



## A. Global Biodiversity Standard: Assessment Form

### 1. Project details

**a. Name of applicant individual**

*Text field – import from online application form*

**b. Name of applicant organisation, agency, or institution**

*Text field – import from online application form*

**c. Name of project**

*Text field – import from online application form*

**d. Site location (attach map, GIS files-require a polygon)**

*Import from online application form*

**e. Restoration type**

*Dropdown menu*

- Protected Area
- Ecological Restoration Area
- Rehabilitation (Agroforestry, etc.)

**f. Restoration category**

*Dropdown menu*

- Facilitation of natural recovery
- Assisted natural recovery without planting, seeding, or faunal introductions
- Assisted natural recovery with planting, seeding, or faunal introductions
- Reconstruction or heavily assisted recovery

**g. Biome**

*Dropdown menu. A link to the biomes document will be provided.*

- T1 Tropical-subtropical forests biome
- T2 Temperate-boreal forests and woodlands biome
- T3 Shrublands and shrubby woodlands biome
- T4 Savannas and grasslands biome
- T5 Deserts and semi-deserts biome
- T6 Polar-alpine (cryogenic) biome
- T7 Intensive land-use biome
- S1 Subterranean lithic biome
- S2 Anthropogenic subterranean voids biome
- SF1 Subterranean freshwaters biome



- SF2 Anthropogenic subterranean freshwaters biome
- SM1 Subterranean tidal biome
- TF1 Palustrine wetlands biome
- F1 Rivers and streams biome
- F2 Lakes biome
- F3 Artificial wetlands biome
- FM1 Semi-confined transitional waters biome
- MT1 Shorelines biome
- MT2 Supralittoral coastal biome
- MT3 Anthropogenic shorelines biome
- MT1 Brackish tidal biome

## 2. Assessor details

### a. Name(s) of assessor(s)

*Text field*

### b. Affiliated institution

*Text field*

### c. Date of visit

*Date*

### d. Persons consulted (representative of management/main landscape interventions/main community interfaces)

#### i. Names

*Free text*

#### ii. Position

*Free text*

#### iii. Organisation

*Free text*

## 3. Monitoring, Evaluation and Management

### a. What management is in place?

*Checkbox options*

- The management plan is co-developed with stakeholders, rights-holders, and local agencies and communities, and integrates measures outlined during planning (See SC13) and results obtained from monitoring and adaptive management.
- The plan builds, as far as possible, on effective local and traditional restoration practices.
- The plan incorporates relevant management agreements and includes a detailed description of all required activities specifying their duration of time and frequency.



- The management plan involves subject matter experts, including stakeholders and rights-holders, who can help develop innovative management methods based on lessons learned from other projects.
- The management is plan available to all those involved in the ongoing management of the project.
- The management plan identifies the ongoing management team, and clearly communicates roles and responsibilities of members of the team.
- The management plan is modified based on the results of periodic monitoring, and on changes in trade-offs or stakeholder or rights holder interests or needs.
- If not fully secured, appropriate long-term sources of funding for ongoing management are determined. There is coordination with other restoration projects to reduce costs and duplication of effort. These synergies can include, for example, alignment of schedules to facilitate sourcing of plant materials, sharing equipment, and monitoring.
- The project conducts periodic monitoring of the site to check for re-occurrence of degradation and to protect the investment in restoration, ideally involving local stakeholders.
- The project conducts site protection measures needed to prevent deleterious external or internal impacts (e.g., protection from unsustainable grazing, prevention of inappropriate fire, prevention of unsustainable harvesting, control of infestations by invasive species, management of weeds and other vegetative competitors).
- The project ensures essential ecosystem functions and processes are operating as appropriate and required to maintain ecosystem integrity and provide ecosystem resilience to degradation stressors (e.g., management of hydrological regimes, ensuring natural disturbance regimes such as periodic fire in fire-adapted ecosystems or flooding of riparian zones).
- The project facilitates beneficial external exchanges with the broader landscape or seascape, including the exchange of genetic material in fragmented landscapes and seascapes (e.g., through hand pollination or movement of propagules), or for depleted populations suffering from inbreeding depression or other genetic deficiencies.
- The project develops or supports training and stewardship programs for local communities and practitioners, to improve ongoing management of the site and prevent harm from inappropriate management.
- The project communicates to new generations about long-term project trajectories and outcomes to ensure that the restoration project and past investments are valued. This can be accomplished by continuing cultural activities that maintain the history of the project and celebrate its achievements, by reinforcing lessons learned including the opportunity to carry out similar projects elsewhere, and through science education and research.
- The project provides a governance structure to oversee ongoing management and stewardship of the site, and ensure legal protections for the investments made in restoration.
- The project prepares contingency plans and protocols in case known degradation drivers re-emerge (e.g., populations of invasive animals that were previously managed through a biocontrol agent that ceases to function).
- The project invests in knowledge sharing, acquisition, and training to incorporate updated best practices when designing and implementing responses to unexpected or unforeseen events that threaten the integrity of the restoration site.



- The project adopts a policy of continuous improvement informed by reliable monitoring. Such a policy can allow managers to continually upgrade and build on project goals to advance initial recovery toward progressively higher outcomes, seeking the highest level of recovery possible over the long-term.
- The project seeks opportunities for the implementation of additional restoration activities or projects at the project site or in the broader landscape or seascape through replication or scaling up.
- The project conducts additional restoration activities that take advantage of the improved condition of the site (e.g., infill planting, reintroduction or augmentation of rare species, reinstatement of natural disturbance regimes).
- The project ensures ownership from local communities, so that they benefit from ongoing management and are involved in continuous improvement.
- The project explores further funding mechanisms and capital investment to extend restoration at sites, including the development of partnerships with local agencies and other partners.

**b. What baseline and monitoring data are available?**

*Checkbox options.*

- The monitoring program was planned while the restoration project or program was being designed, rather than after implementation
- The monitoring program is adequately resourced
- The monitoring program has the proper timing, frequency, and duration so that lessons learned can be applied to adaptive management
- Monitoring questions are directly linked with restoration objectives
- Monitoring questions are clearly described in planning documents, with specific measurable indicators that include the amount of change desired and a specified timeframe
- The monitoring program includes collecting, managing (including cleaning and meta-data documentation), and archiving data
- The monitoring program includes statistical analyses (if appropriate)
- The monitoring program includes a plan for interpreting results and sharing findings
- The monitoring program is being used to apply lessons learned to adaptive management within and across programs
- The monitoring plan includes an evaluation of the efficacy of the monitoring program itself

#### **4. Stakeholder Engagement**

**a. Is there evidence that primary and secondary stakeholders have been adequately identified?**

- Yes
- No

**b. Is there evidence that primary and secondary stakeholders have been consulted or contacted?**



The Global  
Biodiversity  
Standard

Coordinated by BGI

- Yes
- No

**c. What stakeholder engagement activities are implemented?**

*Checkboxes*

- Stakeholder engagement strategy implemented
- Political engagement strategy in place
- Participatory monitoring strategy in place
- Plans to develop stakeholder capacity in place
- Common concerns are defined prior to intervention
- The restoration project is defined from an ecological, social and economic point of view
- Other

**d. What type and diversity of stakeholders are engaged?**

*Checkboxes*

- Individuals
- Local communities
- Local community groups and non-profits (civil society)
- Ethnic or other minority groups, including indigenous peoples
- Women and girls
- Youth
- Local government
- State and provincial government
- National government
- Small and local business
- Regional business
- Global corporations
- Other

**e. Is there evidence that key primary stakeholders – and in particular disadvantaged and vulnerable groups - have not been consulted and engaged?**

- Yes
- No

**f. Is there evidence that the project provides benefits to primary stakeholders?**

- Yes
- No

**g. Is there evidence that the project supports the local economy by utilizing local infrastructure and supply chains or providing local employment?**

- Yes
- No



- h. Is there evidence that the project builds capacity among primary or secondary stakeholders?**
- Yes
  - No
- i. Is there evidence that the project utilizes local knowledge?**
- Yes
  - No
- j. Is there evidence that the project has considered the economic and cultural priorities of local communities or other key stakeholders in species selection and established access or use rights?**
- Yes
  - No
- k. What change in local community restoration-based livelihoods have been achieved since project inception?**
- Dropdown menu*
- Large decrease
  - Small decrease
  - Unchanged
  - Small increase
  - Large increase
- l. Is there evidence that primary stakeholders have faced significant negative economic and social impacts arising from involuntary loss of access to land or natural resources as a result of the project, without a mitigation plan in place?**
- Yes
  - No



## **B. Global Biodiversity Standard: Site check**

### **1. Project Details**

#### **a. Project name**

*Please enter the same project name as provided by the applicant.*

*Free text.*

#### **b. Location number**

#### **c. Location**

*Attach map or GPS tracking route*

#### **d. Area (*in hectares*):**

#### **e. Number of patches:**

#### **f. Ecosystem type**

*Dropdown menu – a link to the ecosystem document will be provided*

- T1.1 Tropical subtropical lowland rainforests
- T1.2 Tropical subtropical dry forests and thickets
- T1.3 Tropical-subtropical montane rainforests
- T1.4 Tropical heath forests
- T2.1 Boreal and temperate high montane forests and woodlands
- T2.2 Deciduous temperate forests
- T2.3 Oceanic cool temperate rainforests
- T2.4 Warm temperate laurophyll forests
- T2.5 Temperate pyric humid forests
- T2.6 Temperate pyric sclerophyll forests and woodlands
- T3.1 Seasonally dry tropical shrublands
- T3.2 Seasonally dry temperate heaths and shrublands
- T3.3 Cool temperate heathlands
- T3.4 Rocky pavements, lava flows and screes
- T4.1 Trophic savannas
- T4.2 Pyric tussock savannas
- T4.3 Hummock savannas
- T4.4 Temperate woodlands
- T4.5 Temperate subhumid grasslands
- T5.1 Semi-desert steppes
- T5.2 Succulent or Thorny deserts and semi-deserts
- T5.3 Sclerophyll hot deserts and semi-deserts



- T5.4 Cool deserts and semi-deserts
- T5.5 Hyper-arid deserts
- T6.1 Ice sheets, glaciers and perennial snowfields
- T6.2 Polar alpine rocky outcrops
- T6.3 Polar tundra and deserts
- T6.4 Temperate alpine grasslands and shrublands
- T6.5 Tropical alpine grasslands and herbfields
- T7.1 Annual croplands
- T7.2 Sown pastures and fields
- T7.3 Plantations
- T7.4 Urban and industrial ecosystems
- T7.5 Derived semi-natural pastures and old fields
- S1.1 Aerobic caves
- S1.2 Endolithic systems
- S2 Anthropogenic subterranean voids biome
- S2.1 Anthropogenic subterranean voids
- SF1.1 Underground streams and pools
- SF1.2 Groundwater ecosystems
- SF2 Anthropogenic subterranean freshwaters biome
- SF2.1 Water pipes and subterranean canals
- SF2.2 Flooded mines and other voids
- SM1.1 Anchialine caves
- SM1.2 Anchialine pools
- SM1.3 Sea caves
- TF1.1 Tropical flooded forests and peat forests
- TF1.2 Subtropical-temperate forested wetlands
- TF1.3 Permanent marshes
- TF1.4 Seasonal floodplain marshes
- TF1.5 Episodic arid floodplains
- TF1.6 Boreal, temperate and montane peat bogs
- TF1.7 Boreal and temperate fens
- F1.1 Permanent upland streams
- F1.2 Permanent lowland rivers
- F1.3 Freeze-thaw rivers and streams
- F1.4 Seasonal upland streams
- F1.5 Seasonal lowland rivers
- F1.6 Episodic arid rivers
- F1.7 Large lowland rivers
- F2.1 Large permanent freshwater lakes
- F2.2 Small permanent freshwater lakes
- F2.3 Seasonal freshwater lakes
- F2.4 Freeze-thaw freshwater lakes
- F2.5 Ephemeral freshwater lakes
- F2.6 Permanent salt and soda lakes
- F2.7 Ephemeral salt lakes





- F2.8 Artesian springs and oases
- F2.9 Geothermal pools and wetlands
- F2.10 Subglacial lakes
- F3.1 Large reservoirs
- F3.2 Constructed lacustrine wetlands
- F3.3 Rice paddies
- F3.4 Freshwater aquafarms
- F3.5 Canals, ditches and drains
- FM1.1 Deepwater coastal inlets
- FM1.2 Permanently open riverine estuaries and bays
- FM1.3 Intermittently closed and open lakes and lagoons
- M1.1 Seagrass meadows
- M1.2 Kelp forests
- M1.3 Photic coral reefs
- M1.4 Shellfish beds and reefs
- M1.5 Photo-limited marine animal forests
- M1.6 Subtidal rocky reefs
- M1.7 Subtidal sand beds
- M1.8 Subtidal mud plains
- M1.9 Upwelling zones
- M2.1 Epipelagic ocean waters
- M2.2 Mesopelagic ocean waters
- M2.3 Bathypelagic ocean waters
- M2.4 Abyssopelagic ocean waters
- M2.5 Sea ice
- M3.1 Continental and island slopes
- M3.2 Submarine canyons
- M3.3 Abyssal plains
- M3.4 Seamounts, ridges and plateaus
- M3.5 Deepwater biogenic beds
- M3.6 Hadal trenches and troughs
- M3.7 Chemosynthetic-based ecosystems (CBE)
- M4.1 Submerged artificial structures
- M4.2 Marine aquafarms
- MT1.1 Rocky shorelines
- MT1.2 Muddy shorelines
- MT1.3 Sandy shorelines
- MT1.4 Boulder and cobble shores
- MT2.1 Coastal shrublands and grasslands
- MT3.1 Artificial shorelines
- MFT1.1 Coastal river deltas
- MFT1.2 Intertidal forests and shrublands
- MFT1.3 Coastal saltmarshes and reedbeds



**g. Assessment category**

*Dropdown menu*

- Protected area
- Ecological restoration area
- Agroforestry area
- Plantation forest area
- Other habitat assessment area

**2. Management Activities**

**a. There is evidence of soil and water management restoration activities**

*Select all that apply*

*Checkbox options.*

- Grading to establish topography
- Soil erosion control and reversal
- Addition of growth medium (e.g. topsoil, mulch, compost, microbial content, mining byproduct)
- Bed preparation (e.g. tilling, raking, disking, rolling, cultipacking, furrowing, pitting, ploughing, scalping)
- Reduced tillage
- Improved fertilizer and agrochemical use efficiency
- Conversion to organic or non-synthetic fertilization and pesticide systems
- Improvement of soil fertility through vegetation management (e.g. crop rotation, cover crops, nurse crops)
- Improved irrigation and water use efficiency at site
- Improved water quality at site
- Improved watershed management
- Rainwater and runoff harvesting (e.g. terracing, stone cords, zaï, half-moons)
- Fog collection
- Desalination wastewater treatment
- Restoration of wetland hydrology
- Amelioration of contaminated or nutrient enriched soils
- Unsealing and decompaction of soils
- Other soil and water management
- None

**b. There is evidence of vegetation cover and ecosystem structure restoration activities**

*Select all that apply*

*Checkbox options.*

- Increase in legal ecosystem protection (e.g. establishment of additional protected areas or conservation easements)
- Enforcement of restrictions or prohibitions on ecosystem conversion or destruction
- Implementation of sustainable ecosystem management practices in productive landscapes (e.g. organic farming; agroforestry; Farmer Managed Regeneration)



- Elimination of sources of degradation (e.g., protection from overhunting, overharvesting, overfishing, or poaching; reestablishment of characteristic hydrology including dam removal and streambank repair; protection from uncharacteristic fire)
- Reinstatement of natural or semi-natural disturbance regimes (e.g., fire; flooding; grazing; haymaking)
- Fire management, including site preparation (e.g. thinning, hardwood reduction, establishment of fire breaks)
- Prescribed burning
- Grazing management (e.g. control of native grazer populations; reductions, removal, or exclusion of non-native grazers)
- Weeding or pruning
- Tree planting
- Shrub planting
- Herbaceous species and subshrub planting (e.g. grasses, forbs, ferns, terrestrial mosses and lichens)
- Other vegetation introduction (e.g. epiphytes, hemiepiphytes, vines, parasites, hemiparasites)
- Direct seeding or dibbling
- Other terrestrial plant establishment methods (additions of hay, soil, use of conmods)
- Other restoration of vegetation cover and ecosystem structure
- None

**c. There is evidence of control of invasive species restoration activities**

*Select all that apply*

*Checkbox options.*

- Quarantine measures
- Species control measures, physical or mechanical (e.g. cutting, pulling, burning, covering, digging up, plowing, scalping, mowing, capturing, hunting)
- Species control measures, biological (release of biological control agents, grazing, predation)
- Species control measures, organic or non-synthetic chemical (e.g. organic herbicides)
- Species control measures, synthetic chemical
- Post-control measures
- Re-invasion monitoring and prevention measures
- Management of secondary invasives
- Other control of invasive species
- None

### **3. Level of Protection**

**a. What was the baseline level of protection at project inception (see reference 1)?**

- Strict nature reserve
- Wilderness Area
- National park
- Natural monument or feature
- Habitat/species management area
- Protected landscape/seascape



- Protected area with sustainable use of natural resources
- Primary conservation practised
- Secondary conservation practised
- Ancillary conservation practised
- Paper park (i.e. only protected on paper)
- Site was conflicted
- Site was of conservation concern
- Site was threatened
- Site was vulnerable
- Site was close to collapse

**b. What is the current level of protection (see reference 1)?**

- Strict nature reserve
- Wilderness Area
- National park
- Natural monument or feature
- Habitat/species management area
- Protected landscape/seascape
- Protected area with sustainable use of natural resources
- Primary conservation practised
- Secondary conservation practised
- Ancillary conservation practised
- Paper park (i.e. only protected on paper)
- Site is conflicted
- Site is of conservation concern
- Site is threatened
- Site is vulnerable
- Site is close to collapse

**4. Ecosystem integrity**

*Ecosystem integrity is scored using a 5-star system (1 star low to 5 stars high; see reference 2).*

**a. Contamination**

**i. What was the baseline level of contamination at project inception (see reference 2a)?**

- Unable to assess
- 1 star
- 2 stars
- 3 stars
- 4 stars
- 5 stars



- ii. **What is the current level of contamination (see reference 2a)?**
    - Unable to assess
    - 1 star
    - 2 stars
    - 3 stars
    - 4 stars
    - 5 stars
  
  - iii. **What is the trajectory of change in contamination (see reference 2a)?**
    - Unable to assess
    - Improving
    - Declining
    - No change
  
  - iv. **Please describe the level of contamination**  
*Free text paragraph*
  
  - v. **Please upload evidence related to the level of contamination**  
*File upload*
- b. Invasive Species**
- i. **What was the baseline level of invasive species at project inception (see reference 2b)?**
    - Unable to assess
    - 1 star
    - 2 stars
    - 3 stars
    - 4 stars
    - 5 stars
  
  - ii. **What is the current level of invasive species (see reference 2b)?**
    - Unable to assess
    - 1 star
    - 2 stars
    - 3 stars
    - 4 stars
    - 5 stars
  
  - iii. **What is the trajectory of change in the level of invasive species (see reference 2b)?**



- Unable to assess
- Improving
- Declining
- No change

**iv. Please describe the level of invasive species**

*Free text paragraph*

**v. Please upload evidence related to the level of invasive species**

*File upload*

**c. Over-Utilization**

**i. What was the baseline level of over-utilisation at project inception (see reference 2c)?**

- Unable to assess
- 1 star
- 2 stars
- 3 stars
- 4 stars
- 5 stars

**ii. What is the current level of over-utilisation (see reference 2c)?**

- Unable to assess
- 1 star
- 2 stars
- 3 stars
- 4 stars
- 5 stars

**iii. What is the trajectory of change in over-utilisation (see reference 2c)?**

- Unable to assess
- Improving
- Declining
- No change

**iv. Please describe the level of over-utilisation**

*Free text paragraph*

**v. Please upload evidence related to the level of over-utilisation**

*File upload*



#### **d. Disturbances**

**i. What was the baseline level of disturbance at project inception (see reference 2d)?**

- Unable to assess
- 1 star
- 2 stars
- 3 stars
- 4 stars
- 5 stars

**ii. What is the current level of disturbance (see reference 2d)?**

- Unable to assess
- 1 star
- 2 stars
- 3 stars
- 4 stars
- 5 stars

**iii. What is the trajectory of change in disturbance (see reference 2d)?**

- Unable to assess
- Improving
- Declining
- No change

**iv. Please describe the level of disturbance**

*Free text paragraph*

**v. Please upload evidence related to the level of disturbance**

*File upload*

#### **e. Water chemo-physical conditions**

**i. What were the baseline water chemo-physical conditions at project inception (see reference 2e)?**

- Unable to assess
- 1 star
- 2 stars
- 3 stars
- 4 stars
- 5 stars



- ii. **What are the current water chemo-physical conditions (see reference 2e)?**
- Unable to assess
  - 1 star
  - 2 stars
  - 3 stars
  - 4 stars
  - 5 stars
- iii. **What is the trajectory of change in water chemo-physical conditions (see reference 2e)?**
- Unable to assess
  - Improving
  - Declining
  - No change
- iv. **Please describe the water chemo-physical conditions**  
*Free text paragraph*
- v. **Please upload evidence related to the water chemo-physical conditions**  
*File upload*
- f. **Substrate chemical conditions**
- i. **What were the baseline substrate chemical conditions at project inception (see reference 2f)?**
- Unable to assess
  - 1 star
  - 2 stars
  - 3 stars
  - 4 stars
  - 5 stars
- ii. **What are the current substrate chemical conditions (see reference 2f)?**
- Unable to assess
  - 1 star
  - 2 stars
  - 3 stars
  - 4 stars
  - 5 stars





**iii. What is the trajectory of change in substrate chemical conditions (see reference 2f)?**

- Unable to assess
- Improving
- Declining
- No change

**iv. Please describe the substrate chemical conditions**

*Free text paragraph*

**v. Please upload evidence related to the substrate chemical conditions**

*File upload*

**g. Substrate Physical conditions**

**i. What were the baseline substrate physical conditions at project inception (see reference 2g)?**

- Unable to assess
- 1 star
- 2 stars
- 3 stars
- 4 stars
- 5 stars

**ii. What are the current substrate physical conditions (see reference 2g)?**

- Unable to assess
- 1 star
- 2 stars
- 3 stars
- 4 stars
- 5 stars

**iii. What is the trajectory of change in substrate physical conditions (see reference 2g)?**

- Unable to assess
- Improving
- Declining
- No change



- iv. Please describe the substrate physical conditions**  
*Free text paragraph*
  
- v. Please upload evidence related to the substrate physical conditions**  
*File upload*
  
- h. Desirable (native species) plants, fungi and lichens**
  - i. What was the baseline composition of desirable plant, fungi and lichen species at project inception (see reference 2h)?**
    - Unable to assess
    - 1 star
    - 2 stars
    - 3 stars
    - 4 stars
    - 5 stars
  
  - ii. What is the current composition of desirable plant, fungi and lichen species (see reference 2h)?**
    - Unable to assess
    - 1 star
    - 2 stars
    - 3 stars
    - 4 stars
    - 5 stars
  
  - iii. What is the trajectory of change in composition of desirable plant, fungi and lichen species (see reference 2h)?**
    - Unable to assess
    - Improving
    - Declining
    - No change
  
  - iv. Please describe the composition of desirable plant, fungi and lichen species**  
*Free text paragraph*
  
  - v. Please upload evidence related to the composition of desirable plant, fungi and lichen species**  
*File upload*
  
- i. Desirable (native species) animals**



- i. What was the baseline composition of desirable animal species at project inception (see reference 2i)?**
  - Unable to assess
  - 1 star
  - 2 stars
  - 3 stars
  - 4 stars
  - 5 stars
  
- ii. What is the current composition of desirable animal species (see reference 2i)?**
  - Unable to assess
  - 1 star
  - 2 stars
  - 3 stars
  - 4 stars
  - 5 stars
  
- iii. What is the trajectory of change in composition of desirable animal species (see reference 2i)?**
  - Unable to assess
  - Improving
  - Declining
  - No change
  
- iv. Please describe the species composition of desirable animals**  
*Free text paragraph*
  
- v. Please upload evidence related to the species composition of desirable animals**  
*File upload*
  
- j. Rare and threatened species**
  - i. What was the baseline composition of rare and threatened species at project inception (see reference 2j)?**
    - Unable to assess
    - 1 star
    - 2 stars
    - 3 stars
    - 4 stars
    - 5 stars



- ii. **What is the current composition of rare and threatened species (see reference 2j)?**
- Unable to assess
  - 1 star
  - 2 stars
  - 3 stars
  - 4 stars
  - 5 stars
- iii. **What is the trajectory of change in composition of rare and threatened species (see reference 2j)?**
- Unable to assess
  - Improving
  - Declining
  - No change
- iv. **Please describe the composition of rare and threatened species**  
*Free text paragraph*
- v. **Please upload evidence related to the composition of rare and threatened species**  
*File upload*
- k. **No undesirable (non-native or invasive) species**
- i. **What was the baseline composition of undesirable species at project inception (see reference 2k)?**
- Unable to assess
  - 1 star
  - 2 stars
  - 3 stars
  - 4 stars
  - 5 stars
- ii. **What is the current composition of undesirable species (see reference 2k)?**
- Unable to assess
  - 1 star
  - 2 stars
  - 3 stars
  - 4 stars
  - 5 stars



**iii. What is the trajectory of change in composition of undesirable species (see reference 2k)?**

- Unable to assess
- Improving
- Declining
- No change

**iv. Please describe the composition of undesirable species**

*Free text paragraph*

**v. Please upload evidence related to the composition undesirable species**

*File upload*

**I. Provenance and genetic diversity**

**i. What was the baseline level of genetic diversity at project inception (see reference 2l)?**

- Unable to assess
- 1 star
- 2 stars
- 3 stars
- 4 stars
- 5 stars

**ii. What is the current level of genetic diversity (see reference 2l)?**

- Unable to assess
- 1 star
- 2 stars
- 3 stars
- 4 stars
- 5 stars

**iii. What is the trajectory of change in genetic diversity (see reference 2l)?**

- Unable to assess
- Improving
- Declining
- No change

**iv. Please describe the genetic diversity**

*Free text paragraph*



**v. Please upload evidence related to genetic diversity**

*File upload*

**m. All vegetation strata**

**i. What was the baseline level of structural diversity of vegetation strata at project inception (see reference 2m)?**

- Unable to assess
- 1 star
- 2 stars
- 3 stars
- 4 stars
- 5 stars

**ii. What is the current level of structural diversity of vegetation strata (see reference 2m)?**

- Unable to assess
- 1 star
- 2 stars
- 3 stars
- 4 stars
- 5 stars

**iii. What is the trajectory of change in structural diversity of vegetation strata (see reference 2m)?**

- Unable to assess
- Improving
- Declining
- No change

**iv. Please describe the structural diversity of vegetation strata**

*Free text paragraph*

**v. Please upload evidence related to structural diversity of vegetation strata**

*File upload*

**n. All trophic levels**

**i. What was the baseline level of diversity of trophic levels at project inception (see reference 2n)?**

- Unable to assess
- 1 star
- 2 stars



- 3 stars
- 4 stars
- 5 stars

**ii. What is the current level of diversity of trophic levels (see reference 2n)?**

- Unable to assess
- 1 star
- 2 stars
- 3 stars
- 4 stars
- 5 stars

**iii. What is the trajectory of change in diversity of trophic levels (see reference 2n)?**

- Unable to assess
- Improving
- Declining
- No change

**iv. Please describe the structural diversity of vegetation strata**

*Free text paragraph*

**v. Please upload evidence related to structural diversity of vegetation strata**

*File upload*

**o. Spatial mosaic**

**i. What was the baseline level of structural diversity with respect to the spatial mosaic at project inception (see reference 2o)?**

- Unable to assess
- 1 star
- 2 stars
- 3 stars
- 4 stars
- 5 stars

**ii. What is the current level of structural diversity with respect to the spatial mosaic (see reference 2o)?**

- Unable to assess
- 1 star
- 2 stars
- 3 stars



- 4 stars
  - 5 stars
- iii. **What is the trajectory of change in structural diversity with respect to the spatial mosaic (see reference 2o)?**
- Unable to assess
  - Improving
  - Declining
  - No change
- iv. **Please describe the structural diversity with respect to the spatial mosaic**  
*Free text paragraph*
- v. **Please upload evidence related to structural diversity with respect to the spatial mosaic**  
*File upload*
- p. **Productivity and Cycling**
- i. **What was the baseline level of ecosystem function with respect to productivity and cycling at project inception (see reference 2p)?**
- Unable to assess
  - 1 star
  - 2 stars
  - 3 stars
  - 4 stars
  - 5 stars
- ii. **What is the current level of ecosystem function with respect to productivity and cycling (see reference 2p)?**
- Unable to assess
  - 1 star
  - 2 stars
  - 3 stars
  - 4 stars
  - 5 stars
- iii. **What is the trajectory of change in ecosystem function with respect to productivity and cycling (see reference 2p)?**
- Unable to assess
  - Improving
  - Declining
  - No change





**iv. Please describe the structural diversity with respect to productivity and cycling**

*Free text paragraph*

**v. Please upload evidence related to structural diversity with respect to productivity and cycling**

*File upload*

**q. Habitat and Interactions**

**i. What was the baseline level of ecosystem function with respect to habitats and interactions at project inception (see reference 2q)?**

- Unable to assess
- 1 star
- 2 stars
- 3 stars
- 4 stars
- 5 stars

**ii. What is the current level of ecosystem function with respect to habitats and interactions (see reference 2q)?**

- Unable to assess
- 1 star
- 2 stars
- 3 stars
- 4 stars
- 5 stars

**iii. What is the trajectory of change in ecosystem function with respect to habitats and interactions (see reference 2q)?**

- Unable to assess
- Improving
- Declining
- No change

**iv. Please describe the ecosystem function with respect to habitats and interactions**

*Free text paragraph*



- v. Please upload evidence related to ecosystem function with respect to habitats and interactions**  
*File upload*
- r. Resilience and Recruitment**
- i. What was the baseline level of ecosystem function with respect to resilience and recruitment at project inception (see reference 2r)?**
- Unable to assess
  - 1 star
  - 2 stars
  - 3 stars
  - 4 stars
  - 5 stars
- ii. What is the current level of ecosystem function with respect to resilience and recruitment (see reference 2r)?**
- Unable to assess
  - 1 star
  - 2 stars
  - 3 stars
  - 4 stars
  - 5 stars
- iii. What is the trajectory of change in ecosystem function with respect to resilience and recruitment (see reference 2r)?**
- Unable to assess
  - Improving
  - Declining
  - No change
- iv. Please describe the ecosystem function with respect to resilience and recruitment**  
*Free text paragraph*
- v. Please upload evidence related to ecosystem function with respect to resilience and recruitment**  
*File upload*
- s. Landscape flows**
- i. What was the baseline level of landscape flows at project inception (see reference 2s)?**
- Unable to assess



- 1 star
- 2 stars
- 3 stars
- 4 stars
- 5 stars

**ii. What is the current level of landscape flows (see reference 2s)?**

- Unable to assess
- 1 star
- 2 stars
- 3 stars
- 4 stars
- 5 stars

**iii. What is the trajectory of change in landscape flows (see reference 2s)?**

- Unable to assess
- Improving
- Declining
- No change

**iv. Please describe the landscape flows**

*Free text paragraph*

**v. Please upload evidence related to landscape flows**

*File upload*

**t. Gene flows**

**i. What was the baseline level of gene flows at project inception (see reference 2t)?**

- Unable to assess
- 1 star
- 2 stars
- 3 stars
- 4 stars
- 5 stars

**ii. What is the current level of gene flows (see reference 2t)?**

- Unable to assess
- 1 star
- 2 stars
- 3 stars



- 4 stars
- 5 stars

**iii. What is the trajectory of change in gene flows (see reference 2t)?**

- Unable to assess
- Improving
- Declining
- No change

**iv. Please describe the gene flows**

*Free text paragraph*

**v. Please upload evidence related to gene flows**

*File upload*

**u. Habitat links**

**i. What was the baseline level of habitat links at project inception (see reference 2u)?**

- Unable to assess
- 1 star
- 2 stars
- 3 stars
- 4 stars
- 5 stars

**ii. What is the current level of habitat links (see reference 2u)?**

- Unable to assess
- 1 star
- 2 stars
- 3 stars
- 4 stars
- 5 stars

**iii. What is the trajectory of change in habitat links (see reference 2u)?**

- Unable to assess
- Improving
- Declining
- No change

**iv. Please describe the habitat links**

*Free text paragraph*



The Global  
Biodiversity  
Standard

Coordinated by BGCI

- v. Please upload evidence related to habitat links**  
*File upload*

### Reference 1: Level of Protection

Category	Description	Source	Points
Strict nature reserve	Strictly protected for biodiversity and also possibly geological/geomorphological features, where human visitation, use and impacts are controlled and limited to ensure protection of the conservation values.	IUCN Cat. 1a	10 points
Wilderness Area	Usually large unmodified or slightly modified areas, retaining their natural character and influence, without permanent or significant human habitation, protected and managed to preserve their natural condition.	IUCN Cat. 1b	10 points
National park	Large natural or near-natural areas protecting large-scale ecological processes with characteristic species and ecosystems, which also have environmentally and culturally compatible spiritual, scientific, educational, recreational and visitor opportunities.	IUCN Cat. II	10 points
Natural monument or feature	Areas set aside to protect a specific natural monument, which can be a landform, sea mount, marine cavern, geological feature such as a cave, or a living feature such as an ancient grove.	IUCN Cat. III	10 points
Habitat/species management area	Areas to protect particular species or habitats, where management reflects this priority. Many will need regular, active interventions to meet the needs of particular species or habitats, but this is not a requirement of the category.	IUCN Cat. IV	10 points
Protected landscape/seascape	Where the interaction of people and nature over time has produced a distinct character with significant ecological, biological, cultural and scenic value: and where safeguarding the integrity of this interaction is vital to protecting and sustaining the area and its associated nature conservation and other values.	IUCN Cat. V	10 points
Protected area with sustainable use of natural resources	Areas which conserve ecosystems, together with associated cultural values and traditional natural resource management systems. Generally large, mainly in a natural condition, with a proportion under sustainable natural resource management and where low-level non-industrial natural resource use compatible with nature conservation is seen as one of the main aims.	IUCN Cat. VI	10 points

Primary conservation	Areas meeting the IUCN definition of a protected area, but where the governance authority (e.g. community, Indigenous peoples' group, religious group, private landowner) does not wish the area reported as a protected area.	OECM definition	8 points
Secondary conservation	Active conservation of an area where biodiversity outcomes are only a secondary management objective, but in-situ conservation is delivered (e.g. some conservation corridors).	Modified from OECM definition	6 points
Ancillary conservation	Areas delivering in-situ conservation as a by-product of management, even though biodiversity conservation is not an objective (e.g. some military training grounds, protected marine war graves and freshwater protection zones).	OECM definition	6 points
Paper park	A legally established protected area where experts believe current protection activities are insufficient to halt degradation.		0 points
Conflicted	Despite management efforts to conserve the ecosystem and maintain associated cultural values, conflicting human activities that are not consistent with sustainable long-term conservation objectives are allowed to occur.		-2 points
Concerned	Conservation objectives are stated but not implemented or met.	Inspired by IUCN RLE	-2 points
Threatened	Lack of management that cause ecosystem alteration (e.g., invasions of destructive flora or fauna, fire suppression or unnatural fire).	Inspired by IUCN RLE	-4 points
Vulnerable	Observed or inferred threatening processes (eg., illegal hunting, grazing, overexploitation) that are likely to cause continuing declines in geographic distribution, environmental quality or biotic interactions and considered to be at a high risk of collapse.	Adapted from IUCN RLE	-6 points
Collapse	Biotic or abiotic features are lost, and the characteristic native biota are no longer sustained (e.g., illegal occupation of protected area, deforestation, mining).	Modified from <a href="#">IUCN RLE</a>	-10 points

**Reference 2 – Ecosystem Integrity 5 star system – Adapted from the Society for Ecological Restoration 5-Star Recovery System (Gann et al. 2019)<sup>1</sup>.**

Ref.	Attribute	One star (★)	Two stars (★★)	Three stars (★★★)	Four stars (★★★★)	Five stars (★★★★★)
a)	Contamination	Some contamination drivers (e.g. use of toxic herbicides, legal or illegal dumping) absent but others remain high in number and degree (residual contamination, spraying for mosquitos, leakage from adjacent sites).	Direct contamination drivers (e.g., residual contamination, spraying for mosquitos, leakage from adjacent sites) intermediate in number and degree.	Number of direct contamination drivers low but some may remain intermediate in degree.	Direct contamination drivers, both external and on-site, low in number and degree.	All threats from contamination managed or mitigated to high extent
b)	Invasive species	Some invasive species drivers (e.g. planting of invasive species, contaminated equipment or supplies) absent but others remain high in number and degree (e.g. reproductive invasive plants on site, soil seed bank, reproductive plants on adjacent sites).	Direct invasive species drivers (reproductive invasive plants on site, soil seed bank, reproductive plants on adjacent sites) intermediate in number and degree (e.g. <10% cover of invasive species).	Number of direct invasive species drivers low but some may remain intermediate in degree (e.g. <5% cover of invasive species).	Direct invasive species drivers, both external and on-site, low in number and degree (e.g. <2% cover of invasive species).	All threats from invasive species managed or mitigated to high extent (e.g. <1% cover of invasive species).

<sup>1</sup> Gann, G.D., McDonald, T., Walder, B., Aronson, J., Nelson, C.R., Jonson, J., Hallett, J.G., Eisenberg, C., Guariguata, M.R., Liu, J., Hua, F., Echeverría, C., Gonzales, E., Shaw, N., Decler, K. and Dixon, K.W. (2019), International principles and standards for the practice of ecological restoration. Second edition. *Restor Ecol*, 27: S1-S46.  
<https://doi.org/10.1111/rec.13035>



Ref.	Attribute	One star (★)	Two stars (★★)	Three stars (★★★)	Four stars (★★★★)	Five stars (★★★★★)
c)	Over-utilization	Protection status secured; some over-utilization drivers (e.g. over harvesting, illegal logging or harvesting, mining) absent but others remain high in number and degree (e.g. overgrazing, over-hunting, infrastructure development).	Direct over-utilization drivers (overgrazing, over-hunting) intermediate in number and degree.	Number of direct over-utilization drivers low but some may remain intermediate in degree.	Direct over-utilization drivers, both external and on-site, low in number and degree.	All threats from over-utilization managed or mitigated to high extent.
d)	Disturbances	Some direct disturbance drivers (e.g. harmful wildfire) absent but others (e.g. absence of appropriate natural disturbances) remain high in number and degree.	Direct disturbance drivers (including, e.g. absence of appropriate natural disturbances) intermediate in number and degree.	Number of direct disturbance drivers low but some may remain intermediate in degree.	Direct disturbance drivers, both external and on-site, low in number and degree.	Threats from direct disturbance drivers minimal or effectively absent.
e)	Water chemo-physical conditions	Most physical and chemical properties of the site's hydrology (e.g., pH, nutrients, hydrological conditions) still highly dissimilar to reference ecosystem but some showing improved similarity.	Physical and chemical properties of hydrology remain at low similarity levels relative to reference ecosystem but capable of supporting some biota of reference ecosystem.	Physical and chemical properties of hydrology stabilized within intermediate range of reference ecosystem and capable of supporting growth and development of many	Physical and chemical conditions of hydrology within high range of reference ecosystem and suitable for ongoing growth and recruitment of most characteristic native	Physical and chemical conditions of hydrology highly similar to that of the reference ecosystem with evidence they can indefinitely sustain all characteristic species and processes.



Ref.	Attribute	One star (★)	Two stars (★★)	Three stars (★★★)	Four stars (★★★★)	Five stars (★★★★★)
				characteristic native biota.	biota.	
f)	Substrate chemical conditions	Most chemical properties of the site's substrates (e.g., pH, nutrients, salinity) still highly dissimilar to reference ecosystem but some showing improved similarity.	Chemical properties of substrates remain at low similarity levels relative to reference ecosystem but capable of supporting some biota of reference ecosystem.	Chemical properties of substrates stabilized within intermediate range of reference ecosystem and capable of supporting growth and development of many characteristic native biota.	Chemical conditions of substrates within high range of reference ecosystem and suitable for ongoing growth and recruitment of most characteristic native biota.	Chemical conditions of substrates highly similar to that of the reference ecosystem with evidence they can indefinitely sustain all characteristic species and processes.
g)	Substrate physical conditions	Most physical properties of the site's substrates (e.g., soil structure) still highly dissimilar to reference ecosystem but some (e.g. topography) showing improved similarity.	Physical properties of substrates remain at low similarity levels relative to reference ecosystem but capable of supporting some biota of reference ecosystem.	Physical properties of substrates stabilized within intermediate range of reference ecosystem and capable of supporting growth and development of many characteristic native biota.	Physical conditions of substrates within high range of reference ecosystem and suitable for ongoing growth and recruitment of most characteristic native biota.	Physical conditions of substrates highly similar to that of the reference ecosystem with evidence they can indefinitely sustain all characteristic species and processes.
h)	Desirable plants, fungi and lichens	Some colonizing native plant, fungi and lichen species present (e.g., ~2% of the reference ecosystem).	A small subset of characteristic native plant, fungi and lichen species present (e.g., ~10% of the reference ecosystem).	A subset of key native plant, fungi and lichen species present (e.g., ~25% of the reference ecosystem) over	Substantial diversity of characteristic native plant, fungi and lichen species and genes present (e.g., ~60% of	High diversity of characteristic native plant, fungi and lichen species and genes present (e.g., >80% of

Ref.	Attribute	One star (★)	Two stars (★★)	Three stars (★★★)	Four stars (★★★★)	Five stars (★★★★★)
			ecosystem) across site.	substantial proportions of the site.	the reference ecosystem) across the site and representing a wide diversity of functional groups.	the reference ecosystem), with high similarity to the reference ecosystem and high potential for colonization of more native species over time.
i)	Desirable animals	Some colonizing native species present (e.g. ~2% of the reference ecosystem).	A small subset of characteristic native species present (e.g. ~10% of the reference ecosystem) across site.	A subset of key native species present (e.g. ~25% of the reference ecosystem) over substantial proportions of the site.	Substantial diversity of characteristic native species and genes present (e.g. ~60% of the reference ecosystem) across the site and representing a wide diversity of functional groups.	High diversity of characteristic native species and genes present (e.g. >80% of the reference ecosystem), with high similarity to the reference ecosystem and high potential for colonization of more native species over time.
j)	Rare and threatened species	Some colonizing rare and threatened species present (e.g. ~2% of the reference ecosystem).	A small subset of characteristic rare and threatened species present (e.g. ~10% of the reference ecosystem) across site.	A subset of key rare and threatened species present (e.g. ~25% of the reference ecosystem) over substantial proportions of the site.	Substantial diversity of characteristic rare and threatened species and genes present (e.g. ~60% of the reference ecosystem) across the site and representing a wide	High diversity of characteristic rare and threatened species and genes present (e.g. >80% of the reference ecosystem), with high similarity to the reference ecosystem

Ref.	Attribute	One star (★)	Two stars (★★)	Three stars (★★★)	Four stars (★★★★)	Five stars (★★★★★)
					diversity of functional groups.	and high potential for colonization of more native species over time.
k)	No undesirable species	Very high levels of nonnative, invasive or undesirable plants (e.g., >80% cover), or nonnative or undesirable animals (e.g. harmful livestock).	High to moderate levels of nonnative, invasive or undesirable plants (e.g., <60% cover), or nonnative or undesirable animals	Moderate to low levels of nonnative, invasive or undesirable plants (e.g., <25% cover), or nonnative or undesirable animals (e.g. harmful livestock).	Low to very low levels of nonnative, invasive or undesirable plants (e.g., <10% cover), or nonnative or undesirable animals (e.g. harmful livestock).	Very low to nil nonnative, invasive or undesirable plants (e.g., <2% cover), or nonnative or undesirable animals (e.g. harmful livestock).
l)	Provenance and genetic diversity	Provenance of material appropriate to site and adequate genetic diversity for a very low proportion of native species (e.g., <2% of the reference ecosystem) are present.	Adequate genetic diversity for a very low to low proportion of native species (e.g., <10% of the reference ecosystem) are present.	Adequate genetic diversity for a low to moderate proportion of native species (e.g. ~25% of the reference ecosystem) are present.	Adequate genetic diversity for a moderate to high proportion of native species (e.g., ~60% of the reference ecosystem) across the site.	High genetic diversity of characteristic native species (e.g. >80% of the reference ecosystem), with high similarity to the reference ecosystem.
m)	All vegetation strata	One horizontal stratum of the reference present (e.g. emergent, canopy, subcanopy, shrub, groundcover).	More than one stratum of the reference present.	Most strata of the reference present.	All strata of the reference present.	All strata of the reference present. Further complexity able to self-organize to highly resemble the reference ecosystem.

Ref.	Attribute	One star (★)	Two stars (★★)	Three stars (★★★)	Four stars (★★★★)	Five stars (★★★★★)
n)	All trophic level	Community trophic complexity still largely dissimilar to reference ecosystem (based on complexity of levels of primary producers, herbivores, secondary consumers, tertiary consumers, apex predators).	Some similarity of trophic complexity, relative to reference ecosystem.	Intermediate similarity of trophic complexity relative to reference ecosystem.	Substantial similarity of trophic complexity relative to reference ecosystem.	All trophic complexity high. Further trophic complexity able to self-organize to highly resemble the reference ecosystem.
o)	Spatial mosaic	Spatial patterning still largely dissimilar to reference ecosystem.	Some similarity of spatial patterning relative to reference ecosystem.	Intermediate similarity of spatial patterning relative to reference ecosystem.	Substantial similarity of spatial patterning relative to reference ecosystem.	All spatial patterning high. Further spatial patterning able to self-organize to highly resemble the reference ecosystem.
p)	Productivity/ cycling	Physical and biological processes and functions (e.g. photosynthesis and growth, water and nutrient cycling) are at a very foundational stage only, compared to the reference ecosystem.	Low numbers and levels of physical and biological processes and functions, relative to the reference ecosystem (including plant growth, decomposition, soil processes), are present	Intermediate numbers and levels of physical and biological processes and functions, relative to the reference ecosystem.	Substantial levels of physical and biological processes and functions, relative to the reference ecosystem are present.	All functions and processes are on a secure trajectory towards the levels of the reference and are showing evidence of being sustained.

Ref.	Attribute	One star (★)	Two stars (★★)	Three stars (★★★)	Four stars (★★★★)	Five stars (★★★★★)
q)	Habitat & interactions	Habitat provision at a very foundational stage only, compared to the reference ecosystem.	Low numbers and levels of habitat provision relative to the reference ecosystem are present.	Intermediate numbers of habitat provision relative to the reference ecosystem are present.	Substantial levels of habitat provision relative to the reference ecosystem are present.	Habitat provisions are on a secure trajectory towards the levels of the reference and are showing evidence of being sustained.
r)	Resilience/ recruitment	Resilience and recruitment are at a very foundational stage only compared to the reference ecosystem.	Low levels of resilience and recruitment relative to the reference ecosystem (including return of appropriate disturbance regimes) are present.	Intermediate levels of resilience and recruitment relative to the reference ecosystem (including return of appropriate disturbance regimes) are present.	Substantial levels of resilience and recruitment relative to the reference ecosystem (including return of appropriate disturbance regimes) are present.	Resilience and recruitment (including appropriate disturbance regimes) are on a secure trajectory towards the levels of the reference and are showing evidence of being sustained.
s)	Landscape flows	Positive exchanges and flows with the surrounding environment (e.g., of species, water, fire) in place for only very low numbers of species and processes.	Positive exchanges and flows with the surrounding environment in place for a few characteristic species and processes.	Positive exchanges and flows between site and surrounding environment in place for intermediate levels of characteristic species and processes.	Positive exchanges and flows with the surrounding environment in place for most characteristic species and processes and likely to be sustained.	Evidence that exchanges and flows with the surrounding environment are highly similar to the reference for all species and processes and likely to be sustained.
t)	Gene flows	Positive genetic flow with surrounding environment in place for only very low	Positive genetic flow with surrounding environment in place	Positive genetic flow between site and surrounding	Positive genetic flow with surrounding environment in place	Evidence that genetic flow with the surrounding

Ref.	Attribute	One star (★)	Two stars (★★)	Three stars (★★★)	Four stars (★★★★)	Five stars (★★★★★)
		numbers of species (e.g. ~2% of the reference ecosystem).	for a few characteristic species (e.g. ~10% of the reference ecosystem).	environment in place for intermediate levels of characteristic species (e.g. ~25% of the reference ecosystem).	for most characteristic species (e.g. ~60% of the reference ecosystem) and likely to be sustained.	environment are highly similar to the reference for nearly all species (e.g. ~80% of the reference ecosystem) and likely to be sustained.
u)	Habitat links	Positive habitat links with surrounding environment in place for only very low numbers of species (e.g. ~2% of the reference ecosystem).	Positive habitat links with surrounding environment in place for a few characteristic species (e.g. ~10% of the reference ecosystem).	Positive habitat links between site and surrounding environment in place for intermediate levels of characteristic species (e.g. ~25% of the reference ecosystem).	Positive habitat links with surrounding environment in place for most characteristic species (e.g. ~60% of the reference ecosystem) and likely to be sustained.	Evidence that habitat links with the surrounding environment are highly similar to the reference for nearly all species (e.g. ~80% of the reference ecosystem) and likely to be sustained.