

**SSC STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING WCC 3.5
CAPE TOWN, SOUTH AFRICA, 11 – 13 APRIL 2007
MINUTES**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

GLOSSARY OF ACCRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS USED	2
DECISIONS AND ACTION ITEMS TABLE	3
1. WELCOME, APOLOGIES, INTRODUCTIONS	6
1.1 Chair’s welcome	6
1.2 Apologies	6
2. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA	6
3. PREVIOUS MINUTES (WCC 3.4, MADAGASCAR 22-25 OCTOBER 2006)	6
4. MATTERS ARISING	7
4.1 SG/TF Chair appointments & RLA Focal Points appointments	7
4.2 Assessment of Interim Chair appointments	7
4.3 Action items from WCC 3.4	8
5. UPDATES	12
5.1 Chair’s update	12
5.2 Species Programme update	13
5.3 SSC Sub-Committees updates: feedback and discussion	15
5.3.1 Marine Conservation Sub-Committee (MCSC)	15
5.3.2 Invertebrate Conservation Sub-Committee (ICSC)	16
5.3.3 Plant Conservation Sub-Committee (PCSC)	16
5.3.4 Sustainable Use Sub-Committee (SUSC)	19
5.3.5 Biodiversity Assessments Sub-Committee (BASC)	19
5.3.6 Biodiversity Indicators Sub-Committee (BISC)	20
5.4 SSC Task Force updates: feedback and discussion	21
5.4.1 Species Conservation Planning Task Force (SCPTF)	21
5.4.2 Restructuring TF (RTF)	22
5.5 Other SSC SC member updates: feedback and discussion	23
5.5.1 Vet Specialist Group (VSG)	23
5.5.2 Invasive Species Specialist Group (ISSG)	24
5.5.3 Reintroduction Specialist Group (RSG)	25
5.5.4 Conservation Breeding Specialist Group (CBSG)	25
SSC AND THE 2009-2012 IUCN PROGRAMME: STRATEGIC PLANNING	26
6. SSC GOVERNANCE ISSUES	27
6.1 Specialist Group Chairs’ Meeting	27
6.2 SSC Specialist Groups and IUCN Policy	29
6.3 Specialist Group Chairs’ Consultation (update on survey)	29
6.4 Awards or Members Emeritus nominations	29
6.5 Means of Assessing Steering Committee members	30
7. SSC FINANCES, FUNDRAISING AND COMMUNICATIONS	30
7.1 Commission Operations Fund 2007	30
7.2 Species Programme Finances	30
7.3 Fund-raising	30
7.4 SSC Communications	32
8. IUCN / SSC DISCUSSION POINTS	33
8.1 Global Species Assessment 2	33
8.2 IUCN Data, Information and Knowledge Assets – inputs to upcoming IUCN meeting	33
8.3 Protected Areas Categories Summit	34
8.4 WCC4	35
9. SSC SUCCESS STORIES	36
10. TIMING AND VENUES OF OCTOBER SC MEETING AND 2008 MEETINGS	36

GLOSSARY OF ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS USED

AIS	Alien Invasive Species	IUCN	The World Conservation Union
AsRSG	Asian Rhino Specialist Group	KBA	Key Biodiversity Areas
AsESG	Asian Elephant Specialist Group	LPI	Living Planet Index
ASWCSG	Asian Wild Cattle SG	MCSC	Marine Conservation Sub-Committee
AZE	Alliance for Zero Extinction	MDG	Millennium Developmental Goals
BASC	Biodiversity Assessments Sub-Committee	MEA	Millennium Ecosystem Assessment
BGCI	Botanic Gardens Conservation International	MFF	Mangroves for the Future Initiative
BIP	Biodiversity Indicators Partnership	MOU	Memorandum of Understanding
BISC	Biodiversity Indicators Sub-Committee	PA	Protected areas
CBD	Convention on Biological Diversity	PCSC	Plant Conservation Sub-Committee
CBSG	Conservation Breeding Specialist Group	RL	Red List
CEC	Commission on Education and Communications	RLA	Red List Authority
CI	Conservation International	RLU	Red List Unit
CITES	Convention on the International Trade in Endangered Species	RLI	Red List Index
COF	Commission Operations Fund	RSG	Reintroduction Specialist Group
COP	Conference of Parties	SC	Steering Committee
CoReg	Commission online registration system	SCB	Society for Conservation Biology
CMS	Convention on Migratory Species	SCPTF	Species Conservation Planning TF
CSWG	Classifications Schemes Working Group of BASC	SG	Specialist Group
CSZ	Chicago Zoological Society	SIS	Species Information Service
DG	Director General	SP	Species Programme
DEM	Data Entry Module (of the SIS)	SRLI	Sampled Red List Index
GAA	Global Amphibian Assessment	SSC	Species Survival Commission
GAINS	Global Avian Influenza Network for Surveillance of Wild Birds	SUSC	Sustainable Use Sub-Committee
GEF	Global Environment Facility	TF	Task Force
GIRLA	Global Invertebrate Red List Authority	ToR	Terms of Reference
GISD	Global Invasive Species Database	UAE	United Arab Emirates
GISP	Global Invasive Species Programme	UN	United Nations
GMA	Global Mammal Assessment	UNEP	United Nations Environment Programme
GMO	Genetically Modified Organism	UNSD	United National Statistical Division
GMSA	Global Marine Species Assessment	UWG	Users Working Group of BASC
GSA	Global Species Assessment	VSG	Veterinary Specialist Group
ICSC	Invertebrate Conservation Sub-Committee	WAZA	World Association of Zoos and Aquariums
IMoSEB	International Mechanism on Scientific Expertise on Biodiversity	WCC	World Conservation Congress
IPCC	Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change	WCMC	World Conservation Monitoring Centre
ISSG	Invasives Species Specialist Group	WCPA	World Commission on Protected Areas
ISSC-MAP	International Standards for the Sustainable Wild Collection of Medicinal and Aromatic Plants	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 3.5:

- J Belant is appointed as Chair of the Small Carnivore SG for the remainder of the Quadrennium (Item 4.1).
- The five initial interim Chairs or Co-Chairs are to remain in their Chairmanship positions until the end of the Quadrennium (Item 4.2).
- SSC should endeavour to have a permanent presence at future SCB meetings (Item 4.3).
- RLU (through J Smart) should ensure that biodiversity assessments on priority plant groups (cycads, palms, legumes, conifers, bamboos, carnivorous plants) will be treated as priority for processing and fund-raising by the Species Programme (Item 5.3.3).
- The Chairs' Meeting, to be hosted by the Abu Dhabi government, will take place on 11–14 February 2008 in Al Ain city, Abu Dhabi. A declaration about the venue, sponsorship and carbon offsetting should be sent to the Chairs prior to the meeting. Definite agenda items are the SSC restructuring, the WCC and IUCN policy issues. Additional attention will be given to responding to Chairs' requests for assistance with fund-raising and communications functions, with enough free time for general discussion and sharing. (Item 6.1).
- H Dublin to go to PA Categories Summit with a listening brief and to foster SSC participation in the revision process, while trying to encourage some editorial changes with regard to the confusing and inexact terminology (Item 8.3)

Action Items Table:

Who	Action Item	Agenda Item	Timeline
C Poole	Draft Executive Summary of minutes as separate document	3. Previous Minutes	asap
H Dublin	Send out B Talukdar's CV to SC if he agrees to be nominated as Co-Chair the AsRSG	4.1 SG/TF Chair appointments	asap
H Dublin / C Poole	Send formal letter of invitation to the proposed Sirenia SG Chair	4.1 SG/TF Chair appointments	asap
J Smart	Ensure that the SSC Website is updated to indicate that the WI Bird Groups are shared groups	4.3 Action item from WCC3.4	asap
T Brooks	Remind BASC about the document regarding what the SRLI can and cannot do, as well as a name for the index	4.3 Action item from WCC3.4	asap
J Smart	Check whether resources secured for assessment work at a national and regional level are reported by the Species Programme	4.3 Action item from WCC3.4	asap
J Smart	Raise the queries of the SC about the Conservation Commons at the Conservation Commons SC meeting. If this does not produce results, H Dublin will try to bring up the item at the PPC again.	4.3 Further Action Item from WCC 3.4	Cons Commons SC meeting
H Dublin	Contact all the SG Chairs who signed up to AZE about the relationship between IUCN and AZE as a whole.	4.3 Further Action Item from WCC 3.4	asap
H Dublin	Continue discussions with C Hails and J Baillie regarding the linkages between SIS and the LPI	4.3 Further Action Item from WCC 3.4	asap
H Dublin	Ask M Chouchena-Rojas to write an article for <i>Species</i> regarding IMoSEB.	4.3 Further Action Item from WCC 3.4	asap
J Smart	Take the concerns and comments expressed by the SC about the Holcim agreement to the Business & Biodiversity Unit and secure assurances that they are being addressed.	5.2 SP Update	asap
J Smart	Provide SSC SC with diagram or table showing which SP staff positions are project funded, which are core funded and which are supported from both sources	5.2 SP Update	WCC3.6
M Maunder, all SC members	Send out full text of the ISSC-MAP to all SC members and all SC members are to read and consider the endorsement of the publication	5.3.3 PCSC	asap

J Smart	Make certain that the ISSC-MAP guidelines have been passed by the IUCN law and policy departments and cross-referenced to other IUCN and SSC guidelines for internal consistency.	5.3.3 PCSC	asap
J Smart, G Schatz & PCSC	Revise RL review document to incorporate comments received, modifying it to included the five assessment approaches discussed	5.3.3 PCSC	asap
J Smart	Provide the outcomes of the discussion on plant assessments and the five assessment approaches articulated at the SC meeting to BASC (meeting late April 2007) and ask for their guidance on next steps.	5.3.3 PCSC	Before BASC
BASC	Discuss these five approaches for plant assessments and to give PCSC clear guidance on how plant assessments by SSC and others (i.e. the main herbaria – Kew, Missouri, Smithsonian, Fairchild) are to be captured and how preliminary plant assessments (contributing to GSPC Target 2) will be portrayed on the RL website, including how visitors will be referred to herbaria links.	5.3.3 PCSC	At BASC meeting
PCSC	Following BASC review & recommendations, PCSC is to develop a plan to implement recommended actions and pass to the SSC SC for final sign off.	5.3.3 PCSC	asap
RLU (through J Smart)	Review backlog and determine those submissions that will be fast tracked and edited by RLU, those that will be returned to submitter for improvement; and those that are beyond our capacity to complete and need to be politely returned to the providers.	5.3.3 PCSC	asap
RLU (through J Smart)	Inform the SSC SC as to the time line and plan for processing the backlog.	5.3.3 PCSC	asap
RLU (through J Smart)	Prepare a statement to be sent to assessment providers regarding an honest indication of the time needed to process submitted RL assessments.	5.3.3 PCSC	asap
M Maunder/L Boitani	Talk to L Boitani about restructuring as it relates to plant portion of SSC network	5.3.3 PCSC	asap
S Stuart or T Brooks	Send proposal that was sent to the Darwin Initiative to N Ash at UNEP-WCMC to facilitate linkages with the MDG7, Target 9bis indicator submission and fund-raising efforts.	5.3.5 BASC	asap
S Stuart or T Brooks	Pass on the interim policy on withholding data on species that might be placed at risk by releases of information under the open access principle to M Maunder for PCSC consideration.	5.3.5 BASC	asap
M Maunder / PCSC	Feed any concerns they may have with regard to the interim policy on withholding data through the SC	5.3.5 BASC	asap
BASC	Assist in modifying the current RLA ToR to ensure that they address their role in implementing and monitoring this policy on sensitive data.	5.3.5 BASC	asap
BASC	Establish a process for linking the CSWG work on utilisation schemes with the relevant taxonomic SGs and SUSG.	5.3.5 BASC	asap
J Smart	Continue to deal with indemnity issue due to the urgency felt by some assessors (particularly those working on commercially valuable marine species)	5.3.5 BASC	asap
BASC	Inform SSC SC regarding progress and plans for the Guidelines for Collection.	5.3.5 BASC	asap
H Dublin	Make sure that B Pressey is asked to look at situations where specific species needs are not addressed adequately through area-based planning approaches	5.4.1 SCPTF	asap
H Dublin	Circulate her PowerPoint on restructuring (used at the Madagascar SC meeting) to the SC.	5.4.2 RTF	asap
R Kock	Arrange meeting with Pharmaceutical companies and discuss this issue with Indian colleagues during his upcoming trip to India and Nepal.	5.5.1 Vet SG	asap

R Kock	Initiate change in the name of the SG and finalise the new website and appropriate hyperlinks.	5.5.1 Vet SG	asap
BASC	Discuss the GISD to investigate the improvement of linkages with the RL database in order to better serve current and future needs.	5.5.2 ISSG	asap
H Dublin and R Lacy	Discuss the visual identity of the Amphibian Ark website, regarding if and how IUCN and SSC logos should be used when Specialist Groups are engaged in conservation partnerships.	5.5.4 CBSG	asap
M Maunder	Bring Amphibian story to the attention of the Gore climate change team.	5.5.4 CBSG	asap
H Dublin & R Mittermeier	Take the SSC concerns about the draft IUCN 2009-2012 Programme to the May Council meeting.	Strategic Planning	Council 12 May
C Imboden	Redo Strategic Planning Table in electronic form and send it out to all SC members and relevant senior SP staff	Strategic Planning	asap
J Smart & C Imboden	Take the lead and be in touch with the chairs of the Sub-Committees to ensure they discuss targets at their next meetings and feed the results back into the strategic planning process. Emphasis is on the priorities and what is really possible – and commitment for targets/outcomes that can be measured. The Sub-Committees should also provide a rationale for their targets/outcomes.	Strategic Planning	asap
C Imboden & C Poole	Focus on the targets/outcome that are not catered for under the Sub-Committees (e.g. disciplinary groups).	Strategic Planning	asap
C Imboden	Present a draft Strategic Plan at the October SC meeting	Strategic Planning	Oct SC meeting
C Imboden	Have a further draft Strategic Plan ready for presentation at the Chairs' Meeting	Strategic Planning	Chairs' Meeting
J Smart	Present (to next SC meeting) a listing of current project funds, their sources and their timelines, as well as a depiction of how the current budget relates to the objectives and outcomes of the SSC Strategic Plan.	7.2 SP Finances	Next SC meeting
J Smart/ H Dublin	Look for ways to set up a system whereby online donors can choose whether they would like to support to RL or the other work of the SGs. This second fund could feed straight into the Sir Peter Scott Fund or through another mechanism to be established.	7.3 Fundraising	asap
J Smart	Send the branding document she is working on with the communications department to a list of recipients (to be suggested by H Dublin) for their comments	7.4 SSC Communications	asap
B Lacy	Put the branding issue on agenda of next CBSG meeting and record the interest from zoos and aquaria on this project	7.4 SSC Communications	asap
J Smart	Be in touch with L Bennun as soon as possible with regards to the branding for BirdLife's book.	7.4 SSC Communications	asap
J Smart	Investigate what other programmatic work has contractual obligations with 2008 deadlines for outputs or deliverables.	8.1 GSA2	asap
J Smart	Obtain, through clarification from Senior SP staff, a decision from IUCN senior management on whether a GSA2-type publication is needed for the WCC4 and if so, what it should look like. A draft outline will then be sent to the SSC SC.	8.1 GSA2	asap
H Dublin	Send out the WCC information to the SC and SG Chairs as soon as it has been released.	8.4 WCC4	asap
All SC Members	Submit their WCC proposals to the Chair's Office by 9 May. The proposals should pay attention to the stream, kind of event and partners to work with.	8.4 WCC4	9 May

1. WELCOME, APOLOGIES, INTRODUCTIONS

1.1 Chair's welcome

At 09:00 on Wednesday 11 April 2007, the SSC Chair welcomed all the SC members to the fifth SSC Steering Committee meeting of the quadrennium. She said she was delighted to host a meeting at her home office in the Kirstenbosch Botanical Gardens. H Dublin reminded all the SC members that a small gathering had been arranged for that evening and encouraged the group to chat to the local conservation practitioners who would be attending. She noted that the agenda is full and time is short due to some SC members having to leave Friday afternoon to catch their flights.

H Dublin also welcomed M Maunder back to the Steering Committee.

1.2 Apologies

The following people attended the meeting:

SSC Steering Committee: H Dublin, F Launay, R Kock, G Mace, J Hutton, M Samways, L Bennun, T Brooks, R Mittermeier, R Lacy, C Imboden, M Maunder and C Campagna

Species Programme: J Smart

SSC Chair's Office: C Poole, S Vosse

Apologies were received from: M Clout, L Boitani, J Robinson and Y Sadovy

2. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

H Dublin added an additional point under Governance: 6.5 Means of Assessing SSC Steering Committee Members. She then noted that the agenda needed to be flexible as some discussions may run longer than others.

3. PREVIOUS MINUTES (WCC 3.4, MADAGASCAR 22-25 OCTOBER 2006)

H Dublin noted that the minutes of WCC3.4 had been adopted by the SC and the final version had been uploaded to the SSC website. She then asked the opinion of the SC members with regard to the Meeting Summary that had been written as per the request at the Madagascar meeting. She noted that the Governance TF of IUCN is satisfied with the minutes of the SSC, and queried whether a summary is indeed needed.

R Kock commented that he felt an Executive Summary would be better than a one-pager (as done for the Madagascar meeting) and it should summarise the main themes, decisions and actions to come out of the meeting. R Mittermeier agreed, recommending a bullet point-type summary of the meeting.

It was concluded that the Executive Summary should be a separate document to the minutes and should inform the front-piece in *Species* (which should be a more informal, general summary of the meetings, amongst other things). It was also decided that once the SSC membership is fully registered on CoReg, it might be possible to send out the Executive Summary of the SC meetings to all the membership in an effort to educate the membership as to the role of the SC.

ACTION: C Poole to draft Executive Summary of minutes as separate document.
--

4. MATTERS ARISING

4.1 SG/TF Chair appointments & RLA Focal Points appointments

H Dublin mentioned that V Kalkman has taken over as Chair of the Odonata SG since the last SC meeting. She also noted that G Lichtenstein is already taking impressive steps in her Chairmanship of the South American Camelid SG. H Dublin expressed her distress with regards to the situation of the Small Carnivore SG, which lost its new Chair and longstanding newsletter editor within a short time. She explained that she has asked Dr J Belant (who had taken over the newsletter) whether he will stand as Chair for the rest of the Quadrennium. Dr Belant agreed to be nominated and provided his curriculum vitae for the SC's perusal.

DECISION: J Belant is appointed as Chair of the Small Carnivore SG for the remainder of the Quadrennium

C Poole explained that C Pollock has been contacting all those Chairs who still need to appoint an RLA Focal Point as well as those stand-alone RLA Focal Points who have yet to sign their Letter of Agreement. The response has been good and the agreements are continuing to arrive at the Chair's Office.

H Dublin reminded the SC that the AsRSG had lost their Co-Chair in the tragic helicopter accident in Nepal last year. The meeting in Kaziranga had been delayed as a consequence, but took place in early March 2007. According to Co-Chair N van Strien, the meeting was a success and group members are feeling energised. The members have suggested a replacement for Dr T Maskey in Dr B Talukdar. H Dublin explained that when asking him whether he is willing to become Co-Chair, she was clear of the need to involve the Nepalese as well as Indian colleagues in all activities. R Kock commented that he is going to India in the near future and would like to contact B Talukdar.

ACTION: H Dublin to send out B Talukdar's CV to SC if he agrees to be nominated as Co-Chair the AsRSG.

H Dublin commented that the WI Duck SG Chair is still vacant. She noted that there are continuing attempts to correspond with Wetlands International, who are progressing with their own restructuring. She noted that the SSC Restructuring TF will be liaising with WI; and that there was much feedback from joint SSC-WI Chairs about the SSC Chairs' Meeting.

H Dublin commented that the Sirenia SG Chairmanship has not been resolved. An ex-Chair who declined reappointment has enquired as to whether he can continue as Chair. H Dublin suggested that he be appointed for the remainder of the Quadrennium and the SC members agreed. R Mittermeier commented that the group functions well and it should be noted who the most responsive, hard-working members are so as to identify future Chair candidates.

ACTION: H Dublin or C Poole to send formal letter of invitation to proposed Sirenia SG Chair

4.2 Assessment of Interim Chair appointments

H Dublin explained that a number of interim Chairs and Co-Chairs were appointed at the start of the Quadrennium and allocated the positions for 12 to 18 months. These Chairs are N van Strein (AsRSG), J Conroy (Otter SG), A Desai and S Hedges (AsESG) and J Burton (ASWCSG). H Dublin noted that she enjoyed interacting with them during a recent review period, and is pleased to announce they are progressing well in their roles. She commented that J Conroy had in particular raised some interesting points and that all the Chairs are improving communications tools and intra-group efforts. On H Dublin's recommendation, the SC agreed that all five of the Chairs remain as Chairs for the rest of the Quadrennium.

DECISION: The five initial interim Chairs and Co-Chairs are to remain in their Chairmanship positions until the end of the Quadrennium

4.3 Action items from WCC 3.4

The following is the Action Items Table from WCC3.4 with the status column indicating the comments given at WCC3.5 on progress. Where a lengthy discussion took place, it is recorded below the table, as are follow-up action items.

Who	Action Item	Status
J Smart	Investigate whether Prof Abuzinada still wants to be the Chair of the Arabian Plan SG.	Completed. He now understands the Chair appointment process
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.	Completed. New Chair to be appointed
JC Vié	Contact the South American Camelid experts to start the process of identifying a new Chair.	Completed.
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.	Completed. L Boitani will consult with some bird groups, WPA & WI. Requests to start new bird groups are being monitored.
J Smart	Ensure that the SSC Website is updated to indicate that the WI Bird Groups are shared groups.	J Smart unsure whether this has been accomplished
All Sub-Com Chairs	Ask their Chairs to inform the members to register online on the CoReg system.	Done, but might be needed again
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.	On agenda for next BASC meeting. G Mace commented that the SRLI will plot things the same way as the RLI, but the naming is difficult.
H Dublin and J Smart	Report on the various BirdLife MOUs at the next SC meeting.	MOUs will be superseded by the RL Partnership Agreement.
H Dublin	Continue discussions with the relevant people in headquarters about the Conservation Commons.	Ongoing. Discussion recorded below.
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 Version 3. 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.	Small committee has not yet been established. J Smart noted that the governance of SIS is within the BASC UWG and CSWG. The action item relates to Version 3, so the group should be set up at a later stage. Oracle wants assurance that Senior Mgmt is involved. DG has many data issues to consider at this time.
All SC	Become more involved in IUCN Leveraging Initiatives	Discussed under 7.3
All SC	Send in ideas for what communication issues should be discussed at WCC3.5	Ongoing to WCC3.6.
ICSC	A person on the Bycatch TF within MCSC should become a representative on ICSC.	A Rogers is the MIRLA FP and will be the representative on MCSC to oversee issues on bycatch
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.	M Samways noted the difficulty of fundraising for invertebrate SGs. Odonata SG is strengthening due to Global Dragonfly Assessment.
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	Completed. M Samways explained the information is available if people are interested
M Samways	Appoint the TIRLA and MIRLA Focal Points and arrange for them to sign RLA Letter of Agreement.	Completed
BASC	Take their recommendations for the Global Plant Assessments to the PCSC for endorsement and onward transmission to the SSC SC.	H Dublin commented that this process needs clarification. Discussed under 5.3.3
All SC	Nominate expert trusted colleagues to assist in the review process of GSA2.	Discussed under 8.1

H Dublin	Establish process for overall review & incorporation of substantive comments to final GSA2.	Completed
All SC	Look into potential publishers for GSA2	Completed – document in pack
S Stuart	Draw up a budget for the publication of the GSA2, with which to approach them for tender bids	Completed. Discussed under 8.1
G Mace	Establish membership of BISC.	Discussed under 5.3.6
H Dublin	Make contact with WWF to discuss the prospects for institutional linkages, which could include a potential contribution of resources.	Completed. Full discussion captured below
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.	Completed. Discussed under 5.3.6. Suggestions given
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.	Completed. Discussion captured below
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.	Discussed during Strategic planning session
All SC	Send their comments on the Restructuring proposal to L Boitani within the next few weeks.	Discussed under 5.4.2
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.	Ongoing
F Launay	Investigate the possibility for a book of case studies of reintroduction successes and failures.	Discussed under 5.5.3
All SC	Assist the Amphibian SG with potential candidates for the Coordinator's position.	Still pending. Negotiations with a candidate have not come to fruition. The person needs good fundraising skills.
J Smart, JC Vié, H Dublin & C Poole	Discuss how to roll out the Chairs' Consultation and how to collate the responses.	Consultations ongoing. Reported under 6.3
Y Sadovy, M Samways, R Kock	Continue their work on the value of species document and seek contributions from others.	It was agreed between M Samways and R Kock to pick up on the document again and circulate it further for inputs, and then decide on the fate of the document/use.
H Dublin	Talk to the CEC about some of these communications challenges and seek their advice.	Completed, possibility of session at WCC3.6.
C Poole, D Zivkovic	Work on a draft budget for the Chairs' Meeting	Completed
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 Chairs' Meeting.	Completed
All SC	Indicate how they or their institution can contribute to the Chairs' Meeting, and speak to any Chairs they are in contact with about the meeting.	Completed
JC Vié	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Investigate accrual system for the Commissions and procedure for Sub-Committees wishing to carry some of their 2006 allocation over to 2007. - Get clarity from IUCN Finance on how to handle disbursement & reporting on COF allocations - Investigate the reporting requirements for the Sub-Committees for the end of 2006. 	Completed
J Smart and J Hutton	Work together so as to have WCMC and IUCN coordinate approaches where the same potential corporate donors are involved.	Ongoing. JH noted that WCMC has decided not to work on an Oracle platform. J Smart stated that IUCN deliberations about the Oracle donation are still ongoing.

H Dublin and S Stuart	Discuss the GEF situation and continue to be proactive on this issue of the service agreement.	Ongoing. H Dublin and the IUCN DG will be approaching new GEF CEO on data issues once GEF has settled on their biodiversity strategy
J Smart and JC Vié	Work out a method of reporting on resources secured for assessment work in the regions.	J Smart commented that most resources are being reported in some way already, but that recording of the national level could be checked.
JC Vié	Look at possibilities for IUCN having a booth at the next SCB meeting.	Completed. SSC will have a booth.
R Mittermeier	Investigate the possibility of funding for the booth and/or sponsored workshop.	Abandoned. SC in agreement that SSC should have a permanent presence at future SCB meetings and be strategic about messages delivered (incl. in special conference journal). Training workshops on RL tools or symposia to help engage developing world scientists may be appropriate.
H Dublin	Liaise with G Mace, JC Vié and S Stuart regarding the MacArthur Climate Change grant.	Ongoing. Interviews were held. Very tight delivery time-line; first workshop in June. IUCN is responding well to climate change issues, and Commissions will be report at May Council. R Mittermeier noted the new avoiding deforestation initiative is progressing. C Campagna commented that the media is covering climate change, but more is needed about species
H Dublin	Draft a letter to AZE with the help of S Stuart and JC Vié.	Completed. AZE responded recently and accept that IUCN is slightly different to other members due to the provision of data. Discussions continue. H Dublin is in discussion with S Stuart & JC Vié, and she will talk to the SGs who signed up to AZE.
H Dublin	Send an informal note to D Schindel saying that the SSC would like to be kept in the loop regarding the DNA barcoding issue, in particular, to help guide the initiative on its practical applications to conservation.	Completed. Invitations to other meetings have come through. G Mace suggested that local SG Chairs be asked to attend these meetings.
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.	Completed through e-bulletin
JC Vié	Assist in applying the IUCN formula to all those who travel on the COF budget.	Ongoing. Linking IUCN flight emissions calculator to COF is proving more difficult than we thought.

Discussion on WCC3.4 Action Items

Conservation Commons: A briefing document drafted by T Hammond for the DG was handed out to the SC members. J Smart commented that it is still not clear whether the Conservation Commons is to become an institution in its own right. She noted that IUCN Senior Management has not yet addressed in any detail the issue of the institutional nature of some of the Conservation Commons activities.

J Hutton, as a SC member of the Conservation Commons, commented that the general consensus at the last SC meeting was that the Conservation Commons is custodian of a set of three Principles. Organisations that sign up to the Principles should be assisted to implement these Principles – the main function of the Conservation Commons staff, and the main need for fundraising. A draft Charter has been drawn up. Another function of the Conservation Commons could be fundraising and running projects, but this is where the conflicts will arise. He concluded that organisations signing up to the Principles are then allowed to use the logo. He suggested there should be a WIKI whereby peer pressure is used to make sure the logo is used in the appropriate manner (as no licensing of the logo is in place). He concluded that there appears to be some confusion or the document is slightly old, as the work areas depicted in T Hammond's document are not the work areas that were agreed upon in the Conservation Commons SC meeting.

After some discussion, all SC members agreed that it is ambiguous to have the Conservation Commons taking on projects as this could lead quickly into issue of institutional identity.

Relationship with WWF/ZSL and the LPI: H Dublin explained that she spoke to WWF and ZSL about possible linkages between the LPI and SIS. Although it is clear that WWF will not provide core funding to the SP, they are willing to investigate joint projects for this endeavour and incorporate these into their fundraising plans. A meeting with C Hails, G Mace, J Baillie and J Loh took place to discuss mechanisms of working together. The conclusions were that IUCN SSC SGs should be given the chance to put their population data into the SIS and then could tick a box as to whether this data could go to the LPI as well, and another to allow them to ask to see datasets of interest already in the LPI. This would be a totally voluntary decision by the person entering data. C Hails is willing to help fundraise for a person to do the technical linkages between the two databases.

There was a lengthy discussion about the LPI and the possible linkage with SIS, with the following main conclusions:

- The LPI and SIS are quite complimentary, but the LPI is not comprehensive and linkages with the SIS would help share data about invertebrates and plants
- The system needs to allow for different definitions of populations within taxonomic groups
- The SSC SGs have expressed an interest in providing population level data and this linkage with the LPI would be a means of allowing this (at present SSC does not have the capacity to provide for this need)
- SSC will set the definitions and standards for the sharing of data between the two systems and the relationship between SSC and WWF should be a contractual one
- SSC must ensure that their data providers understand that the LPI is not an SSC tool and that they have a choice whether their data goes to the LPI or not
- As a medium-term goal, SSC should investigate doing more analyses with population level data and to ensure that the SSC data providers do receive credit for their data.

Consultative process towards an IMoSEB: H Dublin explained that IMoSEB has been discussed at IUCN Council and the PPC, but that there is still confusion as some parts of IUCN are favourable to the establishment of such a mechanism, while others are advocating a watching brief at present. G Mace explained that there are four proposed options of what the new mechanism will look like and stakeholders are being asked to comment on the four options through a consultative process. The options are:

- Status quo by helping to strengthen existing intergovernmental bodies such as UNEP or CBD SBSTTA
- Existing structures such as IUCN or DIVERSITAS taking on a larger role
- A whole new body similar to IPCC
- Asking IPCC to take biodiversity into their remit.

G Mace concluded that it is important to engage at this stage. There was some discussion about the sensibilities of creating a new structure while there are existing instruments that could undertake a better role. It was agreed that the existing instruments are satisfactory, but more collaboration is needed between them to consider which projects should be

financed with the limited resources available. It was felt that linkages between the SSC and DIVERSITAS should be improved, especially now with G Mace and H Mooney in leadership positions. SSC members should also be informed as to these deliberations and M Chouchena-Rojas could be asked to write an article for *Species* to begin to fulfil this need.

DECISION MADE REGARDING ACTION ITEMS FROM WCC3.4: SSC should endeavour to have a permanent presence at future SCB meetings

REMAINING ACTION ITEMS FROM WCC3.4:

- J Smart is to ensure that the SSC Website is updated to indicate that the WI Bird Groups are shared groups.
- T Brooks to remind BASC about the document regarding what the SRLI can and cannot do, as well as a name for the index.
- J Smart is to check whether resources secured for assessment work at a national level are reported by the Species Programme.

FOLLOW-UP ACTION ITEMS FROM WCC3.4:

- J Smart is to raise the queries of the SC about the Conservation Commons at the Conservation Commons SC meeting. If this does not produce results, H Dublin will try to bring up the item at the PPC again.
- H Dublin to contact all the SG Chairs who signed up to AZE about the relationship between IUCN and AZE as a whole.
- H Dublin to continue discussions with C Hails and J Baillie regarding the linkages between SIS and the LPI.
- H Dublin to ask M Chouchena-Rojas to write an article for *Species* regarding IMoSEB.

5. UPDATES

5.1 Chair's update

The following is a brief summary of H Dublin's presentation:

Administration

- S Vosse has been appointed at the George B Rabb Intern and is based in the Chair's Office in Cape Town. She will be staying until after the Chairs' Meeting in February 2008.
- H Dublin has approached C Thouless to start working as the Senior Commission Officer on a part time basis.

Governance

- Various Sub-Committee and Task Forces meetings are taking place as planned.
- The IUCN meeting week in January was a most productive meeting and the new IUCN DG really appreciated the engagement from the SSC.
- Some important SG governance matters have occurred recently, including deliberations over some new Chairs and some groups who are having internal problems.

Programmatic and Partnership meetings

- Various meetings on indicators have taken place, including a CBD alien invasives species indicator workshop in Ascot, UK. H Dublin attended a further meeting in Cambridge with UNEP-WCMC and a sub-group of the UN Statistics Division (UNSD) where possible measures for the new biodiversity target (MDG7, target 9bis) and indicators for measuring its progress were discussed. The IUCN RLI was the preferred measure and detailed documents were submitted to a UNSD meeting in New York (thanks to help from S Butchart of BirdLife International and N Ash of UNEP-WCMC). The indicator was presented in New York by N Ash as it was determined that UNEP, not IUCN, will be recognised by the UN MDG process as the "responsible agency". All indicators must be proportions, so it was agreed that the proposed indicator would be

SSC SC Meeting WCC 3.5 – MINUTES

named “The proportion of species threatened with extinction”. It seems unlikely that the IUCN or IUCN RL brands will be in the publication material, but the IUCN DG and the UNEP Executive Director have agreed to develop an MOU to formalise the relationship, including considerations for how IUCN and SSC can receive some credit. The next step in the adoption process is a UN technical meeting, followed by the UN General Assembly. If adopted, the indicator will not be fully rolled out until 2008. Positive implications are that the indicator will need to be delivered at national and regional levels and this may be a chance to expand building of capacity at the national level for use of the IUCN RL categories and criteria.

- IUCN, CI, UNEP-WCMC and BirdLife have met regarding a development to bring species and protected area information to the private sector to assist with their planning needs. Terms of reference for a facilitator are being prepared and IUCN’s role in this matter will be further discussed at meetings later in April.

Meeting preparations

Preparations for various upcoming meetings are ongoing, and include preparations for the PA Categories Summit, the CITES COP, the SCB meeting, the SUSC meeting, the Chairs’ Meeting and the World Conservation Congress. The upcoming Council meeting will again broach the subject of adopting the Precautionary Principle Guidelines and the Governance TF will be looking at conflict of interest issues and codes of conduct.

Work with IUCN Regional Offices and the Policy Unit

Many species-specific, thematic and policy issues involve work with the IUCN Regional Offices. SG Chairs unfortunately often are confused by the complicated IUCN policies, so much time is taken up with assisting SG Chairs to work within IUCN policy while still moving their activities forward.

5.2 Species Programme update

The following is a brief summary of J Smart’s presentation:

Assessment Work

- There are some personnel and funding issues with the Global Mammal Assessment, but it is moving ahead.
- The European Mammal Assessment is going well.
- The Global Reptile Assessment is progressing well with some countries completed and others involved in primary data collection.
- The Global Amphibian Assessment book will be launched this year.
- The GEF-funded Plants Project: plant assessments are being assisted by BGCI taking on staff to assist in implementation of PDFB phase by carrying out conservation assessments and identifying Important Plant Areas in six countries. The Swedish SIDA is also helping to leverage additional funds as an alternative project to the GEF full sized project (which GEF backed out of).
- The assessment of all cycads is almost complete, while the assessment of palms in Madagascar and the Indian Ocean Islands is continuing thanks to support from CI.
- The Global Marine Species Assessment is starting with endemic corals and seaweeds of the Galapagos. The WCPA Marine Summit in Washington DC will also inform the work of the GMSA.
- Invertebrates are being covered by the fresh water, marine assessments and the SRLI.
- The fresh water biodiversity assessments are being done on a regional basis, with good linkage to the Freshwater Fish SG.
- The RL Unit is working on the 2007 Red List. Features on the website are being improved according to the IUCN Visual Identity

RL Partnership

The new RL Partnership Agreement is in draft and currently with the IUCN Legal Advisor. The next step is to distribute the agreement to the partners, after which bilateral MOUs can be annexed (these will be annual and flexible). Other institutions want to join the partnership.

Trade and Use

- The “use” component of the Data Entry Module (DEM) is being developed and further development of the “use” component of species assessments will be improved through the CSWG of BASC.
- A study on the impact of stricter import regulations is being done in collaboration with TRAFFIC Europe and the IUCN Regional Office of Europe.
- The Sustainable Use Project is identifying factors that contribute to sustainable use of species - funds raised through University of Cambridge.
- Funds were raised to work on the Analyses of the Proposals to Amend the CITES Appendices and went online at the end of March. The team worked very closely with the relevant SGs and TRAFFIC.

SIS

Version 2 of SIS is still under development with the function and technical scoping requirements completed. The corporate sector is being approached to support the SIS.

Network Support

- The position of Network Support Officer has just been offered to a candidate.
- J Griffin, the GEF Plants Project Officer, is also providing support to the plants SGs. Funds are being sought for a second network support position.
- SP staff are also undertaking telephone calls for the Chairs’ Consultation.

CoReg

The registration of commission members is proceeding slowly and so far ~4,000 SSC members have been registered. There have been problems with obtaining membership lists from some SG Chairs. As the SP staff person responsible for CoReg is moving to another department in IUCN, a temporary person will be hired to complete the registration of SSC members. There is a drive to ensure that the next version of CoReg will be correct.

Communications

A “Marketing and Communications Officer” is being recruited. A McMullin will communicate more with SG Chairs, while this new position will focus on marketing and fundraising. Part of the Chairs’ Consultation is to review the communications products of the SP/SSC.

Holcim Partnership

An agreement has recently been signed with Holcim Cement as part of the Business and Biodiversity Unit’s initiatives. A person is to be seconded from Holcim to work in the SP, where they will conduct an audit of biodiversity in Holcim sites and help establish the business relevance of SSC data. They will also look at quarry rehabilitation guidelines and establish a baseline of current practice. Relationship managers will be appointed in the two organisations. Holcim is keen to clean up their practices and engage with IUCN.

There was some discussion around this agreement, with caution noted that the biodiversity benefit or outcome of the relationship needs to be articulated more clearly because of the danger of green-washing or them securing expert advice and assistance below market rates. It was noted that Holcim should be looking at global policy in terms of Corporate Social Responsibility and should want to become leaders in the field. It was also agreed that the clear conservation outcome of the relationship must be made public as soon as possible so as to prevent reports of green-washing and to make it clear that Holcim is not simply benefiting from something that could be done by paid consultants at a greater cost to Holcim.

ACTION: J Smart to take the concerns and comments expressed by the SC about the Holcim agreement to the Business & Biodiversity Unit and secure assurances that they are being addressed.

SP Staff Structure

J Smart explained the new SP organigramme, which builds on the recommendations by Price Waterhouse Coopers from the SP review. There was some discussion on the value of the SC understanding exactly which positions are core funded and which positions are supported by projects in order to assist with strategic fund-raising and support. It was
SSC SC Meeting WCC 3.5 – MINUTES

concluded that the SC should understand these issues because they may be challenged to defend the large staff of the SP. J Smart explained that it is not an easy distinction because in reality the staff are funded through a mixture of projects and core money – the SP is a single cost centre. In addition, it is quite a sensitive issue in terms of teamwork. JH commented on the good interactions between SP staff and UNEP-WCMC staff in the Cambridge offices, but also said there is room for improvement and more collaboration on certain projects. R Mittermeier suggested that SP finances be portrayed to the DG as CHF1m core funding, matched by another over CHF3m from project sources as this might help to paint the SP in a positive manner rather than seen as an outsized staff team

C Imboden suggested that J Smart presents the integration between the SP and the other IUCN thematic programmes in a future presentation for the SC. J Smart commented that at the moment the main interactions are with the Marine Programme, the Business and Biodiversity Unit and the Protected Areas Programme, while IUCN regions are the next challenge. C Campagna commented on the effectiveness of the launch of the RL each year and wondered whether more initiatives could be instigated that would really advertise IUCN (e.g. using Google Earth). J Smart agreed, saying that last year some of the Councillors and Regional Offices had not felt involved enough.

ACTION: J Smart to provide SSC SC with diagram or table showing which SP staff positions are project funded, which are core funded and which are supported from both sources.

5.3 SSC Sub-Committees updates: feedback and discussion

5.3.1 Marine Conservation Sub-Committee (MCSC)

C Campagna presented apologies from Y Sadovy who was unable to attend this SC meeting. He explained that the MCSC was formed to increase the profile of marine issues within SSC and IUCN. He noted that two workshops were held for strategic planning and resulted in a list of 10-12 priorities out of the original 20-30 proposed. These have been categorised as easy, medium or difficult to accomplish, and tools with which to achieve these tasks are being investigated and gathered.

Not much has been achieved since the Austria meeting in mid-2006, but the MCSC membership has been established (although representatives with sustainable use and invasives expertise are needed). Y Sadovy has also suggested that regional representatives, as well as representatives from CITES and Pew should join the MCSC. A meeting is being organised for July 2007 and some products will be delivered quite soon.

In the mean time, the MCSC is ensuring that there is a representative at every BASC meeting, and that a website is put together (in line with IUCN's new website plans rolling out this year). What is most encouraging is that everyone is working together in a creative way.

One need is to streamline the interaction with the GMSA. Some of the priorities set at the original workshop are being followed while others are being undertaken opportunistically, as funding materialises. The MCSC could help in pinpointing where the funding should be sought. The next major priority is to plan for WCC and already some communications initiatives are being started, including an idea for a public event (such as a concert) in Barcelona.

At a recent Pew meeting, S Fowler, Y Sadovy, A Vincent and C Campagna addressed the Pew Fellows on how to make better use of the SSC RL and Red Listing activities and to better achieve marine outcomes in the context of CITES. There may be potential to put a proposal to Pew for future collaborations. H Dublin commented that A Vincent had been instrumental in opening this door to the Pew Fellows, and commended C Campagna on the good work. She said it is important to link to the Pew Fellows so that the MCSC can help to inform policy with science.

R Kock queried whether climate change is on the MCSC's agenda, and C Campagna confirmed that it was but they were unsure of how to proceed – although more collaboration on the oceans in conjunction with the Marine Programme is an option.

H Dublin concluded that she was pleased with the momentum that has built up in the MCSC, despite the fact that C Campagna and Y Sadovy are often in the field. C Campagna concluded by thanking C Imboden for his help on facilitating the strategic planning meetings.

5.3.2 Invertebrate Conservation Sub-Committee (ICSC)

M Samways reiterated that the ICSC is actually planning for the new quadrennium in terms of their structure. He showed a diagram of the ICSC and the various invertebrate Red Listing bodies (a more detailed version of the diagram is available on request). The TIRLA focal point is S Spector and there are various taxonomic and geographical experts under him. The Odonata SG is one of the more productive SGs and will probably end up being a strong SG into the new quadrennium. The MIRLA focal point is A Rogers, again with experts in various taxa under him. The ICSC will be consulting with the MCSC on all marine issues.

The ICSC is gearing up for the WCC and will have something in place. M Samways reiterated that the invertebrate people are enthusiastic and their volunteer status is something that should be appreciated. He reminded everyone that volunteers are sometimes much better than people who are appointed into positions.

5.3.3 Plant Conservation Sub-Committee (PCSC)

M Maunder discussed three topics from the PCSC:

The International Standard for the Sustainable Wild Collection of Medicinal and Aromatic Plants (ISSC-MAP): M Maunder explained that the Medicinal Plant SG is a very active group. They have produced these guidelines, had them reviewed by the PCSC and they are currently under review by the Law and Policy teams at IUCN. They would now like them endorsed by the SSC SC so that the SSC logo can be used. M Maunder explained that the full document will be sent out to the SC within the next few weeks and asked the SC to look over it. G Mace noted that it is essential to ensure that all the IUCN guidelines have been cross-referenced to make sure they are consistent with one another.

ACTIONS:

- M Maunder to send out full text of the ISSC-MAP to all SC members and all SC members are to read and consider the endorsement of the publication.
- J Smart to make certain the guidelines are passed by the IUCN law and policy departments and have been cross-referenced to other IUCN and SSC guidelines for internal consistency.

Plant Assessments: M Maunder explained that this is a complex issue due to the huge number of plants to be assessed and the 2010 Global Strategy for Plant Conservation's Target 2 for preliminary assessments. He explained that J Smart and G Schatz took the lead on reviewing progress in relation to work done on plant assessments. PCSC established priority groups (a combination of key economic groups and charismatic species) for Red Listing, but there has also been spontaneous and ad hoc Red Listing of other species. There is a need to balance the two and make sure that the RLU has enough time to process assessments. There is also an issue of preliminary assessments (i.e. making a determination as to whether a species is "likely threatened", "likely non-threatened", or 'data deficient'). BASC has an algorithm to calculate this, but some of the big herbaria have methods that are not compatible and possibly not comparable either (i.e. some started before the IUCN RL standards were finalised and others have just devised their own methods). The question is whether an informal system can be used that allows these data into the preliminary assessments or a more rigorous assessment of quality is controlled through IUCN. Most of the PCSC favours using the IUCN RL website as a central portal that directs

people to the various institutions, which will then make clear the differences in approach that have been used for assessing specific species or taxa.

G Mace congratulated staff and the PCSC on capturing the problems with plant Red Listing. She confirmed her understanding of the commitment to the Global Strategy for Plant Conservation for preliminary assessments and noted that there are five ways forward: a) through full IUCN RL assessments; b) through the sampled RL approach; c) through national Red Listing; d) through RapidList; or e) using the various herbaria approaches. She commented that she is happy with the national and RapidList options as they can grow easily into a full IUCN assessment using RL criteria, but that she is worried about the herbaria approaches as they only use a small subset of the IUCN RL criteria – and there difficult to grow this into formal IUCN RL assessments. M Maunder agreed, but commented that it is politically sensitive because so many species have already been processed through the big herbaria. He noted that the herbaria are comfortable with the idea that IUCN continues to drive towards the full IUCN RL assessment process, but do want some recognition for what they have achieved due their large time and money investment into assessments.

J Smart noted that the comments received on the paper will be incorporated as soon as possible. She noted that those consulted – including membership of PCSC, SG plant chairs, and partner organisations – do want an IUCN standard for preliminary assessments, particularly as SGs are already inventing ways to do their own preliminary assessments. G Mace agreed, but said that a plan for moving towards the full ‘gold standard’ IUCN RL for all plants species is essential. There is a need to help the herbaria to be recognised for the plant assessments they are doing but to establish a clear separation between their approach and those of IUCN. T Brooks commented that he does not think it is a problem to use the herbaria data; it is only problematic if we use only that data. M Maunder reiterated that the herbaria are aware of these considerations from IUCN.

H Dublin recommended that a subset of the paper presented here is submitted to BASC and BASC give clear recommendations on how plant assessments are portrayed – both on the website and to the herbaria. This will allow us to acknowledge the contribution of the herbaria, while articulating the different approaches and, in particular, clarifying those formally associated with IUCN’s Red List process.

The concluding comments were that, ironically, RapidList is not particularly fast and perhaps people will be encouraged to undertake the full assessment once they start with RapidList. Advice was given to M Samways that the invertebrate community should not get into the same situation, but should pursue the full assessment method from the onset.

T Brooks noted that funding assessment work will increasingly become a problem in years to come. M Maunder agreed, but said that we must encourage Red Listing at a national level to push assessments through to conclusion.

ACTIONS:

- J Smart, G Schatz and PCSC to revise review document to incorporate comments received, modifying it to include the five assessment approaches discussed.
- J Smart to provide the outcomes of the discussion on plant assessments and the five assessment approaches articulated at the SC meeting to BASC (meeting late April 2007) and ask for their guidance on next steps.
- BASC to discuss these five approaches for plant assessments and to give PCSC clear guidance on how plant assessments by SSC and others (i.e. the main herbaria - Kew, Missouri, Smithsonian, Fairchild) are to be captured and how preliminary plant assessments (contributing to GSPC Target 2) will be portrayed on the RL website, including how visitors will be referred to herbaria links.
- PCSC (following BASC review and recommendations), to develop a plan to implement recommended actions and pass to the SSC SC for final sign off.

Red Listing backlog: A large backlog of plant data is waiting to enter the RL, which is causing significant frustrations. Some assessments are backlogged at the RLU because the unit does not have time and others because they do not meet the standards for entry to the Red List. All the SC members agreed that there is a dangerous potential for backlash in setting up Specialist Groups and RLAs and encouraging assessments without the capacity to process them. This presents a risk to the SSC and IUCN. The agreed short-term solution is to warn everyone submitting assessments to the RLU that it might take some time to incorporate their data into the RL, and to ask the RLU to focus on the priority species and taxa. In addition, any submission that is not up to standard should be returned to the provider immediately and they should be asked to only submit the assessment when it is complete. If assessments are submitted correctly, they can be entered into the system as soon as possible, others can be returned to the provider immediately for correction, and others can be inputted later if they are sufficiently far along to merit work by the RLU staff. Those, for which extensive additional work would be required, will simply need to be turned back. People should be encouraged to use the DEM so that the data entry by the RLU is minimised. C Hilton-Taylor should be asked to estimate how long it will take to process the existing backlog so that a time frame for new assessments coming in can be estimated. There was agreement that the new DEM and the future versions of SIS will do a lot to minimise this problem by automating the inputs more consistently, but this is a medium-term solution – as is increasing the RLU capacity. Ensuring that Red Listing at the national level is done better is also a medium-term solution and is definitely a fundraising priority.

DECISION: RLU (through J Smart) should ensure that biodiversity assessments on priority plant groups (cycads, palms, legumes, conifers, bamboos and carnivorous plants) will be treated as priority for processing and fund-raising by the Species Programme.

ACTIONS:

- RLU (through J Smart) to review backlog and determine those submissions that will be fast tracked and edited by RLU, those that will be returned to submitter for improvement; and those that are beyond our capacity to complete and need to be politely returned to the providers.
- RLU (through J Smart) to then inform the SSC SC as to the time line and plan for processing the current backlog.
- RLU is to prepare a statement to be sent to assessment providers regarding an honest indication of the time needed to process submitted RL assessment.

M Maunder went on to mention some other key activities of the PCSC, such as the Global Palm Assessment (progressing well), and the collaboration between CBSG and the Cycad SG in terms of modelling. He also mentioned that the Arctic Plant SG will be looking at the impacts of climate change. The PCSC will be meeting again in August 2007 in Canada and will be thinking of ideas for the WCC. PCSC is also in the final stages of negotiation with Timber Press regarding the re-release of D Given's book, which will need the IUCN and SSC endorsement. M Maunder concluded that he enjoyed being part of the SCPTF meeting in New York. He is particularly interested in the species that are nearing extinction within the next five years and will be writing a proposal for a project that will look at this issue.

H Dublin thanked M Maunder for his in-depth input and willingness to take up the Chairmanship of the PCSC again. She mentioned that the PCSC meeting in Rölle in January has been extremely beneficial for all and they had appreciated her explaining the IUCN and SSC timelines and processes.

ACTIONS:

- M Maunder to talk to L Boitani about restructuring as it relates to the plant portion of SSC network.

5.3.4 Sustainable Use Sub-Committee (SUSC)

J Hutton commented that there have been two main developments with which the SUSG and the SUSC are associated:

- The recreational hunting symposium – which was a large, energetic conference held in London in September 2007. A book will be published and there is thinking about a follow-up process to look at the issues of the standards, best practice guidelines or certification of recreational hunting. A half-day workshop will be held at SCB to follow up on the conservation contributions of hunting.
- The Sustainable Use Sub-Committee meeting will be at White Oak, Florida in July. Preliminary planning is underway and representation will be as inclusive as possible.

H Dublin thanked J Hutton and encouraged other members of the SC to explain to J Hutton what they might need from the SUSC so that these considerations can be discussed at the White Oak meeting.

5.3.5 Biodiversity Assessments Sub-Committee (BASC)

T Brooks explained that the minutes of the last BASC meeting are now available, The next meeting is to be hosted by NatureServe in Washington, DC in late April 2007 and is to be preceded by the various working groups meetings as usual. T Brooks noted the following:

Research highlights:

- The interactions between the RL and climate change will be undertaken by the person to be hired through the MacArthur funding.
- The proposal to revise the RL guidelines in terms of climate change was rejected by NCEAS, but might be funded by the Imperial College Centre for Population Biology and WWF in partnership with NCEAS.
- The revised RL Index formula was published in PLoS ONE.

Process issues:

- The RL User Guidelines have been revised, adopted and posted onto the website
- A petition was reviewed, resulting in *Chlorocardium rodiei* being moved from *Vulnerable* to *Data Deficient*
- The CSWG chaired by A Stattersfield has a number of activities underway, including the addition of Biological Reporting Units to provide a quick way to query occurrence and species distribution on islands, and changes to the utilisation scheme.
- The proposal to the Darwin Initiative to support national RL work was rejected. The reason is unknown, but Darwin has been extremely competitive this round. There is an opportunity for resubmission. H Dublin asked that the proposal be sent to N Ash in UNEP-WCMC so that linkages can be made with the MDG indicators process and associated fundraising opportunities.
- The issue of the authorship of RL assessments is still pending and will be discussed at the next meeting.

Policy for withholding data on certain sensitive species:

BASC has been under pressure to develop a policy for withholding data on certain sensitive species. Open access is a motivating force in SSC network, but there are situations where making explicit geospatial data available can be detrimental to species – especially high value species that are harvested or rare species that could be attractive to collectors, tourists or photographers who may cause damage to the species or habitats. T Brooks noted that wide spread species that aggregate in large numbers at times of year or points of their life cycles may also be at risk. T Brooks explained that several high impact and widely covered scientific papers conclude strongly that there is a potential danger. A formal policy on the issue is therefore warranted, but BASC has developed an interim policy. It is mostly geospatial data that causes risk, and data providers can decide not to enter these data on the DEM. While the default is open access and complete accessibility, BASC is looking at how to responsibly handle exceptions and outlining a policy whereby the RLA can propose that explicit location data is withheld (reviewed after five years). A set of criteria is under

development whereby it is justified to hold species' spatial data off the RL and the RLA will need to notify the RLU if they suspect any problems with its implementation. M Mauger cautioned that some RLAs are not responsive and there should be other methods to request urgent data removal. T Brooks concluded that the RLA and RLU should at all times retain the underlying data. H Dublin cautioned that the Terms of Reference for the RLAs will need to be amended to include this responsibility, and M Mauger asked that the PCSC be given a chance to review the policy and feedback any concerns through the SC.

Other BASC issues:

G Mace clarified that there are two ongoing projects with regard to climate change work: one is the MacArthur-funded project to look at species vulnerability to climate change and the other is looking at new approaches to RL criteria. She explained that due to funding limitations the second one is lagging behind, but it is more of a long-term project to look at the methodological processes for building climate change into the RL criteria. She reiterated that the MacArthur project is very different and it is vital that it should get underway soon.

H Dublin then asked J Smart to ensure that the indemnity issue (where people who assess commercially high-value species should be indemnified by IUCN) is prioritised and followed up with the IUCN Legal Counsel as data providers are concerned. She went on to explain briefly that the issue refers to how assessors and evaluators on IUCN staff are covered currently under IUCN's indemnity insurance, but SSC volunteers are not. IUCN does feel that it is possible to offer some protection, and the IUCN insurance company needs to be brought on board. This issue is not only SSC related, as some of the other Commissions might also need this – e.g. WCPA experts advising on changes to PA categories.

H Dublin asked that BASC be reminded of the pending action item on Guidelines on Scientific Collecting. T Brooks replied that it is on the agenda for the next BASC meeting.

ACTIONS:

- S Stuart or T Brooks to send proposal that was sent to the Darwin Initiative to N Ash at UNEP-WCMC to facilitate linkages with the MDG7, Target 9bis indicator submission and fund-raising efforts.
- S Stuart or T Brooks to pass on the interim policy on withholding data on species that might be placed at risk by releases of information under the open access principle to M Mauger for PCSC consideration.
- M Mauger/PCSC to feed any concerns they may have with regard to the interim policy on withholding data through the SC
- BASC to assist in modifying the current RLA ToR to ensure that they address their role in implementing and monitoring this policy on sensitive data.
- BASC to establish a process for linking the CSWG work on utilisation schemes with the relevant taxonomic SGs and SUSG.
- J Smart to continue deal with indemnity issue within IUCN due to the urgency felt by some assessors (particularly those working on commercially valuable marine species)
- BASC to inform SSC SC regarding progress and plans for the Guidelines on Scientific Collecting.

5.3.6 Biodiversity Indicators Sub-Committee (BISC)

G Mace explained that two meetings of BISC were held in January 2007:

One was paid for by the Secretariat of CBD and was to provide some advice on developing an indicator on Alien Invasive Species (AIS). AIS are a huge driver of species loss and this is a very complicated indicator because the main priority of most organisations has been to look at the worst invasive as apposed to looking at the trends. ISSG, GISP and others attended this meeting, which lead to a report that recommends a shortlist of the indicators that could be used for 2010. There are many separately-funded datasets in the sector, so there is not much cohesion. G Mace concluded that she hopes the CBD will find what they need from the list, but there remains a need to develop a really useful and scientifically rigorous indicator – which is unlikely to come from the existing databases.

For the second meeting, a group of people involved in species-based assessments met to talk about the different indicators being developed – e.g. RLI, SRLI, LPI, European Environmental Agency's SEBI 2010 process, the 2010 Biodiversity Indicators Partnership (2010BIP) – and what stage has been reached. Many projects are still waiting for funding from the 2010BIP project. Some of them are going to rely on the RL database for different cuts of data, and there will need to be in-depth discussions about the coding of threats to species in the RL database. The outcome of the meeting was a decision to bring together more people who are working on these indicators and perhaps recommend more changes to the Classification Schemes to accommodate these needs. G Mace expressed her concern that the stall in the 2010BIP project is hampering progress and said she emphasised the need to work on indicators that will come into effect after 2010. She explained that it is difficult to fundraise for these new indicators as donors are focused on supporting the 2010BIP project. J Hutton said that there have been changes at the GEF Secretariat and it seems that the 2010BIP project has not been signed off by the new CEO. However, efforts are underway to secure matching funding while the GEF process continues.

C Campagna queried how governments are reacting to indicators – i.e. do governments accept advice on how to measure trends? G Mace commented that the indicators have become politicised, which does make it difficult for the SSC to give input. While European countries may be willing to accept a global standard for indicators, developing countries know they might not reach the targets and are more interested in developing national level indicators. National level Red Listing provides an opportunity for this. H Dublin commented that national governments do want to do national Red Listing correctly, which is why it is important to roll out guidance and help to build capacity at the national level. The UN is driving for the national level ownership of the MDG targets and indicators, and there is hope that countries will see this as an incentive to do more and better national Red Listing.

G Mace commented that the CBD indicators are not a good starting point as they do not have positive incentives (they are just straight trend information). It is imperative to have something else that is telling us what is going wrong and why – measures that usefully inform conservation action. The problems are at the political level because the indicators are adopted through political and not scientific processes. H Dublin stated that CEM, WCPA and SSC are trying to clarify and ensure IUCN's role in indicator processes.

C Campagna queried whether there is an education initiative in place to encourage national governments to use indicators. H Dublin explained that CEC and the IUCN communications unit have not been handed this challenge as yet.

J Hutton stated that the SUSG was also involved in a meeting to look at sustainable use indicators, and some money has been allocated for this from the 2010BIP project and Shell. The money is intended for a post-doc to look at sustainable use indicators and the Institute of Zoology at ZSL is organising a workshop on the topic. G Mace commented that it is important for this person to be in touch with the CSWG on the use classification scheme. There was agreement that a more strategic look needs to be taken at this issue and more discussions held, especially because the SGs who have to fill in the information in the DEM on use will need to comment on the relevance and applicability of the scheme.

5.4 SSC Task Force updates: feedback and discussion

5.4.1 Species Conservation Planning TF (SCPTF)

R Lacy reported on the January 2007 SCPTF meeting in New York, funded by the SSC and hosted by WCS, saying that there is great enthusiasm for this project, but still expertise gaps on the TF that will be filled at the next meeting. The meeting mainly consisted of sharing information about wishes and concerns, and the different kinds of tools and processes for species conservation planning that are already in use. The aim was to identify the whole range of steps that can lead to good species conservation planning, and to build a framework to provide guidance to practitioners. Once this basic ideal structure has been agreed upon

by the TF, more feedback will be obtained from a larger group of users of specific conservation planning tools to assess where these tools fit into the framework and what aspects they address. A broader set of experts will be consulted and then smaller WGs will focus on detailed descriptions of the components of the framework.

R Lacy then mentioned that the gaps on the TF include invertebrate and plant experts. He explained that the SCPTF needs to clearly differentiate its mandate from that being taken up by the area-based planning approaches in the joint WCPA/SSC systematic conservation planning initiative. The group does recognise the indistinct line between species conservation planning and multi-species / area planning, and will tackle this issue at their next meeting. A more refined strategy will be brought to the SC in October 2007. R Lacy concluded that other groups need to feed into the process by giving examples of what has worked well and what has not (e.g. the Reintroduction SG is doing a survey of which reintroduction efforts were based on species conservation action plans). After a comment from R Kock that previous action plans often did not have participation at the local levels, R Lacy agreed that the SPCTF identified that much of the problem with the action plans has been that local participation, political buy in, and social and economic impacts were not taken into account.

C Imboden expressed concern that single-species planning may be an old fashioned approach as multi-species, area-based planning is the modern way of conservation planning. There was some discussion around this issue, but the SC agreed that there is a need for guidance on species-level planning for a variety of reasons, including: government needs for plans for their charismatic species; conservation action is required for high-target species; some species cover immense areas (e.g. crop species, wide-ranging and migratory species); and where donors are interested in a specific species, species-level plans could be effective fundraising tools for broader efforts. There was also agreement that the SCPTF needed communicators to help explain why and when species conservation planning is needed, and that the framework should be prefaced with criteria for when a species-specific conservation plan is needed. C Campagna noted that problems can be caused when a single species is targeted for conservation (e.g. save the dolphin), as several other species may suffer. R Lacy concluded that there is a definite need for different outputs aimed at different readers too (e.g. summaries for donors, summaries for managers). He also mentioned that it is important to look at how the species approach can help for a certain problem (e.g. the Asian vultures). G Mace summarised that there are two traditional ways of doing conservation on the ground – species-based or area-based. But in all real cases that have been successful, there has been a measure of interaction between these two methods. She suggested that the WCPA/SSC joint conservation planning initiative looks at when area-based planning is not sufficient and R Lacy's group looks at when species-based planning will not be sufficient.

ACTION: H Dublin to make sure that B Pressey is asked to look at situations where specific species needs are not addressed adequately through area-based planning approaches

H Dublin concluded the discussion by noting that the fascinating diversities of opinion on this topic are all found within the SSC, and it is therefore important to cater for all needs.

5.4.2 Restructuring TF (RTF)

H Dublin gave an update on the activities on the RTF on behalf of the RTF's Chair, L Boitani. She explained that a more substantive session will be held at the October SC meeting. She briefly explained the history of the RTF, saying that results of the external evaluations of the SSC and the voluntarism study had shown the need for restructuring. Unfortunately, even the external evaluators had little idea of how to implement their recommendations. After discussions with IUCN senior management, it was agreed that H Dublin would set up a TF within the SSC to deliberate on the changes that need to be made, and then bring in an external expert who understands how to make change happen. As a result of a chance meeting with H Dublin, Change Consultant P McLagan has offered to assist with the SSC change management *pro bono* and has spoken at length to both L Boitani and J Smart. H Dublin explained that P McLagan has only asked that her travel and communications costs are covered, and has agreed to be involved at least until the next RTF meeting and possibly SSC SC Meeting WCC 3.5 – MINUTES

on to the Chairs' Meeting and the WCC4. It is hoped that she will be able to attend the next SC meeting. H Dublin commented that she knows that P McLagan brings important skills into the arena, and explained that P McLagan now plans to talk to members of the SSC SC and SP staff to ensure that everyone is on the same page before any change processes are initiated. J Smart noted that her conversation with P McLagan was most interesting as P McLagan had grasped the complexity of the situation very quickly. She has a practical approach and is definitely someone who can assist in this sensitive issue of restructuring.

There was a unanimous view that this is a good way forward for the restructuring process, and some SC members (R Mittermeier, C Imboden, R Lacy) volunteered to be the next on P McLagan's list to interview. H Dublin mentioned that she would also try to speak to M Stanley-Price, as the author of the SSC Voluntarism Study. H Dublin encouraged the SC members to think of what they would like to discuss with the RTF, which will have its next meeting in early September. She reiterated that the restructuring remains a sensitive, work-in-progress and that SC members should communicate it as such.

ACTION: H Dublin to circulate her PowerPoint on restructuring (used at the Madagascar SC meeting) to the SC.

5.5 Other SSC SC member updates: feedback and discussion

5.5.1 Vet SG (VSG)

Avian Influenza (AI): R Kock explained that the epidemiology of the current H5N1 outbreak(s) is being unravelled. There are two hubs for the virus – South East Asia and Quangdong, China. The H5N1 virus is circulated amongst domestic poultry and the China strain appears to be the one that has spread more widely. This has been discovered through molecular epidemiology. Although there is a pandemic, it is dependent on continued emergence of the virus from these areas. It may well be a series of epizootics rather than one continuous infection cycle or spread globally. Wild birds may act as carriers of H5N1 but there is no firm evidence for this as yet and it is poultry that are the main epidemiological drivers. There are some interesting examples of infection in wild bird populations – e.g. in Hong Kong, there have been a number of localised outbreaks which can be attributed to the munias (small birds) that are purchased for religious reasons and released at temples. Munias are kept with poultry and are infected prior to being released, and the disease has spread into the wild bird populations (e.g. crows) that hunt the munias. Most of the isolates in wild birds are amongst scavengers and invariably are associated with earlier poultry outbreaks, but unfortunately the press often blames wild birds for introducing AI to an area. The UK and Nigeria outbreaks were both poultry-initiated. CMS is collating information on wild birds and GAINS is progressing to the fieldwork stage. It will be interesting to see the results because the intensity of surveillance is probably too limited to pick up much evidence of H5N1 virus circulation. The collaring of wild susceptible birds is helping to provide some information on movements and potential risk, but a focus on domestic bird populations is the best option for tracking epizootics and ultimately control will depend on work in this sector.

L Bennun mentioned that the findings of a review led by scientists from Tour du Valat, and published recently in *Ibis*, were consistent in that there are local flare ups driven by poultry movements. F Launay commented that outbreaks in falcons in Saudi Arabia, Kuwait and Iran were because the birds are fed with infected poultry then traded across borders, often quarantined with poultry. He also noted the additional challenge created by the tradition of giving fresh poultry meat as a gift in the Middle East.

R Kock concluded that the SSC's role is merely to stay informed so that advice can be given on the disease and the risks of wild birds in the spread of disease. He commented that it is increasingly seen as a political disease with the desire to improve biosecurity leading to moves to close down back-yard poultry businesses, which would benefit large conglomerates. He also noted that the AI story is illustrative for the paper being written by Y Sadovy, M Samways and himself about the value of biodiversity, here in providing a buffer

against a potentially major zoonotic disease. The large wild bird population may well in effect select for mildness in AI viruses and therefore might possibly act as a buffer against H5N1 virulence. The lack of evidence for a major epizootic spread amongst wild bird populations and associated mortality is supportive of this hypothesis.

Diclofenac and vultures: An initiative to engage the Pharmaceutical companies on the Diclofenac issue are moving ahead slowly. The crisis with Asian Gyps vultures continues and it will be years before captive breeding programmes have sufficient numbers for reintroduction. There are efforts to provide Diclofenac-free meat for vultures to feed on, but the replacement of stock with Diclofenac-free animals is too slow and localised to have much impact – especially because Diclofenac is only one of a huge family of drugs that may all be toxic to vultures. Broader engagement with the pharmaceutical industry is essential. The industry is concerned that their ecotoxicology protocol for new drugs (primarily five big pharmaceutical companies contribute to research and development) may be flawed. R Kock explained that the pharmaceutical industry would like to host an initial meeting with the conservation community, veterinary community and the human medical community to talk about this issue. To this end, he called for help in identifying people who bring strong perspective on the conservation of species at this level (e.g. vulture population experts), as scavengers may be an important indicator in ecotoxicological studies. Thereafter, the next stage would be a bigger workshop with more of a public image where mutually-beneficial relationships can be discussed. A long-term goal is more studies and perhaps modifying the R&D safety studies to include avian species.

H Dublin commented that it should be possible to talk to the foundations of these same pharmaceutical companies about assisting, but agreed that it is important to handle the issue sensitively. C Imboden commented that history should be taken into account as there are lessons to be learned about how engagement took place with the industry during the pesticide and herbicide era. R Kock agreed, but noted that even if a drug is found to be harmful to the environment, if it is beneficial to humans it can be passed into circulation. Another worry is the rapid growth in drug use expected in developing countries and the impossibility of controlling generic drug production (Diclofenac is now generic).

R Kock then spoke in general about the VSG and said that although some people don't have the time for voluntary work, others become engaged on particular issues. They are looking for a volunteer to assist with the website management and will link to the new IUCN website process. There is some reluctance in the group with regard to changing the name of the group to the Wildlife Health SG, but discussions are continuing and the new name might be launched along with the new website.

ACTIONS:

- R Kock to arrange meeting with Pharmaceutical companies and discuss this issue with Indian colleagues during his upcoming trip to India and Nepal.
- R Kock is to initiate change in the name of the SG and finalise the new website and appropriate hyperlinks.

5.5.2 Invasive Species SG (ISSG)

H Dublin explained that M Clout is unable to attend May SC meetings due to his lecturing commitments. She went on to say that linkages between databases on AIS and the RL database are still not strong, and that BASC should discuss this as a cross-cutting issue and look at how the ISSG database can serve SSC better. H Dublin also mentioned that more care is needed when fundraising for project implementation rather than simply the provision of technical advice. She explained that the ISSG is in a tricky situation as they are trying to raise money to survive and have therefore been forced into implementing projects in order to raise funds. This has also resulted in the GISD not necessarily being exactly aligned with current and future needs. G Howard has been appointed recently at the IUCN invasive species coordinator and he will be looking at how to assist the ISSG in bringing its technical

expertise to bear and being compensated accordingly. The GISP Secretariat is moving to Nairobi. M Clout is going on sabbatical leave to the UK for an extended period.

ACTION: BASC to discuss the GISD to investigate the improvement of linkages with the RL database in order to better serve current and future needs.

5.5.3 Reintroduction SG (RSG)

F Launay commented that the RSG has been relatively quiet since the WCC3.4 SC meeting, but two meetings are being organised:

- A meeting at ZSL to look at the science and management of avian translocations. This will take place in early 2008 and will include avian reintroduction practitioners.
- Lincoln Park Zoo is providing 50% sponsorship for an international reintroduction conference.

The recruitment of new members is ongoing, particularly for plant reintroduction experts. The book on reintroduction case studies and lessons learned from the reintroduction guidelines is progressing as lead authors have been found and chapter layouts begun. The manuscript should be completed in 2008.

The RSG programme officer is participating in the SCPTF and will continue to do so. The Reintroduction Project Database is being converted to a web-based format where people can share information directly (it will be screened for quality control in the background). F Launay also mentioned that the RSG is making a small start on reintroduction and climate change as there are growing trends to suggest moving species to more favourable areas. This is an important issue to track as it is essential to understand the consequences of moving species, which may be seen as alien invasives.

H Dublin thanked F Launay for his contributions and noted that Holcim might be interested in connecting with the RSG due to their site restoration and rehabilitation needs.

5.5.4 Conservation Breeding SG (CBSG)

R Lacy explained that the CBSG has been active in building capacity at regional levels and holding training programmes. They also work with partners to link models from different systems to create Meta Models – e.g. using climate change and landscape models to pass information back to population models. Programmers think they can link systems while still leaving each intact as a stand alone model (named the Meta Model Manager programme).

A major part of CBSG work is the Amphibian Ark, which is a partnership between CBSG, the Amphibian SG, WAZA, regional and national zoo and aquarium associations, and others. The aim is to guide and promote *ex situ* management, and provide high level guidance on priorities such as husbandry and research. A full-time staff member has been hired to help with publicity and fundraising, and a part-time training coordinator will be hired. Funding for the Ark is from private donors and zoos. The major zoo associations have made a commitment to a global campaign for awareness on the amphibian crisis – 2008 has been dubbed the “year of the frog”. Major concerns about the project remain, including:

- The fact that *ex situ* efforts are charging ahead, with focus on those species that will go extinct quicker. However, there is recognition that all *ex situ* efforts must be coupled to an obligation to deliver *in situ* conservation. Even within the Amphibian Ark there is debate on whether attempts should be made to rescue species that don't have active field programmes to support their eventual reintroduction. There are divergent views regarding whether to place priority for *ex situ* work on species for which there are active *in situ* programmes (hoping that the captive program can be of limited duration) or instead on species for which the *in situ* efforts are still non-existent or clearly inadequate (because we might otherwise soon lose those species).
- Current budgets are only about 10% of what is needed. Donors are expressing concern that *ex situ* work is out of balance with *in situ* efforts. There is a tendency towards increasing the *ex situ* work and a desire to send resources to the *in situ* side. 2008 will hopefully be a year where more funding will come in for the *in situ* work.

The European Association of Zoos and Aquaria is more interested in supporting *in situ* work, and the American and Australian associations are already hiring amphibian coordinators. Monthly reports are available about the Amphibian Ark on request. There has been deliberation regarding whether the Amphibian Ark should become a new organisation, but for now the “bylaws” define how the partners link together in a joint effort. A new website is live and a logo has been designed, but there is debate on whether the IUCN and SSC logos should be very visible and whether the site should be in the IUCN visual identity. H Dublin and R Lacy agreed to discuss this at a later stage.

CBSG will be advising the Japanese Association of Zoos and Aquariums on how they can become more involved in conservation world-wide. CBSG will soon facilitate a meeting on the issue of young dolphins that are caught in drive fishery being sent to aquaria. It is a very contentious issue, but there is hope that some scenarios can be discussed in which these captures might be replaced by breeding in aquaria or by less stressful methods of capture.

M Maunder commented that the scientific world is watching the response to the amphibian crisis, as it is unlikely that this is the last time a large-scale taxonomic die off will be seen (e.g. marine species are also looking critical). H Dublin noted the lack of response for *in situ* work, and reiterated that SSC should just continue spreading the message. She concluded that the imminent book on amphibians and its chapter on the use of amphibians is well-timed. There was a general discussion about mass extinction and M Maunder agreed to highlight the amphibian story to the Gore climate change team as they might be interested in following the story of climate change links to amphibian losses (not least of which is a concern over mosquitoes, malaria and other human health considerations).

ACTIONS:

- H Dublin and R Lacy to discuss the visual identity of the Amphibian Ark website, regarding if and how IUCN and SSC logos should be used when Specialist Groups are engaged in conservation partnerships.
- M Maunder to bring amphibian story to the attention of Gore climate change team.

SSC AND THE 2009-2012 IUCN PROGRAMME: STRATEGIC PLANNING

A two-hour session on strategic planning was facilitated by the SSC planning lead, C Imboden. H Dublin opened the discussion by explaining that now that the 2009-2012 intersessional programme is in the planning phase, SSC needs to make sure it is in alignment. She thanked C Imboden for taking on this task, and concluded that SSC is not expected to contribute to every aspect of the next intersessional Programme.

C Imboden led the SC members through a discussion following the flow of the proposed IUCN programme. The following conclusions came out of the discussion:

- Wording is important and some editorial corrections need to be made to the Draft IUCN 2009-2012 Programme.
- The SSC goal should include concern as well as responsibility for biodiversity loss.
- The SC would feel more comfortable if biodiversity was at the higher level of the programme (as an impact or state measure) and not at the same level as the other four pillars (climate change mitigation and adaptation, green energy, green economies and poverty reduction)
- Despite the challenges, the SSC should place more emphasis on communicating the importance of biodiversity (including the intrinsic value) but that this task may have to be taken to higher levels of IUCN
- The SSC plays an important role in the analysis of data (as well as the provision of data), and it is important to communicate this aspect.
- SSC also needs to concentrate on the “so what?” aspect – so that consequences of the loss of biodiversity can be demonstrated and communicated clearly.
- At present it is not easy to craft the SSC Strategic Plan to the new draft Programme. Effort may be needed to “retrofit” our contributions to the Programme if it is adopted as is.

The discussion concluded that structure of the updated SSC Strategic Plan should be along the lines of the pressure-state-response model with the following objectives (which would need to be related to the IUCN thematic priority areas):

1. Understanding the status of biodiversity (IUCN thematic priority area #1)
2. Understanding the threats to biodiversity (IUCN thematic priority areas #2, #3)
3. Understanding the consequences of biodiversity loss (IUCN thematic priority areas #4 and #5)

A further level is one of methods for concerted actions to address the consequences.

There was agreement from the SC that the SSC should not compromise its priorities and values to ensure that we map directly to the IUCN Programme as expressed in the first draft and that a retrofit should be possible.

ACTIONS:

- H Dublin and R Mittermeier to take the SSC concerns about the draft IUCN 2009-2012 Programme to the May Council meeting.
- C Imboden to redo Strategic Planning table in electronic form and send it out to all SC members and relevant senior SP Staff
- J Smart, working with C Imboden, to take the lead and be in touch with the chairs of the Sub-Committees to ensure they discuss targets at their next meetings and feed the results back into the strategic planning process. Emphasis is on the priorities and what is really possible – and commitment for targets/outcomes that can be measured. The Sub-Committees should also provide a rationale for their targets/outcomes.
- C Imboden and C Poole to also focus on the targets/outcomes that are not catered for under the Sub-Committees (e.g. disciplinary groups).
- C Imboden is to present a draft Strategic Plan at the October SC meeting
- C Imboden should have a further draft Strategic Plan ready for presentation at the Chairs' Meeting

6. SSC GOVERNANCE ISSUES

6.1 Specialist Group Chairs' Meeting

C Poole gave a brief summary of the results of the first announcement to the SG Chairs about this proposed meeting as follows:

- The response (82% response rate) to the email was overwhelmingly positive, with 86% of those who responded willing and able to attend a meeting in February 2008. Some people enquired as to whether programme officers and deputy chairs could also attend. Without programme officers or deputies, but including the SC and some IUCN staff, the number attending the meeting is likely to be approximately 120 people.
- Less than 20% of those wanting to attend can pay their own flight costs. A draft budget has been prepared, but much is dependent on exact flight and accommodation costs.
- 85% of Chairs were willing to prepare a poster for the meeting and 51% said they had the ability and would be willing to facilitate sessions.
- The comments about what should be on the agenda of such a meeting were very varied, but included: fundraising (core money and project money), SG work (priorities, improving the impact of SG work), IUCN policy matters, inter-group interactions and sharing of data, Red Listing and assessment work, members and group structure, preparations for the WCC4, communications, and SSC restructuring.

F Launay stated that his team has settled on Al Ain city (on the border of Oman) as the right venue for the meeting. The meeting will be at the hotel providing accommodation so as to minimise transport. Unfortunately the UAE is an expensive place, but the hotel will most likely be willing to reduce prices for a large group. The hotel is logistically capable of hosting 120 people and has many restaurants, a large conference venue and three break-outs

SSC SC Meeting WCC 3.5 – MINUTES

rooms. There are a number of field trip options in the near vicinity including captive breeding centres, an Arabian oryx reintroduction site and a marine protected area.

H Dublin explained that a few people have expressed discomfort with the venue on two accounts – one being the expense in UAE and the other being UAE policies and practices with negative impacts on conservation. She noted that there is a need to ensure that the benefits of this meeting outweigh the costs. The SC agreed that it should be made clear to all SG Chairs that the UAE sponsorship is available for this meeting only, not for other conservation initiatives. On the issue of conservation practices, it was decided that the opening remarks at the meeting should be controlled, but that the meeting delegates should feel free to express their discomforts with any policies or practices in the region during the meeting. It was concluded that any country hosting such a meeting would raise questions in some people's minds, and it is therefore impossible to please everyone. There was unanimous agreement from the SC to enthusiastically support the UAE as a venue and their sponsorship of the meeting. F Launay explained that the meeting will be hosted by the Abu Dhabi Government and recommended that other co-sponsors contribute. He noted that the current ruler of Abu Dhabi is working hard to change the image of the Emirate and wants to be part of the global conservation movement. H Dublin stated that some of the COF will be set aside to assist with the meeting. C Imboden commented that Swarovski might be interested in assisting in the meeting, but it would need to be from their marine focus. R Mittermeier commented that CI is also willing to help and that the remaining funds from the WCC3.4 SC meeting in Madagascar should be put towards this meeting.

The SC members agreed that the meeting should go ahead on a strong and positive footing. An Organising Committee for the meeting was formed and the following SC members volunteered to help: F Launay, H Dublin, C Poole, M Samways, C Campagna, R Mittermeier, R Kock. J Smart will appoint someone from the SP staff to be the liaison person. The Organising Committee will be responsible for working with the SSC Chair's Office and the SG Chairs, formulating ideas around the agenda and planning the technical modalities for the meeting. For logistical arrangements, F Launay has 10-12 people that will liaise with and assist C Poole and S Vosse.

The SC had a brief discussion on the possible agenda for the meeting and agreed that the definite sessions must be around the restructuring, WCC inputs and IUCN policy issues. It was agreed that basic information about IUCN and SSC should be given at the start of the meeting as it is a golden opportunity to give them all the same message at the same time. Practical training and enough free time for inter-Chair interactions is also essential. Considerable thought needs to go into sessions on fundraising and communications. It is important not to be patronising, but also important to give the Chairs what they need, and allow an opportunity for those who are experienced to share their experiences with others. There was general consensus that the meeting could start with formal presentations, then break down into more informal work, and then end with a completely open session. There was also agreement that someone from IUCN Donor Relations, someone from IUCN Policy Department and someone on restructuring should be invited to the meeting. There was a suggestion to have experts talk on cross-cutting issues such as invasives, climate change and sustainable use.

The SC agreed that the meeting should be four days, with a half-day field trip on one of the mornings, with a more informal session on the afternoon of the field trip. H Dublin concluded the discussion by thanking F Launay for making this important meeting possible and asking the Organising Committee and other SC members to help as much as possible.

DECISION: The Chairs' Meeting, to be hosted by the Abu Dhabi government, will take place on 11 – 14 February 2008 in Al Ain city, Abu Dhabi. A declaration about the venue, sponsorship and carbon offsetting should be sent to the Chairs prior to the meeting. Definite agenda items are the SSC restructuring, the WCC and IUCN policy issues. Additional attention will be given to responding to Chairs' requests for assistance with fund-raising and communications functions, with enough free time for general discussion and sharing.

6.2 SSC Specialist Groups and IUCN Policy

H Dublin explained that there has been a recent increase in contentious and complex policy issues and it seems that some of the SSC network is not well-informed about when an issue could have policy implications for IUCN. For example, a number of development sites have species-relevance, but also implications with IUCN dealings with the private sector. When expressing technical views, it can often come across (when the press picks up an issue) that the person is speaking on behalf of IUCN. This also affects the IUCN Regional Offices, who may or may not already be dealing with an issue when the press grabs hold of it. Therefore, it is highly desirable to get all the right parties together from the onset to discuss these issues before steps are taken, particularly when there are many levels and many players involved, including IUCN State Members, government agency members and NGO members.

Because of the increase in these issues lately, H Dublin said it is now imperative to give clear guidance to the SSC network about how to handle issues with potential policy implications. There should be a protocol of who should be copied on emails and clear guidance on dealing with the media. There is also a need to ensure that all IUCN voices are speaking from a united perspective, as the press like to pick up dissention within the organisation. Some SG Chairs are highly experienced with handling such matters, but others may need guidance.

Unfortunately it is never clear when or where an entry point into an issue will occur. Sometimes a representative of IUCN brings the issue to the Chair's Office, other times the issue is brought up by the SG Chair. At other times, it is released in the press without IUCN's knowledge and it may be too late to do damage control. The best case scenario is when all relevant IUCN players are aware of the issue and are communicating well with each other. Providing advice and guidance on these matters should be a topic for the Chairs' Meeting – to be broached diplomatically and in a positive fashion. The SGs need an explanation on how to deal with other parts of IUCN and on how IUCN policy is formulated.

6.3 Specialist Group Chairs Consultation (update on survey)

C Poole explained that about 20 telephone calls have been made to SG Chairs so far. Although the calls are taking longer than expected, they are proving most interesting and the Chairs appreciate receiving the calls. It is hard to pinpoint patterns in the results of the consultation at this stage, so a more detailed report will be produced for the October SC meeting. In general the SGs are happy with the SSC communications tools, although they do not utilise the website as much as they possibly should. On average, Chairs are spending four days per month on SSC SG work and there is a large amount of in-kind contributions to the SSC and IUCN from the Chairs' host institutions. Answers to the gender balance questions were to be expected in that the SSC does have a large gender imbalance, but it is not considered a problem as the membership is drawn from a biased pool. Appointment remains based on merit and capability rather than on gender or race.

J Smart added to C Poole's comments saying that she has conducted a number of telephone consultations herself. Many of the Chairs, it seems, do not understand the structure of the SP and the SSC. Language can be a problem as some of the French and Spanish speaking Chairs would like more translated correspondence to come from the SP/SSC. Their biggest communication need is help with their websites, so this support should be a priority. The Chairs did not seem to have a problem matching their SG activities to the three SSC objectives, so C Imboden should note this when structuring the new SSC Strategic Plan.

6.4 Awards or Members Emeritus nominations

H Dublin reminded the SC that they could put forward nominations for the various SSC awards – particularly the Sir Peter Scott Award, which will be announced at WCC4. The Chairs' Meeting Organising Committee should also consider awards that could be presented at the meeting.

6.5 Means of Assessing Steering Committee members

H Dublin explained that the GTF has asked Council to consider how it might assess the individual performance of the SC members, as a part of overall Commission governance. The Commission Chairs already have a performance appraisal with the President, as well as a self-assessment completed twice each year and various other reporting requirements to IUCN Headquarters and Council. Commission Chairs have tried to make it clear in Council that Council approved their SC and therefore Council should accept the Commission Chairs' overall performance assessment of their SC. There was some discussion from the SC, but general consensus was that the Chair should be able to inform Council how effective the SC is as a whole, while individual matters should be dealt with by the Chair. It was agreed that it could be viewed as somewhat counterproductive to evaluate volunteers. It was understood that some general guidelines or rules might be appropriate and examples were discussed.

7. SSC FINANCES, FUNDRAISING AND COMMUNICATIONS

7.1 Commission Operating Fund (COF) 2007

The COF budget was provided in the meeting information pack and the SC members were welcomed to ask for any clarification required. H Dublin reiterated that the budget will be adjusted later in 2007 and the Sub-Committee and TF Chairs must therefore let the Chair's Office know if they will not use their full allocation or will require more. H Dublin further reported that there is now clarity on the reporting mechanisms to IUCN Finance and those who receive allocations should feel free to ask if they need further explanation.

7.2 SP Finances

J Smart presented a rough outline of the SP budget, broken down according to IUCN core income, project costs and project staff time recovery costs. At present the project income far outweighs the core income from IUCN. Some staff are core funded and some are project funded (even though some of the project-funded staff undertake core duties) but most are funded from both sources. Broadly speaking the RLU and headquarters staff are covered by core costs, but some core functions are not covered by core money. For 2007, more core income has been allocated by IUCN to cover the new Network Support Officer and there is more incentive to save because of the new 90% "carry forward" policy.

There was some discussion, but the SC agreed that it would be beneficial to see the full SP budget in order to get a better understanding of the current situation and requested a list of projects and their funding amounts and timelines. J Smart said that this had been provided for the Patagonia meeting and she would be happy to provide the same for the next meeting. C Imboden called for the budget to show the relationship to the Strategic Plan as it is essential that the budget is allocated in a way which supports the work indicated in the Strategic Plan.

<p>ACTION: J Smart to present (to next SC meeting) a listing of current project funds, their sources and their timelines, as well as a depiction of how the current budget relates to the objectives and outcomes of the SSC Strategic Plan.</p>

7.3 Fund-raising

H Dublin commented that fundraising is very tricky because besides funding for staff positions, there is also a need to fundraise for the SSC network – network support as well as providing resources to the SGs. H Dublin then briefly explained the IUCN funding structure,

saying that there are Framework Agreements from governments, dues from the Members and funds from bilateral donors, which are for the most part ear-marked, thus presenting certain challenges. She added that there are very limited unrestricted core funds. There followed a brief discussion about IUCN and the private sector relating to money. It is unclear whether the private sector will be allowed membership to IUCN, in if so in what capacity. IUCN does not tap into the private foundation sector and it was agreed that this could be an opportunity to fill the gaps where core funding does not meet the needs of the strategic plan as well as provide some funding to the SGs.

Fundraising Strategy

J Smart explained that IUCN is discussing putting in place a business planning process, and suggested a fundraising strategy for the SSC/SP be developed relating to the next Strategic Plan (by which time the business planning process should be finished). J Hutton commented that the business strategy should really incorporate both the Programme and the Commission activities and determine the needs-driven and supply-driven aspects – i.e. is the Red List really needed and wanted? If it is supply driven, then there will always be a problem of who pays, but if it is needs-driven then fundraising should be easier. He stated that one first step would be to ask for support from the big NGOs. H Dublin replied that their interest and willingness is demand driven – some of these organisations do not use Red List data and some do, so it is fairly clear where funding possibilities lie. C Imboden concluded that the IUCN Programme is probably structured in such a way that provides the bilateral donors what they want and need. R Mittermeier then commented that we should not underestimate how much the corporate sector will need our data. J Hutton agreed, saying that the corporates will want geospatial data and we need to strengthen our ability to provide it.

There was further discussion around the in-kind donations from various institutions that host SG Chairs or give office space to SGs. There was a general feeling that some of these institutions might want some recognition, but it was agreed that the Chairs should request a letter of thanks from the SSC Chair as and when they require this.

Fundraising Update

J Smart distributed a list of fundraising efforts, which can be summarised as follows:

- The RL Corporate Support Group is continuing to grow and there is hope that 10 corporates will eventually be on board to help support the next phase of the SIS
- Conservation Finance and Donor Relations are making an effort with regard to other approaches to the corporate sector – some particularly for the RL and others for the new conservation centre that will house the SP.
- Two grants from foundations were secured for SIS and plant assessment software.
- The MAVA Foundation has been approached to assist with supporting the RL as well as the new building
- The Sir Peter Scott Fund has been supplemented by funding from the Foundation Ensemble. A first call for proposals has been sent to the SGs and 27 projects were received. A short list will be sent to the Foundation board for approval by 15 April.
- An online donation button has been set up on the RL website and the Marketing and Communication Officer will be required to extend the reach of this fundraising tool.

H Dublin then explained some of her fundraising efforts as follows:

- H Dublin and the IUCN DG will approach the GEF as soon as deemed appropriate to discuss support to our assessment work.
- H Dublin recently received a letter from the Sultanate of Oman thanking the SSC for the gifts and opening the door for further communications and possible partnership. The Chairs' Meeting, which is in the vicinity, will be an opportunity to explore further relationships.
- Thanks to MAVA, CSZ, CI, WCS, and WAZA, who continue to support the Chair's Office.
- MAVA has three geographical areas they focus on and have expressed willingness to entertain funding proposals from SGs working in these areas.

- OriginAfrica, is a small company that makes animal product and metal furniture approached IUCN with an idea for fund-raising. This was passed to the Chair's Office to pursue. First round discussions took place about their initiative, which would link the sustainable use of species in commodity sales with the SSC – a type of corporate sponsorship.
- Four SGs have received ear-marked funds from the bequest of K Sanderson – the inheritance has strict provisos and will be managed through the Sir Peter Scott Fund.
- The Mangroves for the Future initiative is still ongoing and there are plans to set up a governance structure after which funding and further calls for input may filter down.
- The Forest Programme has approached the Chair for collaborative work funded under their Landscapes and Livelihoods initiative.

J Smart then explained about the new IUCN building and how this Conservation Centre could be linked to the RL as well as for support staff to the Commission. Holcim is donating the concrete for the building separately.

There was some discussion on the online donation button, which had been suggested several years back to IUCN HQ and there was agreement that this should be a useful fundraising tool and that web-based donors could easily be provided options for their giving. There was a great deal of effort to reach this stage, and there are plans to maximise the button's use, including broadening it out from just the RL website to address other SSC funding needs.

ACTION: J Smart and H Dublin to look for ways to set up a system whereby online donors can choose whether they would like to support to RL or the other work of the SGs. This second fund could feed straight into the Sir Peter Scott Fund or through another mechanism to be established.

7.4 SSC Communications

H Dublin explained that she had decided not to have a communications session at this SC meeting, but that some time might be allocated at the October meeting or the Chairs' meeting in February 2008. The Chairs' Meeting will offer an opportunity to bring in more expertise regarding messaging and communications. She noted the need for communications assistance from IUCN Headquarters, but acknowledged that IUCN knowledge management and communications issues remain very complex. C Imboden commented that IUCN tries to do too much and therefore has no apex and no simple communication message.

H Dublin also explained that a new BBC series called Saving Planet Earth is focussed on endangered species. There are ongoing discussions with the producer and there may be a possibility to fundraise and to harness knowledge from the SSC network and incorporate the RL into the programmes.

IUCN and SSC Branding

J Smart explained that the subject of IUCN and SSC branding has been raised through PCSC and BASC. BirdLife is producing a book in which they would like to list the RL categories alongside each species. Botanical gardens and some zoos have also expressed interest in some kind of symbol on the name plate of the species. The IUCN Global Communications Unit sees this as an opportunity and is looking at making a standard set of symbols for global use. Some work still needs to be done with regard to public consultation and design of the symbols.

H Dublin commented that it is important that the symbols are demand driven, and relevant in all countries and cultures. R Lacy agreed to discuss this issue at the next CBSG meeting and commented that he felt sure the zoos would be interested. F Launay agreed that he would research China and various southern countries. H Dublin concluded by saying that we

should also think about the linkages to threats leading to conservation status as people are interested in threats and what can be done to mitigate them. The project should also consult those who do interpretation in zoos and botanical gardens.

ACTIONS:

- J Smart to send the branding document she is working on with the communications department to a list of recipients (to be suggested by H Dublin) for their comments.
- B Lacy to put the branding issue on agenda of next CBSG meeting and record the interest from zoos on this project
- J Smart is to be in touch with L Bennun as soon as possible with regards to the branding for BirdLife's book.

8. IUCN / SSC DISCUSSION POINTS

8.1 Global Species Assessment 2

H Dublin explained that the proposed partners for GSA2 do not think it is feasible to carry out the proposed plan within the time allowed. What is now being proposed is a slimmed down version for WCC4, with the intent of delivering the large version closer to 2010 – which will provide more time and more resources. This does however have some implications on the planned programme – e.g. the MacArthur climate change project has a contractual obligation to deliver for the GSA2. There is a need to investigate what other programmatic work has a delivery date for 2008 and any other ramifications of the change in plans for GSA2.

There was some discussion over what a “slimmed-down version” would be. Some concern was expressed regarding the impact of this smaller version and whether it was really worth the effort producing it. H Dublin noted that there was no process in place to measure the impact of GSA1, as no intended impact and no target audience had been identified beforehand, making it hard to evaluate the outcome. The only clear result was that it was not a document for decision-makers or policy-makers. She concluded that IUCN should advise as to whether it is essential to have a publication at the WCC4, what this smaller version should contain and what resources are available and to get this back to the SC. After this, the partners can determine if and how they might feed in to the process.

G Mace commented that the lesson learned here is that better project management on these kinds of projects is essential, as is a collective responsibility for better processes, systems and project planning. She agreed that a content discussion should take place at IUCN level.

M Samways commented that having a good product for 2010 does make sense and expressed concern that slimmed-down version realised in 2008 will detract from the final product in 2010. He commented that we should aim for 2011 for the first Species Congress and the product should be delivered before then.

ACTIONS:

- J Smart to investigate what other programmatic work has contractual obligations with 2008 deadlines for outputs or deliverables.
- J Smart to obtain, through clarification from Senior SP staff, a decision from IUCN senior management on whether a GSA2-type publication is needed for the WCC4 and if so, what it should look like. A draft outline will then be sent to the SSC SC.

8.2 IUCN Data, Information and Knowledge Assets – inputs to upcoming IUCN meeting

The issue was initiated with a presentation by H Dublin and placed in the context of the current internal discussions around the development of a strategy and policies to underpin the Union's management of its data, information and knowledge assets and to reduce institutional risk and enhance fundraising prospects for these endeavours.

SSC SC Meeting WCC 3.5 – MINUTES

The discussion was general in nature but the following points were well supported:

1. As an underlying principle - all species data should be used to support our primary objective – the conservation of biodiversity.
2. The principles as laid out in the Conservation Commons are widely accepted.
3. Challenges remain for the implementation of these principles by individual institutions (technical limitations being the main problem, not will). The web-based vision needs to be functioning as soon as possible to allow total open access to SSC data.
4. SSC must develop a means whereby our data providers are: a) made aware of and b) agree to the uses to which IUCN will put their data and c) clear on when, how, where and to whom the data they provide are to be released. This should emphasise the spirit of number 1 above. The issue of policy on pre-publication data access remains to be discussed and articulated but should be dealt with in this context.
5. There was a feeling that SSC should be clearer on when the network should provide data and when they should provide information or knowledge (i.e. not the raw data but rather the information or knowledge to inform policies and decision-making (SSC Strategic Plan Objective 1). In these latter cases, IUCN does not need to have the raw data, per se.
6. SSC needs to be able to cover back-end costs (through securing funds for the SGs to do the RL assessments and for the SP to provide them support to do this), but this would be better done through funding agreements with donors and partners or the delivery of knowledge products (see 7 below) than through the “commercial sale” of data to corporates or others. SSC needs to significantly improve its ability to secure the kinds of funds that others have for similar purposes.
7. SSC should be able to get more of its back-end costs funded by producing more and better knowledge products (higher level analyses, topical analyses using RL data (such as on climate change), geospatial analyses for corporate planning, etc). SSC has not been very successful to date at capturing such resources but must make more of an effort to do so. Good knowledge products are more easily “sold” or fund-raised for than the core work to secure the data, compile them and quality control them.

There was a general conclusion that the underlying principles of the Conservation Commons should be applied to SSC data, to allow open access (which does not necessarily mean free access) but that should issues of confidentiality or ownership of data arise, they should be dealt with within an agreed policy context. Specific terms and conditions for data providers entering their data on the DEM into the IUCN RL should be made clear and providers should be given the opportunity to knowingly accept these conditions. It was agreed that the open access to data is important for the progression of science, but that funding opportunities must be explored at every level so as to ensure that the securing of data for the production of information and knowledge products can continue.

8.3 Protected Areas Categories Summit

H Dublin explained that she had been approached very late to prepare an SSC paper and talk at the upcoming PA Summit. The Summit responds to a WCC3 resolution calling for the guidelines for application of the IUCN PA Categories to be revisited and revised. As time did not allow sufficient consultation, she is reticent to provide anything that might be construed as an SSC-wide message. She explained that she had worked with L Boitani and C Rondinini on a paper to highlight the fact that the PA debate has lost its biodiversity content and, therefore, the main reason behind the establishment of many PAs to begin with. The paper was submitted as a technical contribution to the debate in the names of L. Boitani and C. Rondinini to avoid any confusion regarding the views of SSC. R Mittermeier agreed, saying that care should be taken with regard to changes in the PA Categories as the categories are entrenched in legislation globally. He agreed that the concept of inserting more biodiversity into the Categories and perhaps fine-tuning the Categories and their use of terms is good, but cautioned against reworking the Categories entirely.

H Dublin commented that the paper tries to point out that the terminology used in the guidelines is poor and inconsistent, thus hampering their proper application and making it difficult for managers and others to interpret. She asked the SC whether there is a major message that she should take to the PA Summit on behalf of the SSC. After some discussion, it was agreed that some suggestions of editorial changes would be a good improvement to the Categories. H Dublin agreed to go to the Summit with a listening brief, foster SSC participation in the ongoing process of revising the guidelines and encourage a working group to work on the editorial changes in the categories. She reiterated that the paper as presented was merely meant to stimulate thinking. R Mittermeier concluded that the paper was thought provoking and needed more consideration.

DECISION: H Dublin to go to PA Categories Summit with a listening brief and to foster SSC participation in the revision process, while trying to encourage some editorial changes with regard to the confusing and inexact terminology

8.4 WCC4

H Dublin explained that the exact timings for input to the WCC4 are not clear as yet, but the WCC4 preparatory committee is asking for strategic thinking and inputs. The Commission will most likely be allocated three 2-hour sessions in the Forum (the Forum will also include the Commission meetings this time). The theme for the WCC4 is “A Diverse and Sustainable World”, with three streams: A new climate for change; Healthy environments – healthy people; Safeguarding the diversity of life.

There is obviously some overlap between the streams, but there is potential to interact with all the streams. The Commissions are being encouraged to work with each other and will also be expected to contribute to the Barcelona Legacy – outcomes which go beyond the WCC4 itself. IUCN is placing itself under pressure to make sure the Congress outcomes are worth the money and time spent on the meeting. There are various kinds of events to choose from, but SSC should be cautious about asking people to do things if there is no funding available to ensure their attendance.

The SC then discussed some ideas – including a sculpture or monument about biodiversity by a great artist who is willing to depict the loss of biodiversity; and linking with WCPA on species and area-based planning. The MCSC noted that they would like to do something on trans-boundary high seas and economic exclusion zones, and would also like to have a public activity outside the conference – perhaps a concert with a more public message.

H Dublin asked the SC members to brainstorm with their sub-committees and SGs, and advised everyone to think of profiling the Mediterranean region too. She noted that some of the bigger ideas (such as the monument) would have to be submitted to the preparatory committee and asked the SC to do their homework before submitting ideas. H Dublin and R Mittermeier agreed that they would broach the subject of a monument with P Canals at the Council meeting. H Dublin noted that involving the CEC might be a good option as they are good at producing short films on specific topics. She also noted that a session at the Chairs’ Meeting might stimulate further discussions about resolutions for the WCC.

ACTIONS:

- H Dublin to send out the WCC information to the SC and SG Chairs as soon as it has been released.
- All SC members to submit their WCC proposals to the Chair’s Office by 9 May. The proposals should pay attention to the stream, kind of event and partners to work with.

9. SSC SUCCESS STORIES

The following recent success stories were shared by SC members:

- R Mittermeier stated that there are now over 100 lemur species identified in Madagascar.
- M Maunder commented that a new genus (name to be published soon) of Asteraceae (daisy) has been found in Cuba. It is a monotypic endemic and is restricted to 1km².
- R Mittermeier noted that the Madagascar pochard (a duck), which has not been seen since 1987 in the wild, has been re-discovered a long distance from where it used to occur. Local people do not hunt them and 18 or 19 individuals have been seen.
- M Maunder stated that the Hawaiian Plant SG has 186 species of less than 50 individuals and 15 species of less than five individuals. One of these, the *Cyanea grimesiana* subsp. *grimesiana* (Hawaiian name haha), was extinct in the wild, and went from 3 founder genus's to 500 and have now been reintroduced.

10. TIMING AND VENUES OF OCTOBER SC MEETING AND 2008 MEETINGS

The dates for the WCC3.6 are set for 13–16 October 2007 and the meeting will most probably take place in the People's Democratic Republic of Lao. Dates for the Chairs' Meeting are set as 11–14 February 2008, with the SC meeting taking place either side of it on 9-10 and 15 February. The last SC meeting of the Quadrennium will take place tentatively on 3 – 4 October, just before the WCC.

T Brooks called for a careful examination of the meeting agenda to ensure that the meetings do not cover items that can be done by conference calls or email.

The meeting closed at 16:37 on Friday 13 April by H Dublin thanking everyone for attending.