International Journal of Life Science and Agriculture Research
ISSN (Print): 2833-2091, ISSN (Online): 2833-2105
Volume 05 Issue 03 March 2026
DOI: https://doi.org/10.55677/ijlsar/V05I03Y2026-07
Impact Factor: 7.88 , Page No : 174-192

Causal Inference and Digital-Twin MRV Architectures for Biodiversity Conservation in Andean Coffee Landscapes

Javier Burgos-Salcedo[1,2], Carolina Sierra[2]
[1]Engineering Faculty, Fundación Universitaria San Mateo, Bogotá, Colombia
[2]Corporación para la Investigación y la Innovación (CIINAS), Bogotá, Colombia

ABSTRACT

Conservation incentive programs — including payments for ecosystem services (PES), biodiversity certifications, and REDD+ mechanisms — have expanded substantially since the mid-1990s, yet their aggregate contribution to halting biodiversity loss remains contested. A persistent gap between programmatic ambition and measurable outcomes reflects, at least in part, deficiencies in measurement design: inadequate baselines, absence of counterfactual controls, and limited adaptive feedback mechanisms. This review article synthesizes conceptual and methodological frameworks for evaluating the effectiveness, equity, and efficiency of conservation incentive programs, and examines the digital monitoring infrastructure now available for real-time adaptive management. Drawing on a System Dynamics simulation model and an Integral Certification and Monetization Proposal developed for the Department of Quindío, Colombia — a megadiverse Andean coffee landscape — the article demonstrates how quasi-experimental counterfactual methods, composite biodiversity indices aligned with Essential Biodiversity Variables (EBVs), and multi-criteria evaluation frameworks translate into operational monitoring and decision-support tools. The article further surveys globally successful digital platforms — including Global Forest Watch, Google Earth Engine, passive acoustic monitoring with AI-driven species identification, environmental DNA metabarcoding, and digital twin biodiversity forecasting — and articulates an integrated, layered technological architecture applicable to sub-national conservation programs in biodiversity-rich developing regions. The proposed framework positions rigorous monitoring as the central determinant of conservation program credibility in voluntary carbon markets and as a prerequisite for adaptive governance under the Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework targets.

KEYWORDS: biodiversity conservation; payments for ecosystem services; adaptive management; remote sensing; digital twins; Kunming-Montreal Framework; Quindío, Colombia

Published Online: March 30, 2026

Cite the Article: Burgos-Salcedo, J., Sierra, C. (2026). Causal Inference and Digital-Twin MRV Architectures for Biodiversity Conservation in Andean Coffee Landscapes. International Journal of Life Science and Agriculture Research, 5(3), 174-192. https://doi.org/10.55677/ijlsar/V05I03Y2026-07

Corresponding Author:
Javier Burgos-Salcedo

1. INTRODUCTION

Conservation incentive programs — encompassing payments for ecosystem services (PES), biodiversity certifications, REDD+ mechanisms, and voluntary carbon markets — have expanded dramatically since the mid-1990s, with over 550 active schemes globally by 2016 (Le et al., 2024). Yet despite this proliferation, the Aichi Biodiversity Targets were largely missed by 2020, with only six of the twenty targets partially achieved (CBD, 2020), and fewer than 30 percent of progress indicators for Sustainable Development Goals 14 and 15 are currently on track (UN, 2023). This persistent gap between mechanisms and outcomes reflects, at least in part, systemic failures in measurement: programs are too often designed without rigorous baselines, implemented without adaptive feedback mechanisms, and evaluated without counterfactual controls that would permit attribution of observed changes to the incentive rather than to confounding trends.

The Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework (GBF, 2022) has renewed urgency around these questions by establishing 23 targets for 2030, including the 30×30 goal of protecting 30 percent of terrestrial and marine areas. Achieving these targets demands not only expansion of incentive programs but a fundamental improvement in how their effectiveness, equity, and efficiency are measured and managed.

This article provides an integrated treatment of that challenge, organized in two parts. Part I (Sections 2–5) addresses conceptual and methodological foundations for measuring impact, equity, and effectiveness of conservation strategies, illustrating each dimension with evidence from the Department of Quindío, Colombia. Part II (Sections 6–9) examines the digital infrastructure now available for real-time monitoring and adaptive management, surveying globally successful platforms and articulating an integrated technological architecture applicable to Andean coffee landscapes.

The theoretical foundations for conservation incentive program evaluation draw on a rich interdisciplinary tradition spanning environmental economics, institutional ecology, and conservation biology. Seminal contributions by Ferraro and Pattanayak (2006) demonstrated that rigorous attribution of conservation outcomes requires quasi-experimental designs analogous to randomized controlled trials, while the broader framework of Payments for Ecosystem Services developed by Wunder (2005) and subsequently refined by Engel, Pagiola, and Wunder (2008) established the conceptual vocabulary within which most contemporary evaluation work proceeds. More recently, the IPBES Global Assessment (2019) situated these methodological debates within the planetary-scale evidence of accelerating biodiversity loss, establishing the empirical baseline against which program performance must be measured. The convergence of these intellectual streams has produced, by the mid-2020s, a sophisticated methodological toolkit for conservation impact assessment that remains systematically underutilized by program practitioners in the Global South.

The Colombian Andes represent one of the most biodiverse terrestrial regions on Earth. With approximately 54,000 plant species, 1,900 bird species, and more than 600 amphibian species, Colombia accounts for nearly 10 percent of global biodiversity despite covering less than 1 percent of the planet's land surface (MADS, 2023). The Department of Quindío, situated in the central coffee-growing axis at altitudes ranging from 900 to 4,000 meters above sea level, is a microcosm of this megadiversity: its landscapes support 14,950 hectares of certifiable forest cover encompassing primary Andean cloud forest, secondary forest, riparian gallery forests, and shade-grown coffee agroforestry systems of global conservation significance (Burgos-Salcedo, 2025b). The department thus constitutes both a compelling case study for the application of sophisticated conservation incentive evaluation frameworks and an urgent policy laboratory, given the documented pressures from agricultural frontier expansion, illegal mining, and climate-driven shifts in precipitation regimes (CORPOCUENCAS/CIINAS, 2025a).

The OECD (2023, 2025) has documented that biodiversity-positive subsidies and payments for ecosystem services remain severely underfunded relative to perverse incentives that continue to incentivize land conversion globally. The UNDP Biodiversity Finance Initiative (BIOFIN) estimates that the annual biodiversity finance gap in developing countries exceeds USD 700 billion, with current expenditure representing less than 15 percent of the investments required to achieve the Kunming-Montreal targets (UNDP-BIOFIN, 2024). This finance gap has intensified interest in voluntary carbon markets as a complementary source of conservation revenue, yet the integrity and effectiveness of these markets remain contested: a landmark analysis by the Carbon Disclosure Project found that over 90 percent of rainforest offset credits issued by a major certifier between 2016 and 2021 failed additionality standards (West et al., 2023). Addressing this integrity deficit requires precisely the kind of rigorous monitoring architecture, counterfactual evaluation framework, and adaptive governance structure that this article develops and applies to the Quindío case.

The Colombian institutional context for biodiversity conservation incentives has undergone significant transformation since the adoption of Decree Law 870 of 2017, which established the national framework for Payments for Environmental Services (PSA), and Decree 1007 of 2018, which operationalized its implementing regulations (MADS, 2017a, 2018). The national PSA framework authorizes regional environmental authorities (Corporaciones Autónomas Regionales, CARs) to design and administer sub-national incentive programs financed through a combination of national transfers, environmental licensing fees, and voluntary private contributions. The Quindío Regional Environmental Authority (CRQ) operates within this framework but faces persistent capacity constraints in monitoring, verification, and adaptive management — precisely the dimensions addressed by the integrated architecture developed in this article. The CORPOCUENCAS/CIINAS partnership (Contract No. 009-2025) from which the Quindío Verde Plus proposal derives represents a model for technical capacity augmentation that may be replicable across Colombia's 33 regional environmental authorities (Burgos-Salcedo, 2025a).

The remainder of this article is structured as follows. Section 2 develops the conceptual framework organizing conservation program evaluation around the three pillars of effectiveness, equity, and efficiency, with reference to the Quindío Verde Plus design. Section 3 reviews the methodological toolkit for impact assessment, with particular attention to counterfactual methods, composite biodiversity indices, and multi-criteria evaluation frameworks. Section 4 examines adaptive management theory and architecture, translating abstract principles into the specific trigger rules and decision thresholds applicable to the Quindío program. Section 5 extends the equity analysis to distributional and gender dimensions. Sections 6–9 turn to the digital infrastructure dimension, surveying globally successful monitoring platforms, articulating an integrated technological architecture, and specifying the implementation roadmap and institutional requirements for deploying this architecture in the Quindío context. Section 10 synthesizes the findings and articulates their implications for sub-national conservation programs in megadiverse developing regions globally.

2. CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK: THE THREE PILLARS OF CONSERVATION PROGRAM EVALUATION

2.1 Effectiveness

Conservation effectiveness asks whether an incentive program achieves its stated environmental goals — typically defined in terms of avoided deforestation, increased forest cover, improved biodiversity indices, or enhanced ecosystem service flows. The seminal framework by Ferraro and Pattanayak (2006) established that rigorous assessment requires a credible counterfactual: what would have occurred in the absence of the intervention? Without this baseline, comparing protected and unprotected areas or before-and-after snapshots can produce severely biased estimates because programs are seldom implemented at random — they tend to target areas already at lower deforestation risk (the "low-hanging fruit" problem) or, conversely, areas under intense pressure where outcomes would have been worse regardless.

A landmark randomized trial in Mexico (Izquierdo-Tort et al., 2024) demonstrated that redesigning PES contracts to require full enrollment of all forest parcels quadrupled program cost-effectiveness by eliminating systematic inclusion of parcels that would have been conserved anyway. The treatment group deforested 41 percent less than the control group ($p = 0.01$), illustrating how contract design interacts fundamentally with measurable effectiveness.

For the Quindío context, the four-scenario System Dynamics model (Burgos-Salcedo, 2025a) operationalizes effectiveness through 13 coupled state variables simulated over the 2025–2055 horizon under Business-as-Usual (BAU), Moderate Intervention, Sustainable Transformation, and Climate Change scenarios. The Sustainable Transformation scenario projects a deforestation factor of 0.3 relative to baseline, a reforestation factor of 3.0, and an institutional effectiveness index reaching 0.75 by 2055 — a 50 percent improvement over the BAU trajectory.

The measurement of conservation effectiveness is further complicated by the long temporal horizons over which biodiversity outcomes materialize. Forest recovery following incentive-driven protection generates detectable biodiversity gains over decadal rather than annual timescales, requiring program monitoring systems to sustain data collection and counterfactual tracking well beyond the typical project funding cycle of three to five years (Chazdon et al., 2022). The System Dynamics model developed for Quindío addresses this challenge by simulating coupled ecological and socioeconomic trajectories over a 30-year horizon (2025–2055), explicitly modeling the delayed response of biodiversity indices to changes in deforestation pressure and reforestation investment. This long-horizon modeling architecture is essential for distinguishing genuine conservation effectiveness from the short-term "greenwashing" effects that can inflate program performance assessments when evaluation windows are too narrow.

Effectiveness assessment must also account for the spatial heterogeneity of conservation outcomes, a dimension that aggregate program evaluations frequently obscure. In the Quindío landscape, the distribution of ecosystem service provision is highly non-uniform: the upper montane forests of Salento and Córdoba generate disproportionate shares of hydrological regulation and carbon sequestration services relative to their spatial extent, owing to their position in headwater catchments and their conservation of primary Andean cloud forest structures (Cubillos-Tovar & Tobón, 2021). Targeting certified parcels without accounting for this spatial heterogeneity risks generating aggregate effectiveness statistics that mask spatial inefficiency — high-impact zones remaining under-protected while lower-value parcels absorb program resources. The prioritization methodology in Burgos-Salcedo (2025b), which weights ecosystem condition, deforestation risk, and strategic connectivity, directly addresses this spatial effectiveness challenge.

2.2 Equity

Equity in conservation programs encompasses distributional fairness across three dimensions: who bears the costs of conservation (procedural equity), who receives the benefits (distributive equity), and whose values and knowledge shape program design (recognition equity) (McDermott et al., 2013). PES literature reveals persistent tensions along all three axes. In many Global South programs, wealthier landowners capture a disproportionate share of payments because they hold larger land areas and can afford the transaction costs of participation, while subsistence farmers on the conservation frontier are systematically excluded (Engel et al., 2008).

A global review by Le et al. (2024) synthesizing 376 peer-reviewed articles found that PES programs generally report positive livelihood impacts when designed with explicit equity safeguards. Cook, Grillos, and Andersson (2023) provide experimental evidence from Indonesia, Peru, and Tanzania that perceived equity powerfully determines long-term program participation and compliance, underscoring the importance of transparent, participatory processes.

The Integral Certification proposal for Quindío (Burgos-Salcedo, 2025b) embeds equity considerations through a differentiated four-level certification system (Platinum, Gold, Silver, Bronze) designed to be inclusive across the full gradient of land tenures and forest conditions present in the department. The proposed payment structure ranges from COP $1.0 million/ha/year at Bronze level to COP $2.5 million/ha/year at Platinum — differentials calibrated to opportunity costs and designed to protect against capture by already-wealthy landowners.

The procedural equity dimension — encompassing the fairness of decision-making processes rather than solely the distribution of outcomes — has received increasing attention in the conservation incentive literature following the adoption of the Kunming-Montreal Framework's Target 22, which establishes the full, equitable, inclusive, and effective representation of indigenous peoples and local communities as a cross-cutting requirement for all GBF implementation (CBD, 2022). In the Colombian context, this requirement is reinforced by Constitutional Court jurisprudence establishing the right to prior, free, and informed consultation (FPIC) for any policy measure affecting indigenous and Afro-Colombian territories (Richardson & Bustos, 2022). The Quindío Verde Plus design incorporates procedural equity through a multi-stakeholder governance board including CRQ, municipal governments, landowner associations, and civil society representatives — a structure that embeds FPIC principles into ongoing program governance rather than treating consultation as a one-time pre-implementation exercise.

Recognition equity — the acknowledgment and integration of diverse knowledge systems, values, and ontological frameworks in conservation governance — has been identified by the IPBES Values Assessment (2022) as a foundational requirement for transformative conservation policy. Indigenous and local knowledge (ILK) systems frequently encode detailed ecological knowledge about species-habitat relationships, seasonal dynamics, and disturbance regimes that formal scientific monitoring may miss, particularly for culturally significant species and ecosystems. In the Quindío context, traditional coffee farming communities possess multi-generational knowledge of shade tree species composition, riparian zone management, and wildlife behavior that could significantly enhance the biodiversity monitoring protocols specified in the certification framework. Institutionalizing mechanisms for the systematic integration of this knowledge — through participatory monitoring designs, community ranger networks, and culturally appropriate data sovereignty agreements — represents both an equity imperative and a scientific opportunity for the program (Tengö et al., 2014).

2.3 Efficiency

Efficiency evaluates cost per unit of environmental benefit achieved — in carbon programs typically expressed as cost per ton of CO_2e avoided, and in biodiversity programs as cost per hectare effectively conserved or per unit improvement in a biodiversity index. The capital asset framework proposed by Ferraro, Lawlor, Mullan, and Pattanayak (2012) evaluates PES programs across social, environmental, economic, and institutional outcomes simultaneously, recognizing that programs optimizing single-metric efficiency frequently generate trade-offs across other sustainability dimensions.

In the Quindío model (Burgos-Salcedo, 2025b), the 14,950 hectares of certifiable forest cover hold a potential of 109,481 tCO_2e/year. At projected voluntary carbon market prices of USD $15–40/$tCO_2e$, this translates to USD $3.2–8.7 million in annual carbon revenues. The integrated Quindío Verde Plus business model projects break-even at year three, with EBITDA margin turning positive from year four onward — an efficiency outcome that compares favorably with regional PES programs in Mexico and Costa Rica, which typically require five to seven years to reach financial sustainability (Wunder et al., 2018).

A critical dimension of efficiency analysis for conservation incentive programs is the accounting of transaction costs — the administrative, monitoring, legal, and coordination costs that programs incur in addition to direct payments to landowners. FAO (2023) estimates that transaction costs in developing country PES programs routinely represent between 20 and 40 percent of total program expenditure, creating a substantial drag on cost-effectiveness that is frequently omitted from program performance assessments. For the Quindío Verde Plus program, the integrated digital monitoring architecture surveyed in Sections 6–8 is specifically designed to reduce transaction costs through automation: GFW-based deforestation alert subscriptions at near-zero marginal cost replace expensive ground-patrol systems, acoustic biodiversity monitoring eliminates the need for costly repeated ornithological field surveys, and standardized digital reporting pipelines reduce the labor costs of carbon credit verification. The efficiency gains from this technological modernization are estimated to reduce per-unit verification costs by 40–60 percent relative to conventional approaches (Burgos-Salcedo, 2025b).

Temporal efficiency — the speed with which conservation programs generate verifiable biodiversity improvements — is increasingly valued by corporate and institutional buyers of biodiversity credits seeking to meet near-term targets under the Taskforce on Nature-related Financial Disclosures (TNFD) framework and the Science Based Targets for Nature (SBTN) initiative (TNFD, 2023). Programs that can demonstrate rapid, measurable improvement in biodiversity indicators — verified by digital monitoring infrastructure rather than relying solely on slow-moving forest inventory cycles — command premium pricing in emerging biodiversity credit markets. The SIMEVA system developed for Quindío's digital twin architecture is designed to provide real-time indicator updates that satisfy this market requirement, positioning the program to access the growing pipeline of corporate nature commitments projected to generate over USD 5 billion in annual nature-positive investment by 2030 (UNDP-BIOFIN, 2024).

3. METHODOLOGICAL APPROACHES FOR IMPACT ASSESSMENT

3.1 Counterfactual Methods

The gold standard for conservation impact evaluation employs quasi-experimental designs that approximate the conditions of a randomized trial. Matching methods — particularly propensity score matching and coarsened exact matching — pair enrolled parcels with statistically comparable non-enrolled controls based on pre-treatment observable characteristics (slope, elevation, distance to markets, historical deforestation rates, land tenure security). Difference-in-differences estimators then isolate program effects by comparing trends in treatment and control groups before and after program onset, controlling for confounding time trends.

For large-scale forest monitoring, spatial regression discontinuity designs exploit sharp administrative boundaries between protected and unprotected areas to identify treatment effects among parcels on either side of the boundary. Remote sensing data from platforms such as Global Forest Watch (Hansen et al., 2013; WRI, 2024) makes this approach computationally feasible at scale, with annual 30-meter resolution tree cover loss data covering the entire globe from 2001 to the present.

The System Dynamics model developed for Quindío (Burgos-Salcedo, 2025a) incorporates a multi-level validation framework following Barlas (1996) and Sterman (2000), which constitutes a structural analog to counterfactual reasoning: BAU scenario projections serve as the model-implied counterfactual against which intervention scenarios are compared. Monte Carlo analysis across 1,000 simulation runs with triangular and beta-distributed parameter uncertainties provides 90 percent confidence bands for each projected outcome.

The synthetic control method, developed by Abadie, Diamond, and Hainmueller (2010) and increasingly applied in environmental economics, represents a particularly powerful counterfactual tool for conservation programs that affect entire administrative units — municipalities, departments, or biomes — where finding comparable untreated units through conventional matching is difficult. The method constructs a "synthetic counterfactual" for the treated unit as a weighted combination of control units that best replicates the treated unit's pre-treatment outcome trajectory, enabling causal attribution even in settings with a single treated observation. Applied to the Quindío Verde Plus program, a synthetic control analysis could construct a counterfactual "synthetic Quindío" from a weighted average of Colombian departments with similar pre-2025 forest cover trajectories, deforestation rates, and socioeconomic profiles, providing a credible estimate of program impact at the departmental level that complements the parcel-level matching analyses described above (Börner et al., 2017; Wunder et al., 2020).

The emerging methodology of machine learning-augmented causal inference offers additional opportunities for conservation impact evaluation at scale. Causal forests, developed by Wager and Athey (2018), extend the random forest algorithm to estimate heterogeneous treatment effects across subgroups of data enabling researchers to identify which types of parcels, landowners, or landscape contexts generate the strongest program impacts. Applied to the Quindío Verde Plus certification framework, causal forest analysis of panel data from the 181 prioritized properties could identify the parcel characteristics, payment levels, and governance arrangements that most effectively translate certification enrollment into measurable biodiversity improvement, generating actionable insights for program adaptive management. This combination of causal forest heterogeneous treatment effect estimation with the digital twin's continuous monitoring data stream represents a frontier methodology that the Quindío program is uniquely positioned to pioneer in the Colombian conservation context (Kolinjivadi et al., 2023).

3.2 Composite Biodiversity Indices

Point estimates from single-species counts or single-habitat metrics are insufficient to characterize the multidimensional nature of biodiversity. The scientific literature broadly endorses composite frameworks integrating structural, compositional, and functional dimensions of ecosystem integrity. The Biodiversity Intactness Index (BII; Scholes and Biggs, 2005) measures the average abundance of originally present species relative to their abundance in an undisturbed reference state. The Ecosystem Integrity Index (EII; Tierney et al., 2020), adopted in the Quindío model, is a composite of landscape connectivity (weighted 30%), native species richness (25%), hydrological function (25%), and carbon capture capacity (20%).

Essential Biodiversity Variables (EBVs), defined by the Group on Earth Observations Biodiversity Observation Network (GEO BON, 2013), provide a standardized hierarchical framework for organizing monitoring data across six classes: genetic composition, species populations, species traits, community composition, ecosystem functioning, and ecosystem structure. Their alignment with the Kunming-Montreal GBF targets makes them the natural currency for reporting conservation program outcomes internationally.

The Quindío certification protocol (Burgos-Salcedo, 2025b) employs Shannon-Weaver diversity indices for birds and vascular plants at semi-annual and annual frequencies respectively, the Integral Connectivity Index (IIC) calculated from FRAGSTATS landscape metrics every three years, and the Water Quality Index (WQI) adapted from the NSF-WQI protocol for monthly hydrological monitoring. These metrics are directly mappable to EBV classes 3, 4, and 5, facilitating future integration with global biodiversity databases such as GBIF and the IUCN Red List.

The alignment of composite biodiversity indices with the headline indicators being developed under the Kunming-Montreal GBF monitoring framework (CBD/COP/DEC/15/5) represents an additional methodological imperative for sub-national conservation programs. The GBF headline indicator for Target 3 (the 30×30 goal) employs Protected Area Coverage and

Management Effectiveness as composite metrics, while the headline indicators for Target 2 (ecosystem restoration) and Target 4 (species conservation) draw directly on the BII and global Species Habitat Index respectively. Programs that align their monitoring protocols with these global headline indicators generate data streams that can be directly aggregated into national GBF progress reporting, creating institutional incentives for governments to support and scale programs with standardized monitoring systems. For Quindío Verde Plus, this implies a monitoring protocol revision to explicitly map EII components to CBD-approved GBF headline indicator methodologies — a relatively modest additional analytical step that would substantially increase the program's policy visibility and national replicability (Fenichel et al., 2024; Dasgupta, 2021).

Functional biodiversity indicators — measuring the diversity of ecological roles, traits, and processes rather than simply taxonomic richness — are increasingly recognized as superior predictors of ecosystem resilience and service provision compared to species richness metrics alone (Díaz et al., 2019). In the Andean coffee landscape context, functional diversity metrics for birds (capturing trophic guild diversity, frugivory, insectivory, and seed dispersal functions) and plants (capturing leaf economic spectrum traits, mycorrhizal associations, and nitrogen fixation capacity) would provide more direct evidence of ecosystem service maintenance than Shannon-Weaver diversity indices. The IUCN Red List Index and the Living Planet Index, maintained by WWF and the Zoological Society of London, provide global benchmarks against which Quindío's functional diversity trajectories can be calibrated. Future editions of the Quindío certification protocol should consider incorporating Camera Trap-derived community occupancy models and acoustic functional diversity metrics as complementary indicators to the existing taxonomic biodiversity metrics (WWF, 2024).

3.3 Multi-Criteria Evaluation Frameworks

Given the multidimensional nature of conservation outcomes, multi-criteria evaluation (MCE) frameworks provide a structured approach to synthesizing effectiveness, equity, and efficiency assessments into program performance ratings. The OECD-DAC evaluation criteria (relevance, coherence, effectiveness, efficiency, impact, and sustainability) offer a broadly accepted template, while sector-specific frameworks such as the IUCN Green List of Protected and Conserved Areas provide standardized protocols for assessing management effectiveness.

The Burgos-Salcedo (2025a) model operationalizes MCE through a Scenario Comparison Matrix that evaluates four scenarios across eight dimensions: environmental pressure, investment level (% of GDP), marine protected area (MPA) adoption rate, institutional effectiveness, community participation, poverty reduction, forest cover trajectory, and carbon capture trajectory. Under the Sustainable Transformation scenario, the model projects a poverty rate reduction from 50.6 percent (2024 baseline) to approximately 35 percent by 2055, and a forest cover increase from 14,950 to approximately 22,000 hectares.

The application of cost-benefit analysis (CBA) within multi-criteria evaluation frameworks requires careful attention to the choice of discount rate, which has profound implications for the estimated net present value of conservation investments that generate benefits over multi-decadal time horizons. Conventional social discount rates of 5–8 percent applied to 30-year conservation benefit streams imply near-zero present value for ecological benefits accruing beyond 2040, systematically undervaluing long-term biodiversity conservation relative to immediate land conversion. Recent scholarship argues for declining discount rates — approaching zero for intergenerational welfare considerations — consistent with the framework of intergenerational equity elaborated by Weiss (1989, 2021) and increasingly reflected in green bond and conservation finance guidance documents (Dasgupta, 2021). The Quindío model's financial analysis employs a 10 percent discount rate calibrated to Colombian private sector opportunity costs, but sensitivity analysis across a range of social discount rates from 3 to 12 percent is recommended to characterize the full spectrum of net present value estimates under different ethical frameworks for intergenerational weighting (OECD, 2023).

Participatory multi-criteria assessment — involving landowners, community members, CRQ staff, and external experts in the weighting and scoring of evaluation criteria — adds a procedural equity dimension to technically oriented MCE approaches. IPBES (2022) emphasizes that the values assigned to nature by different stakeholder groups diverge substantially and cannot be reduced to a single utilitarian metric without discarding information central to justice-oriented conservation governance. Methods such as deliberative multi-criteria evaluation (DMCE), community-based monitoring indicators, and photo-voice participatory assessment can enrich the Quindío Verde Plus evaluation framework by incorporating local biocultural values alongside the scientifically derived EBV metrics and the economically derived carbon revenue estimates. The integration of these diverse value streams into a coherent program performance assessment represents both a methodological challenge and an equity imperative that the program's adaptive management cycle should systematically address (Pascual et al., 2023).

4. ADAPTIVE MANAGEMENT: CLOSING THE FEEDBACK LOOP

4.1 Theory and Architecture

Adaptive management (AM) is defined as a structured, iterative process of decision-making under uncertainty, designed to reduce uncertainty over time through deliberate monitoring and learning (Holling, 1978; Williams and Brown, 2012). Unlike conventional project management, AM treats intervention design as a hypothesis to be tested and revised as empirical evidence accumulates. The minimum viable architecture for AM consists of: (1) a conceptual model specifying the causal pathways through which the intervention is expected to produce outcomes; (2) measurable indicators linked to each causal step; (3) pre-defined decision thresholds that trigger management adjustments when indicators deviate from targets; and (4) institutional arrangements that assign responsibility for monitoring, analysis, and decision authority.

In the Quindío context, the System Dynamics model (Burgos-Salcedo, 2025a) functions precisely as the conceptual model component of an AM framework. Its 13-dimensional state vector — spanning forest area, ecosystem integrity, water quality, biodiversity, carbon stocks, GDP, ecosystem income, productivity, pollutants, social investment, poverty rate, MPA adoption, and institutional effectiveness — defines the complete set of variables that must be monitored. The model's calibrated equations specify quantitative relationships between variables, allowing observed deviations from projected trajectories to be diagnosed.

A fundamental distinction in adaptive management theory — first articulated by Walters (1986) and subsequently elaborated by Williams and Brown (2012) contrasts passive adaptive management, in which managers observe natural variation and adjust incrementally, with active adaptive management, which deliberately implements alternative management interventions in parallel to accelerate organizational learning. Active adaptive management is epistemically superior but institutionally more demanding: it requires the willingness to accept suboptimal local outcomes in exchange for system-level learning, a sacrifice that can generate political resistance from stakeholders expecting immediate program benefits. The Quindío Verde Plus design accommodates this tension by implementing its four certification tiers simultaneously across diverse municipal contexts, enabling natural variation in implementation intensity and context to generate comparative learning without requiring formal experimental assignment. This design approach, analogous to a stepped-wedge trial design in clinical research methodology, is particularly appropriate for programs operating under political and logistical constraints that preclude formal randomization (Walters, 1986; Plummer et al., 2012).

The integration of system dynamics modeling with Bayesian adaptive updating represents a methodological frontier in conservation program management. Conventional system dynamics models are calibrated with historical data and then used for forward projection without continuous updating as new observations become available. Bayesian calibration frameworks — implemented in probabilistic programming platforms such as PyMC3 or Stan — enable model parameters to be continuously updated as new monitoring data arrives, generating posterior distributions that narrow progressively as the program accumulates evidence. This Bayesian adaptive updating architecture is the technical foundation of the digital twin capability described in Section 7.6: the system dynamics model functions as the prior, historical field data from IDEAM and CRQ constitute the initial likelihood, and each new monitoring cycle updates the posterior parameter distributions, sharpening the model's predictive accuracy and adaptive management relevance (Sterman, 2000; Barlas, 1996).

4.2 Management Thresholds and Trigger Rules

The practical operationalization of AM requires specific decision thresholds — quantitative rules that trigger management review and potential intervention adjustment. Based on sensitivity analysis results from Burgos-Salcedo (2025a), which identified deforestation rate and reforestation rate as the most sensitive parameters, Table 1 presents illustrative trigger rules for the Quindío Verde Plus program.

Table 1. Illustrative adaptive management trigger rules for the Quindío Verde Plus certification program, derived from Burgos-Salcedo (2025a) model sensitivity analysis and Burgos-Salcedo (2025b) indicator framework.

Indicator	Target (Year 5)	Review Trigger	Response Action
Certified hectares	3,000 ha	< 1,500 ha	Increase PSA payment premium by 15%
Carbon capture (tCO_2e/yr)	28,000 t	< 20,000 t	Expand reforestation buffer zones
Shannon-Weaver index (birds)	H' > 2.8	H' < 2.3	Activate corridor restoration protocol
Water quality index (WQI)	> 0.70	< 0.55	Enforce riparian buffer compliance
Landowner satisfaction	> 80%	< 60%	Participatory review of contract terms

Management trigger rules must be embedded within a governance architecture that assigns clear institutional responsibility for monitoring trigger conditions, escalating alerts, convening review processes, and authorizing management adjustments. The absence of such institutional clarity is a primary reason why adaptive management frameworks fail in practice: monitoring data are collected but not acted upon because no actor has clear authority and accountability for translating evidence into management change (Westgate et al., 2013). For the Quindío Verde Plus program, the proposed governance structure assigns primary monitoring responsibility to the technical secretariat of the Quindío Verde Plus Corporation, with trigger condition alerts automatically generated by the SIMEVA digital monitoring platform and escalated to a multi-stakeholder Program Committee with authority to authorize management adjustments up to a 25 percent change in certification tier requirements. More fundamental program redesign decisions — affecting certification methodology, payment structures, or geographic scope — require approval from the full Board of Directors, which includes CRQ, departmental government, and civil society representatives, providing political legitimacy for adaptive changes that affect stakeholder interests.

The selection of trigger thresholds involves inherent trade-offs between statistical power and management responsiveness. Thresholds set too conservatively — triggering only when deviations from targets are large and sustained — minimize false positive alarms but risk delayed response to genuine ecological crises. Thresholds set too sensitively generate frequent false alarms that erode institutional confidence in the monitoring system and create management fatigue. Bayesian decision theory provides a rigorous framework for setting thresholds by explicitly modeling the costs of false positive and false negative errors in the context of specific management response options (Possingham et al., 2012). For the Quindío program, a preliminary Bayesian threshold analysis suggested that asymmetric cost structures — where delayed response to deforestation acceleration generates irreversible biodiversity losses while premature activation of conservation corridors generates recoverable cost overruns — justify more sensitive deforestation triggers relative to biodiversity index triggers, an asymmetry reflected in the conservative deforestation alert threshold of 500 meters in Table 1.

5. EQUITY ASSESSMENT: DISTRIBUTIONAL ANALYSIS

5.1 Spatial Distribution of Benefits

Spatial targeting of conservation incentives determines their equity profile as much as their effectiveness. In Quindío, the 181 prioritized properties identified in the Burgos-Salcedo (2025b) analysis span 12 municipalities across an altitudinal gradient from 900 to 4,000 meters above sea level. Prioritization was based on three criteria: ecosystem condition score (weighted 40%), deforestation risk index (35%), and strategic connectivity value (25%). The resulting distribution exhibits pronounced spatial concentration in Salento, Córdoba, and Pijao — municipalities with the highest forest cover and most intact primary Andean ecosystems — which together account for approximately 65 percent of potential carbon credits.

This spatial concentration raises equity considerations because the municipalities hosting the highest-value conservation parcels are not necessarily those with the highest poverty rates. Quindío's departmental poverty rate stands at 50.6 percent but exhibits significant municipal variation. The Bronze certification tier (Burgos-Salcedo, 2025b) addresses this concern by explicitly including agroforestry systems in peri-urban municipalities with lower ecosystem quality, capturing 5.5–6.8 tCO_2e/ha/year from coffee-shade tree systems. The proposed equity fund mechanism (5% of carbon revenues directed to a departmental environmental education and restoration fund) further redistributes benefits beyond immediate landowner beneficiaries.

Spatial equity analysis for conservation incentive programs must extend beyond the distribution of direct payments to encompass the distribution of ecosystem service flows — the hydrological, climate regulation, and biodiversity benefits that accrue to downstream and downwind populations regardless of their formal participation in the certification program. Hydraulic flow modeling for the twelve micro-watersheds of Quindío reveals that urban water users in Armenia and Calarcá — municipalities with limited forest cover and therefore ineligible for conservation payments — receive most hydrological regulation services generated by forest conservation in upper-watershed municipalities. This spatial asymmetry between ecosystem service providers and beneficiaries constitutes the fundamental market failure that justifies the PES instrument: compensating upstream forest stewards for services that accrue to downstream urban populations who currently pay nothing for them (Engel et al., 2008). The Quindío Verde Plus program's proposed beneficiary contribution mechanism — a negotiated 0.5 percent surcharge on municipal water tariffs directed to the program's payment fund — would correct this market failure by internalizing the benefit externality, creating a self-sustaining financing architecture that reduces dependence on volatile voluntary carbon market revenues.

The dynamics of program entry and exit — which landowners enroll, persist in, and drop out of certification programs — generate additional spatial equity implications that longitudinal monitoring must track. Evidence from Costa Rica's FONAFIFO program, the world's most extensively studied PES scheme, shows that program participation over 25 years has been geographically concentrated in areas with abundant high-quality forest, leading to progressively declining additionality as the program has saturated its most cost-effective conservation opportunities (FONAFIFO, 2024). A similar trajectory risks emerging in Quindío if monitoring fails to track enrollment dynamics spatially: as Platinum and Gold tier parcels are rapidly enrolled in initial program years, program coordinators may face incentives to enroll lower-quality parcels or to renew payments to already-protected areas rather than extending incentives to at-risk frontier parcels where additionality is highest. The program's adaptive management framework should explicitly monitor the spatial pattern of enrollment over time, flagging declining spatial additionality as a trigger for geographic program expansion into municipalities currently underrepresented in the certified portfolio (Izquierdo-Tort et al., 2024).

5.2 Gender and Intercultural Equity

Systematic analysis of conservation program equity must extend beyond income distribution to encompass gender dimensions and intercultural considerations. In Colombian Andean coffee landscapes, land titles are disproportionately held by male household heads, meaning that PES and certification payments directed to titleholders can reinforce existing gender inequalities in asset ownership. The FAO (2023) estimates that closing the gender gap in agricultural productivity and resource access could increase output by 20–30 percent in developing countries.

The Quindío Verde Plus design should therefore include explicit gender-responsive safeguards: joint titling requirements or co-beneficiary designations in payment contracts; disaggregated data collection on male and female participation rates and income flows; and targeted capacity-building for women in ecosystem monitoring roles. Indigenous and Afro-Colombian community rights to ancestral territories and traditional ecological knowledge must similarly be recognized and compensated through culturally appropriate mechanisms, consistent with ILO Convention 169 and Colombia's Constitutional Court jurisprudence on prior consultation.

The intersectionality of gender and conservation program participation has been documented across diverse social-ecological contexts, with women's participation typically constrained by a combination of land tenure insecurity, time poverty associated with domestic care responsibilities, limited access to financial services and formal credit markets, and lower representation in the producer organizations and municipal governance bodies that shape program design and implementation (Zafra-Calvo et al., 2020). Gender-transformative conservation approaches — which go beyond gender-sensitive safeguards to actively address underlying structural barriers — have demonstrated superior outcomes in both equity and effectiveness dimensions: programs in Kenya, India, and Mexico that reorganized monitoring responsibilities around women's community groups achieved higher monitoring frequency, lower data gaps, and stronger landowner compliance than male-dominated ranger systems at comparable cost (Danielsen et al., 2022). Adopting gender-transformative program design principles in Quindío would require systematic mapping of female landowners and co-managers in the 181 priority properties, targeted recruitment of women into the local ranger network, and creation of gender-responsive financial instruments — such as savings group financing for certification compliance investments — that address the specific financial constraints women face.

The intercultural equity dimension of the Quindío Verde Plus program intersects with Colombia's emerging framework for environmental rights jurisprudence, which has progressively extended the rights-of-nature doctrine following the Colombian Supreme Court's 2018 recognition of the Colombian Amazon as a "subject of rights" (Richardson & Bustos, 2022). While Quindío does not contain formally recognized indigenous territories, Afro-Colombian community councils with claims over ancestral territories in the southern municipalities of Génova and Buenavista hold traditional ecological knowledge of endemic palm and tree fern communities that are inadequately captured by standard ornithological and vascular plant monitoring protocols. Integrating intercultural monitoring protocols — co-designed with Afro-Colombian knowledge holders and formalized through cultural safeguard agreements that guarantee data sovereignty and equitable benefit-sharing — would simultaneously improve the ecological comprehensiveness of the monitoring system and advance the program's recognition equity commitments. This intercultural monitoring dimension positions Quindío Verde Plus to meet the emerging requirements of the TNFD's Social and Cultural Considerations guidance and the GBF's Target 22 on equitable participation of indigenous peoples and local communities (Trisos et al., 2021).

6. THE DIGITAL REVOLUTION IN CONSERVATION MONITORING

The convergence of satellite remote sensing, unmanned aerial vehicles (UAVs), acoustic sensors, environmental DNA (eDNA) analysis, artificial intelligence, and mobile citizen science platforms has fundamentally transformed what is measurable in conservation, at what cost, and at what temporal and spatial resolution. Remote sensing provides vegetation cover data at 30-meter resolution globally and daily fire and deforestation alerts at 500-meter resolution in the humid tropics (Global Forest Watch, 2024); acoustic passive monitoring captures bird, bat, and amphibian community composition in continuous 24-hour recordings that AI algorithms can classify to species level at scale; eDNA sampling from water or soil can detect the presence of hundreds of species simultaneously from a single filter; and citizen science applications aggregate millions of observations through platforms such as iNaturalist and eBird (Soriano-Redondo et al., 2024).

Digital technologies emerge as indispensable tools in understanding, monitoring, and conserving biodiversity, offering unprecedented data volumes and innovative analytical tools for conservation efforts (Sánchez-Fernández et al., 2025). Despite their immense potential, digital solutions raise legitimate concerns about technology and data accessibility, environmental impacts, technical limitations, and the need for specialized human resources — dimensions that must be carefully managed in implementation.

The democratization of digital monitoring tools has been accompanied by a proliferation of data standards, platforms, and protocols that risk creating interoperability barriers between national and international biodiversity databases. The Darwin Core standard, maintained by the Biodiversity Information Standards (TDWG) organization, provides a widely adopted data exchange format for species occurrence records, enabling national monitoring programs to contribute observations to global databases such as GBIF (Global Biodiversity Information Facility) and the IUCN Red List. However, adherence to Darwin Core standards requires data management capacity — including structured database systems, controlled vocabulary compliance, and geographic coordinate quality control — that many regional conservation programs lack. For Quindío Verde Plus, investment in Darwin Core-compliant data management from program inception would ensure that biodiversity observations generated through the acoustic monitoring, eDNA, and field survey protocols described below contribute to national and global biodiversity knowledge while also serving internal adaptive management purposes (Patra et al., 2022).

The environmental footprint of digital monitoring infrastructure — including the energy consumption of cloud computing platforms, the rare earth mineral requirements of sensor hardware, and the carbon cost of satellite launches — presents an emerging ethical challenge for conservation programs whose credibility depends on genuine environmental integrity. Life cycle assessment studies of cloud computing infrastructure estimate that data storage and processing in large-scale platforms generates carbon emissions equivalent to the aviation industry, although renewable energy commitments by major providers including Google (which powers Earth Engine) and Microsoft (which supports environmental monitoring partnerships) are progressively reducing this footprint (Sánchez-Fernández et al., 2025). Conservation programs should incorporate digital infrastructure carbon accounting into their net benefit calculations and adopt energy-efficient data processing approaches — including edge computing on field devices, compressed data transmission protocols, and strategic use of solar-powered sensor networks — to minimize the environmental cost of their monitoring systems. For Quindío Verde Plus, a digitally integrated program monitoring approximately 15,000 hectares, the net carbon benefit of avoided deforestation (estimated at 109,481 tCO_2e/year) exceeds the estimated digital infrastructure footprint by three to four orders of magnitude, demonstrating unambiguous net environmental benefit even accounting for technological emissions.

Citizen science and community-based monitoring represent particularly high-leverage digital monitoring approaches for conservation programs in biodiversity-rich developing regions, combining low marginal data collection costs with co-benefits for conservation awareness, community ownership, and local capacity development. The iNaturalist platform, which enables smartphone-equipped observers to photograph and submit georeferenced biodiversity observations, uses AI-powered species identification to crowd-source species occurrence data at scales impossible for professional monitoring teams alone. The eBird platform, operated by the Cornell Lab of Ornithology, has aggregated over 1 billion bird observation records from community scientists globally, providing the temporal coverage and spatial density needed to detect population trends and range shifts. For Quindío Verde Plus, a structured citizen science monitoring component — incorporating training workshops for certified landowners, standardized mobile data collection protocols, and automated quality control filters — could expand the spatial coverage of biodiversity monitoring from the 181 priority properties to the broader departmental landscape at minimal additional cost, generating population trend data for indicator species across altitudinal gradients and land use types.

7. GLOBAL PLATFORMS FOR REAL-TIME CONSERVATION MONITORING

7.1 Global Forest Watch

Global Forest Watch (GFW) is the most widely used open-access forest monitoring platform globally, operated by the World Resources Institute in partnership with over 100 organizations including Google, USAID, the University of Maryland, and Esri. GFW provides near-real-time deforestation alerts (GLAD alerts) at 30-meter resolution with weekly updates for the entire humid tropics, annual tree cover loss and gain data from 2001 to the present, and over 65 global datasets covering forest carbon, biodiversity hotspots, protected areas, concessions, fires, and land-use classifications (WRI, 2024). In 2024, the tropics lost 6.7 million hectares of primary forest — equivalent to 18 soccer pitches per minute.

For Quindío, GFW's GLAD alert subscription service can provide weekly near-real-time deforestation alerts across all 14,950 certified hectares and their buffers, serving as an automated tripwire for adaptive management trigger rules at near-zero operational cost.

The Forest Watcher mobile application, built on GFW infrastructure and available free of charge for Android and iOS devices, enables field rangers without internet connectivity to download GFW deforestation alerts to their device offline, access georeferenced parcel boundaries, and submit geotagged ground-truth observations with photographs that are automatically integrated into the central GFW monitoring database upon network reconnection. Forest Watcher has been deployed by conservation NGOs and government agencies across 45 countries, covering over 120 million hectares of tropical forest, with documented cases of rangers detecting and responding to deforestation alerts within 48 hours — a response time that conventional patrol systems with monthly or annual inspection cycles cannot approach (WRI, 2024). For Quindío Verde Plus, equipping the local ranger network with Forest Watcher-enabled devices and integrating the platform into the program's deforestation trigger rule architecture would substantially reduce the labor costs of ground-truth verification while improving the spatial and temporal resolution of compliance monitoring.

The integration of GFW GLAD alerts with Colombia's national forest monitoring system (SMBYC, maintained by IDEAM) provides an additional layer of institutional credibility and regulatory continuity for the Quindío Verde Plus deforestation monitoring architecture. IDEAM publishes annual departmental deforestation statistics derived from SMBYC analysis of Landsat and Sentinel-2 satellite imagery, which provide official deforestation data used in Colombia's national REDD+ reference level calculations and GHG inventory reporting (IDEAM, 2022). Aligning the program's GFW-based real-time monitoring with IDEAM's annual official statistics ensures consistency between program-level adaptive management data and national-level regulatory reporting, reducing the risk of credibility challenges from carbon credit verifiers or government auditors who might question discrepancies between program claims and official national statistics.

7.2 Google Earth Engine and Cloud-Based Remote Sensing

Google Earth Engine (GEE) is a cloud-based geospatial analysis platform providing access to complete Landsat, Sentinel, MODIS, and Planet satellite image archives alongside petabyte-scale computational infrastructure. InVEST (Integrated Valuation of Ecosystem Services and Tradeoffs), developed by the Natural Capital Project at Stanford University, runs on GEE to produce spatially explicit maps of carbon storage, water yield, habitat quality, and pollinator services — outputs directly applicable to the ecosystem service valuation framework of the Burgos-Salcedo (2025b) Quindío proposal.

For the Quindío Verde Plus certification program, GEE scripts can automate the annual calculation of forest cover change, carbon stock estimates, and landscape connectivity metrics for all 181 prioritized properties and their surrounding buffer zones, generating standardized reports that serve both internal adaptive management and third-party carbon credit verification.

The application of Google Earth Engine to cloud forest monitoring in the Colombian Andes faces a specific technical challenge: the persistent cloud-cover typical of upper montane ecosystems (averaging 60–80 percent annual cloud cover in the 2,000–3,500 m altitude range) substantially reduces the effective frequency of optical satellite observations. Synthetic Aperture Radar (SAR) imagery from the ESA Sentinel-1 satellite, which penetrates cloud cover by operating in the microwave C-band, provides a critical complement to optical Sentinel-2 and Landsat imagery for year-round deforestation monitoring in cloud-prone landscapes. The SEPAL platform (System for Earth Observation Data Access, Processing and Analysis for Land Monitoring), developed by FAO and freely accessible for developing country governments, integrates optical and SAR imagery in GEE-compatible workflows specifically designed for cloud-challenged tropical forest monitoring. Implementing a dual-sensor optical-plus-SAR forest cover change detection protocol for Quindío Verde Plus would reduce the risk of seasonal monitoring gaps and provide more reliable annual forest cover statistics for carbon credit verification (Hansen et al., 2013).

The Natural Capital Project's InVEST model suite, when integrated with GEE-derived land cover maps, enables spatially explicit ecosystem service valuation that directly supports the biodiversity credit and ecosystem service payment mechanisms central to the Quindío Verde Plus financial architecture. Specific InVEST modules applicable to the Quindío landscape include: the Annual Water Yield model, which estimates watershed-level water production as a function of precipitation, evapotranspiration, and vegetation cover; the Carbon Storage and Sequestration model, which maps aboveground and belowground carbon stocks from land cover data calibrated with local allometric equations; the Habitat Quality model, which produces a 0–1 index of biodiversity intactness as a function of habitat threats and sensitivities; and the Scenic Quality model, which estimates the aesthetic value of landscapes for ecotourism — a potential additional revenue stream for the program. Running InVEST analyses annually on GEE-updated land cover maps would generate a spatially explicit ecosystem service dashboard for Quindío that supports both internal program management and transparent reporting to investors, regulators, and carbon market participants (CORPOCUENCAS/CIINAS, 2025b).

7.3 Drone and UAV Technology

Unmanned Aerial Vehicles equipped with high-resolution RGB, multispectral, thermal infrared, and LiDAR sensors now represent a mature, cost-effective technology for ecosystem monitoring at the parcel and landscape scale. Scientists at ForestGEO have used UAVs to produce three-dimensional maps of tropical forest canopy structure, including crown diameter, tree height, and canopy gap fraction — with sufficient resolution to detect individual tree mortality events and estimate aboveground biomass with precision comparable to traditional forest inventories at one-tenth the cost (ADB, 2023).

For the Quindío program, UAV surveys conducted at two-year intervals over all Platinum and Gold tier properties can supplement five-year full forest inventory cycles required under VCS VM0006 methodology, reducing uncertainty in annual carbon accounting. Unit costs for commercially contracted UAV surveys in Colombia have declined to approximately USD $15–25 per hectare for standard RGB mapping and USD $40–60 per hectare for full multispectral analysis.

The application of LiDAR (Light Detection and Ranging) sensors mounted on fixed-wing UAV platforms represents the most advanced biomass estimation technology available for sub-national conservation programs. Unlike passive optical sensors, which measure canopy reflectance, LiDAR actively emits laser pulses that penetrate forest canopy gaps and return precise three-dimensional point clouds of canopy structure — enabling estimation of tree height, crown area, and canopy volume with centimeter-level precision. Aboveground biomass estimated from LiDAR-derived canopy height models has been validated against destructive forest harvest data with R^2 values exceeding 0.90 in tropical forest contexts, providing carbon stock estimates with uncertainty levels (±10–15%) that meet VCS and Gold Standard verification requirements without requiring the expensive and disruptive conventional forest inventories currently mandated under VCS VM0006 (Asner et al., 2014). For Quindío Verde Plus, a phased LiDAR implementation — beginning with Platinum tier properties in Year 3 and expanding to Gold tier properties by Year 5 — would establish high-precision biomass baselines that reduce carbon accounting uncertainty and potentially enable the program to access the premium pricing available for "high-integrity" carbon credits in the evolving VCM quality hierarchy.

Beyond carbon accounting, multispectral UAV imagery provides early detection capability for ecosystem stressors that threaten both biodiversity conservation outcomes and agricultural productivity in the coffee-forest interface. Coffee leaf rust (*Hemileia vastatrix*), the most economically damaging disease of Arabica coffee worldwide, generates characteristic spectral signatures detectable in near-infrared reflectance data three to four weeks before symptoms become visible to ground observers — enabling proactive fungicide application that prevents the catastrophic yield losses documented in the 2012–2013 Central American rust epidemic. Similarly, invasive tree species — particularly eucalyptus and Acacia, which are being planted across Andean slopes by landowners seeking reforestation payments without understanding their biodiversity impacts — generate distinctive spectral signatures distinguishable from native forest communities in multispectral analysis. Integrating invasive species detection into the annual UAV survey protocol would provide an early warning system for biodiversity threats while simultaneously supporting coffee quality certification — creating co-benefits between conservation and agricultural productivity monitoring that strengthen program value for participating farmers (ADB, 2023).

7.4 Passive Acoustic Monitoring and Bioacoustics AI

Passive acoustic monitors (PAMs) are autonomous recorders that continuously capture soundscapes at programmable schedules, enabling long-term acoustic documentation of avian, mammalian, amphibian, and insect communities without observer presence. The AudioMoth (Hill et al., 2018), a USD $50 open-hardware acoustic recorder, has been deployed in thousands of conservation sites globally to monitor nocturnal species, detect illegal chainsaw activity and hunting gunshots, and track phenological shifts in bird community composition.

AI-powered species identification algorithms, most prominently BirdNET (Kahl et al., 2021), can now identify over 6,000 bird species from audio recordings with accuracy exceeding 80 percent at the species level. NCEAS (2025) is advancing automated monitoring through AI-enabled camera traps and wildlife re-identification systems that support timely, inclusive, and actionable biodiversity assessments at landscape scales. Applied to the Quindío Verde Plus program, a network of 30–50 AudioMoth units deployed across stratified locations in certified properties could provide monthly Shannon-Weaver diversity index updates for birds and amphibians at a total hardware cost below USD $3,000.

The soundscape ecology framework developed by Pijanowski et al. (2011) and subsequently operationalized through the Acoustic Complexity Index (ACI), the Bioacoustic Index (BI), and the Normalized Difference Soundscape Index (NDSI) provides a complementary approach to species-specific acoustic monitoring. Rather than relying on species identification algorithms — which require substantial training data and perform poorly for acoustic cryptic or taxonomically understudied species — soundscape indices quantify the acoustic complexity, biological activity, and anthropogenic noise of entire soundscapes as aggregate biodiversity proxies. Research in tropical and subtropical forests has demonstrated strong correlations between soundscape indices and independently measured species richness and abundance, suggesting that soundscape monitoring could provide a cost-effective surrogate for the full taxonomic biodiversity assessments that certification protocols ideally require. For Quindío's amphibian communities — which are particularly sound-active, ecologically sensitive, and taxonomically diverse — soundscape index monitoring at standardized locations across the altitudinal gradient would enable detection of community-level shifts associated with climate change, disease pressure from chytrid fungi, and habitat degradation without requiring species identification of individual recordings.

The detection of illegal logging and hunting through acoustic monitoring represents a high-value co-benefit of acoustic sensor deployment that resonates strongly with landowners, community rangers, and law enforcement partners. The Rainforest Connection (RFCx) platform, operated by the conservation technology organization Rainforest Connection, processes acoustic recordings from Android smartphones and dedicated sensors in real time using deep learning models trained to detect chainsaw sounds, vehicle engines, and gunshots — generating alerts to field rangers within minutes of illegal activity onset. Evidence from deployments in Ecuador, Cameroon, and Indonesia demonstrates that real-time alert systems reduce illegal logging incidents by 50–70 percent in monitored areas relative to conventional patrol-based enforcement, with benefits extending across forest boundaries as deterrence effects suppress illegal activity in adjacent unmonitored zones (IUCN SOS, 2024). Integrating RFCx or equivalent real-time acoustic anti-poaching technology into the Quindío Verde Plus acoustic monitoring network would substantially increase the deterrence value of the program's physical presence in certified landscapes, contributing to conservation effectiveness outcomes beyond what biodiversity monitoring alone could achieve.

7.5 Environmental DNA

Environmental DNA (eDNA) analysis detects the genetic traces left by organisms in water, soil, or air samples, enabling the simultaneous detection of hundreds of species from a single sample without requiring direct organism capture or observation. eDNA metabarcoding has been validated for freshwater fish and invertebrate communities, amphibians, and increasingly terrestrial mammals and birds. A project supported by IUCN Save Our Species in South Africa employs eDNA to protect and monitor the

Vulnerable freshwater fish *Oreochromis mossambicus* by detecting both native and invasive species more effectively than traditional sampling methods (IUCN SOS, 2024).

For Quindío's hydrological monitoring program, quarterly eDNA sampling of the micro-watershed outlets from the 12 certified municipalities could replace labor-intensive traditional bioassessment surveys while providing superior taxonomic resolution. The resulting multi-taxa biodiversity data can be aggregated into the Water Quality Biological Index (IBEG) required by Colombia's water quality standards (Resolución 2115 of 2007), providing regulatory compliance documentation alongside program monitoring data.

The application of airborne eDNA — the collection and analysis of genetic material shed into the atmosphere through pollen, spores, skin cells, and feathers — represents the newest frontier in eDNA monitoring, with demonstrated capacity to detect terrestrial plant, insect, and vertebrate communities from air filter samples collected at standardized heights and flow rates. A landmark study by Lynggaard et al. (2022) demonstrated that airborne eDNA collected from a single sampling station in a tropical forest detected 262 plant and 49 animal genera, including several vertebrate species not detected by conventional visual and acoustic monitoring methods, at costs comparable to traditional point count surveys. For Quindío's high-canopy cloud forest communities — where direct access to epiphytic orchid communities, canopy-dwelling bromeliads, and upper-canopy bird species is logistically challenging for ground-based observers — airborne eDNA sampling from UAV-deployed air filter systems could dramatically expand the taxonomic coverage of biodiversity monitoring without requiring expensive technical climbing or helicopter surveys. The integration of airborne eDNA sampling with the UAV survey program described in Section 7.3 would create a multimodal biodiversity sensing system with comprehensive taxonomic coverage from soil microbiomes to forest canopy species.

The data management requirements of eDNA metabarcoding — involving bioinformatic pipelines for sequence quality filtering, taxonomic assignment, and diversity metric calculation — represent a significant technical capacity challenge for regional conservation programs in developing countries. Reference sequence libraries for Colombian biodiversity, while improving through the National Biodiversity Institute (Instituto Humboldt) and global databases such as BOLD (Barcode of Life Data System) and NCBI GenBank, remain incomplete for many taxonomic groups, particularly invertebrates, fungi, and microorganisms. This taxonomic coverage gap affects not only the comprehensiveness of eDNA-based biodiversity assessments but also the specific detection of high-conservation-value indicator species for which management decisions may hinge. For Quindío Verde Plus, a strategic eDNA baseline survey in program inception years — targeting the twelve micro-watershed outlets and ten representative forest interior sites across the altitudinal gradient — would simultaneously generate foundational biodiversity data for the certification framework and contribute reference sequences for Colombian cloud forest taxa to global databases, creating a public good that benefits future monitoring programs throughout the Northern Andes biodiversity hotspot.

7.6 Integrated Biodiversity Monitoring Platforms and Digital Twins

Several integrated platforms now synthesize multi-source biodiversity data into standardized dashboards supporting both field management and investor/regulator reporting. The Okala Biodiversity Dashboard, used by Wildlife Conservation Society (WCS) Congo for monitoring across 3.4 million hectares of forest in the Republic of Congo, integrates camera trap data, bioacoustics, eDNA, GIS surveys, and field observations into a single platform where third-party verifiers can audit conservation claims in real time (Okala, 2024). The Pemberton Biodiversity Monitoring Tool, developed under ESA Space Solutions funding, processes satellite imagery, drone imagery, and ecological data through an automated AI pipeline into analysis-ready datasets, targeting the UK Biodiversity Net Gain market (ESA, 2024).

The most cutting-edge development is the application of digital twin frameworks to biodiversity forecasting. A landmark study by Soriano-Redondo et al. (2025) demonstrated a digital twin approach to real-time biodiversity monitoring using a large citizen science dataset on migratory bird species in Finland, reducing the time required to generate actionable biodiversity information for policy and management from years to days. The System Dynamics model developed for Quindío represents a precursor to this digital twin vision: its 13-dimensional ODE system, calibrated with historical data from IDEAM, CRQ, DANE, and Global Forest Watch (2000–2024), is designed to be continuously updated as new monitoring data become available via a Bayesian calibration framework implemented in PyMC3.

The concept of a biodiversity digital twin extends beyond the simulation modeling paradigm to encompass a fully synchronized, real-time computational replica of a conservation landscape that integrates all available sensor streams — satellite imagery, acoustic recordings, eDNA data, ground surveys, and social monitoring data — into a single dynamic state representation. European research programs including the Destination Earth initiative and the Copernicus Land Monitoring Service are developing continental-scale digital twin infrastructure for Earth system modeling, components of which are directly applicable to biodiversity conservation monitoring at sub-national scales. For Quindío Verde Plus, the digital twin architecture should incorporate: a spatially explicit land cover layer updated annually from GEE analysis; acoustic biodiversity layer updated monthly from AudioMoth network data processed through BirdNET; hydrological biodiversity layer updated quarterly from eDNA metabarcoding; carbon stock layer updated biennially from UAV LiDAR surveys; and a socioeconomic layer updated annually from landowner survey data. The integration of these layers within the System Dynamics modeling framework would enable the program to detect emergent relationships between monitoring dimensions — for example, identifying correlations between declining acoustic diversity and subsequent deforestation events, or between water quality degradation and changes in landowner compliance rates — that single-stream monitoring systems cannot detect (Soriano-Redondo et al., 2025).

Blockchain technology offers an additional dimension of data integrity assurance for integrated biodiversity monitoring platforms operating in voluntary carbon and biodiversity credit markets, where the risk of data manipulation — inflating conservation claims to generate additional credit revenue — creates systemic credibility risks. Blockchain-based data provenance systems create cryptographically secured, immutable records of data generation events: a monitoring device ID, GPS coordinates, timestamp, and data hash are recorded on the blockchain at the moment of data collection, creating a tamper-evident audit trail that third-party verifiers can authenticate without accessing the underlying ecological data. South Pole, Gold Standard, and Verra are piloting blockchain-based monitoring record systems for forest carbon projects, with early evidence suggesting that the transparency and tamper-resistance of blockchain records reduces verification time and cost by 30–50 percent relative to conventional document-based audit trails. Integrating blockchain data provenance into the Quindío Verde Plus monitoring architecture from program inception would position the program at the frontier of market credibility standards and potentially command a pricing premium in biodiversity credit markets that are progressively rewarding data integrity investments (Ecosystem Marketplace, 2023).

8. INTEGRATED TECHNOLOGICAL ARCHITECTURE FOR QUINDÍO

8.1 Proposed Monitoring Stack

The integrated technological architecture for the Quindío Verde Plus program synthesizes the platforms reviewed above into a coherent, layered monitoring infrastructure aligned with the indicator framework defined in Burgos-Salcedo (2025b). The architecture is organized in six functional layers, as detailed in Table 2.

Table 2. Proposed integrated monitoring architecture for the Quindío Verde Plus program, organized by technological layer, with indicator coverage and update frequencies derived from Burgos-Salcedo (2025b) protocols.

Layer	Technology	Indicators Covered	Update Frequency
Satellite	Global Forest Watch / GEE / Sentinel-2	Forest cover, deforestation alerts, carbon stocks, landscape connectivity	Weekly (alerts) / Annual (inventory)
Aerial	UAV Multispectral / LiDAR	Biomass increment, canopy structure, agroforestry health	Biennial
In-situ	PAM (AudioMoth) / IoT Sensors / Camera Traps	Bird/amphibian diversity, wildlife presence, microclimate	Monthly (acoustic) / Continuous (camera)
Hydrological	eDNA / Automatic Flow Gauges	Aquatic biodiversity, specific discharge, WQI	Quarterly / Monthly (dry season)
Social	Mobile App (ODK Collect) / Annual Surveys	Landowner satisfaction, income, employment, participation	Annual / Event-triggered
Integration	System Dynamics Digital Twin (Burgos-Salcedo, 2025a)	All 13 state variables + SDG alignment	Continuous (Bayesian update)

The layered monitoring architecture presented in Table 2 is designed around the principle of technological redundancy: critical indicators — particularly forest cover change and carbon stock estimates — are measured by multiple independent technological systems, providing cross-validation capability that reduces the risk of systematic measurement error and strengthens the evidentiary standard for carbon credit verification. Specifically, forest cover change is monitored at the satellite layer through GFW GLAD alerts and annual GEE analysis, at the aerial layer through biennial UAV surveys, and at the in-situ layer through camera trap time-lapse sequences and acoustic signatures of forest interior soundscapes. The convergence of three independent lines of evidence for each deforestation event creates a verification standard that exceeds the current requirements of both Verra's VCS and the Gold Standard, positioning the program to claim a premium for high-integrity credits in markets that are progressively applying more stringent verification requirements in response to integrity controversies (Ecosystem Marketplace, 2023).

The social monitoring layer — encompassing landowner satisfaction surveys, income tracking, employment generation, and community participation metrics — is frequently omitted from conservation program monitoring systems that prioritize biophysical outcomes, yet it provides the leading indicators of program sustainability that early warning systems most need. Evidence from PES programs globally demonstrates that declining landowner satisfaction, measured through annual surveys, predicts non-renewal at contract expiration three to four years in advance, providing program managers with a critical window for adaptive intervention — renegotiating payment levels, simplifying compliance requirements, or addressing grievances — before enrollment declines materialize in the biophysical monitoring data (Cook et al., 2023). The mobile-based survey protocol specified in Table 2, implemented through the Open Data Kit (ODK) Collect platform, enables disaggregated analysis of satisfaction and engagement metrics by gender, certification tier, municipality, and altitude band — providing the resolution needed to identify specific subgroups at risk of disengagement before aggregate program participation metrics signal a problem.

8.2 Data Governance and Interoperability

An integrated monitoring system spanning satellite imagery, field sensors, eDNA laboratories, and social surveys generates data in multiple formats, coordinate reference systems, temporal resolutions, and institutional custody chains. Interoperability requires commitment to open standards: GeoTIFF and GeoJSON for spatial data; Darwin Core and GBIF data schemas for biodiversity observations; ISO 19115 metadata standards for all spatial datasets; and Creative Commons licensing for publicly funded data.

Data governance arrangements must specify who owns the data generated on private properties; how data are shared between the Quindío Verde Plus Corporation, CRQ, IDEAM, and carbon credit verifiers; minimum retention periods for raw data to support future counterfactual analyses; and protocols for protecting sensitive location data from disclosure that could facilitate poaching. A blockchain-based data provenance system — analogous to those being piloted in voluntary carbon markets by South Pole and Gold Standard — can provide tamper-evident audit trails for all monitoring records, strengthening third-party verification of carbon and biodiversity claims.

The assignment of intellectual property rights over monitoring data generated on private lands within the Quindío Verde Plus certification framework requires explicit contractual provisions that balance program transparency requirements against landowner data sovereignty. Carbon credit verifiers and potential biodiversity credit buyers require access to raw monitoring data to conduct independent audits, but landowners may legitimately object to the disclosure of GPS-precise biodiversity occurrence data for commercially valuable orchid or medicinal plant species, which could attract exploitative collection. A tiered data access architecture — providing full data access to accredited verifiers under confidentiality agreements, aggregated data to program governance bodies, and summary statistics to public dashboards — can satisfy both transparency and sovereignty requirements. The FAIR data principles (Findable, Accessible, Interoperable, Reusable), widely adopted in research data management, provide a useful framework for structuring the Quindío Verde Plus data governance policy, ensuring that monitoring data generate maximum scientific and management value while respecting the legitimate interests of data providers (Patra et al., 2022).

Long-term data retention is a frequently neglected dimension of conservation monitoring governance that has profound implications for future impact evaluation. The most rigorous counterfactual evaluation methods — including synthetic control analysis and machine learning causal inference — require panel datasets spanning at least five to ten years of pre-treatment and post-treatment observations. If raw monitoring data are not archived in standardized formats with comprehensive metadata documentation, future evaluators will be unable to apply these advanced methods and will be forced to rely on weaker evaluation designs that are more susceptible to bias. Conservation programs should commit, from inception, to archiving all raw data in open repositories such as GBIF, the Harvard Dataverse, or Colombia's national biodiversity data system (SiB Colombia) with full metadata documentation following ISO 19115 standards. This data stewardship investment generates scientific value that extends far beyond the program's operational lifetime, contributing to the global evidence base for conservation incentive effectiveness and supporting the adaptive management of future programs in similar ecological and institutional contexts (Danielsen et al., 2022).

9. IMPLEMENTATION ROADMAP AND CAPACITY REQUIREMENTS

9.1 Phased Implementation

Deploying the full integrated monitoring architecture requires phased implementation aligned with the Burgos-Salcedo (2025b) rollout timeline. In the initial phase (Years 1–2), priority investments should focus on: (1) establishing GFW deforestation alert subscriptions for all certified properties; (2) deploying a core network of 30 AudioMoth acoustic recorders in Platinum and Gold tier properties; (3) establishing baseline eDNA surveys at all 12 municipal watershed outlets; and (4) launching a mobile data collection application for field technicians. These investments are estimated to require approximately USD $80,000–120,000 in hardware and first-year operational costs — a modest fraction of the USD $3.2–8.7 million annual carbon revenue potential.

The scaling phase (Years 2–3) should implement the satellite-integrated monitoring platform, expand UAV survey coverage to all certified tiers, and formally integrate the Bayesian-calibrated System Dynamics model as the program's digital twin. The consolidation phase (Years 4–5) should automate reporting pipelines for both internal management dashboards and external carbon credit verification packages, and establish data-sharing agreements with the Instituto Humboldt, IDEAM, and regional universities.

9.2 Human Capital and Institutional Requirements

Technology alone cannot deliver effective monitoring — human capital and institutional arrangements are equally critical. The Quindío Verde Plus program will require a core monitoring team comprising a remote sensing specialist with GEE proficiency, a field ecologist with expertise in acoustic monitoring and eDNA protocols, a data engineer responsible for pipeline automation and database management, and a social monitoring coordinator overseeing landowner surveys and community engagement processes.

Local ranger networks — landowners and community members trained in Forest Watcher mobile application use, acoustic recorder maintenance, and basic ecological observation — provide the ground-truth layer that remote sensing cannot replace. Evidence from participatory monitoring programs in Costa Rica, Kenya, and the Philippines consistently shows that locally embedded monitoring networks improve data quality, adaptive management responsiveness, and community ownership of conservation outcomes (Danielsen et al., 2022). The Burgos-Salcedo (2025b) proposal's target of generating 200 direct and indirect green jobs explicitly includes monitoring roles as a significant employment stream.

10. CONCLUSIONS

This article has argued that measurement, monitoring, and adaptive management of conservation incentive programs are not peripheral technical concerns but the central determinants of whether such programs achieve their ecological and social objectives at scale. The three pillars of program evaluation — effectiveness, equity, and efficiency — cannot be assessed without rigorous counterfactual methods, composite biodiversity indicators mapped to Essential Biodiversity Variables, and multi-criteria frameworks that capture the full range of intended and unintended outcomes across environmental, social, economic, and institutional dimensions.

The Quindío case, grounded in the System Dynamics simulation model and the Integral Certification proposal, illustrates how these conceptual frameworks translate into operational tools: a 13-dimensional state model functioning as both a planning instrument and a digital twin infrastructure; a differentiated certification system balancing equity through graduated participation tiers; and a layered monitoring architecture integrating satellite, aerial, in-situ, and social data streams into a coherent, interoperable information system.

More broadly, the technological revolution in biodiversity monitoring — from GFW's near-real-time deforestation alerts to AI-enabled acoustic species identification, digital twin biodiversity forecasting, and blockchain-secured data provenance — is fundamentally reshaping what is possible in conservation program management. The primary remaining constraint is not technological but institutional: the ability of conservation agencies, local governments, and landowner communities to absorb, interpret, and act on the data that digital platforms can now generate. Building that institutional capacity — through training, participatory design, and adaptive governance structures — is the central challenge and the central opportunity for the next generation of biodiversity conservation incentive programs.

CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This research was conducted within the framework of Contract No. 009-2025 (CIINAS–CORPOCUENCAS). The authors gratefully acknowledge the technical inputs of the Quindío Regional Environmental Authority (CRQ) and the field teams supporting monitoring activities in the Department of Quindío.

REFERENCES

1. Abadie, A., Diamond, A., & Hainmueller, J. (2010). Synthetic control methods for comparative case studies: Estimating the effect of California's tobacco control program. Journal of the American Statistical Association, 105(490), 493–505. https://doi.org/10.1198/jasa.2009.ap08746
2. Asian Development Bank (ADB). (2023). Digital tools for accurate and low-cost biodiversity monitoring. Development Asia. https://development.asia/explainer/digital-tools-accurate-and-low-cost-biodiversity-monitoring
3. Barlas, Y. (1996). Formal aspects of model validity and validation in system dynamics. System Dynamics Review, 12(3), 183–210. https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1099-1727(199623)12:3<183: AID-SDR103>3.0.CO;2-4
4. Börner, J., Baylis, K., Corbera, E., Ezzine-de-Blas, D., Honey-Rosés, J., Persson, M., & Wunder, S. (2017). The effectiveness of payments for environmental services. World Development, 96, 359–374. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2017.03.011
5. Burgos-Salcedo, J. D. (2025a). Construcción y calibración del modelo de simulación, integrando escenarios de certificación y sus efectos en el sistema. Technical Report 6, Contract No. 009-2025. CIINAS–CORPOCUENCAS.

6. Burgos-Salcedo, J. D. (2025b). Propuesta de certificación y monetización de bienes y servicios ambientales del Departamento del Quindío. Technical Report 7, Contract No. 009-2025. CIINAS–CORPOCUENCAS.
7. CBD (Convention on Biological Diversity). (2020). Global Biodiversity Outlook 5. Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity.
8. CBD. (2022). Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework. CBD/COP/15/L.25.
9. Chazdon, R. L., Brancalion, P. H. S., Laestadius, L., Bennett-Curry, A., Buckingham, K., Kumar, C., Moll-Rocek, J., Vieira, I. C. G., & Wilson, S. J. (2022). When is a forest a forest? Forest concepts and definitions in the era of forest and landscape restoration. Ambio, 45(5), 538–550. https://doi.org/10.1007/s13280-016-0772-y
10. Cook, N. J., Grillos, T., & Andersson, K. P. (2023). Conservation payments and perceptions of equity: Experimental evidence from Indonesia, Peru, and Tanzania. Current Research in Environmental Sustainability, 5, 100212. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.crsust.2023.100212
11. CORPOCUENCAS / CIINAS. (2025a). Análisis de factores de línea base del PIGCC – Departamento del Quindío. Bogotá: CIINAS.
12. CORPOCUENCAS / CIINAS. (2025b). Propuesta de certificación y monetización de bienes y servicios ambientales – Quindío Verde Plus (E7). Bogotá: CIINAS.
13. Cubillos-Tovar, J. P., & Tobón, C. (2021). Water regulation services of high Andean ecosystems in Colombia: A review. Ecological Indicators, 120, 106914. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolind.2020.106914
14. Danielsen, F., Burgess, N. D., Coronado, I., Enghoff, M., & Holt, S. (2022). Participatory environmental monitoring in forest and biodiversity conservation: Rationale, design, and outcomes. Annual Review of Environment and Resources, 47(1), 659–687. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-environ-012221-040505
15. Dasgupta, P. (2021). The economics of biodiversity: The Dasgupta review. HM Treasury.
16. Díaz, S., Settele, J., Brondízio, E., Ngo, H., Guèze, M., Agard, J., Arneth, A., Balvanera, P., Brauman, K., & Butchart, S. (2019). Summary for policymakers of the global assessment report on biodiversity and ecosystem services. IPBES Secretariat.
17. Ecosystem Marketplace. (2023). State of the voluntary carbon markets 2023. Forest Trends. https://www.ecosystemmarketplace.com
18. Engel, S., Pagiola, S., & Wunder, S. (2008). Designing payments for environmental services in theory and practice: An overview of the issues. Ecological Economics, 65(4), 663–674. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolecon.2008.03.011
19. ESA Space Solutions. (2024). Pemberton biodiversity monitoring tool. European Space Agency. https://business.esa.int/projects/pemberton-biodiversity-monitoring-tool
20. FAO. (2023). Payments for ecosystem services in forests: Guidance for practitioners. Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. https://www.fao.org
21. Fenichel, E. P., Dean, M. F., & Schmitz, O. J. (2024). The path to scientifically sound biodiversity valuation in the context of the Global Biodiversity Framework. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 121(34), e2319077121. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2319077121
22. Ferraro, P. J., Lawlor, K., Mullan, K. L., & Pattanayak, S. K. (2012). Forest figures: Ecosystem services valuation and policy evaluation in developing nations. Review of Environmental Economics and Policy, 6(1), 20–44. https://doi.org/10.1093/reep/rer019
23. Ferraro, P. J., & Pattanayak, S. K. (2006). Money for nothing? A call for empirical evaluation of biodiversity conservation investments. PLOS Biology, 4(4), e105. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pbio.0040105
24. FONAFIFO (Fondo Nacional de Financiamiento Forestal). (2024). Programa de Pagos por Servicios Ambientales: Estadísticas 1997–2023. San José: MINAE.
25. GEO BON (Group on Earth Observations Biodiversity Observation Network). (2013). Building a global observing system for biodiversity. GEO BON.
26. Global Forest Watch (GFW). (2024). Forest monitoring, land use & deforestation trends. World Resources Institute. https://www.globalforestwatch.org/
27. Hansen, M. C., Potapov, P. V., Moore, R., Hancher, M., Turubanova, S. A., Tyukavina, A., Thau, D., Stehman, S. V., Goetz, S. J., Loveland, T. R., Kommareddy, A., Egorov, A., Chini, L., Justice, C. O., & Townshend, J. R. G. (2013). High-resolution global maps of 21st-century forest cover change. Science, 342(6160), 850–853. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1244693
28. Hill, A. P., Prince, P., Piña Covarrubias, E., Doncaster, C. P., Snaddon, J. L., & Rogers, A. (2018). AudioMoth: Evaluation of a smart open acoustic device for monitoring biodiversity and the environment. Methods in Ecology and Evolution, 9(5), 1199–1211. https://doi.org/10.1111/2041-210X.12955
29. Holling, C. S. (Ed.). (1978). Adaptive environmental assessment and management. John Wiley & Sons.

30. IDEAM. (2022). Informe del estado del bosque y los recursos forestales de Colombia. Instituto de Hidrología, Meteorología y Estudios Ambientales. Bogotá: IDEAM.
31. IPBES. (2019). Global assessment report on biodiversity and ecosystem services of the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services. IPBES Secretariat. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.3831673
32. IPBES. (2022). Methodological assessment of the diverse values and valuation of nature. IPBES Secretariat. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.6522522
33. IUCN Save Our Species (IUCN SOS). (2024). Embracing technology for improved wildlife conservation. https://iucnsos.org/embracing-technology-for-improved-wildlife-conservation/
34. Izquierdo-Tort, S., Jayachandran, S., & Saavedra, S. (2024). Redesigning payments for ecosystem services to increase cost-effectiveness. Nature Communications, 15, 9252. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-024-53643-1
35. Kahl, S., Wood, C. M., Eibl, M., & Klinck, H. (2021). BirdNET: A deep learning solution for avian diversity monitoring. Ecological Informatics, 61, 101236. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecoinf.2021.101236
36. Kolinjivadi, V., Adamowski, J., Buscher, B., & Kosoy, N. (2023). Fifteen years of research on payments for ecosystem services. Global Environmental Change, 82, 102734. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2022.102734
37. Le, T.-A. T., Vodden, K., Wu, J., Bullock, R., & Sabau, G. (2024). Payments for ecosystem services programs: A global review of contributions towards sustainability. Heliyon, 10(1), e22361. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2023.e22361
38. Lynggaard, C., Bertelsen, M. F., Jensen, C. V., Johnson, M. S., Præbel, K., Urbanowicz, C., & Bohmann, K. (2022). Airborne environmental DNA for terrestrial vertebrate community monitoring. Current Biology, 32(3), 701–707. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cub.2021.12.014
39. MADS (Ministerio de Ambiente y Desarrollo Sostenible). (2017a). Decreto Ley 870 del 25 de mayo de 2017. Bogotá: Diario Oficial No. 50,244.
40. MADS. (2018). Decreto 1007 del 14 de junio de 2018. Bogotá: MADS.
41. MADS. (2023). Plan de acción en biodiversidad y servicios ecosistémicos 2030. Bogotá: Gobierno de Colombia.
42. McDermott, M., Mahanty, S., & Schreckenberg, K. (2013). Examining equity: A multidimensional framework for assessing equity in payments for ecosystem services. Environmental Science & Policy, 33, 416–427. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envsci.2012.10.006
43. NCEAS (National Center for Ecological Analysis and Synthesis). (2025). Closing the gap: How NCEAS is using AI to unlock the full potential of biodiversity monitoring. https://www.nceas.ucsb.edu
44. OECD. (2023). Scaling up biodiversity-positive incentives: Biodiversity-positive subsidies and payments for ecosystem services. OECD Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1787/19b859ce-en
45. OECD. (2025). Scaling up biodiversity-positive incentives: Delivering on Target 18 of the Global Biodiversity Framework. OECD Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1787/19b859ce-en
46. Okala. (2024). AI-powered biodiversity monitoring software. https://www.okala.io/biodiversity-monitoring
47. Pascual, U., Balvanera, P., Christie, M., Baptiste, B., González-Jiménez, D., & Anderson, C. B. (2023). Diverse values of nature for transformative change: A leverage points perspective. Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability, 64, 101334. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cosust.2023.101334
48. Patra, S., Thakur, A., Bhatt, S., & Tiwari, A. (2022). Remote monitoring methods for biodiversity conservation: A comprehensive review. Environmental Monitoring and Assessment, 196, 487. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10661-023-12049-0
49. Pijanowski, B. C., Farina, A., Gage, S. H., Dumyahn, S. L., & Krause, B. L. (2011). What is soundscape ecology? An introduction and overview of an emerging new science. Landscape Ecology, 26(9), 1213–1232. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10980-011-9600-8
50. Plummer, R., Crona, B., Armitage, D. R., Olsson, P., Tengö, M., & Yudina, O. (2012). Adaptive comanagement: A systematic review and analysis. Ecology and Society, 17(3), 11. https://doi.org/10.5751/ES-04952-170311
51. Possingham, H. P., Grantham, H., & Rondinini, C. (2012). How can you conserve species that haven't been found? Journal of Applied Ecology, 47(3), 1–3. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-2664.2010.01797.x
52. Richardson, W., & Bustos, C. (2022). Implementing nature's rights in Colombia: The Atrato and Amazon experiences. Revista Derecho del Estado, 54, 227–275.
53. Sánchez-Fernández, D., et al. (2025). Biodiversity futures: Digital approaches to knowledge and conservation of biological diversity. World Environment, 25, 29–52. https://we.copernicus.org/articles/25/29/2025/
54. Scholes, R. J., & Biggs, R. (2005). A biodiversity intactness index. Nature, 434(7029), 45–49. https://doi.org/10.1038/nature03289
55. Soriano-Redondo, A., Correia, R. A., Barve, V., Brooks, T. M., Butchart, S. H. M., Jarić, I., & Di Minin, E. (2024). Harnessing online digital data in biodiversity conservation. PLOS Biology, 22(2). https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pbio.3002516

56. Soriano-Redondo, A., et al. (2025). A digital twin for real-time biodiversity forecasting with citizen science data. Nature Ecology & Evolution. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41559-025-02966-3
57. Sterman, J. D. (2000). Business dynamics: Systems thinking and modeling for a complex world. McGraw-Hill.
58. Tengö, M., Brondizio, E. S., Elmqvist, T., Malmer, P., & Spierenburg, M. (2014). Connecting diverse knowledge systems for enhanced ecosystem governance: The multiple evidence base approach. AMBIO, 43(5), 579–591. https://doi.org/10.1007/s13280-014-0501-3
59. Tierney, M., et al. (2020). Ecosystem integrity as a foundation for conservation targets. Science, 370(6522), 1295–1296. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.abd5985
60. TNFD (Taskforce on Nature-related Financial Disclosures). (2023). Recommendations of the Taskforce on Nature-related Financial Disclosures. TNFD. https://tnfd.global/
61. Trisos, C. H., Auerbach, J., & Katti, M. (2021). Decoloniality and anti-oppressive practices for a more ethical ecology. Nature Ecology & Evolution, 5, 1205–1212. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41559-021-01460-w
62. UN. (2023). The Sustainable Development Goals Report 2023. United Nations Publications.
63. UNDP-BIOFIN. (2024). Biodiversity Finance Trends Dashboard 2024. UNDP BIOFIN. https://www.biofin.org
64. Wager, S., & Athey, S. (2018). Estimation and inference of heterogeneous treatment effects using random forests. Journal of the American Statistical Association, 113(523), 1228–1242. https://doi.org/10.1080/01621459.2017.1319839
65. Walters, C. (1986). Adaptive management of renewable resources. Macmillan.
66. Weiss, E. B. (1989). In fairness to future generations: International law, common patrimony, and intergenerational equity. Transnational Publishers.
67. West, T. A. P., Wunder, S., Sills, E. O., Börner, J., Rifai, S. W., Neidermeier, A. N., & Kontoleon, A. (2023). Action needed to make carbon offsets from forest conservation work for climate change mitigation. Science, 381(6660), 873–877. https://doi.org/10.1126/science.ade3535
68. Westgate, M. J., Likens, G. E., & Lindenmayer, D. B. (2013). Adaptive management of biological systems: A review. Biological Conservation, 158, 128–139. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2012.08.016
69. Williams, B. K., & Brown, E. D. (2012). Adaptive management: The U.S. Department of the Interior applications guide. Adaptive Management Working Group, U.S. Department of the Interior.
70. World Resources Institute (WRI). (2024). Global Forest Watch: An online platform for near-real-time forest monitoring. https://www.wri.org/initiatives/global-forest-watch
71. WWF. (2024). Living Planet Report 2024: A system in peril. WWF International.
72. Wunder, S., Brouwer, R., Engel, S., Ezzine-de-Blas, D., Muradian, R., Pascual, U., & Pinto, R. (2018). From principles to practice in paying for nature's services. Nature Sustainability, 1(3), 145–150. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41893-018-0036-x
73. Wunder, S., Brouwer, R., Engel, S., Ezzine-de-Blas, D., Muradian, R., Pascual, U., & Pinto, R. (2020). From principles to practice in paying for nature's services. Nature Sustainability, 1(3), 145–150. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41893-018-0036-x
74. Zafra-Calvo, N., Pascual, U., Brockington, D., et al. (2020). Towards an indicator system to assess equitable management in protected areas. Biological Conservation, 241, 108271. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2019.108271