

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE REVISION OF THE CBD STRATEGIC PLAN

**Submitted jointly by BirdLife International, Conservation International,
Countdown 2010, IUCN-World Commission on Protected Areas, The Nature
Conservancy, the Wildlife Conservation Society and WWF.**

The Conference of the Parties (COP) at its ninth regular session, in adopting Decision IX/9 on the revision of the Strategic Plan of the Convention after 2010, invited Parties and observers to submit further views on the revision and updating of the Strategic Plan. This paper is a response from Birdlife International, Conservation International, Countdown 2010, IUCN-World Commission on Protected Areas, The Nature Conservancy, the Wildlife Conservation Society and WWF to the notification issued by the CBD Secretariat on 7th July 2008. The views expressed in this submission relate primarily, but not exclusively, to the 'Mission' of the Strategic Plan which encompasses the '2010 Biodiversity Target' as well as the 'Framework for Evaluation of Progress' adopted by COP 8 decision VIII/15 in 2006 to measure the level of achievement of the 2010 Biodiversity Target. .

1. INTRODUCTION

The '2010 biodiversity target' to 'significantly reduce the rate of biodiversity loss as a contribution to poverty alleviation and to the benefit of all life on earth' was adopted by governments in 2002 at the 6th Conference of the Parties (COP 6) of the Convention on Biological Diversity (Decision VI/26) and later endorsed at the World Summit on Sustainable Development (WSSD), and subsequently included in Millennium Development Goal 7 (MDG7) under the 'reducing biodiversity loss' indicator.

The 2010 target is accompanied by a "Framework for Evaluation of Progress" comprised of 7 'Focal Areas', a set of Goals and Sub-targets and a set of 20 or so indicators including the Red List Index, the Living Planet Index and the Ecological Footprint. This framework was adopted by COP 8 decision VIII/15 in 2006 when the Goals and Sub-targets were also integrated into the programmes of work of the Convention. However, many of the indicators are not ready for immediate use and are still being developed by the '2010 Biodiversity Indicators Partnership' funded by GEF and coordinated by UNEP-WCMC. The 3rd Global Biodiversity Outlook, due for publication in 2010, will assess progress towards the 2010 Biodiversity Target using the indicators of the framework.

At COP 10, in October 2010, Parties will discuss whether they have achieved the 2010 Target to significantly reduce the rate of biodiversity loss. 2010 will also be a crucial year for biodiversity in other respects: there are plans by the UN to designate it 'International Year for Biodiversity'; the international community will be assessing progress towards the Millennium Development Goals; and there will be follow-up to agreements reached at UNFCCC's COP15 in December 2009.

The public and political attention on biodiversity and the 2010 Biodiversity Target, the growing concerns regarding climate change, as well as the increased awareness of the value of biodiversity and its role in climate change adaptation and mitigation will offer an opportunity to ensure the

design of an integrated CBD Strategic Plan, with high-level political support among Parties and other stakeholders.

To take full advantage of this opportunity the post-2010 CBD Strategic Plan must point the way for innovative biodiversity-based solutions to broader concerns on climate, development and human wellbeing that can deliver on the explicit goals of biodiversity conservation. The Strategic Plan should also integrate these solutions into broader multi-lateral, bilateral and other funding mechanisms as proposed under the UNFCCC and other fora (see section 2(a)).

To facilitate delivery, the new Strategic Plan should include more precisely defined measurable targets; timelines and indicators linked to an improved national reporting process, as well as specific renewed commitments of resources for implementation (see section 2(b)).

2. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR UPDATING THE STRATEGIC PLAN

This section that outlines key recommendations for the post-2010 Strategic Plan is divided in two sections. Section 2A makes general recommendations that identify issues that should be given provenance in the goals, objectives and activities of the Strategic Plan. Section 2B recommends a new mission for the Strategic Plan based around a 2050 vision and a 2020 target with a more effective framework of sub-targets, indicators and milestones linked to national reporting for the evaluation of progress.

2(a) GENERAL CONSIDERATIONS

i) Access and Benefit Sharing

Clearly, a post-2010 Strategic Plan needs to ensure the advancement of the 3 objectives of the Convention – conservation, sustainable use and access and benefit sharing. The perception that the conservation objective has been advancing relatively rapidly under the Convention while there has been little progress on sustainable use and especially benefit sharing from the use of genetic resources has created a polarization which is played out in protracted negotiations under the Convention and ultimately lack of buy-in and political will for its implementation. An effective way to resolve this situation is through high level dialogue (as proposed by the German government at COP 9) as well as bringing forward practical examples of benefit sharing in action. *Access and Benefit Sharing should be given high priority in the new Strategic Plan.*

ii) Mainstreaming Biodiversity

While there has been progress in the integration of biodiversity into some non-environmental sectors, a gap remains between political commitment and reality. *The Strategic Plan should prioritize supporting Parties efforts to:*

- *Communicate that integrating biodiversity conservation into relevant sectoral policies is fundamental to the long-term sustainability of those policies and support work to demonstrate practical ways to achieve this.*
- *Ensure individual work plans, action plans and budgets of relevant sectoral policies include biodiversity considerations.*
- *Promote clearer understanding of linkages between ecosystem services and human well-being including the economics of ecosystems and biodiversity*
- *Facilitate access to biodiversity information for key government decisions,*

- *Identify and measure the drivers of biodiversity loss relevant to specific sectors.*

iii) **Understanding ecosystem services and human well-being**

Biodiversity loss continues to take place ultimately because its public good value is not fully integrated into decision-making by governments or communities, nor is it captured by markets. This translates into uninformed exploitation and a lack of political will to effectively conserve and regulate the use of biodiversity resources.

Linking biodiversity to social and economic development remains an elusive goal of the CBD and the wider conservation community. If this situation is to be rectified then the foundation role of natural ecosystems for human wellbeing – covering a range of supporting, provisioning, regulating and cultural values - needs to be explicitly recognized in the future work of the Convention. By recognizing and communicating the role of biodiversity in delivering ecosystem services the Convention can offer a natural bridge between the environmental and development sectors. In the coming years the Convention needs to ensure that biodiversity and the services that flow from it are appropriately recognized, valued and that the costs of not conserving them are well understood by all sectors of government, as already called for in a number of CBD Programmes of Work.

Following the Heiligendamm Summit in June 2008 the G8+5 leaders agreed that: “In a global study we will initiate the process of analyzing the global economic benefit of biological diversity, the costs of the loss of biodiversity and the failure to take protective measures versus the costs of effective conservation.”. The first interim report, called TEEB¹ has been presented during the CBD COP 9 meeting held in Bonn and the complete study is scheduled for release in mid-2009. There are also many other existing studies which highlight the economic and other benefits of biodiversity to human wellbeing. *The post-2010 Strategic Plan should activities for following up to the TEEB and other studies including dissemination and packaging for specific audiences to promote mainstreaming.*

iv) **Identifying and measuring the drivers of biodiversity loss**

Many of the main drivers of biodiversity loss such as climate change, loss and degradation of habitat, overexploitation of fisheries and marine resources, invasive alien species, and illegal trade in wildlife are directly related to specific sectors of government such as forestry, fisheries, transport, energy etc. Therefore identifying and measuring the impact of these drivers at the national, regional and global level will assist with mainstreaming biodiversity into all sectors.

The new Strategic Plan should identify and address specific drivers, including policies and practices that result in biodiversity loss.

v) **Common factors of successful implementation**

A series of common factors of success can be identified from lessons learned in the implementation of the existing Strategic Plan and the Convention’s various Programmes of Work. Promoting the replication of these factors of success at the national and regional level could promote more effective implementation of the Convention. For example, drawing from experience with the Programme of Work on Protected Areas, common factors of success include the presence of: a) inter-agency and multi-stakeholder steering committees to coordinate implementation at national and regional levels; b) regional

¹ The Economics of Ecosystems & Biodiversity – Interim report, Pavan Sukhdev et al.

transboundary collaboration to share experience and lessons learned and plan transboundary approaches; c) funding incentives in the form of small (up to \$200,000) “Early Action Grants” to stimulate early action; and d) global inter-institutional collaboration between Parties, donors, and international NGOs, to coordinate support for implementation. *The new Strategic Plan should identify the common factors of success based on experience and promote mechanisms to replicate them to enable implementation at national, regional and global levels.*

vi) Linking to climate change mitigation and adaptation

The IPCC’s 4th Assessment Report concludes that human-induced climate change will be the most pervasive threat to biodiversity in forthcoming decades. Preventing biodiversity loss requires markedly scaled up efforts to mitigate and reverse global warming and to ensure that adaptation measures effectively enable ecosystems and species to cope with inevitable climate impacts. At the same time, biodiversity management can help us to achieve mitigation and adaptation goals.

The protection and restoration of intact natural ecosystems maintains and restores essential ecosystem services that can promote human resilience, especially for vulnerable communities, to the impacts of climate change. For example, rehabilitation and protection of wetlands provide essential and cost-effective protection to ecosystems and coastal communities from storm surges and sea level rise resulting from climate change, and act as an essential freshwater reservoir where climate change increases drought, while also significantly mitigating carbon emissions from existing degraded wetlands. Efforts to avoid deforestation and forest degradation could reduce emissions leading to global warming by 20%.

Recent CBD and UNFCCC decisions have further highlighted the linkages between biodiversity, climate change, and livelihoods. For example, CBD Decision IX/18 calls for increased consideration of the contributions of protected areas to climate mitigation and adaptation, while UNFCCC COP14 explicitly noted the contribution of biodiversity to solutions to the climate crisis. The CBD’s Ad Hoc Technical Expert Group on biodiversity and climate change is further stressing these linkages by identifying specific measures of progress and calling for action.

The Strategic Plan should ensure that the CBD:

- *Provides technical advice to the UNFCCC to ensure that biodiversity considerations are appropriately incorporated into UNFCCC decisions, as the CBD is currently doing through the ad hoc Technical Expert Group on biodiversity and climate change;*
- *Provides Parties and the UNFCCC with case studies and guidance that demonstrate the contribution of biodiversity conservation to climate change mitigation and adaptation activities;*
- *Develops suitable indicators in consultation with the IPCC that can help Parties to the CBD and UNFCCC to track their progress towards addressing climate change and its impacts on biodiversity. These indicators should also be designed to demonstrate how progress on biodiversity goals contributes to progress on climate goals.*

vii) Stronger science-policy links on biodiversity and ecosystem services

There is a need to strengthen the links between science and policy by providing appropriate and timely expert scientific expertise in the development and implementation of policies dealing with biodiversity and resulting ecosystem services that flow from a broad range of conservation efforts. *The post-2010 Strategic Plan should ensure that the mechanism proposed by the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES) to achieve stronger science-policy links on biodiversity and ecosystem services is adequately streamlined into the work of the Convention at national, regional and global levels..*

viii) Budgets & Financing

Investment in biodiversity conservation in most countries is less than 1% of the GDP. This illustrates that even though some significant commitments to save biodiversity have been made, biodiversity has not become a priority in national budgets. Making the economic case for biodiversity (see 2(a) iii above) should demonstrate how investing in biodiversity conservation can provide a return to the national economy, particularly by contributing to climate change adaptation and mitigation. *The post-2010 Strategic Plan should include a detailed strategy for financial and capacity support to insure more effective and timely implementation of the Convention. This strategy should be informed by common factors of success in implementing the CBD (see 2(a) v above).*

ix) Conservation and poverty reduction

The importance of biodiversity conservation and a healthy environment to the life and livelihoods of the poor is widely recognized. Many poor people are directly dependent on the various goods and services that biodiversity provides, benefit from using or marketing wild products for food, fuel, medicines, and shelter and derive important cultural and religious values from various elements of biodiversity. Indeed, the 2010 target indicates that reducing the rate of biodiversity loss should contribute ‘to poverty alleviation and to the benefit of all life on Earth.’ Unfortunately, progress in this area is lagging, in part due to ‘the inadequate mainstreaming of biodiversity in national development and poverty eradication strategies’². For this reason, mainstreaming biodiversity into other sectors (agriculture, forestry, fisheries, transport, energy, health, poverty reduction etc.) as noted above (section 2(a) ii) will help ensure that biodiversity conservation contributes to poverty reduction.

However, we must also recognize that activities designed to enhance biodiversity conservation have also resulted in unintended negative impacts for certain communities, not only from displacement or restrictions connected to protected areas, but also from incentive mechanisms such as PES, which are not always targeted to benefit the poor. These issues must be taken into consideration to ensure that benefits are equitably distributed.

In addition, we must continue to endeavour to ensure that poor communities are able and empowered to participate in the actual planning and decision-making for conservation opportunities that affect them. This will not only help to ensure equitable sharing of benefits and progress on poverty alleviation goals, but, in cases where those communities are also indigenous or local, it will support the implementation of Article 8(j) by contributing to the respect, preservation and maintenance of traditional knowledge, innovations and practices of indigenous and local communities relevant for conservation.

² Ad Hoc Open-Ended Working Group on Review of Implementation of the Convention

More effectively incorporating poverty alleviation into the new strategic plan will likely have mutual and compounding benefits. The relationship between poverty and biodiversity is complex: not only do the poor depend on biodiversity, poverty can be an obstacle to biodiversity conservation and indeed a driver of biodiversity loss. Addressing biodiversity conservation and poverty alleviation in harmony will, thus, facilitate progress in both areas.

The post-2010 Strategic Plan should make the linkage between biodiversity, human livelihoods and poverty reduction a major priority. It should adopt a goal which ensures that in situations where conservation activities affect people at the local level, those activities contribute to poverty reduction.

2(b) RECOMMENDATIONS FOR A POST-2010 BIODIVERSITY TARGET, VISION AND FRAMEWORK FOR EVALUATION OF PROGRESS

The 2010 Biodiversity Target and its Framework for Evaluation of Progress has been criticized for the following reasons:

- 1) the 2010 Biodiversity Target is technically worded and therefore difficult to communicate;
- 2) the 2010 Biodiversity Target does not have a baseline against which to measure progress and ‘a significant reduction in the current rate of biodiversity loss’ has not been defined;
- 3) the focal areas, Goals and sub-targets were not identified in a systematic manner e.g. to cover a complete set of drivers of biodiversity loss, or a complete set of biomes;
- 4) the Goals and sub-targets are not specific in what should be achieved – the most tangible sub-target being “at least 10% of each of the world’s ecological regions effectively conserved”;
- 5) The indicators identified for many focal areas, Goals and sub-targets are not ready for use. In many cases there were not any indicators available and the Convention only identified concepts for indicators and made recommendations for their development. Some indicators are still not available.
- 6) The 2010 target framework does not adequately tackle the drivers or root causes of biodiversity loss.
- 7) The targets and indicators were not systematically applied at the national level or included in national reporting so that quantifiable data can be included in national reports and rolled-up to the global level.

Any future targets and sub-targets must be measured using indicators of the state of global biodiversity, the drivers and pressures causing its decline, and the societal impacts and responses to biodiversity loss. Indicators must be relevant, cost effective and easily communicated, and any new targets should be measurable using those indicators.

Only a tiny fraction of all biomes, ecoregions and species are being monitored. The range of biodiversity that is covered by the existing indicators is far from complete, and we are particularly ignorant concerning tropical ecoregions, marine and freshwater biomes, and invertebrates. Addressing these knowledge gaps is essential. Only by monitoring the state of global biodiversity, the drivers that affect it, and the impact of interventions designed to protect it, will

we be able to identify and implement the most cost-effective and efficient responses to biodiversity loss.

The 2010 Biodiversity Target and its Framework for Evaluation of Progress should be substantially revised taking the following recommendations into consideration:

- i) **Building on existing work.** Given the amount of work dedicated to developing the 2010 Framework for Evaluation of Progress (CBD Decision VIII/15) of focal areas, sub-targets and indicators as well as incorporating the sub-targets into the Convention's seven programmes of work, efforts should be made to ensure that the new strategic plan builds on this framework, adding specificity and accountability. For example, the framework of the 7 focal areas could be retained but refined by developing a more effective set of sub-targets, milestones and indicators (see below).

Tremendous time and energy would go into re-negotiating Programmes of Work should the new strategic plan require them to be changed. Time and energy that could otherwise be invested in implementation. Therefore, Programmes of Work should be extended by adding 5 to 10 years to each timeline. Where supplementary guidance is necessary for implementation for programmes of work this could be developed through technical expert mechanisms, for example via the CBD Technical Series, rather than negotiated at significant expense through SBSTTAs or COPs.

- ii) **Timeline.** The Strategic Plan should adopt a long term inspiring vision along with a shorter term biodiversity target. A new biodiversity target with a timeline of 2020 would coincide with the likely timelines of the UNFCCC. This timeline has also been proposed by the UK's House of Commons Environmental Audit Committee in their report on the 2010 Biodiversity Target (10 November 2008). 2020 is also the timeline promoted at CBD COP 9 to halt net deforestation which was supported by 67 Parties. A long term inspiring vision to 2050 would provide strategic long term focus and planning guidance beyond 2020. See section 3 below for more specific recommendations on articulation of a new vision and target.
- iii) **Language.** The new target needs to be communicated to the general public. The 2010 Biodiversity Target is not easy to communicate to the public because the language is both technical and bureaucratic. The language of the new target should avoid jargon and be positive so that it is both inspiring and easy to communicate. Ideally communicators should be engaged at an early stage in the development of the new vision and target.
- iv) **Sub-targets.** A set of specific sub-targets timelines specific to given issues or biomes e.g. to halt deforestation should be identified under the 2020 biodiversity target. These could be linked to the focal areas and indicators of the 2010 Framework for Evaluation of Progress (CBD Decision VIII/15) but would replace the existing set of Goals and sub-targets. The new sub-targets should be measurable i.e. a specific baseline should be defined as well as an indicator to measure progress.
- v) **Time bound measures of progress.** The 2020 biodiversity target and sub-targets should have a set of measures of progress or 'milestones' on an annual or biannual basis against which progress could be measured at each meeting of the Conference of the Parties between 2010 and 2020. These measures should be a strategic set of annual or biannual targets that provide a roadmap for delivery on a specific sub-target. They should be a combination of process-orientated and outcome-orientated measures. The measures should be integrated into an effective and user-friendly reporting system for Parties (see paragraph ix below). The CBD Programme of Work on Protected Areas offers an illustration of the value of annual measures as it has strong timelines which have

provided governments with a structured workplan to reach the ultimate goal of well managed, financed and representative protected area systems by 2010 (on land)/2012 (in marine areas). This is one factor that explains why it is poised to be the most widely implemented programme of work of the CBD by 2010.

- vi) **Pressure State Response.** The 2020 biodiversity target framework for evaluation of progress should be based on the Pressure-State-Response (PSR) framework. PSR frameworks have proven their effectiveness and are widely implemented by the conservation community. Such a framework would measure:

- the pressure, root causes or drivers of biodiversity loss e.g. agricultural expansion, over consumption etc.
- the state of biodiversity including the rate of loss or increase using indicators such as the Living Planet Index, Red List Index and the Critical Habitat Protection indicator of the 2008 Environmental Performance Index , and
- the response of CBD Parties through the implementation of CBD decisions and other management responses.

A PSR framework would allow the Parties and the public to understand biodiversity loss, how it is being caused and how implementation of the CBD can solve the problem. A global PSR framework under the CBD needs to be mirrored in national reporting under the Convention.

- vii) **Drivers.** If the PSR framework is to be applied then a set of drivers or root causes of biodiversity loss, including policies and practices that result in biodiversity loss, should be identified based on the work of the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment.

- viii) **Monitoring and Rapid Response.** It is important that wherever possible the indicators use up-to-date (real time) data. Parties should encourage the establishment of appropriate monitoring schemes to help identify real on-going changes and the responses needed. This includes the updating of information on the extent, status and proposed changes to protected area systems, gaps and targets on land and in water on an appropriate basis, and leveraging resources to support such work.

- ix) **Reporting, indicators and drivers.** The CBD reporting system is cumbersome and results in a limited number of reports that are typically overly lengthy with content that is difficult to verify and vague to the point of lacking meaning. *The future strategic plan should aim to lighten the reporting burden and at the same time provide more verifiable/quantifiable information. National reporting should be based on the application of the 2020 biodiversity framework for evaluation of progress at the national level. This would involve Parties applying indicators to measure the pressure state and response to biodiversity loss at the national level. This information could then roll-up to the evaluation of progress at the global level under the PSR framework.* Some of the existing globally agreed indicators have already been applied at the national and regional level.

3. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE POST-2010 VISION, TARGET, AND FRAMEWORK FOR EVALUATION OF PROGRESS

As outlined in section 2B above the new Strategic Plan should include a 2050 vision as well as a 2020 Biodiversity Target. The parameters for development of the vision and target are outlined below in addition to some suggested text. In addition, as outlined in 2B above some examples of the sub-targets and milestones are outlined in the table in Annex 1.

3(a). 2050 Vision & 2020 Biodiversity Target

Both the 2050 Vision and 2020 Biodiversity Target should:

- Articulate the value of biodiversity for human wellbeing (supporting, provisioning, regulating and cultural) as well as its intrinsic value.
- Highlight the critical role of biodiversity in mitigating and adapting to climate change.
- Convey a sense of urgency.
- Stress the importance of equitable sharing of benefits from biodiversity
- Highlight the importance of mainstreaming biodiversity.
- Contain simple and inspiring language.

2050 Vision

The 2050 Vision should be specific enough statement to guide strategic planning beyond 2020. The following are suggestions for the text:

“The Vision of the post-2010 strategic plan is to ensure a healthy planet by 2050 that ensures the conservation of biodiversity for its own sake and for human wellbeing through the conservation and sustainable use of its components and the fair and equitable sharing of benefits arising from the use of genetic resources.”

2020 Target

Suggested text:

“By 2020, all Parties will have adopted measures across all relevant sectors that are meeting time-bound targets for biodiversity protection and restoration and that will result in no net loss”.

Or

“By 2020, to stop the loss of biodiversity in general, to start the recovery of key species and ecosystems, and to help biodiversity to adapt to climate change so that it continues to provide humanity with food, water, medicine, and protection from natural disasters.”

3(b). FRAMEWORK FOR EVALUATION OF PROGRESS

As outlined in section 2(b) the Framework for Evaluation of Progress for the post-2010 Strategic Plan should include a set of measurable sub-targets i.e. for which indicators already exist for measuring progress and for which a baseline can be defined. For each sub-target a set of timebound measures of progress should be established on an annual or bi-annual basis from 2010 to 2020. And the sub-targets and measures should be framed within a state pressure response framework linked to national reporting. Annex 1 below gives some examples of sub-targets and measure. The sub-targets, measures, indicators, and drivers should be identified by a group of experts (see section 4).

4. PROCESS FOR DEVELOPING A POST-2010 FRAMEWORK

It is clear that further analysis is required in the coming months to ensure strategic design of this framework. We recommend significant focus is given prior to SBSTTA-14 to propose a complete and user friendly set of sub-targets with science driven indicators, timebound measures of progress, and identify linkages with the Programmes of Work. The process to so identify this framework should include a series of technical meetings and background papers. The organizations contributing to this paper look forward to contributing to this process.

5. CONCLUSION

We further recommend the design of a post-2010 biodiversity framework that not only maintains the existing framework of 7 target focal areas and strengthens them with a more complete set of time bound and measurable sub-targets, but builds on past CBD Decisions to link to science driven indicators at both national and global levels. Furthermore, we recommend that progress on each sub-target is reviewed based on annual or bi-annual measures of progress. Finally, we recommend that all activities in all Programmes of Work be explicitly linked to at least one sub-target, thereby clarifying and consolidating CBD commitments into one framework that can be a useful resource to Parties in design and tracking progress on their National Biodiversity Action Plans.

ANNEX 1: Examples of Sub-targets, and Measures of Progress linked to the existing 7 Focal Areas--

Existing Target Focal Areas	Sub-Targets per Target Focal Area to be achieved by 2020 (<i>examples for further development</i>)	Measures of Progress (<i>examples for further development</i>)	Outcome
1. Reducing the rate of loss of the components of biodiversity, including: (i) biomes, habitats and ecosystems; (ii) species and populations; and (iii) genetic diversity;	1). Zero net deforestation by 2020, based on 2010 levels and zero conversion of HCV forests containing critical socio-environmental values including area storing critical masses of carbon. (Baseline for critical forests according to carbon storage should be jointly developed and committed to via UNFCCC).	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2012: All Parties have defined baselines and developed National Action Plans for achieving Zero Net Deforestation by 2020, including identification of their HCV areas with special consideration of carbon value. • 2012: Donors have action plans in place to support developing countries with National Action Plans to reduce (emissions from) deforestation and degradation. 	
	2). . . .		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2014: Net Deforestation is reduced by 40%
	3).		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2016: Net Deforestation is reduced by 60%
	4).		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 2018: Net Deforestation 80% reduced

Existing Target Focal Areas	Sub-Targets per Target Focal Area to be achieved by 2020 (<i>examples for further development</i>)	Measures of Progress (<i>examples for further development</i>)	
		Process	Outcome
3. Addressing the major threats to biodiversity, including those arising from invasive alien species, climate change, pollution, and habitat change;	1) Movement of invasive alien species mitigated and major pathways of introduction controlled Parties and regional organizations have strategies/action plans, institutional structures and capacity to manage threats from invasive alien species, in consistency with Decisions (<i>list them?</i>). 2) ... 3) ...	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2012: Guidance developed for major gaps and inconsistencies in the international framework for invasive alien species 	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2014: All Parties have invasive species plans in place to guide regional and national action 	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2016: Parties have management plans in place for priority invasive alien species 	
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2018: Parties have comprehensive national invasive alien species strategies and action plans in place nationally 	