



HAL
open science

A metric for spatially explicit contributions to science-based species targets

Louise Mair, Leon A Bennun, Thomas M Brooks, Stuart H M Butchart, Friederike C Bolam, Neil D Burgess, Jonathan M M Ekstrom, E. J Milner-Gulland, Michael Hoffmann, Keping Ma, et al.

► **To cite this version:**

Louise Mair, Leon A Bennun, Thomas M Brooks, Stuart H M Butchart, Friederike C Bolam, et al.. A metric for spatially explicit contributions to science-based species targets. *Nature Ecology & Evolution*, 2021, 5 (6), pp.836-844. <10.1038/s41559-021-01432-0>. <hal-03417602>

HAL Id: hal-03417602

<https://hal.science/hal-03417602v1>

Submitted on 5 Nov 2021

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.



HAL Authorization

1 A metric for spatially-explicit contributions to science- 2 based species targets

3 Louise Mair^{1*}, Leon A. Bennun^{2,3}, Thomas M. Brooks^{4,5,6}, Stuart H. M. Butchart^{3,7}, Friederike C.
4 Bolam^{1,8}, Neil D. Burgess^{8,9}, Jonathan M. M. Ekstrom², E J Milner-Gulland¹⁰, Michael Hoffmann¹¹,
5 Keping Ma¹², Nicholas B. W. Macfarlane¹³, Domitilla C. Raimondo^{14,15}, Ana S.L. Rodrigues¹⁶, Xiaoli
6 Shen¹², Bernardo B. N. Strassburg^{17,18}, Craig R. Beatty^{13,19}, Carla Gómez-Creutzberg²⁰, Alvaro
7 Iribarrem^{17,18}, Meizani Irmadhiany²¹, Eduardo Lacerda^{18,22}, Bianca C. Mattos²³, Karmila Parakkasi²¹,
8 Marcelo F. Tognelli^{24,25}, Elizabeth L. Bennett²⁶, Catherine Bryan²⁷, Giulia Carbone⁴, Abhishek
9 Chaudhary²⁸, Maxime Eiselin²⁹, Gustavo A. B. da Fonseca³⁰, Russell Galt³¹, Arne Geschke³², Louise
10 Glew¹⁹, Romie Goedicke²⁹, Jonathan M. H. Green³³, Richard D. Gregory^{34,35}, Samantha L. L. Hill⁸,
11 David G. Hole²⁴, Jonathan Hughes⁸, Jonathan Hutton³⁶, Marco P. W. Keijzer²⁹, Laetitia M. Navarro^{37,38},
12 Eimear Nic Lughadha³⁹, Andrew J. Plumptre^{3,40}, Philippe Puydarrieux⁴, Hugh P. Possingham^{41,42},
13 Aleksandar Rankovic⁴³, Eugenie C. Regan^{8,44}, Carlo Rondinini⁴⁵, Joshua D. Schneck¹³, Juha Siikamäki¹³,
14 Cyriaque Sendashonga⁴, Gilles Seutin⁴⁶, Sam Sinclair⁴⁷, Andrew L. Skowno^{14,48}, Carolina A. Soto-
15 Navarro^{8,36}, Simon N. Stuart^{27,49}, Helen J. Temple², Antoine Vallier⁵⁰, Francesca Veronesi⁵¹, Leonardo
16 R. Viana^{24,52}, James Watson^{26,42}, Simeon Bezeng^{53,54}, Monika Böhm¹¹, Ian J. Burfield⁷, Viola
17 Clausnitzer⁵⁵, Colin Clubbe³⁹, Neil A. Cox^{24,25}, Jörg Freyhof⁵⁶, Leah R. Gerber⁵⁷, Craig Hilton-Taylor³¹,
18 Richard Jenkins³¹, Ackbar Joolia³¹, Lucas N. Joppa⁵⁸, Lian Pin Koh⁵⁹, Thomas E. Lacher Jr.^{60,61}, Penny F.
19 Langhammer^{61,62}, Barney Long⁶¹, David Mallon⁶³, Michela Pacifici⁴⁵, Beth A. Polidoro^{57,64}, Caroline M.
20 Pollock³¹, Malin C. Rivers⁶⁵, Nicolette S. Roach^{60,61}, Jon Paul Rodríguez^{66,67,68}, Jane Smart⁴, Bruce E.
21 Young⁶⁹, Frank Hawkins¹³, Philip J. K. McGowan¹

22 1 School of Natural and Environmental Sciences, Newcastle University, Newcastle upon Tyne
23 NE1 7RU, UK.

24 2 The Biodiversity Consultancy, 3 Kings Parade, Cambridge CB2 1SJ, UK.

- 25 3 Department of Zoology, University of Cambridge, Downing St, Cambridge CB2 3EJ, UK.
- 26 4 IUCN, Rue Mauverney 28, Gland CH-1196, Switzerland.
- 27 5 World Agroforestry Center (ICRAF), University of The Philippines Los Baños, Laguna,
28 Philippines.
- 29 6 Institute for Marine & Antarctic Studies, University of Tasmania, Australia.
- 30 7 BirdLife International, David Attenborough Building, Pembroke St, Cambridge CB2 3QZ, UK.
- 31 8 United Nations Environment Programme World Conservation Monitoring Centre (UNEP-
32 WCMC), Cambridge, CB3 0DL, UK.
- 33 9 The GLOBE Institute, University of Copenhagen, 1350 Copenhagen, Denmark.
- 34 10 Department of Zoology, Oxford University, Oxford OX1 2JD, UK.
- 35 11 Zoological Society of London, Regent's Park, London NW1 4RY, UK.
- 36 12 State Key Laboratory of Vegetation and Environmental Change, Institute of Botany, Chinese
37 Academy of Sciences, 100093 Beijing, China.
- 38 13 IUCN, 1630 Connecticut Ave NW, Washington, DC 20009, USA.
- 39 14 South African National Biodiversity Institute, 0001 Pretoria, South Africa.
- 40 15 IUCN Species Survival Commission, Pretoria, South Africa.
- 41 16 CEFE, Univ Montpellier, CNRS, EPHE, IRD, Univ Paul Valéry Montpellier 3, Montpellier 34293
42 France.
- 43 17 Rio Conservation and Sustainability Science Centre, Department of Geography and the
44 Environment, Pontifical Catholic University, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil.
- 45 18 International Institute for Sustainability, Rio de Janeiro 22460-320, Brazil.
- 46 19 World Wildlife Fund, 1250 24th Street NW, Washington, DC 20037, USA.
- 47 20 IUCN, Los Yoses, San Pedro de Montes de Oca, San José, Costa Rica.
- 48 21 PT Royal Lestari Utama Wisma Barito Pacific, Tower B Floor 3 Jl. Letjen S. Parman Kav.62-63,
49 Slipi Jakarta Barat 11410, Indonesia.
- 50 22 Fluminense Federal University, Niterói, Brazil.

51 23 SSC Post-2020 Biodiversity Task Force. Calle Voluntad, 11. Seville, Spain.

52 24 Conservation International, 2011 Crystal Drive, Suite 600 Arlington, Virginia 22202, USA.

53 25 IUCN-CI Biodiversity Assessment Unit, 1630 Connecticut Ave NW, Washington, DC 20009,
54 USA.

55 26 Wildlife Conservation Society, Bronx, New York 10460, USA.

56 27 Synchronicity Earth, 27-29 Cursitor Street, London EC4A 1LT, UK.

57 28 Indian Institute of Technology (IIT) Kanpur, 208016, India.

58 29 IUCN National Committee of The Netherlands, Amsterdam 1018 DD, Netherlands.

59 30 Global Environment Facility, Washington, DC 20433, USA.

60 31 IUCN, The David Attenborough Building, Pembroke Street, Cambridge CB2 3QZ, UK.

61 32 Integrated Sustainability Analysis, School of Physics, The University of Sydney, Sydney,
62 Australia.

63 33 Stockholm Environment Institute York, Department of Environment and Geography,
64 University of York, York YO10 5NG, UK.

65 34 RSPB, The Lodge, Sandy, Bedfordshire SG19 2DL, UK.

66 35 Centre for Biodiversity & Environment Research, Department of Genetics, Evolution and
67 Environment, University College London, London WC1E 6BT, UK.

68 36 Luc Hoffmann Institute, Rue Mauverny 28, Gland 1196, Switzerland.

69 37 German Center for Integrative Biodiversity Research (iDiv) Halle-Jena-Leipzig, 04103 Leipzig,
70 Germany.

71 38 Institute of Biology, Martin Luther University Halle Wittenberg, 06108 Halle (Saale),
72 Germany.

73 39 Conservation Science Department, Royal Botanic Gardens Kew, TW9 3AE, UK.

74 40 Key Biodiversity Area Secretariat, c/o BirdLife International, The David Attenborough
75 Building, Pembroke Street, Cambridge CB2 3QZ, UK.

76 41 The Nature Conservancy, Arlington, Virginia 22203, USA.

77 42 University of Queensland, Brisbane, QLD 4072, Australia.

78 43 Institute for Sustainable Development and International Relations, Sciences Po, Paris 75007,
79 France.

80 44 Springer Nature, London WC1X 8HB, UK.

81 45 Global Mammal Assessment Programme, Dipartimento di Biologia e Biotechnologie "Charles
82 Darwin", Sapienza Università di Roma, viale dell'Università 32, I-00185, Rome, Italy.

83 46 Parks Canada, Gatineau, Québec J8X 0B3, Canada.

84 47 Biodiversify, UK.

85 48 Department of Biological Sciences, University of Cape Town, Cape Town, South Africa.

86 49 IUCN Species Survival Commission, Bath BA2 6BZ, UK.

87 50 CDC Biodiversité, Paris, 75002, France.

88 51 Industrial Ecology Programme, Norwegian University of Science and Technology (NTNU),
89 7491 Trondheim, Norway.

90 52 Sustainable Forestry Initiative Inc., 2121 K Street NW, Washington, DC 20037, USA.

91 53 BirdLife South Africa, Johannesburg 2196, South Africa.

92 54 Department of Geography, Environmental Management and Energy Studies, University of
93 Johannesburg, Auckland Park 2006, South Africa.

94 55 Senckenberg Research Institute, 02826 Goerlitz, Germany.

95 56 Museum für Naturkunde, Leibniz Institute for Evolution and Biodiversity Science,
96 Biodiversity & Bioeconomy, Center for Integrative Biodiversity Discovery, Invalidenstraße 43,
97 10115 Berlin Germany.

98 57 Center for Biodiversity Outcomes, Arizona State University, Tempe, Arizona 85284, USA.

99 58 Microsoft, Redmond, WA 98052, USA.

100 59 Department of Biological Sciences, National University of Singapore, Singapore 117543,
101 Singapore.

102 60 Department of Ecology and Conservation Biology, Texas A&M University, Texas 77843, USA.

- 103 61 Global Wildlife Conservation, Austin, Texas 78767, USA.
- 104 62 School of Life Sciences, Arizona State University, Tempe, Arizona 85287, USA.
- 105 63 Manchester Metropolitan University, Manchester M15 6BH, UK.
- 106 64 School of Mathematics and Natural Sciences, Arizona State University, Glendale, Arizona
107 85306, USA.
- 108 65 Botanic Gardens Conservation International, Richmond, TW9 3BW, UK.
- 109 66 IUCN Species Survival Commission, Caracas, Venezuela.
- 110 67 Venezuelan Institute for Scientific Investigation (IVIC), Caracas, Venezuela.
- 111 68 Provita, Caracas, Venezuela.
- 112 69 NatureServe, Virginia, 22202, USA.
- 113 *Corresponding author : Louise Mair. Email: Louise.Mair@newcastle.ac.uk

114 **The Convention on Biological Diversity’s post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework will likely**
115 **include a goal to stabilise and restore the status of species. Its delivery would be facilitated by**
116 **making the actions required to halt and reverse species loss spatially explicit. We develop a**
117 **“Species Threat Abatement and Restoration” (STAR) metric, which is scalable across species,**
118 **threats and geographies. STAR quantifies the contributions that abating threats and restoring**
119 **habitats in specific places offer towards reducing extinction risk. While every nation can**
120 **contribute towards halting biodiversity loss, Indonesia, Colombia, Mexico, Madagascar and Brazil**
121 **combined have stewardship over 31% of total STAR values for terrestrial amphibians, birds and**
122 **mammals. Among actions, sustainable crop production and forestry dominate, contributing 41%**
123 **of total STAR values for these taxonomic groups. Key Biodiversity Areas cover 9% of the terrestrial**
124 **surface but capture 47% of STAR values. STAR could support governmental and non-state actors to**
125 **quantify their contributions to meeting science-based species targets within the framework.**

126 The Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) sets the policy framework for biodiversity conservation
127 and sustainable use through the commitments of 195 countries and the European Union. The
128 Strategic Plan for Biodiversity 2011-2020 included Aichi Biodiversity Target 12, which set the goal for
129 2020 of preventing the extinction of known threatened species and improving and sustaining their
130 conservation status. Despite government commitments and successful efforts for certain species¹,
131 overall extinction risk continues to increase, and widespread implementation shortfalls will prevent
132 Target 12 from being met². A new global framework with revised goals and targets is currently being
133 negotiated, which places the stabilisation and restoration of species’ populations as an outcome goal
134 for 2030, as a stepping-stone towards the CBD’s 2050 Vision^{3,4}.

135 The Aichi Biodiversity Targets were largely approached as a list of twenty discrete targets, not
136 making explicit how progress towards pressure-reduction targets would support progress towards
137 biodiversity-outcome targets⁵. In contrast, the proposed post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework
138 explicitly states the need to reduce threats to halt the loss of biodiversity, and proposes specific sub-

139 targets for threat reduction³. While the major direct threats to species are well-documented²,
140 establishing specific targets for threat reduction is complex, because there are large numbers of
141 threatened species (>30,000 species assessed as threatened on the IUCN Red List⁶), rapid
142 deteriorations (revealed by the Red List Index^{7,8}), and large spatial variation in species' distributions,
143 extinction risk trends and the threats impacting them⁹. Tools that support actions to address these
144 threats include the documentation of species recovery¹⁰, identification of important sites¹¹, and
145 systematic conservation planning¹². However, no mechanisms yet exist to quantify the contributions
146 that particular actions in particular places could make towards abating threats to and restoring
147 habitat for threatened species worldwide, to support achievement of the goals of the post-2020
148 biodiversity framework.

149 Results and Discussion

150 *The Species Threat Abatement and Restoration metric*

151 We develop and analyse a “Species Threat Abatement and Restoration” (STAR) metric, which
152 evaluates the potential benefit for threatened species of actions to reduce threats and restore
153 habitat. Like the Red List Index^{7,8}, STAR is derived from existing data in the IUCN Red List and is
154 intended to help address an urgent need. STAR is spatially explicit, enabling identification of specific
155 threat abatement and habitat restoration opportunities in particular places, which if implemented,
156 could reduce species extinction risk to levels that would exist without ongoing human impact.
157 Abatement of threats to species encompasses reduction in threat intensity and/or action to mitigate
158 the impacts of threats. Positive population and/or distribution changes, and resulting reduction of
159 species extinction risk, have been documented in response to threat abatement¹³. STAR assumes
160 that for the great majority of species (see Supplementary Discussion) *complete* alleviation of threats
161 would reduce extinction risk through halting decline and/or permitting sufficient recovery in
162 population and distribution, such that the species could be downlisted to the IUCN Red List category
163 of Least Concern. We recognize that complete threat reduction is difficult, incremental conservation

164 gains will need to be tracked at the species level²³ and species recovery will vary across a species'
165 range²³.

166 For each species, a global STAR threat-abatement (STAR_T) score is defined. This varies from zero for
167 Least Concern species to 100 for Near Threatened, 200 for Vulnerable, 300 for Endangered and 400
168 for Critically Endangered (using established weighting ratios^{7,8}). The sum of STAR_T values across all
169 species represents the global threat abatement effort needed for all species to become Least
170 Concern. STAR_T scores can be disaggregated spatially, based on the area of habitat currently
171 available for each species in a particular location (as a proxy for population proportion). This shows
172 the potential contribution of conservation actions in that location to reducing the extinction risk for
173 all species globally. The local STAR_T score can be further disaggregated by threat, based on the
174 known contribution of each threat to the species' risk of extinction (see Methods). This quantifies
175 how actions that abate a specific threat at a particular location contribute to the global abatement
176 of extinction risk for all species.

177 The STAR metric also includes a complementary habitat restoration component to reflect the
178 potential benefits to species of restoring lost habitat. During the UN Decade on Ecosystem
179 Restoration (2021-2030), restoration efforts are likely to expand. The STAR restoration component
180 applies a similar logic to the STAR threat-abatement component, but for habitat that has been lost
181 and is potentially restorable ('restorable area of habitat'). The STAR restoration component does not
182 make assumptions about the extent of habitat restoration required for individual species, but
183 instead quantifies the potential contribution that habitat restoration activities could make to
184 reducing species' extinction risk. For a particular species at a particular location, the STAR
185 restoration (STAR_R) score reflects the proportion that restorable habitat at the location represents of
186 the global area of remaining habitat for that species. Importantly, a multiplier is applied to STAR_R
187 scores to reflect the slower and lower success rate in delivering benefits to species from restored

188 habitat compared with conserved existing habitat¹⁴. Again, STAR_R scores can be disaggregated by
189 threat, and summed across species within the location.

190 STAR is intended to provide a metric to underpin the establishment of science-based targets as
191 explicit contributions from individual actors towards the post-2020 biodiversity framework, by
192 allowing assessment of actions and locations according to their potential ability to deliver towards
193 international conservation targets. Individual spatially-based STAR_T and STAR_R scores, for all species
194 present in a particular location or country, represent a proportion of the global opportunity to
195 reduce species' extinction risk through threat abatement and restoration respectively. For each
196 species, the total STAR_T score could be achieved by the complete abatement of all threats in
197 remaining habitat, or an equivalent value of the STAR metric can be achieved by a combination of
198 threat abatement in remaining habitat and restoration of lost habitat (with concomitant threat
199 abatement therein). The metric can support establishment of science-based targets by a range of
200 actors across spatial scales. By enabling governments and non-state actors to quantify their potential
201 contributions, STAR, along with other tools, could facilitate achievement of global policy goals,
202 notably the species component of the Sustainable Development Goals and the expected post-2020
203 Global Biodiversity Framework.

204 STAR uses existing publicly available datasets: species' extinction risk categories and threats
205 available from the IUCN Red List⁶ (or, for country endemics not yet assessed globally, from national
206 red lists), and species' area of habitat estimated using species' ranges, habitat associations, and
207 elevation limits, along with digital elevation models and current and historical land cover maps
208 (here, we used back-cast land cover maps of the distribution of habitat pre-human impact, as in¹⁵).
209 To demonstrate the utility of STAR, we calculated global STAR scores for those groups of terrestrial
210 vertebrate species that are comprehensively assessed on the IUCN Red List, i.e. threatened and Near
211 Threatened species of amphibians, birds and mammals globally (n=5,359).

212 *Potential to reduce species extinction risk*

213 Globally, the greatest contribution that could be made to reduce the extinction risk of these groups
214 is tackling threats from annual and perennial non-timber crop production, which account for 24.5%
215 of the global STAR_T score (Figure 1). A further 16.4% is contributed by logging and wood harvesting.
216 There are likely to be specific targets for reducing agriculture and forestry threats in the post-2020
217 framework³ and applying STAR quantifies the large potential contribution that mitigating these
218 threats could make to the goal for species conservation. Appropriate activities to deliver on such
219 targets range along a continuum from land sharing through to land sparing¹⁶.

220 STAR can be used in combination with existing policy and planning tools to quantify the potential
221 contribution of action targets towards species conservation outcomes. The proposed post-2020
222 framework includes an action target for the protection of sites of particular importance to
223 biodiversity³. Key Biodiversity Areas¹¹, which include Important Bird & Biodiversity Areas¹⁷ and
224 Alliance for Zero Extinction sites¹⁸, correspond to such sites. Key Biodiversity Areas so far cover 8.8%
225 of the terrestrial surface (www.keybiodiversityareas.org; identification is ongoing), but already
226 capture 47% of the global STAR_T score for the vertebrate groups analysed. They represent large
227 proportions of some national STAR_T scores: >70% in Mexico and Venezuela, and >50% in
228 Madagascar, Ecuador, the Philippines and Tanzania.

229 STAR_T scores can also support target-setting at national and sub-national scales to help meet
230 international policy goals. The control and eradication of invasive species forms one of the CBD's
231 proposed post-2020 action targets³. New Zealand has already set a "Predator Free 2050" goal that
232 aims to eradicate three invasive mammal species by 2050. New Zealand contributes 0.8% to the
233 global STAR_T score for the three vertebrate groups included in this study. Achieving the Predator
234 Free 2050 goal would contribute 30% of the total STAR_T score for New Zealand, amounting to 0.2%
235 of the global STAR_T score.

236 All countries contribute towards the global STAR_T score, but scores are highly skewed, with a few
237 countries having high STAR_T scores and most having low scores for the vertebrate groups analysed
238 (Figure 2a; Extended Data 1). The highest scoring countries are located in biodiverse regions with
239 many threatened endemic species¹⁹: Indonesia contributes 7.1% of the global STAR_T score, Colombia
240 7.0%, Mexico 6.1% Madagascar 6.0% and Brazil 5.2%. These top five countries contribute 31.3% of
241 the global STAR_T score. In contrast, the lowest scoring 88 countries together contribute only 1% of
242 the global STAR_T score. This does not imply that these low-scoring countries have negligible species
243 conservation responsibilities: the global decline in even common species indicates that all countries
244 must act to reverse the degradation of nature and restore the diversity and abundance of species
245 and integrity of ecosystems²⁰ as well as preventing extinctions at a national scale. Moreover, most
246 countries have a Red List Index²¹, or an equivalent, quantifying their progress or failure in reducing
247 global extinction risk of assessed species relative to their national responsibility for global species
248 conservation; STAR provides a means to guide the reduction of extinction risk and so assist all
249 countries in meeting national species conservation targets.

250 At the global level, we estimated that an equivalent to 55.9% of the global STAR_T score for
251 vertebrates could, theoretically, be achieved by restoring lost habitat within current range (Figure 1).
252 Ecosystem restoration objectives have been identified in many national biodiversity strategies for
253 the CBD, as well as in many countries' commitments under the Bonn Challenge, and as part of
254 Nationally Determined Contributions under the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate
255 Change (UNFCCC). The STAR metric has the potential to support restoration initiatives alongside
256 species conservation targets by quantifying the potential benefit to particular species of restoring
257 habitat in specific places²² (Figure 2b). Restoration may be particularly important for some species,
258 including those assessed under Red List sub-criteria D/D1 (with a very small population), or B_{ac} (with
259 a small range with severe fragmentation, plus extreme fluctuations). For species uniquely assessed
260 under these criteria (2.8% of those included in this study), threat abatement alone is unlikely to
261 eliminate extinction risk, and so might need to be complemented by restoration in order to achieve

262 Least Concern status (see Supplementary Discussion). Moreover, depending on habitat loss and
263 threat type, restoration of habitat may be beneficial for a larger proportion of threatened species.

264 *Application of STAR at the landscape scale*

265 We tested the landscape-scale application of the STAR metric in the southern part of Bukit Tigapuluh
266 landscape, in central Sumatra, Indonesia (Figure 3a). The Bukit Tigapuluh Sustainable Landscape and
267 Livelihoods Project is a sustainable commercial rubber initiative. The study area (approximately
268 88,000 ha) includes a 5 km buffer, which is set aside to support local livelihoods, wildlife
269 conservation areas and forest protection and restoration, and two ecosystem restoration areas,
270 which form a conservation management zone that protects the Bukit Tigapuluh National Park from
271 encroachment.

272 The total STAR_T score for the study area represents 0.2% of the STAR_T score for Sumatra, 0.04% of
273 that for Indonesia and 0.003% of the global STAR_T. The major threats are from annual and perennial
274 non-timber crops, logging and wood harvesting, and collecting terrestrial animals (Figure 3b). The
275 proximate causes of these pressures in the project area are rubber cultivation, oil palm cultivation,
276 industrial logging, subsistence wood cutting, and hunting. STAR analysis shows that areas with the
277 greatest potential to contribute to species conservation through threat mitigation are in remaining
278 natural habitat close to the National Park, with a small area of high potential also to the west, where
279 the relatively small distribution of the Orbiculus leaf-nosed bat (*Hipposideros orbiculus*) overlaps the
280 site (Figure 3A). Additionally, due to recent forest loss, 47% of the STAR_T score for the study area
281 could be achieved through habitat restoration (i.e. STAR_R). Investment in these management actions
282 has the potential to deliver these quantified contributions to national and global biodiversity targets.

283 *Operationalisation and future development*

284 The STAR metric makes use of the best available data, producing results that are relevant to policy
285 and practice. However, there is scope for future refinement as the underlying data improves. Here,
286 the STAR metric covers amphibians, birds and mammals globally, constituting a well-studied but

287 small proportion of taxonomic diversity (see Extended Data 2 and 3 for variation among taxa). STAR
288 can be expanded to other taxonomic groups, including freshwater and marine species, as data
289 become available (reptiles, cacti, cycads, conifers, freshwater fish and reef-building corals are among
290 the groups imminently available for incorporation). Global application of STAR will require
291 comprehensive assessment of taxonomic groups, testing of the transferability of the STAR metric
292 assumptions among taxa as Red List coverage expands, and further development of methods to
293 calculate area of habitat. Area of habitat calculation does not currently capture spatial variation in
294 species' population density, which will be important for many species²³; such data have not been
295 gathered on a global scale yet and could be incorporated as available.

296 The completeness of threat data in the IUCN Red List is uneven but is continually improving. The
297 STAR metric does not currently reflect spatial variation in threat magnitude within species' ranges;
298 more broadly there is a lack of information on the spatial distribution of threats²⁴. Most species
299 included in this study have relatively small ranges; total current area of habitat is <5,000 km² for 55%,
300 <1,000 km² for 33%, and within a single country for 66% (Extended Data 4). This prevalence of small
301 ranges may reduce the significance of spatial variation in threats. Nevertheless, threats may vary
302 spatially for any species not confined to a single location, and there is scope to use threat mapping
303 to inform the likely spatial distribution of threats²⁴. Application of STAR at the landscape or site level,
304 for instance to set targets or identify management actions (e.g. Figure 3), will therefore require
305 verification of the presence and distribution of threatened species (including restorable habitat), and
306 assessment of the distribution and severity of threats. Such assessments should examine synergies
307 among threats²⁵ and potential leakage in response to threat mitigation²⁶; context-specific processes
308 that cannot be accounted for in the global metric. At the global level, periodic recalibration of STAR
309 scores based on updated Red List assessments will be necessary to account for the emergence of
310 new threats²⁷ and the changing extinction risk of species^{7,8} as well as the inclusion of additional
311 groups not previously assessed. Where uncertainty cannot be reduced in a given application of STAR,
312 sensitivity analyses (for example see Methods section below) can be used to explore and quantify

313 uncertainty. For a summary of sources of uncertainty and approaches to quantify and reduce
314 uncertainty in STAR calculations, see Supplementary Table 1 and Extended Data 5.

315 STAR alone does not identify conservation priorities, but could be harnessed alongside other data,
316 for example on costs and benefits of conservation actions, to support conservation planning and
317 prioritisation¹². The STAR metric identifies what, in principle, needs to be done for species to achieve
318 Least Concern status; however, the feasibility of abating threats will depend on the specific threat
319 and context. Threats such as climate change or infectious disease cannot be reduced significantly
320 through local action only. However, they may be mitigated through measures such as (for climate
321 change) conservation translocations or increasing habitat connectivity to support distribution
322 shifts²⁸. Habitat restoration is a particularly important strategy to mitigate climate change impacts,
323 and STAR quantifies the contribution of habitat restoration in combination with threat abatement to
324 reducing species' extinction risk. Appropriate prioritisation²² and local planning are needed to
325 identify the spatial urgency, feasibility and expected benefit from restoration. Furthermore, while in
326 principle complete delivery of STAR_T would achieve downlisting to Least Concern for the great
327 majority of species, the varying reasons for raised extinction risk reflected in different Red List
328 criteria are – necessarily – not conveyed when creating a standardised index (see Supplementary
329 Discussion). Moreover, delivery of STAR_T does not equate to long-term species recovery. Other tools
330 exist to support more ambitious goals, notably the IUCN Green Status of Species, which is
331 complementary to STAR in its data inputs and requirements, scope and audience, and in that it
332 assesses progress towards species' full recovery and ecological functionality¹⁰. Over time, the Green
333 Status approach may also provide additional data that could enhance STAR, but the urgent need is to
334 quantify how actions can contribute to achieving species goals using already available data.

335 Finally, countries with high STAR_T scores face intense pressures on biodiversity, but these pressures
336 often originate from beyond their borders. This is owing both to global-scale threats, such as climate
337 change and infectious disease, and to market forces operating beyond national boundaries. Global-

338 scale and transboundary threats cannot necessarily be addressed within habitats, but require
339 concerted actions within and among countries, for example through national commitments to
340 reduce greenhouse gas emissions, implementation of biosecurity measures to prevent the spread of
341 invasive alien species, and enforcement of restrictions imposed by the Convention on International
342 Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES). STAR scores can indicate the need for
343 such actions, which then require implementation in a non-local context. International trade in
344 commodities and services is an important and growing driver of biodiversity loss. Some countries
345 with high consumption per capita (e.g. in Northern Europe) have relatively low in-country STAR_T
346 scores, suggesting that it is important to consider embodied (i.e. full lifecycle) as well as direct
347 impacts for products and processes. For example, Germany contributes only 0.01% of the global
348 STAR_T score, but is the third biggest importer of biodiversity impacts through commodity supply
349 chains²⁹. There is therefore urgent need to advance supply chain analyses²⁹ in order to quantify and
350 account for the biodiversity impacts driven by end-consumers.

351 *Policy implications*

352 STAR can be disaggregated to identify and quantify the opportunities for both countries and non-
353 state actors to contribute their shares of action towards a global species conservation goal. In doing
354 so, STAR can support a framework analogous to the UNFCCC's 2015 Paris Agreement, which
355 provided a new model for global environmental governance. Uptake of this model among non-state
356 actors has been promising, with 476 companies³⁰ and 98 cities³¹ (as of 5 October 2020) establishing
357 science-based targets for greenhouse gas emissions reduction at the level necessary to deliver the
358 Paris Agreement. Moreover, the approach will doubtless be applied to analyse whether the sum of
359 Nationally Determined Commitments, set by individual countries, is indeed sufficient to hold climate
360 change to 1.5–2°C³². STAR provides an equivalent metric to guide establishment of science-based
361 targets for conserving species-level biodiversity. STAR will need to sit alongside equivalent metrics
362 for ecosystems (e.g.³³) and potentially also genetic diversity³⁴, consistent with the CBD's definition of

363 biological diversity, in supporting the establishment of science-based targets in the post-2020
364 framework.

365 The application of STAR would have important implications for conservation and sustainable
366 development. In terms of the post-2020 biodiversity framework, it could facilitate the establishment
367 of targets to mitigate threats to the level necessary to halt and reverse biodiversity loss. Such an
368 approach could be extended across the other biodiversity-related conventions, with, for example,
369 the Ramsar Convention on Wetlands calibrating its global target as the STAR_T score for wetland
370 biodiversity. It could similarly be extended to inform delivery of the biodiversity-related targets of
371 Sustainable Development Goals 14 (Life below water) and 15 (Life on land); aligned with the role of
372 the Red List Index⁷⁻⁹ as an official indicator. Finally, and perhaps most fundamentally, the approach
373 provides a common metric for the conservation of threatened species that stands to incentivise
374 voluntary contributions from actors beyond national governments: cities, states and provinces, the
375 private sector, and indigenous and local communities. The increasing recognition of the importance
376 of polycentric governance in addressing global environmental challenges³⁵ suggests that such
377 broadening of contributions is not only desirable, but essential and urgent.

378 Methods

379 Data inputs

380 Calculation of the STAR metric requires information on species' extinction risk, threats, and current
381 and restorable Area of Habitat³⁶ (AOH). Species' extinction risk categories and threat classification
382 data were obtained for amphibians, birds and mammals from the IUCN Red List version 2019-3⁶.
383 These taxonomic groups are comprehensively assessed on the IUCN Red List (meaning >80% of the
384 taxonomic group assessed; recent taxonomic splits mean that 16% of amphibian species have been
385 recently recognised and not yet assessed for the IUCN Red List) and range maps are available for
386 nearly all species. Species assessed as Near Threatened and threatened (Vulnerable, Endangered and
387 Critically Endangered) were included in the analysis. Least Concern species were not included, as
388 threats are not coded for the majority of Least Concern species on the IUCN Red List. Data Deficient
389 species were also excluded, as these are too poorly known to classify their extinction risk, and they
390 often lack data on threats, habitats, elevation and/or distribution⁶.

391 The IUCN/Conservation Measures Partnership Threat Classification Scheme is hierarchical^{37,38}, and
392 threats to species are classified at the most detailed level possible. For each threat to each species,
393 the scope (proportion of the global population impacted), severity (rate of decline driven by the
394 threat within its scope) and timing (past, ongoing, or future) of the threat are coded as part of the
395 Red List assessments. Threats that were recorded as "past and unlikely to return" were excluded
396 from the analysis. Threats that were not expected to cause a population decline were also excluded;
397 these were threats with a severity scored as "no decline", and threats with a combination of severity
398 scored as "negligible decline" and scope scored as either the minority or majority of the species'
399 distribution (see explanation in *STAR calculation* below and Supplementary Table 2). Consequently,
400 any species recorded as suffering only from threats that were not expected to cause a population
401 decline were excluded from the analysis.

402 The extent of current and restorable Area of Habitat³⁶ (AOH) for species was determined using 5 km
403 resolution species' AOH rasters. We calculated species current AOH following¹⁵. We used the
404 European Space Agency "Climate Change Initiative" (ESA CCI) land use and cover maps³⁹ from 2015,
405 with 300 x 300 m pixel size. The ESA CCI original 37 land cover classes were reclassified into ten
406 major classes (forests, wetlands, arid ecosystems, natural grasslands, shrublands, croplands,
407 cultivated grasslands, rock and ice, and urban areas), and then matched to the habitat classes from
408 IUCN Red List assessments. Species' range maps^{6,40} were then overlaid with land cover and digital
409 elevation maps to map the area of habitat within each species' range, constrained by the species'
410 elevation range (from the IUCN Red List). Species' range map polygons are coded for presence and
411 origin⁴¹; we excluded from current AOH parts of species' ranges where the species' presence was
412 recorded as Extinct, Possibly Extant or Presence Uncertain, leaving only parts recorded as Extant,
413 Probably Extant (a category that is being phased out) and Possibly Extinct. We also excluded parts of
414 each species' range where the species' origin was recorded as Introduced, Vagrant or Origin
415 Uncertain, thus leaving only parts recorded as Native, Reintroduced or present through Assisted
416 Colonisation.

417 Original area of habitat represented the extent of original ecosystem types before human impact
418 (i.e. the land cover before conversion to croplands, pasturelands or urban areas; following¹⁵). ESA
419 CCI land use and cover maps from 1992 were used to inform back-casting of the extent of original
420 ecosystem types. Species range maps were then overlaid with this back-cast land cover and with
421 digital elevation maps to map the original area of habitat within each species range. For the
422 purposes of this analysis, the extent of species original AOH was constrained to within individual
423 species' range maps according to the IUCN Red List; these range maps largely reflect current range
424 limits due to a lack of consistent information across all species on their historical, recently extirpated
425 range. As with current AOH, we included in original AOH only parts of each species' range where the
426 species' origin was recorded as Native, Reintroduced or present through Assisted Colonisation
427 according to the origin coding of the IUCN Red List assessments⁴¹. We also excluded parts of each

428 species' range where the species' presence was recorded as Possibly Extant or Presence Uncertain.
429 However, for original AOH, we additionally included parts of species' ranges where the species was
430 recorded as Extinct, for all species for which this information was available. Species restorable AOH
431 was then calculated as the difference between original and current AOH. A total of 5,359 species
432 (2,055 amphibians, 1,957 birds and 1,347 mammals) were included in the analysis based on the
433 availability of the necessary data.

434 STAR calculation

435 To calculate STAR values, we used data on the extent of species' current AOH and restorable AOH,
436 extinction risk (IUCN Red List category) and the relative contribution of each threat to the species'
437 extinction risk. The STAR metric is calculated for all Near Threatened and threatened species present
438 at a location. 'Location' in this context represents any spatially defined area; the maximum size is the
439 entire area of the globe, while the minimum practical size is determined by the spatial resolution of
440 habitat maps available for species. The STAR threat-abatement score (T) for a location (i) and threat
441 (t) is calculated among all species as:

442

$$443 \quad T_{t,i} = \sum_s^{N_s} P_{s,i} W_s C_{s,t}$$

444 where $P_{s,i}$ is the current Area of Habitat³⁶ (AOH) of each species (s) within location (i), expressed as a
445 percentage of the global species' current AOH; W_s is the IUCN Red List category weight of species s
446 (Near Threatened = 1, Vulnerable = 2, Endangered = 3 and Critically Endangered = 4^{7,8}); C is the
447 relative contribution of threat³⁸ t to the extinction risk of species s; and N_s is the total number of
448 species at location (i). The relative contribution of each threat to the species' extinction risk was
449 calculated as the percentage population decline from that threat (derived from the product of
450 severity and scope for that threat in each species' IUCN Red List assessment as in⁴²; see
451 Supplementary Table 2) divided by the sum of percentage population declines from all threats to

452 that species. Scores were calculated using the most detailed threat classification available and then
453 aggregated to higher levels in the threat classification scheme by summing scores.

454 The STAR restoration score (R) for the potential contribution of habitat restoration (and threat
455 abatement therein) at location i for threat t is calculated as:

456

$$457 \quad R_{t,i} = \sum_s^{N_s} H_{s,i} W_s C_{s,t} M_{s,i}$$

458 where $H_{s,i}$ is the extent of restorable AOH for species s at location i , expressed as a percentage of the
459 global species' current AOH, and M_i is a multiplier appropriate to the habitat at location i to discount
460 restoration scores. Here, we use a global multiplier of 0.29 based on the median rate of recovery
461 from a global meta-analysis¹⁴ assuming that restoration has been underway for ten years (the period
462 of the post-2020 outcome goals).

463 The STAR metric assumes that abating all current and plausible future threats in species' current
464 AOH would stabilise species populations and distributions, such that they would be downlisted to
465 Least Concern (with few exceptions: see Supplementary Discussion).

466 $STAR_T$ and $STAR_R$ scores were mapped at the 5 km grid cell resolution. For each species, the $STAR_T$
467 score per grid cell was calculated by multiplying each species' total $STAR_T$ score by the proportion of
468 the species' current AOH in the grid cell. The $STAR_R$ score per grid cell was calculated by multiplying
469 the species' total $STAR_R$ score by the proportion of species' restorable AOH present in the grid cell.
470 Global maps of total $STAR_T$ and $STAR_R$ scores were produced by summing the respective score maps
471 across all species. For presentation, maps were aggregated to the 50 km resolution by summing
472 scores across cells.

473 We calculated $STAR_T$ scores for 196 regions (195 recognised countries, including their dependencies,
474 plus Antarctica). The proportion of species' current AOH within each country was estimated by

475 overlaying species' current AOH with polygons of national boundaries. The STAR calculation was
476 then applied at the country level.

477 STAR_T scores were calculated for Key Biodiversity Areas. The boundaries of Key Biodiversity Areas
478 already formally identified were obtained from the World Database of Key Biodiversity Areas⁴³ on 13
479 January 2020. Polygon data were available for 15,782 sites. STAR_T scores for terrestrial sites were
480 calculated by overlaying the Key Biodiversity Area polygons onto the global 5 km grid cell resolution
481 rasters of STAR_T scores, which were generated as described above.

482 In order to relate STAR_T scores to conservation policy in the example of New Zealand, we calculated
483 STAR_T scores per invasive species. Where species have been assessed as threatened by invasive non-
484 native/alien species or diseases, the invasive threat has been documented at genus or species level
485 in 85% of cases. In the case of New Zealand, the invasive threat was documented in 97% of cases,
486 allowing the STAR_T score for invasive species to be calculated at the level of the individual species.

487 Calculation of STAR_T and STAR_R scores for Bukit Tigapuluh landscape in Indonesia was carried out at
488 a higher spatial resolution than for the global STAR analysis, in order to provide more detailed maps
489 at the landscape scale. The Bukit Tigapuluh landscape is dominated by forest, and so only species
490 associated with forest according to the IUCN Red List habitat classification scheme⁴⁴ were included.

491 We used species distribution polygons^{6,40} combined with Global Land Analysis and Discovery maps of
492 forest cover change⁴⁵ at the 30 m resolution to calculate species' current AOH and restorable AOH at
493 the location. Based on available forest change data, current AOH was calculated from forest cover in
494 the year 2018, while restorable AOH was forest lost since 2000. Species AOH was clipped to species'
495 elevation limitations using species' elevation data from the IUCN Red List combined with a digital
496 elevation map⁴⁶. Thus, species' current and restorable AOH were calculated at 30 m resolution for
497 the extent of the Bukit Tigapuluh landscape. Species' global AOH (at 5 km resolution, as described
498 above) was then used to calculate the proportion that species' current and restorable AOH at the
499 location represented of the species global current AOH.

500 All data processing and analyses were carried out using the software R⁴⁷.

501 Sensitivity analyses to inform STAR development

502 The sensitivity of STAR_T scores to variation in the metric's various components was explored in order
503 to inform the development of the metric. All sensitivity analyses were carried out using data on
504 birds, due to the completeness of their Red List assessment data (see Supplementary Methods for
505 detailed methods).

506 Threat scope and severity data are largely complete for birds but missing for the majority of
507 amphibian and mammal species; this information is recommended but not required documentation
508 for Red List assessments, so is not consistently documented. Approaches to dealing with missing
509 scope and severity data were explored (see Supplementary Methods and Extended Data 6) and it
510 was concluded that using the median of possible values of scope and severity to replace missing data
511 was a suitable approach (see also Supplementary Discussion).

512 The effect of applying equal steps weighting, log steps weighting and no weighting to species Red
513 List categories was investigated (Extended Data 7a-b). Equal steps weighting was selected, rather
514 than relative extinction risk weights, for the same reasons as articulated for the Red List Index^{7,48}, as
515 relative extinction risk (log step) weights would make STAR_T values overwhelmingly dominated by
516 threats to Critically Endangered species, whereas the 'equal steps' weights lead to STAR_T scores
517 representing opportunities to improve the extinction risk of a much wider set of threatened and
518 Near Threatened species. Importantly, equal steps align the weighting of species in STAR metric to
519 the weighting of species in the well-established RLI.

520 The effect of giving greater weight to larger proportions of species' current AOH per location and
521 lower weight to smaller proportions of species current AOH per location⁴⁹ was explored (Extended
522 Data 7c), with a view to reflecting the role of habitat configuration in species' persistence. However,
523 this was not adopted, in order to maintain the scalability and additivity of the metric.

524 The percentage population decline expected to be caused by a particular threat was the median
525 value from within the range of expected percentage population declines for the particular
526 combination of scope and severity scores (which represent bands of possible values). The effect of
527 varying the expected percentage population decline within this range for each combination of scope
528 and severity scores was explored, and the metric was found to be robust to this variation (Extended
529 Data 8).

530 Data availability statement

531 Species' extinction risk category, threat data, elevation limitations, habitat associations and
532 distribution polygons are publicly available under specified Terms and Conditions of Use from the
533 IUCN Red List website⁶. KBA boundaries are available from the World Database of Key Biodiversity
534 Areas⁴³, again under specified Terms and Conditions of Use. The European Space Agency "Climate
535 Change Initiative" (ESA CCI) land use and cover maps are available at www.esa-landcover-cci.org³⁹.
536 Forest cover change maps are available from <https://glad.umd.edu>⁴⁵. Digital elevation maps are
537 available from <https://earthexplorer.usgs.gov>⁴⁶. Global STAR threat-abatement and restoration
538 scores for amphibians, birds and mammals at 50 km grid cell resolution are available in TIFF file
539 format as Supplementary Data 1 and 2.

540 References

- 541 1 Hoffmann, M. *et al.* The Impact of Conservation on the Status of the World's Vertebrates.
542 *Science* **330**, 1503-1509 (2010).
- 543 2 Butchart, S. H. M. *et al.* Assessing progress towards meeting major international objectives
544 related to nature and nature's contributions to people. (Secretariat of the
545 Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform for Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services,
546 Germany, 2019).
- 547 3 CBD. Zero draft of the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework. (2020).
- 548 4 Rounsevell, M. D. A. *et al.* A biodiversity target based on species extinctions. *Science* **368**,
549 1193-1195 (2020).
- 550 5 Marques, A. *et al.* A framework to identify enabling and urgent actions for the 2020 Aichi
551 Targets. *Basic and Applied Ecology* **15**, 633-638 (2014).
- 552 6 IUCN. The IUCN Red List of Threatened Species. Version 2019-3. (2019).
553 <https://www.iucnredlist.org>.
- 554 7 Butchart, S. H. M. *et al.* Improvements to the Red List Index. *Plos One* **2**, e140 (2007).
- 555 8 Butchart, S. H. M. *et al.* Measuring global trends in the status of biodiversity: Red list indices
556 for birds. *Plos Biology* **2**, 2294-2304 (2004).
- 557 9 Rodrigues, A. S. L. *et al.* Spatially Explicit Trends in the Global Conservation Status of
558 Vertebrates. *PLOS ONE* **9**, e113934 (2014).
- 559 10 Akçakaya, H. R. *et al.* Quantifying species recovery and conservation success to develop an
560 IUCN Green List of Species. *Conservation Biology* **32**, 1128-1138 (2018).
- 561 11 IUCN. A Global Standard for the Identification of Key Biodiversity Areas, Version 1.0. (IUCN,
562 Gland, Switzerland, 2016).
- 563 12 Moilanen, A., Wilson, K. A. & Possingham, H. *Spatial Conservation Prioritization: Quantitative*
564 *Methods and Computational Tools*. (Oxford University Press, 2009).

565 13 Sodhi, N. S., Butler, R., Laurance, W. F. & Gibson, L. Conservation successes at micro-, meso-
566 and macroscales. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution* **26**, 585-594 (2011).

567 14 Jones, H. P. *et al.* Restoration and repair of Earth's damaged ecosystems. *Proceedings of the*
568 *Royal Society B: Biological Sciences* **285**, 20172577 (2018).

569 15 Strassburg, B. B. N. *et al.* Global priority areas for ecosystem restoration. *Nature* (2020).

570 16 Phalan, B., Onial, M., Balmford, A. & Green, R. E. Reconciling Food Production and
571 Biodiversity Conservation: Land Sharing and Land Sparing Compared. *Science* **333**, 1289-
572 1291 (2011).

573 17 Donald, P. F. *et al.* Important Bird and Biodiversity Areas (IBAs): the development and
574 characteristics of a global inventory of key sites for biodiversity. *Bird Conservation*
575 *International* **29**, 177-198 (2019).

576 18 Ricketts, T. H. *et al.* Pinpointing and preventing imminent extinctions. *Proceedings of the*
577 *National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* **102**, 18497-18501 (2005).

578 19 Myers, N., Mittermeier, R. A., Mittermeier, C. G., da Fonseca, G. A. B. & Kent, J. Biodiversity
579 hotspots for conservation priorities. *Nature* **403**, 853-858 (2000).

580 20 Ceballos, G., Ehrlich, P. R. & Dirzo, R. Biological annihilation via the ongoing sixth mass
581 extinction signaled by vertebrate population losses and declines. *Proceedings of the National*
582 *Academy of Sciences* **114**, E6089 (2017).

583 21 United Nations. *SDG Indicators*, <<https://unstats.un.org/sdgs/indicators/database/>> (2020).

584 22 Strassburg, B. B. N. *et al.* Strategic approaches to restoring ecosystems can triple
585 conservation gains and halve costs. *Nature Ecology & Evolution* **3**, 62-70 (2019).

586 23 Brown, J. H., Mehlman, D. W. & Stevens, G. C. Spatial Variation in Abundance. *Ecology* **76**,
587 2028-2043 (1995).

588 24 Joppa, L. N. *et al.* Filling in biodiversity threat gaps. *Science* **352**, 416-418 (2016).

589 25 Brook, B. W., Sodhi, N. S. & Bradshaw, C. J. A. Synergies among extinction drivers under
590 global change. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution* **23**, 453-460 (2008).

591 26 Ewers, R. M. & Rodrigues, A. S. L. Estimates of reserve effectiveness are confounded by
592 leakage. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution* **23**, 113-116 (2008).

593 27 Sutherland, W. J. *et al.* Future novel threats and opportunities facing UK biodiversity
594 identified by horizon scanning. *J. Appl. Ecol.* **45**, 821-833 (2008).

595 28 McGuire, J. L., Lawler, J. J., McRae, B. H., Nuñez, T. A. & Theobald, D. M. Achieving climate
596 connectivity in a fragmented landscape. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*
597 **113**, 7195 (2016).

598 29 Lenzen, M. *et al.* International trade drives biodiversity threats in developing nations. *Nature*
599 **486**, 109-112 (2012).

600 30 Science Based Targets initiative. *Companies taking action*,
601 <<https://sciencebasedtargets.org/companies-taking-action/>> (2019).

602 31 C40. *C40 Cities*, <<https://www.c40.org/>> (2019).

603 32 Fawcett, A. A. *et al.* Can Paris pledges avert severe climate change? *Science* **350**, 1168-1169
604 (2015).

605 33 Keith, D. A. *et al.* Scientific Foundations for an IUCN Red List of Ecosystems. *PLOS ONE* **8**,
606 e62111 (2013).

607 34 Laikre, L. *et al.* Post-2020 goals overlook genetic diversity. *Science* **367**, 1083 (2020).

608 35 Ostrom, E. Polycentric systems for coping with collective action and global environmental
609 change. *Global Environmental Change* **20**, 550-557 (2010).

610 36 Brooks, T. M. *et al.* Measuring Terrestrial Area of Habitat (AOH) and Its Utility for the IUCN
611 Red List. *Trends in Ecology & Evolution*, 977-986 (2019).

612 37 IUCN. Threats Classification Scheme (Version 3.2). (2019).

613 38 Salafsky, N. *et al.* A Standard Lexicon for Biodiversity Conservation: Unified Classifications of
614 Threats and Actions. *Conservation Biology* **22**, 897-911 (2008).

615 39 European Space Agency “Climate Change Initiative” (ESA CCI). Available online:
616 <https://www.esa-landcover-cci.org/?q=node/158>.

617 40 BirdLife International and Handbook of the Birds of the World. Bird species distribution
618 maps of the world. Version 2018.1. (2019). <http://datazone.birdlife.org/species/requestdis>.

619 41 IUCN. Mapping Standards and Data Quality for the IUCN Red List Categories and Criteria.
620 Version 1.16., (IUCN, Gland., 2018).

621 42 Garnett, S. T. *et al.* Metrics of progress in the understanding and management of threats to
622 Australian birds. *Conservation Biology* **33**, 456-468 (2018).

623 43 BirdLife International. Digital boundaries of Key Biodiversity Areas from the World Database
624 of Key Biodiversity Areas. (2019). Available at
625 <http://www.keybiodiversityareas.org/site/requestgis>.

626 44 IUCN. Habitats Classification Scheme (Version 3.1). (2019).

627 45 Hansen, M. C. *et al.* High-Resolution Global Maps of 21st-Century Forest Cover Change.
628 *Science* **342**, 850 (2013).

629 46 US Geological Survey. USGS EROS Archive - Digital Elevation - Global 30 Arc-Second Elevation
630 (GTOPO30). (2019). <https://earthexplorer.usgs.gov/>.

631 47 R: A language and environment for statistical computing (R Foundation for Statistical
632 Computing, Vienna, Austria, 2018).

633 48 Butchart, S. H. M. *et al.* Using Red List Indices to measure progress towards the 2010 target
634 and beyond. *Philos. Trans. R. Soc. B-Biol. Sci.* **360**, 255-268 (2005).

635 49 Le Saout, S. *et al.* Protected Areas and Effective Biodiversity Conservation. *Science* **342**, 803-
636 805 (2013).

637 **Acknowledgements**

638 We acknowledge the funding by the Luc Hoffmann Institute, Vulcan Inc, Synchronicity Earth, and
639 Global Environment Facility, and the support from the Conservation International GEF Project
640 Agency. We thank Lisa Genasci (ADM Foundation) for providing technical guidance for the field tests,
641 James Deutsch for facilitating funding, and Resit Akçakaya, Julia P.G. Jones, Joseph R. Bennett and an
642 anonymous reviewer for comments on the manuscript. LM is funded by Newcastle University and
643 IUCN, LPK by the National Research Foundation, Singapore (NRF-RSS2019-007), MB by The Rufford
644 Foundation, and AR by the “Investissements d’avenir” programme, managed by the French National
645 Research Agency (ANR) (ANR-10-LABX-14-01).

646 **Author contributions**

647 LM led on analysis, development and manuscript drafting. LAB, TMB, SHMB, FH and PJKM led on
648 design and development, and made substantial contributions to manuscript preparation. FCB, NDB,
649 JMME, EJM-G, MH, KM, NBWM, DCR, ASLR, XS and BBNS contributed substantially to conceptual
650 development and manuscript preparation. CRB, CG-C, AI, MI, EL, BCM, KP and MFT contributed to
651 conceptual development and data acquisition and analysis. ELB, CB, GC, AC, ME, GABdF, RGalt, AG,
652 LG, RGoedicke, JMHG, RDG, SLLH, DGH, JHughes, JHutton, MPWK, LMN, ENL, AJP, PP, HPP, AR, ECR,
653 CR, JDS, JSiikamäki, CS, GS, SS, ALS, CAS-N, SNS, HJT, AV, FV, LRV and JW contributed to the
654 conceptual development of the work. SB, MB, IJB, VC, CC, NAC, JF, LRG, CH-T, RJ, AJ, LNJ, LPK, TELJ,
655 PFL, BL, DM, MP, BAP, CMP, MCR, NSR, JPR, JSmart and BEY contributed to the acquisition of data.
656 FH & PJKM contributed equally to conception and coordination.

657 **Author information**


658 Reprints and permissions information is available at www.nature.com/reprints. Correspondence and
659 requests for materials should be addressed to Louise Mair (louise.mair@newcastle.ac.uk).

660 **Competing Interests Statement**

661 The authors declare the following competing interests: E.C. Regan works for Springer Nature, the
662 publishers of Nature Ecology & Evolution.


663 **Supplementary Information**

664 Supplementary Information is available for this paper.



666

667 **Figure 1. The contribution to the global STAR threat-abatement score of different threats and the**
 668 **potential contribution of habitat restoration.** The total global STAR threat-abatement score
 669 represents the global threat abatement effort needed for all Near Threatened and threatened
 670 (Vulnerable, Endangered and Critically Endangered according to the IUCN Red List) amphibian, bird
 671 and mammal species to be reclassified as Least Concern. This score can be disaggregated by threat
 672 type, based on the known contribution of each threat to species' risk of extinction. The STAR
 673 restoration score quantifies the potential contribution that habitat restoration activities could make
 674 to reducing overall species' extinction risk. The total STAR threat-abatement score thus could be
 675 achieved by the complete abatement of all threats in existing natural habitat, or through a
 676 combination of threat abatement in existing habitat and restoration of lost habitat (with
 677 concomitant threat abatement therein).



678

679 **Figure 2. Global STAR scores for amphibians, birds and mammals at a 50-km grid cell resolution for**

680 **(a) STAR threat-abatement scores and (b) STAR restoration scores.** Each species has a global STAR

681 threat-abatement score weighted relative to their extinction risk. This global STAR threat-abatement

682 score can be disaggregated spatially, based on the area of habitat currently available for each

683 species in a particular location. The total STAR threat-abatement score per grid cell (a) is thus the


684 sum of the individual species' STAR threat-abatement scores per grid cell across all Near Threatened

685 and threatened species of amphibians, birds and mammals included in this study. The global STAR


686 restoration score per species reflects the potential contribution that habitat restoration activities

687 could make to reducing species' extinction risk, and is spatially disaggregated based on the

688 availability of restorable habitat. Thus, the total STAR restoration score per grid cell (b) is the sum of
689 the individual species' STAR restoration scores per grid cell across all species included in this study.



690



691

692 **Figure 3. STAR results for the Bukit Tigapuluh Sustainable Landscape and Livelihoods Project.** The
 693 Bukit Tigapuluh Sustainable Landscape and Livelihoods Project is a sustainable commercial rubber
 694 initiative. The study area (approximately 88,000 ha) includes a 5 km buffer, which is set aside to
 695 support local livelihoods, wildlife conservation areas and forest protection and restoration, and two
 696 ecosystem restoration areas, which form a conservation management zone that protects the Bukit
 697 Tigapuluh National Park from encroachment. STAR results are shown for: **(a)** mapped STAR threat-
 698 abatement scores in areas with remaining forest (green) and restoration scores in areas where forest
 699 has been lost (purple) at the 30 m grid cell resolution; and **(b)** total STAR threat-abatement scores
 700 per threat for the top five highest scoring threats across the study area (the concession, 5 km buffer,
 701 and ecosystem restoration areas combined).

702