

## **WCC-2016-Res-016-EN**

### **The IUCN Red List Index for monitoring extinction risk**

CELEBRATING the adoption of the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 and its 20 Aichi Targets, and the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs), especially SDG 15 "Protect, restore and promote sustainable use of terrestrial ecosystems, sustainably manage forests, combat desertification, halt and reverse land degradation, and halt biodiversity loss";

AWARE that meaningful targets must be accompanied by indicators to track progress and hold governments accountable;

ACKNOWLEDGING the efforts of the Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES), United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) Global Environmental Outlook (GEO), and CBD's Global Biodiversity Outlook (GBO), in undertaking regional, thematic, and global environmental assessments;

NOTING that for 50 years the IUCN Red List of Threatened Species has provided information on the status and trends of the world's species, underpinned by the IUCN Red List Categories and Criteria;

RECOGNISING that the Red List Partnership led the development of the Red List Index (RLI), which is now widely used to monitor trends in species' extinction risk, based only on genuine changes in status;

FURTHER NOTING that the RLI has been adopted as a primary indicator for measuring progress towards Aichi Target 12 and SDG Target 15.5, and can be disaggregated thematically for reporting against many other of the Aichi and SDG Targets;

AWARE of the considerable efforts being undertaken by countries in support of IUCN Resolution 5.018 *Support for the development and implementation of national and regional red lists* (Jeju, 2012) to undertake assessments at the national level and produce national RLIs;

CONCERNED that nearly half of all CBD Parties do not yet have a national Red List, and that few use evidence-based indicators for assessing progress against Target 12; and

WELCOMING efforts to disaggregate the global RLI to national and regional levels and thereby enable countries to report against Aichi Target 12 and SDG Target 15.5 even in the absence of national assessments, while continuing to support and build capacity for full National Red List assessments;

### **The World Conservation Congress, at its session in Hawai'i, United States of America, 1-10 September 2016:**

1. REQUESTS the IUCN Red List Partnership, SSC and Director General to ensure that the IUCN Red List incorporates repeat assessments of taxonomic groups in order to calculate RLIs, and makes these accessible online to facilitate their incorporation, as appropriate, into, *inter alia*:
  - a. National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans (NBSAPs), Programme of Work on Protected Areas (PoWPA) Action Plans, and CBD National Reports; and
  - b. regional, thematic, and global environmental assessments including those by IPBES, GEO, and GBO;
2. URGES IUCN Members, especially Government Agencies, reporting national progress against SDGs, Aichi Targets etc. to include, as appropriate, in national reports and NBSAPs data from the IUCN Red List and national RLIs based on disaggregation of these global data as a complement to those derived from National Red Lists where they exist;
3. FURTHER URGES IUCN Members, especially those involved in IPBES, GEO, GBO, and other intergovernmental environmental assessment processes to incorporate data from the

IUCN Red List, including taxonomic, geographic and thematic disaggregations of the RLI, in their respective assessments, and urges the IUCN Director General to encourage this;

4. URGES IUCN Members, including Government Agencies, and donors, to invest in the IUCN Red List and support the Red List Partnership to maintain and improve the data underpinning the RLI; and

5. ENCOURAGES the IUCN Red List Partnership and SSC to continue to develop the RLI methodology, including through refining methods for thematic and geographic disaggregation, calculating uncertainty, and projecting trends under alternative policy scenarios.