



Meeting 3

JNCC-NGO Overseas Territories and Crown Dependencies Group

12th September 2014

To find more about JNCC's OT and CD programme visit:

<http://jncc.defra.gov.uk/default.aspx?page=4079>

Proposed priority conservation actions for the UKOTs/CDs – August 2014

Collated by UK Overseas Territories Conservation Forum

Process

The second JNCC/NGOs joint meeting on UKOTs/CDs was keen to collect first views on candidate items to include in a shared framework of priorities for support from Britain-based bodies to UKOTs/CDs. We agreed to use the classification emerging from UKOTCF's 2011 workshop; this combined Aichi Targets, Environment Charter commitments and progress, UK Government Strategy, and some initial ideas from the workshop, into 23 extended targets.

UKOTCF is grateful to all the organisations which supplied proposals for the priorities. We have not changed proposals received except to put them in a common format. Also, in a few cases and usually to conserve space, we have added other information, which is always indicated by square parentheses.

The table is inevitably not easy reading, although we have spent some time trying to simplify this without distorting the individual submissions. Several general comments can be made on these priorities. We make these comments below, before the tabulation of proposed priorities. Of course, others may have additional thoughts, but we hope that these initial ones aid discussion.

Overview

Inevitably, the proposals received were at a range of strategic scales and time-frames. As one would expect from efficiently designed projects, most also address a range of the extended Aichi targets, rather than single ones. We have ordered these generally according to the dominant target within each proposal. We have tried to group proposed priorities within related sets of dominant targets, and listed the main targets before each section.

Not surprisingly, the emphasis is on activities in progress or planned by the partners who kindly submitted items, in some cases emphasising the work on which they are concentrating within the next year. Others have tended to try to address wider issues, not limited to their own organisations, including wider strategic targets which they think should be moved towards by various combinations of players. In part, these reflect information gleaned from partner organisations in the UKOTs and CDs. Yet others have taken approaches in between. Despite these challenges, we think that this is a helpful start. It should help both prevent duplication of work already in progress and identify areas where further collaboration might be beneficial. It may also help identify gaps which are not being addressed at present but which should be. The contributors to the present document are all NGOs (although some include ideas from UKOT or CD governmental bodies which are parts of their networks). The other documents, which JNCC agreed at the second meeting to prepare, may complement the present document.

We have not attempted, in the short time available and with limited resources, to collate priorities identified by bodies in UKOTs and CDs (except where they have advised us during normal contacts) as, even where available, these are spread through a large number of dispersed documents. We did look at the latest systematic review of the conservation priorities set by territories themselves. This was undertaken by UKOTCF in the early 1990s, partly with support from the first round of the Darwin Initiative. In the limited time available, we have not attempted to reanalyse the identified conservation priorities of 14-19 years ago in the same format as the main part of the present paper. However, a look through these is instructive, and we include some notes on this at the end of the present paper. Two main points emerge. First, there is a very high degree of similarity in the priorities of nearly 20 years ago with those of the present time. Second, whilst significant progress has been made in several cases in several territories, the vast majority the needs identified nearly 20 years ago remain needs today.

Collated conservation priorities

Short title	Target/ Source	Basis of importance	Reasons for urgency	Current risks	Current opportunities	Barriers to progress	Territory plan links	Current progress
Strategic Goal A: Address the underlying causes of biodiversity loss by mainstreaming biodiversity across government and society								
Aichi 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.								
Environment Charter UKOT 9. Encourage teaching within schools to promote the value of our local environment (natural and built) and to explain its role within the regional and global environment.								
Environment Charter UKOT 10. Promote publications that spread awareness of the special features of the environment in the Territory; promote within the Territory the guiding principles set out above.								
a) Increasing environmental education and awareness	1 UKOTCF	UKOTs include local biodiversity in a global context in their schools curriculum and assessments, with appropriate course materials and field work. It is well established that the most effective way of getting environmental (or other) knowledge embedded is via education,	There is a delay before children become decision-makers. Relative to the rate of biodiversity loss, we are already late.	There are many good educational materials produced by various bodies. However, unless these are integrated into the curriculum by qualified and skilled teachers, it will be impracticable for most teachers to use these. Reducing resources and local teachers	The basis of several useful joint exercises between UKOTCF, the TCI Education Dept and others to build on, with interest from several other territories.	In the last few years, UK Government has cut education out of the topics which qualify for grants in its UKOT conservation funding – for unstated reasons.	Specifically included in Environment Charters signed by UKOT Governments and most plans before and since. Education given high value and priority.	Especially prepared books on local wildlife and its international importance (based in part on RSPB research) prepared and supplied by UKOTCF to the school on Tristan da Cunha, using funding from charitable sources. At request of TCI Education Department, curriculum and courses on water and on wildlife prepared and introduced by UKOTCF, in collaboration with Dept and schools. Most modules in use in all state and some private schools; other

Short title	Target/ Source	Basis of importance	Reasons for urgency	Current risks	Current opportunities	Barriers to progress	Territory plan links	Current progress
		particularly of children.		into education and in some territories.				modules being prepared. Some initial part-funding from OTEP. Currently unsupported. Several other UKOTs are interested in extending this to their Territories. Similarly, without current funding, virtual tours of each territory are being developed on UKOTCF's web-site at the request of people in territories, to raise awareness both in other territories and more widely.
b) Promotion of the UKOTs and other European Territories & Outer Most regions in the UK and throughout Europe	1, (16) Amphibian & Reptile Conservation	There is a disconnect between people in Europe and the UKOTs, leading to an indifference and lack of understanding that we have a particular responsibility for its conservation.	The low profile of the overseas territories in the UK and Europe, both generally and in political and business circles needs to be addressed urgently	As well as a lack of personal commitment this allows political disengagement and removes opportunities for developing corporate responsibilities from business in the territories. In turn this means that opportunities for greater engagement, including developing schemes that bring funds and other resources to projects in the	Opportunities exist for promotions and publicity across Europe and within the UK specifically. Engagement through national schemes/ societies with collaborative project may allow additional resources (e.g. European based volunteers) which will benefit the European based organisation through		Government restrictions on work that is seen and publicity/ promotion will reduce funding opportunities for Government lead on this work.	Projects involving paying surveyors are underway in overseas countries including some in European overseas territories. UKOTCF proposed meeting in Gibraltar

Short title	Target/ Source	Basis of importance	Reasons for urgency	Current risks	Current opportunities	Barriers to progress	Territory plan links	Current progress
				OTs are not being developed.	engagement of its own supporters and allow additional resources (including paying 'Eco tourists') for the projects in the territories.			
c) Co-ordinated UK media response from the FCO / Defra communicating some of the UKOT conservation stories to the UK public	1 Blue Marine Foundation	Need for some Government lead and explicit support	Rapid loss of UKOT biodiversity		[BBC Radio4 interest: "Costing the Earth" which highlighted some of current issues, especially in TCI.]	Reluctance of UK Government to commit resources		[Redfern documentaries of all UKOTs should be complete by end of year. Publication of book to celebrate UKOTs to accompany the programmes to be broadcast initially in UK.]
<p>Aichi 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.</p> <p>Environment Charter UKOT 5. Commit to open and consultative decision-making on developments and plans which may affect the environment; ensure that environmental impact assessments include consultation with stakeholders. (+3 & 4).</p>								
d) A common framework for understanding strategic issues Develop a high level set of strategic outcomes, over a defined time period, for a range of issues/ parameters affecting biodiversity	(1), 2 Amphibian & Reptile Conservation	A clear understanding of desired goals across a range of fields and a framework for determining likelihood of achieving them and issues that need to be addressed to do this is needed. A shared 'vision' through describing realistic (or	The lack of a common framework for prioritisation across organisations and a shared understanding of the contribution of different projects to conservation outcomes, is hampering	Difficulty in getting a shared agenda or being able to agree a common framework.	This exercise will draw on a wide range of perceptions and experience and help determine what is feasible and which of the different issues are considered priorities. This will help set a holistic agenda appropriate to a range of	Probability that different organisations / sectors will have different outlooks and constraints on what they can agree to. Previously the programme of 6-monthly meetings of interested	There is currently insufficient linkage between an overall plan and territory plans; a situation that is causing frustration amongst both territories	NGOs/JNCC joint meetings have made a welcome restart to this.

Short title	Target/ Source	Basis of importance	Reasons for urgency	Current risks	Current opportunities	Barriers to progress	Territory plan links	Current progress
including: Biological levels/ outcomes; Political and policy environment; Socio-economic benefits; Governmental ambitions; Societal awareness and interest; Funding and financial		ambitious) outcomes will help establish a framework for collaboration that helps us to understand/ set priorities for the different partners & stakeholders.	collaborative efforts		organisations. The cross Governmental strategy and the JNCC/NGO forum provide immediate focuses for this work. Scope to develop working through the UKOTCF and State of Nature partnership	parties coordinated by UKOTCF and FCO made progress in this area - the absence of such meeting since their cancellation in 2008 has reduced previous progress in these areas.	and NGOs and needs to be addressed (note comments made at workshop organised by JNCC in March 2013).	
e) Independent assessment of progress	2, 17 UKOTCF work-shops	It is not practicable to assess whether or not the situation is improving if it is not monitored.	Monitoring also aids to assess whether resources are being effectively deployed.			Governments generally are keen to monitor others but do not like being monitored		At the initial request of UK & UKOT Governments, UKOTCF collated information from all stakeholders (except UK Government which declined to provide information) on the implementation of the Environment Charters, reporting in 2007 and 2009. Resources have not been made available since but UKOTCF is exploring means of updating.
f) Strategic physical planning & EIAs	2, (5), (8), (10), 11, 12, 17 UKOTCF	The value of biodiversity in providing ecosystem services needs to be acknowledged and incorporated into UKOT development and strategic plans.	Rapid loss of habitat and damage to ecosystems. We need to target no further	Development proposals in many UKOTs/CDs do not statutorily require Environmental Impact Assessments	Both the Eastern Caribbean Supreme Court and the Bermuda Ombudsman (even more recently confirmed in	Reluctance to put constraints on physical developments, even when these are not in the long-term common	These are commitment in the Environment Charters, to which the UK & UKOT Government	UKOTCF organised a 2-day workshop on this at one of its conferences, and plans to include a half-day session on it at the 2015 conference, but resources are needed for more.

Short title	Target/ Source	Basis of importance	Reasons for urgency	Current risks	Current opportunities	Barriers to progress	Territory plan links	Current progress
		<p>Implemented strategic physical plans (and sustainable development strategies) are needed for each UKOT/CD, incorporating biodiversity and its conservation (and recognising the value of ecosystem services provided by natural systems and species). These plans need to be subject to open consultation with specialists and local persons in draft.</p>	<p>species extinctions in UKOTs.</p>	<p>(EIAs) or these are not required in practice. Plans and EIAs are not openly and readily available in several UKOTs for consultation with specialists and local persons.(2)</p>	<p>Bermuda's Supreme Court) have recently concluded that the Environment Charters (including these measures) are binding commitments.</p> <p>The Joint Ministerial Council recently reaffirmed its commitment to implementing the Environment Charters, as have other recent statements from UK Government.</p> <p>Representatives of several UKOT Governments expressed interest, at a UKOTCF workshop in recent months, in more guidance on EIAs.</p>	<p>interest.</p>	<p>s have recently reaffirmed their commitment .</p>	
<p>Aichi 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.</p> <p>Environment Charter UKOT 3. Ensure that environmental considerations are integrated within social and economic planning processes, promote sustainable patterns of production and consumption within the Territory.</p> <p>Environment Charter UKOT 4. Ensure that environmental impact assessments are undertaken before approving major projects and while developing our growth management</p>								

Short title	Target/Source	Basis of importance	Reasons for urgency	Current risks	Current opportunities	Barriers to progress	Territory plan links	Current progress
strategy. (+ 5)								
g) Achieving effective conservation by raising awareness and stimulating action by users (of all sizes) whose enterprise depends on a healthy environment	1, (2), 3, 4, (5), (8), (10), (13), 14, 17, 18 UKOTCF	Many government departments, international businesses in UKOTs and local businesses have not yet developed environmental management systems, nor realised the dependence of their businesses on natural ecosystems and biodiversity, as well as the wider importance of these. There is a need to incorporate environmental conservation into all governance and economic sectors	Rapidity and scale of current threats of habitat loss, pollution, introductions etc.		Some success in pilot work. The opportunities in certain UKOTs of taking an exciting integrated approach. Development and poverty alleviation strategies acknowledge the role of natural ecosystems and wild species in providing services and give protection to these.	Reluctance of governments (under various pressures) to make and stick with longer-term strategies; the immediate attractions of short-termism, even when the consequences are damaging to longer-term economic and environmental sustainability.		Some success in pilot work in getting commercial interests to become champions of environmental sustainability, through them being helped to understand their dependence on this. UKOTCF and several partners in territories and elsewhere are exploring resourcing for continuing and expanding this work. In the short-term, a Darwin Plus proposal on one aspect has been submitted by UKOTCF at the request of a UKOT Government and other local partners.
h) Supporting territories to manage marine resources sustainably	4, 1, 11 UKOTCF workshop	Montserrat has an ambitious programme of activities in order to manage its fisheries sustainably and requested UKOTCF help.	Unknown impacts of climate change, volcano, invasive lionfish, illegal fishing	Illegal fishing, invasive lionfish, ageing fisherman	New generation of fisherman willing to learn and adopt sustainable techniques Government wish to manage its resource sustainably but need an increase in capacity in order to do this.	Lack of resources	Montserrat Sustainable fisheries plan	UKOTCF, together with the Montserrat Fisheries Department, has been exploring various possibilities, including becoming part of the US-based Waitt Institute's regional programme. The pilot project in Barbuda has been commended. Waitt is in the process of working with several Caribbean islands to see where its resources could be deployed.

Short title	Target/ Source	Basis of importance	Reasons for urgency	Current risks	Current opportunities	Barriers to progress	Territory plan links	Current progress
Strategic Goal B: Reduce the direct pressures on biodiversity and promote sustainable use								
Aichi 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 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.								
Aichi 7. By 2020 areas under agriculture, aquaculture and forestry are managed sustainably, ensuring conservation of biodiversity.								
Aichi 8. By 2020, pollution, including from excess nutrients, has been brought to levels that are not detrimental to ecosystem function and biodiversity.								
Aichi 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.								
Aichi 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.								
Environment Charter UKOT 2. Ensure the protection and restoration of key habitats, species and landscape features through legislation and appropriate management structures and mechanisms, including a protected areas policy, and attempt the control and eradication of invasive species.								
Environment Charter UKOT 8. Ensure that legislation and policies reflect the principle that the polluter should pay for prevention or remedies; establish effective monitoring and enforcement mechanisms. (+ 2, 3, 4, 8)								
i) Coastal zone management (including terrestrial, but virtually all territories are so small that they are entirely in the coastal zone)	5, 6, 7, 8, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 21 UKOTCF	Throughout the world, coastal zones tend to be the most threatened. This is because they are both the most productive and important for trade. This means historic human settlements tend to be centred there but their growth tends to destroy the original productivity. UKOTs tend to have not suffered the worst of this, but several are now doing so. Strategies and plans are needed to prevent further loss	See previous column.		The recognition achieved by local businesses note in the previous item may provide a basis here. In a wider context, the targets of at least 17% of terrestrial and inland water, and at least 10% (and ideally 30%) of coastal and marine areas, are supportive, with systems of truly sustainable use integrated into the wider landscapes and		This links also with the inshore marine sustainable-use and no-take zones, and requests to UKOTCF for advice from several UKOTs (and complement s the large no-take approach of some uninhabited or little-inhabited UKOTs.	UKOTCF identified in 2005, at the request and with the participation of UK & almost all UKOT/CD governments and other stakeholders, sites which should be designated as Wetlands of International Importance under the Ramsar Convention. Some of these have since been designated, and work is needed on more. UKOTCF has continued to give advice to UKOTs/CDS, as well as input to UK's reports to the Convention. UKOT sites on the UK's World Heritage Sites Tentative List 2011 need progressing also.

Short title	Target/Source	Basis of importance	Reasons for urgency	Current risks	Current opportunities	Barriers to progress	Territory plan links	Current progress
		of natural ecosystems. Environmental management plans need to be in place and operational.			seascapes.			UKOTCF and several partners in some UKOTs and elsewhere have developed programmes to address some of these, and are seeking resources. The work noted in the previous sections (g,h) is also relevant.
j) Coral reef restoration	10, 11, 12 UKOTCF Wider Caribbean Working Group	Sharing knowledge and expertise to tackle widespread challenge	Climate Change and global sea temperature changes.		The Central Caribbean Marine Institute based in Cayman are increasing involvement in regional activities and are able to share new lab facilities	UKOTs working in isolation or resources so low they are unable to take part in regional activities.		UKOTCF was able to facilitate involvement of several UKOTs in the Global Coral Reef Monitoring Network workshop in August 2014 Several project proposals submitted to provide opportunities for regional activities.
<p>Aichi 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.</p> <p>Environment Charter UKOT 2. Ensure the protection and restoration of key habitats, species and landscape features through legislation and appropriate management structures and mechanisms, including a protected areas policy, and attempt the control and eradication of invasive species.</p>								
k) Eradication of rodents on South Georgia	12 South Georgia Heritage Trust	South Georgia has the greatest concentration of seabirds on earth but population numbers are down at least 100 million due to predation by invasive rodents.	If rodents are not removed from South Georgia in the next few years, then (a) they will penetrate more areas of the island as glacial barriers recede due to global	South Georgia's seabirds include two endemic species, one of which (the South Georgia Pipit) is at threat of extinction from the rodents. The numbers of several other seabird species on South Georgia	The South Georgia Heritage Trust (SGHT) has raised £5 million of the £7.5 million in funding needed to bait the entire island. To date, it has baited two-thirds of South Georgia and is urgently raising funds to complete	There is an assumption among some parties that SGHT will be able to raise the final £2.5 million in time to undertake the final phase of fieldwork in 2015, but in fact raising the final	If the project succeeds it will positively impact the numbers of several species of petrels on South Georgia, so links in to the	It is now over three years since the first phase of baiting on South Georgia. The rule of thumb for island eradications is that they can be declared successful two years after bait is sown, so long as the area to be baited has been monitored following the baiting work. The trial phase on South Georgia is therefore an official success. Monitoring

Short title	Target/Source	Basis of importance	Reasons for urgency	Current risks	Current opportunities	Barriers to progress	Territory plan links	Current progress
			warming and (b) the opportunity to remove rodents will be lost forever, as without the glaciers separating the infested parts of the island, the area to be cleared would be too large to be baited in its entirety and rodents would re-infest the baited zones.	classified as at threat on the IUCN list are severely depleted by rodents.	the work. Anything short of 100% success in removing the rodents counts as failure. With support, SGHT can remove every last rat and mouse from South Georgia, complete the largest island eradication ever attempted, save entire species from extinction and vastly increase the numbers of the threatened seabirds on the island.	sum is very difficult. Support from the UK Government in any form could make a crucial difference to the success of the project.	Agreement on the Conservation of Albatrosses and Petrels (ACAP) and the CBD. The project also features in the South Georgia Government management plan.	of the much larger area baited in 2013 has also been encouraging, with no sign of rats or mice detected one year on. There is every reason to believe that SGHT, given the necessary funding, could remove every single rat and mouse from South Georgia by the summer of 2015.
I) Restoring Gough Island through the eradication of invasive house mice [NB: there were several comments from others on the need for work on reviewing other invasive species issues including prevention, completion of the	9, 12 RSPB	Gough is a WHS, a Ramsar site, a nature reserve and an IBA. It has been described as the most important seabird island in the world.	If no action is taken, the Gough bunting could be functionally extinct within 10 years. The island will eventually lose the values that make it a WHS.	Risk of failure due to weather is moderate. Non-targets will need management.	With the success of a similar operation on Macquarie Island, the time is right for Gough.	The need to raise more than £5 million to complete the operation.	Restoring Gough has been listed as a priority action in Tristan's Biodiversity Action Plan and the Gough and Inaccessible Management Plan. However, there is not	Research is complete, and the RSPB is now in the process of early planning and will decide on whether to start a project in 2015.

Short title	Target/ Source	Basis of importance	Reasons for urgency	Current risks	Current opportunities	Barriers to progress	Territory plan links	Current progress
Pitcairn Islands exercise, etc (as noted in the meeting by RSPB and others). However, as there were only these two specific submissions, these are noted just here, to save space.]							sufficient capacity on Tristan to plan and implement a project of this scale.	
<p>Strategic Goal C: To improve the status of biodiversity by safeguarding ecosystems, species and genetic diversity</p> <p>Aichi 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.</p> <p>Environment Charter UKOT 2. Ensure the protection and restoration of key habitats, species and landscape features through legislation and appropriate management structures and mechanisms, including a protected areas policy, and attempt the control and eradication of invasive species.</p>								
m) Improving invertebrate knowledge in the UKOTs – establishing a comprehensive baseline for all UKOTs and setting priorities	12 Buglife	Many invertebrates in the UKOTs are endemics and global priorities for conservation but are poorly recorded in the Territories and very limited Red-Listing to establish priorities	Without any knowledge of invertebrates and priorities, invertebrate species can be going extinct without anyone realising	Multiple habitat loss, invasive species, development etc.	Darwin projects, university studies, IUCN specialist groups	Funding and resources and skills in territories to do more field work, data collation and red listing in all territories	Knowing biodiversity and setting priorities should be in most plans	Most territories have some invertebrate data
n) Establishing invertebrate conservation on all UKOTs	12 Buglife	Very limited invertebrate conservation is occurring in the UKOTs despite a high level of endemism and many threats	Invertebrate species will go extinct without action	Multiple habitat loss, invasive species, development etc.	Conservation is occurring and so invertebrates could become embedded within this existing work	Lack of knowledge and skills, as well as baseline data and priorities for action in UKOTs		
o) Addressing lack of baseline data for most taxa Addressing lack of	5, 12, 13, 19 UKOTCF	Need to identify gaps in information, and a programme of surveys in progress		Difficulty in deploying resources most effectively when				To address part of this and the two preceding sections, UKOTCF, Buglife, several Caribbean UKOTs and

Short title	Target/ Source	Basis of importance	Reasons for urgency	Current risks	Current opportunities	Barriers to progress	Territory plan links	Current progress
monitoring data on almost all taxa Database management, curation, development	work-shops	to fill these. Also to develop practicable monitoring programmes for priority taxa in each UKOT.		information is limited. Difficulty both in timely prediction of problems and of knowing the effects of interventions if there is inadequate monitoring.				institutions in UK and USA with relevant collections and experience have combined in a current bid to Darwin Plus to make available dispersed data on UKOTCF insects, fill some gaps, develop conservation plans, and provide training.
p) Stopping illegal bird-killing in the Cyprus Sovereign Base Areas through removal of invasive acacia	5, 9, 12 RSPB	Over 500,000 birds are being illegally killed on British Territory every autumn, and fragile coastal habitats are being lost to planted avenues of invasive acacia	The number of autumn migrants illegally killed is increasing year-on-year. Mist-netting activity on the SBAs has increased by 180% since 2002.	Insignificant or peripheral patches of acacia are removed which have little effect on the hotspots of illegal activity. Local criminals may undermine SBA Administration work.	Removing the acacia avenues at Cape Pyla would also restore a site of considerable floristic value and prevent the spread of a notable invasive.	Lack of will by SBA Administration to address / remove the acacia infrastructure which is enabling the increase in illegal killing.	Under the Strategic Plan of Action, the SBA Administration has committed to removing invasive acacia from Cape Pyla (the illegal bird-killing hotspot).	The SBA Administration has just signed up to a Strategic Plan of Action to combat illegal bird-killing
<p>Aichi 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.</p> <p>Environment Charter UKOT 2. Ensure the protection and restoration of key habitats, species and landscape features through legislation and appropriate management structures and mechanisms, including a protected areas policy, and attempt the control and eradication of invasive species.</p>								
q) Creating an Ocean Sanctuary at Ascension Island [Large marine protected areas	11 RSPB	Ascension is home to the 2 nd largest green turtle nesting site in the Atlantic as well as important populations of seabirds and	There is currently no commercial fishery at Ascension – we should act to protect	A damaging commercial fishery could degrade Ascension’s marine environment fast.	The UK could make a huge contribution to conservation in the Atlantic – Ascension has already been	Political will. A review of fishery/other management options is underway.	This project is not a local priority, as the Ascension government intends to	A campaign to protect Ascension’s waters is gathering momentum.

Short title	Target/ Source	Basis of importance	Reasons for urgency	Current risks	Current opportunities	Barriers to progress	Territory plan links	Current progress
here, around Pitcairn and elsewhere were noted in the meeting also by Blue Marine Foundation and others.]		endemic and threatened marine life.	Ascension's waters before one is re-opened.	Anecdotal evidence already shows a decline in sharks, possibly linked to finning by boats offshore.	identified as a Hope Spot by the Sylvia Earle Foundation (USA)		re-open a commercial fishery at the island. The RSPB's view is that taking the opportunity to contribute to conservation of the Atlantic would be a much better use of Ascension's waters.	
r) Increasing knowledge – assessing the protection of key UKOT habitats	5.11 RSPB	The UKOTs are often said to hold "90% of the unique species for which the UK is responsible". But we know little about the diversity and value of habitats in the OTs despite suspecting they are significant.	Without knowledge of the habitats protected in the OTs, it is impossible to say whether protected area networks are currently sufficient or achieving their local or international objectives	There may be low support from individual Territories who might see this work as interfering in their responsibility or in delivering little value to those Territories with high local capacity	This work should build on current projects that are ongoing (e.g. habitat mapping work in Falklands, Anguilla, Ascension, St Helena, Cayman etc), and the work in Churchyard <i>et al</i> (2014).	Lack of resources to carry this out; lack of will from HMG to manage and coordinate this process.	This project is not likely to be a high local priority for any single Territory, as its value will be to the UK government in being able to look across the Territories and assess where extra support/attention is needed.	The RSPB will be submitting a proposal to Darwin Plus to start this work.

Short title	Target/ Source	Basis of importance	Reasons for urgency	Current risks	Current opportunities	Barriers to progress	Territory plan links	Current progress
Strategic Goal E: Enhance implementation through participatory planning, knowledge management and capacity building								
Aichi 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.								
Aichi 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.								
Aichi 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. This target will be subject to changes contingent to resource needs assessments to be developed and reported by Parties.								
Environment Charter UKOT 1. Bring together government departments, representatives of local industry and commerce, environment and heritage organisations, the Governor's office, individual environmental champions and other community representatives in a forum to formulate a detailed strategy for action. + 5								
Environment Charter UKOT 7. Review the range, quality and availability of baseline data for natural resources and biodiversity.								
Environment Charter UK Government 1. Help build capacity to support and implement integrated environmental management which is consistent with the Territory's own plans for sustainable development.								
Environment Charter UK Government 6. Promote better cooperation and the sharing of experience and expertise between the Territory, other Overseas Territories and small island states and communities which face similar environmental problems.								
Environment Charter UK Government 7. Use UK, regional and local expertise to give advice and improve knowledge of technical and scientific issues. This includes regular consultation with interested non-governmental organisations and networks.								
Environment Charter UK Government 8. Use the existing Environment Fund for the Overseas Territories [replaced by Overseas Territories Environment Programme], and promote access to other sources of public funding, for projects of lasting benefit to the Territory' environment.								
Environment Charter UK Government 9. Help the Territory identify further funding partners for environmental projects, such as donors, the private sector or non-governmental organisations.								
Environment Charter UK Government 10. Recognise the diversity of the challenges facing Overseas Territories in very different socio-economic and geographical situations.								
s) Raising capacity and capabilities of territory partners (NGO & governmental) Increasing available funds and other resources	17, 19, 20, 23 UKOTCF work-shops and Blue Marine Foundation	The capacity of UKOT bodies, and most of those from Britain which have traditionally supported UKOT conservation work, is severely limited by funding. Much effort has been put, largely successfully, to raising the capacities of UKOT bodies, by joint working with NGOs from Britain or	The dependence of most conservation actions on local bodies, their limited capacity, and the tendency for resources for these to decline disproportionately at times of general declines in	Some UKOTs with an appropriate tourism industry have established a conservation fund based on a percentage of visitor taxes held in a separate account for this purpose and managed openly by a body drawn from governmental and NGO	UKOTCF and, more recently others also, have facilitated cooperation and the sharing of experience and expertise between the UKOTs, CDs, other Overseas Territories and small island states and communities which face similar environmental	The need for UK Government to establish a fund of at least £20m pa to contribute to its responsibilities in respect of implementing biodiversity management and species and ecosystem recovery plans etc in UKOTs has been well	Limited capacity, and the need for more support from Britain, are the problems cited most frequently by UKOTs as barriers to conservation progress.	UKOTCF has, for over 20 years, provided or arranged capacity-building support in both organisational and specialist skills for UKOTs & CDs. This has been built on, especially in recent years, by specialist project-related training by bodies such as RSPB, Royal Botanic Gardens Kew, Buglife, and ZSL. In recent years, UK Government has organised

Short title	Target/ Source	Basis of importance	Reasons for urgency	Current risks	Current opportunities	Barriers to progress	Territory plan links	Current progress
		other UKOTs. However, even though large quantities of skilled personnel (often working voluntarily or partly so) would be available with moderate additional funding.	financial resources.	conservation body stakeholders, and used for conservation purposes. Unfortunately, UK Government cancelled this fund in TCI while it was running the government there directly.	problems. NGOs and UKOTs continue to press on National Lottery Funding, such as the Heritage Fund. Whilst, in theory, bodies based in Britain can seek funding to support work in UKOTs, in practice the Fund's policies and administrative procedures block this.	recognised, but is unlikely in the current economic climate. Unfortunately, UK Government has not seen fit to remove the administrative barriers which prevent even British-based bodies access Lottery funding for UKOT work.		assistance on mainly governance issues from some UK local authorities in various UKOTs (as FCO, DFID and Defra do not necessarily have the practical expertise or capacity). UKOTCF's regional Working Groups and its periodic conferences have played a leading role in facilitating sharing of expertise, much appreciated by UKOTs. This will be continued in the 2015 UKOTCF conference, funded mainly by the Government of Gibraltar.
t) Defining conservation goals Develop an approach to determine and articulate a desired 'target states' for key species – this may be quantitative, qualitative, trend related , via 'threat status' or via describing 'position on recovery curves'	17 Amphibian & Reptile Conservation	An indication of a desired target state to help establish a monitoring protocol and necessary actions. In due course 'action plan targets' could be developed as a means of encouraging funding. While it is likely that we would simply be able to define simple 'goals' for a few species, the idea of such targets is to help determine the ambition for any	The lack of a common framework for prioritisation across organisations and a shared understanding of the contribution of different projects to conservation outcomes, is hampering collaborative efforts	Difficulty in getting a shared agenda or being able to agree a common framework.	The Article 17 and European biodiversity strategies are beginning to look at favourable Reference Values as a possible tool for assessing progress towards the targets. This approach could be extended to OTs in the context of CBD? Some work with UK NGOs and through the DEFRA Great	Probability that different organisations / sectors will have different outlooks and constraints on what they can agree to		Partnership working should help define what is feasible and useful; shared intellectual thoughts on this could help develop a common framework. Integrating 'species' and 'habitat' targets could help create a common framework and aid identification of priority conservation areas and necessary actions outside of these.

Short title	Target/ Source	Basis of importance	Reasons for urgency	Current risks	Current opportunities	Barriers to progress	Territory plan links	Current progress
		species (or group of species) that will aid with prioritisation and define conservation actions. Articulating goals against defined metric provides a robust starting point for any monitoring strategy			Crested Newt task force is beginning to further explore the concept of Favourable Conservation Status. [cont in Current Progress column]			
<p>u) Developing an integrated species status programme</p> <p>An integrated 'species status' programme based on extant data, IUCN (or similar) status assessments and predictive mapping. Status assessment and predicted distribution maps, plus identification of 'key herpetological areas' would be some of the outputs</p> <p>This will relate to the 'target setting' and 'monitoring programmes'</p>	<p>17, 19</p> <p>Amphibian & Reptile Conservation</p>	<p>We need a clearer understanding of the conservation status, and hence the conservation priorities associated with different herpetofauna species.</p> <p>A starting point for all conservation work, including prioritisation is an effective understanding of the current status and 'needs' of any species. The assessment should also help establish the level of autecology knowledge, threats and necessary action though the primary</p>	<p>Valuable to explore the concept of such work as soon as possible so that, if there is potential, then this can be developed sooner rather than later.</p>		<p>State of Nature Partnership; JNCC/ RSPB project. Benefit from linking to current UK/ European projects and approaches. Darwin funding could be an opportunity and this could be a strong basis for approach charitable trusts for funding. Link to CBD objectives would provide a strong rationale for supporting this work.</p> <p>Funding may exist for ambitious projects looking</p>			<p>Partnership working will provide a range of benefits: Expertise in developing ideas; Increased data availability; Greater ownership of outputs; Resources including environmental data; Opportunities for developing consistent approaches benefit multiple taxa; Fit to existing schemes and programmes. Look to develop (and fund) longer term projects that 'future proof' the schemes and, in particular, take advantage of new technologies (such as remote sensing and smart phone recording)</p>

Short title	Target/ Source	Basis of importance	Reasons for urgency	Current risks	Current opportunities	Barriers to progress	Territory plan links	Current progress
identified below.		output is to develop the framework for assessing these against current knowledge base			at new technologies (e.g. via Google). [cont in Current Progress column]			
v) Design and establish monitoring programmes	19 Amphibian & Reptile Conservation	Monitoring schemes are in place that reflect not only current status, but trend and status relative to the stated ambitions for those species. Monitoring is key to understanding changes and the needs for and effectiveness of conservation programmes or the impact of other factors (habitat damage, climate change, non-native species, etc). Such approaches will also allow the biological value of 'ecosystems services' to be assessed.	The absence of good baseline and trend data has been identified as an issue for a number of species. This absence of knowledge may lead to extinctions.	Difficulty in getting agreed protocols. Problems with funding/ resources for delivery	The Article 17 and European biodiversity strategies are beginning to look at favourable Reference Values as a possible tool for assessing progress towards the targets. This approach could be extended to OTs in the context of CBD? Some work with UK NGOs and through the DEFRA Great Crested Newt task force is beginning to further explore the concept of Favourable Conservation Status. The partnership would allow wider expertise, exchange of skill			JNCC has identified a clear role here in its strategy.

Short title	Target/Source	Basis of importance	Reasons for urgency	Current risks	Current opportunities	Barriers to progress	Territory plan links	Current progress
					& intelligence, aligning to other schemes and developing 'future proofed' projects with wide buy-in.			
<p>Issues which cross many Aichi Targets, allocated sequential numbers: 21, 23</p> <p>Environment Charter UKOT 6. Implement effectively obligations under the Multilateral Environmental Agreements already extended to the Territory and work towards the extension of other relevant agreements.</p> <p>Environment Charter UK Government 2. Assist the Territory in reviewing and updating environmental legislation.</p> <p>Environment Charter UK Government 3. Facilitate the extension of the UK's ratification of Multilateral Environmental Agreements of benefit to the Territory and which the Territory has the capacity to implement.</p> <p>Environment Charter UK Government 4. Keep the Territory informed regarding new developments in relevant Multilateral Environmental Agreements and invite the Territory to participate where appropriate in the UK's delegation to international environmental negotiations and conferences.</p> <p>Environment Charter UK Government 5. Help the Territory to ensure it has the legislation, institutional capacity and mechanisms it needs to meet international obligations.</p>								
w) Legislation	14, 16, 21, 23 UKOTCF work-shops And Blue Marine Foundati on	Review needed for most UKOTs on legislative needs to fulfil biodiversity conservation requirements and help may be needed on drafting. This needed also for the one UKOT still not in CITES (due to delays of about 4 years in drafting), and possibly the one not in Conservation on Migratory Species, as well as the several not in the Convention on Biological Diversity; support to UKOTs also promised to			All UKOTs/CDs now included in UK's ratification of: Ramsar Convention on Wetlands			

Short title	Target/ Source	Basis of importance	Reasons for urgency	Current risks	Current opportunities	Barriers to progress	Territory plan links	Current progress
		Parliament in respect Freedom of Environmental Information.						

Conservation priorities of the UKOTs in the 1990s

A previous systematic review of the conservation priorities set by territories themselves was undertaken by UKOTCF in the early 1990s, partly with support from the first round of the Darwin Initiative. The report *UK Dependent Territories – a Conservation Review* was published in 1996. The conservation priorities sections of that report were incorporated as one module of UKOTCF’s then new web-database in 2000. This was an interactive database, and several territories took the opportunity to update their entries then. At the time, it was envisaged that further updating would form part of the strategies to implement the evolving Environment Charters, which were agreed in 2001. UK Government, at the request several territories, part-funded UKOTCF to facilitate the development of strategies for action to implement the Charters, by wide ranges of stakeholders, in the Turks and Caicos Islands and in St Helena. UKOTCF helped also to start to this process in Ascension Island and advised several other territories. Unfortunately, by about 2004, UK Government ended its support for the development of strategies for implementation in the other territories. So, the review of conservation priorities of the early 1990s, partly updated around 2000, remains the most recent comprehensive review. With the passage of time and changing software, UKOTCF realised that it was no longer appropriate to maintain the interactive mode for this module, but saw the need for it remain available. Therefore it arranged for it to remain available as static pages in its database. These can be accessed at www.ukotcf.org/cp/index.htm .

In the limited time available, we have not attempted to reanalyse the identified conservation priorities of 14-19 years ago in the same format as the main part of the present paper. However, a look through these is instructive. Two main points emerge. First, there is a very high degree of similarity in the priorities of nearly 20 years ago with those of the present time. Second, whilst significant progress has been made in several cases in several territories, the vast majority the priorities identified nearly 20 years ago remain priorities today. We can look at some examples of these, roughly related to the extended Aichi targets.

In terms of the first group of targets concerned with mainstreaming biodiversity, environmental education was a priority then and remains so now. Useful progress has been made in several territories but a great deal more needs to be done in those and other territories. Progress in this area is not helped by its relatively recent exclusion from UK government funding. The building of biodiversity into planning across all sectors was a priority in the early review and remains so now, but it would be difficult to claim that major progress had been made, although there are a few welcome signs of considering this amongst the governments of a small number of territories.

Turning to the second group of targets, relating to reducing biodiversity loss, sustainable cropping, reducing pollution, and preventing or removing alien invasive species, all these were strongly represented across territories in the early review. There have been a small number of noted successes, including the restoration of seabird populations on Ascension Island following the removal of some alien invasive predators. The current work on South Georgia, the Pitcairn group, and Anguilla is also notable in this regard. However, the need for further protected areas, for more Wetlands of International Importance under the Ramsar Convention, and for more management plans was strongly expressed across most territories 20 years

ago, and remains so now, with only a very small proportion progressed. Notable in this context also was identification by Gibraltar (the only UKOT in the European Union) of the need for progress on Habitats Directive sites – something on which UK Government and its agencies later failed Gibraltar badly in the roles only they, not Gibraltar itself, could fulfil. Dealing with existing alien invasive species and preventing the arrival and establishment of others was also common across the priorities expressed by many territories in the earlier review. This remains so now. There has been progress in some locations (with some examples mentioned above), but less so in others – and it is particularly disturbing to see major alien invasives arriving and becoming established since then, resulting in the near extinction of the unique Caicos Pine in TCI, major marine impacts and others. A great deal remains to be done even on preventing new arrivals as well as on elimination and control.

The third main group of targets overlaps considerably with the second group, addressing the need for more protected areas, both terrestrial and marine, and the prevention of extinction of species. Some aspects of this have been addressed above. However, it is worth underlining the relatively little progress on the increase in protected areas, both domestic and under international designation, in all but a small number of territories during this period. There have been a small number of noted successes in species recovery, amongst which we could include the recovery of the Bermuda cahow, and of the Grand Cayman blue iguana. There is some current encouraging work in some UKOTs on turtles, but major challenges remain in others. Sadly, the period saw also the global extinction on British territory of at least one species (and genus), St Helena olive, the reduction several other species to a few individuals. Whilst there have been a few species rediscoveries, such as a fern on Ascension and beetles in Montserrat, it is suspected that there are also further global extinctions undetected, partly because the species had not been described.

The fourth main group of targets relates to the benefits to all from biodiversity and ecosystem services, and the need to safeguard these. It is probably true to say that, during the period since the last review, there has been increased recognition of the immense contribution that ecosystem services make to human economies. There have also been attempts to assess the value of certain ecosystem services in some territories. Despite this, however, there are still personnel in official positions dealing with UKOTs, in both the UK government and UKOT governments, who persist in the view that protecting the environment is something one can do as and when finances are in a strong state, rather than recognising that the less well off elements of society are even more dependent on ecosystem services from when incomes are high. In this context, it is not surprising that it is difficult to identify cases in which active measures have been put in place to protect these ecosystems and the services they provide.

The fifth main group of targets relates to participatory planning, knowledge management and capacity building. In their identifications of conservation priorities in the 1990s, the UKOTs stressed their need for more funding and staffing, for more of the welcome support from British-based NGOs, for more reviews and updating of legislation, for much more biological survey, for more strategic development planning payin regard to environmental conservation, and the wide adoption of biodiversity strategies and action plans. At least as much as for the other main groups of targets, it is striking how similar is this list of requests from the territories to the conservation priorities which we have just put together, this time based indirectly on the wishes expressed by territories. It would be wrong to say that there has been no progress. But in some areas, this has been on a rather up-and-down basis. Even UK Government funding support has been rather inefficiently stop-go, involving sequentially at least four different funding schemes within the first few years of this century. British-based NGOs have indeed delivered a huge volume of the requested support, but some have suffered from reducing support themselves, thereby limiting this severely. They have however succeeded in helping local people to build strong NGOs and governmental conservation departments in a number of territories. Strategic development plans and widely adopted biodiversity strategies seem limited in their acceptance, despite the clear needs. Early encouragement, by all Britain-based conservation bodies, to UKOTs & CDs to join UK's ratification of multilateral environmental agreements, seems to have reduced largely to NGO encouragement only, although UK Government will help

if strongly requested by the UKOTs and CDs. The Isle of Man achieved, with some difficulty, in getting itself added to UK's ratification of the Convention on Biological Diversity – the only UKOT or CD to manage this in the over 20 years since UK's ratification.