Theme	Questions:	Answer:
All land targets	Can you share again the timeline and sub-targets for target 1, target 2 and target 3 please ?	*Please see our SBTN Land guidance:* *https://sciencebasedtargetsnetwork.org/resources/public-consultation-resources/*
All land targets	Is it fair to say that these targets are not science-based, but are interim targets at a corporate/operations level while waiting for development of science-based land targets next year? Or how should we describe them?	The Land SBTs v1 are the first set of comprehensive nature targets that will raise the bar on corporate ambition on nature in line with the scientific evidence on what nature needs and will allow companies to prepare for adoption of more comprehensive and integrated targets to be published by the SBTN in due course. Specifically, there is scientific evidence for the need to protect remaining natural ecosystems and to reduce agricultural footprint. In this regard, the first two targets are science-based and are preconditions to the achievement of broader nature and climate goals. The third target on the increase of ecological integrity in landscapes is kept broad by design to allow future iterations where prescriptive guidance will be given. This will be rooted in answering at the local level the question "how much nature needs?", for instance in terms of how much regeneration of working land and restoration of degraded ecosystems should be implemented by a company in order to be aligned with nature targets.
Certifications and alignment with reporting standards	Aligning (land-use related) certification standards with the science based land use targets could probably help implementation. Is this being considered? (maybe too early at this stage, but could be an important follow-up and early consultation/involvement could be important). Same is true for CSRD (mentioned already) and EU Taxonomy.	SBTN land targets are not intended to lead to parallel and asynchronous processes that confuse or undermine existing highly endorsed approaches on corporate sustainability. Aligning and building on initiatives such as the Accountability Framework, the GHGs Protocol guidance, and SBTi FLAG methodology demonstrates this approach. In terms of deforestation and conversion-free supply chains, the Accountability Framework provides alignment with numerous standards and reporting frameworks. CDP Forests, for instance, incorporates AFi's guidance in the CDP Forest Questionnaire. Companies will be able to prove compliance with no conversion target requirements by demonstrating deforestation and conversion-free status of commodities produced or sourced, which is aligned with AFi guidance and with the approach of most certification schemes. Land Footprint Reduction is based on the GHG Protocol's accounting guidance and it's aligned with the work companies do to account for emissions from land systems. As we are keen to ensure the broadest possible alignment, whilst ensuring implementability and scientific basis, please provide any specific suggestion (and, when available, contacts) on standards with which SBTN land should align.
Claims	In the slide on "business case for action" I didn't see an explicit element on companies being able to make claims about their contributions to nature conservation. Will claims be part of the SBTN's land approach and, if so, how will this element be integrated?	Alongside the launch of SBTN v1 methods (science-based targets for freshwater and land), an initial group of target validation companies will test the validation process. After distilling lessons learnt from the validation pilot test, the validation process will be open to the public in Q1 2024. Companies with land targets approved (targets that meet the method's criteria) will be able to make claims in accordance to the soon to be launched SBTN Claims Guidance. The SBTN Claims Guidance focuses on communications based on factual information confirmed by the validation team; this is the correct implementation of the methods. Having validated targets is the start of a journey to implement a science-based approach to achieve these targets.

Theme	Questions:	Answer:
Consultation	Could you explain again how decisions are made to include people feedback during the public consultation? Is it decided by the Land Hub Steering Committee? By the SBTN Network?	The public consultation is open to the public, with no exclusions. Individuals and organizations contacted directly will depend on the contact lists our organization has on hand. Hope this answers your question!
Consultation	Hi, where may we find the feedback form mentioned on this slide?	Please see our public consultation resources page: https://sciencebasedtargetsnetwork.org/resources/public-consultation-resources/
Consultation	How would you like to receive feedback?	Please use the feedback form linked here: https://sciencebasedtargetsnetwork.org/resources/public-consultation-resources/
Corporate target setting (general)	Is there an overview of companies who have already set a SBTN based on the draft guidance? As follow-up question: I am referring to the draft guidance released in 2020 with the possible (interim) targets where businesses are incentivized to already set targets. Is there a list of companies who have done this? (https://sciencebasedtargetsnetwork.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/09/SBTN-initial-guidance-for-business.pdf)	Many companies have been road-testing our methods, tools and guidance since 2020 through our Corporate Engagement Program and through our partner network. For specific pilot examples, please our high-level case-studies here. We have not tracked companies who have used our interim targets. As we move forward with the application of our V1 methods for target setting, we will be tracking the targets as part of validation and claims. This includes the target ambition, locations and relevant company pressures.
Data requirements and traceability	The supply chain requirements are too simplistic. There are structural barriers in certain supply chains (e.g., spot market batching) that simply do not even allow traceability to the farm level. How would a company agree to no conversion when traceability is not always possible in the first place? Unless a company is able to trace to the farm level, the target becomes irrelevant.	SBTN Land No conversion target is built to balance ambition and inclusion of companies at different levels of maturity (e.g., their capacity to trace high impact commodities). Requirements differ according to the stage of a company in the supply chain and the shape of purchased commodities. There are different paths to demonstrate compliance of sourced commodities to deforestation and conversion-free states. Examples are: traceability to farm where conversion did not occur after cut-off date, traceability to sourcing area (landscape initiative, jurisdiction, etc) where no conversion occurred, traceability to country with demonstrate no deforestation and no conversion. Certification schemes with chain of custody systems are another option. In addition, the consultation draft also includes a proposal for a mitigation mechanism that allows downstream purchasers of products that include embedded or highly transformed commodities to provide direct investment in high-risk sourcing landscapes in the absence of sufficient traceability to origin.
Data requirements and traceability	What are A B commodities?	Please see annex 1 of the document. These are a list of global and regional conversion-driving commodities
Data requirements and traceability	If a company is not part of the chosen commodity groups for land targets, can they still set a target?	We've based commodity group A and B on a literature review but your help in understanding what may not be covered by this list and a rationale for why it should be covered would be welcome. However, setting targets for nature that are not material for your business may require additional scrutiny by the validation process.

Theme	Questions:	Answer:
Data requirements and traceability	Could you explain what is the first point of aggregation and why indirect sourcing corresponds to steps of the value chain that are downstream at this point please?	SBTN Land no conversion target is built to balance ambition and inclusion of companies at different levels of maturity (e.g., their capacity to trace high impact commodities). Requirements differ according to the stage of a company in the supply chain and the shape of purchased commodities. There are different paths to demonstrate compliance of sourced commodities to deforestation and conversion-free states. Examples are: traceability to farm where conversion did not occur after cut-off date, traceability to sourcing area (landscape initiative, jurisdiction, etc) where no conversion occurred, traceability to country with demonstrate no deforestation and no conversion. Certification schemes with chain of custody systems are another option. In addition, the consultation draft also includes a proposal for a mitigation mechanism that allows downstream purchasers of products that include embedded or highly transformed commodities to provide direct investment in high-risk sourcing landscapes in the absence of sufficient traceability to origin.
Data requirements and traceability	What is the guidance for stage 1, Assessment, for industries with dynamic supply chains where the priority pressures and locations will change year to year?	We are currently in the process of editing our Step 1 & 2 methods, but it is expected that companies will be expected to take different types of actions to control impacts in dynamic supply chains, vs. stable supply chains in which they are able to collaborate with landscape-level actors.
EII	Can you explain the rationale behind the use of the EII for land targets? Is there any flexibility to use other indices? There are extremely large number of data tools like IBAT, ENCORE, WWF Filter, GLOBIO etc. and it is very hard for small businesses to keep up with which one is most relevant/applicable, especially if businesses are setting multiple targets. For example EII was never mentioned anywhere in TNFD guidance until now. Would appreciate more clarification and alignment on data requirements	Different tools and products will provide different insights. We've used EII here because it will provide companies with an estimate of the integrity of the landscape in which they operate in a way that adds value to their understanding of that landscape's condition. The other tools mentioned do not do this. It's also worth mentioning that TNFD, ENCORE, WWF Biodiversity Risk Filter are about understanding risk. EII helps you to baseline a landscape's condition so that you can act on your material risks and dependencies in support of improving the ecological integrity at the landscape scale.
EII	What is the Ecological Integrity Index (EII)? Is there a published reference on the EII? How can companies access data on it for use in setting SBTs for land?	We are expecting an imminent publication by UNEP-WCMC, which will make available the EII's aggregated layer. To this moment, the most updated public resource on EII is the pre-print version that can be accessed here: https://www.biorxiv.org/content/10.1101/2022.08.21.504707v1 The EII layer will be available for use by companies outside of IBAT and without an associated fee. It is the intent of SBTN that these data be available for the launch of version 1 targets.
Finance sector	What feasibility challenges have financial institutions raised so far?	SBTN Land guidance does not include a methodology for financial institutions to set Land SBTs.
Finance sector	Are any investors or banks piloting this framework?	SBTN Land guidance does not include a methodology for financial institutions to set Land SBTs. Hence, financial institutions cannot pilot the methodology.

Theme	Questions:	Answer:
Freshwater method	How does this guideline connect with the freshwater guidance? Has the freshwater guidance been finalized?	Yes, where possible SBTN is looking to help companies navigate the relationships, tradeoffs and co-benefits between land and freshwater guidance. As the methods are applied we will use the learnings to further develop our guidance on tradeoffs and co-benefits. Currently in Step 1 & 2, we incorporate this understanding into the prioritization, asking companies to look for overlapping priority locations. In the Step 3 and 4 guidance we are still looking to further embed synergies and tradeoffs but have taken first steps toward this with shared response options relevant to both methodologies. V1 for Step 3: freshwater will be finalized and released for v1 launch
Human dimensions	How have social issues, consequences been handled in regards to targets and validation on the ground? human rights, local communities and indigenous people?	We recognize the critical importance of applying both effective and equitable SBTs for Nature. In recognition of that critical importance, the Step 3 methods for freshwater and land methods do include consultation of local stakeholders in target setting and model selection. To complement this work in the Step 3 target setting methods, SBTN is developing stakeholder engagement guidance including human rights protections and engagement and consultation with IPLCs. This guidance is being developed alongside similar guidance from our colleagues at TNFD and using an inclusive methods development approach engaging collaborators and consultants from traditionally underrepresented groups.
Land and biodiversity	What is the extent of overlap between the SBTN targets for land and biodiversity?	See answers to other questions on this theme.
Land and biodiversity	What do you include in Land when biodiversity is not included? Is there a risk that we are "just" continuing with climate target and continue with sub optimise? Having only read target 1 and 2 it seems to be little development compared to what we already have in SBTi? Soil health, regen agriculture, etc are all things that improve biodiversity which is not included yet.	Biodiversity is defined as the variety of life at the ecosystem, species and genetic scales. SBTs for nature primarily focus on addressing biodiversity at the ecosystem and species level. The current land and freshwater SBTs for V1 directly address drivers of biodiversity loss, as captured in the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework. Please see this graphic for more detail. SBTN acknowledges that further advancements in the coverage of biodiversity is needed as we further coverage of SBTs for Nature. For that reason, the Biodiversity Hub is complementing the work of the Land & Freshwater hubs, which focus on ecosystem scale protections for biodiversity with a detailed gap analysis to inform species-level indicators and coverage of pressures like overexploitation or invasive species in the future based on science advances.
Land and biodiversity	Just a comment: biodiversity relies on habitat — so fragmentation is a significant issue and is explicitly included in most EIIs ("connectivity"). Biodiversity alone is not a particularly useful measure (look at the Aichi Targets and the fact that none of them have been achieved).	Good point. This is why we have structured biodiversity in the land targets in the way we have.
Land and biodiversity	Are corporations biodiversity disclosures advanced enough yet to be able to set land targets with credibility?	Land targets do not require biodiversity disclosures, just materiality assessments as part of step 1 and 2. Likely they will overlap a great deal.
Land and biodiversity	Concerned to see the Biodiversity guidance before responding to consultation - be good to see direct line biodiversity in these targets	See answers to other questions on this theme.

Theme	Questions:	Answer:
Land Hub	Are there any corporates involved in the core Land Hub team?	We engage corporates in all method testing through the CEP, including land methods. The Land Hub team includes representatives from WWF, Conservation International, The Nature Conservancy, The Food and Land Use Coalition, World Resources Institute and the system change advisory firm Systemiq. We have also worked with others such as World Conservation Monitoring Centre, CDP, Proforest and more on the development of the targets but they are not formally part of the Steering Committee.
Land occupation reduction target	What is the target for total ha footprint reduction?	500 million hectares globally or 690 million hectares globally. We are consulting on which target to align to. The 690 million hectares figure is informed by Leclère et al. (2020) while the 500 million hectares is informed by IPCC (2018) SSP1. See table 21 in the draft guidance for a comparison of sources.
Land occupation reduction target	The amount of land footprint reduction is aligned with COP15 targets?	COP15 (CBD) provided no guidance on the area of land occupation reduction required. However, in the sense of the GBF framework this SBTN Target aligns well. Please see the document for a more detailed description of how. (pages 15 and 16).
Land occupation reduction target	Have I understood it correctly if saying intensity reduction target = production increase?	Land intensity footprint reduction targets would be formulated as follows: [Company name] commits to reduce agricultural land occupation intensity, from direct operations [and upstream impacts] [reduction] % per [unit] by [target year] from a [base year] base year. This corresponds to a % change in absolute land occupation by [target year] from the [base year] base year." With the footprint reduction targets, we reflect the need to reduce the global agricultural footprint to free up land for ecosystem restoration (necessary to deliver on global climate and nature goals) and the need to provide nutritious diets for a growing global population. Demand-side levers here are critical e.g. shifting towards less land-intensive diets (e.g. plant-rich diets), and reducing inefficiencies throughout the food system e.g. food loss and waste. However, we also need to increase yields and achieve higher crop and livestock productivity—especially where yields are currently low—since global food demand is expected to grow. Importantly, the landscape engagement target (target 3) works to ensure that companies appropriately balance the need to use land more efficiently while avoiding unsustainable forms of agricultural intensification (e.g., overuse of fertilizers and chemical inputs, irrigation practices that deplete freshwater resources), all while building resilience. In this way, the three targets work together to incentivize the high level actions needed to achieve nature goals in land systems – namely halting conversion of natural ecosystems (target 1), reducing pressure on those ecosystems and freeing up land for ecosystem restoration (target 2), and improving the ecological integrity of landscapes, including working lands, to enhance ecosystem structure, composition and function (target 3). See page 70 for a discussion on this.

Theme	Questions:	Answer:
Land occupation reduction target	Re the intensity target, Jevons paradox is one to consider: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Jevons_paradox	We discuss Jevons paradox on page 70: Crop and livestock yields vary widely across the globe, differing between some places by up to an order of magnitude (Herrero et al. 2013). Increasing yields and achieving higher crop and livestock productivity—especially where yields are currently low—is a natural and necessary response to the need to reduce agricultural land occupation even as global food demand continues to grow. Indeed, increased agricultural productivity is a common assumption across all of the scenarios of reduced agricultural land occupation listed in the modelling studies in Table 21 in the "Scientific basis of land footprint reduction" section of the draft guidance. However, these productivity gains need to occur with a broader view toward optimizing use of inputs, managing runoff, safeguarding freshwater and soil resources, and improving animal health and welfare. If increased yields are achieved by overuse of fertilizer and agricultural chemicals, or by large-scale irrigation expansion, GHG emissions and water scarcity and/or pollution are likely to increase. Companies should therefore manage interventions with a holistic mindset. Improved soil and water management practices like agroforestry, especially in low-yielding areas, can increase yields while reducing reliance on chemical inputs. In addition, if increased land-use efficiency leads to increased farm profitability, it can lead to agricultural expansion at the local level (Jevons paradox) even while limiting expansion at the global level; pairing agricultural improvements with ecosystem protection in the same landscape (via combination with Targets 1 and 3) will be essential to counteract this effect (Leclère et al. 2020; Phalan et al. 2016).
Land occupation reduction target	Liberating land will be a complicated task to resolves, how are SBTN Landscape guarantee a just ownership of land in the area as many will claim it's land?. Because most of the cases company will had an ownership that might be overlapped with stakeholders on the ground (i.e indigenous people, local community)	The term is used to describe removing an area from the relevant land use (here: agricultural systems). In SBTN this means that the area of land is taken out of production. SBTN makes no claims or guidance regarding how companies make decisions around land ownership. Through our stakeholder engagement we emphasize a rights based perspective, acknowledging resource and land, freshwater rights holders including indigenous people and local communities. That guidance will be released with the V1 methods. Additionally, as part of the landscape engagement target many cooperative solutions, including local stakeholders, may be found.

Theme	Questions:	Answer:
Land occupation reduction target	What soil health testing is available to enable best land stewardship?	The availability of soil health data is not a limiting factor on companies setting v1 Land SBTs. Soil biodiversity hotspots are included as priority areas under Group 1 for the no conversion guidance (target 1). In Table 30, "mapping of incentivized response options", you can also see the corporate response options which are incentivised by the different targets including those which improve soil health e.g. stabilize substrates, soil conservation, rice straw management, fertility management, mulching.

On page 87, we also describe the process overview for setting a Landscape Engagement Target which shows that a company has to set a baseline using the ecological integrity index (EII).

SBTN will revise the v1 SBT Land targets during 2023 and 2024 as land system science and methods for accounting for impacts and dependencies on nature progress. The ambition is for v2 SBT Land targets to reflect what nature needs at a local level (based on place-based, regionally defined and locally-relevant thresholds) and to cover a broader range of material and indicators (such as biodiversity loss, terrestrial eutrophication and soil erosion). |
Land occupation reduction target	How does target 2 address the risk of increasing intensive agriculture through reducing land footprint? Does regenerative agriculture play a role at all (more extensive systems yes but positive biodiversity and soil carbon impact)?	The landscape engagement target (target 3) works to ensure that companies appropriately balance the need to use land more efficiently while avoiding unsustainable forms of agricultural intensification (e.g., overuse of fertilizers and chemical inputs, irrigation practices that deplete freshwater resources), all while building resilience. In this way, the three targets work together to incentivize the high level actions needed to achieve nature goals in land systems – namely halting conversion of natural ecosystems (target 1), reducing pressure on those ecosystems and freeing up land for ecosystem restoration (target 2), and improving the ecological integrity of landscapes, including working lands, to enhance ecosystem structure, composition and function (target 3).
Land occupation reduction target	What is the aim (and the rationale) behind setting an intensity target for land?	There is a need to reduce agricultural land to free up land for ecosystem restoration for biodiversity and climate goals. In the guidance we provide an overview of the different academic sources that provide estimates of how much land globally needs to be freed up for ecosystem restoration. The land footprint reduction target is for large agricultural companies. We have included a consultation question on whether we should require that companies set land footprint reduction targets on an absolute basis, or whether intensity targets should also be allowed. Absolute and intensity targets each have advantages and disadvantages (see Table 18 in the guidance doc).
Land occupation reduction target	Will building soil health and biodiversity through regenerative agriculture be included in this scope?	While it's not explicit in the scope of these targets these actions could likely be a part of a company's commitments under landscape engagement. Additionally, one of the inclusions for Group 1 areas are areas of high soil biodiversity, which will be prioritized for no conversion from direct and indirect sourcing by 2025.

Theme	Questions:	Answer:
Land occupation reduction target	is the target 2 seeking to reduce by 500M - 600M ha agricultural land by 2050? how will this impact food security? what is the incentive to reduce farmland and increase intensity?	We are consulting on whether to specify 500 million hectares globally or 690 million hectares globally. The 500 million hectares is informed by IPCC (2018) SSP1 scenario which is aligned with the Sustainable Development Goals (and therefore balance human needs (i.e. food security) with goals for nature and climate). The 690 million hectares figure is informed by Leclère et al. (2020) in which land-use and biodiversity models are used to assess how humanity can reverse the declines in terrestrial biodiversity caused by habitat conversion. Leclère et al. (2020) states: "We show that immediate efforts, consistent with the broader sustainability agenda but of unprecedented ambition and coordination could enable the provision of food for the growing human population while
Land occupation reduction target	Are there exclusions on industrial livestock raising or other practices that would disqualify a company from using the standard?	No there are no exclusions of this type.
Land occupation reduction target	Freeing up agricultural land and reducing a company's land-footprint in the supply chain ultimately means to intensify the use of agricultural land, i.e. using conventional agriculture or using new tech such as vertical farming. How can this be tied to goals from e. g. the EU to increase production of organic-foods?	With the footprint reduction targets, we reflect the need to reduce the global agricultural footprint to free up land for ecosystem restoration (necessary to deliver on global climate and nature goals) and the need to provide nutritious diets for a growing global population. Demand-side levers here are critical e.g. shifting towards less land-intensive diets (e.g. plant-rich diets), and reducing inefficiencies throughout the food system e.g. food loss and waste. However, we also need to increase yields and achieve higher crop and livestock productivity—especially where yields are currently low—since global food demand is expected to grow. Importantly, the landscape engagement target (target 3) works to ensure that companies appropriately balance the need to use land more efficiently while avoiding unsustainable forms of agricultural intensification (e.g., overuse of fertilizers and chemical inputs, irrigation practices that deplete freshwater resources), all while building resilience. In this way, the three targets work together to incentivize the high level actions needed to achieve nature goals in land systems – namely halting conversion of natural ecosystems (target 1), reducing pressure on those ecosystems and freeing up land for ecosystem restoration (target 2), and improving the ecological integrity of landscapes, including working lands, to enhance ecosystem structure, composition and function (target 3). See page 70 for a discussion on this.
Land occupation reduction target	Is there a risk that the Land footprint reduction target will promote intensive land use which can be worse for biodiversity?	With the footprint reduction targets, we reflect the need to reduce the global agricultural footprint to free up land for ecosystem restoration (necessary to deliver on global climate and nature goals) and the need to provide nutritious diets for a growing global population. Demand-side levers here are critical e.g. shifting towards less land-intensive diets (e.g. plant-rich diets), and reducing inefficiencies throughout the food system e.g. food loss and waste. However, we also need to increase yields and achieve higher crop and livestock productivity—especially where yields are currently low—since global food demand is expected to grow. Importantly, the landscape engagement target (target 3) works to ensure that companies appropriately balance the need to use land more efficiently while avoiding unsustainable forms of agricultural intensification (e.g., overuse of fertilizers and chemical inputs, irrigation practices that deplete freshwater resources), all while building resilience. In this way, the three targets work together to incentivize the high level actions needed to achieve nature goals in land systems – namely halting conversion of natural ecosystems (target 1), reducing pressure on those ecosystems and freeing up land for ecosystem restoration (target 2), and improving the ecological integrity of landscapes, including working lands, to enhance ecosystem structure, composition and function (target 3). See page 70 for a discussion on this.

Theme	Questions:	Answer:
Land occupation reduction target	Is the impact on the use of agrochemicals contemplated in the analysis? Many companies may use this approach to increase productivity.	With the footprint reduction targets, we reflect the need to reduce the global agricultural footprint to free up land for ecosystem restoration (necessary to deliver on global climate and nature goals) and the need to provide nutritious diets for a growing global population. Demand-side levers here are critical e.g. shifting towards less land-intensive diets (e.g. plant-rich diets), and reducing inefficiencies throughout the food system e.g. food loss and waste. However, we also need to increase yields and achieve higher crop and livestock productivity—especially where yields are currently low—since global food demand is expected to grow. Importantly, the landscape engagement target (target 3) works to ensure that companies appropriately balance the need to use land more efficiently while avoiding unsustainable forms of agricultural intensification (e.g., overuse of fertilizers and chemical inputs, irrigation practices that deplete freshwater resources), all while building resilience. In this way, the three targets work together to incentivize the high level actions needed to achieve nature goals in land systems – namely halting conversion of natural ecosystems (target 1), reducing pressure on those ecosystems and freeing up land for ecosystem restoration (target 2), and improving the ecological integrity of landscapes, including working lands, to enhance ecosystem structure, composition and function (target 3). See page 70 for a discussion on this.
Land occupation reduction target	How does the guidance differentiate between agricultural land under conventional management vs agricultural land with "regenerative practices" applied to them? If the spatial boundaries are the same, do they still represent the same extent of land occupation?	The guidance does not differentiate between agricultural land under conventional management vs agricultural land with "regenerative practices" applied to them. Importantly, the landscape engagement target (target 3) works to ensure that companies appropriately balance the need to use land more efficiently while avoiding unsustainable forms of agricultural intensification (e.g., overuse of fertilizers and chemical inputs, irrigation practices that deplete freshwater resources), all while building resilience. In this way, the three targets work together to incentivize the high level actions needed to achieve nature goals in land systems – namely halting conversion of natural ecosystems (target 1), reducing pressure on those ecosystems and freeing up land for ecosystem restoration (target 2), and improving the ecological integrity of landscapes, including working lands, to enhance ecosystem structure, composition and function (target 3). If the spatial boundaries are the same, agricultural land under conventional management and agricultural land with "regenerative practices" have the same extent of land occupation.

Theme	Questions:	Answer:
Land occupation reduction target	how does target 2 address the growing demand for a range of forest and agriculture commodities?	We recognise the need to reduce the global agricultural footprint to free up land for ecosystem restoration (necessary to deliver on global climate and nature goals) and the need to provide nutritious diets for a growing global population. Demand-side levers here are critical e.g. shifting towards less land-intensive diets (e.g. plant-rich diets), and reducing inefficiencies throughout the food system e.g. food loss and waste. However, we also need to increase yields and achieve higher crop and livestock productivity—especially where yields are currently low—since global food demand is expected to grow. Importantly, the landscape engagement target (target 3) works to ensure that companies appropriately balance the need to use land more efficiently while avoiding unsustainable forms of agricultural intensification (e.g., overuse of fertilizers and chemical inputs, irrigation practices that deplete freshwater resources), all while building resilience. The three SBTN targets are designed to work together to incentivize these high level actions needed to achieve nature goals in land systems – namely halting conversion of natural ecosystems (target 1), reducing pressure on those ecosystems and freeing up land for ecosystem restoration (target 2), and improving the ecological integrity of landscapes, including working lands, to enhance ecosystem structure, composition and function (target 3). See page 70 for a discussion on this. For target 2, we are consulting on whether to specify 500 million hectares globally or 690 million hectares globally as the total amount of agricultural land which needs to be freed up. The 500 million hectares is informed by IPCC (2018) SSP1 scenario which is aligned with the Sustainable Development Goals (and therefore balance human needs (i.e. food security) with goals for nature and climate). The 690 million hectares figure is informed by Leclère et al. (2020) in which land-use and biodiversity models are used to assess how humanity can reverse the declines in terrestrial biodiversity caused by habitat conversion. Leclère et al. (2020) states: "We show that immediate efforts, consistent with the broader sustainability agenda but of unprecedented ambition and coordination, could enable the provision of food for the growing human population while reversing the global terrestrial biodiversity trends caused by habitat conversion." See table 21 in the draft guidance for a comparison of sources. We are consulting on the figures which we should align to.

Land occupation reduction target	Are the Target 2 criteria to meet an "and" or "or" criteria.	A company is required to set a Land Footprint Reduction target if they align with the following thresholds:
		 a. Terrestrial Use is material according to Step 1's materiality screening; and
		 b. Are in the Agriculture, Forestry & Fishing or Manufacturing ISIC sections; and
		c. Are required to set an SBTi FLAG target; and
		d. One or more of the following:
		   a. Have a baseline agricultural land occupation of 50,000 hectares or more ; and/or
		   b. Have 10,000 or more Full Time Employees

Theme	Questions:	Answer:
Land occupation reduction target	Do you think including an intensity metric and absolute reduction does not diminish the effectiveness of the standard - it makes comparisons across commitments even more difficult then they will already be, given the complexity of assumptions. Why not stick with absolute emissions reduction targets?	We have included a consultation question on whether we should require that companies set land footprint reduction targets on an absolute basis, or whether intensity targets should also be allowed. Absolute and intensity targets each have advantages and disadvantages (see Table 18 in the guidance doc).
Land occupation reduction target	investing in reducing the water footprint requires more than drip irrigation. Evaporation is responsible for 35-50% of water footprint. A non beneficial use of water that would need investments which require establishing a price for water and a market for water. How do you comply with the objective and avoid increasing food costs to impose hunger stress on the population?	We recognise the need to reduce the global agricultural footprint to free up land for ecosystem restoration (necessary to deliver on global climate and nature goals) and the need to provide nutritious diets for a growing global population. Demand-side levers here are critical e.g. shifting towards less land-intensive diets (e.g. plant-rich diets), and reducing inefficiencies throughout the food system e.g. food loss and waste. However, we also need to increase yields and achieve higher crop and livestock productivity—especially where yields are currently low—since global food demand is expected to grow. Importantly, the landscape engagement target (target 3) works to ensure that companies appropriately balance the need to use land more efficiently while avoiding unsustainable forms of agricultural intensification (e.g., overuse of fertilizers and chemical inputs, irrigation practices that deplete freshwater resources), all while building resilience. The three SBTN targets are designed to work together to incentivize these high level actions needed to achieve nature goals in land systems – namely halting conversion of natural ecosystems (target 1), reducing pressure on those ecosystems and freeing up land for ecosystem restoration (target 2), and improving the ecological integrity of landscapes, including working lands, to enhance ecosystem structure, composition and function (target 3). See page 70 for a discussion on this. For target 2, we are consulting on whether to specify 500 million hectares globally or 690 million hectares globally as the total amount of agricultural land which needs to be freed up. The 500 million hectares is informed by IPCC (2018) SSP1 scenario which is aligned with the Sustainable Development Goals (and therefore balance human needs (i.e. food security) with goals for nature and climate). The 690 million hectares figure is informed by Leclère et al. (2020) in which land-use and biodiversity models are used to assess how humanity can reverse the declines in terrestrial biodiversity caused by habitat conversion. Leclère et al. (2020) states: "We show that immediate efforts, consistent with the broader sustainability agenda but of unprecedented ambition and coordination, could enable the provision of food for the growing human population while reversing the global terrestrial biodiversity trends caused by habitat conversion." See table 21 in the draft guidance for a comparison of sources. We are consulting on the figures which we should align to.

Theme	Questions:	Answer:
Land targets	I am interested to understand the reasoning behind the choice to incentivise land-sparing, which I feel logically follows from the no conversion and footprint reduction targets. I can only find one very brief discussion of this quite fundamental issue in the draft guidance. Being from the UK, many of our species have become well adapted to the ~6500 years of farming here, 'restoring' to another habitat type has significant risks for these species. Could you explain the reasoning here?	We discuss this in page 78. The three targets work together to incentivize the high level actions needed to achieve nature goals in land systems – namely halting conversion of natural ecosystems (target 1), reducing pressure on those ecosystems and freeing up land for ecosystem restoration (target 2), and improving the ecological integrity of landscapes, including working lands, to enhance ecosystem structure, composition and function (target 3). The landscape engagement target (target 3) works to ensure that companies appropriately balance the need to use land more efficiently while avoiding unsustainable forms of agricultural intensification (e.g., overuse of fertilizers and chemical inputs, irrigation practices that deplete freshwater resources), all while building resilience.
Land targets	What do you think are key challenges for companies wanting to set Land targets?	Setting SBTs can be a challenge for companies, primarily around the identification of relevant data, tools, resources and capacity needed to complete the methodology. For that reason, we emphasize places where previous or ongoing engagement with other sustainability frameworks can be leveraged for completion of the SBTN methods. As companies build their capacity through engagement with the target-setting process, we anticipate a reduction in time and resource needs.
Landscape engagement target	No target on ecosystem improvement?	The Landscape Engagement target incentivizes regenerative, restorative, and transformation actions that improve ecological integrity. We currently lack place-specific ecological thresholds for understanding how much ecological integrity should be increased in a specific landscape. Whilst the Land Hub and partner organizations advance the science needed to define thresholds within the next 1-2 years, we rely on the level of ambition of existing landscape initiative to guide corporate action to increase ecological integrity.
Landscape engagement target	What metrics are used to measure alignment with Landscape Engagement targets?	Guidance is provided in section 3.7 of the document on the metrics but will also include those required by the landscape initiative that companies engage with as part of this target.
Landscape engagement target	For target 3 engaging initiatives, it would be often difficult to to find suitable "initiatives" for companies to engage. Does it mean companies should find or create an initiative by themselves...?	The preference is for companies to engage with an existing landscape initiative that meets the validation criteria described in the Target 3 section. Should no initiatives exist, the document outlines the process for starting one, which will require justification to the SBTN Validation process.
MRV	Is Environmental DNA collection included (or being considered) in any of the monitoring methods?	eDNA is not currently a part of these methods as we cannot yet define the thresholds for diversity of species that would be required to set a quantifiable target for companies.
Natural lands map and Group 1 ecosystems	Will you share more on the basis for the map and can we submit questions and comments?	Basis for the map: Needing to answer 'where' the natural ecosystems were in order to inform Target 1. Used the Accountability Framework initiative definition of natural ecosystems, includes Pristine, Regenerated, Managed, and Degraded. Access the map and documentation on page 46 of the methods. Developed with WRI. Process will be developed to enable folks to submit feedback on the maps and suggestions of better data to use.

Theme	Questions:	Answer:
Natural lands map and Group 1 ecosystems	Where does the Natural Maps fit in for Target-setting for corporates? Is it simply for technical advisory?	The Natural Lands map will help you identify where your direct operations have converted natural lands since 2020 or where your sourcing areas include conversion. It is a baselining tool at this stage to allow companies to assess and understand their contributions to ecosystem conversion and where lands are classified as natural - placing them outside of the scope of appropriate areas for direct operation expansion.
Natural lands map and Group 1 ecosystems	natural reserves, protected areas are not included?	These are included as part of the Allan et al. paper. on the minimum land area required to safeguard biodiversity within the Group 1 designation
Natural lands map and Group 1 ecosystems	Does the definition of natural vs non-natural leave some "non-natural" but ecologically valuable habitats at risk of conversion? For example, secondary rainforest?	Yes, this classification is based on AFI's definition of Natural Ecosystems. A more detailed description can be found in the methods or the Natural Land Map technical documentation
Natural lands map and Group 1 ecosystems	Could you share the link to the map of natural ecosystems?	Map can be accessed here: https://wri-datalab.earthengine.app/view/sbtn-natural-ecosystems Technical documentation can be found here:https://docs.google.com/document/d/17xLt8RathbNxzdFAV_tTv0yOrfT3mziE/edit?usp=sharing&ouid=109275792418911359515&rtpof=true&sd=truee
Natural lands map and Group 1 ecosystems	Unfortunately the link to the Natural Lands Map does not work for me, based in the UK	Some users experience temporary issues in accessing the map. The map is occasionally offline for revision. Please retry.
No conversion target	For the no conversion of natural ecosystems targets, which is the real difference between the cut-off date and the target date? (e.g. cut-off date 2018, target date 2030, but between 2018 and 2030 I can't convert any land, so what's the difference?	The cut-off date is latest 2020 - or earlier if you have existing commitments under a deforestation and conversion free commitment. conversion is understood in terms of value chain position and sourcing. The phased approach is to allow companies to better understand conversion in supply chains - with priority areas including all natural forests as part of Group 1 with a 2025 target. Any conversion that continues past 2025 should be due to the inability to trace commodity sourcing and a phased approach is to allow for the world of traceability where possible. Where not possible we take a mitigation mechanism approach for highly-transformed and untraceable volumes of commodities.
No conversion target	How to apply these land targets in producing countries where land use legislation is allowing conversion of natural ecosystems?	These are corporate targets that will often exceed legislative requirements, this is part of how we understand their ambition.
No conversion target	In the No-Conversion Target, target dates for ecosystems outside of "group 1" and for materials sourced "indirectly"/embedded materials are after 2025 - is this considered a misalignment with AFi?	This target is written in collaboration with AFI, so likely not.
No conversion target	How could it possibly be expected that developing countries are expected to have no conversation at all of any natural ecosystem? That simply is not realistic and does not recognize development needs in these countries - not all rules should be applied the same way to the entire globe.	This targets is focused on companies that set land targets, not countries. If a company wants to set science based targets for nature then not converting natural ecosystems is an entirely appropriate voluntary target. In no way does this impact the sovereignty of developing countries.
No regrets actions	Do you intend to add no regrets actions a company can do regarding overexploitation of species? Disturbance? Noise? Light?	These are great suggestions to include in the biodiversity hub gap analysis.
Ocean hub	Where can we specifically read the ocean work to date - understanding was that the ocean hub only started late last year. Please update us	The ocean hub technical leads at CI and WWF have just started. Stay tuned for more updates on our oceans work in upcoming newsletters.

Theme	Questions:	Answer:
other SBTN technical questions	i found the freshwater target setting guidance terribly technical - even as a biodiversity specialist it was a bit too much. Would it be the same for this land guidance?	We will be releasing a "how to" corporate manual in the summer to accompany the methods that will be less technical.
Other SBTN technical questions	If targets are science based then why they are arrived in iterative manner?	Thank you for this question. Science is itself an iterative process through the process of posing and testing hypotheses. SBTN hopes to learn and grow its methodology to align with best-available science. If in the process of reviewing the methods, an issue is identified, we work to evaluate that issue and see whether we can make adjustments to the methodology which maintains that balance between rigor and feasibility. Moving forward we know that the science grows and changes and we expect our methods to do so as well. For example, advances in the availability of biodiversity data at the genetic level will guide our biodiversity methods development, as will new data and empirical analyses for the development of methods for land.
Random	are The Netherlands involved by this process and by which organization or by whom?	Our public consultation is open for comment by anyone in the public. We are a voluntary mechanism and so are not formally engaged in government policy. That said, we seek to elevate the role of science and enhance positive action for nature through intergovernmental forums like the climate and biodiversity COPs.
Response options	Would e.g. different actions taken to increase biodiversity in agriculture count as Landscape engagement?	If these actions align with the landscape scale objectives of the landscape initiative in which you are collaboratively participating, then it is likely this would count, but would depend on the conditions of that initiative and its stakeholder engagement process.
Response options	Could you mention practical examples of actions that companies can take to restore nature? And how should companies navigate and contribute when countries/governments set and drive ambitious nature targets?	Internalize target 3 and engage in the cooperative processes around a material landscape initiative. It is not possible for SBTN to provide such guidance as it is incredibly place-specific. Also, restoring nature has to accompany a companies avoidance and reduction of impacts on nature - you must engage the full mitigation hierarchy.
Response options	Do you have any recommendations on how to translate reduced use of chemical pesticides, tons of food wasted avoided and other actions reducing the demand of land use into a measure that can be used in this exciting framework?	Not for version 1. Your question will likely be more relevant as we develop thresholds and characterization factors for version 2.
Response options	Will there be references/examples of actions companies can take OR research made available for how to measure various actions? For instance, if we "engage" with habitats like riparian restoration will we have resources from/through SBTN noting what our Carbon capture is, what our filtration or infiltration might be, etc.	Not for version 1. Your question will likely be more relevant as we develop thresholds and characterization factors for version 2.
Response options	Will you have place-based examples of actions possible with attached numerics on their effects. Example: replacing turf with native grasses. Carbon capture, water infiltration, etc.	Version 1 does not include this work, though Version 2 of the land targets will include much of this.
Response options	How will regenerative, restorative, and transformative actions be planned and implemented, given the need for landscape-scale conservation planning and measurement (e.g., inclusion of connectivity in goals and plans, as stated in GBF)?	Target 3 directs companies to engage in landscape scale initiatives. It is likely that any initiatives that meet the criteria for inclusion in SBTN based on the conditions outlined in the guidance will have objectives that address regenerative, restorative, and transformative actions.
Response options	How can biodiversity and restoration companies get involved in Target 3, and subsequently in Step 4, where large, landscape-scale alliances led by NGOs are the basis for corporate action?	Service providers should also engage within landscape initiatives or may approach companies regarding the skills and expertise around biodiversity and restoration. The landscape initiative criteria do not prescribe that they be led by NGOs

Theme	Questions:	Answer:
SBTi	How do SBTN targets link in with FLAG SBTi targets? Can a company set both?	Yes companies can set both. The SBTN Land SBTs complement climate SBTs. They are designed to address impacts which climate targets cannot, by incentivizing activities related to wider, non-GHG impacts on land, for example the reduction and treatment of pollution and effluents, reduced pesticide use, erosion control and other actions which promote biodiversity and ecosystem integrity. They also expand focus beyond forests to include other natural ecosystems (e.g., grasslands, wetlands, shrublands) especially as they relate to the working lands (e.g., cropland, rangeland, pasture, managed forest) that facilitate the production of goods used by companies.
SBTi	Could you please clarify, whether SBTi recommends limitation of nature-based climate solutions used for decarbonisation? I.e. what should a share of nature-based solutions be in the overall offsets share used by a company for decarbonisation? Many thanks in advance	Are NbS counted towards the delivery of near- and long-term SBTs as defined in the SBTi Net-Zero Standard? 1) FLAG sector companies: Companies in Forest, Land and Agriculture (FLAG) sectors are required to set targets FLAG science-based targets (SBTs) that apply to a company's GHG emissions from AFOLU, including GHG emissions associated with land use change (LUC) (i.e., biomass and soil carbon losses from deforestation, conversion of coastal wetlands, conversion/draining and burning of peatlands, conversion of savannas and natural grasslands); emissions from land management (i.e., nitrous oxide and methane from enteric fermentation, biomass burning, nutrient management, fertilizer use and manure management); and biogenic removals (i.e., forest restoration, silvopasture, improved forest management, agroforestry and soil carbon sequestration). Critically, FLAG SBTs are separate from SBTs that cover emissions from energy and industrial processes; consequently, FLAG mitigation cannot be used to meet non-FLAG targets (e.g., a company cannot bring forests into its value chain to achieve a science-based target covering energy and industrial processes). We recommend you consult the SBTi FLAG guidance for more detail, including specifically which companies need to set these targets: https://sciencebasedtargets.org/resources/files/SBTiFLAGGuidance.pdf. 2) Companies from non-FLAG sectors: No other sector is permitted to count AFOLU mitigation towards the delivery of non-FLAG near- or long-term science-based targets (i.e. GHG emissions reductions associated with land use change (LUC) (i.e., biomass and soil carbon losses from deforestation, conversion of coastal wetlands, conversion/draining and burning of peatlands, conversion of savannas and natural grasslands); emissions reductions from land management (i.e., nitrous oxide and methane from enteric fermentation, biomass burning, nutrient management, fertilizer use and manure management); and biogenic removals (i.e., forest restoration, silvopasture, improved forest management, agroforestry and soil carbon sequestration)). **Are NbS counted towards beyond value chain mitigation as defined by the SBTi Net-Zero Standard?** Yes. Companies in all sector can (and are encouraged to) deliver climate mitigation beyond their value chains through investment into NbS and other activities. SBTi will be providing guidance in 2023 of what best practice beyond value chain mitigation looks like and the associated quality standards, environmental and social safeguards and reporting requirements.

Theme	Questions:	Answer:
SBTi	Is SBTi FLAG requirement considered as part of SBTN Land target? As a fashion retailer, how do we determine which target must be set? Thanks	SBTN Land has complemented the three Land Targets with a requirement for Forest, Land and Agriculture (FLAG) companies to set a sister target on land GHG emissions following the SBTi FLAG methodology requirements (see SBTi's FLAG guidance to understand which companies have to set SBTi FLAG targets: https://sciencebasedtargets.org/resources/files/SBTiFLAGGuidance.pdf). At a high level, companies should adopt each of the three land science-based targets depending on: 1. The materiality of specific pressures generated because of the company's activities 2. The sector of the company 3. The size of the company 4. The impact of the company in terms of emissions and/or the land occupation footprint. The draft guidance includes decision trees for each of the targets to enable companies to establish whether targets are a) required, b) recommended, c) not required, d) not applicable.
SBTN Framework alignment	Have you assessed how SBTN aligns with the Corporate Sustainability Reporting Directive (CSRD) coming into force in EU next year?	Thanks for the question. We are looking at the evolving CSRD materials and will seek to signpost alignment in our method documents.
Sector applicability	what is the difference between a company that doesn't have to set a target, and a company that has to but choose not to do so? Would it prevent the latter to release sbt for other topic (freshwater...)? I.e. where is the incentive?	A company must set SBts for all issues that are material. If a company is required to set a target and chooses not to, then they cannot make claims regarding targets for nature, since they will not be in compliance with the target setting methodology.
Sector applicability	Are non-agricultural sectors that are expected to require land use change after 2030 excluded from qualifying for SBTN targets?	No, no ag sectors that require land use change must follow IFC PS6 with the additional requirement that there be no offsets. However, this depends on the company's materiality assessment in step 1 and the land guidance which will tell them which land targets they are required to set
Sector applicability	Is a retailer of consumer staples and food considered as a FLAG sector?	Please see the requirements under FLAG. Generally if land use change emissions exceed 20% of your scope 3 emissions you are required to set an SBTi FLAG target.
Sector applicability	Question concerning sector requirement for Land SBTs: Does these apply to renewables? Or are these activities included under the 'electricity , gas, steam and air conditioning supply' sector? (Table 4 p13 of Consultation Guidance)	UN ISIC sector classification are being rewritten to include specific sector classifications for renewables and biofuels (among others). Until then yes, renewable electricity is classified under this sector.

Theme	Questions:	Answer:
Sector applicability	Will there be guidance for which industries Land target-setting will be most relevant? The current framing of Land targets are not applicable for all companies/industries that COULD contribute to land targets	Yes in the guidance document we have decision trees for each of the three targets to help companies identify whether or not they need to set a target. At a high level, companies should adopt each of the three land science-based targets depending on: 1. The materiality of specific pressures generated because of the company's activities 2. The sector of the company 3. The size of the company 4. The impact of the company in terms of emissions and/or the land occupation footprint. The draft guidance includes decision trees for each of the targets to enable companies to establish whether targets are a) required, b) recommended, c) not required, d) not applicable. Depending on these factors, companies in or sourcing from a range of sectors will be required or recommended to set land SBTs including (but not limited to): food, beverage and agriculture, forestry, fishing and aquaculture, bioenergy, mining, infrastructure, accommodation, construction etc.
Sector applicability	How can SMEs get involved? Will there be separate advice for them?	We plan on providing on-ramps to our methods for SMEs in the future, but currently our methods are not specifically designed for SME use. SMEs are welcome to join the Corporate Engagement Program to engage in the development process of SBTN guidance, methods, and tools.
Stakeholder engagement	Delivery of all targets but especially targets 2 & 3 won't be only in the hands of global companies and rely strongly on producer country governments, farmers and IPLCs. How have these stakeholders been engaged by SBTN?	We strongly agree with the need for broad stakeholder engagement throughout the target setting process and in the achievement of targets to ensure both effective and *just targets.* As a first step, we will be releasing stakeholder engagement guidance with our V1 methods for companies to use in parallel with our target setting methods. This piece of guidance aims to complement those places in the methods (within the optional prioritization of Step 2, in Step 3 methods for freshwater, and in the Step 3 methods for land around the inclusion of land rights in the co-conversion target and within the landscape engagement target) where stakeholder engagement and social safeguards are already noted. Special emphasis is placed on the role of local stakeholders and underrepresented groups including Indigenous peoples and local communities. We will be looking to grow this piece of guidance as needed to address the critical role of affected and other stakeholders in the target setting process moving forward.
Step 1 & 2	Can you please remind of us the date for the release of the new Sectoral Materiality Tool and for the High Impact Commodities List?	The SMT and High Impact Commodity List will be included in the v1 release.
Step 1 & 2	For the methodology, how can UN-SEEA natural capital accounting support understanding the baseline?	Natural capital accounting methods like the UN-SEEA and the Natural Capital Protocol can be used by companies to help understand and quantify how they impact nature. As such, these are useful methodologies to use in the initial steps of target setting (Step 1 & 2). Information collected through these methods may need to be refined or complemented with additional data-gathering in Step 3 when defining the target baseline, if the metrics and scales of assessment used are incompatible with those needed to set targets.

Theme	Questions:	Answer:
TNFD	What is the timeline for releasing the SBTN-TNFD guidance?	SBTN and TNFD have already released joint guidance on target-setting, see here: https://framework.tnfd.global/wp-content/uploads/2022/11/TNFD_Additional_Draft_Guidance_v0-3_B.pdf. Additional guidance is expected to become available this spring.
Unknown	@Marco, can you precise the scenarios you use ? Thank you	Land Footprint Reduction scenarios are listed in the draft guidance out for public consultation. Table 21 provides a list of recent studies with global land footprint reduction targets. The studies listed are: Griscom et al. 2017, IPCC 2018, Searchinger et al. 2019, FOLU's Growing Better 2019, Leclère et al. 2020, Roe et al. 2021.
Validation	Timeline (from when on?) for corporates to apply and be validated for SBTN land and freshwater?	As SBTN will launch the underlying process for companies to submit their targets for review and approval ("target validation process") at the same time as the first release of SBTs for nature, the target validation process itself will initially only be available to a small group of companies in order to gain learnings and optimize accordingly, prior to a full target validation process roll out later. SBTN accepted applications from companies for this pilot from January 6 – February 3, 2023. Companies not included in the initial target validation group are encouraged to prepare their targets as soon as V1 is publicly available in March 2023. V1 methods will not change as a result of the validation pilot period and when SBTN launches new method versions, the Network will provide a grace period for implementation. SBTN will open up the validation process for any company to submit targets after distilling lessons from the validation pilot. Tentative timing is Q1 2024. For more information
Validation	Hi! After company setup the land targets, is that will be verified/reviewed by the land hub team and will the company also given any relevant recommendation from the land hub team after that?Thanks.	An independent validation team within SBTN, will be responsible for the target validation of the initial group of target validation companies in 2023. This group will help SBTN test the validation process, and after distilling lessons learnt, it will open the validation process to the public (in Q1 2024). Method developers (aka the Land Hub) won't conduct target validation, yet they may support the SBTN team with office hours to help companies understand and interpret the methods (clarification questions).