

## **SPECIES SURVIVAL COMMISSION STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING WCC 3.4**

---

**Antananarivo, Madagascar, 22 – 25 October 2006**

### ***Meeting Summary***

*The fourth Species Survival Commission (SSC) Steering Committee meeting of the Quadrennium was held in Madagascar – a country renowned for its biodiversity and conservation efforts. The venue of Antananarivo was chosen because of the desire of the SSC Steering Committee to hold their meetings in places where their presence can add value to the conservation initiatives on the ground and contacts can be made with the local conservation community to further shared objectives. With this aim in mind, a social function provided a good opportunity for the Steering Committee members to meet their counterparts in Madagascar and for each member of the Steering Committee to introduce themselves to the attendees (including government officials, staff of international conservation organisations and local conservation workers). Many links were made and contact details shared: an example being potential new members for the Invasive Species Specialist Group – which has, until now, lacked members from Madagascar.*

*Travel to the meeting was by air and mostly from large distances. With climate change issues in mind, the Steering Committee members agreed that carbon emissions from their travel should be offset. The IUCN offset formula will be applied to all tickets purchased with IUCN funds and those projects identified by IUCN credited. The Steering Committee agreed that, as far as possible, all activities of the SSC should be carbon neutral and a statement encouraging participation will be released to all SG Chairs.*

*The Steering Committee meeting was an interesting mix of updates from the various members and discussion of topical issues such as fundraising, the IUCN Leveraging Initiatives, themes for WCC4 and climate change. The main **decisions** from the meeting included a recommendation to the Restructuring Task Force to continue the restructuring planning process, clear plans for SSC's input to the development of the 2009 – 2012 IUCN Programme, and timelines and processes around the development of the next SSC Strategic Plan. A SG Chairs' Meeting, which has been in the offing for many years was again proposed and it was agreed to seek support for a meeting in 2008. In the meantime, a telephone consultation with the SSC SG Chairs will take place in order for the Chairs, the SSC Chair's Office and the Species Programme to be updated as to activities taking place on all fronts. An attempt will be made to once again quantify the shadow resources (both in kind and project-related) raised by the SSC network, as well as those resources that are raised in the IUCN Regional Offices to carry out species assessment work.*

**Action items** from the meeting included clarifying the reporting requirements of the Commission Operations Fund; ensuring a SSC presence at the Society for Conservation Biology meeting in South Africa next July; asking the Commission on Education and Communications to assist and advise on the right way to articulate and publicise SSC's vision of the importance of species; the clarification of SSC's relationship to the Alliance for Zero Extinction; and ensuring that the Global Species Assessment 2 budgeting, reviewing and publishing plans are in place as soon as possible.

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

**GLOSSARY OF ACCRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS USED.....3**

**DECISIONS AND ACTIONS ITEMS TABLE.....4**

**1 WELCOME, APOLOGIES, INTRODUCTIONS..... 4**

    1.1 Chair’s welcome..... 7

    1.2 Apologies..... 7

**2 ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA..... 7**

**3 ADOPTION OF THE PREVIOUS MINUTES (WCC 3.3, CAMBRIDGE, UK 3-5 MAY 2006)..... 7**

**4 MATTERS ARISING..... 8**

    4.1 SG/TF Chair appointments and RLA Focal Points appointments..... 8

    4.2 Action points from WCC 3.3.....10

**5 UPDATES.....14**

    5.1 Chair’s update .....14

    5.2 Species Programme update.....15

    5.3 **SSC Sub-Committees and SC member updates: feedback and discussion.....16**

        5.3.1 Marine Conservation Sub-Committee (MCSC).....16

        5.3.2 Invertebrate Conservation Sub-Committee (ICSC).....17

        5.3.3 Sustainable Use Sub-Committee (SUSC).....18

        5.3.4 Biodiversity Assessments Sub-Committee (BASC) .....18

        5.3.5 Biodiversity Indicators Sub-Committee (BISC) .....21

        5.3.6 Plant Conservation Sub-Committee (PCSC) .....23

    5.4 **SSC Task Force updates: feedback and discussion .....23**

        5.4.1 Species Conservation Planning TF (SCPTF).....23

        5.4.2 Strategic Planning.....23

        5.4.3 Restructuring TF .....24

    5.5 **Other SSC SC member updates: feedback and discussion .....24**

        5.5.1 Veterinary SG .....24

        5.5.2 Invasive Species SG (ISSG).....25

        5.5.3 Reintroduction SG .....26

        5.5.4 Conservation Breeding SG (CBSG).....27

**6 SSC GOVERNANCE ISSUES.....27**

    6.1 **SG Chairs Consultation .....27**

    6.2 **Communications TF and documents .....28**

    6.3 **Members Emeritus and Award nominations .....29**

    6.4 **SG Chairs’ Meeting .....29**

**7 SSC FINANCES.....30**

    7.1 **COF 2006 .....30**

    7.2 **Fund-raising .....30**

**8 IUCN INTERNAL DISCUSSION POINTS.....32**

    8.1 **Mangroves for the Future Initiative .....32**

    8.2 **Themes for WCC4 .....32**

    8.3 **Future of Sustainability .....32**

    8.4 **IUCN Situation Analysis .....32**

    8.5 **WCPA/SSC Joint Conservation Planning Initiative.....32**

**9 BRAINSTORMING AND SHARING .....33**

    9.1 **SCB (Port Elizabeth, South Africa 2007).....33**

    9.2 **Climate Change.....33**

    9.3 **Alliance for Zero Extinction (AZE).....34**

    9.4 **DNA Barcoding and Species Conservation (see CBOL document) .....34**

**10 SSC SUCCESS STORIES.....35**

**11 TIMING AND VENUES OF 2007 SC MEETINGS.....36**

**12 ANY OTHER BUSINESS.....37**

## GLOSSARY OF ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS USED

AZE	Alliance for Zero Extinction
BASC	Biodiversity Assessments Sub-Committee
BGCI	Botanic Gardens Conservation International
BIP	Biodiversity Indicators Partnership
BISC	Biodiversity Indicators Sub-Committee
CBD	Convention on Biological Diversity
CBSG	Conservation Breeding Specialist Group
CEC	Commission on Education and Communications
CI	Conservation International
CITES	Convention on the International Trade in Endangered Species
COF	Commission Operations Fund
CoReg	Commission online registration system
DEM	Data Entry Module (of the SIS)
GAA	Global Amphibian Assessment
GAINS	Global Avian Influenza Network for Surveillance of Wild Birds
GEF	Global Environment Facility
GIRLA	Global Invertebrate Red List Authority
GISD	Global Invasive Species Database
GISP	Global Invasive Species Programme
GMA	Global Mammal Assessment
GMO	Genetically Modified Organism
GMSA	Global Marine Species Assessment
GSA	Global Species Assessment
ICSC	Invertebrate Conservation Sub-Committee
IMOSEB	International Mechanism on Scientific Expertise on Biodiversity
ISSG	Invasives Species Specialist Group
IUCN	The World Conservation Union
LPI	Living Planet Index
MCSC	Marine Conservation Sub-Committee
MEA	Millennium Ecosystem Assessment
MFF	Mangroves for the Future Initiative
MOU	Memorandum of Understanding
PCSC	Plant Conservation Sub-Committee
RL	Red List
RLA	Red List Authority
RLI	Red List Index
RSG	Reintroduction Specialist Group
SC	Steering Committee
SCB	Society for Conservation Biology
SCPTF	Species Conservation Planning Task Force
SG	Specialist Group
SIS	Species Information Service
SP	Species Programme
SRLI	Sampled Red List Index
SSC	Species Survival Commission
SUSC	Sustainable Use Sub-Committee
TF	Task Force
ToR	Terms of Reference
UNEP	United Nations Environment Programme
VSG	Veterinary Specialist Group
WCC	World Conservation Congress
WCMC	World Conservation Monitoring Centre
WCPA	World Commission on Protected Areas
WCS	Wildlife Conservation Society
WG	Working Group
WI	Wetlands International
WWF	World Wide Fund for Nature

## **DECISIONS AND ACTION ITEMS TABLE**

### Decisions made at WCC 3.4:

- V Kalkman takes over as the Odonata SG Chair from April 2007. (Item 4.1 Chair Appointments)
- NatureServe can become the RLA for North American (excluding Mexico) plants, invertebrates and reptiles (three separate RLAs) once funding has been sourced and the appropriate Focal Points identified. (Item 4.1 Chair Appointments)
- Two RLAs are required for the invertebrates Red Listing process – one for terrestrial and fresh water invertebrate species (TIRLA) and one for marine invertebrate species (MIRLA). (Item 5.3.2 ICSC)
- The SC accepts the outline for the GSA2. In future, GSA2 will have its own agenda item on the SC meeting agenda. (Item 5.3.4)
- Authority Files are renamed Classification Schemes; the Authority Files TF is extended to the end of the Quadrennium and renamed the Classification Schemes WG. (Item 5.3.4)
- The Restructuring TF will continue deliberations and the new structure will be rolled out in the 2009 – 2012 Quadrennium. (Item 5.4.3)
- Depending on available funds, the idea of holding the SG Chairs' Meeting in early 2008 was supported under the following guidelines: (Item 6.4)
  - o Only SG Chairs and Co-Chairs will be invited (a Deputy Chair may attend in their stead).
  - o The SC will attend, as will senior staff members of the SP and IUCN.
  - o Presentation sessions where Chairs can present their work will be figured into the agenda (posters could also be an option) and the agenda could be divided into taxonomic groupings.
  - o The meeting should be 3-4 days long
- In future we should have the capacity to report on shadow resources secured by the SGs, funds raised by the Chair's Office and funds raised for SSC activities by the SP. (Item 7.2)
- SSC will try to have a presence at the SCB meeting though a sponsored workshop and booth. SSC members and SGs will be invited to showcase their material in the SSC booth. (Item 9.1)

### Action Items Table:

<b><u>Who</u></b>	<b><u>Action Item</u></b>	<b><u>Agenda Item</u></b>	<b><u>Timeline</u></b>
J Smart	Investigate whether Prof Abuzinada still wants to be the Chair of the Arabian Plan SG.	4.1 Chair Appointments	asap
JC Vié	Contact Roland Wirth regarding the leadership of the Small Carnivore SG and, once the consultation period is over, submit the results to H Dublin.	4.1 Chair Appointments	asap
JC Vié	Contact the South American Camelid experts to start the process of identifying a new Chair.	4.1 Chair Appointments	asap
H Dublin	Brief J Madgwick on the SSC restructuring and use this as a basis for further discussion on a way forward regarding the WI groups.	4.1 Chair Appointments	asap
J Smart	Ensure that the SSC Website is updated to indicate that the WI Bird Groups are shared groups.	4.1 Chair Appointments	asap
All Sub-Com Chairs	Ask their Chairs to inform the members to register online on the CoReg system.	4.2 Actions from WCC 3.3	asap
BASC	Compile document on what SRLI can/cannot do, which way to plot trends, and ideas on what to call the index, keeping in mind the difficulties of a name change.	4.2 Actions from WCC 3.3	At next BASC meeting
H Dublin and J Smart	Report on the various BirdLife MOUs at the next SC meeting.	4.2 Actions from WCC 3.3	Next SC
H Dublin	Continue discussions with the relevant people in headquarters about the Conservation Commons.	4.2 Actions from WCC 3.3	asap

J Ragle + small committee	J Ragle should continue with the current initiation of SIS. A small committee should be established to advise him on the future vision for SIS, to prioritise the list of ideas and help to think through the more complex issues for V3. If possible, this small planning group should link with the IUCN Knowledge Management. A simple and clear brief should be prepared for the new IUCN Director General, with intense follow-up once the system has progressed.	4.2 Actions from WCC 3.3	ongoing
All SC	Become more involved in IUCN Leveraging Initiatives	4.2 WCC 3.3	Ongoing
All SC	Send in ideas for what communication issues should be discussed at WCC3.5	4.2 Actions from WCC 3.3	asap
ICSC	A person on the Bycatch TF within MCSC should become a representative on ICSC.	5.3.2 ICSC	asap
M Samways	Verify that the existing Mollusc and Odonata groups are doing conservation activities besides Red Listing, and classify them accordingly in the proposed structure.	5.3.2 ICSC	Before new Quadren
M Samways + JC Vié	Ensure that assessments are prioritised according to the SSC priorities and carefully ordered so as not to overload the Red List Unit	5.3.2 ICSC	asap
M Samways	Appoint the TIRLA and MIRLA Focal Points and arrange for them to sign the RLA Letter of Agreement.	5.3.2 ICSC	asap
BASC	Take their recommendations for the Global Plant Assessments to the PCSC for endorsement and onward transmission to the SSC SC.	5.3.4 BASC	asap
All SC	Nominate expert trusted colleagues to assist in the review process of GSA2.	5.3.4 BASC	asap
H Dublin	Establish a process for the overall review and incorporation of substantive comments to the final GSA2.	5.3.4 BASC	asap
All SC	Look into potential publishers for GSA2	5.3.4 BASC	asap
S Stuart	Draw up a budget for the publication of the GSA2, with which to approach them for tender bids	5.3.4 BASC	asap
G Mace	Establish membership of BISC.	5.3.5 BISC	asap
H Dublin	Make contact with WWF to discuss the prospects for institutional linkages, which could include a potential contribution of resources.	5.3.5 BISC	asap
H Dublin and G Mace	Suggest to N Ash (of the WCMC BIP Secretariat) governance and technical oversight arrangements for the project and copy J Hutton.	5.3.5 BISC	asap
H Dublin & R Mittermeier	Bring up the issue of IMoSEB in the Programme and Policy Committee and to explore what IUCN and SSC's proper role(s) might be.	5.3.5 BISC	asap
C Imboden	Continue his line of thinking regarding the SSC Strategic Plan and not do a complete rewrite of the 2001-2010 plan, but dovetail any thinking with the IUCN 2009-2012 Programme Planning.	5.4.2 Strategic Planning	asap
All SC	Send their comments on the Restructuring proposal to L Boitani within the next few weeks.	5.4.3 Restructuring	asap
Restructuring TF	Create a whole new set of terms and names so as to avoid any confusion in the future. A glossary of terms should be included in the next version of the restructuring paper.	5.4.3 Restructuring	asap
F Launay	Investigate the possibility for a book of case studies of reintroduction successes and failures.	5.5.3 Reintroduction SG	asap
All SC	Assist the Amphibian SG with potential candidates for the Coordinator's position.	5.5.4 CBSG	asap
J Smart, JC Vié, H Dublin & C Poole	Discuss how to roll out the Chairs' Consultation and how to collate the responses.	6.1 Chairs' Consultation	asap

Y Sadovy, M Samways, R Kock	Continue their work on the value of species document and seek contributions from others.	6.2 Communications	asap
H Dublin	Talk to the CEC about some of these communications challenges and seek their advice.	6.2 Communications	asap
C Poole, D Zivkovic	Work on a draft budget for the meeting	6.4 Chairs' Meeting	asap
F Launay	Indicate as soon as possible (but no later than the end of January 2007) whether the UAE will be able to host the meeting.	6.4 Chairs' Meeting	asap
All SC	Indicate how they or their institution can contribute to this meeting, and speak to any Chairs they are in contact with about the meeting.	6.4 Chairs' Meeting	asap
JC Vié	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Investigate the accrual system for the Commissions and let C Poole know the procedure for those Sub-Committees wishing to carry some of their 2006 allocation over to early 2007.</li> <li>- Get clarity from IUCN Finance on how they wish to handle the disbursement and reporting on COF allocations to the Sub-Committees.</li> <li>- Investigate the reporting requirements for the Sub-Committees for the end of 2006.</li> </ul>	7.1 COF	asap
J Smart and J Hutton	Work together so as to have WCMC and IUCN coordinate approaches where the same potential corporate donors are involved.	7.2 Fundraising	asap
H Dublin and S Stuart	Discuss the GEF situation and continue to be proactive on this issue of the service agreement.	7.2 Fundraising	asap
J Smart and JC Vié	Work out a method of reporting on resources secured for assessment work in the regions.	7.2 Fundraising	asap
JC Vié	Look at possibilities for IUCN having a booth at the next SCB meeting.	9.1 SCB	asap
R Mittermeier	Investigate the possibility of funding for the booth and/or sponsored workshop.	9.1 SCB	asap
H Dublin	Liaise with G Mace, JC Vié and S Stuart regarding the MacArthur Climate Change grant.	9.2 Climate Change	asap
H Dublin	Draft a letter to AZE with the help of S Stuart and JC Vié.	9.3 AZE	asap
H Dublin	Send an informal note to D Schindel saying that the SSC would like to be kept in the loop, in particular, to help guide the initiative on its practical applications to conservation.	9.4 DNA Barcoding	asap
J Smart and JC Vié	Prepare the statement for the SSC website and devise a way to notify the SG Chairs of the carbon neutral initiative.	12 Any Other Business	asap
JC Vié	Assist in applying the IUCN formula to all those who travel on the COF budget.	12 Any Other Business	asap

## **1 WELCOME, APOLOGIES, INTRODUCTIONS**

### **1.1 Chair's welcome**

At 14:00 on Sunday 22 October 2006 H Dublin welcomed everyone to the fourth SSC Steering Committee meeting of the Quadrennium. She commented that the SSC SC has much to celebrate – including M Samways's birthday that day and G Mace's new job – but that recently there has also been great sadness in the SSC community with the loss of so many colleagues. She reflected on the recent deaths of Dr Tirtha Man Maskey, Dr Rod East, Baron Bertrand des Clers, Dr Ralph Daley and Dr Tom Foose – all of whom have played major roles in our lives and in the SSC.

H Dublin then handed over to R Mittermeier who gave a short presentation about the status of conservation in Madagascar. R Mittermeier commented how pleased he was that so many people had made the long trip to this interesting country. He explained that Madagascar has been an island for over 90 million years, resulting in much speciation and high levels of endemism. New species discoveries are still being made, despite the fact that only 10% of the country's natural habitats remain. He commended the current government, President and strong conservation community for their efforts and aims to triple the extent of the current proclaimed Protected Areas.

H Dublin thanked R Mittermeier for his overview and for all the assistance Conservation International (CI) had given regarding logistical preparations for the meeting.

### **1.2 Apologies**

The following people attended the meeting:

*SSC Steering Committee:* H Dublin, Y Sadovy, L Boitani, F Launay, R Kock, G Mace, J Robinson, J Hutton, M Samways, L Bennun, T Brooks, R Mittermeier, M Clout

*Species Programme:* J Smart, S Stuart, JC Vié

*SSC Chair's Office:* C Poole

Apologies were received from: R Lacy, C Imboden and C Campagna. H Dublin commented that D Leaman – Acting Chair of the PCSC – was unable to attend the meeting.

## **2 ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA**

H Dublin explained that after a few general updates and the revision of action items from the previous meeting, a half-day session on Restructuring would be conducted. She mentioned that it would be best to move the ICSC update to after the Restructuring discussion as it might serve as a practical example of the Restructuring proposals. M Samways agreed with this suggestion.

H Dublin also commented that she was pleased to see such a full agenda and commended all the SC members for the amount of work they have been doing between meetings.

The revised agenda was therefore adopted, but these minutes follow the original agenda format for the sake of clarity.

## **3 ADOPTION OF THE PREVIOUS MINUTES (WCC 3.3, CAMBRIDGE, UK 3-5 MAY 2006)**

H Dublin reiterated that the minutes of WCC3.3 had been accepted by the SC and the final version had been uploaded to the SSC website.

## 4 MATTERS ARISING

### 4.1 SG/TF Chair appointments and RLA Focal Points appointments

H Dublin commented that slow, but steady progress has been made with the appointment of the few remaining Specialist Group (SG) Chairs, Task Force (TF) Chairs and Red List Authority (RLA) Focal Points. She referred the SC to the summary in the meeting pack and commented as follows:

#### Specialist Groups

- J Smart will investigate why the Chairmanship of the Arabian Plant SG was changed via the CoReg system without an official resignation.

**ACTION:** J Smart to investigate whether Prof Abuzinada still wants to be the Chair of the Arabian Plant SG.

- There has been no progress on the Carnivorous Plant SG as the person who had been identified was reluctant to take the role.
- The Asian Rhino SG has lost a valuable Co-Chair in the death of T Maskey. H Dublin commented that she is assisting Co-Chair, N van Strein, to try and keep up the spirit in the group and reschedule the South Asia meeting as soon as possible. She also commented that a new Co-Chair will be sought immediately and she is already in touch with many people from the region in this regard, but suggestions are welcome.
- S Stuart commented that he had not progressed with regard to the Sirenia SG. He stated that although he has been working with the former Chair and the group seems to be functioning, no-one wants to lead the group. The group consists of 5-6 members and is merely continuing their work from the previous Quadrennium – including producing a newsletter.
- The Small Carnivore SG is currently without a Chair. H Dublin explained that subsequent communications with interim Chair, P Cavallini have revealed that he does not wish to continue as Chair of the group. JC Vié explained that he had taken the matter forward by sending an email out to all members asking them to nominate a Chair or put themselves forward. He has received seven responses so far with two nominations and two weeks remain for nominations. R Mittermeier commented that the previous Chair, Roland Wirth, would be an important information source and JC Vié agreed to contact him again.

**ACTION:** JC Vié to contact Roland Wirth regarding the leadership of the Small Carnivore SG and, once the consultation period is over, submit the results to H Dublin.

- H Dublin explained that the South American Camelid SG has been a topic of much discussion recently with the resignation of its Chair and suggestions for new members from the IUCN SUR. H Dublin commented that there does not seem to be an ideological problem within the group, so theoretically a new Chair should be found easily. However more talk will be needed with the members, other interested parties and the IUCN SUR. J Robinson suggested that an independent person might be a sensible solution and offered to send possible names to JC Vié, who will organise the consultation.

**ACTION:** JC Vié is to contact the South American Camelid experts to start the process of identifying a new Chair.

- The Odonata SG Chair, V Clausnitzer, wishes to resign in April 2007 and has proposed V Kalkman to be her successor, suggesting that his appointment would result in a seamless transition. M Samways added that V Kalkman is respected, committed and well-known, as well as extremely good at networking and bringing people together (which will be useful in the Global

Dragonfly Assessment). The SP staff agreed that W Darwall and others can assist in bringing V Kalkman up to date on relevant issues. The SC agreed to V Kalkman's appointment in April.

DECISION: V Kalkman to take over as the Odonata SG Chair from April 2007.

- JC Vié said there has been no further word from Wetlands International (WI) regarding the resignation of J Robinson (Duck SG Chair, not the same J Robinson as on the SSC SC). JC Vié then further explained that WI is in the process of restructuring, where various scenarios are in discussion – including the possibility of dissolving all their SGs (this now seems unlikely). Some restructuring is going ahead however, and WI would like to clarify the exact roles of the SSC and WI in the support of the SGs (which includes 15 bird groups and the very active Fresh Water Fish SG, which the SP supports substantively). JC Vié and H Dublin explained that after contacting T Ojei and CEO J Madgwick, they had received a detailed letter from J Madgwick that explained WI's seven options (which basically offer various scenarios of amalgamation, status quo or dissolution of inactive groups). H Dublin explained that WI is interested in what the SSC has to say. She confirmed that she would engage J Madgwick further on this issue as well as on the need to tighten up on the administration (such as the unsigned Letters of Agreement between some bird SG Chairs and the SSC) and issues regarding network support. S Stuart commented that he assumes that, statutorily, WI cannot simply dissolve groups. L Bennun agreed, saying that their governance needs to catch up with their goals and objectives. He explained that some of their SGs were found to not be performing, but that there was also very little support for them. H Dublin commented that their groups do comprise a large number of people (approximately 2000), and some of the groups are extremely active. J Robinson queried whether it would be possible, if WI wishes to dissolve the groups, to take those that are active solely under the SSC banner. There was some discussion about this suggestion. L Bennun was concerned that not many of the groups are actually active, but H Dublin commented that some Chairs she had spoken to were very opposed to any dissolutions. She concluded that this suggestion of J Robinson's would also need some thinking as it may depend on the new definitions of what constitutes a group once the SSC restructuring process takes place. She agreed that it would be best to brief J Madgwick on the SSC restructuring thoughts and use that as a basis to lead further discussion and roll-out into the new Quadrennium. J Hutton noted that the SSC website should state that these are shared groups.

**ACTIONS:**

- H Dublin to brief J Madgwick on the SSC restructuring and use this as a basis for further discussion on a way forward regarding the WI groups.
- J Smart to ensure that the SSC Website is updated to indicate that the WI Bird Groups are shared groups.

**Task Forces:**

- H Dublin explained that nothing has progressed with the Declining Pollinators TF and that she considers it disbanded, but that M Samways has been proposing that this issue be taken up under the ICSC. There are other pollinators besides invertebrates that need attention, but unfortunately there appears to be nobody to pull all the work together at this time and no clear role for SSC. H Dublin further explained that pollinators were suggested as a possible indicator at the recent Ecosystem Indicators Workshop in Prague. There followed some discussion in the group, with R Mittermeier reiterating that more information is needed on measuring the value of this ecosystem service. There was general consensus that more clarity is needed on exactly what the role, if any, of a SSC TF on pollinators would be and that the right person and resources would need to be found before re-establishing any such group.

Red List Authorities:

- Although the Legume RLA is seen as a priority, no one has been found to act as the Focal Point. JC Vié commented that perhaps it will be easier to find someone once actual projects and resources have been identified. S Stuart commented that the International Legume Data Information Service (ILDIS) has a network of legume taxonomists, but no real conservation focus and although they were quite enthusiastic about legume assessments, the process has stalled. H Dublin concluded that this is another case of a potential group or RLA with no one to lead it and that such bodies should not be established in the absence of an identified leader.
- H Dublin indicated that there are three proposed new RLAs to be led by NatureServe: North American plants, invertebrates and reptiles. S Stuart explained that the SSC has a solid relationship with NatureServe, whose documentation and use of the Red List criteria is of high-quality. He asked that the SC agree in principle that NatureServe can become an RLA for the above mentioned groupings, and then further fundraising can occur as well as the identification of the right Focal Points. H Dublin cautioned that it is best not to establish an RLA before it is clear how it will function and S Stuart agreed. S Stuart clarified that NatureServe is only offering to be the RLA for North America excluding Mexico and he felt that this was a good decision, but that the geographic remit needed to be made clear on all occasions.

DECISION: NatureServe can become the RLA for North American (excluding Mexico) plants, invertebrates and reptiles (three separate RLAs) once funding has been sourced and the appropriate Focal Points identified.

**4.2 Action points from WCC 3.3**

The following is the Action Points Table from WCC 3.3, with the status column indicating the comments given at WCC 3.4 on progress. If a lengthy follow-up discussion took place, it is recorded below the table.

<b>Who</b>	<b>Action Item</b>	<b>Status</b>
Whole SC	Notify the Chair's office if you have contact with Chairs who need assistance in appointing RLA Focal Points. Chairs of the taxonomic Sub-Committees should assist C Poole in asking the SGs to appoint RLA FPs.	Partly achieved; more FPs to be appointed. One-on-one emails have helped.
JC Vié	Liaise with WI regarding new Chair for Duck SG	WI has not appointed a new chair. Wider discussions now taking place with WI.
R Lacy	Send out cross-referenced list of Zoo Association people to taxon SGs, send list to Chair's Office	H Dublin commented that she is not aware if this has happened
Relevant Sub-Com Chairs	Explain to their SGs the need to inform members that CoReg is the formalisation of their invitations to enable the online registration for all Commission members.	H Dublin reiterated the need for the Sub-Committee Chairs to tell their members to accept the invitations online.
MCSC	Produce a strategy, including details of the bridges to be formed within IUCN; appoint MCSC rep. to BASC.	Completed
M Samways	Consider separating out FPs for taxonomic groups to be included under a GIRLA & for other activities before being represented in ICSC organogram.	Completed
SUSG	SUSC is to be formed and grapple with how to go back to basics and push issues, while actively involving relevant players from other SGs.	J Hutton commented that he now has a list of potential people

Whole SC	Give S Stuart ideas of what GSA2 should contain	See item 5.3.4
S Stuart & M Samways	Include JC Vié to talk about the Global Dragonfly Assessment and ensure their use of the DEM.	JC Vié has discussed this with ICSC and will ensure that new Chair V Kalkman knows.
S Stuart & J Ragle	Supply a schematic of how assessments, the DEM, the Red List Database and SIS fit together.	Not done due to time constraints.
M Maunder, G Mace, S Stuart & J Hutton	Draft doc for RL website to articulate the appropriate uses of the RL; the modified Scientific Collection Guidelines to be annexed. Forward to the IUCN Env. Law Centre for comment before posting online	S Stuart stated that this had been discussed at the BASC meeting, but that it was decided to return to it at a later stage.
BASC then to BISC	Compile document on what SRLI can/cannot do, which way to plot trends, and ideas on what to call the index, keeping in mind the difficulties of a name change at this stage.	This will be an item for the next BASC meeting. S Stuart explained that there had been frequent communications with J Baillie and that a name is still being discussed.
H Dublin	Put G Mace in touch with CEM's indicators focal point	Completed. G Mace did not attend their workshop
G Mace	Constitute / convene BISC with H Dublin.	Reported under 5.3.5
J Smart & M Maunder	Ask C Hilton-Taylor to look at the Plant Database at UNEP-WCM Clout, M Maunder is to comment on its more general utility.	C Hilton-Taylor has concluded that the database is useful as a checking tool, but nothing further as much of the data are out of date.
H Dublin	Go to the PPC to request a look at the relationship between IUCN and ISSG and clarification on the institutional relationship between IUCN and GISP.	Completed. See discussion below
Whole SC	Assist H Dublin to identify & nominate a new Deputy Chair	All regional offices and all SC members have been asked for nominations. All five people recommended have declined. H Dublin reiterated the necessity of finding a Deputy Chair before the 67 <sup>th</sup> Council meeting
R Lacy	Ensure proper articulation of the intent of our species conservation planning approach in the final ToRs.	H Dublin explained that changes were made to the ToR, which have been placed in the meeting pack.
R Lacy	Develop a list of proposed people for the Species Conservation Planning TF.	Completed. R Lacy is currently working on meeting plans.
H Dublin	Liaise with J Hutton re meeting the EU point person on climate change & biodiversity.	Not done. No longer relevant.
H Dublin	Speak to E Lahmann and S Maginnis in the margins of the upcoming IUCN Council.	Completed. Climate change person has been appointed in the Forest Programme.
G Mace	Send minutes of ZSL meeting to H Dublin.	Completed
S Stuart	Look at potential to set up a review group for GSA2's climate change components.	S Stuart explained that this has been superseded and will be discussed under 5.3.4
J Smart	Ask JC Vié to put together a document on what the IUCN is doing from their side on climate change.	Not done.
Species Programme	Begin work on the following activities - Overlay species data with areas that will be impacted by climate change (scenario maps from IPCC) - Characterize species that are most vulnerable to cc by establishing vulnerability traits; code into the AFs	S Stuart explained that much of this has been included in the proposal to MacArthur and therefore will be taken up if that funding comes through.
H Dublin	Ask R Pethiyagoda for the two communications documents discussed at WCC3.2; improve/redraft.	H Dublin explained that there has been no response from RP, despite repeated requests.
C Poole	Google incomplete Members Emeritus list	Completed and list is on the SSC website.
C Poole	Prepare an appointment letter for C Jermy with M Maunder's assistance	Completed

H Dublin	Prepare and bestow the agreed awards.	Awards bestowed to R East and R Sharp
J Smart	Ask D Zivkovic to develop a list of all recipients of the Sir Peter Scott award using archive information.	Completed
All Sub-Committees	Budget for the participation of their representative to BASC.	M Seddon is attending from ICSC, Y Sadovy from MCSC. No one from PCSC.
H Dublin & J Smart	Review all current BirdLife International MOUs	Ongoing. To be reported on at the next meeting.
H Dublin	Talk to A Rowles-Anobile on issues pertaining to SSC SC concerns with regard to the possible merger with UNEP-WCM Clout and to the Conservation Commons	Completed. Further discussions recorded below
H Dublin	Continue to talk to WWF about the potential for future partnership on a communications approach to raising the profile and understanding of the relevance of species to human livelihoods and wellbeing.	Completed. H Dublin explained that WWF are very interested in collaborating, but that SSC needs to consolidate communications so that we have something to offer to the partnership.
J Smart	Let J Ragle know that, further to his query, the SSC SC feels the following should be incorporated in SIS: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Improvements &amp; modifications on climate change</li> <li>- Identification &amp; impact of alien invasive species</li> <li>- Human-wildlife conflict - Disease</li> <li>- The volumes of trade and harvest</li> <li>- Habitat loss, fragmentation, land conversion</li> <li>- Addressing the issue of taxonomic updating</li> <li>- Possible linkages to WIKIE Species.</li> </ul>	Completed. Further discussion recorded below.
Whole SC	Through the Chair, become involved in the Change Management Projects and Leveraging Initiatives, as well as to provide ideas regarding potential SSC engagements and contributions or other individuals who might be involved on behalf of the SSC.	Ongoing. Update on Leveraging Initiatives below.
M Samways, R Kock, Y Sadovy	Put a document together on biodiversity, productivity, resilience, web-of-life, etc. and have it ready for the pack for next SSC SC meeting.	A draft was circulated in the pack and discussed under Agenda Item 6.2
Whole SC	Email any success stories to the SP office	Ongoing
C Poole	Make arrangements for WCC 3.4, liaising with R Mittermeier on logistics / a social event; & M Maunder regarding the potential for SC members to do guest lectures at the University in Antananarivo.	Completed
H Dublin	Invite someone from the CEC to assist our communication needs at a future SSC SC meeting.	Completed. CEC is willing to recommend someone to the next SSC meeting, but the SSC SC must give guidance on the outputs required.

### Discussion on WCC 3.3 Action Items

**ISSG and Invasives Issues:** H Dublin commented that she understood that G Howard will be appointed the global coordinator for invasives work, but it will take time to phase him out of the regional office. GISP relationships have been clarified to a certain extent and the GISP secretariat will probably move to Nairobi. Funds from the GISP coordinating organisations will hopefully allow GISP to return to its original mandate of assisting ISSG. They will also be involved in indicators

work. IUCN has agreed a portion of funding for projects on invasives issues will be set aside for ISSG to provide technical input. This will then negate the problem ISSG has of no financial support from those they advise. The SP will help to ensure that the right coordination happens.

**Conservation Commons:** There is a lack of clarity regarding the Conservation Commons initiative and their recent steering meeting revealed some concerns about governance issues. The meeting had concluded that two issues require further work:

1. What it means to use the Conservation Commons logo and helping organisations deepen their use of the principles.
2. Projects and initiatives that need funding.

The general consensus was that they should not be running projects. A person has been commissioned to draft a simple constitution. H Dublin will discuss this issue again when she is next in Headquarters.

**SIS:** In developing the next phase of SIS (V 2.0) Jim Ragle is, and will continue to be, in consultation with various Specialist Groups during the next year. J Smart will follow up with J Ragle on exactly how this interaction will occur (within the design phase). Version 2 is the RL assessments tools and Version 3 will be a decision support tool – which means that some of these ideas are in V2 and others in V3. Some existing databases will be able to be linked to the RL data through SIS (such as GISD) although it is understood that the structures may be too different. It was agreed that J Ragle should continue with the current development of tools for the Red List assessment process; and that the SSC SC should establish a small committee to advise J Ragle on the future vision for SIS, to prioritise the list of ideas and help to think through the more complex issues for V3 – taking into account any IUCN institutional directions with regards to Knowledge Management.

**IUCN Leveraging Initiatives:** M Maunder and others put significant effort into the Mangroves for the Future Initiative and SSC might receive some projects / funding as a result. The Energy and Biodiversity Initiative is moving fast and representation from the SSC is important. There is also pressure for the Commissions to become involved in the regionalisation and decentralisation initiative and SSC is particularly vulnerable because it is not regionally structured. A Genetically Modified Organisms Action Plan is a new initiative on which SSC are being pressured to give input, but we have made it clear that any actions required of SSC remain an unfunded mandate.

**FOLLOW-UP ACTION ITEMS FROM WCC 3.3:**

1. All Sub-Committee Chairs were reminded to ask their SG Chairs to inform the members to register online on the CoReg system.
2. At next BASC meeting: Compile document on what SRLI can/cannot do, which way to plot trends, and ideas on what to call the index, keeping in mind the difficulties of a name change.
3. H Dublin and J Smart to report on the various BirdLife MOUs at the next SC meeting.
4. H Dublin to continue discussions with the relevant people in headquarters about the Conservation Commons.
5. J Ragle should continue with the current initiation of SIS. A small committee should be established to advise him on the future vision for SIS, to prioritise the list of ideas and help to think through the more complex issues for V3.
6. All SC to become more involved in IUCN Leveraging Initiatives
7. All SC to send in ideas for what communication issues should be discussed at WCC3.5

## 5 UPDATES

### 5.1 Chair's update

H Dublin explained that she is continuing to produce quarterly reports for her donors even though this is not a requirement, as it helps her keep a record of activities to make reporting at Council and SC meetings easier. The following is a brief summary of her presentation.

#### Administration and Fundraising:

- It has not been possible to appoint a Senior Commission Officer as funding is not guaranteed. An intern will be sought for the SSC Chair's Office.
- Many fundraising initiatives have taken place in the last five months – including work on the Mangroves for the Future Initiative, the MacArthur Foundation proposal on climate change impacts on species, and some fundraising for work on the Sampled Red List Index (SRLI).
- The Indianapolis Zoo Prize gala award dinner and prize giving was an amazing event and it was wonderful to see George Archibald commended for all his work.
- K Sanderson, a resident of KwaZulu Natal in South Africa, has bequeathed money to four SSC SGs and the SSC Chair's Office is investigating how to best administer the bequest.

#### Governance:

- The registration of SSC members on CoReg remains a struggle and SSC, probably due to its size, is the only Commission with problems. The COF is tied to the registration of members
- Sadly, M Maunder has resigned from the SSC SC and a new PCSC Chair is being sought.
- There has been much Council work lately, including the search for the new Director General.

#### Programmatic and Partnership Meetings:

- H Dublin gave a keynote speech at a meeting in New Zealand – a fascinating congress about indigenous people's view of indicators ecosystem health and human well-being. The trip also provided an opportunity to give lectures at the University of Auckland, visit R East and the ISSG.
- The WCPA/SSC Joint Conservation Planning Initiative meeting took place in June and the TORs and funding for the follow up are now in order.
- Various CITES meetings have taken place – MIKE (the Monitoring of the Illegal Killing of Elephants) and the 54<sup>th</sup> CITES Standing Committee meeting.
- The Recreational Hunting Symposium in London was a success; thanks to the European chapter of SUSG and ZSL who partnered the event.
- The WildScreen Festival was interesting and it seems that many of the filmmaker community agree that the film industry is not actively communicating conservation messages as they could.
- The recent Ecosystem Indicators Workshop in Prague was an important step in the right direction, as SSC made many useful contacts and some fascinating papers were presented.

#### Future initiatives and meeting preparations

- TF for best practice for managing the local ecological impacts of elephants is progressing.
- PCSC – working with Acting Chair, D Leaman on next steps.
- Ongoing discussions on the Conservation Commons, the IUCN-WCMC merger and data ownership, control and use.
- Species Conservation Planning TF meeting early next year (in collaboration with WCS).
- The Society for Conservation Biology (SCB) is holding a meeting in South Africa next July. A number of SGs and some SP staff are involved, but IUCN is not involved at a higher level as yet. *A discussion followed on this topic, but it is recorded under Agenda Item 9.1.*
- SSC is working well with the regions and supporting the work they are doing – e.g. the Asia programme has been grateful for help from the Veterinary SG regarding the vulture issue.

## Other Initiatives and News

- Possibly only four Northern white rhino are left in the wild.
- The Forest Programme has appointed E Saxon as their climate change person, which provides a good connection point for SSC.
- SSC has had compliments on our input to the IUCN Situation Analysis. Programme planning will begin in January.
- The GEF senior evaluators have made a linkage with IUCN for more capacity building on evaluations in the realm of environment and sustainable development. – e.g. a new emphasis will be placed on climate change projects – from the adaptation rather than mitigation side
- SSC input a number of ideas into the theme for the World Conservation Congress (WCC4) and hopefully other Councillors will agree that the Congress theme should focus on our heartland – conserving biodiversity.

## **5.2 Species Programme update**

J Smart explained that the SP has been implementing the recommendations from the Price-Waterhouse-Coopers review. A new matrix structure has been developed, which covers location management, and Terms of Reference (ToR) for each post are being adjusted. Current recruitments include the administrative support position in Cambridge, the Biodiversity Trade and Use Officer and a replacement communications person.

Fundraising continues and a number of Concept Notes have been developed. A restraint on fundraising remains in the UK as the Cambridge office is not a legal entity for the purposes of fundraising.

There is a good link with Global Communications and the new communications appointee will be required to provide fundraising support. A common identity is being promoted – ensuring that all the offices of the SP use the same email footers, business cards and visual identity.

Network support has suffered due to the long-term decline in support for the SP work from WWF (it was reduced to zero in 2005), which resulted in two network support positions being cut. The aim is to have at least two general network support positions in Headquarters. H Dublin commented that many donors think they are providing funds for the SSC and the SP, but in fact this money is distributed elsewhere. She feels that the new Director General should be made aware of this issue as soon as possible, although it can be quite a delicate situation because the SSC is the largest Commission and the SP the largest programme and it therefore appears that money is not a problem. L Boitani suggested that the issue should be worded so as to make it clear that the lack of support for the SP is damaging the SSC. S Stuart agreed, saying that the cost of doing assessments was increasing because of the lack of network support. J Smart concluded by saying that one network support position has been requested through the recent budget submission.

J Smart then explained that rules of engagement or roles and responsibilities between the Secretariat and the Commissions are being developed and the Commission Chairs will be asked to comment on and approve them. H Dublin commented that the SSC should work harder on explaining what the Commission needs as there is not always good understanding in Headquarters of exactly what is needed. There was some discussion about further outsourcing of staff to other institutions (where their salaries are supplemented) and the general conclusion was that a mix of models is required for the SP to function well.

J Smart explained that CoReg is a continuing problem and a cause for embarrassment as only 25% of SSC members have been registered. The secretary doing the administration is working extremely hard with a problematic system. Another source of delay is that members are not actually logging in to accept their invitations and complete their registration. Discussions are underway about how to speed up this process and find assistance for this work. H Dublin concluded that the other

Commissions are not allies in this matter as they have already registered their limited membership and are already moving to establish independent Phase 2 initiatives – collating and inputting data regarding member's fields of expertise.

J Smart stated that SIS Version 1 is ready and J Ragle is working on the specifications for Version 2. She reiterated that a decision must be taken by IUCN (to whom the donation was made) on what to do with the donation of software from Oracle (one issue is that it is necessary to ensure that the SP has no liability for licensing bills).

An urgent meeting is required with regards to plant network issues. BGCI have partnered on the new GEF plants project and a support position has been created to assist with this project, arrange a workshop to celebrate 300 years of Linnaeus in Sweden, and provide some support to the Plants SGs.

With regard to global species assessments, S Stuart commented that the GMA is a very complicated project and needs a tighter management system in place, more contact with SGs and more planning meetings. There is an immediate crisis for the proposed Cetacean workshop as only \$20,000 of the required \$60,000 has been forthcoming.

H Dublin thanked the SP staff for their good feedback and commented that there continue to be many challenges.

### **5.3 SSC Sub-Committees and SC member updates: feedback and discussion**

#### **5.3.1 Marine Conservation Sub-Committee (MCSC)**

Y Sadovy explained that the preparatory meeting in December 2005 was followed by a meeting in Wattens, Austria in August 2006 for Strategic Planning for the MCSC. There were productive outcomes from the Wattens meeting (meeting report available) – including identifying practical issues and ways in which various tasks can be undertaken; as well as a needs and capacity assessment.

Next steps include attending the BASC meeting in December (Y Sadovy will attend). Other initiatives are to work closely with K Carpenter to identify priorities and people for the GMSA, including RLAs to handle species assessments likely to be generated from various workshops being planned by the GMSA. The assessments of some species (e.g. tuna) will need to be handled extremely sensitively due to their economic value and use factors. One of the priority areas identified for the MCSC is as a focal point for the collation and distribution of information; we need to find the means to make species information more readily accessible and available for the SSC and partners in response to their various needs. For example, information on certain species may be needed for marine protected area work by WCPA, and for marine species listed under CITES, that could assist range states in dealing with obligations of non-detriment findings.. This, and other communication needs, has resulted in a need for a communications and website expert to assist. A future goal is also to input into the WCC4.

H Dublin commended Y Sadovy and C Campagna on their energy and pro-activeness, and reminded everyone that the MCSC requires a linkage with a marine invasive species expert. She also mentioned that a number of marine colleagues (including C Campagna and S Fowler) are Pew Fellows, so it will be good to make the linkage to the Pew Foundation. Y Sadovy is to attend a meeting with the Pew Fellows in December and give a talk on marine work within IUCN. H Dublin also thanked C Imboden for securing support from Swarovski for the MCSC work and assisting in the Strategic Planning sessions. Y Sadovy concluded that there are still a few gaps in the MCSC membership – including experts on invasives, invertebrates, disease and climate change.

### 5.3.2 Invertebrate Conservation Sub-Committee (ICSC)

The following discussion actually took place after item 5.4.3.

M Samways explained that the evolving work plan and structure is developing, with the main aim to bring global cohesion (although much cohesion is already in place as many global institutions are on board). The option of a Global Invertebrate RLA (GIRLA) has been accepted as a sensible solution to deal with the many taxa that require Red Listing, but do not have SGs. There are many enthusiastic people who would like to Red List the special creatures (such as earwigs, booklouse, etc), and an overall coordinator is being sought to act as the GIRLA Focal Point. There will probably be one specialist who does the assessments and one who does the evaluations.

There is also much discussion about caves and islands, as well as marine invertebrates. Terrestrial and fresh water aquatic invertebrates can be categorised together, but the marine invertebrates are a totally unique matter. Some discussion followed and it was accepted that two RLAs is a sensible solution.

**DECISION:** Two RLAs are required for the invertebrates Red Listing process – one for terrestrial and fresh water invertebrate species (TIRLA) and one for marine invertebrate species (MIRLA).

There was some discussion about whether this model allowed room for growth – i.e. if a specialist or group does more than just Red Listing, it could eventually become a fully-fledged SG. L Boitani made it clear that this could only happen if such a group was conducting activities in line with the SSC Strategic Plan, but all the SC members agreed that the potential for diversification into other conservation activities would be allowed. Although ICSC and MCSC have identified the issues that require input, the right people still need to be identified. It was agreed that, for now, a person on the Bycatch TF within MCSC can become a representative on ICSC. M Samways was also tasked to verify that the existing Mollusc and Odonata groups are doing conservation activities besides Red Listing, and classify them accordingly in the proposed structure.

M Samways then went on to explain that geographical regions are also important in invertebrates, so some focal points will be identified to assist in the Red List process by regions. Taxonomically, some people have already been identified and approached to act as Focal Points. The three most important taxa are fresh water crabs, butterflies and scarabs. H Dublin enquired whether the capacity in the Red List Unit in Cambridge is sufficient to cope with the various assessments that will be sent in once this structure has been finalised and the Focal Points identified. S Stuart responded that the Red List Unit is ready as long as it is carefully planned – in particular, the assessments must be done properly and within the correct timeframe. He suggested that some training on quality controls will be required and perhaps a sample system can be initiated to ensure people are using the DEM and SIS systems correctly. He reminded the SC that there are some fresh water and marine staff who can assist, but that there are currently no staff to support the terrestrial invertebrate species assessments. H Dublin asked M Samways to ensure that the assessments are prioritised according to the SSC priorities and carefully ordered so as not to overload the Red List Unit. JC Vié agreed to assist in this regard.

#### **ACTIONS:**

- A person on the MCSC Bycatch TF should become a representative on ICSC.
- M Samways to verify that the existing Mollusc and Odonata groups are doing conservation activities besides Red Listing, and classify them accordingly in the proposed structure.
- M Samways, with help from JC Vié, to ensure that assessments are prioritised according to the SSC priorities and carefully ordered so as not to overload the Red List Unit.
- M Samways is to appoint the TIRLA and MIRLA Focal Points and arrange for them to sign the RLA Letter of Agreement.

In conclusion, M Samways was advised not to use any of the proposed restructuring terms before the restructuring exercise is complete so as not to cause confusion. The group thanked M Samways for the interesting discussion, which was a “live” example of how the restructuring will work.

### 5.3.3 Sustainable Use Sub-Committee (SUSC)

J Hutton explained that he has compiled a list of proposed SUSC members, which has been amended several times to balance geographic and other issues. A meeting is planned for the SUSC members and other interested parties to discuss sustainable use in the wider context of IUCN and changing paradigms. It is envisaged that after this meeting it will be easier to narrow the groups down to finalise the membership of the SUSC and the SUSG.

Current issues include a range of concepts such as sustainable consumption, mainstreaming and sustainable management. The development and testing of sustainable use indicators for the CBD 2010 target is in the offing and some funding will be made available through the GEF 2010 BIP project. More linkages will be made with the MCSC.

### 5.3.4 Biodiversity Assessments Sub-Committee (BASC)

T Brooks opened the update of BASC by explaining that since the last SC there has been another BASC meeting in May 2006 – possibly the largest meeting to date – hosted at the University of Virginia. Meetings of the Working Groups and the Authority Files TF had been held before the main meeting began, which was a successful strategy. A number of key points emerged that require some approval from the SC.

**The Global Plant Assessment** is very important under Target 2 of the CBD’s Global Strategy for Plant Conservation, but is also quite a difficult undertaking. There is a proposal to have the Global Plant Assessment be an umbrella over all the different current plant assessment undertakings (such as the sampled Red List Index, the regional projects, the assessments for various taxonomic groups, and the global preliminary assessment). The key issue is to make sure that the Global Plants Assessment is not a duplication of these projects and that all are synchronised and clearly described.

A brief discussion followed on whether M Maunder’s resignation has affected the Global Plant Assessment process, and it was revealed that his resignation may have resulted in some recommendations of BASC not being passed through PCSC as yet.

H Dublin followed up by asking whether some control has been initiated over the need to harmonise assessment processes being used by those institutions (such as Kew or Fairchild) that are moving ahead on assessment work and those being proposed by BASC. S Stuart answered that attention has been given to this in BASC and a tool has been developed (Rapid List) which provides a step-by-step process – which is hopefully going to improve the way these preliminary assessments are conducted. J Smart added that Craig Hilton-Taylor has attended meetings with some of these institutions and has at least enabled the right people to talk to each other in this regard. S Stuart and J Smart concluded that once Kew is using the system, many of the others will take their lead.

ACTION: BASC to take their recommendations for the Global Plant Assessments to the PCSC for endorsement and onward transmission to the SSC SC.
--

**The Global Species Assessment 2 (GSA2)** has been developed further, using the input from the last SC meeting. A further focus on the drivers of threats is needed, but a proposed outline for the publication has been developed. Section 1 will be similar in concept to the previous GSA, but

Section 2 will be an in-depth look at threats, bringing in external data. Four drivers will be discussed in detail:

- Invasives (working with ISSG and the GISD)
- Climate change (much work will hopefully be funded by the MacArthur Foundation)
- Utilisation (meetings between TRAFFIC and SP to better incorporate use data)
- Habitat loss (better analysis in this edition)

Pollution and disease are also discussed, but not in detail. Two related outputs are to accompany the release of GSA2:

1. A 10-15 page summary document that is aimed at policy-makers – a policy-relevant summary of both sections.
2. A regional focus (because it will be released at WCC4) – a broad picture of biodiversity in the Mediterranean region.

S Stuart requested comment on the outline, saying that input is essential and the outline must be approved as soon as possible. Some discussion followed, but it was decided that a small review group should be formed as the GSA2 is no longer just a BASC document – it involves the whole of the SSC and experts can therefore input in their field. S Stuart agreed, saying that Section 1 remains the status of species, but that Section 2 is far more in depth on threats and drivers. He agreed that SC members should become involved in review at a higher level. There was a suggestion that some other expertise from could be brought in from volunteers in other institutions (such as WCS) so as to not place the huge burden of review work on the SC members. There was general agreement that allowing trusted colleagues to review various sections could assist in their final SC sign-off. It was decided that some independent people could be sought for the technical review, but that the SSC Chair would have to be the final sign-off of the document. S Stuart reiterated that the SP are the coordinating editors, and then the SC should review and sign-off the final document. It was agreed that the SSC Chair would establish a process for this review to take place and for substantive comments to be incorporated in the final GSA2.

**ACTIONS:**

- All SC members are to nominate expert trusted colleagues to assist in the review process of GSA2.
- SSC Chair to establish a process for the overall review and incorporation of substantive comments to the final GSA2.

S Stuart then commented again on the proposed accompanying documents for policy-makers, saying that he felt that the SP staff cannot write this. He said that it is also important how this information will be fed back to the SGs so as to involve them in policy issues. H Dublin commented that timing is important and it is vital to bring the right people on board to compile this policy document as soon as possible. S Stuart agreed, saying that the writing team for Section 1 will be assembled soon and much of work will be based on the 2008 Red List data. L Boitani commented that the policy document should do an analysis at global level, but also at other specific scales. He suggested a global-, regional- and national-level policy scale and commented that it is important to target the policy document to where there is an implementing agency (e.g. one could look at the European scale because there is an implementing agency for the region). H Dublin agreed, giving the example that the IUCN New Zealand national committee had wanted more tailored press releases about the Red List. She concluded that it is important to identify who are the policy players in each region.

H Dublin commented on the section on the placement of the analysis of social and economic context and that the analysis would require additional expertise, and S Stuart agreed, saying that this should perhaps go into Section 2 instead of Section 1. H Dublin recommended that information from the current IUCN Situation Analysis is used in Section 2.

There was a suggestion from L Boitani that SSC partners with a major distributor to avoid the document becoming a solely IUCN document. He offered help from the SCB for budgeting purposes. J Robinson and G Mace suggested publishing options. There followed a discussion about the use of private publishers and the need for copy editing if the document is to be widely distributed.

**ACTIONS:**

- H Dublin and other SC members to look into potential publishers
- S Stuart is to draw up a budget for the publication of the GSA2, with which to approach them for tender bids

**DECISIONS:**

- The SC accepts the revised outline for the GSA2.
- In future, GSA2 will have its own agenda item on the SC meeting agenda.

S Stuart went on to explain that **The Red List User Guidelines** is a very technical document, but its content can have major implications for the way in which species are listed on the Red List. The document will continue to be “live” and will be reviewed approximately twice a year. It is published online so as to avoid printing costs.

With regards to **Climate Change**, the MacArthur proposal will hopefully ensure some funding. A follow on will be the development of guidelines for the application of the criteria.

The discussion over the mathematics underpinning the **Red List Index** has been finalised and a new paper has been submitted to the journal, PLoS One. Application of the new formula may not cause major changes, but the new formula will cause some important differences – e.g. the new formula will predict the non-recovery of amphibians, whereas before their recovery was predicted.

The revision of the **IUCN Authority Files** has taken place, with many thanks to A Stattersfield. A broader and more robust set of analyses is now possible – which will make a huge difference on marine habitat and in GSA3. BASC recommended that the name Authority File be changed to Classification Scheme and that the TF is extended to a WG.

**DECISIONS:**

- Authority Files are renamed Classification Schemes.
- The Authority Files TF is extended to the end of the Quadrennium and renamed the Classification Schemes WG.

**The National Red Listing** discussions continue and more emphasis on the linkages between national and global Red Lists is needed. A proposal was submitted to the Darwin Initiative to fund this further work and hopefully news will be forthcoming as to its success before the year end. The national and regional guidelines are seen as being working guidelines and they need to be reviewed as a few issues still need to be finalised

The **Scientific Collection Guidelines** will be brought up again at the next BASC meeting in early December and then submitted to the next SC meeting.

There was a very good discussion at BASC on **authorship and ownership**. H Dublin is in contact with an intellectual property lawyer who is assisting IUCN on issues of data ownership, control and use. A meeting is planned in IUCN HQ with the Global Operations and Programme Directors and

the Legal Counsel for November. BASC is concerned particularly about ensuring better credit for the assessors and evaluators.

H Dublin thanked T Brooks and S Stuart for the early version of the BASC minutes as they were very useful. S Stuart concluded that various SP staff assisted with the minutes, but that the lead rapporteur, who deserves particular thanks, is C Pollock.

### 5.3.5 Biodiversity Indicators Sub-Committee (BISC)

G Mace explained that one of the main goals of BISC was to encourage the use of SSC species information in a manner that informs people about biodiversity and trends and which can in turn inform policy and decisions. BISC is intimately related to BASC and because much of the work focuses on species indicators for the CBD 2010 targets, much of the work falls under the new GEF/WCMC 2010 BIP project. H Dublin commented that a certain amount of confusion has been created by the CBD's formal recognition of the BIP, seeing it as far more than a small, collaborative GEF project as it was originally conceived. For example, with the establishment of the BIP, some donors now feel that there is no need to give more funding to any of the individual contributing organisations, feeling instead that if they give funds to WCMC in support of the BIP, they are implicitly benefiting all. G Mace concluded that the project is small and the budgets inadequate for indicator development. As a result, the aim of developing biodiversity indicators that are not covered within the project design or those not on the CBD list of indicators is problematic due to lack of funds. As it stands, SSC will receive some support for the Sampled Red List Index (SRLI), sustainable use invasives, and food and medicinal indicators under the WCMC-administered GEF 2010 indicators project, but other sources have proven hard to find.

The SRLI process has been going well; and a number of workshops have been held. Species have been selected for fish and reptiles, and fish will have a workshop in 2007. By the end of 2007 all vertebrates will be covered. Work will begin on invertebrates next year once expert assessors have been appointed. By the end of 2008 the main drivers of change and the invertebrate report will be available.

Sustainable use issues do not have enough funding, although hopefully more will come through by the end of the year. There are still a number of conceptual issues to be worked out in this area.

An initial exploratory project on the Invasive alien species indicators has been funded by the CBD Secretariat, and the report should be available by the end of 2006 with hopes of a follow-up workshop early in the New Year.

At present, the food and medicines indicator work has only been allotted a very small sum of money and other organisations also expect to be involved.

Non CBD indicators we would like to work on include:

- The impacts of climate change.
- The impacts of emerging infectious diseases.
- Additional work to establish the links between ecosystem services and species.

G Mace commented that no Sub-Committee has been formed as yet, but a meeting is planned for early next year. G Mace stated that she is happy to receive recommendations of who should be on the Sub-Committee. JC Vié commented that several people had expressed an interest in contributing to the work of the BISC.

G Mace mentioned that work is needed to bring in the Living Planet Index (LPI) data as our data are additive and complimentary. She suggested that work should start with WWF on this, as it would benefit our programme to join forces with them. The SSC Chair was asked to establish contact with WWF and initiate a dialogue on possible SSC/LPI linkages.

**ACTIONS:**

- G Mace to establish membership of BISC.
- H Dublin to make contact with WWF to discuss the prospects for institutional linkages, which could include a potential contribution of resources.

J Hutton then commented that IUCN was not strong enough in guiding the BIP process at the start, which has resulted in a focus on a new range of indicators instead of actually doing the ones already in progress. H Dublin agreed that IUCN possibly had failed at the outset and that SSC could help to rectify the situation by making it clear to donors that the BIP project is not the entire solution and more money will actually need to be spent.

**ACTION:** H Dublin and G Mace to suggest to N Ash (of the WCMC BIP Secretariat) governance and technical oversight arrangements for the project and copy J Hutton and the SP staff.

G Mace then provided an update on the International Mechanism on Scientific Expertise on Biodiversity (IMoSEB), a body that emerged out of the biodiversity meeting in Paris in 2005. The meeting consisted of two groups formed from government representatives from the G8 countries plus a group from the scientific community. The two groups worked together at the meeting and released a joint statement for biodiversity. Following a long planning period, a large Steering Committee (150+ people) was formed to take the recommendations forward; in large part this called for a new scientific advisory process for biodiversity science and policy. The SC met and formed an executive committee (of which G Mace and M Chouchena-Rojas are members), although some members were not supportive of the need for a new body from the outset. IMoSEB is the body formed to take forward the consultation on the need for such a body. The open consultation was largely through a web-based forum (which was plagued with technical problems). A questionnaire is also being circulated and G Mace will forward on to those who are interested or provide their names to the IMoSEB Secretariat. There are also issue-based papers being done by contractors – including one mapping out the role of other intergovernmental examples that could guide IMoSEB. JC Vié then commented that IMoSEB does seem to have a life of its own, despite IUCN not really wanting to support it. H Dublin clarified that IUCN is actively involved in the discussions to date but that there appear to be differences of opinion on the functions and form of any future mechanism. In trying to gain clarity on the IUCN position, she asked for an agenda item at the upcoming Programme and Policy Committee of IUCN Council in November, this was not accepted, so she will bring it up under any other business.

T Brooks commented that he had the impression from the Nature commentary that DIVERSITAS was pushing itself for this role. Some discussion followed on whether IUCN should be pushed to take up this role. The general consensus was that this is the type of issue that IUCN exists for, and therefore IUCN should be pulling together the relevant data to better inform policy and decision making. However, it was felt that some qualities might be lacking (most importantly the actual desire to undertake this work) and therefore it was necessary to understand better IUCN's institutional position on the matter.

**ACTION:**

- H Dublin & R Mittermeier to bring up the issue of IMoSEB in the Programme and Policy Committee and to explore what IUCN and SSC's proper role(s) might be.

### 5.3.6 Plant Conservation Sub-Committee (PCSC)

H Dublin commented that focus is needed on moving forward and bringing the ideas discussed in the restructuring session to the plant domain. She explained that a meeting is planned that will bring together some members of the PCSC for interim discussion on the next steps and identification of a new Chair appointment. A few members of the PCSC have been in touch and there is a large and interesting mix of opinions in the group. Some players are representing more institutional views and others their own agendas. While there had previously been a somewhat uniting framework around the PCSC own strategic plan and the CBD GSPC, there has been a loss of strategic focus, so it is essential to have this meeting.

J Smart commented that many people are watching as to how this will pan out. The large GEF project is very important, as are the people who want to partner us on plant assessment work.

H Dublin stated that she has continued to be in contact with M Maunder, who is not stepping away from SSC as he wants to contribute on certain issues. Many members of PCSC have reiterated their strong faith in M Maunder, but unfortunately he no longer wants to Chair the PCSC.

H Dublin concluded that ICSC can help the PCSC through being an example of what restructuring is possible. As many of the plant groups are not functioning effectively, some restructuring may be necessary and some network support is essential here as it is for other parts of the SSC network.

## **5.4 SSC Task Force updates: feedback and discussion**

### 5.4.1 Species Conservation Planning TF (SCPTF)

H Dublin explained that the revised ToR, as guided by discussion in the SSC SC 3.3, are in the meeting pack and that a meeting is planned for the new year in New York in partnership with WCS. R Lacy is coordinating this meeting and will also be submitting a list of members. There was some comment that the name of TF is confusing due to it sounding like broader, multi-species conservation planning, but H Dublin commented that this was a short-term TF and the ToRs clearly delimit the work so terminology should not be a problem.

### 5.4.2 Strategic Planning

H Dublin commented that C Imboden has put forward a document on a new framework and his feelings are that SSC should merge this process into the existing 2001-2010 Strategic Plan. She reiterated that the Cambridge meeting Strategic Planning session had fed into the Workplan for 2007 and 2008 and that the longer-term issues will be built into the next Strategic Plan. H Dublin also explained that there will be a meeting in early 2007 to focus on the IUCN Programme over the coming Quadrennium and SSC will input to this.

H Dublin concluded that she feels positive about the direction that the Strategic Planning is taking, but it will need to fit into the IUCN programme planning too. The IUCN Programme reports against Key Results Areas as well as the Knowledge, Governance and Empowerment framework – so it is not exactly clear how we should structure the next SSC strategic plan at this stage, although it will probably include broad targets.

Some discussion followed on the SSC Strategic Planning – with many people complimenting C Imboden's thinking, but also commenting that it is vital to give more input into the higher level structure of the IUCN Programme. S Stuart commented that many SGs do not feel like they fit in with the Strategic Plan, and therefore it is vital to engage the SGs. H Dublin agreed, saying many of the Chairs are confused as to whose Strategic Plan it is. Often it is best to ask them what they do

and then fit this into the Strategic Plan rather than asking them to identify where they fit. She also explained that there are currently no dedicated resources for the Strategic Planning.

**ACTIONS:**

- C Imboden is to continue his line of thinking regarding the SSC Strategic Plan and should not do a complete rewrite of the 2001-2010 plan, but dovetail any thinking with the IUCN 2009-2012 Programme Planning.

### 5.4.3 Restructuring TF

L Boitani facilitated an afternoon workshop session about restructuring on Monday 23 October. H Dublin reminded everyone that this process was needed due to the external review results that showed that some elements of the SSC structure were not contributing as they should be. She called for everyone to think outside the 60 year-old box that has been created and move forward from the very fruitful SSC WCC3.3 discussions. An in-depth and lively discussion followed. The main discussion centred on how to create a structure that provided for those groups whose work focuses strongly on species assessments, as well as for those groups who undertake other conservation activities, which directly contribute to the SSC's Strategic Plan, alongside assessment. The general consensus was that the restructuring thinking was progressing well. The Restructuring TF was mandated to continue their deliberations, with the aim to further discuss the proposals to the Red List Unit staff, other IUCN staff and the SSC network as soon as is appropriate. It was agreed that the new structure would be rolled out in the 2009 – 2012 quadrennium.

**DECISIONS:**

- The Restructuring TF will continue deliberations.
- The new structure will be rolled out in the 2009 – 2012 Quadrennium.

**ACTIONS:**

- All SC members should send any further comments on the restructuring proposal to L Boitani within the next few weeks.
- The Restructuring TF to create a whole new set of terms and names so as to avoid any confusion in the future. A glossary of terms should be included in the next version of the restructuring paper.

## 5.5 **Other SSC SC member updates: feedback and discussion**

### 5.5.1 Veterinary SG

R Kock provided an overview of the current situation with **Avian Influenza**. He explained that the virus has been isolated in blowflies (similar to Anthrax), but it is unclear whether this is part of the transmission cycle. There is smouldering activity amongst the Asian wild bird populations, but the European outbreak has died down. North America has been classified as low risk as there is little movement between the old and new worlds. Africa has had outbreaks in poultry, but there are no confirmations of outbreaks in wild birds. Sampling is taking place on a large scale. The Global Avian Influenza Network for Surveillance of wild birds (GAINS), spear-headed by WCS, should produce results soon. Many GAINS people are members of the Veterinary SG, so we are closely involved. Low prevalence levels will make it difficult to get valid data, but tagging should result in some useful information on migratory patterns. Many efforts continue to raise money for control programmes.

The field of **pharmaceuticals and the environment** grew from the Diclofenac and vultures issue in South Asia. Some countries have banned Diclofenac and three countries are promoting an alternative. It will take some time to reduce the drug in the environment because the existing levels are quite toxic. R Kock explained that there are reports of Diclofenac also affecting kites and griffins – so more studies will be required. SSC (represented by the VSG) was invited to a recent workshop of the pharmaceutical industry in Holland, which was well attended. Although drug manufacturers are supposed to conduct environmental risk assessments, human patient always come first. The average drug costs \$20billion to reach shelf stage and there may be a million chemicals that are tested before the one that works is found. Prediction of effects on the environment is very hard, so the system needs a more holistic approach to finding the problems. Most of the industry is willing to engage and find alternative approaches as it can align with their Corporate Social Responsibility work. An endowment fund could be a way forward, but a long-term fund is also needed to backstop the situations where problems are identified at a later stage. The SSC networks have assisted a great deal on the Diclofenac issue and a list has been provided which identifies all those products that contain Diclofenac. Although much research is done on surface water and sewerage, more is needed to investigate the effects of cosmetic and bath products washed through the systems.

R Kock explained that the African Rhino SG is being supported by the Veterinary SG and the Reintroduction SG in the development of Reintroduction and Translocation Guidelines and there is hope that this project can also involve the Asian Rhino SG – perhaps creating the potential for study tours or the sharing of information.

H Dublin commended R Kock on his work with the pharmaceutical industry and commented that there is also good support from the IUCN Business and Biodiversity Unit for this issue.

#### 5.5.2 Invasive Species SG (ISSG)

M Clout began his report back by thanking H Dublin for her trip to New Zealand and her support of the ISSG. He then stated that the group has an active listserve and all members have been registered on CoReg (200 members in 45 countries). He explained that there are gaps in the membership in terms of geographic spread (people from South America and Madagascar are required). There are nine ISSG-related staff at the University of Auckland – five on projects involving the management of invasive species and a Pacific Island Invasives project funded by CEPF and the Government of New Zealand. The rest of the staff work on technical issues (including the Global Invasives Species Database (GISD)) partly funded by the US geological survey and partly by the New Zealand government. GISD is perhaps not as comprehensive as it should be due to the slight distortion because of who is funding the project. The GISD data are useful and should be linked more directly to the Red List database/SIS and overlapped with other information on threats caused by invasive species, but funding is needed to forge these linkages.

M Clout then commented that funding is the ISSG's main challenge, with the group being forced to take on contract work to sustain themselves. He noted that the appointment of G Howard as the IUCN Invasive Alien Species Coordinator might help. It has been very confusing to have both GISP and ISSG in existence, but there is hope that the role of GISP can change to be a help to ISSG rather than competition.

The coordination and mainstreaming of invasive species into IUCN has put a large load onto the ISSG's Coordinator, M De Poorter, and there is a need to refocus her time onto core activities. Other activities of ISSG include a book that will be out by the end of 2006 and will be a good tool to build further awareness in Asia. The book focuses on Japan, which is one of the few countries in the region that has IAS legislation. The ISSG's main activities focus on providing technical support for policy makers. M Clout reiterated that the ISSG responds to requests and tries to put people in touch with the right experts, but there is also a need to become further involved in managing the problem so that technical advice can be provided to management – using well-chosen

demonstration projects. Taken together, the GISD, the guidelines and the demonstration projects at various sites should all act as means to demonstrate new approaches and raise awareness.

H Dublin explained that the evaluation of GISP has indicated that the GISP Secretariat needs to stop doing project work – which means that the institutional consortium members will have to put funding in or else it will simply die. She also reiterated that IUCN has agreed to incorporate funds for ISSG into the development of any related projects. M Clout indicated that the core costs of ISSG are approximately US\$175,000 per annum.

### 5.5.3 Reintroduction SG

F Launay explained that the recent activities of the RSG included translating the Reintroduction Guidelines and the Guidelines for the Replacement of Confiscated Animals into Korean (Korea is embarking on a large reintroduction and relocation exercise). A forum on translocation was held in Bangladesh and guidelines for the reintroduction of non-human primates (great apes) are being revised with the Primate SG. A European Reintroduction Advisory Group has been made within the European Aquarium and Zoo Association. New members are being recruited who can assist in the reintroduction of plant species. An international conference on reintroduction will be held in early 2008 and is being sponsored by the Lincoln Park Zoo in Chicago. Another conference on avian reintroduction is planned in 2007 in London, with the support of the Zoological Society of London.

Administration-wise the group is secure, as it has support from the UAE Government that covers all its operational costs as well as office space. A second programme officer should be recruited soon.

H Dublin queried whether there was any update of the strategic thinking of the RSG since the Cambridge meeting. F Launay commented that the RSG is structured regionally and taxonomically and many of the chairs of these sub-groups are looking at developing more proactive programmes. There are also plans to create a training manual and module so that training can be conducted wherever it is needed. F Launay explained that they are often requested to run training workshops alongside other meetings – such as CBSG. There are also more and more requests for assistance on confiscated animals (especially from South East Asia and South Asia), as many animals are released into the wild without any consideration of the animal's origin. F Launay acknowledged that this work is more solving problems than conservation. He also indicated that the role of the RSG has changed somewhat in recent years as members pushed to influence practical decisions around proposed reintroductions. He explained that they have decided if they cannot positively influence a decision, they should pull out of the engagement.

J Robinson queried whether there is much work with primate orphanages and F Launay commented that they had attended a meeting recently as observers but agreed with R Mittermeier that many of these animals are never actually reintroduced so the RSG would have limited input.

There was some discussion around a suggestion for a book on case studies that will assess the successes and failures of reintroduction, perhaps focusing on the various phases such as planning, implementation, monitoring – and using the guidelines as an outline. F Launay acknowledged this idea and said that funding for the book had already been secured, but it would require some extra thought. Many attempts do not even qualify as reintroduction and often it is a case of convincing people that they can do something good for conservation without necessarily releasing the animals. Reintroduction is often a very emotional subject and it is sometimes difficult to engage people at the right level.

<p><b>ACTION:</b> F Launay to investigate the possibility for a book of case studies of reintroduction successes and failures.</p>
--

There was some discussion on the impact of citizens in some Middle Eastern countries on the species and F Launay commented that the United Arab Emirates is one government that is committed to large projects all over the region and acts as an example to others. JC Vié then commented that the IUCN West African Office is planning to organise a workshop on the hunting of arid land species and said he would check whether there was funding sourced for this initiative.

#### 5.5.4 Conservation Breeding SG (CBSG)

In his absence, R Lacy provided a written brief on the work of the CBSG in recent months. S Stuart commented that R Lacy has really been instrumental in encouraging CBSG to take the lead on the role of the *ex-situ* community in mitigating the amphibian crisis. J Robinson agreed, saying that the Bronx Zoo has even recruited a herpetologist curator to focus on the issue. H Dublin asked the SC to assist the Amphibian SG to find a coordinator to work on the *ex-situ* and *in-situ* issues, as this requires full-time input to keep the impetus going. She asked that suggestions for this person should be sent to the group's Co-Chairs. There is money for this position but the right person has not yet been found. She explained that this is a vital issue as many people fear that the *in-situ* issues are being neglected relative to the *ex-situ* initiatives. Although R Lacy has been trying to persuade people that *in-situ* work is also important, the *in-situ* side is not progressing as well. The CBD is interested and is concerned about more issues being driven from the *ex-situ* communities of the developed world. H Dublin explained that, once recruited, the Global Amphibian Coordinator would need to be able to move into a high-level job with energy.

ACTION: All SC members are to assist the Amphibian SG with potential candidates for the Coordinator's position
--

## 6 **SSC GOVERNANCE ISSUES**

### 6.1 **SG Chairs Consultation**

C Poole explained that the idea for a consultation with the SG Chairs has arisen both out of H Dublin's needs to report to Council on various issues (such as shadow resources and progress on implementing the SSC's mandate) and from the need to have more informal interactions with those Chairs we do not often hear from. We know there are dysfunctional SGs and we need to understand their issues. She explained that a list of discussion topics has been drawn up and it is the intention that she and staff of the SP would then telephone the Chairs – being careful to record any items that may need specific follow-up (such as technical questions about Red Listing).

H Dublin explained further that this is a gentle way to be in touch with people who are not in contact – just to keep up to date with what they are doing or what their problems might be. She also commented that it is a good opportunity for the staff to have more personal contact with the Chairs. If there is a specific known sensitivity, a senior person (such as J Smart, JC Vié and H Dublin) could handle these calls.

There was some discussion about the awkwardness of asking people to comment on the service provided by the various IUCN offices. H Dublin commented that she feels any criticism will be constructive. JC Vié agreed, saying the main reasons for the call might be just to explain the situation in the SP with the lack of network support and to explain how the SSC and SP are set up, the problems with CoReg and various other issues – offering them a way to discuss any problems they might have.

ACTION: J Smart, JC Vié, H Dublin and C Poole to discuss how to roll out the Chairs' Consultation and how to collate the responses.
---

## 6.2 Communications TF and documents

H Dublin explained that she has been trying to obtain the documents from R Pethiyagoda, but nothing has been forthcoming.

She then explained that a comment at the Cambridge meeting had prompted Y Sadovy, M Samways and R Kock to work on a document regarding why species are important (draft document in the SSC SC3.4 pack). Y Sadovy explained that they had brought together a range of examples of the use of species, but that more work was needed. She said that the aim was to make the value of species understood using concrete examples and by being very visual, while avoiding too much technical talk. M Samways added that this is purely a SSC perspective as it is in response to the question of what is SSC doing. Scientifically this issue has been dealt with, so this document was more about putting SSC into context from an ecosystem function perspective.

A lengthy discussion on the purpose of the document and the audience it is aimed at followed. There was some debate as to whether the audience is an internal IUCN audience or whether it should be aimed at the wider public or donors. The main conclusion from the discussion was that it is essential that SSC learns how to present the case of the value of species much better. The useful advice and recommended additions to the document can be summarised as follows:

- Papers from the recent Prague Ecosystem Indicators Workshop could be a source of examples
- Impacts of single species (e.g. the introduction of Arctic foxes to an island resulting in a shift of the whole ecosystem to tundra) should be included
- Too many case studies could make the document too academic
- The MEA has good examples that can be used
- The cultural, aesthetic and religious values of species should not be neglected
- This could evolve into a coffee table book of some substance
- This document could be used to brief the new Director General
- The publication of this document must not clash with the publication of GSA2
- Not all species supply an ecosystem service, so it is important to include other values (such as intrinsic value or the unknown consequences of loss)
- Film makers could make use of this document and highlight specific aspects or examples
- Case studies are sometimes problematic, but often communicators find them necessary and easier to understand
- It is vital not to be perceived as anti-livelihoods (there is some debate whether there is a case for all species to contribute to livelihoods or whether some trade-offs are necessary).

The conclusion from this discussion was that there is definitely more than one message and that it is difficult to package it all in a single document. However, it is important to make a start and present at least some of the arguments (perhaps starting with the ecosystem services arguments). Another conclusion was that a really well-packaged message is not necessarily going to change behaviour, as leaders often take decisions on the basis of other values and objectives (such as societal). In this respect it might be best to start from a human perspective, which might result in some extreme detail (e.g. how does it change human lives if all frogs are lost?). It was concluded that this discussion and document is an excellent theme for the next SC meeting where a person from CEC will be present to advise on communications issues and potential communications products.

### ACTIONS:

- The writing group should continue their work and seek contributions from others.
- H Dublin to talk to the CEC about some of these challenges and seek their advice.

### 6.3 Members Emeritus and Award nominations

H Dublin reported that the Members Emeritus webpage is live. There were no further nominations for awards, but H Dublin confirmed that these awards can be made at any stage during the year.

### 6.4 SG Chairs' Meeting

H Dublin explained that a SG Chairs' Meeting has long been a goal of the SSC, and there are many good reasons for holding the meeting before the end of this Quadrennium as a means of influencing the next intersessional programme of IUCN. She explained that IUCN has developed a 2-year budgetary process, and there is talk that the carry-forward policy will be amended at the next Council meeting (carry-forward would then be "taxed" at 10% as opposed to the previous 40% rate). If this resolution is carried, it will be an incentive for cost centres to save for future eventualities. To make the Chairs' Meeting a possibility, savings could be made from the 2006 and 2007 COF and would contribute to a meeting to be held in early 2008. The current SSC budgets that were submitted on 22 September reflect this planning and show that CHF 35,000 could be allocated to such a meeting. These budgets are provisional, pending Council approval.

H Dublin noted that she has canvassed some Chairs already and some could pay for themselves. It is important to source more funding partners soon, but there will be the possibility that the meeting might have to be scaled back, depending on the level of funding support found. If finance can be found, it would now be the time to look at in-depth planning for the meeting (timing and venue).

There was some discussion around the meeting idea, and the general consensus was one of support. F Launay indicated that he would enquire as to whether the meeting could be hosted in Abu Dhabi and supported locally. J Smart agreed to ask D Zivkovic to start investigating a ball-park figure for airfares. She stated that it is vital that the meeting dates are set and slotted into the diaries of IUCN Senior Management as soon as possible. The feeling was that late January 2008 might be a good time as it will then not interfere with Council meetings or SC meetings.

L Boitani commented that a clear rationale is needed for organising this meeting, as well as clear goals and targets. The WCC4 and the SSC restructuring are two main topics for discussion and should be good enticements for people to attend. R Mittermeier suggested that the Chairs be given an opportunity to speak about what they have been doing. R Mittermeier also suggested that Conservation International might be able to support the meeting financially. JC Vié stated that it is best to have a clearly articulated link between this meeting and the WCC4. T Brooks suggested that the meeting might also be the best place to discuss the idea of a Species Congress.

#### DECISION:

Depending on available funds, the idea of holding the SG Chairs' Meeting in early 2008 was supported under the following guidelines:

- Only SG Chairs and Co-Chairs will be invited (a Deputy Chair may attend in their stead).
- The SC will attend, as will senior staff members of the SP and IUCN.
- Presentation sessions where Chairs can present their work will be figured into the agenda (posters could also be an option) and the agenda could be divided into taxonomic groupings.
- The meeting should be 3-4 days long

#### ACTIONS:

- C Poole to work with D Zivkovic on a draft budget for the meeting
- F Launay to indicate as soon as possible (but no later than the end of January 2007) whether the UAE will be able to host the meeting.
- All SC members should indicate how they or their institution can contribute to this meeting, and should speak to any Chairs they are in contact with about the meeting.

## **7 SSC FINANCES**

### **7.1 COF 2006**

H Dublin explained that the SSC had been required to submit a revised 2006 COF budget as well as a two-year budget for 2007 and 2008 to the IUCN Finance department. She also commented that the IUCN Finance Department is becoming slightly stricter on the reporting on money spent. The problem is when allocated funds are carried forward between years (e.g. a meeting takes place in January using the previous year's funding), as the close of year is very precise and all money must be spent by 15 January. There is a possibility for accruing money to the following year with the intention of it being spent on a specific project early in the next calendar year. JC Vié and H Ruiz Lozano will investigate how this procedure should be put in place for those Sub-Committees or TFs that need or wish to do this.

H Dublin further explained to the Chairs of the Sub-Committees that it is vital for her to know if they cannot spend their whole allocation, as then money can be reallocated to other worthy causes within the year and avoid Headquarters "taxation". She assured the Sub-Committee Chairs that the amounts indicated in the 2007 budget will be available from January and they should ensure that their reporting from 2006 and their budgets for 2007 are sent in to the Chair's Office as soon as possible so that their allocations can be forwarded to them. S Stuart recommended that, to the extent possible, COF funds be spent from Headquarters (BASC has found this works well). He also advised everyone to ensure that contracts are written up so that people are required to sign for any money that is allocated to them. H Dublin commented that situations do vary and that each Sub-Committee should decide which procedures suit them the best and liaise with the Chair's Office accordingly. She reminded everyone that the COF is not to be used for projects, but for governance and strategic work.

There was some discussion amongst the Sub-Committee Chairs regarding the best options for managing their allocations. It was understood that no money can be released without a budget on file. There was also agreement that general accounting should be kept of all expenditure on the COF and all receipts or invoices should be kept in case IUCN Finance requests them. C Poole and JC Vié confer with IUCN Finance to confirm that the report of a Sub-Committee meeting will stand as the technical report back on the funds.

#### **ACTIONS:**

- JC Vié to investigate the accrual system for the Commissions and let C Poole know the procedure for those Sub-Committees wishing to carry some of their 2006 allocation over to early 2007.
- JC Vié to get clarity from IUCN Finance on how they wish to handle the disbursement and reporting on COF allocations to the Sub-Committees.
- JC Vié is to investigate the reporting requirements for the Sub-Committees for the end of 2006.

### **7.2 Fund-raising**

H Dublin explained that both she and J Smart have fundraising as one of their ToR, so it is important to try and gain agreement on priority needs. H Dublin further explained that the Commissions Chairs are often crippled because they are competing with IUCN for donor funds. H Dublin concluded that there are opportunities with private foundations in the USA, but that the protocols and funding models of IUCN are often discouraging to efforts. IUCN does not favour the Commission running project funds through partner organisations as they prefer the control and depend on the cost recovery for their financial survival.

J Smart agreed and said that although they are going ahead and developing concept notes for priority fundraising needs, the general funding model in IUCN is problematic. She explained that it is also frustrating for the SP – because money is needed for network support staff. She further said that if donor funds flow directly to SGs and the SP gets no cost recovery, it is difficult for them to provide support.

J Smart tabled and spoke to a paper summarising current fundraising issues and approaches then highlighted the various fundraising initiatives that are ongoing at this time:

- IUCN Conservation Finance Donor Relations (CFDR) mostly deal with the framework donor governments and are fundraising for the new IUCN building and for the next Congress. One of the staff at CFDR is enthusiastic about species issues and hopefully some support will be forthcoming. The Cemex Red Book is used all the time as a gift to donors, and other options (such as a Green Book of Plants) could be explored.
- J Rada has offered to help identify 10 corporates who can become partners in SIS at US\$40,000 per company. This could provide the core funding to put SIS on track. The first corporates that will be approached will be Geneva-based. J Hutton cautioned that he and J Smart should work together so as to have WCMC and IUCN coordinate approaches where the same potential corporate donors are involved. This was agreed by the Committee.

**ACTION:** J Smart and J Hutton to work together so as to have WCMC and IUCN coordinate approaches where the same potential corporate donors are involved.

- JC Vié mentioned that there were ongoing discussions with Fonds Français pour l'Environnement Mondial regarding the possibility of packaging the RL in such a way as to make it eligible for their funding. R Mittermeier offered to help J Smart with this relationship as CI has a good working relationship with them. He also advised that any fund established be called a Trust Fund rather than an endowment as endowment has a bad connotation, particularly in the USA. J Smart agreed to investigate whether this is also the case in Europe.
- The new fundraiser in the IUCN US office is enthusiastic about fund-raising for species. R Mittermeier noted that the new DG has many contacts in the USA and needs to fundraise there.
- The Sir Peter Scott Fund is becoming a popular method of funding and the Fondation Ensemble will be supporting it for two years with €100,000.

Further creative ways of fundraising are being investigated and the SP communications staff member to be recruited should have a marketing background and be willing to do approaches to the corporate sector. Regular proposal-writing is also occurring and all staff members are involved.

S Stuart explained that he and M Hoffman attended a meeting with the GEF to follow up on the idea of a service agreement with the GEF Secretariat for the provision of data services to the GEF. With a new CEO, the GEF Secretariat is in disarray and it is very difficult to access the right people to pursue these discussions at present. D Wheeler (of the World Bank) is, however, putting S Stuart in touch with various people at the World Bank who might want to use SSC data. H Dublin commented that her involvement with the GEF (monitoring and evaluation side) is very separate from the GEF Secretariat side and reports directly to the Council. She said it is important to keep the lines of communication between SSC and the GEF open.

**ACTION:** H Dublin and S Stuart to discuss the GEF situation and continue to be proactive on this issue of the service agreement.

L Boitani enquired as to whether SSC should be reporting more regularly on shadow resources. H Dublin cautioned that care is taken not to double report to IUCN (e.g. report on shadow resources through SSC and the SGs reporting on projects that run through IUCN), but it is vital that SSC does

Minutes of SSC Steering Committee Meeting WCC 3.4

report on shadow resources as well as on what the regional offices raise for Commission-related work (e.g. the Mediterranean assessments). H Dublin said that the important thing was to capture “in kind” contributions from the time devotion of SSC members and any explicit project funds that they raise as a result of their own efforts (but are not run through IUCN).

**ACTION:** J Smart and JC Vié to work out a method of reporting on resources secured for assessment work in the regions.

**DECISION:** In future we should have the capacity to report on shadow resources secured by the SGs, funds raised by the Chair’s Office and funds raised for SSC activities by the SP.

## **8 IUCN INTERNAL DISCUSSION POINTS**

### **8.1 Mangroves for the Future Initiative (MFF)**

H Dublin explained that the SSC may soon be asked to put more in depth proposals and ideas forward for this initiative. The US Special Envoy for Tsunami follow-up, President Clinton, is preparing to formally endorse the initiative before he leaves this post and the MFF team have therefore had to really work hard on pulling things together at the last minute for their meeting with him on 31 October. H Dublin warned everyone that they may be called upon to quickly provide extra input. She commented that the way funds will be distributed is not yet clear, but the SSC is well within the discussion, so we will be kept apprised.

### **8.2 Themes for WCC4**

H Dublin explained that she and R Mittermeier will push, at the upcoming Council meeting, to support the species-relevant themes proposed by H Dublin in response to the call for proposed themes last August. H Dublin commented that she will also approach some of the regional representatives who might be interested in pushing the species themes as well. She asked M Clout and F Launay to encourage their regional representatives on Council for support.

### **8.3 Future of Sustainability** (Discussed under 5.1)

### **8.4 IUCN Situation Analysis** (Discussed under 5.1)

### **8.5 WCPA/SSC Joint Conservation Planning Initiative**

H Dublin explained that the outcomes so far of this initiative are in two parts:

- R Pressey is working towards agreed ToR (available in the SSC SC3.4 pack) and has hired a post-doctoral student to assist him. Funds from multiple donors have been sent to the University of Queensland via IUCN Canada and the plan will be rolled out over the next year. R Pressey is also hoping to present progress at SCB 2007 meeting in South Africa.
- J Robinson and E Sanderson did a first draft of a preamble for a slightly different target audience – one that included a discussion on what attributes of biodiversity must be valued in the context of conservation planning. This draft is now out for comment and may then be distributed more broadly as a reinforcement of the attributes of biodiversity.

H Dublin concluded by saying the various documents and contacts are available should anyone wish to see them.

## **9 BRAINSTORMING AND SHARING**

### **9.1 Society for Conservation Biology (SCB) (Port Elizabeth, South Africa 2007)**

H Dublin explained that although she had hoped to be able to make this happen, it is not clear whether IUCN will have a higher-level presence at the event (though at the moment it seems unlikely). Many SGs are working hard and will be well-represented, but there are still more opportunities to do things from a species point of view.

G Mace confirmed that a symposium was submitted that deals with the Sampled Red List Index, the Living Planet Index and species, but she commented that there is an issue of institutions vs. science (as this is supposed to be an emerging science meeting not a showcase for institutions). R Mittermeier commented that the SSC should look at how to make species a fundamental piece in SCB. H Dublin agreed, saying that there are incredible opportunities with the meeting being in South Africa as the country is trying so hard to promote biodiversity conservation in their highest levels of planning and implementation. J Robinson commented that there are further opportunities around the meeting (in satellite meetings or presentations) – including presenting to the scientific community about the Red List assessment process and other SSC tools for species conservation.

After some discussion around who and what is needed to ensure a presence at the meeting, it was decided that a sponsored workshop and a booth should be investigated as possible means of communicating SSC messages and reaching out to the scientific community. The biggest problem being that no one has the time to do the organising and we have missed the initial submission date for symposia.

**DECISION:** SSC will try to have a presence at the SCB meeting though a sponsored workshop and booth. SSC members and SGs will be invited to showcase their material in the SSC booth.

#### **ACTIONS:**

- JC Vié is to look at possibilities for IUCN having a booth at the next SCB meeting.
- R Mittermeier is to investigate the possibility of funding for the booth and/or sponsored workshop.

### **9.2 Climate Change**

H Dublin explained that the proposal to the MacArthur Foundation is asking for US\$50,000 more than what they had originally indicated they might be interested in supporting. It is therefore imperative that further funding is sought for this initiative.

The National Centre for Ecological Analysis and Synthesis (NCEAS) has also been approached to review the proposal put to them by R Ackakaya and T Brooks, noting that even if this does come through it will not be for another year at least.

**ACTION:** H Dublin to liaise with G Mace, JC Vié and S Stuart regarding the MacArthur Climate Change grant.

### 9.3 Alliance for Zero Extinction (AZE)

H Dublin introduced this topic by saying that the SSC was approached to sign an MOU with AZE under the Chairmanship of D Brackett. She explained that the June 2004 minutes of the SSC SC meeting reflect that the decision was not to sign the MOU. However, this issue has been raised again and requires fresh discussion. H Dublin also reminded everyone that IUCN has new policies on the signing of MOUs and they all require the IUCN Legal Counsel to advise on the signing before delegating the signing to anyone in IUCN. She concluded that there are some signatories (i.e. two IUCN SSC SGs) on this MOU who are actually not legal entities and therefore should not have signed.

JC Vié said he thought that the decision not to sign at the 2004 meeting centred on the fact that IUCN could not be the same level as all the other signatories because it supplies the data – therefore, the wording of an MOU would have to state that IUCN SSC is an advisor and a supplier of data. However, no correspondence had been exchanged with AZE explaining this decision.

T Brooks then explained that AZE is an alliance established with the goal to identify sites where Critically Endangered and Endangered species are restricted and then safeguard those sites (without dictating how this protection might be achieved). He stated that AZE has almost 70 signatories and IUCN is conspicuous by its absence. The launch in December 2005 had huge international coverage and was accompanied by the publication of a map, brochure and peer-reviewed scientific paper. T Brooks further explained that AZE has established a simple governance mechanism in that the Chair is an elected representative of the signatories and the SC comprises individual representatives from four regional and four international organisations.

There followed some discussion with the conclusion that, while SSC may support such an alliance, IUCN SSC relationship to AZE is not one of a member but rather of a data provider and adviser on data use. Some discussion also took place about control over the release of site-level data for species which require protection through the restriction of data access. IUCN SSC can advise AZE on the criteria for making such distinctions.

It was decided that H Dublin is to write a letter to AZE, containing the following:

- Apologising for the non-response after the 2004 meeting
- Explaining that acknowledgement of a special relationship is needed between AZE and IUCN (with IUCN acting as advisors and the suppliers of data) and asking for clear recognition of the supporting data from IUCN SSC's data to be placed on the AZE website and in their publications.
- Explaining that certain site-level data are sensitive and that the IUCN SSC should be brought in to advise on develop criteria and a process for making these decisions.

<b>ACTION:</b> H Dublin to draft a letter to AZE with the help of S Stuart and JC Vié.
--

### 9.4 DNA Bar Coding and Species Conservation

H Dublin explained that she had been contacted by D Schindel, of the Smithsonian Institution, who is the Executive Secretary of the Consortium for the Barcode of Life (CBOL; [www.barcoding.si.edu](http://www.barcoding.si.edu)), and requires feedback from the SC on whether SSC would like to be involved.

G Mace opened the discussion by stating that she had attended a meeting earlier this year on the initiative. She commented that the initiative has areas of uncertainty, but it would be good for SSC to participate at this early stage as the initiative is dominated by the molecular taxonomic community. L Bennun commented that BirdLife has also worked with them, but that the initiative might be more important for non-bird taxa. M Samways confirmed that they had linkages through the dragonfly community and the work so far has been most interesting.

G Mace suggested that the SSC ask to be invited to discussions and meetings and kept apprised of their progress. S Stuart agreed, saying that he is expecting some important papers to be published soon on using the short gene sequence to identify species. The general feeling of those present at the meeting was that this is an interesting initiative and that SSC should be involved passively.

H Dublin voiced one concern in that there are fears that this initiative might create a funding problem for other more applied conservation genetics initiatives as some donors are quite keen to fund these modern techniques. She mentioned that the use of the gene sequencing on ivory has not materialised into a practical tool, yet, although a large amount of money was spent. G Mace agreed, saying that this is why it is important for SSC to participate at this early stage. H Dublin said she does see that there could be potential for its use the bushmeat trade if costs could be kept low and practical applications designed.

**ACTION:** H Dublin to send an informal note to D Schindel saying that the SSC would like to be kept in the loop, in particular, to help guide the initiative on its practical applications to conservation.

## **10 SSC SUCCESS STORIES**

The SC noted the following success stories:

1. Two new species of dragonfly have been found in Stellenbosch (where some alien vegetation had been removed and recovery was underway) during a Red Listing process. M Samways commented that the discovery of new species is definitely a positive spin-off from Red Listing.
2. The discovery of new species in Madagascar is amazing – with 16 new species of primates having been identified recently and probably more coming. R Mittermeier commented that this could really grab the media's attention and suggested that the GMA should be prepared for this. Madagascar is a good success story, and helps one realise that the world is a richer place than we thought, but also that the job of protecting species is harder because many new species identified are outside of protected areas.
3. J Robinson noted that a new genus of African monkey has been discovered. Known locally as 'kipunji', the new genus *Rungwecebus* is known from only two localities – one in a reserve and one outside. The Tanzanian government is delighted as they are now one of the few countries with endemic primates, and they have promised to do everything possible to conserve the species.
4. M Clout commented that a significant difference can be made by removing alien species – particularly visible on islands where eradication is possible. Biodiversity recovery is remarkable and reintroduction becomes possible. An example is Candle Island where the rats have all been removed and the birds are re-colonising. He explained that one has to wait for two years for the land to recover from the eradication method, but that recovery is actually seen almost immediately.
5. R Mittermeier explained that someone has found an as yet un-described species of giant tortoise in captivity in the Seychelles. Although the genetics are not yet decisive, the person is attempting to breed with the population in the hopes to restore the species to the wild at some stage.
6. L Boitani explained that the bear that was shot in Germany (that had travelled over 100km from Italy and been shot for killing a few chickens) actually turned into a success story because it was on the news all summer, and has resulted in people challenging this decision at a political level.

7. Y Sadovy explained that there is now talk of protecting the whole of TayTay Bay, Palawan, Philippines following discussions that emerged during consultations to protect a single spawning aggregation of groupers. This aggregation is the first to be specifically protected in SE Asia (for its value as an aggregation) and, in so doing, sparked a much wider debate on protecting a bigger area.
8. J Hutton commented that someone had put female lions on a hunting quota, but after members of the Cat SG had investigated the populations in Zimbabwe and put forward their findings, the quota has been reduced to zero.
9. The wood bison reintroduction in Canada has been a success, even though the local people were not consulted at the onset. The local communities were quite concerned at first due to the size of the bison and the consequences of them expanding into the Inuit communities' living spaces. Hunting quotas were issued for the locals and this has encouraged them to make more range for the bison and totally accept their reintroduction.
10. R Kock commented that a Saudi Arabian gazelle population has increased from close to zero to the stage where the population is almost collapsing due to over population. Management discussions are taking place around hunting quotas.
11. R Kock also commented that the black rhino populations continue to grow and the species is in general doing well.
12. H Dublin explained that there has been a breakthrough in process in the Saiga antelope situation, in that a meeting in Uzbekistan brought all the producing and consuming states together. The Co-Chair of the Antelope SG and a member of the ESUSG were very involved and ended up helping to update the entire Action Plan, after which all the players agreed to it. Another letter has been sent to the President of the Russian Federation from the President of IUCN urging Russia to sign the CMS MOU.
13. A recent publication from BirdLife indicates the number of birds (15 species) that have been saved through conservation efforts in the wild. This is an important example and should perhaps be expanded to other species as examples of success stories.
14. The California condor can now actually be seen from the highway – whereas 20 years ago the talk was of “let it go extinct with dignity”. SSC played a key role in these discussions over the ensuing years.

H Dublin concluded by saying how useful it is to bring together stories of what worked and what did not work. All species conservation work has challenges and it is important to learn from each other's experiences. She said that the volunteer network can sometimes become quite pessimistic and that it is one of the roles of the SC to provide motivation. She commented that there has been fantastic feedback from the Chair profiles in *Species* as apparently the individual recognition in this feature provided a great deal of inspiration. She encouraged everyone to collect more success stories from SSC members.

## **11 TIMING AND VENUES OF 2007 SC MEETINGS**

H Dublin explained that it works best to have the two SC meetings each year before Council, and the next Council meeting is likely to be in mid-May 2007. R Mittermeier and T Brooks commented that the CI annual meeting is always in early May, this meeting will always be impossible for them. S Stuart commented that BASC meeting is in late April. After some discussion, it was agreed that the week just after Easter (10-13 April) might be the best dates, but C Poole is to resend the availability table so that everyone can investigate their dates.

It was decided that everything possible should be done to encourage the new Director General to attend at least one day of the next SC meeting. The SC members concluded that the meeting should not be held in Gland, as this might prove too distracting for staff and the Director General.

Regarding the venue, the SC members agreed that it would be a good idea to hold the meeting in Asia. Suggestions were: Lao PDR, Sri Lanka (both easy venues because IUCN Asia Office can offer logistical support), the Philippines (15-18 April is WCS of the Philippines meeting, thereafter a reptile assessments meeting, so it would be possible to combine some travel), and Malaysia (J Hutton will give details of who is interested in assisting to host the meeting).

Some discussion also took place about having a feature in *Species* about where the meetings occur – perhaps to highlight some of the conservation issues in the area. It was concluded that it is essential to go places where the meeting and our presence can have an impact.

H Dublin concluded that meetings will be planned as far in advance as possible, although it is always likely that some members of the SC will be unable to attend. She also commented that she will try to bring to the attention of IUCN the need to proactively think of solutions to the climate change issue, such as consideration of the need and frequency of meetings within IUCN.

## **12 ANY OTHER BUSINESS**

A discussion centred on the need to **reduce the detrimental impacts of travel** and reduce greenhouse gas emissions. Video Conferencing might be a viable alternative for the future, but the importance of face-to-face meetings was acknowledged. It was decided that the SC should make the need for their meetings clear, so as to minimise criticism that SSC is not concerned about emissions. To further this, all the SC members should also offset their emissions – and encourage their respective organisations to do the same. Those whose airfares are paid by their institutions agreed to work out how to offset their emissions. The IUCN formula will be applied to those whose travel is paid for by the COF. It was decided that a short statement should be placed on the SSC website saying that the SSC encourages all travel-related work (SC meetings, Sub-Committee meetings, SG activities, etc) to be carbon neutral. This can act as an example to other companies and Commissions. The statement should also be proactively promoted among the SG Chairs, so that they are aware of the initiative.

### **ACTION:**

- J Smart and JC Vié are to prepare the statement for the SSC website and devise a way to notify the SG Chairs of the carbon neutral initiative.
- JC Vié is to assist in applying the IUCN formula to all those who travel on the COF budget.

There was also discussion around a **meeting statement** – a single page policy statement or meeting summary that sets out the key outputs of the meeting. The point of this statement would be to provide a short, sharp justification for the meeting and a summary of the outputs of the meeting – mainly directed at those who do not wish to read the entire minutes. The conclusion was that this statement should be a part of the minutes, but that it should set out the following:

- The choice of meeting venue
- Travel to the meeting and how this was offset
- Projects that were supported or visited
- The main decisions from the meeting
- Major action points that will be taken forward

H Dublin reported back on the issue of the **liability of assessors** who work on commercially viable species. She explained that an extensive document has been put together and provided to the IUCN Legal Counsel at his request. The next step is for him to talk to the IUCN insurance company, but this is a complex issue because IUCN has little control over the liability risks incurred by volunteers. She further stated that when assessors are taking these risks at the request of IUCN, it is our responsibility to try and cover their exposure. The fact that the RLA Focal Points must sign a Letter of Agreement was seen by the Legal Counsel as providing some of the necessary control. Other Commissions might have some other liability issues among their volunteer members that could be addressed along with this one. The deadline for addressing this issue is not within the control of the Commission but is a matter that must be undertaken by the IUCN Secretariat.

The Programme and Policy Committee is constantly enquiring as to what the Commission is doing on **gender issues**. Leadership in conservation science and practice has traditionally been male, and it is not clear exactly what one can do about this issue. L Bennun suggested that this topic be added to the telephone consultations with the Chairs as perhaps they might have some proactive ideas. R Kock suggested that a base-line survey is important so that the start point is known.

H Dublin explained that there is also a Council agenda item on the development of an Action Plan on **Genetically-Modified Organisms (GMO)**. The SSC may be called on to comment or act on relevant actions, although there is unlikely to be any financial support. It was agreed that commenting on documents could be handled, but further work would require funding. The group agreed that the SSC convening power could be very important in this issue, and various SGs (such as ISSG) might be able to help.

J Robinson commented that the **creation of new species** might also become an issue and might bear some thinking. He gave the example of a cactus that is growing human hair. There was some discussion about what constitutes a species and where the limits of “natural” should be placed. It was agreed that it would depend on how these new “species” are affecting biodiversity, especially if they are potentially invasive. It was agreed that a dedicated agenda item could be created on this topic for a future SC meeting as there are various issues to be discussed – including the potential for genetically-modified amphibians that are resistant to disease, as well as the fast evolution in invertebrates, and the boundaries of SSC involvement.

H Dublin closed the meeting at 11am on Wednesday 25 October and thanked all those who had participated. She gave a special word of thanks to C Poole and the CI staff members who had made all the arrangements for the meeting.