



The Strategic Plan for Migratory Species 2015-2023

March 2014

Contents

		Page
Chapter 1	Rationale.....	1
Chapter 2	Vision and Mission.....	3
Chapter 3	Strategic Goals and Targets.....	3
Chapter 4	Enabling Conditions for Implementation	7
Annex A	Correspondence between SPMS and Aichi Targets	11
Annex B	Indicative Strategic Plan Indicators.....	13

Chapter 1. Rationale

1.1 Background to the SPMS

At the Tenth Meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Migratory Species (CMS COP10; November 2011; Bergen, Norway), Parties resolved to prepare a new Strategic Plan for the period 2015-2023. COP8 had previously adopted a Plan for the period 2006-2011, which was extended by COP10 with minor changes to 2014, taking account of a review of implementation.

The end-date of the present Plan was agreed because it coincides with the CMS COP cycle and, more importantly, it allows time for a stock-take of progress during the UN Decade on Biodiversity. It also provides an opportunity to assess how the Strategic Plan for Migratory Species 2015-2023 (SPMS) has supported the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and its Aichi Biodiversity Targets.¹

A Strategic Plan Working Group (SPWG) was established with the task of drafting the Strategic Plan 2015-2023 for consideration by the Conference of the Parties at its 11th meeting.² The Working Group commissioned a more in-depth review of implementation experience to date, and took account of strategic planning processes in other multilateral environmental agreements. Two key recommendations emerged from its discussions:

- (1) The Strategic Plan for Biodiversity and its Aichi Biodiversity Targets would be used as a framework when developing the SPMS. This approach was taken to: keep the SPMS consistent with UN General Assembly resolutions on biodiversity³; link migratory species priorities to the relevant Aichi Targets; and provide a logical and effective way for migratory species targets to be integrated into National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans (NBSAPs), thereby ensuring they are part of national planning and priority-setting processes.
- (2) The new plan would be a Strategic Plan for Migratory Species (the SPMS) and would focus on migratory species, rather than on the Convention itself. This approach shifted the focus from the *institution* to the *issue*, thereby broadening relevance and “ownership” among the CMS “family” of instruments and beyond. This approach is also consistent with COP decisions regarding the CMS “Future Shape” process, which identified the need for a coordinated and coherent approach to migratory species conservation among CMS and its daughter agreements.

Migratory species have distinct conservation needs, associated in particular with their spatio-temporal cycles and transnational migration patterns. Conservation of migratory species at the population level can only be achieved by coordinated and cooperative international action between the range States that share these populations on their migration routes. These States and other relevant stakeholders therefore share a joint responsibility to develop and implement coherent strategies. That responsibility may include activities such as collaboration to, *inter alia*, ensure free and open access to relevant data, information and models, so as to provide sound scientific grounding for decisions relating to migratory species. Overall it demands the taking of a *migratory systems approach*, which by its very nature is a strategic consideration - involving joint international cooperative efforts, linking species- and ecosystem-based approaches at national levels, coordinated across a migratory range.

¹ See Convention on Biological Diversity (2010). Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and the Aichi Biodiversity Targets. Annexed to CBD COP10 Decision X/2.

² CMS COP10 Resolution 10.5, CMS Strategic Plan 2015–2023.

³ For example, Resolution 67/212 where the General Assembly: “Notes the efforts to mainstream the Aichi Biodiversity Targets in the contribution of the United Nations system to support the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011–2020, and invites the United Nations system to continue facilitating cooperation among its members in support of the implementation of the Strategic Plan.” This also has relevance, among other things, to the UN’s post-2015 Sustainable Development Goals.

Since 1979, the Convention on Migratory Species has provided the primary specialised intergovernmental framework for this⁴, through its agreements, action plans and other systematic instruments.

This SPMS therefore does not merely duplicate the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity, but complements it by adding the necessary specificity for and focus on these issues within the context of the CMS Family.

1.2 Why are migratory species a global priority?

Migratory species are a major component of biodiversity in general, underpinning ecological systems. Many different groups of animals are involved, from antelopes to fish, from whales to elephants, from bats to birds and even butterflies. They form a significant proportion of the world's genetic variety, having evolved in particularly intricate interrelationships with plant and other animal species; and they play essential roles in ecosystem functioning and dynamics. Their multidimensional connectedness gives them a special role as ecological keystone species and indicators of the linkages between ecosystems and of ecological change.

These same attributes mean that migratory species have their own special vulnerabilities. Migratory journeys expose them to heightened survival risks, and habitat requirements are often a complex mix of different components in breeding areas, non-breeding areas, and the places in between. Concentrations of large numbers of individuals during specific periods at specific sites, also increases the risk of serious impacts from negative pressures at those sites. Barriers to migration pose special challenges, whether or not in the form of physical obstacles, which may cause direct mortality, or fragmentation of ecological resources disrupting movement from one place to another.

Conservation strategies therefore need to give holistic attention not only to populations, species and habitats, but to the entire span of migratory routes and the functioning of the migration process. Many of the actions defined in this Plan are accordingly directed towards "migratory systems"; a concept which reflects the interdependent complexes of places, routes between places, populations, ecological factors and temporal cycles involved.

The repeating cycles and trans-boundary ranges inherent to the phenomenon of migration are fundamental to the ability of the planet to support humankind and biodiversity overall. Migration is a key adaptation to natural rhythms and evolutionary changes; and by the same token both migratory species and their habitats can be affected/disrupted by human impacts, including climate change.

A great many migratory species are of major direct and indirect importance for people's food security and livelihoods. Many human communities rely on the regular influx of migratory animals: as a basis for subsistence; for economically and/or culturally important hunting, fishing, tourism and recreation; or to maintain ecosystem function in a way that allows another resource to be harvested. Levels of use by one community can significantly affect availability of the resource to communities in different, possibly distant, locations. The conservation and sustainable use of migratory species is therefore a key contribution to wider aims of sustainable development and requires global attention.

1.3 Scope of the SPMS

The Working Group decided that the SPMS would attract more political traction and visibility by restricting its content to *strategy*. Activities that concern *implementation* – an essential

⁴ Recognition of this is enshrined for example in cooperation agreements with other Conventions; and in the case of the CBD also by CBD COP Decision VI/20 (2002) which recognises CMS as "the lead partner in conserving and sustainably using migratory species".

component of a successful and effective Strategic Plan – are compiled in a separate Companion Volume⁵ to support the implementation of the Plan.

The SPMS defines long-term and high-level outcomes in a way that allows progress toward them to be tracked and evaluated, and course-corrections to be applied as necessary.

The migratory systems approach taken is reflected in the SPMS by clear references to: (1) migratory species; (2) their habitats and migratory routes; and (3) threats to both. All elements are included in the targets to the extent possible.

The SPMS is designed to apply to **migratory species as defined by the Convention, i.e. the entire population or any geographically separate part of the population of any species or lower taxon of wild animals, a significant proportion of whose members cyclically and predictably cross one or more national jurisdictional boundaries**. This definition reflects the importance of concerted international action necessary to address trans-boundary challenges associated with the conservation of migratory species. In addition, it invites meaningful engagement by all interested stakeholders – including CMS and its daughter instruments. The word “species” where it occurs in this Plan should be interpreted in line with the same definition, meaning that such references may apply to lower taxonomic levels when the context so requires.

The SPMS is broad enough to harness all related migratory species conservation efforts in the same direction, and in doing so, creates opportunities for greater coherence and visibility in policy and political terms for these issues.

[Diagram to be inserted showing the Relationship between the SPMS and other relevant frameworks & processes]

Chapter 2. Vision and Mission

The purpose of the Strategic Plan for Migratory Species is to provide vision, leadership, and a driving force toward the full and effective implementation of commitments related to migratory species.

This SPMS aims to achieve the following vision:

“Living in harmony with nature – where populations and habitats of migratory species (along with all biodiversity) are valued, conserved, restored and wisely used, thereby contributing to global sustainability.”

The following Mission guides the implementation of this Plan:

“To promote actions to ensure the favourable conservation status of migratory species and their habitats, and to ensure the ecological integrity, connectivity and resilience of these habitats.”

Chapter 3. Strategic Goals and Targets

The five goals articulated below express strategic outcomes of this Plan. These include conservation outcomes and ways to measure them. Operational detail to support implementation is provided in a Companion Volume (see section 4 below).

⁵ Consultation Note: this Companion Volume is yet to be prepared.

Under each goal, performance targets are provided that specify the scale and nature of the main tangible shifts required in each case. The purpose of the targets is to define priorities and to clarify what constitutes successful performance. Where applicable, this includes a quantifiable standard. Broadly derived from the Aichi Biodiversity Targets in the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity – so as to facilitate coherence with biodiversity-related activities (see **Annex A**) and support efforts during the UN Decade of Biodiversity – the SPMS goals and targets have been drafted to contribute to the objectives of the CMS instruments, retain a clear identity, and reflect the needs of migratory species. This means that each one has been independently re-examined in the context of conditions existing in 2014, and is based on judgements about achievability and the specific priority needs of migratory species in this context.

Nothing in this Plan shall be taken to dilute or reduce the commitments represented by the Aichi Biodiversity Targets. In general, each target should be achieved at global level within the timeframe set for the corresponding Aichi Target (see Annex A), where applicable. Individual governments may wish to set earlier deadlines for some or all of the targets according to their national circumstances. Adoption of specific national plans of action may assist in elaborating such matters.

Sub-targets

Certain key contributions to the delivery of the targets in this Plan can be defined in the form of subsidiary targets, addressing specific issues. In some cases, more specific aspects of a given target may be sufficiently well-defined (e.g., under one of the CMS daughter instruments) so it is possible to distil specific sub-targets.

One important category of these relates to actions which will be or are undertaken in the context of one or more of the CMS “family” of Agreements, Memoranda of Understanding and Action Plans. Such actions are for the governing bodies of those instruments to adopt; and are distinguished from the rest of the Plan in that respect. They are therefore noted in [DocumentINF] by way of supporting information, and in order to encourage an integrated approach to implementation of the Plan across the family of instruments.

This picture will evolve, and further sub-targets are likely to be agreed in their own respective contexts. [Document... INF] is therefore designed to be an open-ended list which will be updated from time to time. There is no implication that a sub-target necessarily needs to be defined in respect of any particular SPMS target or any particular instrument. Conversely, the sub-targets given at any one time do not necessarily represent the totality of commitments that may exist or may further need to be defined at this level.

Indicators

Core measurable indicators are included to track and account for progress towards the achievement of the targets. These are shown in **Annex B**, and are based on indicators devised for use with the corresponding Aichi Targets. Details on indicators (including achievement milestones) can be found in the implementation Companion Volume.

Goal 1: Address the underlying causes of decline of migratory species by mainstreaming relevant conservation and sustainable use priorities across government and society

Target 1: People are aware of the multiple values of migratory species and their habitats and migratory systems, and the steps they can take to conserve them and ensure the sustainability of any use.

Note: “Awareness” here is intended to be more than passive, and to include positive support and engagement at political levels, as well as among the public.

Target 2: Multiple values of migratory species and their habitats have been integrated into international, national, and local development and poverty reduction strategies and planning processes, and are being incorporated into national accounting, as appropriate, and reporting systems.

Note: Actions towards this SPMS target may also contribute to SPMS target 13.

Target 3: National, regional, and international governance arrangements and agreements affecting migratory species and their migratory systems have improved significantly, making relevant policy, legislative and implementation processes more coherent, accountable, transparent, participatory, equitable and inclusive.

Note: Reference to governance “affecting” migratory species here indicates that this is not limited only to conservation governance, but extends to other levels/sectors that may also have an effect.

Target 4: Incentives, including subsidies, harmful to migratory species, and/or their habitats are eliminated, phased out or reformed in order to minimize or avoid negative impacts, and positive incentives for the conservation of migratory species and their habitats are developed and applied, consistent with engagements under the CMS and other relevant international obligations and commitments.

Note: The precise approach to this will vary, in some cases sub-nationally, according to specific local circumstances.

Goal 2: Reduce the direct pressures on migratory species and their habitats

Target 5: Governments, key sectors and stakeholders at all levels have taken steps to achieve or have implemented plans for sustainable production and consumption, keeping the impacts of natural resource use on migratory species well within safe ecological limits to promote the favourable conservation status of migratory species and maintain the quality, integrity, resilience, and connectivity of their habitats and migratory routes.

Note: Where there is uncertainty about what constitutes a “safe ecological limit” in a given case, a precautionary approach should be taken.

Target 6: Fisheries and hunting have no significant direct or indirect adverse impacts on migratory species, their habitats or their migration routes, and impacts of fisheries and hunting are within safe ecological limits.

Note: Achievement of this target will require that migratory species are managed and harvested sustainably, legally and through the use of ecosystem-based approaches. Overexploitation of migratory species must be avoided, and recovery plans and measures should be in place for all depleted species. Where there is uncertainty about what constitutes a “safe ecological limit” in a given case, a precautionary approach should be taken.

Target 7: Multiple anthropogenic pressures have been brought to levels that are not detrimental to the conservation of migratory species or to the functioning, integrity, ecological connectivity and resilience of their habitats.

Note: The pressures concerned may include those relating to climate change, renewable energy developments, power lines, by-catch, underwater noise, ship strike, poisoning, pollution, disease, invasive species, illegal and unsustainable take, and marine debris.

Goal 3: Improve the conservation status of migratory species and the ecological connectivity and resilience of their habitats

Target 8: The conservation status of threatened migratory species has considerably improved throughout their range.

Note: Actions towards this SPMS target may also contribute to SPMS target 11.

Target 9: International action and cooperation between States for the conservation and effective management of migratory species fully reflects a migratory systems approach, in which all States sharing responsibility for the species concerned engage in such actions in a concerted way.

Note: The Convention on Migratory Species emphasises that “conservation and effective management of migratory species of wild animals require the concerted action of all States within the national jurisdictional boundaries of which such species spend any part of their life cycle”. This would include the necessary capacity building as a key component of trans-boundary cooperation. Target 9 seeks more complete engagement by all of the States who share joint responsibility in such circumstances.

Target 10: All key habitats and sites for migratory species are identified and included in area-based conservation measures so as to maintain their quality, integrity, resilience and functioning in accordance with the implementation of Aichi Target 11.

Note: Aichi Target 11 states that “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”.

Goal 4: Enhance the benefits to all from the favourable conservation status of migratory species

Target 11: Migratory species and their habitats which provide important ecosystem services are maintained at or restored to favourable conservation status, taking into account the needs of women, indigenous and local communities⁶, and the poor and vulnerable.

Note: The services concerned may include water supply, quality and regulation; disaster risk reduction; climate regulation; cultural services; food and other socio-economic benefits, all contributing to people’s health, livelihoods and well-being. Actions towards this SPMS target may also contribute to SPMS target 8.

Target 12: The genetic diversity of wild populations of migratory species is safeguarded, and strategies have been developed and implemented for minimizing genetic erosion.

Note: Safeguarding actions may include maintenance of the original gene pool for migratory species that are managed under human care for re-introduction into the wild and other purposes, or are otherwise of socio-economic as well as cultural value.

Goal 5: Enhance implementation through participatory planning, knowledge management and capacity building

Target 13: Priorities for effective management and conservation of migratory species and migratory systems have been included in the development and implementation of national biodiversity strategies and action plans, where relevant, with reference to regional CMS agreements and action plans and their regional implementation bodies.

⁶ At the time of adopting this Plan, terminology for referring to indigenous people/peoples and local communities is under debate in other intergovernmental contexts. The wording in this Plan should not be taken to favour any one terminology over another.

Note: Other types of national plans and strategies, such as those for the implementation of other Multilateral Environmental Agreements or national development plans, may also be highly relevant. Even if they are not designed overtly to have biodiversity-related purposes, plans for issues such as land use, resource use, environmental health, disaster risk reduction, infrastructure distribution and economic development can include provisions that make an important difference to migratory species conservation. Actions towards this SPMS target may also contribute to SPMS target 2.

Target 14: The traditional knowledge, innovations and practices of indigenous and local communities relevant for the conservation and sustainable use of migratory species, their habitats and migratory systems, and their customary sustainable use of biological resources, are respected, subject to national legislation and relevant international obligations, with the full and effective participation of indigenous and local communities, thereby contributing to the favourable conservation status of migratory species and the ecological connectivity and resilience of their habitats.

Note: This target reflects international thinking on the subject in other fora.

Target 15: The science base, information, awareness, understanding and technologies relating to migratory species, their habitats and migratory systems, their value, functioning, status and trends, and the consequences of their loss, are improved, widely shared and transferred, and effectively applied.

Note: The “science base” here does not relate only to new research and monitoring, but also to making better use of existing datasets, and improving the standardization of data collection protocols. In addition to investigation and understanding of specific events, phenomena, patterns and consequences, greater efforts may also be required to improve data on baseline conditions, so that meaningful assessments of significance, and assessments of change, can be made.

Target 16: The mobilization of adequate resources from all sources to effectively implement the Strategic Plan for Migratory Species has increased substantially.

Note: This target refers to resource mobilisation in the broad sense including international and domestic funding from public, private and other sources. It however also implies policy choices that reduce the costs of repairing damage to migratory species and thus also benefits from the correct implementation of Goals 1 and 2. Developing countries, least developed countries, small island developing States and countries with economies in transition have particularly acute needs in this regard. Resource flows to as well as within these countries need to increase, both through “north-south” and “south-south” cooperation.

Chapter 4. Enabling Conditions for Implementation

The successful achievement of the SPMS objectives depends on the commitment and engagement of Parties and other stakeholders. The SPMS was designed to maximise high-level political engagement with the issue, and real impact will come from the willingness and commitment of all concerned to be imaginative, positive, collaborative, and determined to realize the adopted vision through their everyday actions in practice.

This needs to be supported by a range of organizational arrangements and implementation measures. Building on lessons learned from the 2012 review of the 2006-2014 CMS Strategic Plan, the present chapter describes the main areas in which suitable high-level conditions need to be created in order to *enable* the range of implementation measures required. This covers, in particular: delivery mechanisms, supporting infrastructure, and performance assessment. In each of these areas a minimum level of human, technical and financial resources will be required if this plan is to succeed. To this end, the suggestions below should assist governmental and non-governmental actors to translate and integrate the global targets into their specific regional and national contexts.

More detailed guidance on the practical dimensions related to the implementation of the SPMS by all concerned stakeholders is provided in the Companion Volume on Implementation which accompanies this Strategic Plan. That Companion Volume is intended to help both country experts and other stakeholders to put in place and execute the necessary means of implementation towards reaching the goals and objectives of the SPMS.

1) Outreach, promotion and uptake of the Plan

The SPMS and its issues will be promoted by the entire CMS Family and CMS channels in order to raise awareness of the Plan and effect implementation of the Targets.

2) The delivery framework

The Convention and the CMS Family of agreements have a specific role as a primary delivery framework for the SPMS, as well as their subsidiary bodies and national focal points.

Existing delivery mechanisms and activities include among others relevant CMS Family decisions, sub-strategies, guidelines and programmes supporting the SPMS, including priorities for development of future CMS instruments and initiatives.

The SPMS should furthermore guide the COP when developing new instruments and tools to support the individual Targets

3) Key partnerships and other supporting delivery frameworks

Key partnerships to support delivery of the SPMS include those with other Conventions, civil society, the private sector, regional bodies, and more. A wide range of civil society organizations and other stakeholders make an invaluable contribution to implementing the Convention and conserving migratory species. This large amount of work is often facilitated by governmental processes, and could usefully be reported by governments at the national and international levels.

4) Capacity development

The CMS Family, Parties and stakeholders need to address capacity building needs relating to information, awareness, knowledge and understanding as covered in the strategic targets. This is supported in particular by implementation of the CMS Capacity Building Strategy. A further step in this direction is capacity development using the Manual for the National Focal Points for CMS and its Instruments - a capacity building tool to guide the NFPs of CMS and its instruments on their roles and responsibilities, helping them to make a more effective contribution to implementation.

5) Resourcing

While resourcing is needed to implement the SPMS, not every action costs money. In fact, some of the principles of efficiency and partnership espoused by this Plan allow financial savings to be made in some areas. At the same time, total global funds currently committed to migratory species conservation are insufficient to achieve the full suite of goals and targets expressed in this Plan. Creative mobilisation of additional resources is required.

What matters about resource mobilization for biodiversity in the end is the amount of funding available for biodiversity.

⇒ Increased funding

This depends on increasing the total amount of resources made available for biodiversity both domestically and internationally, from a variety of sources. This can be done through increased allocations towards biodiversity activities but also through enhancing biodiversity

aspects in sectoral policies and better engaging all actors, including key production sectors and the private sector.

Increased/available funding also depends on the effectiveness and sustainability of international and national financial flows for biodiversity. This needs the necessary institutional, national, administrative and managerial capacities to ensure the enabling environment for more effective and sustainable use of resources and to mobilize private and public-sector investments.

⇒ Reduced costs

Furthermore, the challenge of mobilising resources is certainly also about reducing the need for more resources in the first place. The need for resources for the Targets depends highly on the policy choices made by key sectors. Different costing scenarios are therefore possible, depending on the sectoral policies. If less biodiversity is impacted negatively by national, regional and/or global policies, then fewer resources will be needed to protect or restore it. Examples from key sectors such as forestry, fisheries, agriculture, and so on show that win-win situations for both the sector and biodiversity are possible and even desirable when considered under a medium to long-term perspective. Integration of migratory species issues in sector policies can support sustainable development and a more stable long term basis.

Target 16 addresses this at headline level. It should be supported in particular by implementation of the Resource Mobilisation Strategy adopted under the Convention on Biological Diversity (COP 9 Decision IX/11, 2008) and the associated targets agreed by COP11 in 2012 in Decision XI/4.

With the engagement of champions, ambassadors, philanthropists, and skilled public relations specialists, the evocative cause of migratory species lends itself well to fundraising efforts at all levels. Guided by the SPMS, specific implementation activities may be clustered into appealing regional or thematic programme for this purpose, or advertised in portfolios of costed projects.

“Capacity” in the broadest sense is covered under a separate item; it is closely related to essential forms of resourcing that go beyond questions of funding. “In-kind” support from the voluntary efforts of individuals and civil society at large can be expected to make a major contribution to scientific research, surveillance, awareness-raising, and other areas of implementation. Innovations in knowledge management and information technology will also substantially increase the power of what can be done with available financial resources.

6) Monitoring and evaluation; including indicators, milestones and feedback to the sub-strategies, as well as headline measures of success by which overall success of the SPMS may be judged

The SPMS defines expected long-term and high-level outcomes in a way that allows the assessment of progress and results. Setting a direction is meaningless, if not followed by: evaluations of implementation; assessments of on-the-ground impacts; and calculations of ‘return on investment’. In addition, a system of learning and adaptive management should be integral to the system.

To this end, **Annex B** outlines the scope of existing or planned indicators that should (to varying degrees) track progress toward individual SPMS targets. Further detail on these indicators is provided in the Companion Volume. To be credible, the monitoring and evaluation regime will need to be thorough, transparent, and trustworthy, with a clear (and plausible) sense of the logic of expected causal pathways between activities, outcomes, and impacts. Robustness and quality in this area may even be a way of providing some of the strength that most biodiversity-related conventions lack through the absence of compliance mechanisms.

In addition to target-by-target evaluation, it is expected that principal institutions (such as the CMS COP) will endeavour to evaluate overarching headline measures of success by which the overall success of this Plan may be judged as a whole.

7) Reporting on and review of progress at national level and by COP

The SPMS provides goals, yet is also part of a revolving cycle of feedback and adaptive management. Using information from indicators, the SPMS should provide a means toward efficient, effective, and meaningful reporting.

National reporting cycles provide one means by which progress against the SPMS can be measured. These reports can help build a picture of progress toward achievement of the goals and targets of the SPMS, and can highlight areas for attention. Continued development of harmonised on-line reporting systems, as well as information provided by NGOs and civil society, will be important in this regard.

Annex A. Correspondence between SPMS and Aichi Targets

SPMS	Aichi Targets
Target 1	Aichi Target 1: By 2020, at the latest, people are aware of the values of biodiversity and the steps they can take to conserve and use it sustainably.
Target 2	Aichi Target 2: By 2020, at the latest, biodiversity values have been integrated into national and local development and poverty reduction strategies and planning processes and are being incorporated into national accounting, as appropriate, and reporting systems.
Target 3	None
Target 4	Aichi Target 3: By 2020, at the latest, incentives, including subsidies, harmful to biodiversity are eliminated, phased out or reformed in order to minimize or avoid negative impacts, and positive incentives for the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity are developed and applied, consistent and in harmony with the Convention and other relevant international obligations, taking into account national socio-economic conditions.
Target 5	Aichi Target 4: By 2020, at the latest, Governments, business and stakeholders at all levels have taken steps to achieve or have implemented plans for sustainable production and consumption and have kept the impacts of use of natural resources well within safe ecological limits. Aichi Target 7: By 2020 areas under agriculture, aquaculture and forestry are managed sustainably, ensuring conservation of biodiversity.
Target 6	Aichi Target 6: By 2020 all fish and invertebrate stocks and aquatic plants are managed and harvested sustainably, legally and applying ecosystem based approaches, so that overfishing is avoided, recovery plans and measures are in place for all depleted species, fisheries have no significant adverse impacts on threatened species and vulnerable ecosystems and the impacts of fisheries on stocks, species and ecosystems are within safe ecological limits
Target 7	Aichi Target 8: By 2020, pollution, including from excess nutrients, has been brought to levels that are not detrimental to ecosystem function and biodiversity. Aichi Target 9: By 2020, invasive alien species and pathways are identified and prioritized, priority species are controlled or eradicated, and measures are in place to manage pathways to prevent their introduction and establishment. Aichi target 10: By 2015, the multiple anthropogenic pressures on coral reefs, and other vulnerable ecosystems impacted by climate change or ocean acidification are minimized, so as to maintain their integrity and functioning.
Target 8	Aichi Target 12: By 2020 the extinction of known threatened species has been prevented and their conservation status, particularly of those most in decline, has been improved and sustained.
Target 9	None
Target 10	Aichi Target 5: By 2020, the rate of loss of all natural habitats, including forests, is at least halved and where feasible brought close to zero, and degradation and fragmentation is significantly reduced. Aichi Target 11: 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.
Target 11	Aichi Target 14: By 2020, ecosystems that provide essential services, including services related to water, and contribute to health, livelihoods and well-being, are restored and safeguarded, taking into account the needs of women, indigenous and local communities, and the poor and vulnerable. Aichi Target 15: By 2020, ecosystem resilience and the contribution of biodiversity to carbon stocks has been enhanced, through conservation and restoration, thereby contributing to climate change mitigation and adaptation and to combating desertification.

Target 12	Aichi Target 13: By 2020, the genetic diversity of cultivated plants and farmed and domesticated animals and of wild relatives, is maintained, and strategies have been developed and implemented for minimizing genetic erosion and safeguarding their genetic diversity.
Target 13	Aichi Target 17: By 2015 each Party has developed, adopted as a policy instrument, and has commenced implementing an effective, participatory and updated national biodiversity strategy and action plan
Target 14	Links to Aichi Target 18: By 2020, the traditional knowledge, innovations and practices of indigenous and local communities relevant for the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity, and their customary use of biological resources, are respected, subject to national legislation and relevant international obligations, and fully integrated and reflected in the implementation of the Convention with the full and effective participation of indigenous and local communities, at all relevant levels.
Target 15	Aichi Target 19: By 2020, knowledge, the science base and technologies relating to biodiversity, its values, functioning, status and trends, and the consequences of its loss, are improved, widely shared and transferred, and applied.
Target 16	<p>Aichi Target 20: By 2020, at the latest, the mobilization of financial resources for effectively implementing the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 from all sources, and in accordance with the consolidated and agreed process in the Strategy for Resource Mobilization, should increase substantially from the current levels.</p> <p>CBD Resource Mobilization Strategy (COPIX/11) and the resource mobilization target (COPXI/4§7): <i>“Double total biodiversity-related international financial resource flows to developing countries, in particular least developed countries and small island developing States, as well as countries with economies in transition, by 2015 and at least maintaining this level until 2020, in accordance with Article 20 of the Convention, to contribute to the achievement of the Convention’s three objectives, including through a country-driven prioritization of biodiversity within development plans in recipient countries, using the preliminary baseline referred to in paragraph 6.</i>”</p>

Annex B. Indicative Strategic Plan Indicators

A central part of the monitoring & evaluation regime for the Strategic Plan for Migratory Species is a suite of headline indicators, used to track progress towards the achievement of the goals and targets. The selection of appropriate measures for these is not simply a matter of identifying issues on which data can be generated, but involves careful thought as to the ability ultimately to generate adequate “storylines” on the success or otherwise of the Plan in securing genuinely strategic outcomes and real impacts for migratory species, rather than just indicators of process implementation.

Given that the SPMS has built upon the Aichi Targets in the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity, indicators already defined in support of the latter provide much of the basis for the measures identified here.

A primary source has therefore been the suite of indicators defined in 2011 by an Ad-Hoc Technical Expert Group (AHTEG) under the Convention on Biological Diversity, and reflected subsequently in the annex to CBD COP Decision XI/3 (October 2012). The AHTEG developed 12 headline indicator titles, each of which typically relates to several Aichi Targets. At a more specific level, it developed 97 operational indicators, for each of which a “most relevant Aichi Target” was identified.

In tandem with this process, the global Biodiversity Indicators Partnership (BIP) has classified its indicator list against the Aichi Targets. At the time of adoption of this Plan there were [29] BIP indicators.

One of the targets of the Strategic Plan for Migratory Species (target 3 on governance) has no direct Aichi equivalent; and some other issues go a little beyond existing biodiversity indicator regimes, such as ecological networks and factors affecting the migration process. Otherwise there has been no strong need to define new indicator topics, and the indicators listed below (elaborated in more detail in the Companion Volume on Implementation) are based on relating the AHTEG operational indicators and the BIP indicators to each of the targets in the SPMS, according to their links to relevant Aichi targets. Further work is needed to elaborate a “migratory species disaggregation” of the relevant existing or already-proposed biodiversity indicators, and in most cases to operationalize this.

The indicative list below identifies a priority selection of headline indicators that could be used (following further development, where necessary) to track progress towards achievement of the targets in the Migratory Species Strategic Plan.

SPMS Target	Headline Indicator
Target 1:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Trends in awareness and attitudes to migratory species
Target 2:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Trends in integration of migratory species values in national and sectoral policies.
Target 3:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> (Governance-related indicator on CMS implementation).
Target 4:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> (None).
Target 5:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Status of migratory species in trade. Wild Commodities Index for migratory animals.

Target 6:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proportion of migratory fish stocks in safe biological limits.
Target 7:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Trends in threats to migratory species.
Target 8:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Red List Index for migratory species. • Living Planet Index for migratory species. • Wild Bird Index for migratory birds. • Trends in distribution of migratory species.
Target 9:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • (Indicator based on range-related coverage of migratory species agreements and other concerted actions between States)
Target 10:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Trends in conservation status, including connectivity, of identified habitats of key importance for migratory species. • Coverage of key habitats for migratory species in protected areas. • Management effectiveness of areas protected specifically for migratory species.
Target 11:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Trends in delivery of ecosystem services directly dependent on migratory species.
Target 12:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Trends in genetic diversity of selected species.
Target 13:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Trends in integration of migratory species concerns in National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans.
Target 14:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Trends in the degree to which traditional knowledge and practices are respected through: full integration, participation and safeguards in national implementation of the Strategic Plan for Migratory Species.
Target 15:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Number of validated publications on migratory species conservation actively disseminated for policy-relevant use.
Target 16:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Aggregated international flows of funding, per annum, for achieving the goals of the Strategic Plan for Migratory Species. • Amount of domestic financial support provided, per annum, to support those domestic activities which are intended to achieve the goals of the Strategic Plan for Migratory Species.