



IUCN input paper to the IPBES-12 Plenary

Twelfth meeting of the Plenary of the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services

Manchester, UK, 3–8 February 2026

IUCN congratulates and thanks all involved with IPBES for their hard work over 2024–5.

IUCN welcomes the inclusion of acknowledgement of IUCN's in-kind contributions to IPBES in 2025 through provision of a 0.5 FTE as in-kind support to the IPBES Stakeholder Engagement Strategy (Paragraph 53 in IPBES/12/4 and Table 3.2 in IPBES/12/5).

Input into Business & Biodiversity Assessment SPM (Agenda item 7)

- ✓ KM5. Edit title to read “Existing methods and data for measuring impacts and dependencies can and already do inform decisions and actions”. {4.5.1}.
- ✓ KM5. Add sentence at end of second para to read “Typically, businesses should measure metrics of both significance and intactness for species and ecosystems; and metrics of both provision and realisation of nature’s contributions to people {4.2.2}.” {4.2.2, Table 4.1}.
- ✓ KM9. Expand text to read “a) inadequate data, especially regarding the impact of commodity production up value chains” (in first para) and “Collect and disclose data on business locations and activities by location, and, especially, on commodity production impacts up value chains” (in second bullet point). {4.4.3}.
- ✓ B5. Add sentence at end of second para, reading “Best practice tools, initiatives, and experience already exist to support implementation of most of these approaches, enabling all actors to apply them more broadly.” {5.6, 5.7, 6.3}.
- ✓ Table SPM.3. Expand text in “technology and data” row to read “Lack of access to technology and data, knowledge regarding their use, and incentives and regulation to increase their uptake”. {5.3.2, 6.3.4, 6.3.5}.
- ✓ C1. Add text at the end of first para reading “Business impact on the state of nature should be measured using metrics of significance (eg species extinction risk; risk of ecosystem collapse) as well as metrics of intactness (eg species population size and habitat area; ecosystem extent and condition) for species and ecosystems. Business impacts and dependencies on nature’s contributions to people should be measured as change in the quantity of provision of services as well as the benefits or values realised by people.” {4.2.2, Table 4.1}.
- ✓ C1. Edit second sentence of fourth para to read “To be considered fit for purpose, application of methods in aggregate need...”. {4.2.1}.
- ✓ C1. Add clause to the fifth sentence of fifth para to read “...these shortcomings can be addressed by application of bottom-up methods (location-based observations, participatory monitoring and mapping)”. {4.4}.
- ✓ C2. Edit second sentence to read “...and mechanisms already exist to present them for business decision-making, but identification of specific actions to remedy impacts in specific places may require further data gathering...”. {4.4}.
- ✓ Table SPM.5. Expand text in “corporate” row to read “Top down approaches like life cycle approaches and macro-scale environmental models and bottom up approaches like location-based observations can both be used...”. {4.4.2}.
- ✓ C4. Add text at beginning of second sentence reading “While robust data, metrics, and tools already exist to assess operation-level decision-making, for value chains, many...” {4.4.4, 5.6.2}.
- ✓ C6. Edit title to read “Actionable guidance for measuring business dependencies on biodiversity and nature’s contributions to people is needed, complementing existing guidance for measuring business impacts (well established).” {3.3.2}.

For more information, please contact:

Thomas Brooks
Chief Scientist
IUCN Headquarters
thomas.brooks@iucn.org

Laure Denos
Senior Science-Policy Expert,
IUCN Headquarters
laure.denos@iucn.org

IUCN Headquarters
Rue Mauverney 28
1196 Gland
Switzerland
Tel: +41 22 999 0000
Fax: +41 22 999 0002
mail@iucn.org
<http://www.iucn.org>

Background

IUCN has for 75 years served as a science-policy interface for biodiversity and ecosystem services, with its scientific excellence delivered by its independent expert Commissions, and its policy demand delivered from its Membership of States, Government Agencies, and Subnational Governments, and of Non-Governmental and Indigenous Peoples' Organisations. The governance structure of the Union is neatly complementary with that of IPBES, as a wholly intergovernmental mechanism. Given the similarity of functions of the two institutions, IUCN's Members adopted [Resolution 118](#) at the 2012 IUCN World Conservation Congress, mandating "A significant role for IUCN in IPBES". Since 2016, IUCN and IPBES have operationalized this collaboration through a strategic partnership including substantial in-kind support to stakeholder engagement (see Paragraph 53 in IPBES/12/4 and Table 3.2 in IPBES/12/5), including in facilitating the Open-Ended Network of IPBES Stakeholders (ONet) and providing in-kind and financial support to the organization of the Stakeholder Days preceding the IPBES plenary. IUCN is grateful to the Government of France for their support to IUCN's engagement with IPBES.

IUCN presents below its inputs for consideration of Member States at the 12th Plenary.

Item 5 of the provisional agenda - Progress in the implementation of the rolling work programme up to 2030 (IPBES/12/4)

IUCN welcomes the inclusion in Section E.3 (paragraph 53, page 10, regarding Objective 5 (c): strengthened engagement of stakeholders) of acknowledgement of IUCN's in-kind contributions to IPBES in 2025 through provision of a 0.5 FTE as in-kind support to implementation of the IPBES Stakeholder Engagement Strategy.

Item 6 of the provisional agenda - Financial and budgetary arrangements for the Platform (IPBES/12/5)

IUCN welcomes the inclusion in Table 3.2 (page 9) of acknowledgement of its in-kind contributions to IPBES in 2025, of approximately \$71,000 through provision of a 0.5 FTE and associated costs in support of implementation of the IPBES Stakeholder Engagement Strategy.

Item 7 of the provisional agenda – Business & Biodiversity Assessment (IPBES/12/6)

KM5. Simply saying that "Existing methods and data for measuring impacts and dependencies can inform decisions and actions" fails to recognise the extent to which tools like IBAT are already in use in informing business decision-making. Suggest edit to read "Existing methods and data for measuring impacts and dependencies can and already do inform decisions and actions". Traceable account is {4.5.1}.

KM5. The second paragraph of KM5 lacks the specificity needed to guide businesses regarding metrics which is provided in Chapter 4. The KM would be greatly strengthened by adding a sentence at the end of this paragraph to read "Typically, businesses should measure metrics of both significance and intactness for species and ecosystems; and metrics of both provision and realisation of nature's contributions to people {4.2.2}." Traceable accounts are {4.2.2, Table 4.1}.

KM8. The first two sentences of KM8 are rather weak and would be better rephrased as "Data and knowledge exist on business impacts and dependencies within the scientific community, among Indigenous Peoples and local communities and within businesses, but these data and knowledge are often siloed and not sufficiently considered by businesses in decision-making. Scientific literature is often

poorly understood by businesses and uptake of science could be strengthened by improved attention to business needs.”

KM9. The most important inadequacies in data concern the impact of commodity production up value chains. Thus, suggest expanding “a) inadequate data” to read “a) inadequate data, especially regarding the impact of commodity production up value chains”. Similarly, expand “Collect and disclose data on business locations and activities by location” to read “Collect and disclose data on business locations and activities by location, and, especially, on commodity production impacts up value chains”. Traceable account is {4.4.3} in both cases.

B5. The second paragraph of B5 fails to recognise that best practice already exists to support application of most of these approaches. Suggest adding a new final sentence, at the end of B5 second paragraph, reading “Best practice tools, initiatives, and experience already exist to support implementation of most of these approaches, enabling all actors to apply them more broadly.” Traceable accounts are {5.6, 5.7, 6.3}.

B10. The clear guidance in the first paragraph of B10, on what businesses can do to improve traceability and collaborative action in the value chain, is particularly valuable – important to retain.

Table SPM.3. Several key barriers are missing regarding technology and data. Suggest expanding point regarding “Lack of access to technology and data” to read “Lack of access to technology and data, knowledge regarding their use, and incentives and regulation to increase their uptake”. These are consistent with, and link to, the subsequent rows regarding capacity and knowledge. Traceable accounts are {5.3.2, 6.3.4, 6.3.5}.

C1. The first paragraph of C1 lacks the specificity needed to guide businesses regarding metrics which is provided in Chapter 4. It would be greatly strengthened by adding two sentences to the end of this paragraph reading “Business impact on the state of nature should be measured using metrics of significance (eg species extinction risk; risk of ecosystem collapse) as well as metrics of intactness (eg species population size and habitat area; ecosystem extent and condition) for species and ecosystems. Business impacts and dependencies on nature’s contributions to people should be measured as change in the quantity of provision of services as well as the benefits or values realised by people.” Traceable accounts are {4.2.2, Table 4.1}.

C1. In the fourth paragraph of C1, it is important to recognise that relevant pressure types, and impacts and dependencies, typically require very different methods and tools for their measurement. Thus, fitness-for-purpose should be considered regarding application of such methods in aggregate, not of individual tools. Therefore suggest editing “To be considered fit for purpose, a method needs...” to read “To be considered fit for purpose, application of methods in aggregate need...”. Traceable account is {4.2.1}.

C1. In the fifth paragraph of C1, it is important to recognise that the limitations of top-down modelling approaches (like multi-regional input-output modelling, life cycle approaches or spatial modelling) can be addressed by application of bottom-up approaches. It would therefore be appropriate to add a clause to the sentence on the subject to read “Methods based on modelling approaches (multi-regional input-output modelling, life cycle approaches or spatial modelling) can sometimes provide a false sense of accuracy not supported by the level of detail of the underlying data or models (well established); these shortcomings can be addressed by application of bottom-up methods (location-based observations, participatory monitoring and mapping)”. Traceable account remains {4.4}.

C2. The second sentence, concerning location-based observations, fails to recognise that large volumes of location-based observations already exist and can already be harnessed for business decision-making. Suggest revising the clause “Location-based observations (including remote sensing) can inform

biodiversity assessments at all levels and for all business purposes but require significant amounts of data gathering...” to read “Location-based observations (including remote sensing) can inform biodiversity assessments at all levels and for all business purposes, and mechanisms already exist to present them for business decision-making, but identification of specific actions to remedy impacts in specific places may require further data gathering...”. Traceable account remains {4.4}.

Table SPM.5. The row for corporate-level decision-making currently focuses too heavily on top-down approaches, especially given their limitations. Suggest revising the first clause of the first sentence here from “Life cycle approaches and macro-scale environmental models can both be used...” to read “Top down approaches like life cycle approaches and macro-scale environmental models and bottom-up approaches like location-based observations can both be used...”. Traceable account is {4.4.2}.

C3. Several of the traceable accounts in the first paragraph are to {4.5.4} but this section does not exist in the main text (presumably because numbering has changed in the main text subsequent to drafting of the SPM). It is also unclear whether the traceable accounts to {4.5.3} are most appropriate. Suggest generalising these to {4.5}.

C4. It is appropriate to highlight the data limitations facing addressing impacts and dependencies generated through value chains, but the C4 paragraph puts too much emphasis on these at the expense of the addressing operation-level impacts and dependencies, which are much easier to assess. Suggest adding a clause reading “While robust data, metrics, and tools already exist to assess operation-level decision-making, for value chains, many...” to the beginning the second sentence, to read “While robust data, metrics, and tools already exist to assess operation-level decision-making, for value chains, many gaps exist in the availability and accessibility of these data and of information on the origin of input materials used by specific businesses.” Traceable accounts are {4.4.4, 5.6.2}.

C6. The current wording of the title could misleadingly imply that guidance to measure impacts – which already exists – is not needed. Suggest adding the words “complementing existing guidance for measuring business impacts”, to read “Actionable guidance for measuring business dependencies on biodiversity and nature’s contributions to people is needed, complementing existing guidance for measuring business impacts (well established).” Traceable account is {3.3.2}.

Item 10 of the provisional agenda - Request, input and suggestions for additional elements of the rolling work programme of the Platform up to 2030 (IPBES/12/9/Add1)

Over the different options available a) assessment of biodiversity and pollution, b) assessment of biodiversity and poverty, c) assessment of biodiversity and cities, d) assessment of biodiversity and climate change, and a long list of alternative assessments or workshops, IUCN supports the suggestion from Germany and Japan on point G, Additional considerations, to lead workshop and promote the use of completed assessments instead of starting new assessments. Especially with the 2nd Global assessment on his way, it is crucial to reallocate available resources to capacity building to help IPBES members to move from knowledge to action.