



Potential elements, indicators and milestones for a new species-focussed target; this is proposed without prejudice to IUCN's final position on the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework

In CBD/SBSTTA/23/2/Add.4, the potential elements for the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework are discussed. The use of outcome-oriented goals is discussed which should link to the 2050 Vision as well as the 2030 mission and its targets. Specifically, a goal focused on species is mentioned in the document: "Species – A goal may address the concepts of preventing extinctions, increasing the abundance of species and/or on the desired status of species in 2050. Such a goal may consider the improved status of threatened species or maintenance/prevention of risk for all species. It may also relate to genetic diversity. Indicators, such as the Red List of Threatened Species of the International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN) or the Living Planet Index, could be used to provide a baseline and assess the progress for such a goal".

In this paper we outline the current Aichi 12, progress to date and the target's shortcomings, suggest elements for a new species-focussed target and explain the basis for these, discuss proposed indicators (and milestones and baselines for these), and discuss proposed actions needed (with indicators and milestones). Our proposed target could also serve as one of the goals towards the 2050 Vision. This paper has been prepared by the IUCN SSC Post-2020 Biodiversity Targets Task Force.

Context

The Vision of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity is "*Living in Harmony with Nature*" where "*By 2050, biodiversity is valued, conserved, restored and wisely used, maintaining ecosystem services, sustaining a healthy planet and delivering benefits essential for all people.*"

Despite this vision, and the actions to implement it since 2010, biodiversity is continuing to decline. IUCN has therefore proposed as a 2030 Mission: *Halt the loss of species, ecosystems and genetic diversity [nature] by 2030; restore and recover biodiversity to ensure a world of people "living in harmony with nature" by 2050.*

Aichi Target 12

Authors: Stuart Butchart¹, Friederike Bolam², Wendy Elliott³, Ian Harrison⁴, Jean Harris⁵, Sean Hoban⁶, Catherine Machalaba⁷, Louise Mair², David Mallon⁸, Dao Nguyen⁹, Domitilla Raimundo¹⁰, Dilys Roe¹¹, Xiaoli Shen¹², Paul Smith¹³, Braulio Ferreira de Souza Dias¹⁴, and Philip McGowan²

The current Aichi Target 12 states: *By 2020, the extinction of known threatened species has been prevented and their conservation status, particularly of those most in decline, has been improved and sustained.*

Progress towards Target 12

Several taxa have gone extinct since Target 12 was set, including Bramble Cay Melomys, Western Black Rhinoceros, Pinta Giant Tortoise and Alagoas Foliage-gleaner. Overall, species are continuing to move towards extinction rapidly, with cycads, amphibians and particularly corals declining most rapidly according to the Red List Index. However, conservation action has reduced the decline in the Red List Index [pre-2010 reductions in decline were equivalent to preventing 39 bird species (2.8% of threatened species) each moving one IUCN Red List category closer to extinction between 1988 and 2008, while for mammals the figures were equivalent to preventing 29 species (2.4% of threatened species) moving one category closer to extinction between 1996 and 2008 (Hoffmann et al. 2010). There are ongoing efforts to update this information for 2010 – 2020. Conservation action has reduced the accumulation of extinction debt among birds by 40% since 1988 (Monroe et al in review). Without conservation efforts, the overall decline in the status of ungulates would have been nearly eight times worse than observed, with six species that now would be listed as extinct (Hoffmann et al. 2015). A recent model estimated that conservation investment during 1996-2008 reduced biodiversity loss (measured in terms of changes in extinction risk for mammals and birds) in 109 countries by 29% per country on average (Waldron et al. 2017). From 1970 to 2014, global populations of vertebrate species declined by 60% on average according to the Living Planet Index (WWF 2018), with this number being much higher in some groups such as freshwater species (83% decline). Species' distributions are also contracting; for 177 mammals with detailed data, all have lost more than 30% of their range, and over 40% have lost over 80% of their range (Ceballos et al. 2017). Hence, despite some conservation successes, progress to Target 12 has been poor (IPBES 2019); this lack of progress on species survival status, and the changes in ecosystems associated with and often accompanying it, also presents threats to the maintenance of ecosystems and provision of ecosystem services that species contribute to.

While there are a number of explanations for this, including the fact that meeting many of the other Aichi Targets is necessary to achieve Target 12, there are also two key shortcomings and challenges with the existing target:

1. Preventing extinctions is a laudable ultimate objective, but extinction itself is difficult to measure in a timely fashion, and it represents the extreme end of biodiversity loss. The emphasis on preventing extinctions and threatened species, and exclusion of a more positive aim to restore healthy, diverse and functional species populations is arguably problematic. While relatively few species have been documented to have become extinct, most threatened species are worsening in status, and the population abundance of species has continued to decline. The target doesn't address the need to prevent further declines and maintain or, where needed, restore the abundance of non-threatened species.
2. Improving the status of threatened species is important, but the target highlights those 'most in decline'. However, these aren't necessarily the threatened species at greatest risk of extinction (some species that are not declining rapidly but that have tiny populations or distributions are at higher risk of going extinct and in need of more urgent action).

There are also some additional issues: the target does not specify 'human-induced extinctions' (preventing extinctions from some natural events, like volcanoes, may not be feasible); some

Authors: Stuart Butchart¹, Friederike Bolam², Wendy Elliott³, Ian Harrison⁴, Jean Harris⁵, Sean Hoban⁶, Catherine Machalaba⁷, Louise Mair², David Mallon⁸, Dao Nguyen⁹, Domitilla Raimundo¹⁰, Dilys Roe¹¹, Xiaoli Shen¹², Paul Smith¹³, Braulio Ferreira de Souza Dias¹⁴, and Philip McGowan²

species have inherently high extinction risk (e.g. isolated island endemics) and it may not be possible to change their status; and the terms ‘improved’ and ‘sustained’ are ambiguous and not currently defined.

Proposed elements of a new species-focused target

We propose that a new species-focused target should have three elements:

Halt overall¹ species’ population declines by 2030 such that they have recovered by 2050, prevent extinctions of all species², and improve the status³ of at least 30% of species³ by 2030 and 100% by 2050⁴.

Proposed indicators

To measure progress towards these target elements and milestones, we propose the following indicators that could be tracked at the global scale, numbered in relation to the three elements of the proposed target (species populations, extinctions and threatened species). Additional indicators may be useful at the national scale⁵.

1. Trends in species’ population abundance⁶ (e.g., globally: [the Living Planet Index](#) [available for vertebrates since 1970; WWF], [Wild Bird Index](#) [available for Europe since 1980 and North America since 1968; BirdLife International/EBBCC/USGS], [Existing indicator; relevant to element 1; already adopted for Target 12]

¹ By ‘overall’, we mean average (mean). While this could be achieved if half of all species are increasing while the other half are decreasing by an equivalent degree, which is obviously undesirable, it is unrealistic to halt ALL species population declines by 2030. Parties may wish to prioritise actions to tackle population declines for particular subsets of species, for example, those of socio-economic importance or those that are important for ecosystem function, or those for which they have a high responsibility for their global conservation, eg endemics.

² While the ambition is to prevent all extinctions, in practice this would likely be about those species that are known to be threatened, which refers to those documented as threatened on the global IUCN Red List. Countries may wish to interpret these at a national scale and also consider national red lists (which may also broaden the taxonomic coverage beyond those groups that have been comprehensively assessed globally) as well as target country-level drivers of population declines for threatened species. Further, there are factors over which we have no control, such as earthquakes and volcanoes, and preventing extinctions caused by them is not feasible.

³ ‘Improve the status’ means ‘reduce the extinction risk’ and refers not just to improvements that are sufficient to qualify species for a lower category of risk on the IUCN Red List, but also includes expanding distributions, increasing population trends, or halting declines.

⁴ If the next set of targets are to be focussed on 2020–2030, we suggest the following wording: “*Halt overall species’ population declines by 2030, prevent extinctions of all species, and improve the status of at least 30% of species by 2030*”. Achieving this target requires parties to ensure that all threatened species have at least stabilised in status by 2030 such that they do not have increased risk of extinction thereafter, while simultaneously improving the status of 30% of threatened species by 2030.

⁵ Potential national indicators include those based on national red lists, reporting rate metrics, occupancy metrics, the [Wildlife Picture Index](#) (available for 15 countries since 2007).

⁶ Preferably measured at continental scale (like the Wild Bird Index) rather than locally, as the latter is more akin to biotic integrity than overall species abundance. The LPI represents a mix of datasets from local to continental scales.

Authors: Stuart Butchart¹, Friederike Bolam², Wendy Elliott³, Ian Harrison⁴, Jean Harris⁵, Sean Hoban⁶, Catherine Machalaba⁷, Louise Mair², David Mallon⁸, Dao Nguyen⁹, Domitilla Raimundo¹⁰, Dilys Roe¹¹, Xiaoli Shen¹², Paul Smith¹³, Braulio Ferreira de Souza Dias¹⁴, and Philip McGowan²

2a. Trends in species' extinction risk (i.e. the [Red List Index of species survival](#); IUCN and BirdLife International) [Existing indicator; relevant to elements 2 & 3; already adopted for Target 12 and SDG 15].

2b. Trends in number of species becoming extinct or qualifying for uplisting to Critically Endangered (i.e. species classified as Extinct, Extinct in the Wild, or Critically Endangered). Critically Endangered species are included here because they can be regarded in some senses as 'functionally extinct', as they typically have such low population sizes that they no longer fulfil the ecological functions that they formerly delivered before human impacts threatened them so severely that they qualified as Critically Endangered (Rounsevell et al in review). The advantage of including Critically Endangered in this metric is that it is much easier to detect the movement of species from lower threat categories to Critically Endangered than it is to detect species becoming extinct. Note that species being re-categorised as Critically Endangered owing to improved knowledge, taxonomic revisions and other 'non-genuine' changes would be excluded. [New indicator; relevant to element 2; feasible to develop rapidly from IUCN Red List data; IUCN and BirdLife International]

2c Number of extinctions prevented owing to conservation actions (including sustainable use). [Existing indicator available [1994-2004 for birds](#) and being updated for 2010-2019 for birds and mammals; relevant to element 2; only feasible to calculate in 2030 at the end of the period for the target; IUCN, BirdLife International and other Red List Partners].

3. Trends in the proportion of threatened⁷ species that have improved in status⁸ relative to 2020. [New indicator; feasible to develop from IUCN Red List data as species are reassessed post-2020; also noting the utility of BGCI's plant conservation action tracker]
4. Number of threatened species that are included in implemented action or recovery plans at global or national levels – this may include both individual species action plans, as well as national spatial plans

Proposed milestones


To measure progress towards these target elements using the proposed indicators, we suggest the following milestones, numbered as for the indicators above, and illustrated in the graphs below.

1. Mean population abundance of species decreases by 1% during 2020-2025 and by 0% during 2025-2030.
- 2a. The Red List Index decreases by 1.5% during 2020-2025 and by 0.5% during 2025-2030.
- 2b. The number of species becoming Extinct, Extinct in the Wild or Critically Endangered owing to genuine deterioration reduces to 20 during 2020-2025 and 0 during 2025-2030.
3. The proportion of threatened species that have improved in status relative to 2020 exceeds 15% by 2025 and 30% by 2030.

⁷ Including Extinct in the Wild species to incentivise their reintroduction into the wild, even though such species are technically not included in the term 'threatened'

⁸ Note this includes species that have improved sufficiently to qualify for a lower category of risk on the IUCN Red List, plus species with expanding distributions, species with increasing population trends, and species that had declining trends in 2020 but stable trends currently.

Authors: Stuart Butchart¹, Friederike Bolam², Wendy Elliott³, Ian Harrison⁴, Jean Harris⁵, Sean Hoban⁶, Catherine Machalaba⁷, Louise Mair², David Mallon⁸, Dao Nguyen⁹, Domitilla Raimundo¹⁰, Dilys Roe¹¹, Xiaoli Shen¹², Paul Smith¹³, Braulio Ferreira de Souza Dias¹⁴, and Philip McGowan²



Relevant baselines for the proposed indicators and milestones:

The numeric values for the milestones above are proposed taking into account the current baseline values for these indicators, numbered below as for the indicators and milestone above.

1. The Living Planet Index was at ~ 0.46 in 2000, compared to ~ 0.4 in 2014.
- 2a. The RLI declined by 3.5% in 2000-2010 and by 3.3% in 2010-2019.
- 2b. 16 species have been driven extinct since 2000 (including 8 birds, 2 mammals, 2 reptiles, 2 gastropods, and 2 plants). Suitable post-2000 data on Red List category changes for comprehensively assessed groups are only available for birds, mammals [1996-2008, but treated as post-2000] corals and cycads. Among these groups, 84 species (36 birds, 34 mammals, 12 cycads, 2 corals) qualified for uplisting to Critically Endangered owing to genuine deterioration in status since 2000, while 21 species (15 birds, 5 mammals, 1 cycad, but no corals) were downlisted from Critically Endangered to lower categories of threat owing to genuine improvement resulting from conservation actions since 2000.
- 2c. It is likely that tens of threatened species would have gone extinct in the absence of conservation actions since 2010. Work is underway to quantify this value for birds and mammals (Bolam et al in prep). By comparison, it was estimated that 16 bird species would have gone extinct (or extinct in the wild) in the absence of conservation action in the period 1994-2004 (Butchart et al. 2006), while at least six ungulate species would have gone extinct (or extinct in the wild) in the absence of conservation action during 1996-2008 (Hoffmann et al. 2015).
3. 2.7% of threatened species in groups with relevant post-2000 information (birds, mammals, cycads, corals) improved in status sufficiently to qualify for lower categories of threat since 2000 (40/1497 bird species, 8/1079 mammals, 1/218 cycads, 0/845 corals) or had increasing population trends (an additional 42 species: 38 birds, 4 mammals, but no cycads or corals).

Proposed actions and responses:

The target elements and indicators proposed above focus explicitly on the ambition to conserve species, focusing on outcomes and state indicators. However, it would also be helpful to indicate some of the key actions and responses necessary to meet these aims, as measured by a set of response indicators and milestones. These are listed separately to avoid mixing response metrics with those for the state of biodiversity as listed above. The metrics proposed here focus on the actions and responses for threatened species, and will need to be complemented by actions

Authors: Stuart Butchart¹, Friederike Bolam², Wendy Elliott³, Ian Harrison⁴, Jean Harris⁵, Sean Hoban⁶, Catherine Machalaba⁷, Louise Mair², David Mallon⁸, Dao Nguyen⁹, Domitilla Raimundo¹⁰, Dilys Roe¹¹, Xiaoli Shen¹², Paul Smith¹³, Braulio Ferreira de Souza Dias¹⁴, and Philip McGowan²

stimulated by other Targets, e.g. on: loss of natural habitats; sustainable agriculture, forestry and fisheries; invasive species; pollution etc.

Potential indicators for actions and policies to conserve threatened species include (but are not limited to⁹):

1. Mean % of each Key Biodiversity Area¹⁰ identified for globally threatened species¹¹ that is covered by protected areas or Other Effective Area-based Conservation Measures (OECMs) [feasible to develop rapidly from data from the World Database of KBAs for terrestrial, freshwater and marine environments]
2. Proportion of Key Biodiversity Areas identified for globally threatened species¹¹ in 'favourable condition' (based on habitat extent/condition as a surrogate if population trends of threatened species at each site are not available)¹². [Feasible to develop from data in the World Database of KBAs, but expanded monitoring efforts required; BirdLife International and the KBA Partnership].
3. Numbers of species assessed on the IUCN Red List and the number of comprehensively assessed groups that have been reassessed to determine trends¹³ [[Existing indicator](#) for Target 19; IUCN]

⁹ Gaps identified but no specific indicators available in relation to international trade, unsustainable use, migratory species, other policy responses, although it is possible to disaggregate the RLI to address some of these: e.g. for migratory species, or to show trends driven largely by international trade or its management/control, or by use and its management/control.

¹⁰ Key Biodiversity Areas are sites of significance for the global persistence of biodiversity. Over 16,000 KBAs have been identified to date, spanning all countries and terrestrial, freshwater and marine environments. About two-thirds of these (10,352) have been identified as important because of the populations of globally threatened species that they support. Effectively conserving these sites is key to the conservation of these species. On average, 38.5% of each KBA identified for threatened species is covered by protected areas, with 12.9% (1,337) completely covered, 50.6% (5,243) partially covered and 36.4% (3,772) lacking any coverage by protected areas. The coverage of unprotected KBAs by OECMs is not known, but preliminary data for 10 countries indicates that 76% of such sites are at least partially covered by candidate OECMs. To date, only one country has submitted any data on OECMs to the WDPA/WCMC. As this dataset expands, it will be possible to incorporate this information into the indicator. It may be necessary to update the proposed milestones as such information becomes available. Alliance for Zero Extinction sites are KBAs holding the last remaining population of any highly threatened species; a total of 853 have been identified as of May 2019. Comprehensive data on other systematic site networks for threatened species are not yet available.

¹¹ Note that this is a subset of an indicator proposed for a new site conservation target covering all KBAs, not just those identified for threatened species.

¹² Currently, 35.6% of Key Biodiversity Areas identified for threatened species are in favourable condition (out of 1,212 with relevant data). A KBA monitoring protocol, and definitions and methods for determining favourable condition, is in development

¹³ The IUCN Red List is widely regarded as the most objective system for assessing the conservation status (i.e. extinction risk) of species. As of July 2019, over 105,000 species have been assessed for the Red List. To track trends in status over time, the [Red List Index](#) summarises extinction risk trends for groups in which all or nearly all species have been assessed (i.e. 'comprehensively assessed' groups). As of May 2019, these comprise mammals, birds, amphibians, warm water reef-building corals and cycads. Additional comprehensive groups for which repeat global assessments are currently underway or planned before 2030 include cartilaginous fishes, freshwater crabs and crayfish, bumblebees, mangroves, and seagrasses.


4. Numbers of countries with nation-wide systematic species abundance/occupancy monitoring programmes established [Baseline data available from Moussy et al (in prep); feasible to update periodically].

Additional desirable indicators that may be feasible to develop include:

5. Number of National Red List assessments.
6. Proportion of countries with high resolution spatial distribution data for all species in at least 5 classes of organisms.
7. Proportion of threatened species with persistence targets included in land-use, watershed, or sea-use cross-sectoral spatial plans.
8. Proportion of countries with legislation for protecting and sustainably managing species that adequately covers known threatened species and is effectively implemented.
9. Proportion of countries with dedicated funding mechanisms for species conservation.
10. Proportion of countries with enhanced capacity for threatened species conservation relative to 2020.
11. Proportion of private sector safeguard policies that integrate threatened species and the key sites for their conservation.
12. Proportion of countries with development safeguard policies and systems of economic incentives and subsidies that integrate threatened species and the key sites for their conservation.
13. Proportion of NBSAPs that incorporate or are based on quantitative analysis of the threats driving species' population declines in the country, the actions needed to address them, and the species for which the country has disproportionate responsibility for their global conservation (e.g. national endemics).
14. Number of species that have 'recovered' (according to IUCN Green List).

Potential milestones for the first four of these indicators, as illustrated in the graphs below.

1. The average proportion of each KBA for threatened species covered by protected areas and OECMs exceeds 50% by 2025 (including 100% of sites holding the sole population of any highly threatened species), 70% by 2030 and reaches 100% by 2040¹¹
2. The proportion of Key Biodiversity Areas identified for threatened species in favourable condition exceeds 50% by 2025, 60% by 2030, 80% by 2040 and 100% by 2050¹²
3. IUCN Red List assessments of species' extinction risk have been carried out for 150,000 species by 2025, 200,000 species by 2030 (with all comprehensively assessed species groups having their conservation status reassessed by 2030), and 275,000 by 2050¹³
4. The number of countries with nationwide systematic species abundance/occupancy monitoring programmes established for at least one taxonomic group exceeds 100 by 2025, 150 by 2030 and 200 by 2040. [51 countries have such schemes currently, Moussy et al. in prep]



Author Affiliations

1. BirdLife International and Department of Zoology, University of Cambridge, UK
2. School of Natural and Environmental Sciences, Newcastle University, UK
3. WWF
4. Conservation International
5. WILDOCEANS
6. The Morton Arboretum
7. EcoHealth Alliance
8. Division of Biology and Conservation Ecology, Manchester Metropolitan University and IUCN Species Survival Commission
9. IUCN
10. Biodiversity Research and Monitoring Directorate, South African National Biodiversity Institute
11. International Institute for Environment and Development
12. Institute of Botany, the Chinese Academy of Sciences
13. Botanic Gardens Conservation International
14. Department of Ecology, University of Brasilia, Brazil

Authors: Stuart Butchart¹, Friederike Bolam², Wendy Elliott³, Ian Harrison⁴, Jean Harris⁵, Sean Hoban⁶, Catherine Machalaba⁷, Louise Mair², David Mallon⁸, Dao Nguyen⁹, Domitilla Raimundo¹⁰, Dilys Roe¹¹, Xiaoli Shen¹², Paul Smith¹³, Braulio Ferreira de Souza Dias¹⁴, and Philip McGowan²