**NATIONAL PERFORMANCE INDEX**

The national performance index documents the hotspot nations in regard to 1) perceptions of corruption, 2) environmental performance, 3) the status of national biodiversity planning, 4) evidence of spatial land use planning, and 5) national biocapacity and ecological footprints. The hotspots are also listed with their percentage of protected area as well as their ranking as compared to other hotspots in achieving the Aichi 17% goal and the number of ecoregions which fall short of the 17% target.

1. The perception of corruption ranking is taken from a sample of 168 nations assessed by Transparency International’s 2015 Corruption Perceptions Index.[[1]](#footnote-1) The scoring system is 0 (most corrupt) -100 (least corrupt).
2. The national environmental performance ranking is based on the 2016 Environmental Performance Index (EPI) created by the Yale Center for Environmental Law and Policy, the Yale Data Driven Environmental Group, and the Colombia University Center of international Earth Science Information Network in collaboration with the Samuel Family Foundation, the McCall MacBain Foundation, and the World Economic Forum. [[2]](#footnote-2) 180 nations are ranked in the assessment. 1st (best) – 180th (worst).
3. The status of national biodiversity planning indicates how nations are adhering to their commitment to the Convention on Biological Diversity to submit and regularly update National Biodiversity Strategy Actions Plans (NBSAPs).[[3]](#footnote-3) Nation’s plans are categorized as revised plans, original plans, plans under revision, or plans in progress and are accompanied by the date of publication. NA indicates that the nation is either not a signatory to the Convention on Biological Diversity (USA for example) or information is unavailable and/or in the case of remote territories under the hegemony of other nations. For up to date NBSAP status reports the CBD website should be referred to.
4. The assessment of whether a nation’s National Biodiversity Strategy Actions Plan has any evidence of spatial planning is limited to desk top analysis. This factor is important in that it suggests the translation of words and targets into actual land use planning.
5. National biocapacity and ecological footprints are taken from the Global Footprint Network.[[4]](#footnote-4) Biocapacity is a “measure of the amount of biologically productive land and sea area available to provide the ecosystem services that humanity consumes”.[[5]](#footnote-5) Ecological footprints are a “measure of the demand populations and their activities place on the biosphere in a given year, given the prevailing technology and resource management.”[[6]](#footnote-6) The total footprint is reached by adding data for food, energy, forest products, urban area and waste.
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