberative valuation can be found in the section on assessment of methods 2.2.

1814	Nick Hanley	Individual	Workshop - BIOECON Network	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	33				Page 33 It's not obvious how production function approaches – valuing the environment as an input – fit into your “4 main families” of method. The best statement of this approach is Barbier: Barbier, E.B. (2007) “Valuing ecosystem services as productive inputs” Economic Policy, 22, 177-229. You don't mention this approach until Table 3.8. The stated preference, revealed preference and production function approaches estimate the direct (stated and revealed preference) and	Thank you for this comment. Production function approach is now included in the integrated valuation method family.
1815	Nick Hanley	Individual	Workshop - BIOECON Network	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	69	1813			Page 69 line 1813 – in the vast majority of stated preference studies, respondents state their individual preferences, not what they think are group preferences. I also think it would be very hard to show that what you call “citizen preferences” are strictly separable from “consumer preferences”.	Many thanks for the comment to which we agree. We acknowledge that there is a very large number of studies that focus on individual preferences. We have also deleted the consumer/citizen dichotomy as it was not contributing to the clarity of the text.
1816	Nick Hanley	Individual	Workshop - BIOECON Network	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	71	1865			Page 71 line 1865 Again, a more recent review (than the 2016 cite) is Hanley N. and Czajkowski M. (2019) “The role of stated preference valuation methods in understanding choices and informing policy” Review of Environmental Economics and Policy, 13 (2), 248-266, 10.1093/reep/rez005.	Added suggested citation
1817	Nick Hanley	Individual	Workshop - BIOECON Network	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	74	1985			Page 74 line 1985 A recent review of the use of environmental valuation in policy-making is Atkinson, G., Groom, B., Hanley, N., & Mourato, S. (2018). Environmental Valuation and Benefit-Cost Analysis in U.K. Policy. Journal of Benefit-Cost Analysis, 9(1), 97-119.	Thanks for the comment. We have included the suggested reference.
1818	Nick Hanley	Individual	Workshop - BIOECON Network	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	76				Page 76 You say “Moreover, if participants know or believe that their responses will have a material effect on policy design, then they may respond strategically”. But we need people to believe their responses are consequential, otherwise they are not incentivised to reveal their true WTP – see Johnstone et al 2017.	This has been corrected.
1819	Nick Hanley	Individual	Workshop - BIOECON Network	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	76				Page 76: We do not assume in SP that respondents have complete information over the environmental good being valued, or how changes in this good will affect their wellbeing. There is a big literature on how learning about these environmental goods changes stated WTP: this is summarised in:	The comment did not indicate a line number, so we are not sure which sentence the comment addresses. We do not believe that our text implies that people should be fully informed prior to elicitation.
1820	Nick Hanley	Individual	Workshop - BIOECON Network	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods					Needham K., Czajkowski M., Hanley N. and LaRiviere J. (2018) “What is the Causal Impact of Information and Knowledge in Stated Preference Studies?” Resource and Energy Economics, Volume 54, Pages 69-89.	We are sorry but we haven't been able to identify what is being asked.
1821	Nick Hanley	Individual	Workshop - BIOECON Network	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	90				You say “identification of all impacts over the lifetime of alternatives in monetary units” in the description of how to do a CBA. That is wrong. We only include those impacts which are economically relevant according to CBA criteria – see Hanley and Barbier, 2009 “Pricing Nature – cost-benefit analysis and environmental policy” – for example, transfer payments usually need to be excluded.	“all” has been removed, indeed, thanks for spotting this
1822	Nick Hanley	Individual	Workshop - BIOECON Network	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	90				Page 90: you neglect to point out many of the other advantages of doing a CBA – such as the identification of distributional impacts, and the setting of a clear agenda/framework for analysing policy choice. See Carolus, J. F., Hanley, N., Olsen, S. B. and Pedersen, S. M. (2018) A bottom-up approach to environmental Cost-Benefit Analysis. Ecological Economics, 152, 282-295. Also, on line 2365 you talk about “limited potential for appropriate scaling-up due to the measurement of contextual preferences” – I have	Thank you for these comments. We agree that the treatment was too one-sided. We have made it clear that the formalised procedures for policy choice is a strength and the use of CBA in the analysis of distribution of impacts is also now included in the section on Robustness of valuation (section 3.3.2). The chapter now includes a section on aggregation (scaling-up) (in section 3.3.2) which address some of the fundamental challenges (that are not specific to CBA). Furthermore, the the text on linking CBA to interdisciplinary analyses

1823	Nick Hanley	Individual	Workshop - BIOECON Network	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	136				Page 136. You say "Another point of criticism by economists is that the decision behaviour of individuals participating in studies is often found to diverge from the standard neoclassical economic theories underpinning consumer choice theory and welfare measurement". This seems a very out of date statement. The economic analysis of choices and values now incorporates many insights from behavioural science, such as default effects, loss aversion, social preferences and framing. Very few economists, I would argue, would agree that the "standard	We have adapted the text to include that more recent insights from behavioral and experiment economics have developed the models. It is beyond the scope of the chapter to go into depth but we acknowledge the contribution. However, the critiques of SP methods still persists despite the lessons learned.
1831	Julia Touza	Individual	Workshop - BIOECON Network	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	21	532		544	The use of hedonic price valuation in relation to human health can include richer literature, as for example that related to health risk in relation to natural disasters, see for example. Tanaka S. and Zabel J. (2018) Valuing nuclear energy risk: Evidence from the impact of the Fukushima crisis on U.S. house prices. Journal of Environmental Economics and Management, 88: 411-426. There is also a rich literature on the value of green spaces for mental and physical health, that could be included	The references on hedonic valuation has been updated. The chapter also now includes a health valuation section that acknowledges multiple links between nature and biodiversity and human health.
1832	Julia Touza	Individual	Workshop - BIOECON Network	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	18			29	The history section seems to be need the role play for production function approaches and expected damages avoided in capturing regulating ecosystem services values.	The history section is no longer in the chapter but production function approaches are included in the assessment of methods section (2.2).
1833	Julia Touza	Individual	Workshop - BIOECON Network	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	General				Uncertainty is mentioned in a few places, as rarely communicated in ecosystem assessments and valuation exercises, but the implications of lacking to communicate this and address uncertainty in decision making seems to something in which the chapter can be improved. See for example Albers, H. (1996) Modeling ecological constraints on tropical forest management: spatial interdependence, irreversibility and uncertainty. Journal of Environmental Economics and Management, 30: 73-94.	Uncertainty is a part of reliability of valuation: This topic is the focus of section 3.3.2 and has been a core part of the review.
1834	Julia Touza	Individual	Workshop - BIOECON Network	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	General				The increasing literature that recognise the value of nature on reducing natural disaster impacts (its insurance value) can be a topic for being expanded to capture in the chapter the role of nature and biodiversity in building resilience. See for example, Mangroves shelter coastal economic activity from cyclones, published in PNAS. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1820067116 Ex. Watson K.B. et al. (2016) Quantifying flood mitigation services: The economic value of Otter Creek wetlands and floodplains to Middlebury, VT. Ecological	Thank you for the suggestions. We agree that these are useful examples and we have included the references in the text on behaviour based methods - section 3.2.2.
1835	Julia Touza	Individual	Workshop - BIOECON Network	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	General				There is also an increasing literature on the value of natural capital as stock, see for example https://www.nature.com/articles/s41893-020-0592-8 Fenichel et al Modifying national accounts for sustainable ocean development. Nature Sustainability 3. Or Hein, L. et al. Progress in natural capital accounting for ecosystems. Science 367, 514-515 (2020). When focusing on valuing nature as stock, then key issues emerge, as valuing nature for providing a 'portfolio' of options for the future. See for example,	Thanks for these suggestions, yet we have not been able to tackle this specific aspect within the given scope
1836	Julia Touza	Individual	Workshop - BIOECON Network	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	General				The link between nature and health could be expanded in the report, for example, see in relation to infectious disease http://www.oecd.org/coronavirus/policy-responses/biodiversity-and-the-economic-response-to-covid-19-ensuring-a-green-and-resilient-recovery-d98b5a09/ Or the paper on The impact of protected areas in the incidence of infectious diseases https://assets.researchsquare.com/files/rs-105927/v1/dfabef41-aa4c-4c78-9fef-14ad73e1d8c8.pdf . Other much earlier studies where this	We now have a Box on Health Valuation that expands on this topic in the TOD.
1837	Amy Graham	Government	Australia	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	25				Box SPM.4 - Natural Capital Accounting. The line: '...consistent and comparable way of identifying ecosystem service values at the national scale'. Note that the standard does not require the preparation of monetary estimates of values, and that it can be applied sub-nationally.	The chapter now includes a section emphasising the multiple scales that NCA can be applied. (section 3.3.4)
1849	Vera Helene Hausner	Organisation	UiT-the Arctic University of Norway	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	34	845	34	867	The four methods families for valuation do not cover the expression of values through art (songs, murals, dances, paintings etc). Art is particularly important for expressing emotional connections to nature (see Maximilian M. Muhr (2020) Beyond words – the potential of arts-based research on human-nature connectedness, Ecosystems and People, 16:1, 249-257) These ways of expressing values of nature and human-nature relationships are widespread in indigenous communities, but do not fit in any of the methods families described	Art-based methods are now explicitly mentioned in the statement based methods Table and accompanying text

1850	Vera Helene Hausner	Organisation	UiT-the Arctic University of Norway	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	115	2856	115	2856	Photo Voice, community voice or creative voice is lacking from the application figure. Since Photovoice was explicitly searched for, this application should at least be reported here.	The application figures have been omitted
1851	Vera Helene Hausner	Organisation	UiT-the Arctic University of Norway	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	142	3293	142	3301	PPGIS could contribute to spatial value transfer from one region to another (see Brown et al. 2016) An empirical evaluation of spatial value transfer methods for identifying cultural ecosystem services. Ecological Indicators Volume 69, October 2016, Pages 1-11. This apply to some cultural ecosystem services, but not all.	Thank you for the suggestion. We have chosen to keep the text on PPGIS and Transfer methods separate as most applications of the methods are not joint applications. We do not have the space to go into this level of detail.
1862	Guadalupe Yesenia Hernández Márquez	Individual		Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	9	243			Regarding process legitimacy it would be convenient to integrate stakeholders representativity o that of other groups who have been in disadvantage	Executive summary. Make sure Step 1. involves integration of all relevant stakeholders.
1865	Fatima Manji	Government	UK	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	66	1735			It would be useful to expand on how classifications for Natural, Semi natural and modified habitats are determined and how they should be used effectively, given the relatively subjective approach that is used to determine the status.	Thanks for these suggestions, yet we have not been able to tackle this specific aspect within the given scope
1866	Fatima Manji	Government	UK	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	0				An additional section setting out methodologies to combine the diverse range of types of valuations to create global valuations, would be helpful.	Not clear if 'integrated valuation' is meant?
1867	Fatima Manji	Government	UK	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	174	4165	175	4184	It would be useful to set out who you think would be best placed to provide this guidance and standardisation.	Section 3.4 of the chapter is now dedicated to providing guidance for valuation and mentions the stakeholders that could and should be involved given the specific contexts that call for valuations. Rather than suggest who is "best placed", however, we summarise what existing literature shows and suggests. Chapter 6 of the Assessment is has the mandate to make recommendations.
1881	Technical support unit on knowledge and data	Organisation	TSU Knowledge and Data	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	26	670	26	670	Figure 3.3 - Flip the x axis so it goes from 1987 to 2021 and increase the size of the labels as it is difficult to read. Please ensure that the code behind this figure is included in a data deposit package	Thank you for your comments, this figure has been edited accordingly.
1885	Technical support unit on knowledge and data	Organisation	TSU Knowledge and Data	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	116	2867	116	2869	Figure 3.16 - Please add the code behind the figure to the data deposit package or mention how it was created if using ArcGIS, etc.	The DMR includes the documentation of the figure.
1886	Technical support unit on knowledge and data	Organisation	TSU Knowledge and Data	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	60	1588	60	1589	Figure 3.8 - What does the number beside each name represent?	This figure has been removed.

1887	Technical support unit on knowledge and data	Organisation	TSU Knowledge and Data	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	101	2592	101	2596	Figure 3.11 - Please specify a unit for the y axis	Thank you for your comment, we have included an explanation in the footnote of the figure.
1888	Technical support unit on knowledge and data	Organisation	TSU Knowledge and Data	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	119	2895	119	2898	Figure 3.20 - What does each blue shade specifically represent? Please specify in caption specifically Regulatory, material, cultural/spiritual	This figure has been removed.
1889	Technical support unit on knowledge and data	Organisation	TSU Knowledge and Data	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	167	3980	167	3984	Figure 3.45 - How was versatility calculated? Please make sure that the methods and workflow behind this analysis is clear and easy to find	versatility is no longer used as a key concept in the TOD
1935	Ricardo Castro Díaz. Brasil. Universidad Federal de Río Grande	Individual	Workshop - ESP (LAC)	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods					Limitations of valuation methods. Emphasize what are the limitations that exist in the valuation methods, which are the values that are highlighted in each method	This is now realized. Every section describing the methods families also exposes the shared limitations that methods within those families have.
1936	Ana Gomez. España. Universidad Politécnica de Valencia	Individual	Workshop - ESP (LAC)	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods					Ecosystem disservices. Include more broadly, the issue of ecosystem disservices.	The reviewed valuation methods include a broad range of methods, and indicators which quantify or qualify decreases in welfare or wellbeing, damages to livelihoods etc.
1937	Ana Gomez. España. Universidad Politécnica de Valencia	Individual	Workshop - ESP (LAC)	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods					Valuation barriers between marine and terrestrial ecosystems. Specific methods for integrating communities in the valuation of the marine ecosystems. Highlight the barriers that have the exercise of marine valuation against land areas valuation, especially the limitations of the methods becomes. As for marine ecosystems valuation, do not have a methodology, for example, you can do surveys? how to involve the community?. It would be interesting to know such experiences.	Thanks for these suggestions, yet we have not been able to tackle this specific aspect within the given scope
1938	Ana Gomez. España. Universidad Politécnica de Valencia	Individual	Workshop - ESP (LAC)	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods					Reference currency to present economic assessments. When monetizing unify the results in any currency What is the currency that is always used? There is no current consensus on the reference currency to present the results of economic valuations. The chapter could bring some light about it	This is true but the suggestion is too specific for the scope of the chapter.
1939	Ana Gomez. España. Universidad Politécnica de Valencia	Individual	Workshop - ESP (LAC)	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods	86	2219	87	2224	Note that the method is not only to make economic values but also to make decisions, perform mappings and prioritization especially for identifying ecosystem services.	MCDA is included in the section on decision making methods in the final version of the chapter.
1940	Janwar Moreno. Colombia. INVEMAR	Individual	Workshop - ESP (LAC)	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods					National environmental accounts. Families valuation. Currently in Colombia we are trying to do a pilot exercise with national environmental accounts and assessment of marine ecosystem services. It is required to know the information found in studies for the country and identify not only monetary valuation. There is the question: What elements minimums can be integrated into the valuation?. There are different objectives, academics, public policy. I would like to see what are the minimum	We have included such a stepwise process and a few hypothetical application examples

1941	Ana Gomez. España. Universidad Politécnica de Valencia	Individual	Workshop - ESP (LAC)	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods					Policy Makers. The chapter gives a basis for policy makers to see the issues they work.	Positive feedback is appreciated.
1942	Ana Gomez. España. Universidad Politécnica de Valencia	Individual	Workshop - ESP (LAC)	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods					Chapter should show what are exceptions, dig a little deeper for the policies makers can better understand the business context	Thanks for these suggestions, yet we have not been able to tackle this specific aspect within the given scope
1943	Juan Regino. Oaxaca. Universidad Politécnica de Oaxaca	Individual	Workshop - ESP (LAC)	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods					Better valuation method depending on the context. The document fails to state what should be the best method according to the context, in the case of hydrological valuation, sometimes the valuation of the basins when they are in good condition is not seeking to highlight any element that is associated with the condition of conservation Basin. Decision makers often work with themes and priority areas, methods must address those needs. Contexts sometimes are not related to the needs of decision makers.	We have included such a stepwise process and a few hypothetical application examples
1944	Juan Regino. Oaxaca. Universidad Politécnica de Oaxaca	Individual	Workshop - ESP (LAC)	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods					Better valuation method depending on the context. Discrete choice methods have an inherent difficulty in more complex statistical part and still does when mixed with qualitative methods.	We do not discuss the pros and cons of specific methods as this would require us to do so for 50+ methods. We do, however, highlight the main shortcoming of methods within method families. This is the best we can do given the limited space allocated to each chapter.
1945	Juan Regino. Oaxaca. Universidad Politécnica de Oaxaca	Individual	Workshop - ESP (LAC)	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods					If it is not the purpose of the work or implicitly it says. Two points. 1. The need for building a framework of economic valuation where the valuation methods of ecosystem services that many are non-market. Not only from the positivists based economy, but also it is based from the contributions of other disciplines such as ecological economics, social and collectivist economy. In order to support the plurality of measurement methods. 2. I do not know if the chapter should include a few lines on economic instruments to encourage users and	Review of instruments is not within the scope of Ch3.
1946	Ana Gomez. España. Universidad Politécnica de Valencia	Individual	Workshop - ESP (LAC)	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods					Contexts in research. The presentation of the context is sometimes limited by the same journals, magazines emphasize the theme to explain the method	We acknowledge the potential bias in our assessment re. language, academics and other choices made.
1947	Daniela Avila. México	Individual	Workshop - ESP (LAC)	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods					scales. Methods and results change to suit the scale. Water World and Costing Nature can be low cost tools that could help decision makers. It has been observed that the valuation methods change according to the scales of the study.	We cannot address this comment as the references are not provided
1948	Patricia Balvanera	Individual	Workshop - ESP (LAC)	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods					Robustez data and step by step. There is a demand to deepen the explanation about some methods, about the robustness, opportunities and limitations of each method. Patricia Balvanera question: would you like to see, and what specific tools are required for each method? To explain some, few. steps: A, B, C... about the implementation methodologies.	Thank you for the comments. This is now adressed in section 3.3.4 (specific pros and cons on individual methods) and section 3.4 (explaining on the steps).
1949	Zolantie González. Bogotá	Individual	Workshop - ESP (LAC)	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods					Non-material contributions of nature (cultural). Section 3.3.3.4 is intended to valuation. Section 3,3,4,5 assessment of cultural ecosystem services have different valuation methods, it would be interesting to list a method most used to put people in relation to the subject. Propose a list of methods for cultural services and those most commonly used.	Thank you for the comment. Section 3.2.3 and Table 3.8 aims to give the overview the reviewer is asking for. Section 3.2.3. is a new section in the TOD.

2084	Klara J Winkler	Individual	Workshop - ESP (NA)	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods		4035			VERY RELEVANT STATEMENT	Positive feedback is appreciated.
2095	ESP - AF	Individual	Workshop - ESP (AF)	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods					There is a huge effort trying to determine values and valuation. The issue is how this is linked to the decisions, the final step of getting somewhere with this kind of product. Decision makers and politicians need to know not only the natural value of the ecosystem but the amounts or costs to deal with such important issues - of integrating values across levels - . The assessment needs to show the link on how decision makers can integrate this (considering cost perspectives) and benefits of supporting this approach for transformative change.	We have included such a stepwise process and a few hypothetical application examples
2129	Kremena Gocheva	Individual	Workshop - ESP (ECA)	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods					I would be interested in hearing how the review draws the border between economic and non-economic values with a view of accounting. While SEEA-EA gives general guidance, there are potentially many grey zones due to underestimating nature's contributions to economy, the general principle being that we define a number of potential benefits (or ecosystem services) but only account for a few of them that we have historical data on or that are prioritized for other reasons. It is my guess that the majority of such benefits that	Thanks for these suggestions, yet we have not been able to tackle this specific aspect within the given scope
2130	Oleksandr Karasov (Johannes Langemeyer supports this point, we have a very active ESP group addressing these aspects and recently conducted a very sophisticated lit review, please feel free to get in touch for further info	Individual	Workshop - ESP (ECA)	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods		1648, table			I would discuss more visual landscape perspectives assessable with social media and ground-based data (citizen science, social media analysis). For example, there is a large body of knowledge on remote sensing and GIS-based visual landscape quality analysis. The table is missing a social media component among social valuation tools and approaches	Social media analysis has been considered as part of behaviour-based methods. It analyses people behaviour on social media spaces. When it is used to say something about the biophysical components of nature (such as butterfly migration), then - rightly so - it can (and should be included) in the nature valuation methods, similar to expert consultation or citizen science.
2131	Louise Willemen	Individual	Workshop - ESP (ECA)	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods					Assessment questions, order of 6 steps of conceptual framework might need to be reconsidered. Visualization is also not very straightforward	This has been reconsidered, clarified and adapted
2132	Fernando Santos Maritn	Individual	Workshop - ESP (ECA)	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods					It is mentioned that socio-cultural methods are usually underrepresented. Maybe it will be useful to express why and what will be the problem for this gap.	We are not saying that they are underrepresented. We are saying that not many reviews exist that are not reviews of economic valuation studies. This is a finding. The most likely explanation is that there are not so many studies.
2133	Stefanos Solomonides	Individual	Workshop - ESP (ECA)	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods					Despite their limitations, monetary values and methods seem to be the most operational for decision making support. That is because it makes it easier to perform a CBA between different policy/development options. The SEEA standard takes this effort one step further. However, in the ES literature there is a plethora of other types of values used to value nature. How can we facilitate better inclusion of such values in the decision making process, within the context of the multi-value provision of nature to human development and well-being? Can this be	Thanks for these suggestions, yet we have not been able to tackle this specific aspect within the given scope
2134	Stefanos Solomonides	Individual	Workshop - ESP (ECA)	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods					What is the representation between different value types through this analysis? In terms of magnitude are there under-represented or over-represented values?	The types of values represented in the review are reported in section 3.2.1 and 3.3.1 in the TOD.
2135	Stefanos Solomonides	Individual	Workshop - ESP (ECA)	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods					ES Valuation Database digital repository can also be used as input.	The use of existing studies often in the form of a digital repository is a way of reducing resource needs. A review of the current experiences of this can be found in section 3.3.3

2136	Katerina Kaprova	Individual	Workshop - ESP (ECA)	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods		1893		1899	I am not sure with which definition of "intrinsic" value the report works; but in my view, there is very little on whether the intrinsic values are or CAN be part of the worldview of the human society; if I use Delphi techniques and other expert-based methods etc. (as it is cited here), am I really targeting the "intrinsic" value, or the "value" that biologists etc. (that take part in Delphi surveys) see that the nature/ecosystem has or should have based on some "human-based" criteria as "nature SHOULD be healthy" or "for management of natural	We agree that the literature is not very clear on this point. Ch2 reviews the concept of intrinsic values. Ch3 reviews how authors have included intrinsic values in valuation studies. The ch3 review therefore includes diverse interpretations on whether and how intrinsic values can be measured.
2137	Katerina Kaprova	Individual	Workshop - ESP (ECA)	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods					Mostly traditional valuation methods. I wonder whether some of methods from environmental psychology would also fit here? Theory of planned behaviour by Ajzen; or Campbell's paradigm? They explain links between values and behaviour and are used also in environmental contexts. Or also Schwartz's theory of values is sometimes linked with env. valuation and helps explain the behaviour in env. context with "value orientation"?	The literature on the gap between values, motivations and behaviour has been reviewed in ch2 and ch4. This is not a core topic for ch3.
2138	Katerina Kaprova	Individual	Workshop - ESP (ECA)	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods					Nice to have it covered in here. What I see as the major obstacle in here is not what is written already here, but how to link non-use values (mostly coming from choice experiment studies, with limited levels of "values" of this attribute, typically "low", "medium", "high") with some actual continuous measure of biodiversity, if "biodiversity" is addressed by the study. Then basically, we see from the study whether people react to the "biodiversity" parameter or not; but we fail to connect the levels that the people are able to perceive (=what is in the	We agree with the point but the limited attention to biophysical changes in statement based valuation is better reflected in section 2.1.
2139	Katerina Kaprova	Individual	Workshop - ESP (ECA)	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods					IPBES reports sum up the state-of-the-art and defines the ways forward; and then we need quick action I suppose :-). I agree we have to "act quickly". It is necessary to broaden the scope of values, I agree. But even the uptake of some "already developed" methods "based on the western-world view" that address values and their use into decisionmaking and governance/stewardship is very insufficient (I mean specifically: a) (environmental and other) economics;	We have applied a stratified sampling strategy to cover different valuation method 'families' in a balanced way, rather than reflecting the body of literature which is very different between them. Yet, where relevant, we do represent the 'real life' occurrence of different valuations types, and indeed the majority of valuations have been nature-based. Hence, we do not underrepresent them, we compare them, and represent their abundances.
2140	Katerina Kaprova	Individual	Workshop - ESP (ECA)	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods					I notice that even if the chapter deals with "traditional" methods (environmental economics, etc.) in its body, they are not commented on here in the summary. (The same I noticed in the Pollination IPBES report, where the chapter on economic values is very informative, with the FAQ so well put at place and well-done; but then does not get into the Summary almost at all.). Maybe there is not much "space" to capture the complexity of these methods - but please rethink this again. These are very well developed methods compared to other	Thank you for this comment. It is true that we have focussed on conducting a broad review across different types of methods and as a result "traditional" methods does not get the space that is proportional to their abundance in the literature. However, economic methods are included in the summary as that are included under the different methods families.
2141	Katerina Kaprova	Individual	Workshop - ESP (ECA)	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods					I believe economics as a science is underestimated here as a tool for stewardship analysis/guidance suitable perhaps even "outside" western value setting. Economics has to have something to say also on competing uses of scarce resources in "nonwestern" value setting (as it is dealing with scarce resources allocation taking into account the preferences and values), definition "who benefits" and "who loses" etc. Regardless what the value system is based on, it can help. The problem here can be that (as far as I have seen) in economics,	We agree that economics and economic valuation has important contributions to make in many context. The chapter highlights many of these potentials. It is not clear from the comment how we can improve the review.
2142	Katerina Kaprova	Individual	Workshop - ESP (ECA)	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods		114		114	(environmental) psychology is missing	Environmental psychology is now included.
2143	Katerina Kaprova	Individual	Workshop - ESP (ECA)	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods		468		477	not only externalities, but the concepts of utility; and not only env. accounting, but also concept of total economic value (is mentioned later at 565, but is not the same concept as valuation for env. accounting)	We agree, and added this to the text.
2144	Katerina Kaprova	Individual	Workshop - ESP (ECA)	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods		595		595	what I find interesting and perhaps is not mentioned anywhere (?), is that it is very problematic to aggregate economic values into TEV (or total sum of ES values) due to doublecounting, not clear links within particular ES (stems from gaps in knowledge also in the biophysical "system" of ES modelling), and due to the fact that most values have been estimated for a different context and purpose -> and therefore even if they are all in "monetary terms", it makes no logical sense to add them all up "as they are". Meta-analyses and benefit transfers are	The topic is addressed in section 3.3.1.3. This section evaluates how valuation studies combine different types of values. Double counting is one of the challenges involved in aggregation across different types of values that could be overlapping.

2145	Katerina Kaprova	Individual	Workshop - ESP (ECA)	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods		1385		1385	I agree. I also think there has not been much development lately and that most studies have applied equal weights. Shouldn't it be somewhere in the text "ways forward" as a concept that is available, but should be more worked upon in future? If I am not mistaken, it is a common problem (setting weights) as for multi-criteria analysis (line 2257), where the choice of multi-criteria decision analysis method i. a. also implies different weight setting (not mentioned there - line 2257 and farther) -> different results; and there is not much guidance	thanks! the topic of weights for value types as well as for social aggregations is now dealt with much more thoroughly, focussing on the need for transparency and the consequences for valuation quality rather than providing a standard (which would be based on a global level)
2146	Katerina Kaprova	Individual	Workshop - ESP (ECA)	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods		2359		2371	CBA - also, the big limitation is that we cannot really estimate the "whole" TEV with the state-of-the-art of knowledge; just its parts for which we have methods developed. CBA requires to have accounted at least for those "externalities" or "non-marketed values", that are "most important". But how can we know that we are not missing something important, if part of the values we cannot address now? So if the result is NPV<0, it may not in reality mean that the project (say, on improving biodiversity at some place) "really should not be done from the societal	Interesting point. We have included this implicitly in the critiques on CBA
2147	Katerina Kaprova	Individual	Workshop - ESP (ECA)	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods		3069			Also some use values are neglected - e. g. recreation. Perhaps rather "nonmarket" values, than "non-use"? Or "nonmarket use values and non-use values"? From the TEV concept, I see, the chapter is on non-use values only, but this mentioned problem is valid for both.	Recreational values are often estimated using behaviour-based methods. This is in section 2.2 of the chapter.
2148	Katerina Kaprova	Individual	Workshop - ESP (ECA)	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods		3100		3113	I do not see this at all as divergency of real behaviour from "model behaviour that neoclassics assumes", as you specifically write at line 3100. That is a completely different level. Rather, it is the problematics of stated preference surveys (the specific technique of envi economics) to not be able to measure what it intends to measure, without biases mentioned correctly here (-> the ability to reconstruct the theoretical economical model with real data without biases is perhaps affected?).	These are two different points made in the literature about whether SP techniques can provide useful information about real behaviour. We have kept the text.
2149	Katerina Kaprova	Individual	Workshop - ESP (ECA)	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods		3329		3335	nice explained. Thanks for that!	Positive feedback is appreciated.
2150	Pedro Cabral	Individual	Workshop - ESP (ECA)	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods					Generally enjoyed reading the whole chapter. Excellent work, congrats! It could, however, include more examples of how private sector is dealing with ES. For instance, the California or Australia Water Futures. Some links: https://www.bloomberg.com/news/articles/2020-12-06/water-futures-to-start-trading-amid-growing-fears-of-scarcity and https://www.agriculture.gov.au/water/national/northern-australia/northern-australia-water-futures-assessment	Thanks for these positive points and suggestions. We now have a Box that specifically addresses how valuation is used in the private sector.
2151	Arantza Murillas-Maza (AZTI)	Individual	Workshop - ESP (ECA)	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods		987		1491	Congratulations because it is a high-quality and improved understanding of the topic. The criteria developed for main review topics of the application evaluation introduced in Chapter 3 are very useful. These should not be considered as a consecutive list, but a set of strong linkages and trade-offs can also be emphasized and analysed between them. A pairwise (or higher) analysis table might be very illustrative with this aim! i.e. cursory practices are highly associated to the time series data gap	Thank you for these comments. The final version of the chapter has synthesised the understanding of the interaction between review topics further. This text can be found in section 3.3 Key considerations in Valuation.
2152	Jan Ramel Tumbaga	Individual	Workshop - ESP (ECA)	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods					The families of valuation methods are concrete and well specified. However, is there any way to include a sort of "political" valuation (i.e., policies, regulations – provided with a degree) implemented in the area of interest? It is highlighted that the constructs of valuation are also political (e.g., line 4090). Probably there is no or minimal literature on this area that must be incorporated in the chapter.	Thank you for the comment. Regulation (i.e. policy instruments) is outside the scope of Ch3. We recognise that valuation can be used to design policy instruments but the regulation itself has not been included in the scope of CH3.
2153	Arantza Murillas-Maza (AZTI)	Individual	Workshop - ESP (ECA)	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods		2974		3000	Procedural Justice: it is key to mention a common missing aspect when speaking about the participation of stakeholders as part of the valuation process. One of the key barriers to engage stakeholders is the lack of knowledge about the Ecosystem Services Concept. Setting the concepts is a prerequisite for their active participation.	The comment is relevant but this is not the right section to mention this particular reason for the lack of stakeholder's participation

2154	Stefanos Solomonides	Individual	Workshop - ESP (ECA)	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods		3055		3156	On the valuation of non-use values: Despite the clear limitations of the method such as moral, protest and unrealistic bids of WTP, it somehow seems to be the most feasible way to account for non-use values of nature. However, the biggest pitfall I believe usually comes from the side that conducts the valuation exercise. From my experience, it is unfortunately not very common for CV studies to accurately and explicitly describe what would be the added benefits that would arise from the stated payments. Even though the associated non-use benefits	We agree and this is also the conclusion in line with the conclusion of the section.
2155	Maria Tsiafouli	Individual	Workshop - ESP (ECA)	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods					Ecosystem services provided by soils and soil biodiversity should also be taken into consideration in policy decisions. Although the link between ecosystem services and soil biodiversity has yet not been well described in literature, a comprehensive description is provided in Figure 3.2.1, p. 135 in the first "State of Knowledge of Soil Biodiversity" Report. http://www.fao.org/documents/card/en/c/CB1928EN/	It is hard to address this comment as it does not relate to a specific place in text. We do mention several times that soil has been taken into account in valuation studies
2156	Lorena Muñoz	Individual	Workshop - ESP (ECA)	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods		1805			In section 3.3.1.2 Method family 2: Statement-based valuation (page 69, line 1805) I miss PPGIS, used in socio-cultural valuation of ES/NCP, which is being increasingly used and has the potential to include a wide range of people in valuation studies. I include some references here: Brown, Greg, and Delene Weber. 2013. "Using Public Participation GIS (PPGIS) on the Geoweb to Monitor Tourism Development Preferences." <i>Journal of Sustainable Tourism</i> 21 (2): 192–211.	Thanks for the suggestion. We referred to PPGIS in line 1949 in the SOD and cited a review on the topic by Brown & Fagerholm et al., 2015. We have now added one additional reference suggested by the reviewer.
2157	Lorena Muñoz	Individual	Workshop - ESP (ECA)	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods					During the seminar there was a request for literature on social media use for socio-cultural valuation, so here I include some references: Ghermandi, Andrea, and Michael Sinclair. 2019. "Passive Crowdsourcing of Social Media in Environmental Research: A Systematic Map." <i>Global Environmental Change</i> 55: 36–47. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2019.02.003 . Hausmann, Anna, Tuuli Toivonen, Rob Slotow, Henrikki Tenkanen, Atte	This is related to comment No. 4300 on social media analysis. We will include a small mention of this in the nature-based valuation table as a maximum of two of these great references.
2165	Sarai González	Organisation	La Ceiba S.C	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods		291		249	Distinguish between methods and approaches. There seems to be a hierarchical aspect to it, so perhaps this can help explain the differences. So far, it is not clear, and it seems important to make a distinction. Also, it seems important to highlight the issue of 'practices' for IPLC valuation methods. To me valuation doesn't occur in the same way or for the same purposes in every context, and IPLC contexts tend to have a particularity that is that decisions are often made in the context with strong connection to the territory, and valuation follows	This is a very good point, and was discussed extensively. The distinction depends on the scale of reference, and there is no 'one way' to define method vs. approach. We have opted to use the terms quasi-interchangeably to make sure all meanings of both 'method' and 'approach' were kept broad enough to cover the valuations we actually consider.
2177	Sarai González	Organisation	La Ceiba S.C	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods					For method families review of reviews I suggest to read the following paper by Chan and Satterfield "The maturation of ecosystem services: Social and policy research expands, but whether biophysically informed valuation?" https://doi.org/10.1002/pan3.10137	We appreciate your valuable comment, this reference is now included in the Chapter.
2201	Sarai González	Organisation	La Ceiba S.C	Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods					I would like to congratulate you for the impressive work to link ILK valuation methods and western valuation methods. This work will definitely make a difference in the way we select and apply methods later on. I wonder if a set of principles can be distilled on how to apply valuation methods with and within IPLC contexts based on your findings?	Thank you for these kind words. We now have several sections that refer to key considerations for including IPLC valuation and IPLCs in valuation. We also have provided a table with examples of guidelines and handbooks for inclusion of multiple knowledge systems in valuation.
2204	Rovshan Abbasov	MEP		Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods					This sentence is controversial. Early estimates date back to the 18th century, and perhaps even earlier.	We agree, and deleted this sentence. In the TOD, this sentence no longer appears.
2205	Rovshan Abbasov	MEP		Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods					At least one or two sentences should be added about Eastern and Islamic valuations (Ibn Batuta, Biruni, Avicenna etc)	We have deleted this section; it was extremely unbalanced in terms of representation diverse cultures and their philosophers.

2206	Rovshan Abbasov	MEP		Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods					The information shown in this diagram (Figure 3.3) is somewhat controversial and depends more on the search category. It would be better to give other information instead.	The Figure only show that participatory research have been increasing over the part 25 years. We do not find this controversial.
2207	Rovshan Abbasov	MEP		Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods					These methods have never been used separately by the authors, and in most cases a combination of these methods is used. Therefore, I think this classification is subjective	We agree that this classification (as any) is subjective. However, not all authors are using combinations of these methods
2208	Rovshan Abbasov	MEP		Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods					Sustainable ecosystem Management (SEM) helps to use nature sustainably. So, the terms use and management cannot be contrasted. In general, this idea is somewhat controversial. SEM also means sustainable use.	Thanks for this comment. These terms are used in diverse ways by different groups. We have defined and contrasted them based on literature and in function of clarity of the review criteria. This comes at the risk of not capturing some more subtle, cross-over concepts.
2209	Rovshan Abbasov	MEP		Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods					Table 3.3 WHY VALUATION? I did not see here hazard management. Sometimes valuations made because of hazard/disaster risk managements	Where ecosystems provide protection against hazards and disasters, such values will have been included under those ecosystem services??
2210	Rovshan Abbasov	MEP		Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods					should be added: Sometimes, people knowing that they will not pay for the good in reality, intentionally increase WTP values. There were cases, when WTP was very high, but actual payments much lower.	added (since they expect that they will actually have to pay) to make this more clear
2211	Rovshan Abbasov	MEP		Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods					It is felt that authors are very critical to stated preferences methods. But, these methods were very good in assessing many kinds of nonuse values. So., authors should keep balance and show that despite some problems, stated preference methods are still the only methods that theoretically justified.	The potentials of the methods and their strengths are highlighted in section 2.2. This section reviews the critiques of the methods in terms of reliability of the results. The topic has received a lot of attention in the literature and we have aimed to write a balanced review of the debate.
2212	Rovshan Abbasov	MEP		Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods					Should be added: Valuation for business and the private sector is important because in some cases it is necessary to understand that sustainable use of resources is more beneficial and income promising than the traditional use	The Box on Methods for valuation of nature for businesses has been expanded and now address this topic
2213	Rovshan Abbasov	MEP		Chapter 3. Assessment of Valuation Methods					How about TSA (targeted Scenario Approach)? They worked well to evaluate long-term changes in Ecosystem services	We are sorry but we haven't been able to identify to which lines in the text this specific comment referred to.