



Convention on Biological Diversity

Distr.
GENERAL

UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/20/2
10 February 2016

ORIGINAL: ENGLISH

SUBSIDIARY BODY ON SCIENTIFIC, TECHNICAL AND TECHNOLOGICAL ADVICE

Twentieth meeting
Montreal, Canada, 25-30 April 2016
Item 3 of the provisional agenda*

UPDATED ASSESSMENT OF PROGRESS TOWARDS SELECTED AICHI BIODIVERSITY TARGETS

Note by the Executive Secretary

INTRODUCTION

1. In its decision X/2, paragraph 14, the Conference of the Parties, decided that, at its future meetings, it would review progress in the implementation of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020, and requested the Executive Secretary to prepare an analysis/synthesis of national, regional and other actions, including targets as appropriate, established in accordance with the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 (para. 17(b)).
2. Further to decision XII/1, SBSTTA-19 was requested to identify further opportunities and additional key actions, including for those Aichi Biodiversity Targets for which there has been the least progress at the global level. A list of such targets was contained in an annex to the note by the Executive Secretary for that session (UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/19/2) pursuant to the assessment of progress provided in the fourth edition of the *Global Biodiversity Outlook*. As outlined in the annex, a number of activities were under way to enhance progress towards their achievement.
3. The present note provides an updated and detailed assessment of progress towards Aichi Biodiversity Target 11. Section I introduces Target 11. Section II presents the strategy and technical support for collecting and sharing information and data on status and priority actions. Section III presents information on progress towards the various elements of Aichi Biodiversity Target in four clusters: area protected; coverage of areas important for biodiversity and ecosystem services and representativeness; connectivity and integration into the wider landscape and seascape; and management effectiveness and equity. Conclusions are given in section IV. Section V suggests next steps based on lessons learned. Draft recommendations are provided in section VII.
4. Further analysis is under way to update progress on other Aichi Targets including Targets 5 and 15 (UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/20/INF/38) and 12 (UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/20/INF/44). Some preliminary information on progress towards Target 12 is provided in section VI of the present note. In addition, information on progress towards Targets 3, 16, 17 and 18 and 20 is provided in documents prepared for the first meeting of the Subsidiary Body on Implementation (UNEP/CBD/SBI/1/7/Add.2,

* UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/20/1/Rev.1.

UNEP/CBD/SBI/1/3, UNEP/CBD/SBI/1/2/Add.1, UNEP/CBD/SBI/1/2/Add.3 and UNEP/CBD/SBI/1/7/Add.1). In addition, further opportunities and additional key actions suitable for advancing on the achievement of Targets 6 and 7 are addressed in the document on mainstreaming biodiversity into sectors (UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/20/15).

5. Building on multiple lines of evidence derived from a wide range of sources, information document UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/INF/38 analyses the status, trends, pressures and progress under Targets 5 and 15, in particular with regard to forest ecosystems. The report describes the importance of these targets and their contribution to the advancement of other global policy agendas. It also presents a regional review of reporting and good practices, based on experiences from countries in Latin America, and reviews commitments and developments linked to forests undertaken in other policy processes. This review demonstrates that national targets and progress reported in national reports and national biodiversity strategies and action plans do not always take into account related commitments under other forums. Better integration between these processes could ensure that more accurate information is reported, leading to better assessments of progress and efforts still needed on the global scale. The report also highlights a number of elements reported, in order to provide relevant quantitative and, where possible, spatially explicit information that could be aggregated to better assess overall global progress under these targets. It suggests a number of freely available sources which could help countries include these elements in their national reporting.

I. BACKGROUND ON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF AICHI BIODIVERSITY TARGET 11

6. In decision XI/24 on protected areas, the Conference of the Parties invited Parties to undertake major efforts to achieve all elements of Aichi Biodiversity Target 11, including to: continue to conduct assessments of the governance of protected areas; strengthen recognition of and support for community-based approaches; renew efforts to establish multi-sectoral committees; align protected area projects in action plans for the programme of work on protected areas (PoWPA) with the fourth, fifth and sixth replenishment periods of the Global Environment Facility (GEF); and to report on the implementation of actions, including incorporation of the results of implementing projects funded by GEF and other donors, in order to track progress towards achieving Aichi Biodiversity Target 11.

7. Aichi Biodiversity Target 11 is: “By 2020, at least 17 per cent of terrestrial and inland water, and 10 per cent of coastal and marine areas, especially areas of particular importance for biodiversity and ecosystem services, are conserved through effectively and equitably managed, ecologically representative and well connected systems of protected areas and other effective area-based conservation measures, and integrated into the wider landscapes and seascapes.”

8. The Conference of the Parties at its twelfth meeting, in 2014, undertook a midterm evaluation of the status of Aichi Biodiversity Targets on the basis of the fourth edition of the *Global Biodiversity Outlook*,¹ Aichi Biodiversity Target 11 showed significant progress suggesting that with more focused and systematic efforts, many elements of this target could be achieved by 2020. More specifically, the first element of the target relating to the quantitative aspect of 17 per cent terrestrial and inland water areas under protection was assessed to be on track, and with continued efforts from Parties, this element is expected to be achieved by 2020. For the other elements of the target relating to the quantitative aspect of 10 per cent of coastal and marine areas under protection, areas important for biodiversity and ecosystem services, ecological representation, effectively and equitably managed protected areas, and protected areas well connected and integrated into the wider landscape and seascape, significant progress was reported in 2014, but it was not sufficient to achieve these elements by 2020 without additional efforts.

¹ Secretariat of the Convention on Biological Diversity (2014), *Global Biodiversity Outlook 4*. Montreal, Canada, 155 pages.

II. STRATEGY AND TECHNICAL SUPPORT FOR COLLECTING INFORMATION ON STATUS AND PRIORITY ACTIONS ON TARGET 11

9. In order to facilitate the achievement of Aichi Biodiversity Target 11, since May 2015, the Secretariat, in collaboration with partner organizations, has undertaken efforts to reach out to Parties including through the organization of regional capacity-building workshops and has collected information on the status of elements of Aichi Biodiversity Target 11 as well as draft priority actions that Parties will undertake in the next five years. These efforts include the following steps: renewing partnerships and commitments from partner organizations; developing baseline data for countries in the form of information dossiers; providing capacity development to Parties; securing the submission of questionnaires, status matrices and national actions (road maps); and collating country submissions into a coherent report. Details of the approach and technical support provided are described in the information note (UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/20/INF/43). Prior to the workshops, countries were also provided with information about the outcomes identified in the project identification forms (PIF) of their respective GEF 5 projects.

10. Three subregional workshops have been held to date: for countries in mainland Asia, Latin America and the Caribbean. The results are very encouraging: of 78 countries invited, 52 attended, 43 submitted status information on Aichi Biodiversity Target 11, and 42 submitted their priority actions to achieve this target in the next five years. It should be noted, however, that not all of these countries have submitted full information for each element of the target. Response rates and information submitted by countries is summarized in section III. The next workshop in the series is scheduled for the end of March, covering 54 African Parties. The above-mentioned information note (UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/20/INF/43) will be updated following the reception of information from these countries. Further workshops, covering Parties in the rest of the world, will be conducted in 2016, subject to the availability of funds. The information collected in the entire series will be made available to the Conference of the Parties at its thirteenth meeting.

III. STATUS AND PROJECTIONS FOR THE ACHIEVEMENT OF TARGET 11

11. Each subsection below presents information on the global status as per worldwide databases, as well as more detailed status and projections for mainland Asia, Latin America and the Caribbean, as per data collected through the workshops. Examples of Parties' actions, as per nationally submissions information, and suggestions for furthering the achievement of the element are also provided.

A. Area protected

“By 2020, at least 17 per cent of terrestrial and inland water, and 10 per cent of coastal and marine areas...are conserved...systems of protected areas and other effective area-based conservation measures...”

1. Terrestrial and inland water and coastal and marine protected areas

12. At the global level, 15.4 per cent of terrestrial and inland water areas, 10.9 per cent of coastal and marine areas in territorial waters (0-12 nautical miles) and 8.4 per cent of coastal and marine areas within Exclusive Economic Zones (EEZ) (0-200 nautical miles) are currently protected according to the World Database of Protected Areas.²

13. Of 41 countries in mainland Asia, Latin America and the Caribbean that have submitted numerical information on the status of terrestrial and inland water protected areas, 21 have reached or surpassed the 17 per cent mark, 3 countries are close to reaching the mark, with less than 1 per cent of additional protected areas needed, while 6 have less than 5 per cent of their land areas protected.

² Juffe-Bignoli, D., Burgess, N.D., Bingham, H., Belle, E.M.S., de Lima, M.G., Deguignet, M., Bertzky, B., Milam, A.N., Martinez-Lopez, J., Lewis, E., Eassom, A., Wicander, S., Geldmann, J., van Soesbergen, A., Arnell, A.P., O'Connor, B., Park, S., Shi, Y.N., Danks, F.S., MacSharry, B., Kingston, N. (2014). *Protected Planet Report 2014*. UNEP-WCMC: Cambridge, United Kingdom.

14. A total of 21 countries have submitted actions for increasing the protection of terrestrial areas; 8 of these countries have presented their projected increase for terrestrial areas as a percentage. For example, Mexico has already protected 13.15 per cent of its terrestrial territory, and aims to create seven new terrestrial protected areas, adding 48,318.03 km², bringing the total to 15.6 per cent of the terrestrial territory. This process includes the verification of Wildlife Management Units and forest reserves in order to officially include those with the optimal conditions in the National System of Protected Areas.

15. Out of 27 countries in mainland Asia, Latin America and the Caribbean that have submitted numerical information on the status of coastal and marine protected areas, 7 have reached or surpassed the 10 per cent mark. One other country is close to reaching the mark, with less than 1 per cent of additional protected areas needed, while 11 have less than 1 per cent of marine areas within their jurisdiction protected.

16. A total of 24 countries have submitted actions for increasing the protection of coastal and marine areas; 9 of these countries have presented their projected increase for marine areas as a percentage. Three countries (Bahamas, Chile and Mexico) project reaching the target. For example, Chile intends to protect 989,144 km² of its marine areas by 2020, including: Easter Island's marine biodiversity (approximately 577,000 km² of the surrounding EEZ), an objective that is currently in development with the local board (Mesa del Mar Rapa Nui); the Nazca-Desventuradas marine park (300,035 km²); the Juan Fernández Archipelago marine protected area (12,109.02 km²), which will be a mix of (6) marine parks (1,081.36 km²) with a multiple-use area around them (11,027.66 km²); and the southern tip of Patagonia (100,000 km²), to be developed soon with key strategic partners.

17. Out of the 41 countries that submitted information on terrestrial protected areas, 19 have GEF 5 projects that will increase the coverage of terrestrial protected areas when implemented. For example, implementation on one of its GEF-5 projects would enable Tajikistan to reach the 17 per cent mark. Similarly, of the 27 countries that submitted information on marine protected areas, 10 have GEF 5 projects that will increase the coverage of coastal and marine protected areas when implemented. For example, implementation on one of its GEF-5 projects would enable Bahamas to reach the 10 per cent mark.

18. It can be noted that the projected increase from the expected outcomes of the GEF 5 PIFs differs from the actions submitted through the workshops. Some countries have not reflected the expected outcomes of their GEF 5 projects in their priority actions. Thus, if countries were to incorporate into their road maps the expected outcomes of the GEF 5 projects, and also the GEF 6 projects, as well as other bilaterally funded projects, the projections could increase.

2. *Other effective area-based conservation measures*

19. The PoWPA (adopted by decision VII/28) and successive decisions of the Conference of the Parties (IX/16, X/31, XI/31 and XII/19) recognize protected areas run by Government agencies at various levels, co-managed protected areas, private protected areas and indigenous peoples and community conserved areas (ICCAs). However, there is much variation among Parties in the extent that these various types of governance are formally recognized and consequently a lack of consistency in information provided by countries to the World Database on Protected Areas. Many countries may limit official designations of protected areas to those run by government agencies. Accordingly, the estimates provided in paragraph 8 above are likely to be significant underestimates of the total area protected. With a view to improving understanding on what constitutes "other effective area-based conservation measures" (OECMs), the IUCN World Commission on Protected Areas (IUCN-WCPA) has established a task force to develop guidance on the matter.

20. Increasingly, countries are recognizing private reserves and ICCAs. For example, the private reserve system in Brazil is recognized under federal law and is currently represented by 1,182 reserves, protecting 7,502 km² of land across seven terrestrial biomes.³

21. A total of 21 countries in mainland Asia, Latin America and the Caribbean identified priority actions addressing what they stipulated are OECMs. For example, Lebanon has identified natural parks, natural sites and monuments, Himas (community-based natural resources management systems), and sites recognized by international organizations and conventions as other effective area-based conservation measures. Lebanon has already established 11 terrestrial Himas and 3 Himas protecting inland water resources. Within the next five years, Lebanon aims to increase the number of community conserved areas by establishing new Himas as part of its priority actions.

22. To improve the information on the status of protected areas, understanding on OECMs and improve progress towards achievement of the targets, countries can:

(a) Revise their actions to take into account the projected outcomes of GEF 5 and 6 protected area projects and other bilaterally funded projects;

(b) Regularly update their national information in the World Database on Protected Areas, managed by the International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN) and the United Nations Environment Programme's World Conservation Monitoring Centre (UNEP-WCMC), to avoid discrepancies and improve the quality of global information for reporting and planning;

(c) Undertake concerted efforts to implement their identified road maps and report on their implementation prior to COP 14 and COP 15, as part of their commitments to report on the implementation of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020;

(d) Upon clear guidance on what constitutes OECMs, can map them with other elements of Target 11 (ecological representation, areas important for biodiversity and ecosystems services, connectivity and conservation corridors, and equity) and include such areas in their official reports.

B. Areas of importance for biodiversity and ecosystem services and representativeness

“...especially areas of particular importance for biodiversity and ecosystem services, are conserved through...ecologically representative systems of protected areas...”

1. Areas important for biodiversity and ecosystem services

23. Areas of particular importance for biodiversity, or “key biodiversity areas”, are areas that are locally, nationally and globally important at the genetic, species and/or ecosystem level; they are nationally identified sites using global criteria and thresholds.⁴ Some KBAs include Important Bird and Biodiversity Areas (IBAs) and Alliance for Zero Extinction sites (AZEs).⁵ Currently, IBAs and AZEs are the only available globally comprehensive subsets of areas of particular importance for biodiversity.

24. Globally, out of 11,220 IBAs, 2467 are completely covered by protected areas (98 per cent coverage or more), 5044 are partially covered by protected areas (2 to 98 per cent coverage) and 3709 are not covered by protected areas (less than 2 per cent coverage), as indicated by BirdLife International.⁶ Furthermore, out of 587 AZEs, 137 are completely covered by protected areas (98 per cent or more coverage), 206 are partially covered by protected areas (2 to 98 per cent coverage) and 244 are not covered by protected areas (less than 2 per cent coverage). Of the 1,292 terrestrial protected areas that

³ Pegas, Fernanda de Vasconcellos and J. Guy Castley. 2016. Private reserves in Brazil: Distribution patterns, logistical challenges and conservation contributions. *Journal for Nature Conservation*, 29:14-24.

⁴ Other areas are Biodiversity Hotspots; High-biodiversity wilderness areas; and Global 200 priority ecoregions as summarized in UNEP-WCMC. 2014. “Key Biodiversity Areas (KBA)”. Biodiversity A-Z website. Available at <http://www.biodiversitya-z.org/content/key-biodiversity-areas-kba>.

⁵ G. L. Worboys, M. Lockwood, A. Kothari, S. Feary and I. Pulsford (eds.) 2015. Protected Area Governance and Management, ANU Press, Canberra. Table 3.7 on page 70.

⁶ Data compiled from BirdLife International website: <http://www.birdlife.org/>

GEF has supported (in 119 countries), covering a total area of 2,785,350 km², 58 per cent are considered areas of particular importance for biodiversity.⁷

25. In mainland Asia, Latin America and the Caribbean, 22 countries have identified priority actions to improve the coverage of IBAs and AZEs by protected areas. For example, out of 105 IBAs in the Philippines, 11 are completely covered by protected areas, 41 are partially covered by protected areas and 53 are not covered by protected areas. As part of its priority actions, the country aims to protect 9 additional terrestrial IBAs under a GEF project and 5 IBAs in the Manila Bay region under a Supreme Court act. In another example, Colombia has reported 124 IBAs and 45 AZEs, out of which 60 per cent and 7 per cent, respectively, are completely covered by protected areas. Colombia aims to protect 3 IBAs and 3 AZEs.

26. Well managed protected areas can provide vital ecosystem services, such as water purification and retention leading to water security, erosion control, and reduction of both flooding and unnatural wild fires. In mainland Asia, Latin America and the Caribbean, out of the 26 countries that responded to the questionnaire, 20 have assessed areas important for ecosystem services and have specified if they have some form of legal or other protection, of which 17 have some level of protection, including 6 that are protected indirectly through legislation. The main ecosystem service mentioned by countries (9 times) is the provisioning of water.

27. A total of 11 countries in mainland Asia, Latin America and the Caribbean identified draft priority actions addressing areas important for ecosystem services. For example, Nepal has identified rangelands, wetlands and catchment forests as areas important for ecosystem services. Most of these areas are protected under biodiversity-related policies and legislation, such as the National Wetlands Policy (2012). Nepal aims to promote the development of a Payment for Ecosystem Services mechanism in selected sub-watersheds.

2. Ecological representation

28. Globally, there are 14 terrestrial biomes, 62 marine provinces, 8 biogeographic realms and 12 marine realms.⁸ At the global level, ecological representation is usually assessed on the basis of ecoregional representation in protected area networks.⁹ A target of 10 per cent of each ecoregion at the global level covered by protected areas, as decided by the Conference of the Parties in its decision VIII/15, annex II, was set as an indicator of the achievement of the ecological representation element of Aichi Biodiversity Target 11. It is important to note that coverage of ecological regions by protected areas are a useful indicator for assessing ecological representativeness at the global level, but at the national level, they may be too coarse to apply, requiring proper alignment to the national biogeographic classification systems.

29. Globally, as per the *Protected Planet Report*, of 827 terrestrial ecoregions, 490 (59.3 per cent) have reached at least 10 per cent protection, and of 232 marine ecoregions, 88 (37.9 per cent) have reached at least 10 per cent protection.¹⁰ A total of 38 terrestrial and 38 marine ecoregions have protection of less than 0.5 per cent; of those, 22 terrestrial and 14 marine ecoregions are not protected at all.

30. A total of 25 countries in mainland Asia, Latin America and the Caribbean have identified focused actions addressing ecological representation. For example, the current system of protected areas

⁷ GEF. 2015. Impact Evaluation of GEF Support to Protected Areas and Protected Area Systems. Available at [EN_GEF.ME_C.49.inf_02_Biodiversity_Impact_Eval_Report_2015.pdf](#).

⁸ Olson, D. et al. 2001. 'Terrestrial ecoregions of the world: a new map of life on Earth. *Bioscience* 51; 933-8; Spalding, M.D., et al. 2013. *Ocean Yearbook* 27, 213-48.

⁹ Jenkins, C. and L.N Joppa. 2009. Expansion of the global protected area systems. *Biological Conservation* 142:2166-74; Bastian Bertzky, Colleen Corrigan, James Kemsey, Siobhan Kenney, Corinna Ravilious, Charles Besançon and Neil Burgess (2012) *Protected Planet Report 2012: Tracking progress towards global targets for protected areas*. IUCN, Gland, Switzerland and UNEP-WCMC, Cambridge, United Kingdom; Juffe-Bignoli, et al. 2014.

¹⁰ Juffe-Bignoli, D., Burgess, N.D., Bingham, H., Belle, E.M.S., de Lima, M.G., Deguignet, M., Bertzky, B., Milam, A.N., Martinez-Lopez, J., Lewis, E., Eassom, A., Wicander, S., Geldmann, J., van Soesbergen, A., Arnell, A.P., O'Connor, B., Park, S., Shi, Y.N., Danks, F.S., MacSharry, B., Kingston, N. (2014). *Protected Planet Report 2014*. UNEP-WCMC: Cambridge, UK.

of Cuba covers different types of ecosystems and the range of many endemic species, as assessed in a gap analysis conducted in 2007. As part of its priority actions, the country aims to increase the protection of different landscape and ecosystem types by increasing the protection of: 4 per cent of landscape types; 3 per cent of natural wetlands; 3 per cent of marine ecosystems; 3 per cent of natural vegetation; 2 per cent of endemic plants; 3 per cent of endemic and/or threatened species of terrestrial vertebrates; and 3 per cent of key areas for marine species.

31. To improve the information on the status of coverage the areas important for biodiversity and ecosystem services, as well as ecological representation, and improve progress towards achievement of the target:

(a) Countries could undertake mapping of their proposed new protected areas vis-a-vis the current coverage of their community conserved areas, KBAs (including IBAs and AZEs), ecosystem services and ecological regions;

(b) Agencies, such as IUCN, UNEP-WCMC, the Joint Research Centre of the European Commission, ICCA Consortium, UNDP Small Grants Programme, BirdLife International, and the Alliance for Zero Extinction, can consider undertaking systematic compilation of ICCAs and their relations with the other elements of Aichi Biodiversity Target 11.

C. Connectivity and integration in landscapes and seascapes

“...well connected systems of protected areas...integrated into the wider landscapes and seascapes...”

1. Well connected systems of protected areas

32. Protected areas established in isolation (geographical as well as sectoral) may not fully yield their expected benefits. Connectivity conservation helps link habitats across whole landscapes, enabling ecosystems, species and diversity within species to move or adapt.¹¹ The term is widely used in the literature to refer to the “ease with which organisms move between particular landscapes, the number of connections between patches of habitat [...] or the interlinkages of key processes within and between ecosystems.”¹² Thus, spatial connectivity includes the movement of migratory animals, birds and marine life across landscapes and seascapes within and between countries. Connectivity conservation can be considered on multiple scales. Detailed information at the different scales is lacking to provide a comprehensive picture.

33. In 2015, UNEP launched the “Strengthening biodiversity conservation at a landscape and seascape scale” initiative. It aims to tackle the problem of increasing habitat fragmentation through the development of a global connectivity conservation strategy that will support countries and regions to integrate connectivity conservation within their national land use and seascape planning. To achieve this, the initiative seeks to promote an understanding of the priorities for connectivity and the use of connectivity as a conservation tool to strengthen the protection of biodiversity, enhance the provision of ecosystem services, and increase resilience to climate change. This will provide policy and legislative tools and resources to national Governments, non-governmental organizations and other stakeholders.

34. UNEP-WCMC, with the collaboration of IUCN-WCPA and other partners worldwide, is in the process of producing a Global Connectivity Conservation Database.¹³ The database represents the first attempt to create a standardized platform for collating information on connectivity conservation initiatives from around the world. Currently (February 2016), there are almost 600 connectivity conservation initiatives in over 150 countries and territories in the database. Latin America and the Caribbean is by far the best represented region, contributing to more than 35 per cent of all initiatives recorded in the

¹¹ Ian Pulsford, David Lindenmayer, Carina Wyborn, Barbara Lausche, Maja Vasiljević and Graeme L. Worboys. “Chapter 27: Connectivity Conservation Management” in Worboys, G. L., M. Lockwood, A. Kothari, S. Feary and I. Pulsford (eds.) 2015. Protected Area Governance and Management, ANU Press, Canberra.

¹² Ibid, page 853.

¹³ Personal communication, IUCN-WCPA Taskforce.

database. Despite this, information is still unavailable for over 50 per cent of the countries and territories within this region. Oceania as a whole is a poorly represented region, contributing to just 5 per cent. This is largely due to the fact that marine connectivity conservation initiatives are currently underrepresented within the database. Overall, transboundary initiatives represent 28 per cent of all initiatives submitted, with Europe and Africa having the greatest proportion of initiatives.

35. A total of 21 countries in mainland Asia, Latin America and the Caribbean identified draft priority actions addressing connectivity and ecological corridors. For example, Bhutan has established nine biological corridors representing 9 per cent of the country's area. The country aims to complete demarcation and zonation of biological corridors and conduct a review of the functionality of existing corridors.

2. *Integration of protected areas into the wider land- and seascapes*

36. By integrating protected areas into the wider landscape and seascape, including incorporation of protected areas into sectoral plans and strategies, the investments in protected areas will pay biodiversity and societal dividends well into the future. Many Parties have yet to systematically act on integrating protected areas into the wider land- and seascapes through, for example, comprehensive landscaping planning that integrates all relevant sectors. Therefore, detailed information on integration of protected areas into the wider land- and seascapes is not available at the global level at this time.

37. A total of 11 countries in mainland Asia, Latin America and the Caribbean identified focused actions in their priority actions addressing integration into the wider land- and seascape. For example, Colombia has created biosphere reserves and sectoral plans integrating biodiversity and protection into wider land- and seascapes. The country aims to create legal and political tools to incorporate social and environmental considerations in mining activities and their impact on 10,000 km² of land. The country also aims to adopt sectoral plans in critical sectors, such as agriculture and mining, to reduce their pressure on forests and biodiversity.

38. To improve the information on the status of connectivity and integration and progress towards achievement of the target:

- (a) Detailed guidance on connectivity conservation is needed;
- (b) More awareness of the benefits of connectivity corridors to biodiversity conservation and as a natural solution to global environmental problems, including climate change adaptation, is needed;
- (c) Countries and partners can explore the possibility of developing global and/or regional projects to demark connectivity corridors, including through ICCAs and other effective area-based conservation measures as stepping stones, and through ecosystem restoration, and create their management plans;
- (d) Further guidance on what is integration of protected areas into the wider land- and seascapes is needed, including how to integrate in major economic sectors and their respective stakeholders;
- (e) A more systematic assessment of the gaps in delivering integration into wider land- and seascapes for terrestrial and marine systems is needed;
- (f) Relevant agencies and organizations can consider undertaking systematic compilation of criteria/elements for integration into wider land- and seascapes for terrestrial and marine systems, including their relations with the other elements of Aichi Biodiversity Target 11, and the development of related tools.

D. Management effectiveness and equity

“...effectively and equitably managed...systems of protected...”

1. Effectively managed

39. As of January 2015, the Global Database on Protected Areas Management Effectiveness (GD-PAME) has collected 17,739 PAME assessments, representing 9,037 protected areas, of which only 3,666 sites have multiple assessments. Seventeen per cent of countries have implemented management effectiveness evaluations in at least 60 per cent of their protected areas.¹⁴ Specifically, the Latin American and Caribbean region has carried out the most terrestrial assessments, with most countries having assessed 30 to 60 per cent of their total protected areas. The Central American and Caribbean subregions have carried out the most marine assessments, with a significant number of countries having assessed over 60 per cent of their total protected areas. Among biomes and ecoregions, the frequency of PAME assessments is the highest in tropical forests, where 45 per cent of protected areas have been assessed.

40. From the GD-PAME, information on how many of the 9,037 protected areas fall under sound management (that is a score of 0.66 or more on a scale of 0 to 1.0, with 0.33 indicating inadequate management) is not clear.¹⁵ In an earlier global study covering 6,800 protected area assessments in 100 countries, 22 per cent were categorized under sound management.¹⁶

41. In a 2015 study on impact evaluation of GEF-supported projects on protected area systems, the mean Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool (METT) score was reported to be 0.47; only evaluations that had more than half of the questions answered were used, which amounts to 20 per cent of the total assessments.¹⁷ Only 275 out of the total 1,924 GEF supported protected areas have repeated assessments that can be used to analyse management effectiveness changes over time. Of these 275 areas, 70 per cent recorded improvements in the total score, 27 per cent experienced declines and 3 per cent had no change. Recently approved and ongoing GEF projects continue to evaluate and improve management effectiveness.

42. A total of 32 countries in mainland Asia, Latin America and the Caribbean have identified focused actions addressing management effectiveness. The table below summarizes the status, priority actions and outcomes of GEF 5 PIFs for 9 countries. For example, the Ministry of Environment and Forestry of Indonesia has conducted management effectiveness studies on 33 per cent of all protected areas. Of these, in 2014, 32 per cent of protected areas had endorsed management plans. As part of its priority actions, the country aims to improve the management score of 260 protected areas to at least 0.7.

¹⁴ Coad, Lauren, et al. 2015. Measuring impact of protected area management interventions: current and future use of the Global Database of Protected Area Management Effectiveness. *Phil. Trans. R. Soc. B* 370: 20140281.

¹⁵ Fiona Leverington, Marc Hockings and Katia Lemos Costa. 2008. Management effectiveness evaluation in protected areas: Report for the project ‘Global study into management effectiveness evaluation of protected areas’, The University of Queensland, Gatton, IUCN-WCPA, TNC, WWF, Australia.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*

¹⁷ GEF. 2015. Impact Evaluation of GEF Support to Protected Areas and Protected Area Systems. Available at [EN_GEF.ME_C.49.inf_02_Biodiversity_Impact_Eval_Report_2015.pdf](#).

Table. Submissions by focal points and expected outcomes of projects approved under the fifth replenishment period of the Global Environment Facility addressing management effectiveness of protected areas for nine countries from mainland Asia and the Latin American and Caribbean Group

Country	Status	Priority Actions	GEF 5 Project Outcomes ¹⁸
Bangladesh	45 per cent of protected areas (PAs) assessed	Conduct Management Effectiveness (M.E.) assessment for 30 per cent of PAs every year	Management Effectiveness Tracking Tool (METT) scores of 70 per cent for 3 new PAs
Costa Rica	86 PAs have management plans 84 PAs assessed by a M.E assessment	By 2020, 70 per cent of PAs use M.E. tools	M.E. improvement in 20 per cent of marine PAs as measured by METT scores M.E. of 7 internationally important wetland PAs increases by 20 per cent
Honduras	49 per cent of PAs have management plans	Effectively manage the funding and implementation of 15 new management plans	10 per cent increase in the average M.E. rating of PAs as measured by METT
India	125 PAs assessed for M.E. 43 Tiger Reserves assessed for M.E.	Evaluate all remaining PAs (approximately 500) Periodical M.E. assessment of all PAs; by 2020, all PAs should have management plans	Improve M.E. of 7 mountain PAs (266 km ²) Enhanced M.E. in 3 protected wetlands
Indonesia	33 per cent of PAs assessed	Achieve METT scores of over 70 per cent for 260 protected areas	Improved M.E. of existing and new PAs Expanded network of effectively managed marine PAs
Mexico	2 PAs assessed 123 Management plans developed	Evaluation of 5 new PAs	Improved M.E. of existing and new PAs, as measured by METT scores Increased M.E. of 18 key protected areas
Peru	97 per cent of PAs have management plans	Evaluation of 68 PAs	10 PAs (5,600 km ²) meet or exceed their M.E. targets (80 per cent) Increase the M.E. of islands and peninsulas Improved M.E. of underrepresented areas
Uruguay	23 per cent of PAs have management plans	80 per cent of PAs with management plans	Improved M.E. of existing and new PAs Improved M.E. of marine PAs Increased METT scores of 5 PAs by 20 per cent
Viet Nam	More than 3 per cent of PAs assessed	Improve the management system of PAs	Increased PAs M.E., as measured by METT scores

43. Further, in the Latin American and Caribbean workshop, the results of a coordinated audit evaluating the implementation and management of 1,120 protected areas in 12 Latin American countries (Argentina, Bolivia, Brazil, Colombia, Costa Rica, Ecuador, El Salvador, Honduras, Mexico, Paraguay,

¹⁸ Projects that are IA approved, council endorsed, CEO endorsed or under-implemented were included in the assessment.

Peru and Venezuela) were presented.¹⁹ The report employs a georeferenced tool that is composed of indicators and indexes, including the Rapid Assessment and Prioritization of Protected Areas Management (RAPPAM) and the METT, which are visualized on maps, known as Indi-mapa. Classification is divided into three ranges: red, yellow and green, corresponding respectively to low, medium and high levels of implementation and management. The report concluded that, while the protection goal for terrestrial areas has already been reached by eight countries, the protection in coastal areas is still far from being achieved. In terms of governance, almost 30 per cent of the protected areas are on the lowest range. For example, 47 per cent of the protected areas evaluated lacked a management plan, 13 per cent of the territories did not have a manager, and 44 per cent did not monitor biodiversity.

2. *Equitably managed*

44. The programme of work on protected areas, in its Goal 2, provides guidance on governance, participation, equity and benefit-sharing, including with regard to mechanisms for the equitable sharing of both costs and benefits arising from the establishment and management of protected areas, and on the full and effective participation of indigenous and local communities and involvement of relevant stakeholders. However, information on the implementation and on the quality of governance at the global level is lacking.

45. A total of 22 countries in mainland Asia, Latin America and the Caribbean identified draft priority actions addressing equity and governance issues. For example, the Dominican Republic has 23 protected areas under co-management as recognized under the Law on Protected Areas 202-04. The country aims to implement co-management in 10 protected areas and evaluate and monitor co-management initiatives. In another example, the Bangladesh Wildlife Act of 2012 recognizes CCAs and private management, allowing for co-management in most protected areas. The country aims to carry out community capacity-building to increase shared management responsibilities in protected areas by 2020.

46. To improve the information on the status of effective and equitable management and progress towards achievement of the target:

(a) A more systematic assessment of management effectiveness gaps in each country is needed, with the aim to complete a national assessment within the next five years, and the results should be reported to the GD-PAME maintained by UNEP-WCMC;

(b) Monitoring guidance on the integration of modern techniques with traditional assessments that encompasses all elements is needed;

(c) Partner organizations can explore the possibility of developing global or regional projects to complete national assessments of management effectiveness gaps in a coherent manner;

(d) Undertaking measures to raise the effectiveness of protected areas from the “inadequate management” category to the “sound management” category is needed;

(e) Additional guidance and understanding on equity, including on the link between governance and equity, how to measure governance quality, and simple, user-friendly formats for collecting information is needed;

(f) Parties can provide information on governance types as well as quality of governance;

(g) Partners can develop further guidance, case studies, and best practices, including organizing training programmes.

¹⁹ Federal Court of Accounts of Brazil. 2015. *Protected areas: Latin America: coordinated audit*. Organization of Latin American and Caribbean Supreme Audit Institutions (OLACE FS), Special Technical Commission on the Environment (COMTEMA); Coordination Tribunal de Contas da União, Contraloría General de la República de Paraguay. Brasília: Tribunal de Contas da União.

IV. CONCLUSIONS

47. Section II has provided a summary of elements of Aichi Biodiversity Target 11 grouped into four clusters, using globally available data and information submitted by Parties, including case studies. The results from the three subregional workshops held so far have provided a platform for a number of countries to increase their understanding of what are the different aspects of the target, what information is needed for planning their achievement and what actions they can undertake to bring the elements and the target as a whole to fruition.

48. In sum, countries from mainland Asia, Latin America and the Caribbean have identified a number of priority actions addressing: the expansion of terrestrial and inland water (21) as well as coastal and marine (24) protected areas; other effective area-based conservation measures (21); areas important for biodiversity (22) and ecosystem services (11); ecological representation (25); well connected systems of protected areas (21); integration into wider land- and seascapes (11); effectively managed (32); and equitably managed (22). Further, they have committed to increasing terrestrial and inland water protected areas by 0.8 per cent and coastal and marine protected areas by 6.2 per cent.

49. Given the presentation of country road maps from mainland Asia, Latin America and the Caribbean, it is estimated that, for some elements of the target, progress may be better compared to the midterm assessment in the fourth edition of the *Global Biodiversity Outlook*. Specifically, it is estimated that two elements of Aichi Biodiversity Target 11 can be achieved before 2020, and even exceed the target by 2020 (terrestrial and inland water areas conserved, coastal and marine areas within national jurisdiction conserved); other elements will need particular efforts to be achieved by 2020). This estimation of progress may improve following completion of the series of workshops, covering all United Nations regions, and through analysis and reporting to the Conference of the Parties at its thirteenth meeting.

V. LESSONS LEARNED AND NEXT STEPS

50. Out of the 52 Parties that attended the workshops, 43 (82 per cent) countries from mainland Asia, Latin America and the Caribbean have provided information on the status and draft priority actions (road maps). This remarkable response rate shows their commitment to achieving Aichi Biodiversity Target 11. If similar commitment is evinced in other regions as the series of workshops progress, the projections for reaching the target by 2020 may further improve.

51. The lessons learned thus far from facilitate achievement of Aichi Biodiversity Target 11 are as follows:

(a) The development of a strategy that coherently brought all stakeholders to the same level of understanding was greatly useful in: providing an overarching picture for a collective pathway; demonstrating, internally and externally, the use of funds; and bringing together related activities;

(b) The development of country data dossiers providing a starting point for country focal points to better understand the information needed to achieve each element of the target, sparking discussion between Parties and partner organizations about the information held in global databases, providing inputs to their updating processes, and increasing coordination between the Secretariat and partner organizations;

(c) From the three workshops held thus far in the series, the amount of time invested in training country focal points (through emails, conference calls and face-to-face interactions) increased significantly, leading to a better understanding of the information needed to achieve each element of the target, greater quality of submissions, and more communications following the closure of the workshop, such as sharing information about the creation of new protected areas;

(d) In tracking the PIFs of GEF 5 projects, a wealth of implementation information was highlighted. Although workshop focal points were encouraged to take this information into consideration in the development of their road maps, it has been noted that most did not take this additional step.

52. It can be noted that the elements of the target are closely linked; working towards one will influence the implementation of others. For example, an action to improve the coverage of terrestrial and marine protected areas will invariably contribute to improving ecological representation and, potentially, coverage of areas important for biodiversity and ecosystem services. However, for the target to be achieved, all elements need to be considered. Therefore, countries should aim to implement the elements together in a cohesive manner, keeping in mind they are parts of a whole. For example, an action to map a particular type of other effective area-based conservation measure will also impact the coverage of protected areas, connectivity, representativeness, biodiversity and ecosystems services, its management, and integration into the wider land- or seascape. Thus, interlinkages between the elements, as well as to other Aichi Biodiversity Targets, should be explicit in order to facilitate implementation and reporting in a comprehensive manner.

53. Further, implementation of Aichi Biodiversity Target 11, especially with respect to improving the goods and services ecosystems provide, will provide practical means for achieving relevant targets of the Sustainable Development Goals, such as Goal 6 on water, Goal 14 on oceans and Goal 15 on terrestrial ecosystems, directly and indirectly. Implementation of Target 11 road maps also contributes to climate change adaptation and Article 5.1 of the Paris Climate agreement, which requires Parties to take action to conserve and enhance, as appropriate, sinks and reservoirs of greenhouse gases, including forests.

54. Given the above, what is required to facilitate the implementation of these road maps? For making implementation a reality, foremost, focused actions are needed. Then, for undertaking the implementation of those actions, funding (bilateral, multilateral and national budgets) and technical support are needed. Once the implementation is under way, monitoring and reporting are needed. All relevant partners, including relevant government ministries, departments, GEF implementing agencies, regional organizations, bilateral and multilateral funding agencies, the private sector, and conservation and community organizations, should consider aligning their activities towards supporting implementation of those road maps as the primary framework of action and, thus, approach implementation in a concerted manner with comprehensive coordination among all.

55. Expected outcomes included in the GEF 5 approved protected area projects address the first two requirements (focused actions and funding). From the three regional workshops held so far, almost all GEF eligible Parties already have one or two approved protected area projects that address various elements of Aichi Biodiversity Target 11. Countries should align their priority actions with the expected outcomes included in those approved projects and pose the identified actions in their GEF 6 STAR allocations, if not already prioritized. Bilateral funding agencies, private foundations, the private sector, and other donors should also consider aligning their funding programmes with those road maps.

56. In each United Nations region, the possibility of enabling implementation support networks consisting of project coordinators, regional organizations, GEF implementing agencies, bilateral funding agencies, and Friends of PoWPA should be explored to promote the implementation of such projects. Clustering these projects by theme and enabling the implementation support networks to provide structured technical support through regular communications, exchange of best practices, tools and lessons learned, including the organization of webinars and training programmes, and facilitating monitoring and reporting, should also be explored as a means to help achieve Aichi Biodiversity Target 11. Some lead agency (preferably a GEF implementing agency) should undertake the coordination of the subregional implementation support networks and develop an action plan for facilitating the implementation of those road maps at the national, regional and global levels.

VI. PROGRESS IN THE ACHIEVEMENT OF AICHI BIODIVERSITY TARGET 12

57. In order to facilitate the achievement of Aichi Biodiversity Target 12, the Secretariat, in collaboration with partner organizations, has undertaken efforts to reach out to Parties, including developing baseline data for countries in the form of information dossiers, building capacity to better understand and fulfil the achievement of this target, and securing the submission of questionnaires, success stories on species conservation, status matrices, and national priority actions (road maps) through regional workshops. Based on submissions from four regional workshops in Africa, mainland Asia and

Latin America and the Caribbean, an updated assessment of progress was compiled. The full assessment is presented in an information note (UNEP/CBD/SBSTTA/20/INF/44) and the main conclusions are summarized here.

58. Globally, the assessment of the conservation status of species is incomplete for most taxonomic groups as only 5 per cent of the world's described species have been assessed by the IUCN Red List version 2015-4. Only four taxonomic groups (amphibian, mammal, birds, gymnosperms) have been comprehensively evaluated (i.e., >87 per cent of the described species have been assessed) and for most of the other taxonomic groups, such as reptiles, fishes, invertebrates, and lower plants, complete conservation status assessment is not available, even at global level. For example, for flowering plants, only 7 percent of the approximately 268,000 described species have been assessed. At the national level, information on the conservation status assessment is also very scant, and information is available only for a few countries, including some megadiverse countries. Brazil assessed the conservation status of all described vertebrate species as well as some selected invertebrates and plants, with a total of 18,873 species assessed. China conducted a conservation status assessment of 34,450 plant species, including angiosperms, gymnosperms, bryophytes and pteridophytes. Globally, the number of threatened species assessed by the IUCN Red List went from 15,000 in 2004 to over 23,000 in 2015.

59. In the regional workshops, countries reported that species conservation management plans helped improve the conservation status of species. Yet, data on how many threatened species have conservation management plans is reported only sporadically. The information note provides information on the number of conservation management plans relative to threatened species for the three regions covered by the workshops, based on information in the countries' fifth national reports and their submissions following the workshops. Reasons reported for improvement the conservation status of species include improvement in habitat conservation and reduction of threats. As studies have shown the expansion of protected area networks to areas important for biodiversity is effective in preventing the extinction of known threatened species²⁰, the overlap of the range of amphibian, mammal and bird species with protected areas²¹ in Africa, mainland Asia, Latin America and the Caribbean was examined. In general, Africa was found to have the greatest overlap for described, threatened and threatened endemic species. However, between 13 and 32 per cent of threatened amphibian, mammal and birds species do not hitherto have any of their range overlapping with existing protected areas in these three regions. The revised national biodiversity strategies and action plans, where available, were also examined for specific actions to conserve threatened species. Because of the considerable gaps in the conservation status assessment of most taxonomic groups, and lack of information on species conservation plans, it is not possible to make a conclusive statement on the status of Target 12 at this time.

60. The following elements would be needed to enhance progress towards Aichi Biodiversity Target 12:

- (a) A complete conservation status assessment of more taxonomic groups both at the global level by IUCN and at the national level is urgently needed;
- (b) Species conservation plans targeting all threatened species in a country, or at least critically endangered endemic species, have to be developed at the national level;
- (c) Expansion of protected area networks to areas important for biodiversity and recognition of other effective area-based conservation measures should be used by countries as a means to improve and sustained the conservation status of species, particularly those species most in decline, and to prevent the extinction of known threatened species;
- (d) Utmost priority should be accorded to critically endangered species which are endemic in a single country.

²⁰ Butchart et al. 2012.

²¹ World Database on Protected Areas, 2014.

VII. SUGGESTED RECOMMENDATIONS

61. The Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice may wish to recommend that the Conference of the Parties at its thirteenth meeting adopt a decision along the following lines, taking into account also any updated information on progress that is available at that time:

The Conference of the Parties,

Welcoming the continued progress towards the achievement of Aichi Biodiversity Target 11,

Acknowledging with appreciation the support of partner organizations, donors, host Governments and the Executive Secretary, for organizing the workshops and related activities on achieving Aichi Biodiversity Target 11 and 12,

Noting that implementation of one element of Aichi Biodiversity Target 11 will influence the others and will aid in the implementation of Target 12 and other relevant Aichi Biodiversity Targets as well as the Sustainable Development Goals;

1. *Invites* Parties:

(a) To provide regularly updated information to the World Database on Protected Areas, managed by the International Union for Conservation of Nature and the United Nations Environment Programme's World Conservation Monitoring Centre on their protected area systems, including, as appropriate, areas that are effectively conserved through indigenous peoples, local communities and the private sector, with a view to improving the accuracy and completeness of global information for reporting and planning, and to avoid or reduce discrepancies;

(b) To undertake concerted efforts to develop and implement their road maps for the achievement of Target 11 at the national level, taking full account of any relevant projects funded by the Global Environment Facility and other donors, and to report on progress prior to the fourteenth and fifteenth meetings of the Conference of the Parties;

(c) To give priority, in establishing new protected areas, to those that would expand the coverage of areas important for biodiversity and ecosystem services and improve ecological representativity as well as those that protect the habitats of threatened species, in particular those of critically endangered species that are endemic in a single country;

(d) To undertake more systematic assessment of management effectiveness gaps, with the aim of completing a national assessment within the next five years, and to report the results to the Global Database on Protected Areas Management Effectiveness;

(e) To undertake the measures to raise the effectiveness of protected areas from the "inadequate management" category to the "sound management" category;

2. *Invites* relevant partners, regional agencies, bilateral and multilateral funding agencies, in collaboration with the Executive Secretary:

(a) To develop further guidance on:

(i) Criteria for effective area-based conservation measures;

(ii) Measures to enhance connectivity and integration of protected areas into the wider land- and seascapes;

(iii) Understanding equity, including the link between governance and equity and how to measure governance quality, with simple, user-friendly formats for collecting information, and organizing training programmes on equitable management;

(b) To explore the possibility of developing global and/or regional projects to identify, designate and map connectivity corridors, including through the integration of Indigenous Community Conservation Areas and other effective area-based conservation measures as stepping stones, as well as through ecosystem restoration;

(c) To explore the possibility of developing global or regional projects to complete national assessments of management effectiveness gaps in a coherent manner, and to promote improvements in management effectiveness;

(d) As part of such projects, to facilitate the completion of assessments of the conservation status of key species groups and the preparation of management plans for the conservation of threatened species;

(e) To enable implementation support networks at the subregional level, with the involvement of project coordinators, regional organizations, Global Environment Facility implementing agencies, bilateral funding agencies, and Friends of PoWPA as well as other partners, to facilitate the implementation of road maps in a coherent manner and to provide structured technical support through regular communications, exchange of best practices, tools, and lessons learned, including the organization of webinars and training programmes, and facilitating monitoring and reporting;

(f) To promote dissemination of tools, best practices, challenges, experiences and lessons learned through the subregional implementation support networks;

(g) To report on progress to the Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice and/or the Subsidiary Body on Implementation at a meeting held prior to the fourteenth meeting of the Conference of the Parties;

3. *Invites* the Global Environment Facility and its implementing agencies to facilitate the alignment of the development and implementation of protected area projects in its sixth and seventh replenishment cycles with the actions identified in the road maps, with a view to facilitating the systematic monitoring and reporting of the results of those projects as they contribute to implementation of the road maps and achievement of Aichi Biodiversity Targets 11 and 12 and other related targets;

4. *Encourages* bilateral and multilateral donors, Parties and Governments in a position to do so, subject to the availability of funding, to support mobilization of funding to implement road maps, taking into account the fact that implementation actions for achieving Aichi Biodiversity Targets 11 and 12 will aid in the implementation of other relevant Aichi Biodiversity Targets as well as relevant targets of Sustainable Development Goals and will contribute to Article 5.1 of Paris Climate agreement.²²

²² United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, Conference of the Parties, twenty-first session, decision 1/CP.21 (see FCCC/CP/2015/10/Add.1).