1 # Past, present, and future of the Living Planet Index

2 Sophie E H Ledger[1*], Louise McRae[1*], Jonathan Loh[2], Rosamunde Almond[3], Monika Böhm[4], Chris
3 Clements[5], Jessica Currie[6], Stefanie Deinet[1], Thomas Galewski[7], Monique Grooten[3], Martin Jenkins,
4 Valentina Marconi[1], Brett Painter[8], Kate Scott-Gatty[1], Lucy Young[9] and Robin Freeman[1]

5 [1] Institute of Zoology, Zoological Society of London (ZSL), London, UK

6 [2] School of Anthropology and Conservation, University of Kent, Canterbury, UK

7 [3] WWF Netherlands – World Wide Fund for Nature (Formerly World Wildlife Fund), Zeist, Netherlands

8 [4] Global Center for Species Survival, Indianapolis Zoo, Indianapolis, USA

9 [5] School of Biological Sciences, University of Bristol, Bristol, UK

10 [6] WWF Canada – World Wildlife Fund for Nature (Formerly World Wildlife Fund),Canada, Toronto, Canada

11 [7] Institut de recherche pour la conservation des zones humides méditerranéennes, Tour du Valat, Arles, France

12 [8] Environment and Climate Change Canada (ECCC), Government of Canada, Canada

13 [9] WWF UK – World Wide Fund for Nature (Formerly World Wildlife Fund), Cambridge, UK

14 * *Joint first and corresponding authors:* sophie.ledger@ioz.ac.uk; louise.mcrae@ioz.ac.uk

15 ## Abstract

16 As we enter the next phase of international policy commitments to halt biodiversity loss (e.g. Post-2020
17 Biodiversity Framework), biodiversity indicators will play an important role forming the robust basis upon
18 which targeted, and time sensitive conservation actions are developed. Population trend indicators are
19 perhaps the most powerful tool in biodiversity monitoring due to their responsiveness to changes over short
20 timescales and their ability to aggregate species trends from global down to at a sub-national or even local
21 scale. We consider how the project behind the foremost population level indicator - the Living Planet Index -
22 has evolved over the last 25 years, its value to the field of biodiversity monitoring, and how its components
23 have portrayed a compelling account of the changing status of global biodiversity through its application at
24 policy, research and practice levels. We explore ways the project can develop to enhance our
25 understanding of the state of biodiversity and share lessons learned to inform indicator development and
26 mobilise action.

27
28

29

30

31

32

33

34

35

36

Box 1. The Living Planet Index Project

The Living Planet Index project (the index, methodology, and database) and its secondary outputs (methods papers and R code, database and website, global index, and subset indices) have had wide-ranging applications within the fields of biodiversity monitoring and research, as well as across policy, education, and outreach.

The Living Planet Index (LPI) is a biodiversity indicator which tracks trends in the relative abundance of wild vertebrate populations (where population is defined as to a single species in a defined location rather than the biological definition). Relative abundance captures how populations are changing over time on average in comparison to a reference point, or "baseline" (the LPI uses 1970). It is often described as analogous to a stock market index for species. The index is comprised of thousands of population time-series for vertebrate species from locations around the world; the trends from these populations are averaged to produce terrestrial, freshwater, and marine indices, which are further aggregated to a global LPI. The latest global LPI shows a decline of 68% between 1970 and 2016 globally [1]. This is an average trend based on time-series data from 20,811 populations of 4,392 species of mammals, birds, reptiles, amphibians, and fish.

The LPI database includes population data for any species for which time-series population data could be found, regardless of threat status, or whether they show increasing or declining trends. These population time-series are sourced from scientific papers, online databases, government, and expert led published reports. They can be searched and downloaded from the project website (www.livingplanetindex.org). More technical information is available on the LPI stats website (http://stats.livingplanetindex.org/).

37

Introduction

39 The Living Planet Index (LPI) (Box 1) was first proposed as a means of evaluating environmental change,
40 particularly by tracking trends in global biodiversity, a quarter of a century ago [2]. At that time, although there
41 was mounting evidence of anthropogenic impacts on nature [3], there were very few indicators of the state of
42 biodiversity or ecosystems at a global, or even regional scale. The initial version of the LPI, based on
43 trends in vertebrate populations and forest cover, indicated that biodiversity was in decline globally [2]. A
44 successful response to what is now widely recognised as a global biodiversity crisis [4-7] will involve
45 transformative changes in the way humans use the planet's resources,[8-10] widespread intergovernmental
46 action [11] and ambitious targets [9,10] (intergovernmental agreements such as the Convention on Biological
47 Diversity (CBD) [12] and the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) [13]). To this end we need
48 meaningful and reliable biodiversity indicators, generated from high quality and large-scale data to track
49 progress towards targets down to the national level [10,14]. As such, the development of biodiversity indicators
50 has become an increasing focus in conservation science [15-17], particularly to ensure they are fit for purpose
51 as tools for management and policy, as well as to improve the representation of the underlying data beyond
52 well-studied taxa and regions.

53 Within this review we chart the history, progression, and applications of the LPI project (Box 1). We review
54 the LPI as a tool for public engagement and outreach, policy, and to drive further research and, analyse
55 citation data to explore other applications of the LPI. We discuss challenges faced in maintaining a large
56 biodiversity dataset and in current uses of the LPI. Finally, we look to the future and propose how the LPI
57 project could evolve by enabling global collaboration to strengthen the indicator, harnessing new
58 technologies for collecting population data, and developing new analysis to better understand the
59 relationships between drivers and wildlife population trends.

60

The origins and development of the Living Planet Index

The Living Planet Index was conceived in 1997 by the World Wildlife Fund for Nature (WWF International). The primary aim was to "*develop a measure of the changing state of the world's biodiversity over time*" [18] using aggregate time-series population trends for a large sample of species from across the world. As very little data were available on plants, fungi or invertebrate species, the pragmatic approach was taken to restrict the initial LPI taxonomically to vertebrates. There was also geographic unevenness in the distribution of the available data: long-term monitoring studies dating back decades were located mainly in Europe and North America. To address the biases in data coverage, a benchmark of 1970 was set, and the data were divided up into three broad biomes – terrestrial, freshwater and marine – and then further into regional groupings. The source data and LPI outputs were at first collaboratively managed by WWF and the World Conservation Monitoring Centre (now UN Environment Programme WCMC) for use within WWF's flagship publication, the Living Planet Report (LPR). First published in 1998, the LPR used the initial iteration of the LPI as a communications tool to convey biodiversity trends into a singular message on the health of the planet for a broad audience, alongside measures of humanity's impact on the planet [2]. Calculated as -32% between 1970 and 1995 (Loh, et al. [2]), the downward trend of the LPI was already apparent.

In the early 2000's, as the LPI dataset and methods were developed further [18], their potential for use in advocacy, research, and as an indicator for monitoring biodiversity were recognised more widely. In 2002, the Parties to the CBD committed to achieve a significant reduction of the rate of biodiversity loss at the global, regional and national level by 2010 and required a framework of biodiversity indicators to monitor their progress [19]. The first national LPI, the 'Living Uganda Index', was published with the National Biodiversity Data Bank recording scheme at Makerere University, Uganda in 2004 [20,21] and was presented as a case study for country-level applications of species population indices at CBD COP 7 [22]. A Discussion Meeting held at the Royal Society in 2004 brought together leading academic and NGO researchers working on biodiversity indicators, and the resulting papers, including one on the LPI, were published in a special issue of Philosophical Transactions B [23]. This meeting laid much of the groundwork for subsequent indicator development in the context of the CBD and other international biodiversity monitoring processes [24]. In 2005, the Convention's scientific advisory body adopted the LPI metric as part of a suite of biodiversity indicators, deployed to monitor progress towards that target [25]. In 2010, the CBD Parties agreed a further set of biodiversity targets, the Aichi Targets, for the period 2011 to 2020 [4] and the LPI was identified as an indicator for several of these.

To strengthen the LPI's scientific foundations and improve its capacity as an indicator for tracking progress towards international biodiversity policy targets, an in-depth peer-reviewed paper on the methodology was published [18] and the current partnership between WWF and the Zoological Society of London (ZSL) was subsequently formed in 2006. Since then, two updates to the methodology behind the global index have been published [26,27] and the research potential of the LPI data has expanded by incorporating metadata on ecology, geography, threats and management into the database, the core data of which were made openly accessible online in 2013 (18% of the data set is not available due to a confidentiality clause in the data sharing agreement, often for rare or threatened species).

Applications of the LPI

Here we provide an overview of the uses of the different LPI project elements (see Box 1) and outputs, grouped into three themes: public engagement and advocacy, policy and research.

1. *The LPI as a communication tool for public engagement and advocacy.*
   From its inception, the LPI was seen as a powerful tool and WWF communications found that it resonated with the public better than any other conservation messages at that time. The LPI helps to set the scene for the state of global biodiversity by conveying a complex topic as a singular takeaway message for a broad audience. The key conduit for the global LPI has been as the headline biodiversity indicator within the Living Planet Report (LPR). The LPR is an open access,

biennial publication of the latest research and insights into global biodiversity trends, the human drivers behind them, and proposed solutions to halt biodiversity loss and "bend the curve" [10] back towards restoration. Its widespread distribution and WWF's communications expertise have provided a regular global media platform and, emphasizing opportunities for awareness raising and advocacy regarding the biodiversity crisis. The 13th edition, published in 2020, was translated into 16 languages and circulated around the world, with over 290 million social media views and 3,560 mentions from monitored global news outlets within the first month of its launch [28]. The consistent use and media exposure within the LPR has accorded the LPI with familiarity within the public realm (see communication and interpretation of the LPI section). An analysis of online posts and articles (in English) containing the LPR 2020's keywords or hashtags showed that 51% mentioned the 2020 global LPI statistic [28]. Apart from global LPI figures, analysis of subset indices such as those featured in the LPR 2020 (LPI by IPBES regions, taxonomic focus (e.g. reptiles) and ecological biome (e.g. forests and freshwater)) have been used to draw focus towards trends within different species groups [5,29,30].

Both the underlying data in the LPI and the global results have been used in several educational formats, in schools and higher education. As part of the latest LPR outreach campaign, a youth edition including the LPI trends was prepared [31] and adapted by WWF country offices to enable young people to learn from the report's key messages and promote engagement of schools globally in biodiversity issues.

Nature documentaries provide another medium for large-scale biodiversity outreach [32]. The 2019 Netflix series "Our Planet," narrated by Sir David Attenborough, used the global LPI statistic from LPR 2018 to set the scene for its narrative alongside other headline biodiversity indicators and, within the first month of the launch, was viewed by 45 million accounts across the world [33].

National scale LPI analysis and LPRs such as those undertaken by WWF offices in Belgium [34], the Netherlands [35] and Canada [36], and regional approaches like the 2013 "Wildlife Comeback in Europe" report [37] have used LPI figures to illustrate species trends and raise public awareness to what is happening to status and trends of the biodiversity on their doorstep. The Wildlife Comeback report reached 138 million people across Europe and worldwide [38].

2. *The use of the LPI project within policy*

Analyses of the LPI dataset and trends within a geopolitical, ecological or taxonomic focus have been used to provide evidence of biodiversity change for policy makers, fed into policy and target development, and monitored progress towards those targets. The LPI is part of a suite of biodiversity indicators adopted by the CBD, measuring trends in relative abundance of vertebrates and deployed to monitor progress towards the 2010 Biodiversity Target [19], subsequent 2020 Aichi targets [4], and is one of the indicators within Goal A of the Post-2020 Biodiversity Monitoring Framework [39]. As a measure of population trends compiled at annual intervals, the LPI is sensitive enough to detect annual changes, which is of value for informing policy [15] and evaluating the impact of conservation interventions [40,19].

ZSL and WWF joined the Biodiversity Indicators Partnership (BIP) in 2007 to further develop the LPI and make it available for use under the CBD strategic plan. This resulted in the use of the LPI as evidence of biodiversity decline in international policy documents (Table 1): global and regional assessments (Millennium Ecosystem Assessment (2005) [41], IPBES global, regional and thematic assessments [7,42-45] and successive updates of UN Global Environment Outlook [25,46-49] and UN Global Biodiversity Outlook [50-53]) as well as thematic assessments (Ramsar Convention on Wetlands, (2018) [54], Mediterranean Wetlands Outlooks (2012 and 2018) [55,56], the Convention on Migratory Species reports (CMS) (2008 and in 2019) [57,58] and Arctic Biodiversity Assessment (2013) [59]). More recently, the global and regional indices were used to illustrate the state of nature and how this varies geographically as part of the evidence base for the Dasgupta review, an independent report on the economics of biodiversity [60].

LPIs have been used as a scientific basis and in their scene setting capacity, to influence policy development when advocating for transformative change and setting ambitious biodiversity targets

163   [9,10]. The global LPI statistic has featured in high-level biodiversity discussions, for example within
164   Volkan Bozkir's (President of the UN General Assembly) speech to heads of state at the 75th UN
165   Summit on Biodiversity in 2020 and within UK parliament in 2016 to support an Early Day Motion on
166   Global Biodiversity [61].

167   The LPI dataset and guidance on applying the method at a sub-global scale [62] have allowed for
168   regional, national and in some areas, sub-national scale analysis (Table 1). This 'scalability' is a key
169   requirement for indicators to be effective at tracking progress of signatory parties towards larger
170   intergovernmental targets [62,63]. CBD parties, for example, can develop national LPIs to fulfil part of
171   their progress reporting requirements within their National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plans
172   (NBSAP) [3]. Several members, including the Netherlands, Uganda, Canada, and China have
173   provided LPI analysis of species trends within their NBSAP reports. In France, this process has
174   been scaled down even further and; provinces such as Provence-Alpes-Côte d'Azur have used LPI
175   analysis to track progress towards their National Biodiversity Strategy [64]. In Australia, a new
176   application of the LPI method focussed on threatened species to monitor their national progress
177   towards Aichi Target 12 (extinction prevented) [65].

178   Aside from tracking CBD commitments, nations have adapted the LPI method and applied it to suit
179   their state biodiversity indicator needs such as the "Canadian Species Index," developed by ZSL in
180   partnership with Environment and Climate Change Canada (ECCC) [66,67]. The package in the
181   programming language "R" for calculating the LPI (rlpi), is freely available via GitHub [68], and has
182   been used by collaborators from around the world to produce their own regional and national
183   indices e.g. national and scientific agencies within Brazil use it within a national bird and mammal
184   monitoring programme [69].

185

Application of the LPI	Corresponding biodiversity and sustainable development targets and other multilateral environmental agreements (MEAs)		
Disaggregation and reference	*CBD*	*SDG*	*MEAs*
Sub national			
LPI-Cat, State of Nature in Catalonia 2020 report for Catalunya, Spain. [70]	CBD 12	SDG 14, SDG 15	ipbes
Indice Région Vivante (IRV), province of Provence-Alpes-Côte d'Azur, France. [64]	CBD 12	SDG 14, SDG 15	ipbes
Indice Région Vivante (IRV), bird indicator for the province of Franche-Comté, France. [71]	CBD 12	SDG 15	CMS, ipbes
National			
Living Uganda Index (LUI), Uganda. [21,72-75]	CBD 12	SDG 15	ipbes
Living Planet Index or Naturindeks for Norge, Norway. [76]	CBD 12	SDG 14, SDG 15	ipbes
Canadian Species Index (CSI), one of a suite of Canadian Environmental Sustainability Indicators, Canada. [67,77] The Canadian Living Planet Index (C-LPI). [36]	CBD 12	SDG 14, SDG 15	ipbes
Living Planet Index Netherlands, the Netherlands. [78,79]	CBD 12	SDG 14, SDG 15	ipbes
Living Planet Index, China. [80 81]	CBD 12	SDG 15	ipbes
Belgian Living Planet Index, Belgium. [34]	CBD 12	SDG 14, SDG 15	ipbes
Threatened Species Index (TSX), for birds, Australia. [65]	CBD 12	SDG 15	ipbes
The Austrian Living Planet Index, Austria. [82]	CBD 12	SDG 15	ipbes
Regional			
Arctic Species Trend Index (ASTI) for vertebrates across the Arctic [59,83,84]	CBD 10, CBD 12	SDG 14, SDG 15	ipbes, Ramsar

Index	SDG icons	SDG icons	MEA logos
ASTI for Arctic marine mammals, birds and fish [85]	10 12	14	ipbes
Arctic Migratory Birds Index [86]	10 12	14 15	CMS ipbes
Mediterranean wetlands Living Planet Index [55,56,87]	5	6	ipbes Ramsar
European marine vertebrates Living Planet Index, European Environment Agency (EEA) [88]	6 12	14	ipbes
Ecological			
Living Planet Index for global estuarine systems [89]	6 7 10 12	6 14 15	ipbes Ramsar
Living Planet Index for migratory species [58,90]	12	14 15	CMS ipbes
Living Planet Index by marine, freshwater and terrestrial biomes [54,91]	5	6	ipbes Ramsar
Living Planet Index for Reptiles [92]	12	14 15	ipbes
Living Planet Index for freshwater megafauna [93]	7 10 12	6 15	CMS ipbes Ramsar
Living Planet Index for migratory freshwater fish [94]	6 10 12	6 15	CMS ipbes Ramsar
Forest Specialists Index [95]	12	6 15	ipbes
Conservation management and species utilisation			
Protected areas and protected area management [96-99]	11	15	
Impacts of conservation management on species [40] and threatened species [36,100]	12	15	
Living Planet Index for recovering populations of European mammals and birds [37]	5 7 11 15	15	ipbes
Living Planet Index for utilized species [101,102]	4 12	8 12 14 15	CITES ipbes
Trends in target and bycatch species (oceanic sharks and rays) [103]	6 12	14	ipbes
Other influences of the LPI			
Index of Linguistic Diversity [104,105]	18	1 16	ipbes
The Wetland Extent Trends Index [106,107]	5	6	ipbes Ramsar
Sustainability Policy Transparency Toolkit (SPOTT) Index [108]	4 5 7	12	
The Species Awareness Index (SAI) [109]	1		

Table 1. Selected applications of the LPI data and/or method and the corresponding and suggested uses for tracking global conventions on biodiversity, sustainable development, and other multilateral environmental agreements (MEAs). Sourced from: UNEP (United Nations Environment Programme) [12,]UN [13,]UNEP-WCMC (UN Environment Programme World Conservation Monitoring Centre) [110]. The Post-2020 Biodiversity Framework targets were not finalised at the point of submission and are not included.

191   3. *The LPI project as a tool for research*
192   The LPI methods, dataset and metrics have been used either individually or in unison for numerous
193   research projects around the world (Table 1 and Figure 1). Within a random sample of 341 citations
194   containing the term "Living Planet Index," 90% of author and document affiliation was classed as
195   research (academic institution or university); of the outputs themselves, 53% were within academic
196   journals (Supplementary Materials A and B).

197   The Living Planet Database (LPD) (except for about 18% of the data marked as confidential – see
198   the origins and development of the Living Planet Index) has been publicly available since 2013
199   when the LPI website was created to facilitate viewing and downloading the data. Prior to this,
200   subsets of the database were shared upon request. The LPD is now the largest repository of
201   vertebrate population trend data (containing over 38,000 populations of more than 5,000 species at
202   the time of writing), adding to a wealth of available biodiversity data for species occurrence (GBIF
203   [111]), species extinction risk (IUCN Red List [112]) and ecological community data (PREDICTS [113],
204   BioTIME [114]). To date, www.livingplanetindex.org has had over 6,000 registered users from 145
205   countries around the world.

206   Within the LPD, the population and ancillary data (Supplementary Materials D Figure 5) have
207   facilitated a wide range of research topics (Table 1). In particular, the threat and management data
208   at population-level allows for more fine-grained analysis compared with using species-level data.
209   Recent applications of the data include: measuring the effectiveness of protected areas [96-98];
210   evaluating the correlates of abundance trends in subsets of species such as mammals, reptiles,
211   forest specialists, freshwater megafauna and migratory species [90,92,93,95,115]; the nature of population
212   dynamics in response to threats or management [99-101,116,117]; the effects of land use and climate on
213   species [118] and exploring linkages between human development variables and wildlife population
214   trends [119].

215   The LPD has been incorporated into an open access repository at the University of Edinburgh,
216   dedicated to providing free online courses in statistics for ecology and environmental scientists [120].
217   In a more informal setting, LPI data have been used to present challenges for data visualisation or
218   analysis as part of Hackathons, one of which led to the development of a tool to automatically
219   identify papers containing abundance data [121].

220   The framework used to calculate the LPI has been applied to produce other metrics and not just
221   biodiversity. Conceptually, relative change, as calculated by the geometric mean, can be applied to
222   other units of measurement that have been collected consistently over time. Using the code for
223   calculating the LPI, new indicators have been developed for wetland areas [106,107], linguistic diversity
224   [104], monitoring environmental, social and governance transparency in palm oil production [108] and
225   biodiversity awareness [109], of which the first two of these are part of the ongoing suite of indicators
226   for the CBD (Table 1).

227

Fig. 1. The number of publications per year citing the Living Planet Index between 1998-2020. The secondary Y-axis shows the cumulative total of publications. These 2,152 citations are from academic and grey literature in English and non-English languages retrieved from Google Scholar using the Publish or Perish software and combined with supplementary and unique results from Scopus and Web of Science searches for the keywords "Living Planet Index" between the years 1998-2020 (as of 18th of January 2021). See Supplementary Materials A for details on the methods.

Challenges and opportunities

Along with other high-profile biodiversity indicators and reports [122,123], the underlying data, methods, and interpretation of the LPI have come repeatedly under scrutiny, which has been a positive catalyst for new research, collaborations and ameliorations on the scientific rigour of the index. Here we provide an outline of the challenges faced by the LPI and aim to provide clarity on common misconceptions that have arisen within recent years.

1) *The dataset underpinning the LPI*

One of the strengths of the LPD is that it is not static: data are continually added and updated to provide the most complete and accurate picture possible of relative trends in population sizes (Figure 2). To ensure data are comparable, only species-level time-series which fulfil the following criteria are added: they are a measure of population abundance (or proxy, such as number of breeding pairs), with two or more years of data, collected within a specified geographic location under consistent methods (or explicitly corrected for) [26]. Supplementary metadata (Supplementary Materials D) are continually updated for both new, and existing time-series, adding a further step in the data extraction process [26]. The rigorous evaluation of data sources and data extraction not only limits the amount of applicable data that can be included, but it is also time consuming and labour intensive, and affects the volume of data that can be processed for each update. Storing these data in suitable infrastructure and the financial support required to maintain it are a further limitation common to other biodiversity databases [124]. The costs of running the entire project can be complex to calculate as the source data is often already published and there are many stakeholders including researchers and policymakers to consider. A detailed estimate has not been done but the approximate costs of just maintaining the LPD, alongside basic global and national LPI development is estimated at £250k per year but this is not always secured annually.

Long-term, population, abundance studies at a species population level are a limited resource in themselves, particularly for highly speciose taxa such as invertebrates and plants which have not

been included in the LPD to date (see the future section). Studies which include population data may not have been designed for long-term population monitoring but to assess population size and so their methods and survey effort might change with advances in population estimate approaches (e.g. revised Orangutan estimates in Sabah [125], which render these data incompatible for inclusion in the LPD). This issue is amplified for regions and taxa which are recognised as underrepresented within the dataset such as tropical regions and fish, reptiles and amphibians (see Supplementary Materials E) [27,126].

Subsequently, the composition of the LPD is likely to reflect bias inherent in species monitoring schemes which tend to favour certain taxa (e.g. birds), or regions (e.g. high income countries) [27,127,128]. This is a challenge shared by biodiversity indicators and databases in general [122,129]. In addition, attempts to source data from grey literature or offline databases is often dependent on the time and expertise available from researchers and field contacts within chronically neglected and underfunded areas [130]. To counteract bias in the resulting LPI, two approaches are taken. At the data inputting stage, a gap analysis of the taxonomic and geographic representation of the LPD is used to prioritise taxa and regions for targeted data searches (Supplementary Materials E). However, focussed searches are not always fruitful: within the 2020 LPI, only 4 populations of African amphibians were included despite targeted efforts [131]. The second step for overcoming bias in the LPI is in the adoption of the diversity-weighted method (see the LPI methods section).

Language is a further constraint to collating representative data for the LPI and can exacerbate existing geographic biases [132]. The dominance of English-language data sources is partly a reflection of the LPI project being hosted in an English-speaking country but also of English as a globally used language for science [133]. However, over a third of biodiversity documents from a single year were published in languages other than English [134], so there are likely to be data that have not been captured because language barriers have not yet been adequately addressed.

Collating and storing a continually increasing repository of LPI data, that aligns with FAIR (Findable, Accessible, Interoperable, and Reusable) Data Principles, requires ongoing investment in the data infrastructure and management [124,135]. Coupled with this is the importance of promoting data sharing in a way that alleviates concerns over data ownership and provides appropriate credit to data providers. Unless a system is in place whereby data providers maintain ownership and control of their data, there is likely to be a barrier to mobilising data.

Figure 2. a-d. Growth in number of populations and species in the Living Planet Database (LPD) by region and taxa. The cumulative number of new populations (panel a) and species (b) entered by region, and the cumulative number of populations (c) and species (c) entered by taxon. Please note 2b adds up to more than the individual number of species as some species occur in more than one region.

2) The LPI methods

The key methodological challenges for the LPI project are to generate a robust LPI indicator of biodiversity and to model the time-series data in the LPD, which vary in length and scale, in a way that allows exploration of underlying patterns in population trends. A further challenge that underpins both issues, is addressing the taxonomic and geographic gaps in the underlying data (Supplementary Materials E).

The basic formula for calculating the LPI has remained consistent: each logged population trend is averaged within a single species and the species trends are aggregated to produce a single index [18]. This aggregation is produced using a geometric mean, an approach used to generate other indices of relative abundance from species abundance data [136-138]. Further levels of aggregation are often used for global, national, and local contexts (see Supplementary Materials F for the global example).

A challenge in the use of a geometric mean of abundance for the calculation of indicators is that it can be sensitive to outliers in the data which may impact the precision of the long-term trend if not addressed [139-141]. While this method is still considered to a more suitable and sensitive metric to assess changes in biodiversity [142,143], understanding the impact of outliers is important. To tackle this, each new iteration of the global LPI analysis includes sensitivity tests on the influence of single species on the trends and of the effect of short time-series on the LPI, as these are more commonly associated with highly variable or extreme trends [131]. These tests are published in any supplementary information or website for transparency and to demonstrate the robustness of any index [131].

The modelling of the time-series data in the LPD has been periodically improved. In early iterations of the LPI, the chain method was implemented, which involved linearly interpolating the rate of change between 5-year intervals, (following Loh, et al. [18]). As this approach was sensitive to abrupt changes in population trends, generalised additive modelling (GAM) was adopted to better capture

long-term nonlinear trends in populations [26]. National variations of modelling have been tailored to the type of species monitoring data in the country in question, for example the use of linear regression for short-term trends in the Canadian Species Index [66,79].

More recently, Bayesian approaches such as state-space models have been applied to model the population time-series whilst incorporating observation error into the estimation of trends [144], which is something that the GAM framework does not account for. This has allowed for new ways of analysing the LPD, which lend themselves to uncovering the correlates of vertebrate population trends [145] and the taxonomic and geographic patterns of population trends globally [141].

A significant challenge remains in tackling the underrepresentation in the LPI database of particular taxa and regions in the LPD so an adaptation to the LPI method was made to mitigate the impacts of this bias on the index. This diversity-weighted approach was developed and subsequently adopted for calculating global and regionals LPIs [27]. This method places greater weight on species trends from regions and taxa that are more species-rich but tend to be disproportionately under-represented in the LPD e.g. the Neotropics. This provides a more representative picture of global vertebrate trends in lieu of a more complete data set. One drawback is that weight is often placed on species and regions with the lowest data availability so if the sample of data from a region is not representative, this could cause an over- or under- estimation of trends. Efforts are also underway to address gaps in the data set through targeted data collection and to develop models to predict trends in locations and for taxa which are data deficient, as has been done for extinction risk [146].

3) *Communication and interpretation of the LPI*

Key attributes of biodiversity indicators are that they should be simplified and easily understood [138]. The LPI was developed with these criteria in mind and, by aggregating trends from different ecological realms and geographic regions, it can provide a useful overview and communication tool for broad audiences. However, the index has been critiqued as oversimplifying the state of biodiversity [147] and masking important trends [141]. Arguably, there is need for a balance between providing a simple, clear message about global biodiversity trends whilst supporting it with more in-depth analysis [123]. To explore this variation, disaggregations of the LPI have been developed (Table 1), for example, for forest specialists [95].

The limited availability of quality, ecological data prior to the 1970s is a common limitation to many biodiversity indicators [129,148]. The LPI is benchmarked at a temporal baseline of 1970, and this raises the importance of interpreting the index in context, as geopolitical regions have been impacted by anthropogenic pressure at different points in time and varying intensity. In Europe, for example, a significant amount of habitat destruction and overexploitation of some species had occurred prior to the 1970s and therefore the LPI baseline is set at a significantly depleted reference point [37]. The year chosen as a baseline can affect the interpretation of the state of biodiversity in a particular region [149]. Without taking this into consideration, it is possible to underestimate the gravity of the decline in biodiversity or overestimate a recovery within any given landscape.

Communications around biodiversity indicators and biodiversity loss have often centred on species, and species extinctions respectively, rather than attempting to explain the multi-faceted nature of biodiversity change and how we measure it [123,150]. Miscommunication and oversimplification of biodiversity and biodiversity loss, or decline, across the science-society and science-policy interface, are a challenge shared by biodiversity indicators in general [123]. The impact of substituting a single word for another in press and media communications, "loss" vs "decline", has sometimes led to misinterpretation of the global LPI statistic. A negative trend in the LPI depicts a relative decline in population sizes, on average, since 1970. The use of the word "loss" in some media articles can imply that a negative LPI trend is analogous with the disappearance of populations and even the extinctions of species, which can prove challenging to correct. Media headlines have referred to large percentages of populations being "wiped out" [151], which could mislead the public about the severity of biodiversity decline and, it has been argued, such negative statements about environmental issues may be counterproductive in trying to stimulate action [152].

373 Efforts to minimise misinterpretation have been made with each iteration of the LPI, by engaging
374 with journalists directly through press briefings, providing background information to
375 communications teams and publicising the supporting information available in technical
376 supplements to the LPR [131], websites (http://stats.livingplanetindex.org/) and blogs [153]. These efforts
377 have also reinforced the LPI as a measure of "relative abundance" rather than "abundance" to help
378 avoid misinterpretations [154]. We have already seen an uptake in the use of the LPR 2020 technical
379 supplement in recent publications and blogs exploring the LPI [155,156]. The analogy of a FTSE index
380 for biodiversity is most commonly used to describe the LPI, but a focus in the future should be on
381 finding other ways to communicate the index that mitigate the use of dramatic narratives but without
382 compromising while retaining the simple message of the LPI that can be broadly understood.

383

The future

385 The LPI project has grown significantly over the last 25 years and provides an important dataset to
386 communicate the trends in vertebrate populations and investigate the factors that influence them. We
387 identify four key priorities for the immediate future.

388 *1. Increasing representation in the LPI*
389 The composition of the LPI needs to be improved, crucially by increasing the taxonomic and geographic
390 representation of the data particularly for aquatic species. Incorporating invertebrate and plant species into
391 the LPI is likely to be challenging given the paucity of monitoring compared to some vertebrate groups [157]
392 but is key to attaining an indicator of broader biodiversity in addition to and providing a fuller data set for
393 macro-ecological research. Many national LPIs have already been developed, and maintaining this focus
394 on increasing the representation of species within countries will provide nations with a tool to track progress
395 towards future CBD and SDG targets. Indicators also need to be ecologically relevant [138], so ensuring that
396 different functional attributes of species within an ecosystem are reflected will be the focus of new research.
397 These developments in the data set will be realised through the use of emerging techniques to incorporate
398 unstructured data, such as that collected through citizen science initiatives [158-160], and capitalising on
399 growing technology for monitoring biodiversity such as eDNA, satellite monitoring and AI-assisted counting
400 of species, provided they can be transformed into usable metrics of abundance.

401 *2. Streamlining data collation and data access*
402 Sourcing and extracting data continue to be significant bottlenecks for the development of the LPD. Data
403 searches can be automated to some degree using predictive models based upon titles and abstracts [121],
404 but extracting data automatically remains a challenge. Working with publishers, data holders, government
405 institutions and research funding bodies to automate the process of identifying and extracting data from
406 articles would be beneficial particularly if a standardised workflow is developed (e.g. Cardoso, et al. [161]),
407 and systematic review tools may advance data collation in a community-driven way [162]. To address
408 language barriers, which in turn could help to fill taxonomic and regional data gaps [163], a protocol for
409 conducting data searches in multiple languages is under development. This should be part of a broader
410 strategy to build a sustainable data network for the LPI, which provides accessibility to a global database
411 (both for data download and upload, e.g. from new national LPI datasets) whilst retaining data quality and
412 ownership, and assuring appropriate credit to data gatherers and providers. It is also important that the
413 LPD is made as accessible as possible, both through simple, downloadable, tidy data formats [164] and the
414 development of Application Programming Interfaces (API) to allow the data to interoperate with other
415 resources such as the IUCN Red List [112], Protected Planet [165] and GBIF [111].

416 *3. Better models to link population trends with drivers*
417 The LPI continues to highlight that global biodiversity is in trouble and understanding (and predicting) which
418 regions and species are likely to decline most in the future is useful. As such, models to better predict
419 wildlife abundance trends for species and regions where we have poorer data is critical. Understanding the
420 quality and utility of these models will allow us to make concrete and valuable predictions. The varied
421 response of some populations to their changing environment highlights an important question – are some
422 populations useful 'canaries' of pending ecosystem collapse and how might we best identify them?

423 Models that combine LPI data with drivers such as land-use and climate-change data have demonstrated
424 that both are important drivers of population trends [118]. Developing these models further allows us to make
425 predictions about how biodiversity might change under future scenarios and management interventions [9],
426 highlighting one evolving use of biodiversity datasets like the LPD.

427 Whilst incorporating data on drivers from other global data sets can inform explanatory analysis for species
428 trend data [118], population-scale information can also provide a powerful set of variables, for example in
429 understanding the effect of different direct drivers [101] or to pave the way for counterfactual analysis of
430 different management types (e.g. Jellesmark, et al. [166]). However, the current coding for threats and
431 conservation action in the LPD lacks alignment with established frameworks [167], so transferring the ancillary
432 information into these classification schemes and maintaining the recording of population drivers will
433 improve the utility of models and ground-truthing of broad scale data sets in the future.

434 *4. Increasing the utility of the LPI for policy*
435 From a policy perspective, an emphasis on developing LPIs at the national level is needed to expand its
436 use as a communication and reporting tool. With reporting requirements at a national level for the SDGs
437 and the CBD, national LPIs would serve a dual purpose of providing countries with a sensitive indicator for
438 reporting while boosting data representation for the global index. Disaggregations of the LPI on themes
439 such as use, trade, migration and wetlands should continue to be developed, so that these are available for
440 reporting against other multilateral environmental agreements such as the Ramsar Convention on
441 Wetlands, CITES and the CMS.

442 The LPI performed well in an evaluation of biodiversity indicators using decision science [17], although gaps
443 were identified in the practice of regular tests of the index and in assessing the cost- effectiveness of the
444 LPI relative to other indicators. Creating a better understanding of how the LPI fits within the growing suite
445 of biodiversity indicators such as the Red List Index [168] and the Biodiversity Intactness Index [169], and clearly
446 presenting the complementarity of these indicators with each other, will be key to developing a clear and
447 consistent narrative of global biodiversity change [14] and to ensure the suitability of the LPI within any multi-
448 dimensional indicator framework [170,171].

449 # Conclusion

450 The LPI has evolved from a simple communications tool to a large and growing database, policy tool and
451 foundation for research. The open-access dataset and method are globally important resources for the
452 scientific community and beyond, but improvements are still needed to enhance the representation of
453 biodiversity in the underlying data and produce clear and meaningful outputs. Collaboration and
454 engagement within the fields of science, policy, conservation and communication — some of which have
455 fuelled much of the development to date, will continue to be important for ensuring the LPI project remains
456 fit for purpose.

457

458 # Acknowledgements

465

466 # Supporting information

467 Supplementary information is available for this paper at: DOI XXX

468 These include the methods for the citation search in academic and grey literature, and metadata coding
469 (Supplementary materials A), the results of citation search and metadata coding (Supplementary materials
470 B), the results of the Altmetric data analysis for key LPI papers (Supplementary materials C), an infographic
471 of the underlying data within the LPD and summary of the growth in populations and species in the LPD
472 over time (Supplementary materials D), a summary of LPD data diagnostics for underrepresented taxa and
473 realms (Supplementary materials E) and a visualisation of the global aggregation LPI method
474 (Supplementary materials F).

References

476 1   WWF/ZSL. *The Living Planet Index Database (LPD)*, <www.livingplanetindex.org> (2020).

477 2   Loh, J. *et al.* Living planet report: 1998. (WWF, Gland, Switzerland, 1998).

478 3   UN. Convention on biological diversity. 5th June 1992. (United Nations Conference on Environment
479   and Development, Rio de Janeiro, 1992).

480 4   Tittensor, D. P. *et al.* A mid-term analysis of progress toward international biodiversity targets.
481   *Science* **346**, 241-244, doi:10.1126/science.1257484 (2014).

482 5   WWF. Living planet report 2020 - Bending the curve of biodiversity loss. (WWF, Gland, Switzerland,
483   2020).

484 6   Diaz, S. *et al.* Assessing nature's contributions to people. *Science* **359**, 270-272,
485   doi:10.1126/science.aap8826 (2018).

486 7   IPBES. Global assessment report on biodiversity and ecosystem services of the Intergovernmental
487   Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services. (IPBES Secretariat, Bonn,
488   Germany, 2019).

489 8   Diaz, S. *et al.* Pervasive human-driven decline of life on Earth points to the need for transformative
490   change. *Science* **366**, doi:10.1126/science.aax3100 (2019).

491 9   Leclère, D. *et al.* Bending the curve of terrestrial biodiversity needs an integrated strategy. *Nature*
492   **585**, 551-556, doi:10.1038/s41586-020-2705-y (2020).

493 10   Mace, G. M. *et al.* Aiming higher to bend the curve of biodiversity loss. *Nature Sustainability* **1**, 448-
494   451, doi:10.1038/s41893-018-0130-0 (2018).

495 11   Xu, H. *et al.* Ensuring effective implementation of the post-2020 global biodiversity targets. *Nat Ecol
496   Evol* **5**, 411-418, doi:10.1038/s41559-020-01375-y (2021).

497 12   UNEP (United Nations Environment Programme). Decision X/2: The strategic plan for biodiversity
498   2011–2020 and the Aichi Biodiversity Targets. Adopted at the 10th Conference Of The Parties
499   (COP) to the Convention On Biological Diversity (CBD). (UNEP, Montreal, Canada, 2010).

500 13   UN. Transforming our world: The 2030 agenda for sustainable development. (United Nations (UN),
501   2015).

502 14   Hill, S. L. L. *et al.* Reconciling Biodiversity Indicators to Guide Understanding and Action.
503   *Conservation Letters* **9**, 405-412, doi:10.1111/conl.12291 (2016).

504 15   Jones, J. P. *et al.* The why, what, and how of global biodiversity indicators beyond the 2010 target.
505   *Conserv Biol* **25**, 450-457, doi:10.1111/j.1523-1739.2010.01605.x (2011).

506 16   Nicholson, E. *et al.* Making robust policy decisions using global biodiversity indicators. *PLoS ONE* **7**,
507   e41128, doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0041128 (2012).

508 17   Watermeyer, K. E. *et al.* Using decision science to evaluate global biodiversity indices. *Conserv Biol*
509   **35**, 492-501, doi:10.1111/cobi.13574 (2021).

510   18   Loh, J. *et al.* The Living Planet Index: Using species population time series to track trends in
511   biodiversity. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences* **360**, 289-295,
512   doi:10.1098/rstb.2004.1584 (2005).

513   19   Butchart, S. H. *et al.* Global biodiversity: Indicators of recent declines. *Science* **328**, 1164-1168,
514   doi:10.1126/science.1187512 (2010).

515   20   Arinaitwe, H., Pomeroy, D. E. & Tushabe, H. The State of Uganda's Biodiversity: 2000. 56 (National
516   Biodiversity Data Bank, Makerere University Institute of Environment and Natural Resources,
517   Kampala, Uganda, 2000).

518   21   Pomeroy, D. & Tushabe, H. The State of Uganda's Biodiversity 2004. (National Biodiversity
519   DataBank (NBDB). Makerere University Institute of Environment and Natural Resources (MUIENR),
520   Kampala, Uganda, 2004).

521   22   Jenkins, M., Kapos, V. & Loh, J. Rising to the biodiversity challenge. The role of species population
522   trend indices like the Living Planet Index in tracking progress towards global and national
523   biodiversity targets. (World Bank, Washington, DC. USA, 2004).

524   23   Balmford, A., Crane, P. R., Green, R. E. & Mace, G. M. Discussion Meeting Issue 'Beyond
525   extinction rates: monitoring wild nature for the 2010 target'. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal*
526   *Society B: Biological Sciences* **360**, 219-477 (2005).

527   24   UNEP (United Nations Environment Programme). Decision VIII/15: Framework for monitoring
528   implementation of the achievement of the 2010 target and integration of targets into the thematic
529   programmes of work. Adopted at the 8th Conference Of The Parties (COP) to the Convention On
530   Biological Diversity (CBD). (UNEP, Curitiba, Brazil, 2006).

531   25   UNEP (United Nations Environment Programme). Report on the eighth meeting of the Conference
532   of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity, CBD. (UNEP, Nairobi, 2006).

533   26   Collen, B. *et al.* Monitoring change in vertebrate abundance: The Living Planet Index. *Conservation*
534   *Biology* **23**, 317-327, doi:10.1111/j.1523-1739.2008.01117.x (2009).

535   27   McRae, L., Deinet, S. & Freeman, R. The diversity-weighted Living Planet Index: Controlling for
536   taxonomic bias in a global biodiversity indicator. *PLOS ONE* **12**, e0169156,
537   doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0169156 (2017).

538   28   WWF. Living Planet Report 2020 - Network results. (WWF, Internal report, 2021).

539   29   WWF. Living planet Report 2020. Bending the curve of biodiversity loss: a deep dive into climate
540   and biodiversity. (WWF, Gland, Switzerland, 2020).

541   30   WWF. Living planet Report 2020. Bending the curve of biodiversity loss: a deep dive into
542   freshwater. (WWF, Gland, Switzerland, 2020).

543   31   WWF. Living Planet Report 2020 youth edition: A guide for our future. (WWF, Gland, Switzerland,
544   2020).

545   32   Jones, J. P. G., Thomas-Walters, L., Rust, N. A., Veríssimo, D. & Januchowski-Hartley, S. Nature
546   documentaries and saving nature: Reflections on the new Netflix series Our Planet. *People and*
547   *Nature* **1**, 420-425, doi:10.1002/pan3.10052 (2019).

548   33   WWF/tve. Our Planet: Our impact - The first year of the Our Planet Project. (WWF-UK, Woking, UK,
549   2020).

550   34   WWF. Rapport Planète Vivante - La Nature en Belgique. (WWF, Brussels, Belgium, 2020).

551   35   Wereld Natuur Fonds. Living Planet Report Nederland. Natuur en landbouw verbonden. (WWF-NL,
552   Zeist, 2020).

553 36 WWF-Canada. Living Planet Report Canada: Wildlife At Risk. (World Wildlife Fund Canada,
554   Toronto, Canada, 2020).

555 37 Deinet, S. *et al.* Wildlife comeback in Europe: The recovery of selected mammal and bird species.
556   Final report to Rewilding Europe by ZSL, BirdLife International and the European Bird Census
557   Council. (ZSL, London, UK, 2013).

558 38 Rewilding Europe. Annual review 2013. (Rewilding Europe, The Netherlands, 2013).

559 39 UNEP (United Nations Environment Programme). in *24th Meeting of the Subsidiary Body On*
560   *Scientific, Technical And Technological Advice (SBSTTA)*   (Convention on Biological Diversity
561   (CBD),, 2020).

562 40 Jellesmark, S. *et al.* Assessing the global impact of targeted conservation actions on species
563   abundance. *bioRxiv*, 2022.2001.2014.476374, doi:10.1101/2022.01.14.476374 (2022).

564 41 Millennium Ecosystem Assessment. Ecosystems and Human Well-being: Biodiversity Synthesis.
565   (World Resources Institute, Washington, DC., 2005).

566 42 IPBES. The IPBES regional assessment report on biodiversity and ecosystem services for the
567   Americas of the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem
568   Services. (Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services.
569   IPBES Secretariat, Bonn, Germany, 2018).

570 43 IPBES. The IPBES regional assessment report on biodiversity and ecosystem services for Europe
571   and Central Asia of the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem
572   Services. (Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services.
573   IPBES Secretariat, Bonn, Germany, 2018).

574 44 IPBES. The IPBES regional assessment report on biodiversity and ecosystem services for Africa of
575   the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services.
576   (Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services. IPBES
577   Secretariat, Bonn, Germany, 2018).

578 45 IPBES. The IPBES regional assessment report on biodiversity and ecosystem services for Asia and
579   the Pacific of the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem
580   Services. (Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services.
581   IPBES Secretariat, Bonn, Germany, 2018).

582 46 UNEP (United Nations Environment Programme). Global Environment Outlook 3: Past, present and
583   future perspectives. (United Nations Environment Programme, Nairobi, Kenya, 2002).

584 47 UNEP (United Nations Environment Programme). Global Environment Outlook 4: Environment for
585   development. (United Nations Environment Programme, Nairobi, Kenya, 2007).

586 48 UNEP (United Nations Environment Programme). Global Environment Outlook 5: Environment for
587   the future we want. (United Nations Environment Programme, Nairobi, Kenya, 2012).

588 49 UNEP (United Nations Environment Programme). *Global Environment Outlook – GEO-6: Healthy*
589   *planet, healthy people*. (United Nations Environment Programme. Cambridge University Press,
590   2019).

591 50 Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity. Global Biodiversity Outlook 2. 81 + vii
592   (Montréal, Canada, 2006).

593 51 Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity. Global Biodiversity Outlook 3. 94 (Montréal,
594   Canada, 2010).

595 52 Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity. Global Biodiversity Outlook 4. 155 (Montréal,
596   Canada, 2014).

597   53   Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity. Global Biodiversity Outlook 5. (Montréal,
598   Canada, 2020).

599   54   Ramsar Convention on Wetlands. Global wetland outlook: State of the world's wetlands and their
600   services to people. (Ramsar Convention Secretariat, Gland, Switzerland, 2018).

601   55   MWO (Mediterranean Wetlands Observatory). Mediterranean Wetlands Outlook. First
602   Mediterranean Wetlands Observatory report - Technical report. 128 pages (Tour du Valat, France,
603   2012).

604   56   MWO (Mediterranean Wetlands Observatory). Mediterranean Wetlands Outlook 2: Solutions for
605   Sustainable Mediterranean Wetlands. (Tour du Valat, France, 2018).

606   57   Deinet, S. The Living Planet Index (LPI) for species listed on the CMS Appendices. Technical
607   summary submitted to UNEP-WCMC and the CMS Secretariat. 11 (ZSL,
608   UNEP/CMS/COP13/Doc.24/Annex 5, 2019).

609   58   Latham, J., Collen, B., McRae, L. & Loh, J. The Living Planet Index for migratory species: An index
610   of change in population abundance. 22 (ZSL/WWF, 2008).

611   59   CAFF (Conservation of Arctic Flora and Fauna). *Arctic biodiversity assessment. Status and trends
612   in Arctic biodiversity*. (Conservation of Arctic Flora and Fauna, 2013).

613   60   Dasgupta, P. The economics of biodiversity: The Dasgupta review. (HM Treasury, London, 2021).

614   61   UK Parliament. *Early Day Motions. Number 624: Global biodiversity. Tabled 31st October, 2016
615   (2016-17 Session)* (2016).

616   62   McRae, L. *et al.* Living Planet Index Guidance for national and regional use Version 1.1. 11
617   (Cambridge, UK., 2008).

618   63   Brooks, T. M. *et al.* Analysing biodiversity and conservation knowledge products to support regional
619   environmental assessments. *Scientific Data* **3**, 160007, doi:10.1038/sdata.2016.7 (2016).

620   64   PACA (Observatoire Régional de la Biodiversité en Provence-Alpes-Côte d'Azur). Indice Région
621   Vivante. Comment évolue la biodiversité en Provence-Alpes-Côte d'Azur? , (Observatoire Régional
622   de la Biodiversité en Provence-Alpes-Côte d'Azur, 2018).

623   65   Bayraktarov, E. *et al.* A threatened species index for Australian birds. *Conservation Science and
624   Practice* **3**, doi:10.1111/csp2.322 (2020).

625   66   Marconi, V. *et al.* Population declines among Canadian vertebrates: But data of different quality
626   show diverging trends. *Ecological Indicators* **130**, 108022, doi:10.1016/j.ecolind.2021.108022
627   (2021).

628   67   Environment and Climate Change Canada (ECCC). Canadian Environmental Sustainability
629   Indicators: Canadian species index. (2019).

630   68   Freeman, R., McRae, L., Deinet, S., Amin, R. & Collen, B. *rlpi: Tools for calculating indices using
631   the Living Planet Index method. R Package*, <https://github.com/Zoological-Society-of-London/rlpi>
632   (2017).

633   69   ICMBio-CENAP/Programa-Monitora-Florestal-Global. *Analise de dados Mastoaves do protocolo
634   florestal global do programa Monitora*, <https://github.com/ICMBio-CENAP/Programa-Monitora-
635   Florestal-Global> (2021).

636   70   Brotons, L. *et al.* Estat de la Natura a Catalunya 2020. (Departament de Territori i Sostenibilitat.
637   Generalitat de Catalunya, Barcelona, 2020).

638 71   Maas, S. & Giroud, I. Indice Région Vivante (IRV) : indicateurs oiseaux de Franche-Comté. 11p
639   (LPO Franche-Comté, DREAL Bourgogne Franche-Comté et Conseil Régional Bourgogne Franche-
640   Comté, 2016).

641 72   Pomeroy, D., Tushabe, H. & Loh, J. The State of Uganda's Biodiversity 2017. (National Biodiversity
642   Data Bank. Makerere University, Kampala, 2017).

643 73   Pomeroy, D. & Tushabe, H. The State of Uganda's Biodiversity 2006. (Makerere Institute of
644   Environment and Natural Resources/National Biodiversity Data Bank, 2006).

645 74   NEMA (National Environment Management Authority). State of Environment Report for Uganda.
646   332 (NEMA, Kampala, Uganda, 2006/7).

647 75   Pomeroy, D. & Tushabe, H. The state of Uganda's biodiversity report: Sixth biennial report.
648   (National Biodiversity Data Bank (NBDB), Makerere University Institute of Environment and Natural
649   Resources (MUIENR), 2008).

650 76   WWF-Norge. Naturindeks for Norge 2005. Utfor bakke med norsk natur. (WW-Norge, Oslo, Norway,
651   2005).

652 77   Muller, H. *et al.* The Canadian Species Index. (ZSL/Environment Canada, 2016).

653 78   CBS, PBL, RIVM & WUR. *Trend fauna - all species monitored - Living Planet Index Netherlands,*
654   *1990-2018 (indicator 1569, version 05 , 30 March 2020),* <https://www.clo.nl/en/indicators/en1569-
655   living-planet-index-for-the-netherlands> (2021).

656 79   van Strien, A. J. *et al.* Modest recovery of biodiversity in a western European country: The Living
657   Planet Index for the Netherlands. *Biological Conservation* **200**, 44-50,
658   doi:10.1016/j.biocon.2016.05.031 (2016).

659 80   WWF China. Living planet report China 2015: Development, species and ecological civilization.
660   (WWF China in partnership with China Council for International Cooperation on Environment and
661   Development (CCICED), Institute of Geographic Sciences and Natural Resources Research
662   (IGSNRR) and Institute of Zoology of Chinese Academy of Sciences (CAS), and the Global
663   Footprint Network, 2015).

664 81   The Government of China. Sixth national report to the Conventional on Biological Diversity.
665   (Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity (SCBD), The Clearing-House Mechanism of
666   the Convention on Biological Diversity (CHM), 2019).

667 82   Semmelmayer, K. & Hackländer, K. Monitoring vertebrate abundance in Austria: Developments over
668   30 years. *Die Bodenkultur: Journal of Land Management, Food and Environment* **71**, 19-30,
669   doi:10.2478/boku-2020-0003 (2020).

670 83   McRae, L., Böhm, M., Deinet, S., Gill, M. & Collen, B. The Arctic Species Trend Index: using
671   vertebrate population trends to monitor the health of a rapidly changing ecosystem. *Biodiversity* **13**,
672   144-156, doi:10.1080/14888386.2012.705085 (2012).

673 84   McRae, L. *et al.* Arctic Species Trend Index 2010. Tracking Trends in Arctic Wildlife. (CAFF
674   International Secretariat, 2010).

675 85   McRae, L., Deinet, S., Gill, M. & Collen, B. The Arctic Species Trend Index: Tracking trends in Arctic
676   marine populations. (Conservation of Arctic Flora and Fauna (CAFF), Iceland, 2012).

677 86   Deinet, S. *et al.* Arctic Species Trend Index: Migratory Birds Index. (Conservation of Arctic Flora and
678   Fauna (CAFF), Akureyri, Iceland, 2015).

679 87   Galewski, T., Segura, L., Biquet, J., Saccon, E. & Boutry, N. Living Mediterranean Report:
680   Monitoring species trends to secure one of the major biodiversity hotspots. (Tour du Valat (TdV),
681   France, 2021).

682 88 EEA (European Environment Agency). Marine messages II: Navigating the course towards clean,
683   healthy and productive seas through implementation of an ecosystem-based approach. (European
684   Environment Agency, Luxembourg, 2019).

685 89 Deinet, S. *et al.* The Living Planet Index for Global Estuarine Systems: Technical report. (WWF/ZSL,
686   2010).

687 90 Hardesty-Moore, M. *et al.* Migration in the Anthropocene: how collective navigation, environmental
688   system and taxonomy shape the vulnerability of migratory species. *Philos Trans R Soc Lond B Biol*
689   *Sci* **373**, doi:10.1098/rstb.2017.0017 (2018).

690 91 WWF. Living planet report 2016. Risk and resilience in a new era. Report No. 978-2-940529-40-7,
691   (WWF, Gland, Switzerland, 2016).

692 92 Saha, A. *et al.* Tracking Global Population Trends: Population Time-Series Data and a Living Planet
693   Index for Reptiles. *Journal of Herpetology* **52**, doi:10.1670/17-076 (2018).

694 93 He, F. *et al.* The global decline of freshwater megafauna. *Glob Chang Biol* **25**, 3883-3892,
695   doi:10.1111/gcb.14753 (2019).

696 94 Deinet, S. *et al.* The Living Planet Index (LPI) for migratory freshwater fish - Technical Report.
697   (World Fish Migration Foundation, The Netherlands, 2020).

698 95 Green, E. J. *et al.* Below the canopy: global trends in forest vertebrate populations and their drivers.
699   *Proc Biol Sci* **287**, 20200533, doi:10.1098/rspb.2020.0533 (2020).

700 96 Geldmann, J. *et al.* A global analysis of management capacity and ecological outcomes in terrestrial
701   protected areas. *Conservation Letters* **11**, e12434, doi:10.1111/conl.12434 (2018).

702 97 Craigie, I. D. *et al.* Large mammal population declines in Africa's protected areas. *Biological*
703   *Conservation* **143**, 2221-2228, doi:10.1016/j.biocon.2010.06.007 (2010).

704 98 Barnes, M. D. *et al.* Wildlife population trends in protected areas predicted by national socio-
705   economic metrics and body size. *Nature Communications* **7**, 12747, doi:10.1038/ncomms12747
706   (2016).

707 99 Costelloe, B. *et al.* Global biodiversity indicators reflect the modeled impacts of protected area policy
708   change: Biodiversity indicators and protected areas. *Conservation Letters* **9**, 14-20,
709   doi:10.1111/conl.12163 (2016).

710 100 Currie, J., Marconi, V. & Kerr, J. An analysis of threats and factors that predict trends in Canadian
711   vertebrates designated as at-risk. *Facets* **5**, 49-66, doi:10.1139/facets-2019-0017 (2020).

712 101 McRae, L. *et al.* A global indicator of utilised wildlife populations: regional trends and the impact of
713   management. *bioRxiv*, doi:10.1101/2020.11.02.365031 (2021).

714 102 Tierney, M. *et al.* Use it or lose it: Measuring trends in wild species subject to substantial use. *Oryx*
715   **48**, 420-429, doi:10.1017/S0030605313000653 (2014).

716 103 Pacoureau, N. *et al.* Half a century of global decline in oceanic sharks and rays. *Nature* **589**, 567-
717   571, doi:10.1038/s41586-020-03173-9 (2021).

718 104 Harmon, D. & Loh, J. The index of linguistic diversity: A new quantitative measure of trends in the
719   status of the world's languages. *Language Documentation & Conservation* **4**, 97-151,
720   doi:http://hdl.handle.net/10125/4474 (2010).

721 105 Loh, J. & Harmon, D. Biocultural Diversity: threatened species, endangered languages. (WWF
722   Netherlands, Zeist, The Netherlands, 2014).

723 106 Dixon, M. J. R. *et al.* Tracking global change in ecosystem area: The Wetland Extent Trends index.
724 *Biological Conservation* **193**, 27-35, doi:10.1016/j.biocon.2015.10.023 (2016).

725 107 Darrah, S. E. *et al.* Improvements to the Wetland Extent Trends (WET) index as a tool for
726 monitoring natural and human-made wetlands. *Ecological Indicators* **99**, 294-298,
727 doi:10.1016/j.ecolind.2018.12.032 (2019).

728 108 Oppenheimer, P. *et al.* The SPOTT index: A proof-of-concept measure for tracking public disclosure
729 in the palm oil industry. *Current Research in Environmental Sustainability* **3**,
730 doi:10.1016/j.crsust.2021.100042 (2021).

731 109 Millard, J. W., Gregory, R. D., Jones, K. & Freeman, R. The Species Awareness Index (SAI): a
732 Wikipedia-derived conservation culturomics metric for public biodiversity awareness. *bioRxiv*,
733 doi:10.1101/2020.08.17.254177 (2020).

734 110 UNEP-WCMC (UN Environment Programme World Conservation Monitoring Centre). *The
735 Biodiversity Indicators Partnership (BIP)* <https://www.bipindicators.net/> (2021).

736 111 GBIF. *GBIF: The Global Biodiversity Information Facility*, <https://www.gbif.org/> (2021).

737 112 IUCN. *The IUCN Red List of Threatened Species. Version 2021-3.*, <https://www.iucnredlist.org>
738 (2021).

739 113 Hudson, L. N. *et al.* The database of the PREDICTS (Projecting Responses of Ecological Diversity
740 In Changing Terrestrial Systems) project. *Ecology and Evolution* **7**, 145-188, doi:10.1002/ece3.2579
741 (2017).

742 114 Dornelas, M. *et al.* BioTIME: A database of biodiversity time series for the Anthropocene. *Glob Ecol
743 Biogeogr* **27**, 760-786, doi:10.1111/geb.12729 (2018).

744 115 Collen, B. *et al.* Predicting how populations decline to extinction. *Philosophical Transactions of the
745 Royal Society B: Biological Sciences* **366**, 2577-2586, doi:10.1098/rstb.2011.0015 (2011).

746 116 Di Fonzo, M. D., Collen, B. & Mace, G. M. A new method for identifying rapid decline dynamics in
747 wild vertebrate populations. *Ecol Evol* **3**, 2378-2391, doi:10.1002/ece3.596 (2013).

748 117 Noviello, N., McRae, L., Freeman, R. & Clements, C. Body mass and latitude predict the presence
749 of multiple stressors in global vertebrate populations. doi:10.1101/2020.12.17.423192 (2020).

750 118 Spooner, F. E. B., Pearson, R. G. & Freeman, R. Rapid warming is associated with population
751 decline among terrestrial birds and mammals globally. *Glob Chang Biol* **24**, 4521-4531,
752 doi:10.1111/gcb.14361 (2018).

753 119 Ament, J. M. *et al.* Compatibility between agendas for improving human development and wildlife
754 conservation outside protected areas: Insights from 20 years of data. *People and Nature* **1**, 305-
755 316, doi:10.1002/pan3.10041 (2019).

756 120 University of Edinburgh. *Our Coding Club*, <https://ourcodingclub.github.io/> (2021).

757 121 Cornford, R. *et al.* Fast, scalable, and automated identification of articles for biodiversity and
758 macroecological datasets. *Global Ecology and Biogeography* **30**, 339-347, doi:10.1111/geb.13219
759 (2020).

760 122 Rodrigues, A. S., Pilgrim, J. D., Lamoreux, J. F., Hoffmann, M. & Brooks, T. M. The value of the
761 IUCN Red List for conservation. *Trends Ecol Evol* **21**, 71-76, doi:10.1016/j.tree.2005.10.010 (2006).

762 123 Turnhout, E. & Purvis, A. Biodiversity and species extinction: categorisation, calculation, and
763 communication. *Griffith Law Review* **29**, 669-685, doi:10.1080/10383441.2020.1925204 (2021).

764 124 Kays, R., McShea, W. J., Wikelski, M. & Zurell, D. Born-digital biodiversity data: Millions and billions.
765   *Diversity and Distributions* **26**, 644-648, doi:10.1111/ddi.12993 (2020).

766 125 Ancrenaz, M. *et al.* Aerial surveys give new estimates for orangutans in Sabah, Malaysia. *PLoS Biol*
767   **3**, e3, doi:10.1371/journal.pbio.0030003 (2005).

768 126 Collen, B., Ram, M., Zamin, T. & McRae, L. The tropical biodiversity data gap: Addressing disparity
769   in global monitoring. *Tropical Conservation Science* **1**, 75-88, doi:10.1177/194008290800100202
770   (2008).

771 127 Moussy, C. *et al.* A quantitative global review of species population monitoring. *Conserv Biol*,
772   doi:10.1111/cobi.13721 (2021).

773 128 Proença, V. *et al.* Global biodiversity monitoring: From data sources to Essential Biodiversity
774   Variables. *Biological Conservation* **213**, 256-263, doi:10.1016/j.biocon.2016.07.014 (2017).

775 129 Hoffmann, M., Brooks, T. M., Butchart, S. H. M., Gregory, R. D. & McRae, L. in *Encyclopedia of the*
776   *Anthropocene*   175-184 (2018).

777 130 Stephenson, P. J. *et al.* Priorities for big biodiversity data. *Frontiers in Ecology and the Environment*
778   **15**, 124-125, doi:10.1002/fee.1473 (2017).

779 131 WWF. Living planet Report 2020. Bending the curve of biodiversity loss: a deep dive into the Living
780   Planet Index. Marconi, V., McRae, L., Deinet, S., Ledger, S. and Freeman, F. in (WWF, Gland,
781   Switzerland, 2020).

782 132 Amano, T. & Sutherland, W. J. Four barriers to the global understanding of biodiversity
783   conservation: wealth, language, geographical location and security. *Proc Biol Sci* **280**, 20122649,
784   doi:10.1098/rspb.2012.2649 (2013).

785 133 Montgomery, S. L. *Does science need a global language?* , (The University of Chicago Press,
786   2013).

787 134 Amano, T., Gonzalez-Varo, J. P. & Sutherland, W. J. Languages Are Still a Major Barrier to Global
788   Science. *PLoS Biol* **14**, e2000933, doi:10.1371/journal.pbio.2000933 (2016).

789 135 Wilkinson, M. D. *et al.* The FAIR Guiding Principles for scientific data management and stewardship.
790   *Sci Data* **3**, 160018, doi:10.1038/sdata.2016.18 (2016).

791 136 Buckland, S. T., Magurran, A. E., Green, R. E. & Fewster, R. M. Monitoring change in biodiversity
792   through composite indices. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*
793   **360**, 243-254, doi:10.1098/rstb.2004.1589 (2005).

794 137 Buckland, S. T., Marsden, S. J. & Green, R. E. Estimating bird abundance: making methods work.
795   *Bird Conservation International* **18**, S91-S108, doi:10.1017/s0959270908000294 (2008).

796 138 Gregory, R. D. *et al.* Developing indicators for European birds. *Philos Trans R Soc Lond B Biol Sci*
797   **360**, 269-288, doi:10.1098/rstb.2004.1602 (2005).

798 139 Buckland, S. T., Studeny, A. C., Magurran, A. E., Illian, J. B. & Newson, S. E. The geometric mean
799   of relative abundance indices: a biodiversity measure with a difference. *Ecosphere* **2**,
800   doi:10.1890/es11-00186.1 (2011).

801 140 Gregory, R. D., Skorpilova, J., Vorisek, P. & Butler, S. An analysis of trends, uncertainty and
802   species selection shows contrasting trends of widespread forest and farmland birds in Europe.
803   *Ecological Indicators* **103**, 676-687, doi:10.1016/j.ecolind.2019.04.064 (2019).

804 141 Leung, B. *et al.* Clustered versus catastrophic global vertebrate declines. *Nature* **588**, 267-271,
805   doi:10.1038/s41586-020-2920-6 (2020).

806 142 Santini, L. *et al.* Assessing the suitability of diversity metrics to detect biodiversity change. *Biological*
807   *Conservation* **213**, 341-350, doi:10.1016/j.biocon.2016.08.024 (2017).

808 143 van Strien, A. J., Soldaat, L. L. & Gregory, R. D. Desirable mathematical properties of indicators for
809   biodiversity change. *Ecological Indicators* **14**, 202-208, doi:10.1016/j.ecolind.2011.07.007 (2012).

810 144 Auger-Méthé, M. An introduction to state-space modeling of ecological time series. *arXiv preprint*,
811   doi:arXiv:2002.02001 (2020).

812 145 Daskalova, G. N., Myers-Smith, I. H. & Godlee, J. L. Rare and common vertebrates span a wide
813   spectrum of population trends. *Nat Commun* **11**, 4394, doi:10.1038/s41467-020-17779-0 (2020).

814 146 Bland, L. M., Collen, B., Orme, C. D. & Bielby, J. Predicting the conservation status of data-deficient
815   species. *Conserv Biol* **29**, 250-259, doi:10.1111/cobi.12372 (2015).

816 147 Jaspers, A. Can a single index track the state of global biodiversity? *Biological Conservation* **246**,
817   108524, doi:10.1016/j.biocon.2020.108524 (2020).

818 148 Martin, L. J., Blossey, B. & Ellis, E. Mapping where ecologists work: biases in the global distribution
819   of terrestrial ecological observations. *Frontiers in Ecology and the Environment* **10**, 195-201,
820   doi:10.1890/110154 (2012).

821 149 Collins, A. C., Böhm, M. & Collen, B. Choice of baseline affects historical population trends in
822   hunted mammals of North America. *Biological Conservation* **242**, doi:10.1016/j.biocon.2020.108421
823   (2020).

824 150 Navarro, M. & Tidball, K. G. Challenges of biodiversity education: A review of education strategies
825   for conserving biodiversity. *International Electronic Journal of Environmental Education* **2**, 13–30
826   (2012).

827 151 Carrington, D. *Humanity has wiped out 60% of animal populations since 1970, report finds*,
828   <https://www.theguardian.com/environment/2018/oct/30/humanity-wiped-out-animals-since-1970-
829   major-report-finds> (2018).

830 152 O'Neill, S. & Nicholson-Cole, S. "Fear won't do it": Promoting positive engagement with climate
831   change through visual and iconic representations. *Science Communication* **30**, 355-379,
832   doi:10.1177/1075547008329201 (2009).

833 153 Freeman, R. *The Living Planet Index – data analysis, clusters and biodiversity loss*,
834   <https://www.zsl.org/blogs/science/the-living-planet-index--data-analysis-clusters-and-biodiversity-
835   loss> (2020).

836 154 Puurtinen, M., Elo, M. & Kotiaho, J. S. The Living Planet Index does not measure abundance.
837   *Nature* **601**, E14-E15, doi:10.1038/s41586-021-03708-8 (2022).

838 155 Buschke, F. T., Hagan, J. G., Santini, L. & Coetzee, B. W. T. Random population fluctuations bias
839   the Living Planet Index. *Nature Ecology & Evolution* **5**, 1145-1152, doi:10.1038/s41559-021-01494-
840   0 (2021).

841 156 Ritchie, H. *Living Planet Index*, <https://ourworldindata.org/living-planet-index> (2021).

842 157 Hochkirch, A. *et al.* A strategy for the next decade to address data deficiency in neglected
843   biodiversity. *Conserv Biol* **35**, 502-509, doi:10.1111/cobi.13589 (2021).

844 158 Outhwaite, C. L., Gregory, R. D., Chandler, R. E., Collen, B. & Isaac, N. J. B. Complex long-term
845   biodiversity change among invertebrates, bryophytes and lichens. *Nature Ecology & Evolution* **4**,
846   384-392, doi:10.1038/s41559-020-1111-z (2020).

847   159   Pocock, M. J. O., Logie, M. W., Isaac, N. J. B., Outhwaite, C. L. & August, T. Rapid assessment of
848   the suitability of multi-species citizen science datasets for occupancy trend analysis. *bioRxiv*,
849   813626, doi:10.1101/813626 (2019).

850   160   van Strien, A. J., van Swaay, C. A. M., van Strien-van Liempt, W. T. F. H., Poot, M. J. M. &
851   WallisDeVries, M. F. Over a century of data reveal more than 80% decline in butterflies in the
852   Netherlands. *Biological Conservation* **234**, 116-122, doi:10.1016/j.biocon.2019.03.023 (2019).

853   161   Cardoso, P., Stoev, P., Georgiev, T., Senderov, V. & Penev, L. Species Conservation Profiles
854   compliant with the IUCN Red List of Threatened Species. *Biodivers Data J*, e10356,
855   doi:10.3897/BDJ.4.e10356 (2016).

856   162   Grames, E. *et al.* Trends in global insect abundance and biodiversity: A community-driven
857   systematic map protocol. *Open Science Framework (osf.io/uxk4a)* doi:10.17605/OSF.IO/Q63UY
858   (2019).

859   163   Amano, T. *et al.* Tapping into non-English-language science for the conservation of global
860   biodiversity. *bioRxiv*, doi:10.1101/2021.05.24.445520 (2021).

861   164   McRae, L., Deinet, S. & Freeman, R. LPI_LPR2016data_public.csv. *Figshare. Dataset*,
862   doi:https://doi.org/10.6084/m9.figshare.4300022.v1 (2016).

863   165   UNEP-WCMC & IUCN. *Protected Planet*, <https://www.protectedplanet.net/en> (2021).

864   166   Jellesmark, S. *et al.* A counterfactual approach to measure the impact of wet grassland
865   conservation on U.K. breeding bird populations. *Conserv Biol* **35**, 1575-1585,
866   doi:10.1111/cobi.13692 (2021).

867   167   Salafsky, N. *et al.* A standard lexicon for biodiversity conservation: unified classifications of threats
868   and actions. *Conserv Biol* **22**, 897-911, doi:10.1111/j.1523-1739.2008.00937.x (2008).

869   168   Butchart, S. H. *et al.* Improvements to the Red List Index. *PLoS One* **2**, e140,
870   doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0000140 (2007).

871   169   Hill, S. L. L. *et al.* Worldwide impacts of past and projected future land-use change on local species
872   richness and the Biodiversity Intactness Index. *bioRxiv*, doi:10.1101/311787 (2018).

873   170   Soto-Navarro, C. A. *et al.* Building a Multidimensional Biodiversity Index – A scorecard for
874   biodiversity health. Project report. (UN Environment Programme World Conservation Monitoring
875   Centre (UNEP-WCMC), Cambridge, UK and Luc Hoffmann Institute (LHI), Gland, Switzerland.,
876   2020).

877   171   Soto-Navarro, C. A. *et al.* Towards a multidimensional biodiversity index for national application.
878   *Nature Sustainability* **4**, 933-942, doi:10.1038/s41893-021-00753-z (2021).

879