

# Verification Mechanism

---

Version 0.2 | October 2020



**LANDSCALE**

# VERIFICATION MECHANISM

VERSION 0.2 | OCTOBER 2020

## About this version

LandScale version 0.2 incorporates feedback received on version 0.1 during the first public consultation period and field-testing from August to October 2019. Responses and key changes to version 0.1 are available in a [summary of the version 0.1 public comments](#).

Version 0.2 will have a piloting phase conducted in more than 10 landscapes around the world and is [open for public comment](#) until December 1, 2020. The pilots' experience and input, as well as feedback from the second public consultation, will be incorporated into version 1.0, available in 2021.

Version 0.2 includes the following resources:

- [LandScale overview](#): a brief description of what LandScale is, how it works, who can use it, and where it is being piloted
- [Summary of the assessment framework](#): a brief description of the assessment framework including pillars, goals, and indicators
- [Assessment Framework](#): goals, indicators, and performance metrics that constitute the scope of an assessment
- [Assessment Guidelines](#): detailed guidance on the process of conducting a LandScale assessment
- [Verification Mechanism](#) (this document): the system for evaluating adherence to the LandScale guidelines and verifying the reliability of assessment results
- [Claims Guidelines](#): information on the type of claims that may be made based on LandScale assessment results and the process for communicating such claims
- Supplementary resources including:
  - [Annex 1. Sustainable Landscape Partnership Module](#)
  - [Annex 2. World Ecosystem Map and IUCN Typography](#)
  - [Annex 3. Human Rights Assessment Guidance](#)
  - [Annex 4. Human Rights Enabling Conditions](#)
  - [Annex 5. Terms & Definitions](#)
  - [Annex 6. Restoration Typology](#)
  - [Various appendices](#)

# 1 Introduction

## 1.1 Purpose

The purpose of the verification mechanism is to answer the following questions:

1. Is the LandScale assessment complete and has it been conducted in accordance with the assessment guidelines?
2. Are the assessment results credible and reliable, and are there any limitations to their accuracy or interpretation?

The answers to these questions determine the degree to which a LandScale assessment may be used to externally communicate about landscape sustainability performance through the LandScale online platform and *claims*.

This verification mechanism includes two levels of verification – one for each question.

## 1.2 Level 1 Verification: Completeness Check

Verification at this level addresses question one in section 1.1 above, affirming whether the assessment has met all substantive requirements of the assessment process as described in the LandScale assessment guidelines. This includes:

- Adherence to LandScale guidelines on the assessment team composition and capacity
- Delineation and justification of an appropriate landscape boundary
- Selection and inclusion of all relevant *landscape-dependent* indicators based on the applicability criteria
- Measurement of all required indicators, subject to allowances for deferring a proportion of these based on data gaps
- Inclusion of appropriate *performance metrics* for each indicator
- Documentation of the stakeholder consultation process carried out for the assessment, as well as the *assessor's* response to relevant comments arising from such consultation (see section 1.3 of the [Assessment Guidelines](#))



A *completeness check* is required before the results of an assessment can be published on the LandScale reporting platform. The completeness check and publication on the reporting platform are also prerequisites for level 2 verification. Results that are part of an assessment that has passed the completeness check (level 1 verification) but have not been quality assured (level 2 verification) will be labelled as such on the platform.

The completeness check will be conducted by members of the LandScale team or their designees and may include consultation with external experts. Different aspects of the completeness check may take place at different stages in the process of conducting the assessment. For instance, confirmation that the composition and expertise of the assessment team adheres to the assessment guidelines may be sought prior to embarking on an assessment. Full details of the completeness check are provided in section 2 of this document.

### 1.3 Level 2 Verification: Quality Assurance of Assessment Results

Verification at this level addresses question two in section 1.1, verifying that assessment results are a credible and reliable representation of the situation in the subject landscape. Level 2 verification also identifies any limitations to the accuracy or interpretability of assessment results that should be made known to users of the results and that may limit the issuance, scope, or phrasing of claims.

Level 2 verification is carried out by evaluating:

- The quality of data sources used to generate assessment results
- The rigor of methods used to analyze, synthesize, and interpret source data to evaluate the selected metrics
- The presence or absence of potential defects or limitations in the assessment results, based on considerations such as data bias, gaps, errors, insufficient spatial resolution or collection frequency, or insufficient segmentation by population group or other attributes

*LandScale users* may decide whether to carry out quality assurance for all, some, or none of the indicators and metrics for which assessment results are generated. At a minimum, this level of verification will be required for the indicators or metrics for which landscape performance claims are to be made.

Quality assurance of assessment results must be conducted by an *independent third-party verifier*.<sup>1</sup> These individuals or organizations should have:

- Competencies, experience, and a credible track record in auditing and/or peer reviewing
- Competencies in analyzing the quality of data sources and the legitimacy of data analysis and reporting practices
- Expertise in the specific topics (pillars, indicators, and metrics) to be verified

If multiple topics are to be verified, then the *verifier* may comprise a team consisting of multiple persons with the requisite expertise.

LandScale intends to develop additional detailed guidelines regarding the required qualifications and expertise of a verifier or verification team as part of the verification oversight mechanism, which is due to be published alongside version 1 of LandScale in 2021.

Full details of the quality assurance of assessment results (level 2 verification) are provided in section 3 of this document.

## 1.4 The Verification Mechanism and Assessment Guidelines

Table 1 illustrates the relationship between the assessment guidelines, verification mechanism, and allowable claims. The assessment guidelines set out the requirements of the assessment process through a series of steps. For each of these steps, the verification mechanism describes what is expected of the individual or team commissioned to verify an assessment. The relevant sections of the verification mechanism are indicated in the table.

Level 1 verification (completeness check) evaluates whether the LandScale assessment has properly followed steps 1, 2, 3, 5, and the first part of step 4. Level 2 verification (quality assurance of assessment results) addresses step 4 in greater detail in order to check the quality of data sources and the rigor of methods used to evaluate performance metrics and thereby generate assessment results. The LandScale claims guidance sets out the types of claims allowed according to the level of verification established through the verification mechanism.

---

<sup>1</sup> This is defined as an entity with no material interest in the results of the assessment and no business or personal connections to the entity that has undertaken the assessment, or to parties whose interests might be harmed by the outcomes of the verification process.

**Table 1. Relationship Between the Verification Mechanism and the Assessment Guidelines<sup>2</sup>**

Assessment Guidelines	Verification Mechanism	
	Level 1 Responsible: LandScale Team Scope: All indicators and metrics	Level 2 Responsible: Independent third-party verifier Scope: Indicators and/or metrics for which verification is sought – often with the purpose of supporting claims.
Step 1. Preparation	Level 1	Level 2
Step 2. Boundary selection		
Step 3. Indicator selection		
Step 4. Metric & data selection		
Step 5. Reporting		
	Allowable claims: complete assessment	Allowable claims: landscape performance, contribution, and association

## 1.5 Verification Scenarios

To inform investments in verification, LandScale users should consider how they expect to use the outcomes of an assessment. Specifically:

- If there is interest in publishing the results of an assessment on the LandScale online platform, then a completeness check (level 1 verification) is required. This provides those interested in the results with assurance that the assessment has been completed in accordance with the LandScale assessment guidelines. It therefore adds greater credibility to the results than if they were shared privately. It also makes the results available to a wider range of organizations who may have interest in the given landscape. If the completeness check is conducted but quality assurance (level 2 verification) is not, then the user may make a ‘complete assessment’ claim (see [Claims Guidelines](#) section 2.1) but none of the claims that reference landscape performance (see [Claims Guidelines](#) sections 2.2, 2.3 and 2.4).
- If there is interest in making claims about landscape performance, then quality assurance of assessment results (level 2 verification) is required for the indicators and metrics upon which the claim will be based. Indicators and metrics for which assessment results have attained quality assurance are

<sup>2</sup> The sections’ numbers in the table reference the assessment guidelines document.

eligible as the basis for claims that use the LandScale logo and name. Any such claims and use of the LandScale brand assets must adhere to the LandScale claims requirements (see [Claims Guidelines](#) section 2.2).

**Table 2. Verification Required for Intended Uses of Results and Associated Claims**

Intended use of assessment results and associated claims	Verification required
Assessment results published on the LandScale online platform. Claims limited to a “complete assessment claim” (see <a href="#">Claims Guidelines</a> section 2.1).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Level 1 - completeness check only</li> <li>● No requirement for quality assurance of assessment results</li> </ul>
Intention to make claims that involve landscape performance in relation to one or more indicators or metrics.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>● Level 1 - completeness check</li> <li>● Level 2 - quality assurance of assessment results for those indicators and/or metrics on which claims are to be made</li> </ul>

## 2 Completeness Check (Level 1 Verification)

Completeness checks are initiated by the assessor by requesting the check from the LandScale team. The check may be done step-by-step or at the end of the assessment. The first approach is advised to ensure that the assessment does not proceed from one step to the next with uncorrected problems, such as inadequate team composition or a non-compliant landscape boundary. Such problems may be difficult or costly to correct later in the process.

To proceed with the completeness check, assessors will be required to provide the outputs of each step and additional information may be requested via emails or web meeting discussions. The completeness check may result in a determination of “complete” – indicating that all substantive requirements of the assessment process were met; or a determination of “incomplete” – in which case specific deficiencies will be identified. In the case of an “incomplete” determination, an assessor may correct the noted deficiencies and request a follow-up completeness check.

The following subsections describe the scope of the completeness check in relation to each step of the assessment process being reviewed.

## 2.1 Assessment Step 1: Preparation

The completeness check begins with a review of the assessment team composition and capacity based on the requirements outlined in section 1.1 of the assessment guidelines. This includes the provision of appropriate technical expertise within the team covering all four LandScale pillars.

## 2.2 Assessment Step 2: Boundary Selection

The completeness check will validate whether the boundary for the assessment was defined and delineated in accordance with the assessment guidelines.

For a proposed boundary based on a jurisdiction or catchment, the check will confirm that the boundaries are of standard, mapped units and do not comprise more than one unit (in which case it would be considered a user-defined boundary).

User-defined boundaries will be assessed relative to the requirements and criteria presented in step 2 of the assessment guidelines. This includes the assessor's rationale for the user-defined boundary and the documentation and outcomes of the *adjacency analysis*. If insufficient information is provided, or if the documentation does not demonstrate full consideration and incorporation (as needed) of potential adjacencies, then the LandScale team may request additional information or recommend adjustments to the boundary to fulfill the requirements of step 2 of the assessment guidelines.

## 2.3 Assessment Step 3: Indicator Selection

This part of the completeness check includes two related aspects: a) whether the appropriate landscape-dependent indicators were included in the assessment scope and b) whether the minimum required proportion of all required indicators (both *core* and applicable landscape-dependent indicators) were actually assessed.<sup>3</sup>

First, the completeness check will validate whether the assessor completed the indicator selection process in accordance with the assessment guidelines. This includes:

- Adherence to the method for selecting landscape-dependent indicators, as set out in table 3 of section 3.2 of the assessment guidelines
- Adequate justification for any exclusion of landscape-dependent indicators, referring to the considerations set out in table 3 and supported by an analysis

---

<sup>3</sup> The completeness check will also be inclusive of the optional indicators that have been selected by the assessor.



of existing problems, trends, and drivers related to the excluded indicator(s), based on published sources, expert advice, and local stakeholder perspectives

- Documentation of any stakeholder consultation related to the indicator selection process, particularly the mandatory consultation process to support the selection of human rights indicators

Second, the completeness check will determine whether at least the minimum proportion of required indicators (i.e., all core indicators, plus all landscape-dependent indicators determined to be applicable for the given landscape) have been assessed. While it is preferable to assess all required indicators, LandScale does provide an allowance to defer a proportion of indicators due to a lack of available data or ability to collect adequate data within the scope of the assessment. See section 4.4 of the assessment guidelines for information on these allowances. The completeness check will assess and validate the following:

- The number of deferred indicators does not exceed the maximum allowance (i.e., at least the minimum proportion of required indicators has been assessed)
- For each indicator that the assessor has proposed to defer:
  - LandScale has not identified a global data set for the relevant metric(s) that could have been used.
  - The assessor has documented reasonable efforts to search for existing data sources and/or explore options for generating new data related to the deferred indicator and, based on this search, has reasonably concluded that it is infeasible at this time to assess the relevant metric(s) for the deferred indicators.

## 2.4 Assessment Step 4: Metric Selection

This part of the completeness check validates whether the assessor selected appropriate performance metrics for each required indicator in accordance with the assessment guidelines (section 4.1). Assessors are expected to use all performance metrics labeled as “required”, except where it is not feasible or appropriate to use a required metric. In those cases, assessors should develop an alternate metric in accordance with the guidelines. Additionally, in the cases where the assessor selects optional indicators, the completeness check will also review the recommended and/or assessor-defined metrics for those indicators. The completeness check will assess and validate the following:

- Required metrics were assessed for all core and applicable landscape-dependent indicators for which they are specified (except for indicators that are validly deferred, as explained in the prior subsection), or else an acceptable alternate metric was used.
- For all instances where an alternate metric was used in lieu of a required metric, the assessor has adequately documented that either: a) an alternate metric was needed because the required metric was not feasible; or b) the alternate metric provided a superior measurement of the given indicator relative to the assessment's objectives and context.

The completeness check does not include an evaluation of the quality of data sources or data analysis methods used to evaluate performance metrics. These aspects are included as part of level 2 verification.

## 2.5 Assessment Step 5: Reporting

The final part of the completeness check will confirm whether the guidance for reporting each step of the assessment has been followed appropriately and whether all required outputs listed in step 5 are provided and sufficiently complete. This includes completing the LandScale reporting template, which covers key information and results from each step of the assessment, including information on the stakeholder consultation process related to the assessment. The completeness check will review only the required reporting templates; the optional extended assessment report narrative (see step 5 section 5.3 of assessment guidelines) will not be evaluated.

## 3 Quality Assurance of Assessment Results (Level 2 Verification)

Level 2 verification provides a review and quality assurance of assessment results for specific indicators and metrics. The LandScale user (i.e., the party who commissioned the LandScale assessment) and/or other organizations permitted to make claims may seek verification of those indicators and metrics that most interest them, for claims purposes or otherwise.

As shown in table 1, the entire level 2 verification process is linked to step 4 of the LandScale assessment process. It involves reviewing a) whether selected metrics were assessed in accordance with the LandScale assessment guidelines (including the steps of data gathering, processing, and analysis) and b) the reliability of the assessment results generated through this process. The verifier must refer to these

sections in the assessment guidelines to evaluate whether the assessor has followed them properly. The verifier will also need to refer to assessor-provided documentation related to step 4 of the assessment process, and may also need to review source data, calculations used in determining metric values, or other supporting information related to the assessment of the indicators and metrics for which verification is sought. The assessor must make such information available to the verifier to support the verification process. If certain information is confidential (e.g., proprietary or protected data sources used in the assessment), the assessor may provide these to the verifier with appropriate restrictions on disclosure and use, to which the verifier must agree.

For each assessment result (at the indicator and/or metric level), the verification process will result in one of the following three determinations (with associated implications for potential claims):

1. **Quality-assured result:** metrics for which assessment results have been fully quality assured without caveats – these results will be indicated as verified on the reporting platform and may be used to support claims that pertain to landscape performance
2. **Quality-assured result with caveats or limitations:** metrics for which assessment results have been quality assured but with caveats or limitations on the quality, reliability, or interpretability of the results, e.g., related to the age, level of precision, or degree of segmentation of the underlying data. These results will be indicated as verified on the reporting platform, with the caveats and limitations noted alongside the result. Such results may support claims, but the scope and phrasing of such claims may be restricted based on the specific caveats or limitations identified through the verification process.
3. **Results that are not quality-assured:** metrics for which quality of the assessment result cannot be assured due to limitations in the quality, reliability, or interpretation of the data – these results will not be indicated as verified on the reporting platform and may not be used to support claims that pertain to landscape performance; if one or more required metrics, including alternate metrics, for a given indicator are not quality-assured, then no indicator-level claim may be made for the indicator that includes those metric(s)

In the case of the second or third scenarios above, the verifier should recommend improvements in data sources, analysis, or other aspects of the assessment process to improve the quality of assessment results with a view to enabling full quality assurance for future assessment results. Under either of these scenarios, the

LandScale user, at their option, may revise the assessment and seek re-verification to address the deficiencies that prevented full quality assurance.

The following subsections elaborate the scope and process of level 2 verification. Subsections correspond to the requirements detailed in sections 4.2 - 4.4 of the assessment guidelines and are illustrated in the data journey (Figure 2 in the [Assessment Guidelines](#)).

### 3.1 Assessment Step 4: Metric Selection

The completeness check addresses the inclusion of required metrics and suitable alternate metrics as part of the overall assessment scope. For level 2 verification, this should be supplemented with a validation of any additional assessor-defined metrics within the verification scope. The verifier should review the assessor’s documented justification for the chosen assessor-defined metric and explanation for how the metric effectively measures the indicator with which it is associated. If the verifier finds there to be significant weaknesses with the chosen metric, these should be noted as caveats for quality assurance. If the weaknesses in or unsuitability of the metric are so severe that they are likely to render the result substantially inaccurate or misleading, then the verifier may decide that the result related to the given metric cannot be quality-assured.

### 3.2 Data Gathering, Collection, and Evaluation

This step in the level 2 verification process evaluates whether suitable secondary or primary data sources were identified, gathered or collected, and whether the data from these sources are of good quality. The verification should address the following questions about data sources and data quality based on the criteria and process noted in Table 3 below. Note that these questions need to be addressed only for the indicator(s), metric(s), and corresponding data sources within the scope of the level 2 verification.

**Table 3. Data Quality Evaluation Process**

<p><b>Is there sufficient documentation of the data gathering, collection, and evaluation process?</b></p>
<p><u>How to determine:</u> Evaluate whether the assessor provided the documentation indicated in section 4.5.1 of the assessment guidelines and in figure 3 of this document.</p>



Verifier's action: If there is insufficient documentation of these aspects, then the verifier should request further documentation from the assessor; without this, quality assurance cannot be provided.

### Are the secondary data sources used in the assessment appropriate and of good quality?

How to determine: Evaluate quality of the data sources based on:

- Criteria in tables 13 and 14 of the assessment guidelines (including but not limited to any assessor-provided documentation of adherence to these criteria)
- Any other metric-specific considerations in tables 5-12 or in the pillar resources (available for LandScale Pilots)
- Any data gaps and limitations documented by the assessor
- Additional insight into the quality of the data sets from the verifier's own knowledge or consultation with stakeholders or experts

Verifier's action: Note whether the data sources are of good quality. If there are substantive quality deficiencies but the data are still fundamentally valid, then specific caveats or limitations should be noted. If there are fundamental quality deficiencies that render the data largely invalid or misleading, then these should be noted along with a determination that quality cannot be assured.

### Were better quality secondary data available but not used?

How to determine: Review the documentation of the data identification and screening process and data sets that were considered, including all datasets identified by LandScale. Assess whether a robust data search process was conducted and whether any rejected data sources were rejected for good cause. Determine whether superior secondary data were available and reasonably knowable to the assessor (based on verifier's own knowledge or consultation).

Verifier’s action: If the data identification, screening, and selection process was not sufficiently broad or logical, this should be noted for consideration in future assessments. If superior data were available but not used, recommend their use in future assessments. At the verifier’s discretion, note a caveat or limitation related to these points.<sup>4</sup>

**If primary data were used, were sources and collection methods appropriately identified and planned; did they follow accepted methods and standards from the relevant disciplines; and are the resulting data of good quality?**

How to determine: Review the documentation on primary data collection to assess its adherence to section 4.2.3.3 of the assessment guidelines. Evaluate quality of the data based on the same criteria listed in the row above for secondary data. Additionally, assess the degree to which methods adhere to accepted practices and standards, as evidenced (for instance) by the assessor’s use of credible scientific or technical literature to inform methods.

Verifier’s action: Same action as previous question above on secondary data.

If the verifier is unable to answer any of the preceding verification questions (in full or in part) due to an incomplete understanding of the assessment process and the decisions that it entailed (e.g., related to data searching, selection, and screening), they should contact the assessor to request additional information or documentation to enable a fully-informed verification process.

As implied in Table 3, to the extent possible, verifiers should triangulate multiple sources of information to assess the appropriateness and quality of the selected data sources. This may include consultations (triangulation interviews) with experts familiar with the landscape to gain an independent perspective on data reliability. If the assessor has used data collected by different stakeholders on the ground, the verifier should compare and check for consistency and coherence across these different sources.

Where time and resources permit, the verifier may visit the field for direct observation and further interviews with actors on the ground to check the

---

<sup>4</sup> A non-comprehensive data search process or the availability of superior data that were not used in an assessment does not, by itself, necessarily indicate inadequacy of a LandScale assessment nor provide cause not to quality-assure its results. However, if it appears that the assessor may have deliberately disregarded superior data sources or conducted an overly narrow data search to focus on a preferred data source or otherwise to influence the outcomes of the assessment, then this is a potential indication of bias that must be noted as a caveat or limitation.

consistency of data. However, this is not commonly expected. In many cases, triangulation through remote interviews, comparison of data sources, and desk-based analysis can provide a good substitute for field-based verification of assessment results.

### 3.3 Step 4: Data Processing and Interpretation

This step in the level 2 verification process evaluates whether the selected data sets were properly cleaned, processed, and analyzed to generate results for the metrics used in the assessment and insights on metrics and/or corresponding indicators. The verification should address the following questions based on the criteria and process noted in table 4. Note that these questions need to be addressed only for the indicator(s), metric(s), and corresponding data sources within the scope of the level 2 verification.

**Table 4. Data Processing and Interpretation Process**

<b>Were the data sources appropriately cleaned and processed?</b>
<p><u>How to determine:</u> Evaluate whether the assessment process adhered to the elements on data cleaning and data processing in section 4.3 of the assessment guidelines. Where additional data cleaning or processing guidelines are provided for specific performance metrics (see tables 5 - 12 of the assessment guidelines), evaluate whether these have been followed. If multiple data sets were used in combination to assess a given metric, evaluate whether this combination of sources is coherent, comparable, and relevant to inform the given metric.</p>
<p><u>Verifier’s action:</u> Note whether the selected data were properly cleaned and processed (to the extent required). If these processes revealed or resulted in substantive quality deficiencies but the processed data are still fundamentally valid, then specific caveats or limitations should be noted. If there are fundamental quality deficiencies that render the processed data largely invalid or misleading, then these should be noted along with a determination that quality cannot be assured. If there is insufficient documentation of data cleaning or processing, then the verifier should request further documentation.</p>
<b>Were metric values calculated or derived from cleaned/processed data in a manner that was legitimate, transparent, and consistent with accepted good practice?</b>
<p><u>How to determine:</u> Evaluate whether calculations of metric values were done in a manner consistent with good practice and sufficiently documented. Where additional data analysis guidelines are provided for specific performance metrics</p>

(see table 5 - 12 of the assessment guidelines), evaluate whether these have been followed.

Verifier's action: Note whether metric values were calculated or derived in a logical and legitimate manner. If there were minor or moderate shortcomings in this process but the calculated values are still fundamentally valid, then specific caveats or limitations should be noted. If there are fundamental flaws in this process that render the metric values largely invalid, misleading, or of unknown validity, then these should be noted along with a determination that quality cannot be assured. If there is insufficient documentation of the metric calculation process, then the verifier should request further documentation from the assessor.

**To the extent that additional insights, interpretations, or narrative results were provided alongside metric values, do these logically follow from and are they supported by the available evidence? Are they clear, credible, balanced, and reflective of their context?**

How to determine: Evaluate the legitimacy of any insights, interpretations, or narrative results provided in the assessment according to criteria including clarity, truthfulness, balance, completeness, contextualization, scope, and, optionally, other relevant criteria of the verifier's choosing.<sup>5</sup>

Verifier's action: If this review reveals any caveats or limitations to the validity or interpretability of the statements, the verifier should recommend to the assessor that these be addressed in a revision to the assessment results. If any part of the statements are incorrect or misleading, then the result may not be quality assured, unless and until such statements are removed or corrected according to the recommendations.

---

<sup>5</sup> Truthfulness = the insights accurately reflect the underlying evidence. Balance = if evidence reveals a mix of findings (e.g., favorable and less favorable findings), then insights reflect a similar balance. Completeness = insights do not "cherry pick" one portion of the evidence without acknowledging other relevant aspects. Contextualization = insights make the significance of the findings more apparent by highlighting relevant aspects of the context in which they occurred. Scope = the scope of the insights (e.g., sustainability topics covered or land area or population segments to which they apply) does not exceed the scope of the evidence upon which they are based and does not include inferences or extrapolations that cannot be supported by the evidence. These are indicative criteria to guide the verifier's review: it is not obligatory that each statement of insight, interpretation, or narrative results necessarily demonstrate all the criteria.



## About LandScale

The Rainforest Alliance, Verra, and Conservation International are developing LandScale with support from a growing coalition of partners. To date, partners include the Climate, Community & Biodiversity Alliance, EcoAgriculture Partners, the International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN), the Nature Conservation Research Centre (NCRC), Proforest, and Solidaridad.

An advisory group, representing both subject matter experts and potential LandScale users, provides strategic input and guidance on developing the LandScale initiative to help ensure it makes a significant contribution to driving improvements in landscape sustainability. The global initiative is supported by the International Climate Initiative (IKI) of the German Federal Ministry of the Environment, Nature Conservation and Nuclear Safety (BMU) and the BHP Foundation's Environmental Resilience Global Signature Program. Visit [www.landscale.org](http://www.landscale.org) to learn more.



Supported by:



based on a decision of the German Bundestag

