UNITED
NATIONS

EP

IPBES/2/INF/9

Distr.: General
19 September 2013

English only

United Nations Environment Programme

Plenary of the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services
Second session
Antalya, Turkey, 9–14 December 2013
Item 4 (a) of the provisional agenda*

Initial work programme of the Platform: Work programme 2014–2018

Supporting documentation on the prioritization of requests, inputs and suggestions put to the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services

Note by the secretariat

The annexes to the present note supplement document IPBES/2/3 on the prioritization of requests, inputs and suggestions put to the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services. Annex I sets out a summary list of the requests, inputs and suggestions put to the Platform by 21 May 2013, with indications of how they have been addressed in the proposed Platform work programme for 2014–2018 (IPBES/2/2). Annex II sets out the bundles of requests, inputs and suggestions put to the Platform by 21 May 2013, with indications of how they have been prioritized and addressed in the proposed Platform work programme for 2014–2018. The annexes have not been formally edited.

Annex I

Report on the prioritization of requests, inputs and suggestions put to the Platform

Summary list of requests, inputs and suggestions received by 21 May 2013, with indication of how they have been addressed

The first four columns of this table summarise the submissions received, drawing heavily on the original wording of the submissions. The full submissions found on the IPBES website at www.ipbes.net/intersessional-process/previous-comments-received.html. The last column of this table summarises how the submissions are related to the request bundles and would be dealt with if the proposed work programme is agreed by the IPBES Plenary at its second session. The following abbreviations are used in the table:

ABNJ	Areas Beyond National Jurisdiction
AEWA	African-Eurasian Waterbird Agreement
bioGENESIS	A programme of DIVERSITAS
BIP	Biodiversity Indicators Partnership
CBD	Convention on Biological Diversity
CITES	Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora
CMS	Convention on Migratory Species
COP	Conference of the Parties
DLDD	Desertification, Land Degradation and Drought
DRR	Disaster and Risk Reduction
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
GBIF	Global Biodiversity Information Facility
GBO	Global Biodiversity Outlook
GEF	Global Environment Facility
GEO	Global Environmental Outlook
GEO-BON	Group on Earth Observations – Biodiversity Observation Network
GIS	Geographic Information System
GRAME	Global Reporting and Assessment of the State of the Marine Environment
GTI	Global Taxonomy Initiative (CBD)
IAASTD	International Assessment of Agricultural Knowledge, Science and Technology for Development
ICSU	International Council for Science
IPCC	Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change
IUCN	International Union for Conservation of Nature
LADA	Land Degradation Assessment in Drylands
MA	Millennium Ecosystem Assessment
LDC	Least Developed Country
MEA	Multilateral Environmental Agreement
NBSAP	National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan
NDF	Non-Detriment Finding (CITES)
NEFO	Network-Forum for Biodiversity Research (Germany)
NIES	National Institute of Environmental Studies (Japan)
NGO	Non-Government Organization
OECD	Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development
PEBLDS	Pan-European Biological and Landscape Diversity Strategy
PEDRR	ISDR Partnership for Environment and Disaster Risk Reduction
REDD++	Reducing emissions from deforestation
SEEA	System of Environmental-Economic Accounting
SGA Network	Sub-global Assessment Network
SLM	Sustainable Land Management
TEEB	The Economics of Ecosystems and Biodiversity
UN	United Nations
UNCCD	United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification
UNCLOS	United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNEP	United Nations Environment Programme
UNEP-WCMC	UNEP World Conservation Monitoring Centre
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
UNISDR	United Nations International Strategy for Disaster Reduction
WAVES	Wealth Accounting and Valuation of Ecosystem Services
WBCSD	World Business Council for Sustainable Development
WCRP	World Climate Research Programme
WMO	World Meteorological Organization
WOA	World Ocean Assessment
WTO	World Trade Organization
WWF	World Wide Fund for Nature

Country	Intervention requested	Scientific and Policy Relevance *IPBES objectives (7a), urgency (7b), relevance (7c), geographic scope (7d), existing work (7f)*	Implications for work programme and resource requirements *complexity (7e), availability of information (7g), financial and human resource requirements (7i)*	Indication on how request was addressed
Requests from Governments				
Australia	***Environmental accounting: from theory to practice*** To test the application of the System of Environmental-Economic Accounting (SEEA) framework to establish its feasibility for organizing data in a format useful for contributing indicators to national thematic assessments. The intervention should be based on collaborative institutional arrangements that cover cooperation, technical exchange and capacity building and training, and should provide self-assessment tools and data quality assessment.	Strong alignment with the IPBES objective: functions and work programme of IPBES are strongly supported as there is a parallel and similar process of capacity building, policy support and knowledge generation. SEEA is intended to support regular/timely assessments and is focused on achieving scientific accreditation for the account subject conceptual model and the methods applied. Requested action would help develop feasible, transparent methods for delivering biodiversity reporting at multiple scales, particularly at national and international levels, though potentially at the sub-regional scale as well In spite of an active international community of practice and the establishment of suitable accounting frameworks, the he accounting tools and structures need to be applied and the results evaluated. The development and testing of the theory of ecosystem and biodiversity accounting would be best conducted with an international perspective using internationally developed best practice as this will produce methods with wide applicability across the world. National pilots are suggested, but as accounts mature and capacity is built the application is global.	Complexities of comprehensive biodiversity accounting are significant and this request is designed to reduce those complexities by focusing on account subjects that are already defined or by tackling a thematic account Extensive scientific resources are available internationally Requirements for financial and human resources, and potential duration of the requested action would need to be negotiated following assessment of the request by the Bureau and MEP.	Bundle: Included in ***Decision support tools*** and ***Values of biodiversity and ecosystem services***. Work programme: Included in policy support tool activities (deliverable 4b). High priority for inclusion in rapid methodological assessment on values (deliverable 3d). Policy support tools embedded in assessment activities.

Country	Intervention requested	Scientific and Policy Relevance *IPBES objectives (7a), urgency (7b), relevance (7c), geographic scope (7d), existing work (7f)*	Implications for work programme and resource requirements *complexity (7e), availability of information (7g), financial and human resource requirements (7i)*	Indication on how request was addressed
Belarus	***Expert analysis of tools and methodologies available for the valuation of biodiversity and ecosystem services*** To identify possible gaps and effective implementation of the system of valuation of ecosystem services and biodiversity in various sectors of Belarus.	Development of tools and approaches to the valuation of biodiversity and ecosystem services, and recommendations for further strengthening of capacity. Need to identify possible gaps and effective implementation of the system of valuation of ecosystem services and biodiversity in order to support the revision of the Belarus National Strategies for biodiversity, protected areas for 2015-2020 Need to make the case, economic evaluation of ecosystem services and biodiversity necessary for public decision-making (including at the level of the Government)on the effects of economic and other activities on biodiversity, protected areas The request has a National scope (Republic of Belarus) In 2012, the Republic of Belarus developed approaches to the valuation of ecosystem services and biodiversity, adopted by the relevant technical normative legal act. However, these approaches only cover the estimation of certain types of ecosystem services.	Approaches available from TEEB, and with information available from PEBLDS Human resources: international and national experts; Financial resources: funding for 2-3 workshops; Duration: 2 years	Bundle: Included ***Decision support tools*** and ***Values of biodiversity and ecosystem services.*** Work programme: Included in policy support tool activities (deliverable 4b). High priority for inclusion in rapid methodological assessment on values (deliverable 3d). Policy support tools embedded in assessment activities. Notes: Request has a national scope, but has been bundled with more general requests for access to the necessary policy support tools and capacity building.
China (1)	***Assessment of progress towards "2020 Biodiversity Targets" on national scale*** This assessment is to test whether "2020 targets"(Aichi biodiversity targets) are met and raise following actions. Assessments on the progress towards the targets should be carried out on the global, regional and national scales.	This request is relevant to the assessment function of IPBES. If we cannot met the "2020 Biodiversity Targets" (Aichi Targets), the world ecosystem will skip to the unrecoverable tipping-point. Therefore, It is urgent to assess the progress towards 2020 Targets, identify gaps and take following actions CBD requested the parties to assess the progress towards 2020 Targets in the fifth national report to CBD, therefore it is a obligation of each party of CBD. Assessments should be conducted on global, regional and national scales. The best way is the bottom-up approach. Many countries have conducted the assessment towards "2010 biodiversity targets" in the forth national report to CBD, and there were also some global assessments made by relevant institutions, which have made a solid foundation for the assessment of progress towards "2020 biodiversity targets".	The anticipated level of complexity is medium, because we have carried out the assessment towards "2010 Biodiversity Targets" in the forth national report to CBD. We have initiated indicators and methodologies for the assessment of "2010 targets", which may be suitable for the assessment of "2020 targets". It is necessary that the developing countries should be provided with capacity building.	Bundle: Included in ***Regional assessments.*** Work programme: High priority for inclusion in regional and global assessments (objective 2). Notes: Request has a national scope, but it has been bundled with requests for inclusion of Aichi 2020 targets in regional scale assessments.

Country	Intervention requested	Scientific and Policy Relevance *IPBES objectives (7a), urgency (7b), relevance (7c), geographic scope (7d), existing work (7f)*	Implications for work programme and resource requirements *complexity (7e), availability of information (7g), financial and human resource requirements (7i)*	Indication on how request was addressed
China (2)	***Biodiversity and ecosystem services assessment in ecological vulnerable area, and its relationship with human well-being*** Ecological vulnerable area is a transition region between two different ecosystem types. Ecological environment conditions of the transition regions have structurally different from the two core region of ecosystem. In addition to the fragile ecological background, the excessive interference of human activity is a direct cause.	Biodiversity and ecosystem services assessment is core function of the platform. Multi-scale assessment is a focus of the future. The sub-region scale assessment underpins human well-being. Ecological vulnerable area assessment will effectively promote biodiversity and ecosystem conservation, environment construction and the coordinated development of human economic and social. If we still think that the resources, environment and ecosystem services are free, that only can lead to reduce the welfare of the human potential, or increase the cost of maintaining this service. Therefore, the most efficient protection measure will be to begin biodiversity and ecosystem services assessment in the ecological vulnerable area, consider the relationship with human welfare and develop a plan of protection scheme.	China will active participation and collaboration IPBES process. We would like to share research results with platform members and other stakeholders, provide a practical example in biodiversity and ecosystem services assessment of the ecological vulnerable area, and improve the effectiveness of the implementation of the valuation of ecosystem services and biodiversity in different sectors. Financial resources would need to be negotiated depending on the scale of the assessment undertaken and demonstration building.	Notes: This is a relatively broad request that fits into many of the overall goals of IPBES concerning assessments. Thematic, regional and global assessments will include focuses on vulnerable areas.
China (3)	***Biodiversity and ecosystem services assessment in post-disaster reconstruction area*** Large-scale natural disasters such as earthquakes will not only endanger the safety of human life and property, and it will damage the organisms living environment, and thus undermine regional biodiversity. We recommend setting the "people-oriented" reconstruction as environmental purpose for biodiversity and ecosystem services assessment.	Biodiversity and ecosystem services assessment is an important function of the platform. The relationship between Biodiversity, ecosystem services and human well-being is the core and foundation of the conceptual framework. Set "people-oriented" reconstruction as environmental objectives, to carry out assessment of biodiversity and ecosystem services, considering the human survival and sustainable development needs to ensure focusing on sensitive areas planning to carry out an independent assessment. Such assessment programs will help developing countries improve the ability to participate in the work platform. Biodiversity and ecosystem services assessment in earthquake reconstruction area is fundamentally important for scientific planning and policy making. Previous work and existing initiatives of a similar nature: Wenchuan and Yushu earthquake in China, mostly carried out geological environment survey and evaluation, post-disaster environmental safety assessment, environmental capacity assessment, resources and environment carrying capacity evaluation, mainly for biodiversity and ecosystem services assessment is still blank.	Activity with high level of complexity. 1.Needs technical and expert support from assessment system of the platform; 2. Needs financial support during the scientific evaluation preparation for assessment processes, the implementation process of the evaluation process and assessment reconstruction demonstration zone.	Bundle: Included in ***Disaster mitigation and recovery.*** Work programme: High priority for inclusion in regional and global assessments (objective 2).

Country	Intervention requested	**Scientific and Policy Relevance** *IPBES objectives (7a), urgency (7b), relevance (7c), geographic scope (7d), existing work (7f)*	**Implications for work programme and resource requirements** *complexity (7e), availability of information (7g), financial and human resource requirements (7i)*	**Indication on how request was addressed**
China (4)	***Assessment of links between biodiversity and ecosystem conservation and poverty reduction/alleviation/prevention*** Issues to be covered include: 1) Biodiversity-poverty links and assessment of relevant evidence; 2) Value of biodiversity and ecosystem services to the poor; 3) Conflicts and synergies between poverty reduction/alleviation and biodiversity conservation; 4) Policy tools and strategies to synergize biodiversity and poverty reduction.	In the context that both biodiversity conservation and poverty reduction become political and societal goals in international society and countries, the link between biodiversity and poverty has been widely recognized by both academics and politicians. The request submitted is expected to build systematic knowledge foundation for mainstreaming biodiversity into developmental strategies at various levels. It coincides with IPBES's aim to promote effective use of science in decision-making, and to address the needs of Multilateral Environmental Agreements that are related to biodiversity and ecosystem services (for example: CBD Aichi Targets). The requested action focus on Strategic Goal D of Aichi Targets: Enhance the benefits to all from biodiversity and ecosystem services, especially Target 14, which drives efforts to safeguard ecosystems that provide essential services in taking into account the needs of women, indigenous and local communities, and the poor and vulnerable. Also, Target 2 requires to integrate biodiversity values have been integrated into national and local development and poverty reduction strategies and planning processes. To fully explore the link between biodiversity and poverty and identify appropriate policy tools is an effective way to transform the confliction between biodiversity and poverty to synergies, thus benefit a wide range of countries and regions faced with common threats in biodiversity decline and poverty, especially for LDCs.	Activity with high level of complexity. Previous work and existing initiatives: At international level, a wide range of intergovernmental organizations, NGOs and universities have been working on biodiversity-poverty relevant research. For example UNEP - WCMC, World Bank, Wildlife Conservation Society etc. It is also concern of Multilateral environmental conventions. At regional and national level, policies and practices to achieve biodiversity-development synergy are undertaken. Requirements for financial and human resources need to be further assessed and negotiated.	Bundle: Included in ***Human well-being, biodiversity and ecosystem services.*** Work programme: High priority for inclusion in regional and global assessments (objective 2). Policy tools embedded in assessment activities.
China (5)	***Build an information-sharing mechanism for the global biodiversity and ecosystem services assessment***	Information and knowledge is indispensable to complete assessment work. So, the platform should actively establish information exchange and cooperation, promote the information and knowledge sharing, update their own information collection, and regularly evaluate knowledge/information and update. Knowledge/information sharing and updating mechanism for the biodiversity and ecosystem services assessment will provide some basic data for the multi-scale /multi-subject assessment. And it can help the developing countries to improve the ability to participate in platform. Previous work and existing initiatives: At present, NGO, scientific organizations and other international organizations have set up information sharing platform. Such as GBIF. In China, there are the Chinese Biodiversity Information Yystem database etc.	At present, many countries and regions around the world have entered a great deal of research on this issue, and also published articles. There are many successful experience and cases, which will provide important sources for the construction of information platform.	Bundle: Included in ***Monitoring, data access and visualization.*** Work programme: Included in deliverable 1d (also 4a). Note: IPBES does not have the mandate to develop tools, only assess, stimulate knowledge building and provide access to such tools.

Country	Intervention requested	Scientific and Policy Relevance *IPBES objectives (7a), urgency (7b), relevance (7c), geographic scope (7d), existing work (7f)*	Implications for work programme and resource requirements *complexity (7e), availability of information (7g), financial and human resource requirements (7i)*	Indication on how request was addressed
France (1)	***Development of tools for the evaluation of a product/service life cycle on biodiversity and ecosystems*** There is a demand, especially by companies, for indicators to assess the effects of their products and services on biodiversity. They could be used to raise awareness among the public. IPBES could support the national programmes under development by bringing the question at the international level	In line with IPBES functions: tools and methods would be relevant to support policies and inform economic agents (both producers and consumers) on their impact on biodiversity. The entire product life cycle has to be studied, from the supplier to the consumer, at all scales. It includes as well the production of new scientific knowledge and capacity building. The companies are asking for such tools in order to reduce their impacts on biodiversity. It would contribute to public awareness raising as well. Evaluation of impacts of goods and services on biodiversity would help taking measures to prevent environmental, social and economic adverse effects. It stresses the importance of ecosystem services. Assessment at the global level, as national products and services are exported to developing countries in particular.	Already existing analysis of products life cycle contain gaps regarding biodiversity and ecosystems. Work on that issue is under process but a specific programme could facilitate it. No tools ready for use at the international level yet. At the national level, a study was conducted on a biodiversity indicator for food products. This could be done within 2 years. Efforts should focus on tracking local data.	Bundle: Included in ***Decision support tools; socio-economic drivers;*** and ***Sustainable management, production and consumption***. Work programme: Addressed in deliverable 4b. High priority for inclusion in regional and global assessments (objective 2). Policy support tools embedded in assessment activities. Note: IPBES does not have the mandate to develop tools, only assess, stimulate knowledge building and provide access to such tools.
France (2)	***Assessment of the interactions between biodiversity loss and land degradation (specifically desertification)*** Identifying the interactions and assessing the effects on ecosystem services would help to chose best trade-offs regarding sustainable development. A synthetic review of the scientific literature and complementary work if required is needed in order to provide decision-makers with concrete solutions to prevent land-degradation.	This area of work is part of the thematic assessment function of IPBES. Sustainable agriculture is part of the Rio Conventions' programmes but little is known about the effects of land-degradation due to the complexity of the issue. A first major step would be to gather the existing knowledge, especially on drylands, as they are the most vulnerable areas. The degradation of lands has heavy consequences, especially in Africa were it leads to food insecurity. The most vulnerable populations are too poor to implement sustainable agriculture, thus becoming even poorer because of the land degradation. Human lives are threatened. This would be relevant for agricultural and development policies, which have to fulfill the commitments taken in signing MEAs. It would contribute to the CBD Programme of Work on Dry and Sub-humid Lands Biodiversity, the UNCCD Strategic Plan 2008-2018 and several Aichi Targets. The study needs to be conducted at the global level, taking into account differences across continents and types of degradation.	The issue is complex because of the variety of types and causes of land degradation. More than scientific research, it should lead to the design of new agricultural practices. 2 international scientific conferences were organized by UNCCD. The works of the FAO Global Soil Partnership and the Global Soil initiatives are relevant as well. Reasonably large body of recent and fast-growing scientific literature is available, but a synthetic work is required.	Bundle: Included in ***Restoration and degradation.*** Work programme: High priority topic for thematic assessment (deliverable 3b) and inclusion in regional and global assessments (objective 2).

Country	Intervention requested	Scientific and Policy Relevance *IPBES objectives (7a), urgency (7b), relevance (7c), geographic scope (7d), existing work (7f)*	Implications for work programme and resource requirements *complexity (7e), availability of information (7g), financial and human resource requirements (7i)*	Indication on how request was addressed
France (3)	***Assessment of agricultural options to conserve biodiversity and ensure food security*** Studies on agricultural practices contributing to the conservation of biodiversity and the role of agriculture in ecosystem services. Contribution to the international work on the issue of agriculture and food security, emphasizing the agricultural threats on biodiversity and ecosystem services and stressing how biodiversity and ecosystem services can contribute to reduce food insecurity.	This work is strongly in line with IPBES objective to assess the consequences of biodiversity loss for human societies. Providing and securing food is crucial for populations' well-being. This could be used as a pilot project for other studies related to biodiversity and human well-being. As agricultural policies are decided at a highly political level, such studies are tools supporting policy as well. The growing population in the developing world makes the question of food security even more urgent. Some agricultural practices are very harmful for soils and biodiversity. Knowledge on that issue would enable to react rapidly to this irreversible process reducing arable land. The World Bank and IAASTD identified agricultural policies as a development priority. Aichi Biodiversity Target 7is directly related to the issue. IPBES was invited by the FAO to contribute to a report, and should take this opportunity to bring inputs on overlooked issues. The action should be undertaken at the global level.	Complex interactions between agriculture and biodiversity, at different levels, from genes to ecosystems. Knowledge on the contribution of agriculture to ecosystem services is hardly available. IAASTD, and growing literature on ecosystem services provided by agriculture. Reports by institutions such as UNDP, FAO, World Bank. Study at the national level. Anticipated duration: 2 years	Bundle: Included in ***Agriculture, food security and biodiversity.*** Work programme: High priority theme for deliverable 4b and inclusion in regional and global assessments (objective 2). Priority topic for thematic assessment (deliverable 3b).
France (4)	***Assessment of how to ensure protection and sustainable use of marine ecosystems*** IPBES should prepare a contribution to the protection and sustainable use of marine ecosystems by 2018, in line with the work of the UN World Ocean Assessment.	The fast evolution of the marine environment changes our understanding and management of its ecosystems. Conservation and sustainable development objectives require the design of a strategic plan for the marine environment and the exploration of solutions to enable the continuation of all related activities. IPBES could contribute to the on-going work on this assessment, especially to ensure that biodiversity and ecosystem services are taken into account. This concern the marine environment at the global level.	Contribute to the Regular process for GRAME – ensure a cross-cutting approach to biodiversity and ecosystem services.	Bundle: Included in ***Marine systems*** and ***Sustainable management, consumption and production*** Work programme: High priority for inclusion in regional and global assessments (objective 2). Notes: Very important topic, but World Ocean Assessment fills this niche for the thematic assessment.

Country	Intervention requested	Scientific and Policy Relevance *IPBES objectives (7a), urgency (7b), relevance (7c), geographic scope (7d), existing work (7f)*	Implications for work programme and resource requirements *complexity (7e), availability of information (7g), financial and human resource requirements (7i)*	Indication on how request was addressed
France (5)	***Quantification of the impacts of global changes on biodiversity and ecosystem services*** Inventory of knowledge and quantification of related, cumulative and interactive effects of pressures on biodiversity and ecosystem services. Inventory of monitoring, quantification and assessment methods regarding global changes. Gathering, synthesizing and coordinating work on the issue.	This activity is relevant for several IPBES objectives, including policy support by stressing pressures on biodiversity to deal with in priority. The major part of the work would be to develop a standardized method to quantify the impacts, and to identify which data are required for such quantification, which is related to the assessment and knowledge generation functions of IPBES. Researchers, managers and decision-makers would then get clear, objective, comparable and easily communicable information. This issue is related to Strategic Goal B of the Aichi targets, guiding policies in order to reduce direct pressures on biodiversity. Linking climate change and ecosystem preservation is necessary to achieve the expected results. There should be a focus on some biomes or taxa but the objective is to get a regional and global perspective. The tools and methods developed would be relevant for smaller scales in future work.	This is a highly complex issue, adverse effects bearing on many biodiversity characteristics and at different levels. That is why only specific work has been done on that matter, but no generalization is available. Abundant body of literature is available. Links to GEO-BON, GBIF, IUCN red list, IPCC, etc. IPBES would enable the applicability of these at the global level.	Bundle: Included in ***Direct pressures and their impacts on biodiversity and ecosystem services*** set of bundles. Work programme: High priority for inclusion in regional and global assessments (objective 2).
France (6)	***Assessment of existing relevant scenarios with a view to identifying and meeting needs in the development of models and scenarios on the future of biodiversity and ecosystem services*** Development of models and scenarios on biodiversity and ecosystem services to assist decision-making and anticipating unwanted effects of climate change.	Scenarios on how to adapt biodiversity management to global changes have been discussed within IPBES for a while. They are necessary to help anticipating action instead of facing emergencies. They can contribute to public information as well. The issue is covered by all IPBES objectives: knowledge generation, as there is still much to do in order to get ready-to-use scenarios; assessment of the potential scenarios results in order to guide policies (policy support tools and methodologies) and capacity building for the decision-makers to use these tools. This is important to develop such tools as decisions need to be taken now in order to anticipate future effects of global changes on biodiversity and ecosystem services. Such scenarios are required as part of the global assessment of the state of biodiversity and to achieve the Aichi targets. The global, regional and local scales are concerned.	High level of complexity because of the uncertainties. The understanding of how effects affect scales differently is complex. The model validation require highly scientific expertise. The models need to be as general as possible. Large body of scientific literature exists, WCRP, WMO, MA, GEO, GBO, TEEB, etc. IPBES will need to cooperate with other institutions producing models and scenarios.	Bundle: Included in ***Scenarios and models.*** Work programme: Addressed in rapid methodological assessment on scenarios (deliverable 3c) and integral part of thematic, regional and global assessments (objective 2).

Country	Intervention requested	Scientific and Policy Relevance *IPBES objectives (7a), urgency (7b), relevance (7c), geographic scope (7d), existing work (7f)*	Implications for work programme and resource requirements *complexity (7e), availability of information (7g), financial and human resource requirements (7i)*	Indication on how request was addressed
Italy	***Assessment of and tools for Sustainable Land Management (SLM) in areas affected or sensitive to Desertification, Land Degradation and Drought (DLDD)*** Request for IPBES to acquire the scientific and technological capacity to develop and share internationally objective methodologies and tools for supporting decision making processes in addressing biodiversity conservation pursuits in the context of DDLD processes, e.g. through definition/selection of biodiversity indicators re: DLDD; relevant economic evaluation of traditional and modern SLM techniques amenable to support resilience and the conservation of ecosystem services to support the identification and development of cost-effective policies and strategies for addressing DLDD.	Request responds to the IPBES functions of assessment, knowledge generation, and development of tools and methodologies. It aims at contributing to the consolidation of IPBES capacity in term of systemic cross-sector scientific methodologies which are essential to address objectively the above relationships in support of planning and management biodiversity pursuits. The goal put forward at the Rio+20 Conference "to improve scientific and technical knowledge on economic aspects of sustainable development", and therefore SLM, should be addressed by IPBES to minimize the impacts of DLDD in terms of biodiversity loss correlated to food insecurity, poverty, unemployment and migration. The need is pressing for scientific support toward addressing the impact on biodiversity conservation of the current intensification and expansion of land degradation processes. Global geographic scope as biodiversity loss induced by soil degradation and drought affects in different ways extensive areas in all continents and different climatic setups. Additionally, test and consolidated the above capacities in pilot applications with an inter-regional geographic scope (suggestion: Mediterranean basin). IPBES has the potential to constitutes the most effective mechanisms providing scientific references tools and guidelines to redress this gap while promoting and supporting dialogue and synergy between the post Rio Conventions and relevant international processes.	Economics of SLM can be addressed at different level of complexity depending on the scale and the range of ecosystems services and processes to be considered. Supporting literature exists such as the new edition of World Atlas of Desertification which represents a valuable methodological reference for relevant SLM; but limited body of key research has been published in peer-reviewed academic journals on the cost and benefits of SLM for combating DLDD. Integrated approach to soil sustainability is a rapidly growing field of study. Requirements for financial and human resources, and potential duration of the requested action would need to be negotiated following assessment of the request by the Bureau and MEP.	Bundle: Included in ***Restoration and degradation.*** Work programme: High priority topic for thematic assessment (deliverable 3b). High priority for inclusion in regional and global assessments (objective 2). Policy support tools embedded in assessment activities.

Country	Intervention requested	Scientific and Policy Relevance *IPBES objectives (7a), urgency (7b), relevance (7c), geographic scope (7d), existing work (7f)*	Implications for work programme and resource requirements *complexity (7e), availability of information (7g), financial and human resource requirements (7i)*	Indication on how request was addressed
Japan (1)	***Assessment of the sustainable use of biodiversity within socio-ecological production landscapes*** Proposal for IPBES to appropriately evaluate and establish guidelines on the ecosystem services provided by agriculture, including and especially those of rice paddy agriculture, for the Asia Monsoon region where large human populations and biodiversity have been sustained for thousands of years.	An assessment of biodiversity and ecosystem services in light of the importance of agriculture, meets the objective of the IPBES to assess the interaction of human activity with biodiversity and ecosystem services. Within these regions, ecosystem services from local socio-ecological production landscapes have provided the resources and places necessary for human life. At the same time, from the biological point of view, these regions are also biodiversity hotspots with many endemic species and great biodiversity. These regions are now the centre of worldwide economic growth. The traditional agriculture that had supported the life of local people is being been displaced by rapid industrialization and agricultural modernization within the flow of the global economy that is now threatening severe impacts on biodiversity and ecosystem services. This initiative will contribute to biodiversity preservation in the region, as well as greatly contribute to achieving the Aichi targets adopted by COP10 of the CBD to prevent the loss of biodiversity hotspots. Suggestion to focus initially on the Asian Monsoon Region, encompassing, at least South, Southeast, and East Asian regions, as the first step. However, this programme could be applied to many regions around the world with long histories of agricultural practice.	Complex, but prototypes of assessment programs have been completed by the OECD Agri-Environmental Indicators programme. International Partnership for the Satoyama Initiative is also making progress of developing indicators on socio-ecological production landscapes including agricultural land. In addition to the OECD and CBD, a growing research literature exists on rice paddy ecosystems, fish-paddy systems, home-garden and other aspects of ecosystem services available within agricultural systems. Requirements for financial and human resources, and potential duration of the requested action would need to be determined	Bundle: Included in ***Agriculture, food security and biodiversity*** Work programme: High priority for inclusion in regional and global assessments (objective 2). Priority topic for thematic assessment (deliverable 3b).

Country	Intervention requested	Scientific and Policy Relevance *IPBES objectives (7a), urgency (7b), relevance (7c), geographic scope (7d), existing work (7f)*	Implications for work programme and resource requirements *complexity (7e), availability of information (7g), financial and human resource requirements (7i)*	Indication on how request was addressed
Japan (2)	***Ecosystem-based Disaster Risk Reduction*** Developing guidelines, collecting best practices and holding workshops on ecosystem-based disaster risk reduction such as the usage of coastal wetlands and forest as natural barriers from tsunami for building resilience in a sustainable way. Raise awareness about the importance of ecosystem based options for DRR, both on their own and in combination with more infrastructure based options. Have case studies and data to support this.	Request responds to the IPBES functions of assessment, policy support tools and methodologies, capacity building. Natural disasters and disaster risk are increasing rapidly and causing massive economic damage around the world. Such disasters are both more frequent and extreme. The recognition of ecosystem management for DRR is growing. important to provide concrete policy and practice guidance for the implementation of ecosystem/environment based options for DRR Geographic scope is global: Areas vulnerable to possible natural disasters such as earthquake, tsunami, drought and flood. It might be also useful to have more detailed risk assessments to be carried out on areas where disasters are more likely to happen. IUCN is working to enhance ecosystem management for disaster risk reduction at national and local scales around the world. In addition, the International Strategy for Disaster Reduction - Partnership for Environment and Disaster Risk Reduction (PEDRR) was formed to advance an integrated approach to disaster risk reduction, climate change adaptation, ecosystem management and livelihoods. However, according to the assessment of Hyogo Framework for Action, a priority area including natural solutions for disaster risk reduction is the least progressed area among the framework (UNISDR 2011).	Sometimes environment based options for DRR are more complex, as it is not as simple as, for example a concrete wall. But there are significant co-benefits for both the environment and for people's livelihoods. They can be used on their own, or in combination with hard infrastructure. However such environment based options also require local (community, village) support to be successful and this will depend on local governance arrangements . IUCN, PEDRR, UNISDR. Availability of good practices around the world and expertise available to support capacity building Approx. US$ 300,000 for holding expert workshops and drafting reports	Bundle: Included in ***Disaster mitigation and recovery*** and also referred to in the bundle on ***conservation and sustainable use of forest ecosystems*** Work programme: High priority for inclusion in regional and global assessments (objective 2).

Country	Intervention requested	Scientific and Policy Relevance *IPBES objectives (7a), urgency (7b), relevance (7c), geographic scope (7d), existing work (7f)*	Implications for work programme and resource requirements *complexity (7e), availability of information (7g), financial and human resource requirements (7i)*	Indication on how request was addressed
Japan (3)	***A Global Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services Assessment*** Preparation of global biodiversity and ecosystem services assessment which will substitute Global Biodiversity Outlook 5 (GBO 5). In order for IPBES to conduct this and other assessment work, a long-term framework for biodiversity data provision and use should be developed with close consultation with GBIF	Request is directly related to the Assessment function of the Platform and follows Decision XI/13 the Conference of the Parties to the CBD on IPBES. Currently GBO-4 is under preparation by the CBD and the output is supposed to be presented at the CBD/COP12, to be held in October 2014- The first IPBES global assessment on biodiversity and ecosystem services should be initiated based on the GBO-4, however, the development of a long-term framework for biodiversity data provision and use should be commenced as soon as possible. With regard to the requested assessment, the series of GBOs conducted by CBD should be referred to as previous works. If IPBES were not to take the lead to conduct such an assessment and CBD were to conduct GBO5, there could be unnecessary overlap in their efforts. Although GBIF has the information infrastructure for biodiversity data and mobilizes significant useful data content, its reach in terms of geographic, temporal and taxonomic coverage is limited. The wider membership reach of IPBES makes it well suited to encourage and enable increased efforts in data availability.	With regard to the requested assessment, the level of complexity is likely the same as the preparation of GBO-4. The data provision and use framework development with GBIF would not be as complicated, as GBIF has already developed information infrastructure and is willing to collaborate with IPBES. Wide range of available data and info. The CBD has accumulated knowledge of conducting GBO. Extensive expertise in operating an open data infrastructure resides in the GBIF Secretariat and its community of national nodes.	Bundle: Included in ***Global assessment***. Related to ***Monitoring, data access and visualisation.*** Work programme: Included as deliverable 3c.
Mexico (1)	***Satellite monitoring of ecosystem transformation, fragmentation, loss of connectivity.*** Provision and establishment of tools and best practices to assess and address threats to biodiversity	Request responds to the IPBES functions of tools and methodologies, capacity building There is a need for specific technologies and capacities. Geographical scope covers global, regional, national, subnational levels.	Regarding financial recourse requirements, satellite imagery analysis costs likely to be high.	Bundle: Included in ***Monitoring, data access and visualization.*** Work programme: Partially included in deliverable 3d. Note: IPBES does not have the mandate to develop or run monitoring programs. This will be done in collaboration with partners having this mandate.

Country	Intervention requested	Scientific and Policy Relevance *IPBES objectives (7a), urgency (7b), relevance (7c), geographic scope (7d), existing work (7f)*	Implications for work programme and resource requirements *complexity (7e), availability of information (7g), financial and human resource requirements (7i)*	Indication on how request was addressed
Mexico (2)	***Methodologies to assess impacts of different pollution agents on biodiversity components*** Provision and establishment of tools and best practices to assess and address threats to biodiversity:	Request responds to the IPBES functions of tools and methodologies, capacity building There is a need for specific technologies and capacities. Geographical scope covers global, regional, national, subnational levels.		Bundle: Included in ***Pollution*** Work programme: High priority for regional and global assessments (objective 2).
Mexico (3)	***Protocols and information systems to monitor invasive species distribution and impacts on ecosystems (early warning systems).*** Provision and establishment of tools and best practices to assess and address threats to biodiversity.	Request responds to the IPBES functions of tools and methodologies, capacity building There is a need for specific technologies and capacities. Geographical scope covers global, regional, national, subnational levels.		Bundle: Included in ***Invasive species.*** Also addressed in ***Identifying and addressing capacity building needs*** and ***decision support tools.*** Work programme: High priority topic for thematic assessment (deliverable 3b). High priority for regional and global assessments (objective 2).

Country	Intervention requested	Scientific and Policy Relevance *IPBES objectives (7a), urgency (7b), relevance (7c), geographic scope (7d), existing work (7f)*	Implications for work programme and resource requirements *complexity (7e), availability of information (7g), financial and human resource requirements (7i)*	Indication on how request was addressed
Mexico (4)	***Modeling at different scales of biodiversity adaptation according to difference climate change scenarios.*** Provision and establishment of tools and best practices to assess and address threats to biodiversity.	Request responds to the IPBES functions of tools and methodologies, capacity building There is a need for specific technologies and capacities. Geographical scope covers global, regional, national, subnational levels.	Regarding financial recourse requirements, considerable financial resources required for comprehensive approach to modeling	Bundle: Included in ***Climate change*** and ***Scenarios and models***. Also addressed in ***Identifying and addressing capacity building needs*** and ***decision support tools.*** Work programme: High priority for regional and global assessments (objective 2). Included in rapid methodological assessment on scenarios and models (deliverable 3c). Policy tools and capacity building embedded in assessments.

Country	Intervention requested	Scientific and Policy Relevance *IPBES objectives (7a), urgency (7b), relevance (7c), geographic scope (7d), existing work (7f)*	Implications for work programme and resource requirements *complexity (7e), availability of information (7g), financial and human resource requirements (7i)*	Indication on how request was addressed
New Zealand	***Thematic assessment of pollination services*** A global thematic assessment of pollination services as an early demonstration of IPBES's ability to conduct assessments at this scale. Pollination services is a highly focused subject that already has significant amounts of suitable literature and country specific initiatives, but whose impact is still limited by the lack of global policy uptake and implementation effort.	Request responds to the IPBES functions of provision of thematic assessments. Pollination services are critical for ecosystem wellbeing in all countries. A thematic assessment would be important for both developed and developing countries, across all strata of society. Such an assessment would be critically important for indigenous peoples and communities whose wellbeing is often intricately linked to the provisioning services provided by natural areas. With increasing global populations, any reduction in food production would mean that targets to reduce poverty, increase sustainability and livelihoods would be increasingly difficult to meet. Well considered advice on methods to enhance the presence of native pollinators in landscapes of ever increasing monoculture crop production and land use intensification and ways of reducing the ever increasing impact these activities are having is urgently needed. Critical for the future land use policies and practices. Linked to Aichi targets 12 and 14. Existing initiatives include the CBD/FAO International Pollinator Initiative with region specific effort as identified below. A large percentage of this effort has focused on pollination services in relation to agriculture and horticultural production. Less effort has been targeted at key plant/pollinator interactions, critical for the maintenance of indigenous biodiversity, and the effects that their loss might have on local indigenous communities.	Average Complexity. Significant scientific literature already exists, particularly on domesticated pollinators and exotic crop interactions, but less literature on native pollinator-plant interactions. The economics of pollination services has also been traversed, primarily in relation to crop production, honey production but also in relation to payment for ecosystem services and increased livelihoods in developing countries. Globally there is significant expertise in this area that can be harnessed in a new assessment. An estimate of duration would be 12-24 months depending on the scale of the assessment undertaken.	Bundle: Included in ***Pollinators and pollination*** Work programme: Included as the topic for the rapid thematic assessment (deliverable 3a). High priority for inclusion in regional and global assessments (objective 2).

Country	Intervention requested	Scientific and Policy Relevance *IPBES objectives (7a), urgency (7b), relevance (7c), geographic scope (7d), existing work (7f)*	Implications for work programme and resource requirements *complexity (7e), availability of information (7g), financial and human resource requirements (7i)*	Indication on how request was addressed
Norway (1)	***A global assessment on status and trends, the impact of biodiversity and ecosystem services on human well-being, and the effectiveness of responses*** This also implies IPBES to deliver a set of assessments and associated knowledge generation and policy-support deliverables. In addition there is a need for IPBES to deliver a set of supportive deliverables (see following requests by Norway).	Global, regional and thematic assessments and associated knowledge generation and policy support products are identified as key deliverables in the functions and operating principles of the Platform. In accordance to CBD COP Decision XI/2 and the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020, and Aichi Targets. Geographical scope: Global	A wealth of scientific literature and activities exist. Norway stands ready to contribute with budgetary and in-kind resources in the form of expertise To be launched in 2018	Bundle: Included in ***Global assessment.*** Work programme: Included in global assessment (deliverable 2c)
Norway (2)	***A set of regional assessments***	Global, regional and thematic assessments and associated knowledge generation and policy support products are identified as key deliverables in the functions and operating principles of the Platform. There is an urgent need to initiate regional and thematic assessments and also sub-global assessments where necessary. They are important for supporting policymaking and for knowledge generation in the form of modeling, monitoring, research and use of traditional and indigenous knowledge. Such assessments are also needed as the foundation for a global assessment. Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020, and Aichi Targets Geographical scope: Regional	A wealth of scientific literature and activities exist. Norway stands ready to contribute with budgetary and in-kind resources in the form of expertise	Bundle: Included in ***Regional assessments*** Work programme: Included in regional assessment (deliverable 2b). Policy support tools embedded in assessment activities.

Country	Intervention requested	Scientific and Policy Relevance *IPBES objectives (7a), urgency (7b), relevance (7c), geographic scope (7d), existing work (7f)*	Implications for work programme and resource requirements *complexity (7e), availability of information (7g), financial and human resource requirements (7i)*	Indication on how request was addressed
Norway (3)	***A thematic assessment on critical changes in biodiversity and ecosystem services, in relation to Pollination services***	Global, regional and thematic assessments and associated knowledge generation and policy support products are identified as key deliverables in the functions and operating principles of the Platform. There is an urgent need to initiate regional and thematic assessments and also sub-global assessments where necessary. They are important for supporting policymaking and for knowledge generation in the form of modeling, monitoring, research and use of traditional and indigenous knowledge. Such assessments are also needed as the foundation for a global assessment. Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020, and Aichi Targets Geographical scope: Global	A wealth of scientific literature and activities exist. Norway stands ready to contribute with budgetary and in-kind resources in the form of expertise	Bundle: Included in ***Pollinators and pollination.*** Work programme: High priority topic for a rapid thematic assessment (deliverable 3a) and for inclusion in regional and global assessments (objective 2).
Norway (4)	***A thematic assessment on critical changes in biodiversity and ecosystem services, in relation to soils, desertification, land-degradation and drought in support of inter alia the UNCCD***	Global, regional and thematic assessments and associated knowledge generation and policy support products are identified as key deliverables in the functions and operating principles of the Platform. There is an urgent need to initiate regional and thematic assessments and also sub-global assessments where necessary. They are important for supporting policymaking and for knowledge generation in the form of modeling, monitoring, research and use of traditional and indigenous knowledge. Such assessments are also needed as the foundation for a global assessment.	A wealth of scientific literature and activities exist. Norway stands ready to contribute with budgetary and in-kind resources in the form of expertise	Bundle: included in ***Restoration and degradation***. Work programme: High priority topic for thematic assessment (deliverable 3b) and for inclusion in regional and global assessments (objective 2).
Norway (5)	***A thematic assessment on critical changes in biodiversity and ecosystem services, in relation to state of acidification and ecosystem change of oceans and its impacts on food security and human well-being***	Global, regional and thematic assessments and associated knowledge generation and policy support products are identified as key deliverables in the functions and operating principles of the Platform. There is an urgent need to initiate regional and thematic assessments and also sub-global assessments where necessary. They are important for supporting policymaking and for knowledge generation in the form of modeling, monitoring, research and use of traditional and indigenous knowledge. Such assessments are also needed as the foundation for a global assessment.	A wealth of scientific literature and activities exist. Norway stands ready to contribute with budgetary and in-kind resources in the form of expertise	Bundle: Included in ***Marine systems*** and ***climate change*** Work programme: High priority for inclusion in regional and global assessments (objective 2).

Country	Intervention requested	Scientific and Policy Relevance *IPBES objectives (7a), urgency (7b), relevance (7c), geographic scope (7d), existing work (7f)*	Implications for work programme and resource requirements *complexity (7e), availability of information (7g), financial and human resource requirements (7i)*	Indication on how request was addressed
Norway (6)	***A guide for the development and endorsement of sub-regional assessments, deliverables and capacities***	Global, regional and thematic assessments and associated knowledge generation and policy support products are identified as key deliverables in the functions and operating principles of the Platform. There is an urgent need to provide guidance that will help ensure that assessments from all level (including national) and across all themes are carried out in a coherent manner, consistent the IPBES operating principles. Appropriate guidance will help in addressing all four IPBES functions as part of the assessment process.	Millennium Assessment and TEEB manuals provide a basis of information.	Bundle: Included in ***Guidance on integrating assessments across scales.*** Work programme: Included in deliverable 2a, but also relevant to deliverable 1a.
Norway (7)	***A network of networks for strengthening the science-policy interface capacities for biodiversity and ecosystem services***	The platform also has a facilitatory and supportive role in enhancing capacities. The need to consider networking and matchmaking in the context of the work programme was identified in the intersessional process agreed in Panama. Capacity building is key to ensure a broadest possible participation in IPBES activities. There is therefore an urgent need to put in place the supportive guidance, networking and matchmaking tools. Geographical scope: national, regional, global	Many existing networks operating on which this request could build. Norway willing to contribute in the form of a technical support unit for capacity building in Trondheim, Norway	Bundle: Included in ***Networking*** and ***Identifying and addressing capacity building needs.*** Work programme: Included in deliverables 1a and 1b on capacity building.
Norway (8)	***A match-making facility for science-policy interface capacities for biodiversity and ecosystem services***	The platform also has a facilitatory and supportive role in enhancing capacities. The need to consider networking and matchmaking in the context of the work programme was identified in the intersessional process agreed in Panama. Capacity building is key to ensure a broadest possible participation in IPBES activities. There is therefore an urgent need to put in place the supportive guidance, networking and matchmaking tools. Geographical scope: national, regional, global	The purpose of this activity is to assist in locating the financial and human resource requirements that Governments and others will need in improving the science-policy interface at all levels. Norway willing to contribute in the form of a technical support unit for capacity building in Trondheim, Norway.	Bundle: Included in ***Identifying and addressing capacity building needs*** Work programme: Included in the deliverable 1b on capacity building

Country	Intervention requested	Scientific and Policy Relevance *IPBES objectives (7a), urgency (7b), relevance (7c), geographic scope (7d), existing work (7f)*	Implications for work programme and resource requirements *complexity (7e), availability of information (7g), financial and human resource requirements (7i)*	Indication on how request was addressed
United Kingdom (1)	The UK provided suggestions for consideration rather than specific requests: ***Medium term objective should build towards a global assessment of biodiversity and ecosystem services (CDB COP-10 decision on IPBES)***	Request responds to the IPBES functions of assessment, policy support, capacity building, knowledge generation. The UK welcomes the request for a global assessment of biodiversity and ecosystem services to be launched (completed) in 2018 as expressed by the Eleventh Conference of the Parties of the Convention on Biological Diversity (Decision XI/2). The UK endorses the principle of a bottom up approach in so far as a global assessment should build upon integrated regional and sub-regional assessments at a variety of scales wherever these are available, and also on relevant thematic assessments. Supports capacity building to enable participation by scientists in all regions and building partnerships.	Reference made to the structure of the UK National Ecosystem Assessment	Bundle: Included in ***Global assessment.*** Work programme: Included as global assessment (deliverable 2c).
United Kingdom (2)	The UK provided suggestions for consideration rather than specific requests: ***Short term deliverables on tools for mapping and measuring ecosystem functions and services, including indicators***	Request responds to the IPBES functions of policy support tools and methodologies Short term deliverables should aim at demonstrating the added value of IPBES (see following short terms requests by UK; urgent need to review, promote and guide the use of policy support tools, and the associated capacity building, that enable biodiversity and ecosystem services to be mainstreamed in sustainable development, poverty alleviation and other sectoral strategies.		Bundle: Included in ***Monitoring, data access and visualisation***. Also related to ***Decision support tools***. Work programme: Included in deliverable 1d on priority knowledge and data needs. Policy support tools embedded in assessment activities. Notes: Pushes limits of IPBES mandate on development of new tools.

Country	Intervention requested	Scientific and Policy Relevance *IPBES objectives (7a), urgency (7b), relevance (7c), geographic scope (7d), existing work (7f)*	Implications for work programme and resource requirements *complexity (7e), availability of information (7g), financial and human resource requirements (7i)*	Indication on how request was addressed
United Kingdom (3)	The UK provided suggestions for consideration rather than specific requests: ***Short term deliverables on methods to measure and communicate awareness of the benefits people and business obtain from biodiversity and Ecosystem Services, their impacts on biodiversity and mitigation options***	Request responds to the IPBES functions of policy support tools and methodologies Short term deliverables should aim at demonstrating the added value of IPBES (see following short terms requests by UK; urgent need to review, promote and guide the use of policy support tools, and the associated capacity building, that enable biodiversity and ecosystem services to be mainstreamed in sustainable development, poverty alleviation and other sectoral strategies.		Bundle: included in ***Values of biodiversity and ecosystem services*** and ***Communications*** Work programme: Included in proposed rapid methodological assessment on values (deliverable 3d) and in communication (deliverable 4c). High priority for inclusion in all assessment activities.
United Kingdom (4)	The UK provided suggestions for consideration rather than specific requests: ***Short term deliverables on measuring how society values biodiversity and ecosystem services, including non-monetary values and developing tools to include values and trade-offs in decision making***	Request responds to the IPBES functions of policy support tools and methodologies Short term deliverables should aim at demonstrating the added value of IPBES (see following short terms requests by UK; urgent need to review, promote and guide the use of policy support tools, and the associated capacity building, that enable biodiversity and ecosystem services to be mainstreamed in sustainable development, poverty alleviation and other sectoral strategies.		Bundle: Included in ***Values of biodiversity and ecosystem services*** and ***Human well-being, biodiversity and ecosystem services.*** Also related to ***communications*** Work programme: Included in proposed rapid methodological assessment on values (deliverable 3d). High priority for inclusion in regional and global assessments.

Country	Intervention requested	Scientific and Policy Relevance *IPBES objectives (7a), urgency (7b), relevance (7c), geographic scope (7d), existing work (7f)*	Implications for work programme and resource requirements *complexity (7e), availability of information (7g), financial and human resource requirements (7i)*	Indication on how request was addressed
United Kingdom (5)	The UK provided suggestions for consideration rather than specific requests: ***Short term deliverables on mobilizing information and developing practical tools to integrate biodiversity and ecosystem services into development and poverty reduction strategies in a wide range of situations***	Request responds to the IPBES functions of policy support tools and methodologies Short term deliverables should aim at demonstrating the added value of IPBES (see following short terms requests by UK; urgent need to review, promote and guide the use of policy support tools, and the associated capacity building, that enable biodiversity and ecosystem services to be mainstreamed in sustainable development, poverty alleviation and other sectoral strategies.		Bundle: Included in ***Human well-being, biodiversity and ecosystem services.*** Work programme: Partially included in proposed rapid methodological assessment on values (deliverable 3d). High priority for inclusion in regional and global assessments.
United Kingdom (6)	The UK provided suggestions for consideration rather than specific requests: ***Early products on knowledge generation***	May include a strategy for mobilization of knowledge and data to feed into assessments, and identification of priorities for research as an input to Future Earth and other research funding initiatives. Early deliverables will also include a conceptual framework to underpin the work of IPBES.		Bundle: Included in ***Knowledge generation.*** Work programme: Included in deliverable 1d on priority knowledge and data needs and embedded in assessment activities.

Country	Intervention requested	Scientific and Policy Relevance *IPBES objectives (7a), urgency (7b), relevance (7c), geographic scope (7d), existing work (7f)*	Implications for work programme and resource requirements *complexity (7e), availability of information (7g), financial and human resource requirements (7i)*	Indication on how request was addressed
Requests from Multilateral Environmental Agreements				
Convention on Biological Diversity (1)	The COP invites IPBES to prepare a ***global assessment on biodiversity and ecosystem services***, focusing on status and trends, the impact of biodiversity and ecosystem services on human well-being, and effectiveness of responses, including the Strategic Plan and its Aichi Biodiversity Targets, building, inter alia, on its own and other relevant regional, subregional and thematic assessments, as well as national reports. The COP has requested the CBD Executive Secretary to explore with IPBES options for preparation of a global assessment on biodiversity and ecosystem services, including its implications for future editions of the GBO.	Parties to the CBD have adopted the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and committed to contribute to its implementation by setting national targets related to the Aichi Biodiversity Targets, updating their National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans (NBSAPs) and adopting these as policy tools. Implementation of NBSAPs will require access to data, tools and resources as well as political will based on the mainstreaming of biodiversity into sectoral, financial and national development processes. The Platform has a significant potential to assist countries in these processes. There is an urgency to address biodiversity loss and to consider – and address - its underlying causes. The lack of engagement and the absence of such action would risk a failure to achieve the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020. The assessment should build upon, inter alia, on its own and other relevant regional, subregional and thematic assessments. Indeed, in the initial discussions on the IPBES work programme, there appears to be emerging consensus that a global assessment undertaken within the context of IPBES should be carried out in a bottom-up approach, starting with a suite of regional/subglobal assessments, complemented by thematic assessments on priority issues, all of which would then collectively feed into a global assessment as an integral part of the multi-scale assessment.	Given the complexity of the multi-scale assessment envisioned it will be challenging to have a thoroughly reviewed report, approved by the IPBES Plenary in time to inform the discussions at the Conference of the Parties in 2018. However it would be important that the global assessment of biodiversity and ecosystem services scheduled so as to enable its endorsement by the IPBES Plenary at such a time that the assessment can be considered by the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity no later than its meeting in 2020.	Bundle: Included in ***Global assessment.*** Work programme: Included as global assessment (deliverable 2c).
Convention on Biological Diversity (2)	The COP has requested IPBES to ***build on and contribute to the preparations of the fourth edition of the Global Biodiversity Outlook***	The COP has requested the Executive Secretary of the CBD to collaborate with and engage the IPBES in the preparations of the fourth edition of the Global Biodiversity Outlook, as appropriate and in accordance with their respective mandates.		Bundle: Included in ***Global assessment.*** Work programme: Included as global assessment (deliverable 2c). Note: Timing and content to be discussed with CBD

Country	Intervention requested	Scientific and Policy Relevance *IPBES objectives (7a), urgency (7b), relevance (7c), geographic scope (7d), existing work (7f)*	Implications for work programme and resource requirements *complexity (7e), availability of information (7g), financial and human resource requirements (7i)*	Indication on how request was addressed
Convention on Biological Diversity (3)	The COP has requested IPBES to ***contribute to assessments of the achievement of the Aichi Biodiversity Targets***	Parties to the CBD have adopted the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and committed to contribute to its implementation by setting national targets related to the Aichi Biodiversity Targets, updating their NBSAPs and adopting these as policy tools. Implementation of NBSAPs will require access to data, tools and resources as well as political will based on the mainstreaming of biodiversity into sectoral, financial and national development processes. The Platform has a significant potential to assist countries in these processes. There is an urgency to address biodiversity loss and to consider and address its underlying causes. The lack of engagement and the absence of such action would risk a failure to achieve the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020.		Bundle: Included in some form in most bundles so not explicitly indicated in Annex 2. Work programme: Included in many aspects of the work programme.
Convention on Biological Diversity (4)	The COP has requested IPBES to ***provide information on policy options available to deliver the 2050 Vision of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020***	Parties to the CBD have adopted the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and committed to contribute to its implementation by setting national targets related to the Aichi Biodiversity Targets, updating their NBSAPs and adopting these as policy tools. Implementation of NBSAPs will require access to data, tools and resources as well as political will based on the mainstreaming of biodiversity into sectoral, financial and national development processes. The Platform has a significant potential to assist countries in these processes. There is an urgency to address biodiversity loss and to consider and address its underlying causes. The lack of engagement and the absence of such action would risk a failure to achieve the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020.		Bundle: Included in some form in most bundles so not explicitly indicated in Annex 2. Work programme: Included in many aspects of the work programme.

Country	**Intervention requested**	**Scientific and Policy Relevance** *IPBES objectives (7a), urgency (7b), relevance (7c), geographic scope (7d), existing work (7f)*	**Implications for work programme and resource requirements** *complexity (7e), availability of information (7g), financial and human resource requirements (7i)*	**Indication on how request was addressed**
Convention on Biological Diversity (5)	There are a number of ***other potential interventions*** identified in CBD COP decisions, and these are identified in an annex to the CBD submission.	Parties to the CBD have taken a wide range of decisions that include elements relevant to the mandate of IPBES. All of the identified activities are intended to support implementation of the CBD and national and international levels. Particularly relevant are: o Assessment of ecological and socio-economic implications for trends in pollinator populations o Assessment of soil biology, fertility and the ecological and socio-economic implications of soil loss o Assessment of options to mitigate land use change and restore degraded ecosystems o Training in use of scenarios o Capacity building and training in use of valuation tools o Capacity building for LMO management o Policy support tools		Bundle: Included in ***Pollinators and pollination; Restoration and degradation; Scenarios and models; Values of biodiversity and ecosystem services; Identifying and addressing capacity building needs; Agriculture, food security and biodiversity;*** and ***Decision support tools*** Work programme: Included in proposed rapid thematic assessment on pollination and food production (deliverable 3a), thematic assessment on degradation and restoration (deliverable 3b), rapid methodological assessments of scenarios and of values (deliverables 3c & d). Also broadly addressed in objectives 1 (capacity building) and 4 (policy support tools). Capacity building and decision support embedded in assessment activities.

Country	Intervention requested	Scientific and Policy Relevance *IPBES objectives (7a), urgency (7b), relevance (7c), geographic scope (7d), existing work (7f)*	Implications for work programme and resource requirements *complexity (7e), availability of information (7g), financial and human resource requirements (7i)*	Indication on how request was addressed
Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora	CITES is asking assistance from IPBES to support the making of 'non-detriment finding' (advice on whether or not trade will impact conservation status) in order to ***strengthen capacities and tools for the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity.*** They suggest that activities under IPBES might include: - assessment on relationship between harvest and trade for key species - knowledge generation, particularly for those taxa in need of further biological information - capacity building and policy support tools to sustainably manage wildlife trade	The request directly concerns the delivery of thematic, regional and global assessments relating to conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity and ecosystem services, in particular the sustainable harvest and trade of wild species, and further identification of related knowledge gaps. It is also relevant for the development of policy support tools and methodologies to enhance sustainable wildlife management schemes (including the establishment and management of harvest and export quotas), to aid compliance and enforcement measures, and to address capacity building needs in countries of origin. Example: One could examine the relationship between harvest and trade for key species where there is relatively good data, providing an account of the ecological, commercial and social factors that affect whether harvest and trade have positive or negative impacts on wild populations. The knowledge generated from such assessments can then be coupled with necessary capacity building tools to sustainably manage wildlife trade. According to the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment overexploitation is among the top 5 direct drivers of biodiversity loss, and trends indicate that the current situation will worsen if urgent measures are not taken. In order to ensure that wildlife harvest and trade are carried out in a sustainable manner, technical tools, protocols and capacity building activities are needed to support decision making, compliance and enforcement.	This activity is of medium complexity. Available scientific literature and expertise: CITES Appendices and related case studies and toolkits; Resolution Conf. 16.xx on Non-detriment findings (as recently adopted by CITES CoP16, and soon to be made available in the 'Resolutions' section of the CITES website), and other guidance work on how to develop NDFs. Human resources: Policy or decision makes, practitioners and scientists (both natural and social) specialized in wildlife management and related trade, population assessments, and forensic science.	Bundle: Included in ***Sustainable management, consumption and production***. Work programme: Priority topic for thematic assessment (deliverable 3b). High priority for inclusion in regional and global assessments (objective 2).

Country	Intervention requested	Scientific and Policy Relevance *IPBES objectives (7a), urgency (7b), relevance (7c), geographic scope (7d), existing work (7f)*	Implications for work programme and resource requirements *complexity (7e), availability of information (7g), financial and human resource requirements (7i)*	Indication on how request was addressed
Convention on Migratory Species (1)	***An assessment of the ecological function of migratory species*** This assessment would also address the impact of global environmental change (e.g. land-use change, habitat fragmentation, climate change, pollution, exploitation, etc.) on migratory species and their ecological functions, as well as the contribution of migratory species to increasing the resilience of ecosystems in the face of global environmental change and land use.	Relevant to work programme as thematic assessment. The assessment would support policy formulation and implementation of the CMS and AEWA Strategic Plans and to the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 by providing the baseline science and information policy-makers need to consider and communicate more explicitly the impacts of migratory species as mobile links between ecosystems. Migratory species of wild animals play a very significant role in the functioning of ecosystems which in many cases still has to be fully understood. At the same time, migratory species are very vulnerable as a result of their long migrations, which involve many risks. They are, on average, subject to a greater number and variety of threats than non-migratory species. Issues to be covered include the functional role of migratory species in ecosystems, the impact of global environmental change on migratory species and their ecological functions, as well as the contribution of migratory species to increasing the resilience of ecosystems. The assessment is expected to have a significant impact on making the case for migratory species conservation, thereby contributing to the achievement of the CMS Strategic Plan and, more broadly to the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020	Activity with high level of complexity. A wealth of previous work on the functional role of species in ecosystems has been conducted. Work with a specific focus on migratory species exists but is less common, and often focused on case studies. A global assessment bringing these studies together is missing. It is estimated that undertaking this assessment will require approximately 300,000 Euro and 1 year of work.	Bundle: Included in ***Migratory Species.*** Work programme: High priority for regional and global assessments (objective 2). Priority topic for thematic assessment (deliverable 3b).
Convention on Migratory Species (2)	***An assessment of the economic value of ecosystem services provided by migratory species*** Migratory species of wild animals are a significant source of value. They provide a wide range of (provisioning, supporting, regulating and cultural) ecosystem services including food, seed and nutrient dispersal, pollination, and cultural, intellectual and spiritual inspiration. They play an important role in people's livelihoods and local, national and regional economies.	The thematic assessment would generate knowledge on the economic value of the ecosystem services provided by migratory species. It would support policy formulation and implementation under the CMS and other Multilateral Environmental Agreements. The assessment would contribute to the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity as well as long-term human well-being and sustainable development. The assessment is expected to have a significant impact on making the case for migratory species conservation, thereby contributing to the achievement of the CMS and AEWA Strategic Plan and, more broadly to the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020. A global assessment on the value of migratory species is a clear gap in this work. Case studies exist for various migratory species an attempt at a meta study to bring them together is still missing. IPBES, as an intergovernmental platform with a global reach and scope, would be best suited to undertake such a global meta study.	Activity with high level of complexity. Expertise available through TEEB and its networks. Considerable scientific literature available It is estimated that undertaking this assessment will require approximately 300,000 Euro and 1 year of work.	Bundle: Included in ***Migratory Species*** and ***Values of biodiversity and ecosystem services.*** Work programme: High priority for regional and global assessments (objective 2). Priority topic for thematic assessment (deliverable 3b).

Country	Intervention requested	Scientific and Policy Relevance *IPBES objectives (7a), urgency (7b), relevance (7c), geographic scope (7d), existing work (7f)*	Implications for work programme and resource requirements *complexity (7e), availability of information (7g), financial and human resource requirements (7i)*	Indication on how request was addressed
Convention on Migratory Species (3)	***An assessment of traditional knowledge on migratory birds.*** The assessment would make best use of traditional knowledge to assess possible historical changes in the presence, abundance and phenology of migratory birds. Traditional knowledge would be synthesized and valued through an analysis of the modern scientific literature providing biological explanations for bird patterns and behaviours.	Thematic assessment on an issue highlighted by IPBES in general: the value of different knowledge systems, including traditional knowledge, and the importance of taking them into account. It would assess the importance of traditional knowledge based on modern ornithology and science, and generate a better understanding of the scientific basis of indigenous traditions, expertise and know-how. The assessment would also contribute to local economies through raising interest about migratory birds and maintenance of traditional cultures. Contributes to the implementation of the CMS and AEWA Strategic Plans and to the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 As a first pilot case, the scope of the assessment would be regional (the Western Hemisphere flyway from Alaska to the lowest latitudes of South America).	Activity with high level of complexity. Ample existing scientific literature, traditional knowledge scattered It is estimated that undertaking this assessment will require approximately 300,000 Euro and 1 year of work.	Bundle: Included in ***Migratory Species*** and ***Values of biodiversity and ecosystem services.*** Work programme: Addressed in deliverable 1c on indigenous and local knowledge. High priority for regional and global assessments (objective 2). Priority topic for thematic assessment (deliverable 3b).
Convention on Migratory Species (4)	***Assessment of the extent to which existing major protected area systems address the needs of migratory species*** This assessment should include the issue of resilience to climate change. Such an assessment could develop global principles, building on case studies for key migratory species of all relevant taxa and geographic areas.	Activities requested are relevant to the work programme as thematic assessment (strategic review); knowledge generation,, tools and methodologies. It contributes to CMS strategic plan, and Aichi Targets 5 and 11 Global (and maybe specific case studies in Africa) IPBES is best suited to take action on this issue because addressing the needs of migratory species in protected area systems requires a solid science base that has to be translated into policy development. The request is strongly focusing on the science-policy interface of migratory species conservation.	Activity with medium level of complexity. Ample existing scientific literature, traditional knowledge scattered It is estimated that undertaking this assessment will require approximately 300,000 Euro and 1 year of work.	Bundle: Included in ***Migratory Species.*** Work programme: High priority for regional and global assessments (objective 2). Priority topic for thematic assessment (deliverable 3b).
Convention on Migratory Species (5)	***Assessment of the effectiveness of current policies governing Marine Areas Beyond National Jurisdiction (ABNJ)*** This assessment should include those areas which are currently under consideration in protecting and managing migratory species.	Activities requested are relevant to the work programme as thematic assessment; and would contribute to knowledge generation on key migratory species in ABNJs The assessment would provide crucial input into the wider ocean governance debate and would link directly with work carried out on ABNJs by the UN General Assembly, UNCLOS and the CBD. It would further support policy formulation and implementation under the CMS and other Multilateral Environmental Agreements. Previous work and existing initiatives of a similar nature: GEF ABNJ programme: FAO, World Bank and UNEP	Activity with medium level of complexity. Adequate literature exists (see full submission) It is estimated that undertaking this assessment will require approximately 250,000 Euro and 1 year of work	Bundle: Included in ***Migratory Species*** and ***Marine systems*** Work programme: High priority for regional and global assessments (objective 2). Priority topic for thematic assessment (deliverable 3b).

Country	Intervention requested	Scientific and Policy Relevance *IPBES objectives (7a), urgency (7b), relevance (7c), geographic scope (7d), existing work (7f)*	Implications for work programme and resource requirements *complexity (7e), availability of information (7g), financial and human resource requirements (7i)*	Indication on how request was addressed
Convention on Migratory Species (6)	***Global assessment on the impacts of climate change on migratory species of animals***	Activities requested are relevant to the work programme as thematic assessment; generate knowledge on the impacts of climate change on migratory species; policy support Migratory species are especially at risk due to Climate Change because they require separate breeding, wintering, and migration habitats of high quality and in suitable locations. Often, one or more of these habitats could be at risk because of changing temperature ranges, hydrological patterns and habitat loss due to increasing human pressures. Given their high sensitivity to seasonality of environmental conditions, migratory animals are powerful indicators of the effects of Climate Change. This work would contribute to the CMS Strategic Plan and Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020.	Activity with high level of complexity. Considerable scientific literature available and also expertise available through the CMS network of experts It is estimated that undertaking this assessment will require approximately 350,000 Euro and 1 year of work	Bundle: Included in ***Migratory Species*** and ***Climate change*** Work programme: High priority for regional and global assessments (objective 2). Priority topic for thematic assessment (deliverable 3b).
UNCCD	***Assessment and valuation of Sustainable Land Management in maintaining and enhancing ecosystem services and biodiversity by combating Desertification, Land Degradation and Drought.***	Thematic assessment Contributes to supporting the UNCCD strategic plan Global	High Building on LADA and other assessments	Bundle: Included in ***Restoration and degradation*** Work programme: High priority topic for thematic assessment (deliverable 3b). High priority for inclusion in regional and global assessments (objective 2).

Country	Intervention requested	Scientific and Policy Relevance *IPBES objectives (7a), urgency (7b), relevance (7c), geographic scope (7d), existing work (7f)*	Implications for work programme and resource requirements *complexity (7e), availability of information (7g), financial and human resource requirements (7i)*	Indication on how request was addressed
Inputs and suggestions from other stakeholders				
BioGENESIS	***Thematic assessment and synthesis addressing the multiple values of biodiversity in support of Aichi targets 1 and 2*** Synthesis on the topic of biodiversity values to streamline multiple definitions and ensure all the values are known and taken into account in policy processes, including development planning.	The work enters IPBES functions of thematic assessment, catalyzing new research and capacity building. The assessment will support policy decision-making. This is an urgent work to be undertaken in order to meet Aichi Targets in time. As outcomes such as national baseline surveys are already under design, it is important to ensure no biodiversity value is overlooked. This work is relevant for IPBES as it contributes to Aichi Targets 1 and 2 but the assessment of biodiversity values is required for IPBES own work programme as well. It will be helpful for IPBES to work further on Aichi Targets as requested by the CBD. Biodiversity values would be assessed at a global, national and local scale.	Medium level of complexity, due to the need of a multidisciplinary approach and the numerous terminologies and opinions related to the topic, which need to be synthesised. Considerable scientific literature available but expertise required for the multidisciplinary approach of the question. IPBES is suited for such work. Authors/ investigators to undertake the assessment are needed, perhaps modeled on the approach taken for the MA. Funding is required for two meetings (1 ‘large’ and 1 ‘small’)	Bundle: Included in ***Values of biodiversity and ecosystem services.*** Work programme: Included in rapid methodological assessment on values (deliverable 3d). High priority for inclusion in regional and global assessments.

Country	Intervention requested	Scientific and Policy Relevance *IPBES objectives (7a), urgency (7b), relevance (7c), geographic scope (7d), existing work (7f)*	Implications for work programme and resource requirements *complexity (7e), availability of information (7g), financial and human resource requirements (7i)*	Indication on how request was addressed
BirdLife International	***A regional assessment of the magnitude, distribution and value of ecosystem services arising from the coastal zone of the East Asian-Australasian Flyway*** With a focus on coastal, including inter-tidal, wetlands of East and South-East Asia, aiming to synthesise and analyse information in support of decision-making related to coastal ecosystems. It will consist in reviewing tools and outlining options. ***A review of policy-relevant tools and processes for coastal zone management*** That could be valuable in developing ecologically sustainable options for national-, provincial- and local-level decisions impacting on the coastal zone in this region.	This is directly relevant to the objective of IPBES to provide policy-makers with a strong scientific basis on biodiversity and policy-making. This is related to its functions of assessment, producing policy-relevant tools and methodologies, generation of knowledge (by indentifying and prioritizing gaps) and capacity development (by sharing information). No research on the value of ecosystem services was undertaken at the regional or national level in Asia. This is important to conduct such researches for coastal zone development, especially because coastal habitats lost is occurring at a fastest rate in this region. Biodiversity and ecosystem services are affected. It supports the integration of biodiversity and ecosystem services into policies at local and regional levels pertaining to land use and coastal management and in stimulating capacity development. It contributes to the achievement of Aichi Targets, obligations under the Ramsar Convention, Convention on Migratory Species and Resolution 28 of the 5th IUCN World Conservation Congress. It corresponds to the request of the MEAs' COPs. Existing work deals with the global scale only or do not offer a synthesis approach. Some scientific research is going on but does not always make the link with policy. National level – countries within the EEAF that have coasts (20 countries)	The issues are complex but analysis of current information and policy tools should not be so difficult. The main problem might be that existing literature to be reviewed is in several languages. Considerable scientific literature is available on that issue, and a UNEP project was conducted at a sub-regional level. Cost: $300K Duration: 1 year Human resources required are 1 or 2 experts engaging with a network of scientists and other stakeholders at the national level. It would be mainly a desk study with some country visits as required, and a work of translation at some point.	Bundle: Included in ***Coastal systems*** and ***Migratory species.*** Work programme: High priority for inclusion in regional and global assessments (objective 2). Priority topic for thematic assessment (deliverable 3b).

Country	Intervention requested	Scientific and Policy Relevance *IPBES objectives (7a), urgency (7b), relevance (7c), geographic scope (7d), existing work (7f)*	Implications for work programme and resource requirements *complexity (7e), availability of information (7g), financial and human resource requirements (7i)*	Indication on how request was addressed
GBIF	***Long-term framework for biodiversity data provision and use*** • Development of reference datasets for assessments (thematic, global, sub-global), with mechanisms to feed back into priorities for data mobilization; • A growing set of national species lists; and • Improved structures for building national and regional capacity to manage data, information and knowledge about biodiversity and ecosystem services	The development of reference datasets is relevant for the assessment function of IPBES awhile national species checklists relate to knowledge generation and capacity building. Capacity building is necessary for the management of data. This would result in GIS-based decision tools to support policy-making. A partnership agreement between GBIF and IPBES is suggested to deliver the outcomes. All IPBES activities might benefit from improved systems of managing data and information; that is why this activity could be considered as a priority. This request is relevant for many policies, including on protected areas, food security (agricultural biodiversity, pollinator services...), spatial planning and economic development. This action needs to be undertaken at the global level, to get as much information as possible relevant for IPBES work. GBIF is working on data mobilization since 2001 in collaboration with many partners, but the wide membership of IPBES would contribute a lot to that work.	There is a high level of complexity, involving technical and economic issues, along with social barriers to data sharing. These difficulties between GBIF and partners were overcome in the past though. Extensive, open access online resources is held by GBIF, that will build on the proposed data management framework. Archive of scientific literature on principles and practices of biodiversity data management are available through GBIF. Costs would be largely met through in-kind contributions, through GBIF work programme 2014-2016, although funds would be required for capacity building.	Bundle: Included in ***Monitoring, data access and visualisation***. Work programme: Included in deliverable 3d on priority knowledge and data needs. Note: IPBES does not have the mandate to develop or run monitoring programs. This will be done in collaboration with partners such as GBIF having this mandate.

Country	Intervention requested	Scientific and Policy Relevance *IPBES objectives (7a), urgency (7b), relevance (7c), geographic scope (7d), existing work (7f)*	Implications for work programme and resource requirements *complexity (7e), availability of information (7g), financial and human resource requirements (7i)*	Indication on how request was addressed
ICSU (1)	***Assessment of available knowledge, data and observing capabilities related to the implementation of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and its Aichi Targets, and design a strategy to identify and fill gaps*** I) to consider for each target the set of indicators proposed to evaluate progress; available scientific knowledge; existing data and observing capabilities to collect relevant new data to inform these indicators and assess progress; II) to identify gaps in knowledge, data and observation capabilities. Provide suggestions to build a knowledge and data generation strategy involving all relevant stakeholder in order to address these gaps; III) Assess policy support tools for each one of the targets, and propose new tools and methodologies; IV) Assess current activities on capacity building and assess and prioritize needs for further capacity building.	The detailed activities are relevant for the 4 IPBES main functions which are I) Assessment; II) Generation of knowledge; III) Policy support tools and IV) Capacity building. It matches IPBES objective by delivering information to policy-makers. In order to implement the CBD Strategic Plan on schedule (by 2020), it is urgent to have data to assess and mitigate the risk of biodiversity loss. This request addresses the implementation of the Strategic Plan on Biodiversity 2011-2020 and its Aichi Targets. The work concerns the global scale but implementation would be at multiple scales. The SBSTTA of the CBD is already working on these issues, and IPBES could collaborate with SBSTTA by building upon and expanding existing reports.	These issues are complex, especially because they require coordination between political, socioeconomic and biophysical entities. A large body of available knowledge exists but it needs to be assessed, with an emphasis on social sciences. However, there is a lack of appropriate data and there is a need to prioritise and coordinate the collection of data, building on what is being done for GEO and GEO BON. No indication on financial and human resources, nor on duration, were provided.	Bundle: Included in ***Monitoring, data access and visualisation; Decision support tools*** and ***Knowledge generation.*** Work programme: Included in deliverable 3d on priority knowledge and data needs and in deliverable 4b on policy support tools.

Country	Intervention requested	**Scientific and Policy Relevance** *IPBES objectives (7a), urgency (7b), relevance (7c), geographic scope (7d), existing work (7f)*	**Implications for work programme and resource requirements** *complexity (7e), availability of information (7g), financial and human resource requirements (7i)*	**Indication on how request was addressed**
ICSU (2)	***Strengthening the use of scenarios and models in assessments*** This request focuses on scenarios of indirect drivers of biodiversity and ecosystem services and models of the impacts of global change on biodiversity and ecosystem services.	This request is most directly related to the functions of IPBES: knowledge generation by developing the models and scenarios; capacity building to carry out scenario-based analysis and policy support by providing the basis for strengthening the use of scenarios and models on biodiversity change in policy-making. The development of scenarios and models is a priority as they will be relevant for all thematic assessments IPBES will carry out. The undesirable impacts of development on biodiversity, ecosystem services and human well-being have to be anticipated as early as possible to be dealt with. Necessary to achieve goals for protecting biodiversity and ecosystem services, like Aichi Targets. Scenarios and models are pertinent to MA, GBO-3 and Aichi Targets among other. The scope is global, even if implementation would be at multiple spatial and temporal scales. Models and scenarios are already used for assessments but gaps remain, especially regarding biodiversity and ecosystem services and the drivers affecting them.	A high level of complexity is anticipated. There is a large body of available knowledge that is growing very rapidly. The financial and human resources requirements depend on the scope of the actions so it is difficult to estimate them at that stage.	Bundle: Included in ***Scenarios and models.*** Work programme: Included in rapid methodological assessment on scenarios (deliverable 3c) and integral part of thematic, regional and global assessments (objective 2).

Country	Intervention requested	Scientific and Policy Relevance *IPBES objectives (7a), urgency (7b), relevance (7c), geographic scope (7d), existing work (7f)*	Implications for work programme and resource requirements *complexity (7e), availability of information (7g), financial and human resource requirements (7i)*	Indication on how request was addressed
ICSU (3)	***Social assessment*** Assess and synthesize scientific and other forms of knowledge so as to better understand the transition to the equitable and sustainable access and use of biodiversity and ecosystem services Improving the information available for decisions and informing relevant stakeholders to press for necessary change. Provide policymakers and the public with state of the art scientific information on the behavioural and cultural drivers of global environmental change, as well as likely and preferred behavioural and cultural responses.	The work corresponds to IPBES objectives: the work is in first place relevant for the assessment function but it would provide support tools for policy and private sector, would lead to capacity building at all scales and generate new knowledge by developing methodologies for cross-sectoral assessment as well. No assessment addresses indirect drivers of changes in biodiversity and ecosystem services while they are root problems. It is urgent to fill this gap in order to make policy decisions addressing in a more efficient way what is at stake. The specific policies and processes addressed are the implementation of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and its Aichi Targets in particular targets 1 to 4. There is a growing literature on the issue but no prior assessment exercise. The scope is global but implementation would be at multiple scales.	The issue is highly complex as human systems are themselves complex, non-linear and uncertain. There is a large body of available knowledge that would need to be assessed. One key area would relate to social sciences, since issues related to indirect drivers of change such as values, behaviours and institutions have been highlighted by the CBD as key obstacles in reaching the 2010 target, and represent therefore a priority for 2020. Indications on human and financial resources and duration were not provided.	Bundle: Included in ***Socio-economic drivers***. Work programme: High priority for inclusion in regional and global assessments (objective 2). Partly addressed in rapid methodological assessment on scenarios (deliverable 3b).

Country	Intervention requested	Scientific and Policy Relevance *IPBES objectives (7a), urgency (7b), relevance (7c), geographic scope (7d), existing work (7f)*	Implications for work programme and resource requirements *complexity (7e), availability of information (7g), financial and human resource requirements (7i)*	Indication on how request was addressed
Institut des Foraminiferes Symbiotiques	***Cryogenic Saving of Earth Biodiversity*** Request that IPBES considers the subject of a huge programme of Cryogenic Saving of Earth Biodiversity: To put a maximum biodiversity in cryogenic saving, in liquid nitrogen, for recovery after our coming "Global Change" time, not for us but for our descendants.	The suggested activity- to put a maximum biodiversity for cryogenic saving in liquid nitrogen - is not relevant to the objective, functions and work programme of IPBES. The suggestion put forward seems also not relevant to any other policy or processes at international or other level relevant to IPBES.	It requires 1000 big cryogenic tanks, an investment of 150 M$ with building, and running cost 5 M$ per year. Plus the mobilisation of 100 000 scientists and volunteers to collect samples over 10 years. Or 5000 salaried employees for 10 years, crude 300 M$. Or step by step, first a working group of ten scientists during two years and a Mauritian project (75 k€); and 1 million $ for the Frozen Ark of cryogenic saving of threatened species ; at end a worldwide effort of 200-500 million $ for one/three decade(s) with about 100 000 scientists involved.	Not considered to be within the IPBES mandate

Country	Intervention requested	Scientific and Policy Relevance *IPBES objectives (7a), urgency (7b), relevance (7c), geographic scope (7d), existing work (7f)*	Implications for work programme and resource requirements *complexity (7e), availability of information (7g), financial and human resource requirements (7i)*	Indication on how request was addressed
IUCN	Suggests that IPBES would prioritize in its work the responses to the decision taken at CBD COP requesting that IPBES contribute to **assessments in support of the achievement of the Aichi Biodiversity Targets.** This could be reached , e.g., through: - Enhancing the work of the Biodiversity Indicator Partnership (BIP), focusing in particular on Aichi Targets 10, 16 and 17, and 5; - taking into account Aichi Targets in its sub-regional, regional and global assessments; - Drawing on national reports to the CBD about capacity-building; - Tracking indicators measuring achievements of the Aichi Targets and providing assistance on developing modeling approaches.	The 4 functions of IPBES are required in order to achieve Aichi Targets, but this task focuses on Assessments. The platform is relevant to lead this interdisciplinary approach. This work is urgent as there is a schedule settled for the achievement of the CBD Strategic Plan on Biodiversity. This is thus directly relevant for the implementation of the Strategic Plan on Biodiversity 2011-2020 and its Aichi Targets. The geographical scope of the request is regional to global (as appropriate). There is already existing work by the BIP.	There is no existing literature specified but IUCN offers to share its data, information and knowledge on the issues. The duration of IPBES work should be aligned with the one of the Strategic Plan. IUCN would like to propose as inputs in IPBES work its data, information and knowledge particularly related to assessments of status and trends of species, protected areas, ecosystem management relevant for water and food security, climate change mitigation and adaptation, disaster risk reduction, and natural resource governance.	Bundle: Included in ***Regional Assessments; Global Assessments;*** and ***Monitoring, data access and visualisation.*** Work programme: Included in deliverable 1d on priority knowledge and data needs. Included in regional and global assessments (objective 2).

Country	Intervention requested	Scientific and Policy Relevance *IPBES objectives (7a), urgency (7b), relevance (7c), geographic scope (7d), existing work (7f)*	Implications for work programme and resource requirements *complexity (7e), availability of information (7g), financial and human resource requirements (7i)*	Indication on how request was addressed
National Institute for Environmental Studies Japan (1)	***Assessing the impact of climate change on biodiversity and ecosystem services*** Climate change is affecting distribution and activity of organisms, and is regarded as one of the major threats to biodiversity. Greater understanding is needed of the impacts of climate change on biodiversity so that action can be taken to mitigate its effects.	Climate change is a prominent factor affecting distribution and activity of organisms, and therefore assessment of its impacts is significant. Climate change is already causing changes, especially in the marine environment, and increased understanding is critical to mitigation action. Climate change as an issue is important at both regional and global levels. IPCC publishes reports on relevant issues, but the topic is broad and information on biodiversity and information services is limited. Increased collaboration with IPCC is needed	Build on work in IPCC reports.	Bundle: Included in ***Climate change.*** Work programme: High priority for inclusion in regional and global assessments (objective 2).
National Institute for Environmental Studies Japan (2)	***Assessment of the effectiveness of conservation measures*** With respect to Aichi Biodiversity Targets 11 and 1 in particular it is important to understand the effectiveness of conservation measures so as to ensure that resources are reasonably and efficiently allocated.	Suggestions and inputs are highly relevant to achieving the Aichi targets. This is highly urgent because of the lack of global evaluation f the effectiveness of conservation measures. This is highly relevant to achieving Aichi Biodiversity Targets 11 and 12. Relevant at all levels, although in early phases this may be easier t assess at national or regional levels. Little previous work because of lack of exhaustive assessments of quantitative extinction risks of threatened species with high spatial resolution. Action essential for appropriate evaluation of Aichi Biodiversity Targets.	Relatively complex because of the need for significant stakeholder involvement and associated capacity building across a wide range of countries. Some literature and practice to build on. Highly dependent on existing data and capacity.	Bundle: Relevant to ***Monitoring, data access and visualisation*** and ***Decision support tools.*** Work programme: Addressed in deliverable 1d on knowledge and data needs and deliverable 4d on policy support tools

Country	**Intervention requested**	**Scientific and Policy Relevance** *IPBES objectives (7a), urgency (7b), relevance (7c), geographic scope (7d), existing work (7f)*	**Implications for work programme and resource requirements** *complexity (7e), availability of information (7g), financial and human resource requirements (7i)*	**Indication on how request was addressed**
National Institute for Environmental Studies Japan (3)	***Platform for sharing information on the identification and control of invasive alien species*** Invasive alien species are identified as a severe causative agent of biodiversity decline. However risks and impacts vary among countries depending on a range of issues. It is important for each country to address invasive alien species urgently, drawing on the experience of others.	International platform of alien species control and quarantine. Reinforcement of quarantine system needed in every country because of increased risk of dispersion of invasive species as a result of globalization. Platform for sharing alien species information, developing associated tools and capacity building. Important to share information and knowledge globally. GTI and CABI have proposed worldwide collaboration in controlling alien invasive species, but no platform currently exists.	Issues to do with alien invasive species make this a complex problem. Can build on available scientific literature, but would also require the involvement of WTO in developing quarantine systems. Significant training would be required.	Bundle: Included in ***Monitoring, data access and visualisation*** and ***Invasive alien species.*** Work programme: Addressed in deliverable 1d on knowledge and data needs and deliverable 4d on policy support tools. Note: IPBES does not have the mandate to develop or run monitoring programs. This will be done in collaboration with partners having this mandate.
National Institute for Environmental Studies Japan (4)	***Information and capacity building on taxonomy*** Taxonomy is the basis for assessing biodiversity and ecosystem services. The number of trained taxonomists is a limiting factor for some taxa, and especially in the tropics. It is important to assess the gaps and put capacity building in place.	Taxonomy is the basis for assessing biodiversity and ecosystem services. Though the need for taxonomy is high, the number of taxonomists is limited. Relevant at both regional and global scales. Builds on the work of the CBD Global Taxonomy Initiative (GTI), identifying gaps based on information sharing.	Medium complexity. Draws on the work of the GTI. Need for taxonomists who cover both morphology and DNA analyses.	Bundle: Included in ***Identifying and addressing capacity building needs.*** Work programme: Included in deliverables 1a and 1b on identifying and addressing capacity building needs.

Country	Intervention requested	Scientific and Policy Relevance *IPBES objectives (7a), urgency (7b), relevance (7c), geographic scope (7d), existing work (7f)*	Implications for work programme and resource requirements *complexity (7e), availability of information (7g), financial and human resource requirements (7i)*	Indication on how request was addressed
Network Forum Biodiversity Research Germany (1)	***Subsidies and other fiscal tools and biodiversity*** Positive and negative impacts of subsidies and other fiscal tools on biodiversity and the role of the harmonization of public policies at the different scales. (Aichi-target 3)	Relevance: Subsidies are a major economic steering instrument. Therefore, they are relevant for several policy processes at various scales. In particular, reference to this topic is made in Aichi-target 3 and the EU-biodiversity strategy (Target 6, action17c). The TEEB study has collected estimates on global subsidies potentially harmful to biodiversity and ecosystem services (TEEB for national Policy, chapter 6, Table 6.1). In agriculture alone they amount to about 261 billion USD/ year. They are thus a major economic factor and heavily influence the use of ecosystems across the globe. The scope of the topic is of global importance, although the policies are often approved at a smaller scale (e.g., on EU or state level). In the marine context, such regional or national policies have a global impact.	Status of knowledge on the topic: The mentioned TEEB report for national Policy (2009) has already gathered substantial knowledge (based on many existing assessments, e.g. from OECD, World Bank and others) on the topic – on subsidies as well as other fiscal instruments. However, a detailed assessment across regions and the different implications of the impacts of these policies on biodiversity is still lacking. This knowledge remains scattered and would profit from a detailed analysis, also with regard to the development of new or refined policy tools and methodologies.	Bundle: Included in ***Socio-economic drivers.*** Work programme: Addressed in rapid methodological assessment on scenarios (deliverable 3c). High priority for inclusion in all assessment activities.
Network Forum Biodiversity Research Germany (2)	***Sustainable use of marine ecosystems*** How to protect and altogether sustainably use marine ecosystems? (Aichi target 6)	Relevance for specific policy processes: Ensuring a sustainable use of marine systems and enabling a coherent network of marine protected areas are important issues of the CBD Aichi targets. The use of marine ecosystems has become more and more complex over the last two decades. Besides fisheries and the over-use of fish stocks, ongoing pollution, ocean acidification and deep-sea mining activities pose additional challenges. Hardly any area of the world's oceans is not affected by human activities. Many aspects need to be explored further to better account for these increasing pressures. E.g., for natural marine ecosystems, the localization of marine protected areas is utterly important, and has to be seen in the context of other large-scale drivers such as increasing temperature, reduced ice shields, release of methane or oxygen depletion (hypoxia). Furthermore, impending changes in ocean circulation may have large impacts on marine biodiversity and natural resources (see El Nino / El Nina).	Status of knowledge on the topic: The Assessment of Assessments (AoA) of marine systems (2009) is one major project in this field. If IPBES would take up the topic, it would need to be tightly linked to this process.	Bundle: Included in ***Marine systems*** and ***Sustainable management, consumption and production*** Work programme: High priority for inclusion in regional and global assessments (objective 2). Notes: Very important topic, but World Ocean Assessment fills this niche for the thematic assessment.

Country	Intervention requested	Scientific and Policy Relevance *IPBES objectives (7a), urgency (7b), relevance (7c), geographic scope (7d), existing work (7f)*	Implications for work programme and resource requirements *complexity (7e), availability of information (7g), financial and human resource requirements (7i)*	Indication on how request was addressed
Network Forum Biodiversity Research Germany (3)	***Conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity and ecosystem services in agricultural and forest landscapes*** Reconciling actions and their trade-offs. (Aichi target 7)	Relevance for specific policy processes: The overall topic is of global concern for a sustainable food production, but also for the main goal of conserving species and ecosystems. The topic is of global relevance, but faces quite different developments and challenges across the different biomes of the earth: e.g., the continuing conversion of tropical primary forests to agricultural landscapes and/or oil palm plantations has worldwide implications. Tropical forests fix a major share of global CO2; and leach nutrients which have accumulated in these systems over centuries; clear-cutting of these tropical forests leads to soil erosion which ultimately results in a rapid and irreversible decline of soil fertility. With these ongoing changes in the ecosystems and the continued fragmentation of habitats, great losses in species diversity can be expected. Similar processes are occurring in other habitats of the world, especially in intensively used agricultural landscapes that mainly focus on the ecosystem service of biomass and food production.	Status of knowledge on the topic: The general situation with regard to the topic has been thoroughly analyzed and described in the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment in 2005. For the agricultural perspective, the IAASTD delivered additional and substantial input in 2008. There is no need for repeating these efforts. Accordingly, IPBES should focus on those aspects that specifically address the needs for Aichi Target 7 and on analyzing potential actions, policy tools and methodologies to address trade-offs.	Bundle: Included in ***Agriculture, food security and biodiversity*** and ***conservation and sustainable use of forest ecosystems***, and also directly relevant to ***Restoration and degradation.*** Work programme: High priority for inclusion in regional and global assessments (objective 2). Priority topic for thematic assessment (deliverable 3b).

Country	Intervention requested	Scientific and Policy Relevance *IPBES objectives (7a), urgency (7b), relevance (7c), geographic scope (7d), existing work (7f)*	Implications for work programme and resource requirements *complexity (7e), availability of information (7g), financial and human resource requirements (7i)*	Indication on how request was addressed
Network Forum Biodiversity Research Germany (4)	***Restoration of ecosystems and their services*** Status and trends and options for action on different scales. (Aichi-target 14)	Besides the Aichi targets and the respective goals in the Rio+20 declaration, Europe has adopted a similar goal: to restore 15% of its degraded ecosystems by 2020 (target 2 of the European biodiversity strategy). The topic of degraded ecosystems and their restoration is directly linked to policy sectors such as agriculture, forests, water management, economic development and human health (see for example TEEB for National Policy 2009, Chapter 9: Investing in ecological infrastructure). Due to the global nature of the Aichi targets, the topic is globally relevant. But since the degradation of ecosystems shows significant differences among different regions of the world as well as among ecosystem types (e.g. the recovery times of ecosystem types might differ between some few years to thousands of years in specific cases), the topic needs a regional and even local approach. Knowledge about degraded systems and their restoration is mainly collected locally and strongly scattered across regions as well as across domains of knowledge, from scientific to practical and even traditional knowledge.	Currently, scientific knowledge is partly being integrated via the work of the Society of Ecological Restoration (which right now carries out a scoping study for the CBD), and is based on testing ecological concepts and theories within restoration settings, where there has been much progress in integrating knowledge in recent years. However, much of the knowledge gained from local projects is barely available beyond local contexts. IPBES work on this topic could thus help in providing an overview about lessons learned in many different regions of the world, and the conditions for successful restoration efforts using different policy tools and methodologies to achieve them.	Bundle: Included in ***Restoration and degradation*** and also relevant to other bundles. Work programme: High priority topic for thematic assessment (deliverable 3b) and inclusion in regional and global assessments (objective 2).

Country	**Intervention requested**	**Scientific and Policy Relevance** *IPBES objectives (7a), urgency (7b), relevance (7c), geographic scope (7d), existing work (7f)*	**Implications for work programme and resource requirements** *complexity (7e), availability of information (7g), financial and human resource requirements (7i)*	**Indication on how request was addressed**
Network Forum Biodiversity Research Germany (5)	***Biodiversity and food security*** Win-win situations and trade-offs and ways to promote biodiversity-agriculture integration.	The issue is covered by the Aichi targets 7 and 13. Furthermore, it is presently dealt with by the EU Common Agricultural Policy reform which was originally proclaimed to ease the trade-offs between food production and biodiversity – with minor success. Another process feeding into that debate might be the IAASTD. The topic is globally relevant since food production takes place all over the world, with the majority of the production chains becoming increasingly globalized. However, the most dramatic trade-offs between food production and biodiversity conservation in terms of land resources occur in developing countries (both in industrial and traditional production systems, like e.g. agroforestry) since here most of the global biodiversity hotspots are located. Subsequently, there will be a need to particularly assess this issue on a regional and even local level. There is a range of evidence on the trade-offs between food production and biodiversity conservation at various spatial scales.	Particularly relevant knowledge (see above) is generated through (scientific) case studies in developing countries. Those studies are mostly fed by traditional knowledge and usually draw on information about traditional farming systems and their impacts on biodiversity. Furthermore, they need to address the issue of reconciling nature conservation and development. Multilateral processes like the IAASTD and activities and reports by the FAO have also contributed considerably to the current knowledge on this topic. IPBES could compile these different sources of knowledge and thereby strengthen the biodiversity perspective.	Bundle: Included in ***Agriculture, food security and biodiversity.*** Work programme: High priority for inclusion in regional and global assessments (objective 2). Priority topic for thematic assessment (deliverable 3b). Note: IPBES does not have the mandate to develop or run monitoring programs. This will be done in collaboration with partners such as UNEP having this mandate.

Country	Intervention requested	Scientific and Policy Relevance *IPBES objectives (7a), urgency (7b), relevance (7c), geographic scope (7d), existing work (7f)*	Implications for work programme and resource requirements *complexity (7e), availability of information (7g), financial and human resource requirements (7i)*	Indication on how request was addressed
Network Forum Biodiversity Research Germany (6)	***Biodiversity, ecosystem services and health*** How BES can contribute to maintaining and improving human health in different regions of the world.	Pandemics and emerging diseases require the attention of authorities across the globe as well as rapid assessments of the underlying agents (e.g. viruses, bacteria, priones) and their infection pathways. Often the policy sectors relevant in this context –environmental and health policy – are not sufficiently connected. The issue is of global importance as the close dependency of human health on biodiversity, intact ecosystems and their services is a universal phenomenon. Assessing the chances for and consequences of the emergence of new diseases as well as policy tools and methodologies to combat them may be particularly relevant for regions where pristine ecosystems and large human populations are in close proximity to each other. There are two competing mechanisms at the interrelation between biodiversity and health – close contact with humans and (destroyed) ecosystems can lead to infectious disease (e.g. Ebola, HIV Aids) while a high biodiversity may dilute the epidemic function of pathogens. It is important to investigate this relationship in more detail to develop precautious/preventive management strategies interfacing the health and the environment sector, and thus also linking different important aspects of human well-being.	Status of knowledge on the topic: Knowledge in this field is still quite scattered across knowledge domains and a global overview and integrative studies are only starting. Among others, the WHO may have a considerable amount of data available that is relevant for this topic.	Bundle: Included in ***Human well-being, biodiversity and ecosystem services.*** Work programme: High priority for inclusion in regional and global assessments (objective 2). Policy tools embedded in assessment activities.
Network Forum Biodiversity Research Germany (7)	***Sustainable production and consumption*** How to better take into account biodiversity when creating and consuming products? Ways to integrate biodiversity and ecosystem assessments in life-cycle assessments and other relevant tools.	In endorsing this topic, IPBES would address one baseline topic relevant for the ongoing discussions for the future sustainability goals on the global level, Thereby, IPBES could highlight and further assess the role of externalizing the damages caused by the current consumption patterns in industrialized countries to other regions of the world. It would thus also contribute to (and could benefit from) the ongoing discussions on the global level, e.g. the World Business Council on Sustainable Development (WBCSD) and the WAVES programme (Wealth Accounting and Valuation of Ecosystem Services). The topic is globally relevant. The production of other consumer goods is mostly globalized and to a substantial amount outsourced into the regions with high biodiversity, i.e. particularly into developing countries. However, this displacement of the production is not only severely impacting biodiversity, but also externalizing other negative effects of the production process. Outlining the knowledge available in this context and specifying the needs for future metrics will be important for a more evidence-based discussion and policy tool development in this highly relevant field.	While the last years faced a rapid development of knowledge and understanding of the topic with regard to the more business and industry related issues (e.g., via the TEEB for Business report and the work of the WBCSD), there is a major lack of knowledge, even down to the conceptual approach level, on measuring the impact of consumption on biodiversity and ecosystem services at different levels. Estimates like Footprint indices (e.g., the ecological or water footprint) are first steps in this direction but often lack coherence and depth.	Bundle: Included in ***Sustainable management, consumption and production.*** Work programme: High priority for inclusion in regional and global assessments (objective 2). Partly addressed in rapid methodological assessment for scenarios (deliverable 3c).

Country	Intervention requested	Scientific and Policy Relevance *IPBES objectives (7a), urgency (7b), relevance (7c), geographic scope (7d), existing work (7f)*	Implications for work programme and resource requirements *complexity (7e), availability of information (7g), financial and human resource requirements (7i)*	Indication on how request was addressed
Network Forum Biodiversity Research Germany (8)	***Analysis of capacities for the compilation of baseline information*** for biodiversity and ecosystem services assessments (national and regional).	The capacity analysis proposed will be relevant for each country as baseline for their policies on conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity. It will thus directly inform international multilateral agreements, especially the CBD. Global assessments of biodiversity and of ecosystems are necessary to provide information and tools for conservation work on the ground. This is especially important for tropical countries, which in most cases do not have national inventories, red lists or any other information to prioritize for conservation work. This topic will thus be relevant on the national scale, but will inform regional and global efforts and thus support the work of IPBES on biodiversity related topics. The same applies even more for information on ecosystem services.	First overview studies on the capacities for the compilation of baseline information on species diversity have been carried out in the context of the GTI and other global initiatives. For red lists, the knowledge tools are already available through IUCN's Species Survival Commission.	Bundle: Included in ***Identifying and addressing capacity building needs.*** Work programme: Included in deliverables 1a and 1b on identifying and addressing capacity building needs.
Network Forum Biodiversity Research Germany (9)	***Methodologies for assessing environmental non-carbon benefits in relation to REDD+***	Under the UNFCCC the COP decided in Doha as an outcome pursuant to the Bali Action Plan to undertake a work programme on results-based finance for REDD+ in 2013, which will address options to incentivize non-carbon benefits (FCCC/CP/2012/8/Add.1). A core question is how to assess options of incorporating the monitoring of ecosystem-derived benefits within the carbon MRV system. Another issue is to identify the added value of non-carbon benefits in relation to the safeguard decided upon by the COP 16 in Cancun (FCCC/CP/2010/7/Add.1), taking also into account the work on safeguards undertaken by the CBD. The scope for assessing non-carbon benefits is global, but with a focus on tropical and sub-tropical forests and on the national level. Countries with high and low forest cover and with high and low rates of deforestation should be well represented.	Many studies identified changes in biodiversity following different types of forest modification or conservation, and spatial analyses have been conducted on carbon density and biodiversity with the aim to prioritize high value areas. However, a systematic approach to how environmental and especially biodiversity benefits in regard to the different REDD+ activities can be assessed and monitored is missing.	Bundle: Included in ***Socio-economic transformation to sustainability***, and also relevant to ***conservation and sustainable use of forest ecosystems***. Work programme: High priority for inclusion in regional and global assessments (objective 2).

Country	Intervention requested	Scientific and Policy Relevance *IPBES objectives (7a), urgency (7b), relevance (7c), geographic scope (7d), existing work (7f)*	Implications for work programme and resource requirements *complexity (7e), availability of information (7g), financial and human resource requirements (7i)*	Indication on how request was addressed
Pan-European Biodiversity Platform (submitted by the Russian Federation as Chair of the Platform)	***Sub-global assessment for the Pan-European Region*** Focus on areas where the available knowledge on biodiversity and ecosystem services is limited To fill the data gap between the countries of the Pan-European region; To link efficiently ecosystem services, human well-being and drivers of change; IPBES could provide experience, data, capacity and/or resources to the project.	This work directly concerns the Assessment function of IPBES. The data produced would be very useful for the 3 other functions for further projects to be led at the Pan-European level. Many changed occurred in the Pan-European region, affecting biodiversity and land-use among other, but policies did not adapt. The assessment is needed to support policies in conserving hotspots and encouraging sustainable development. This action would contribute to the reporting of the countries on NBSAPs, the Pan-European 2020 Strategy for Biodiversity, the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and Aichi Targets (including the obligations under the six biodiversity related Conventions). The scope of the work is sub-global (Pan-Europe) with a focus on the Central Asia, Eastern Europe, the Caucasus, and the Western Balkans sub-regions. Some countries of the Pan-European region already have data after carrying out ecosystem assessments. WWF and the EU were involved in such assessment the sub-regional levels.	High The constraints to the projects are the lack of data and limited financial support. The level of complexity is relatively high, especially as most of the existing data is in Russian only. Carrying out subregional assessments is a long and difficult process. There is a considerable amount of scientific data existing in Russian but is not gathered yet. The human and financial resources required depend on the scope of the assessment (number of ecosystem services and aspects of human well-being to be taken into account; temporal and spatial scale; languages...) but there is an estimation of a $1 M project during 2 years.	Bundle: Included in ***Regional assessments.*** Work programme: Inclusion in regional assessments (objective 2). Notes: Request has a single regional scope, but it has been bundled with requests for regional scale assessments.
UNEP (1)	***Complete a foresight (horizon scanning) process for biodiversity and ecosystem services.*** This aims to maintain an overview of the current and emerging issues that will affect biodiversity and ecosystem services in the short to medium term. Building on existing work around the world, this would be an initial and rapid exercise to bring IPBES up to speed with the findings emerging from various other similar efforts.	List of activities has relevance to all aspects of the work programme. The tasks identified range in urgency and risks. The tasks identified will address CBD programme of work, existing synthesis products (GEO and GBO) and feed into the environmental legislation of UN Member States. The geographic scope of the requested action is global, but also regional and national. Elements of these actions have been completed and other assessments have been undertaken.	Varying levels of complexity, with modeling and global assessments being highly complex exercises. A considerable body of scientific literature is available to build on. Financial and human resources vary according to the different areas of work.	Bundle: Included in ***Forward look mechanism*** Work programme: Suggested as an activity for the MEP and Bureau.

Country	Intervention requested	Scientific and Policy Relevance *IPBES objectives (7a), urgency (7b), relevance (7c), geographic scope (7d), existing work (7f)*	Implications for work programme and resource requirements *complexity (7e), availability of information (7g), financial and human resource requirements (7i)*	Indication on how request was addressed
UNEP (2)	***Undertake a comprehensive global assessment*** On the status and trends in biodiversity and ecosystem services and the consequences of their change for human well-being that includes global scenarios, thereby bringing scenario work from the GEO and GBO (and other relevant) processes together.	List of activities has relevance to all aspects of the work programme. The tasks identified range in urgency and risks. The tasks identified will address CBD programme of work, existing synthesis products (GEO and GBO) and feed into the environmental legislation of UN Member States. The geographic scope of the requested action is global, but also regional and national. Elements of these actions have been completed and other assessments have been undertaken.	Varying levels of complexity, with modeling and global assessments being highly complex exercises. A considerable body of scientific literature is available to build on. Financial and human resources vary according to the different areas of work.	Bundle: Included in ***Global assessment.*** Work programme: Included as global assessment (deliverable 2c). Note: Timing and content to be discussed with CBD (GBO) and UNEP (GEO)
UNEP (3)	***Undertake a regional assessment for Africa*** As a pilot, lessons learnt will then be used to undertake regional assessments for the other regions. Africa is proposed as this region was singled out in the GEO5 as a region were environmental data was less compiled and less comprehensive than in other major regions.	List of activities has relevance to all aspects of the work programme. The tasks identified range in urgency and risks. The tasks identified will address CBD programme of work, existing synthesis products (GEO and GBO) and feed into the environmental legislation of UN Member States. The geographic scope of the requested action is global, but also regional and national. Elements of these actions have been completed and other assessments have been undertaken.	Varying levels of complexity, with modeling and global assessments being highly complex exercises. A considerable body of scientific literature is available to build on. Financial and human resources vary according to the different areas of work.	Bundle: Included in ***Regional assessments.*** Work programme: Inclusion in regional assessments (objective 2). Notes: Request has a single regional scope, but it has been bundled with requests for regional scale assessments.
UNEP (4)	***Establish a data centre/data management approach*** such that data brought together and used within global and regional assessments can be made available to the global research and policy community. Following current practice, this will largely be a meta data center with links to the primary datasets maintained by other institutions that were used for the compilation work within the assessments.	List of activities has relevance to all aspects of the work programme. The tasks identified range in urgency and risks. The tasks identified will address CBD programme of work, existing synthesis products (GEO and GBO) and feed into the environmental legislation of UN Member States. The geographic scope of the requested action is global, but also regional and national. Elements of these actions have been completed and other assessments have been undertaken.	Varying levels of complexity, with modeling and global assessments being highly complex exercises. A considerable body of scientific literature is available to build on. Financial and human resources vary according to the different areas of work.	Bundle: Included in ***Monitoring, data access and visualization.*** Work programme: Included in deliverable 1d (also 4a). Note: IPBES does not have the mandate to develop tools, only to assess, stimulate knowledge building and provide access to such tools.

Country	Intervention requested	**Scientific and Policy Relevance** *IPBES objectives (7a), urgency (7b), relevance (7c), geographic scope (7d), existing work (7f)*	**Implications for work programme and resource requirements** *complexity (7e), availability of information (7g), financial and human resource requirements (7i)*	**Indication on how request was addressed**
UNEP (5)	***Support the work to measure the achievement of the 20 Aichi Targets of the CBD*** building off the work that UNEP has been facilitating in this regard; for example the CBD-mandated Biodiversity Indicators Partnership (BIP).	List of activities has relevance to all aspects of the work programme. The tasks identified range in urgency and risks. The tasks identified will address CBD programme of work, existing synthesis products (GEO and GBO) and feed into the environmental legislation of UN Member States. The geographic scope of the requested action is global, but also regional and national. Elements of these actions have been completed and other assessments have been undertaken.	Varying levels of complexity, with modeling and global assessments being highly complex exercises. A considerable body of scientific literature is available to build on. Financial and human resources vary according to the different areas of work.	Bundle: Included in ***Monitoring, data access and visualization*** and relevant to several others. Work programme: Included in deliverable 1d (also 4a). Note: This request addresses a very wide range of bundles and activities in the work programme.
UNEP (6)	***Include a strong emphasis on communicating the science and other work of IPBES*** The communication of scientific findings is a key issue that needs to be undertaken well if IPBES is to raise awareness and inform decisions by governments and other stakeholders.	List of activities has relevance to all aspects of the work programme. The tasks identified range in urgency and risks. The tasks identified will address CBD programme of work, existing synthesis products (GEO and GBO) and feed into the environmental legislation of UN Member States. The geographic scope of the requested action is global, but also regional and national. Elements of these actions have been completed and other assessments have been undertaken.	Varying levels of complexity, with modeling and global assessments being highly complex exercises. A considerable body of scientific literature is available to build on. Financial and human resources vary according to the different areas of work.	Bundle: Included in ***Communication, outreach and engagement products and processes.*** Work programme: Included in deliverable 4c on communication products and processes.

Country	Intervention requested	Scientific and Policy Relevance *IPBES objectives (7a), urgency (7b), relevance (7c), geographic scope (7d), existing work (7f)*	Implications for work programme and resource requirements *complexity (7e), availability of information (7g), financial and human resource requirements (7i)*	Indication on how request was addressed
UNEP (7)	***Pre-determine and specify a formal framework delineating what ecosystem models need to produce (i.e. outputs that are needed, rather than just available), and standards for models to report against (i.e. methods for model intercomparison, common baselines, and key output metrics).*** There are new process-based modeling approaches that may, over the long-term, fundamentally improve our ability to model ecosystems, and that can usefully complement correlative models over the short-term. Given these recent developments, it is important that a broad range of complementary modeling approaches are considered by IPBES, with the focus on outputs and capabilities rather than model structure. Critical model outputs, common baseline scenarios for intercomparison, and model reporting frameworks can be defined prior to selecting IPBES models, and be specified independently of model structure.	All aspects of the work programme, and in particular will be critical when considering policy support tools and methodologies Modeling and exploring scenarios will be a long-term effort, and the consequences of taking an inappropriate approach will be difficult to rectify. Therefore, it is urgent to consider this need at the earliest possible outset, in order to most effectively guide strategy. An added benefit is that this would be a useful tool for spurring model development, and ensuring that the types of model that are used are those that should be available, rather than using an ad hoc selection of currently available modeling approaches. Impact on predictive outputs from IPBES, which can then be used to inform or guide individual policies and processes. Numerous books and papers exist on the use of models in conservation biology. However, because this is a fast-moving field, it is important to be aware of the most recent developments, so would likely be necessary to supplement any existing reviews. Global, regional, national and local	Financial and human resources are contingent upon the strategy taken, as outlined in the main body of the request. Simply keeping a broad range of modeling approaches in consideration would require very limited resources, both financial and human. We also recommend that this issue be revisited on an annual or semi-annual basis, as the diversity of models continues to grow. The resources required to manage a process of model intercomparison and further development to address the needs of IPBES as defined by IPBES own internal reviews, would require considerable investment. This investment would be expected to come from the national science funding mechanisms of IPBES member states, and might be overseen by a Technical Support Unit established and managed by IPBES secretariat.	Bundle: Included in ***Scenarios and Models.*** Work programme: Included in rapid methodological assessment of scenarios and models (deliverable 3c). Integral part of thematic, regional and global assessments.

Country	Intervention requested	Scientific and Policy Relevance *IPBES objectives (7a), urgency (7b), relevance (7c), geographic scope (7d), existing work (7f)*	Implications for work programme and resource requirements *complexity (7e), availability of information (7g), financial and human resource requirements (7i)*	Indication on how request was addressed
UNEP (8)	***Assessment of the knowledge on threats to biodiversity at global to national scales.*** This work will help in identifying future knowledge needs, provide the basis for identifying new policy tools and methodologies. More specifically, the work is proposed as to map and model the spatial and temporal distribution of pressures and threats on biodiversity in the context of the 'Driver, State, Pressure, Response' framework.	Spatial and temporal mapping of threats to biodiversity is relevant to all functions of the work programme, though it mainly speaks to the assessments and new knowledge functions, but also has high policy relevance and would include significant capacity building. Urgent need: measuring and mapping the pressures (and drivers) of biodiversity loss will be required to inform other elements of IPBES work. The product produced would have major political impact. It would become one of the fundamental metrics of the state of the earth and pressures placed on it. Global (but built regionally using similar methodology)	The activity is not trivial, but there is a wealth of untapped potential in remote sensing data, in scientific and technical literature, and in indigenous knowledge and 'citizen science'. Meeting of scientists would be required. The work could be overseen by a Technical Support Unit (TSU). The activity would likely take 2 -3 years.	Bundle: Included in ***Monitoring, data access and visualisation*** and ***Decision support tools***. Work programme: Included in deliverable 1d on knowledge and data nees and in deliverable 4b on policy support tools.

Annex II

Bundles of requests, inputs and suggestions received by 21 May 2013, with indications of how they have been prioritized and addressed

The following table provides the link between the requests, inputs and suggestions summarized in Annex 1, and the manner in which they have been addressed in the draft work programme, including the comments made by the MEP and Bureau on relevance and priority for each bundle of requests, inputs and suggestions. The table includes the following abbreviations;

ABNJ Areas Beyond National Jurisdiction
bioGENESIS A programme of DIVERSITAS
BIP Biodiversity Indicators Partnership
BirdLife BirdLife International
CBD Convention on Biological Diversity
CITES Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species
CMS Convention on Migratory Species
COP Conference of the Parties
FAO Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
GBIF Global Biodiversity Information Facility
GBO Global Biodiversity Outlook
GEO Global Environmental Outlook
ICSU International Council for Science
IPCC Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change
IUCN International Union for Conservation of Nature
MA Millennium Ecosystem Assessment
MEA Multilateral Environmental Agreement
NEFO Network-Forum for Biodiversity Research (Germany)
NIES National Institute of Environmental Studies (Japan)
REDD++ Reducing emissions from deforestation
SGA Network Sub-global Assessment Network
TEEB The Economics of Ecosystems and Biodiversity
UNCCD United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification
UNEP United Nations Environment Programme
UNEP-WCMC UNEP World Conservation Monitoring Centre
WOA World Ocean Assessment

Bundle	Description	Specific topics in submissions	Submissions	Comments on niche for IPBES	Remarks on priority and approach
Broad-scale assessments					
Global Assessment	What are the status, trends and future trajectories of biodiversity and ecosystem services at global scales? What are the key drivers and pressures at global scales? What international governmental and institutional actions could lead to sustainability?	Could include global focus on: • Progress towards CBD Aichi 2020 targets • Progress towards CBD 2050 vision • Thematic issues identified in submissions • Need for links between assessments at different scales	Japan (3) Norway (1) UK (1) CBD (1-5) ICSU (1), IUCN, UNEP(2) and requests concerning CBD targets	Could build on recent and past global assessments, including addressing gaps. Need to coordinate with GBO work and activities leading up to 2020 CBD COP, as well as with other ongoing assessment processes.	• Assessment: Recognised as a high priority, and included under Objective 2 of the draft work programme. • Links to other request bundles: Note the significant potential to focus on thematic issues prioritized in submissions as indicated below, including those not taken up in thematic assessments. The global assessment will also draw substantially on regional assessments. • Delivery of other IPBES functions: Such an assessment will identify knowledge gaps and the need for policy support tools, and will support capacity building both directly and indirectly.
Regional and Sub-regional Assessments	What are the status, trends and future trajectories of biodiversity and ecosystem services at sub-global scales? What are the key drivers and pressures at sub-global scales? What international and national governmental and institutional actions could lead to sustainability?	Could include regional focus on: • Progress towards CBD Aichi 2020 targets • Progress towards CBD 2050 vision • Thematic issues identified in submissions • Need for links between assessments at different scales	China (1) Norway (2) UNEP (3), Pan-European Platform, IUCN, and requests concerning CBD targets	Could build on recent national MA-type assessments (e.g. UK, South Africa, Portugal). Need to coordinate with GBO work and activities leading up to 2020 CBD COP, as well as with other ongoing assessment processes. Also important to draw on national ecosystem assessments.	• Assessment: Recognised as a high priority, and included under Objective 2 of the draft work programme. • Links to other request bundles: Note the significant potential to focus on thematic issues prioritized in submissions as indicated below, including those not taken up in thematic assessments. The regional assessments will also contribute to the global assessment. • Delivery of other IPBES functions: Such assessments will identify knowledge gaps and the need for policy support tools, and will support capacity building both directly and indirectly.

Bundle	Description	Specific topics in submissions	Submissions	Comments on niche for IPBES	Remarks on priority and approach
Guidance on integrating assessments across scales	IPBES will be carrying our assessments at global, regional, subregional scales, as well as thematic assessments, and will be promoting and facilitating assessments at subregional and national levels. Guidance is needed to ensure that these are consistent and can be integrated to the extent necessary so that work carried out at one scale is relevant at another.	• Common elements and approaches to include in assessments • Guidance on integration of assessments across scales • Promoting integration of all four IPBES functions into assessments	Norway (6)	Build on experience from the MA, GBO and GEO assessments and draw on the community of practitioners represented by the SGA Network. Good guidance will not only help in ensuring consistent approaches, but will also support the identification of key capacity building needs at all levels.	• Guidelines on assessment: High priority for inclusion under Objective 2 as an early deliverable which should be promulgated widely so as to provide a basis for integrating assessments from multiple levels into global and regional assessments. • Ensuring assessments build capacity: This is a significant step in building up assessments from the local to the global, and at the same time to promote approaches that identify how to effectively build identification of knowledge gaps and capacity needs into assessment processes at all levels.
Thematic issues: Underlying drivers of change in biodiversity and ecosystem services, values and socio-economic transformation					
Socio-economic drivers	What are the socio-economic drivers of change in biodiversity and ecosystem services? How can their impacts be evaluated and included in decision making?	• Assessment of socio-economic drivers of environmental change • Economic incentives and their impacts • Trade as a driver of biodiversity change • Forestry and biodiversity	France (1) CBD (3) ICSU (3) NEFO (1)(3)(7)	Some overlap with GBO4 and related work due out in 2014.	• Component of other assessments: High priority for inclusion in global/regional assessments (Objective 2), and should be addressed in their scoping. • Delivery of other IPBES functions: Underpins identification, development and application of policy support tools, and associated capacity building.
Values of biodiversity and ecosystem services	What are the monetary and non-monetary values of biodiversity and ecosystem services? How can these values be taken into account by governments and institutions?	• Cultural, intrinsic and option values • Traditional knowledge of values • Environmental accounting • Lost opportunities through not acting	Australia Belarus UK (3)(4) CBD (3)(5) CMS (2)(3) bioGENESIS	Strongly related to completed and ongoing work of TEEB. Some overlap with GBO4. This would require close collaboration with these activities.	• Methodological assessment: High priority for rapid evaluation (Objective 3), as this is an essential foundation for all work of IPBES and is highly relevant to multiple MEAs. • Guidance: The evaluation will provide guidance on how to integrate values of biodiversity and ecosystem services into all IPBES assessments. • Delivery of other IPBES functions: Underpins identification, development and application of policy support tools, and associated capacity building.
Human well-being, biodiversity and ecosystem services	What role do biodiversity and ecosystem services play in supporting human well-being?	• Biodiversity and poverty reduction • Biodiversity and health	China (4) UK (4)(5) CBD (3) NEFO (6)	Addressed in different ways in a number of assessments, and with a growing body of literature and practical experience.	• Component of other assessments: High priority for inclusion in global/regional assessments (Objective 2), and should be addressed in their scoping. • Delivery of other IPBES functions: Underpins identification, development and application of policy support tools, and associated capacity building.

Bundle	Description	Specific topics in submissions	Submissions	Comments on niche for IPBES	Remarks on priority and approach
Socio-economic transformation to sustainability	What are the plausible socio-economic development pathways that would lead to sustainability? What socio-economic transformations are necessary?	• Social assessment of means to attain sustainability • Policy options for meeting CBD 2050 Vision • Non-carbon benefits of REDD+	CBD (3) ICSU (3) NEFO (1)(9)	Some overlap with GBO4, and there are elements of this in both GEO and TEEB.	• Component of other assessments: High priority for inclusion in global/regional assessments (Objective 2), and should be addressed in their scoping. • Delivery of other IPBES functions: Underpins identification, development and application of policy support tools, and associated capacity building.
Sustainable management, consumption and production	Development of assessments, tools and methodologies for evaluating the impact of commercial products and services on biodiversity and ecosystem services, including of harvesting and trade in species.	• Sustainable consumption and production • Life Cycle Analysis • Evaluation of impacts and potential impacts	France (1) CBD (3) CITES NEFO (7)	Some overlap with GBO4 with respect to the impacts of overexploitation and the moves towards more sustainable use. Relevant to other assessment processes, particularly those involved with resource use.	• Thematic assessment: High priority for consideration as a thematic assessment (Objective 3), in particular because of its relevance to multiple MEAs. • Component of other assessments: High priority for inclusion in global/regional assessments (Objective 2), and should be addressed in their scoping. • Delivery of other IPBES functions: Underpins identification, development and application of policy support tools, and associated capacity building.
Disaster mitigation and recovery	What role does biodiversity and ecosystem services play in mitigating the effects of natural disasters, and in supporting recovery?	• Ecosystem-based disaster risk reduction • Importance of biodiversity and ecosystem services in recovery programmes	China (3) Japan (2)	Partially addressed in a number of major assessments, including in particular IPCC, but not comprehensively addressed in any. Significant literature and experience that could be drawn on.	• Component of other assessments: High priority for inclusion in global/regional assessments (Objective 2), and should be addressed in their scoping. • Links to thematic assessments: Could also be partially addressed in any thematic assessment on restoration and degradation. • Delivery of other IPBES functions: Underpins identification, development and application of policy support tools, and associated capacity building, and may be a key issue for increased sharing of information and experience.
Thematic issues: Direct pressures and their impacts on biodiversity and ecosystem services					
Climate change	What are the impacts of climate change on biodiversity and ecosystem services?	• Climate change • Rising atm. CO2 • Sea level rise and ocean acidification	France (5) Mexico (4) Norway (5) CBD (3) CMS (6) NIES (1)	High overlap with IPCC Fifth Assessment Report due out in 2014. Some overlap with GBO4. Need to coordinate and build on efforts of IPCC.	• Assessment: High priority for inclusion in global/regional assessments (Objective 2) as one of the primary threats to biodiversity identified by the CBD, and should be addressed in their scoping once the potential overlap with IPCC in particular has been explored.

Bundle	Description	Specific topics in submissions	Submissions	Comments on niche for IPBES	Remarks on priority and approach
Invasive alien species	What are the impacts of invasive alien species on biodiversity and ecosystem services?	• What is the best way to monitor and assess the impacts of invasive alien species?	France (5) Mexico (3) CBD (3) NIES (3)	Some overlap with GBO4. There are various international programmes on alien invasive species that could be drawn upon, including a partnership working on increasing access to information on alien invasive species. The CBD has convened an Inter-Agency Liaison Group on Invasive Alien Species which includes in its terms of reference promoting cooperation in the gathering, access and use of relevant and reliable information.	• Thematic assessment: High priority topic for a thematic assessment (Objective 3) in order to increase understanding of the impacts of invasive alien species. • Component of other assessments: High priority for inclusion in global/regional assessments (Objective 2) as one of the primary threats to biodiversity identified by the CBD, and should be addressed in their scoping. • Delivery of other IPBES functions: This is an area where identification, development and application of policy support tools, and associated capacity building is important, including development of assessment methodologies and approaches for sharing information.
Pollution	What are the impacts of pollution on biodiversity and ecosystem services, and how can these impacts be most effectively assessed?	• Primarily focused on the need for tools and methodologies, and associated capacity building.	France (5) Mexico (2) CBD (3)	Some overlap with GBO4.	• Component of other assessments: High priority for inclusion in global/regional assessments (Objective 2) as one of the primary threats to biodiversity identified by the CBD, and should be addressed in their scoping. • Delivery of other IPBES functions: This is also an area where identification, development and application of policy support tools, and associated capacity building is important, including development of assessment methodologies. This might be most effectively addressed through means of more widely sharing experience.
Overexploitation	Addressed under “sustainable management, consumption and production” above				
Habitat loss and degradation	Addressed under “restoration and degradation” below				

Bundle	Description	Specific topics in submissions	Submissions	Comments on niche for IPBES	Remarks on priority and approach
Thematic issues: Biodiversity, ecosystem services and human well-being in terrestrial and inland water ecosystems					
Restoration and degradation	How does degradation of terrestrial and freshwater systems affect biodiversity, ecosystem services and human well-being? What role does biodiversity play in underpinning sustainable systems? What role can biodiversity play in restoring degraded systems?	• Desertification, land degradation and drought • Restoration of degraded lands and freshwater systems • Sustainable land management • Ecologically vulnerable areas • Forestry and biodiversity	China (2) France (2) Italy Norway (4) UNCCD CBD (3)(5) NEFO (3)(4)	Partially addressed in UNCCD (2009) and Conserving Dryland Biodiversity (2012) syntheses, but large gaps remain. Small overlap with Pan-Africa Freshwater Biodiversity Assessment (IUCN)	• Thematic assessment: High priority for thematic assessment (Objective 3) because of its relevance to multiple MEAs. • Component of other assessments: High priority for also including within regional and global assessments (objective 2), as habitat loss is one of the primary threats to biodiversity identified by the CBD. • Delivery of other IPBES functions: For some of the specific topics (such as sustainable land management), this is an area where identification, development and application of policy support tools, and associated capacity building is important.
Agriculture, food security and biodiversity	How does the production of food and fibre impact biodiversity and ecosystem services? What role can biodiversity at multiple levels play in underpinning sustainable agricultural systems and in ensuring food security?	• Agriculture, food security and biodiversity • Multiple use • Cultural landscapes	France (3) Japan (1) CBD (3)(5) NEFO (3)(5)	Potentially high overlap with FAO assessment in preparation. Need to coordinate and build on efforts of FAO.	• Assessment: High priority for either thematic assessment (Objective 3) or embedding within regional and global assessments (objective 2), but would need careful coordination with work of FAO. • Delivery of other IPBES functions: This is an area where identification, development and application of policy support tools, and associated capacity building is important.
Conservation and sustainable use of forest ecosystems	What are impacts of forest management and deforestation on biodiversity and ecosystem services? How can forests be managed to protect biodiversity and ecosystem services? How can biodiversity contribute to ecosystem services provided by forests?	• Conservation and sustainable use of forests • Forests and natural barriers mitigating environmental risk • Assessing non-carbon environmental benefits in relation to RED++	Japan (2) CBD (3) NEFO (3)(9)	There is already significant assessment and research in the forest sector, including the FAO Forest Resources Assessment. IPBES could build on this by addressing the potential value of different policy support options.	• Components of other assessments: High priority for inclusion in global/regional assessments (Objective 2) and should be addressed in their scoping. However this needs to be developed in liaison with FAO. • Delivery of other IPBES Functions: This is an area where identification, development and application of policy support tools and associated capacity building is important.

Bundle	Description	Specific topics in submissions	Submissions	Comments on niche for IPBES	Remarks on priority and approach
Thematic issues: Biodiversity, ecosystem services and human well-being in marine and coastal ecosystems					
Coastal systems	What are the status, trends and future trajectories of biodiversity and ecosystem services in coastal systems? What are the impacts of multiple pressures on biodiversity and ecosystem services? What role does biodiversity play in underpinning sustainable coastal systems?	• Coastal ecosystem services, especially related to environmental risk	Japan (2) Birdlife	Moderate overlap (for coastal marine and estuary systems) with World Ocean Assessment (WOA) due out in 2014	• Component of other assessments: This would be a high priority for inclusion in global/regional assessments, but this needs careful coordination with the WOA, including identification of how to build on their work. For this reason it would not be considered for thematic assessment at this time.
Marine systems	What are the status, trends and future trajectories of biodiversity and ecosystem services in marine systems? What are the impacts of multiple pressures on biodiversity and ecosystem services? What role does biodiversity play in underpinning sustainable marine systems?	• Sustainable fisheries, food security and biodiversity • Global change impacts on marine systems • Coral reefs	France (4)(5) Norway (3) CBD (3)(5) CMS (5) NEFO (2)	High overlap with World Ocean Assessment (WOA) due out in 2014.	• Component of other assessments: This would be a high priority for inclusion in global/regional assessments, but this needs careful coordination with the WOA, including identification of how to build on their work. For this reason it would not be considered for thematic assessment at this time.
Thematic issues: Species and species groups of special concern: conservation and relationships to ecosystem services and human well-being					
Migratory species	What is the extent of the role or migratory species in supporting ecosystem functioning and delivering ecosystem services. How well are migratory species protected, and how are they impacted by global change.	• Ecological function • Economic value • Traditional knowledge • Protected area coverage • Effectiveness of policies in ABNJ • Impacts of climate change	CMS (1-6) Birdlife	No recent or ongoing broad scale assessment of which we are aware, and none were identified in the submission.	• Thematic assessment: Strong contender for thematic assessment, and would help to build IPBES linkages with biodiversity-related MEAs. • Component of other assessments: High priority for inclusion in global/regional assessments (objective 2) where this is appropriate, and should be addressed in their scoping. • Note: However it will also be important to ensure the inclusion of appropriate specific topics within other thematic assessments, and this should be addressed in their scoping where relevant.

Bundle	Description	Specific topics in submissions	Submissions	Comments on niche for IPBES	Remarks on priority and approach
Pollinators and pollination	What are the status, trends and future trajectories of pollinators? How do changes in pollinator populations affect ecosystem services?	• Pollinators in agricultural systems • Pollinators in natural systems	New Zealand Norway (3) CBD (5) CMS (1) (connectivity)	Would complement and build on the FAO (2008) assessment, and the ongoing work of FAO and a range of other organizations. Need to coordinate and build on efforts of FAO.	• Component of other assessments: High priority for inclusion in global/regional assessments (objective 2), and should be addressed in their scoping. • Thematic assessment: This is also a strong contender for a fast track thematic assessment as a 'flagship' for demonstrating IPBES capability.
Species groups experiencing recent rapid declines or near extinction	What are the status, trends and future trajectories of species experiencing recent rapid declines?	• Tropical hard corals • Amphibians • Freshwater fish	CBD (3)	Some overlap with GBO4	• Component of other assessments: High priority for inclusion in global/regional assessments (Objective 2), and should be addressed in their scoping.
Thematic issues: Genetic diversity: conservation and relationships to ecosystem services and human well-being					
Genetic diversity of cultivated plants, domesticated animals and wild relatives	What are the status, trends and future trajectories of agriculturally important genetic resources?	•	CBD (3)	Some overlap with upcoming GBO4, but also considerable potential overlap with the work of the FAO Commission on Genetic Resources for Food and Agriculture. Need to coordinate and build on efforts of FAO.	• Component of other assessments: High priority for inclusion in global/regional assessments (Objective 2) and should be addressed in their scoping. However this needs to be developed in liaison with FAO and the Commission.
Mechanisms and approaches for supporting work programme implementation					
Monitoring, data access and visualization	Collaborate with key partners to improve monitoring, access to data and visualization of data of biodiversity and ecosystem services (including use of indicators), as well as providing links to data on drivers, pressures and responses. This includes access to tools and best practices, with specific reference in one request to satellite monitoring to identify change.	• Status and trends of biodiversity and ecosystem services • Status and trends of drivers, pressures (incl. invasive species, areas of high "threat") and responses	China (5) Japan (3) Mexico (1) UK (2) ICSU (1), GBIF, IUCN, NEFO (8), UNEP (4)(5)(8)	Need to build collaborative interface with BIP, GBIF, GEO, IUCN, UNEP-WCMC, Future Earth, CBD reporting and other international structures involved in monitoring.	• Underlying tools/activities: High continuous priority (Objective 1) supporting achievement of many other deliverables in the draft work programme. • Note: Need to clarify interactions with key partners in order to increase access to the necessary data and information both for IPBES deliverables and for improving the science-policy interface more widely. • Note: IPBES mandate does not include developing monitoring programmes, nor large data infrastructures. Thus, some requests cannot be fully accommodated.

Bundle	Description	Specific topics in submissions	Submissions	Comments on niche for IPBES	Remarks on priority and approach
Networking	Develop scientific and science-policy networks and communities of practice to develop capacity for IPBES activities in all regions, and to increase sharing of knowledge.	• Science - Policy matchmaking • Network of networks • Sharing knowledge	Norway (7) NIES (2) And a key element in addressing many other submissions	IPBES mandate	• Underlying tools/activities: Essential activity (Objective 1) supporting achievement of many other deliverables in the draft work programme. • Note: Need to both develop tools and approaches, and to build close relationships with other relevant networks and communities of practice.
Knowledge generation	Includes strategies for mobilization of knowledge and data to feed into assessments, as well as the identification of priorities for research as an input to Future Earth and research funding initiatives.	• Identification of knowledge needed and knowledge gaps • Liaison with research funding bodies and processes	UK (6) ICSU Also a key element in scoping and implementation of many of the other requests, inputs and suggestions	IPBES mandate	• Knowledge generation: Essential activity (Objective 1). • Links to other activities: Draws heavily on the understanding of knowledge needs and knowledge gaps gained in scoping and implementing assessments (objectives 2 and 3), and using policy support tools (objective 4).
Identifying and addressing key capacity building needs	Analyze capacities of countries and regions to carry out IPBES activities in order to prioritize capacity building actions, and help to address priority needs..	• Identification of capacity building needs • Building networks and facilities that help to match needs with resources	Norway (7)(8) CBD (5) ICSU (1), NEFO (8), NIES (4), UNEP(8) Also a key element in scoping and implementation of many of the other requests, inputs and suggestions	IPBES mandate	• Capacity building: Essential activity (Objective 1). • Links to other activities: Draws heavily on the understanding of capacity needs and gaps gained in scoping and implementing assessments (objectives 2 and 3), and using policy support tools (objective 4).

Bundle	Description	Specific topics in submissions	Submissions	Comments on niche for IPBES	Remarks on priority and approach
Decision support tools	Collaborate with key partners to develop and use decision support tools.	Many different sorts of needs have been identified in submissions: • some relating to specific themes *(such as sustainable use, poverty reduction or impact of pollution)* • others relate to specific types of tool *(such as scenarios or indicators)*	Australia Belarus France (1) UK (2)(4)(5) CBD (5) NIES (2) In addition to references in many of the other requests, inputs and suggestions identified above.	IPBES mandate to increase access to policy support tools and methodologies. Need to build collaborative interface with key partners developing decision support tools.	• Policy support tools: High continuous priority (Objective 4) to improve access to existing tools and methodologies, and to those developing and using them. • Links to other activities: Specifically identified as high priority deliverables to accompany the methodological assessments on ***values of biodiversity and ecosystem services*** and ***scenarios and models*** (Objective 3). • Links to other activities: In addition many of the submissions imply a need to policy support tools, as has been indicated above, and these could help identify priorities for early delivery within the proposed ***catalogue of policy support tools*** (Objective 4). • Note: IPBES mandate needs to be clarified concerning the potential development of decision support tools by the Platform itself.
Scenarios and Models	Collaborate with key partners to develop and use socio-economic scenarios for assessments and policy support. Evaluate available types of models of pressures and impacts and encourage model improvement.	• Build capacity for development and use of scenarios and models • Provide access to scenarios and models as decision support tools	France (6) Mexico (4) CBD (5) ICSU (2), UNEP (7)	Need to build collaborative interface with key partners developing regional and global scenarios of socio-economic pathways. Some overlap with IPCC scenarios development.	• Methodological assessment: High priority for rapid evaluation (Objective 3). • Support for all IPBES functions: Early agreement on standards is essential for all IPBES-related assessments, coupled with the need to identify and promote improved access to the necessary policy support tools, and facilitate associated capacity building. • Links to other activities: The effective use of scenarios is likely to be particularly important for those thematic assessments addressing socio-economic drivers, whether these are independent assessments or part of global or regional assessments • Note: IPBES mandate does not include developing scenarios and models. Thus, some requests cannot be fully accommodated.

Bundle	Description	Specific topics in submissions	Submissions	Comments on niche for IPBES	Remarks on priority and approach
Communication, outreach and engagement products and processes	Communication with policy makers, scientists, knowledge holders, a broad range of other stakeholders and the public concerning the activities IPBES.	•	UK (3) UNEP (6)	IPBES mandate	• Underlying tools/activities: Essential activity (Objective 4). • Note: These need to address not only communication on IPBES itself, but also provide materials which allow more wide-scale communication of the values of biodiversity so that the importance of the science-policy interface is understood.
Catalogue of assessments	Maintain a database of assessments at local, national, regional and global scales related to biodiversity and ecosystem services.	• Sharing of experience between experts • Record of available resources and relevant contacts	Norway (7) NEFO Pan-European Biodiversity Platform	IPBES mandate	• Underlying tools/activities: High continuous priority (Objective 4) in order to address the mandate already given.
Forward look mechanism	Horizon scanning activities to improve the ability of IPBES to indentify and anticipate emerging issues.	• Possible examples of emerging issues identified or implied in requests, inputs and suggestions include loss of pollinators, ocean acidification and geoengineering.	UNEP (1)	While this is not a mandated activity, it would be very valuable for IPBES to be sensitive to upcoming issues that its Members may want addressed	• Underlying tools/activities: This would an ongoing activity, but not a high priority for urgent action. The Plenary could ask the Bureau and MEP to carry out a periodic review of horizon scanning exercises to remain aware of issues which might arise.