

RED LIST AUTHORITIES TERMS OF REFERENCE

The IUCN Species Survival Commission (SSC) is responsible for maintaining and developing the IUCN Red List of Threatened Species – widely regarded as the world’s most objective and comprehensive listing of species at risk of extinction. In order to maintain the credibility of the IUCN Red List, the SSC has formalized the process by which species can be included on the list. In particular, this process includes the designation of Red List Authorities (RLAs), the responsibilities of which are outlined in this document.

The Red List Assessment Process

Species assessments (including assessments of subspecies, varieties and subpopulations) submitted for inclusion on the IUCN Red List, are primarily done by members of Specialist Groups and Red List Authorities. One or more members of a Specialist Group typically do assessments, but in some cases where all members of an SG/RLA are consulted the assessment might be attributed to the group itself, or the assessment might be attributed to the participants of a specific assessment workshop.

However, assessments can be done by anyone and submitted to the IUCN Species Programme staff for consideration. In such circumstances, the IUCN Species Programme staff will screen the assessments for any major problems. If any problems are detected, the assessments will be returned to the assessor(s) with an explanation of the problems (corrected assessments can be resubmitted for further consideration). If no major problems are detected the Species Programme staff will forward the assessments and the details of the assessor(s) to the relevant Red List Authority Focal Point for evaluation (as outlined under point B of *Focal Point Responsibilities* below; noting where relevant the procedure for external assessments under the section on *Overlapping Red List Authority Jurisdictions* below). IUCN Species Programme staff will remain the main point of contact between external assessors and the RLA, but RLAs are welcome to make direct contact with the external assessor(s). Where no such RLA or Focal Point exists, the IUCN Species Programme staff will arrange for a formal review process of the assessment by appropriate experts, as required.

In all cases, every assessment submitted for consideration must go through the following process:

- a) Evaluation by at least two named members of an appropriate Red List Authority. If there is no Red List Authority for the species concerned, the IUCN Species Programme staff will arrange for the assessment to be evaluated by appropriate experts (this may include staff). The evaluation process is similar to the peer review process used by scientific journals in deciding which manuscripts to accept for publication (see under Evaluation below).
- b) Checking by the IUCN Species Programme staff (especially Global Assessment coordinators and the Red List Programme Office) for consistency in the application of the Red List Categories and Criteria, and the adequacy of all the supporting documentation.

The Standards and Petitions Working Group of the Biodiversity Assessments Sub-Committee also has the right to check assessments for accurate and consistent application of the Red List Categories and Criteria.

If deemed to be acceptable, the assessments will be processed and they will appear in a future update of the IUCN Red List. All rejected assessments will be sent back to the relevant assessor/s with an explanation for the rejection. The rejected assessments can then be revised and/or corrected following the guidance provided, and resubmitted for further consideration.

Appointment

The Chair of the IUCN Species Survival Commission (SSC) appoints Red List Authorities on the advice of the Biodiversity Assessments Sub-Committee and in discussion with the IUCN Species Programme, and, where applicable, the Plant Conservation Sub-Committee, the Invertebrate Conservation Sub-Committee, and the Marine Conservation Sub-Committee. Red List Authorities serve from the time of their appointment until the next meeting of the IUCN World Conservation Congress, after which they may be re-appointed. The Chair of the SSC may at any time revoke the appointment of a Red List Authority.

Red List Authority Membership and Governance

Red List Authorities are NOT individual people, but are groups of people who are either members of a specific SSC Specialist Group (SG) or are members of a specifically appointed Red List Authority (RLA) established to cover a certain (global or regional) taxonomic group. All members of a Specialist Group do not have to be members of the RLA. A variety of governance structures are possible within a Red List Authority, ranging from consensus style decision-making to regional sub-groups. The RLA Focal Point (see below) or the SG Chair (in the case of a Specialist Group appointed as an RLA) is, however, ultimately responsible for the overall governance of the RLA. The Focal Point will provide the IUCN Species Programme staff and the SSC Chair's office with an outline of the chosen governance structure.

The members of Red List Authorities will in most cases be appointed as IUCN SSC members, however, in certain instances the SSC Steering Committee may decide that members of a particular RLA should not be appointed as members of SSC (this may be as a result of a specific request by an RLA itself).

Overlapping Red List Authority Jurisdictions

Given the structure, taxonomic scope and geographic coverage of the SSC Specialist Groups and Red List Authorities, there is a degree of taxonomic overlap between some RLAs.

In the case of RLA assessments:

- When an RLA submits an evaluated assessment of a species for inclusion in the Red List, the IUCN Species Programme staff will inform the relevant overlapping RLA/s about the assessment.
- The overlapping RLA/s may request a copy of the assessment for evaluation.
- If the overlapping RLA/s disagree with the assessment or the supporting documentation, the IUCN Species Programme staff will put the respective RLAs in contact with each other to resolve the differences.

- If the changes are mutually agreed, the revised assessment will be accepted and all the evaluators from the RLAs involved will be acknowledged.
- If the differences cannot be resolved, the overlapping RLA/s may petition the assessment once it appears on the IUCN Red List.

In the case of external assessments:

- The IUCN Species Programme staff will send the assessment to the RLA who they deem is most appropriate to do the evaluation.
- The RLA should acknowledge receipt of the assessment and evaluate it as described above, informing the Species Programme staff of the outcome within three months of receiving the assessment (unless a longer time is agreed).
- If the RLA does not acknowledge receipt or fails to evaluate the assessment within the prescribed period, the Species Programme staff may use alternative evaluators.
- The overlapping RLA/s will be informed of the acceptance of any external assessments, and the process for dealing with overlapping RLA assessments described above will be followed.

Red List Authority Activities

The activities of the RLA include:

- a) Establishing mechanisms for assessing and monitoring the status and trends of species within the RLA's remit and preparing Red List assessments following IUCN's Red List Categories and Criteria and guidelines, using the Species Information Service as the means to submit data, unless another means is previously agreed with staff of the IUCN Species Programme;
- b) Working with the staff of the IUCN Species Programme to participate in relevant IUCN SSC global and regional biodiversity assessment processes and, as part of this, "populating" the Species Information Service with the most up-to-date information available on the species within their remit;

Red List Authority Focal Point

For those Specialist Groups appointed as a Red List Authority, the SG Chair must recommend to the SSC Chair one person to act as the Focal Point (the Chair may elect to take this role on themselves). For all other RLA's, the Focal Point is directly appointed by the Chair of SSC. In addition to specific activities listed below, the general responsibilities of the RLA Focal Point include:

- Overseeing and coordinating Red List activities within the group;
- Serving as the contact person between the RLA members and the various IUCN and SSC structures including the IUCN Species Programme staff, the SSC Biodiversity Assessments Sub-Committee (that oversees the Red List process), and the office of the Chair of SSC.

Focal Point Responsibilities

A. Assessment

Each RLA Focal Point is responsible for establishing mechanisms for assessing and monitoring the status and trends of species within the RLAs remit through:

1. Working closely with the IUCN Species Programme staff and any Global Species Assessment projects being implemented by IUCN and SSC;

2. Ensuring that the assessors are familiar with and up-to date with the Red List Categories and Criteria, and their application;
3. Requiring assessors to take full account of past and present literature (published and grey) and other reliable sources of information, relating to the taxon;
4. Assisting assessors to seek and locate the best available background data relating to the threats likely to affect the taxon;
5. Requiring assessors to consult internally within the Red List Authority, and externally with appropriate specialists and other interest groups;
6. Ensuring that for each assessment, the assessors provide supporting information in line with the minimum documentation requirements, as set out in Annex 1 to these Terms of Reference;
7. Ensuring that for each assessment, the assessors adhere to the agreed taxonomic standards adopted for use on the IUCN Red List (see http://www.iucnredlist.org/info/info_sources_quality.html and Annex 2);
8. Ensuring that all species are reassessed at least once every ten years, or if possible (resources permitting) once every five years;
9. Submitting the results of new assessments including changes in categorization or changes in supporting documentation to the IUCN Red List Programme Office in the format required using the Species Information Service (unless another means is previously agreed) and within schedules set for updates of the IUCN Red List of Threatened Species.

B. Evaluation

Each RLA Focal Point is responsible for verifying Red List assessments through:

1. Ensuring that at least two named evaluators agree the status of each taxon based on the supporting evidence;
2. Ensuring that the evaluators check the documentation provided and deem it to be adequate;
3. Ensuring that the evaluators are competent in the relevant fields;
4. Ensuring that the evaluators are familiar with and up-to date with the Red List Categories and Criteria, and their application;
5. Ensuring that the evaluators are completely familiar with the Red List documentation requirements;
6. Requiring evaluators where necessary to take account of past and present literature and other reliable sources of information, relating to the taxon;
7. Ensuring that the evaluators are not the same as the assessors, although some degree of overlap may be inevitable in cases where there are very few world experts. In such cases, at least one of the evaluators should not be an assessor;
8. Acknowledging receipt of external assessments sent by IUCN Species Programme staff to the RLA for evaluation;
9. Ensuring that the external assessments described under point 8 are evaluated and that within three months of receipt the IUCN Species Programme staff are informed of the outcome (unless a longer time is agreed);
10. Noting that failure to evaluate external assessments within the prescribed time period will result in the IUCN Species Programme staff using alternative evaluators.

C. Petitions Process

In the case of a petition against the listing of any taxon for which the RLA is responsible, the RLA Focal Point will:

1. Establish a process for handling the petition as set out in Annex 3 to these Terms of Reference;
2. Abide by any decisions of the arbitrating Standards and Petitions Working Group.

Red List Authority Deliverables:

- Focal Point contact information and description of the Red List Authority governance structure;
- Regular updates of species assessments consistent with the IUCN's work plan (in particular any relevant Global Species assessment projects) and resulting Species Programme staff requests;
- Prompt evaluation of external species assessments;
- Appropriate response to any petitions;
- A mechanism for delivery of relevant information from the RLA to relevant global and regional biodiversity assessment processes, using the Species Information Service.

All deliverables should be sent to the IUCN Red List Programme Office at redlist@ssc-uk.org

ANNEX 1

Documentation Requirements for Taxa Included on the IUCN Red List

Standard Documentation

The following is the **standard** set of information that should accompany every assessment submitted for incorporation into the IUCN Red List of Threatened Species, unless otherwise agreed with the Red List Programme Office:

- Higher taxonomy details including Kingdom, Phylum, Class, Order and Family
- Scientific name including authority details (includes infra-specific details if relevant)
- Name of subpopulation if relevant
- Common names in English, French and Spanish wherever possible
- Major synonyms (this should not be a complete synonymy – only those synonyms that are commonly used, or names that have been used on past Red Lists)
- Growth forms for plants
- Red List Category and Criteria (including sub-criteria) met following the rules laid down in the IUCN Red List Categories and Criteria (IUCN 2001)
- A rationale for the listing (including any numerical data, inferences or uncertainty that relate to the criteria and their thresholds – some of the numeric data will also be recorded in specific fields)
- Information on any changes in the Red List status of the taxon, and why the status has changed
- Countries of occurrence and sub-country units for large countries and islands far from mainland countries
- Occurrence in FAO Fisheries Areas (only marine taxa)
- Occurrence in Large Marine Ecosystems (only marine taxa)
- Occurrence in inland water bodies or systems (only inland water taxa)
- A GIS map of the extent of occurrence
- Altitudinal or depth information
- Current population trends (increasing, decreasing, stable or unknown)
- Major habitat preferences
- Major threats (past, present and future)
- Conservation measures in place and needed
- The utilization of the species (see under Optional Documentation below for livelihoods and ecosystems services)
- General notes about population, range, habitat and ecology, threats, what conservation measures are in place or needed, and comments on the utilization of the taxon
- Bibliography (cited in full; including unpublished data sources but not personal communications)
- Consultation process, including:
 - The name/s of the assessor/s who made the assessment
 - The names of at least two evaluators and the RLA/s involved in the evaluation process
 - Contact details for the assessor/s and evaluators

Additional Case-specific Documentation:

- In addition to the minimum documentation, the following information should also be supplied where appropriate:
- If a quantitative analysis is used for the assessment (i.e., Criterion E is used to trigger a listing), the data, assumptions, structural equations, and Population Viability Analysis model if used should be included as part of the documentation
- For Extinct or Extinct in the Wild taxa, extra documentation is required indicating the effective date of extinction, possible causes of the extinction, and the details of surveys which have been conducted to search for the taxon
- For taxa listed as Near Threatened, the rationale for listing should include a discussion of the criteria that are nearly met or the reasons for highlighting the taxon (e.g., they are dependent on ongoing conservation measures)
- For taxa listed as Data Deficient, the documentation should include what little information is available
- If the RAMAS® Red List software is used to make an assessment, additional guidance on how this should be done and details on what additional supporting documentation is required are given in Annex 3 of the IUCN Red List Categories and Criteria version 3.1 booklet (IUCN 2001)

Optional Documentation:

The Species Information Service contains tables, fields and options for recording additional information, these include:

- Widely used common names in other languages (specifying in each case the language of the name supplied)
- Life history details (e.g., life history details for fish, and breeding strategies for amphibians and reptiles)
- Occurrence in Land Cover units
- Livelihood information
- Ecosystems services

Reference:

IUCN 2001. *IUCN Red List Categories: Version 3.1*. Prepared by the IUCN Species Survival Commission. IUCN, Gland, Switzerland and Cambridge, UK. (See <http://www.iucn.org/themes/ssc/redlists/RLcategories2000.html> to download this document).

ANNEX 2

Taxonomic Standards to be followed in the IUCN Red List

Taxa Included on the IUCN Red List

The IUCN Red List includes global assessments for:

- species
- subspecies
- varieties (only for plants)
- geographically separate subpopulations

Geographically separate subpopulations of a species are defined as those populations that are so isolated from others of the same species that it is considered extremely unlikely that there is any genetic interchange. In general, listings of such subpopulations should be restricted to those that have been isolated for a long period of time.

Assessments of subspecies, varieties and geographically separate subpopulations must adhere to the same standards as for species assessments. However, these assessments will only be accepted provided there is a global assessment of the species as a whole.

The inclusion of newly described species will be addressed on a case-by-case basis. The Red List Authority and/or Species Programme staff should consult with relevant experts to ascertain how widely accepted these are. An exception will be made for highly distinct species that are clearly new.

The listing of undescribed taxa is discouraged, but in exceptional circumstances these may be included if:

- Evidence is provided that they are clearly distinct
- Clear distributional information can be provided
- There is a conservation benefit to listing the taxon (i.e., Data Deficient and Least Concern taxa would be excluded)
- They can be traced to a numbered voucher specimen in a named museum or herbarium

Details of the voucher collection must be cited as follows: collectors name, collection and/or voucher number, and museum or herbarium where housed (these details are made public unless there is a specific request not to do so).

Taxa Not Included on the IUCN Red List

- Taxa assessed locally, nationally or regionally are not considered for inclusion on the IUCN Red List of Threatened Species unless they are global assessments
- Hybrids (except for apomictic plant hybrids which are treated as 'species')
- Infra-specific ranks such as formas, subvarieties, cultivars, etc.
- Taxa known to have gone Extinct before 1500 AD
- Undescribed taxa assessed as Data Deficient or Least Concern
- Assessments of higher taxa (i.e., above the species level)

- Taxa that do not adhere to the general taxonomic standards outlined below

General Taxonomic Standards

1. All taxa assessed (with the exception of the undescribed taxa described above) must be validly published in accordance with the appropriate international nomenclatural codes and should be currently accepted names. Standard taxonomic checklists should be used wherever possible for names. The standard lists adopted by IUCN are periodically reviewed and listed on the Red List web site: http://www.iucnredlist.org/info/info_sources_quality.html . For many groups no standards are available, or there may be a valid reason for adopting another treatment. In such cases, the taxonomic treatment followed should be indicated and if not one of the standards followed by IUCN, the reference should be cited in full and a reason for the deviation given.
2. The following higher level taxonomic information must be provided for each taxon assessed: Kingdom, Phylum, Class, Order and Family.
3. The authorities for all specific and infra-specific names used in the Red List must be given following the appropriate nomenclatural rules. This should include the date of publication, except in the case of plant names. The abbreviations used for author names of plants should follow Brummitt and Powell (1992) and subsequent updates on the International Plant Names Index web site (<http://www.ipni.org/index.html>).
4. Any taxonomic problems or issues should be documented and appropriate synonyms should be listed if necessary. If appropriate, all relevant taxonomic literature should be cited in full.

Reference:

Brummitt, R.K. & Powell, C.E. 1992. *Authors of Plant Names*. Royal Botanic Gardens, Kew. (See http://www.ipni.org/searches/query_author.shtml for a searchable database)

ANNEX 3

Procedure for Handling of Petitions against Current Listings on the *IUCN Red List of Threatened Species*TM

Introduction

Status assessments presented in the *IUCN Red List of Threatened Species*TM are open to challenge. Petitions may be made against current listings of species, subspecies or geographic subpopulations (hereinafter referred to as species). Petitions against historical listings (i.e., those that have since been updated with a new listing for the taxon in question) are not considered. Petitions may only be made on the basis of the IUCN Red List Categories and Criteria (version 3.1 - http://www.iucnredlist.org/info/categories_criteria2001.html) and in reference to any supporting documentation accompanying the listing. It is not possible to change listings for political, emotional, economic, or other reasons not based on the Categories and Criteria.

Disagreements with Current Listings

Any party may contact the IUCN Red List Programme Office (RLPO) at any time to express disagreement with any current listing. If this disagreement is based on scientific or technical grounds, the RLPO will put this party in contact with the relevant Red List Authority (RLA) or assessor (in the absence of an RLA) with intention of resolving the disagreement without entering a formal petition process. In the event of a disagreement concerning the listing of a species that is in the process of being reassessed, the RLA will seek to involve the party expressing disagreement in the reassessment process, with the objective of reaching consensus on the new listing.

The Formal Petitions Process

If the above process is not successful in resolving the disagreement, a formal petition may be submitted. The attached flow diagram presents a summary of the formal petitions process; the process is described in greater detail below.

A formal petition should be very brief, and just summarizing the points of disagreement, with explicit reference to the criteria under which the species is listed (2 pages maximum). The steps to follow for filing petitions are outlined below:

Petition Submission and Validation

1. Petitions can be submitted to the RLPO at any time. The RLPO will acknowledge receipt of the petition, and will inform the petitioner of the date on which the petition was received.
2. The RLPO will consult with the SSC Biodiversity Assessments Standards and Petitions Working Group (SPWG) to determine whether or not the petition has been filed on the basis of the IUCN Red List Categories and Criteria. If the petition has not been made on the basis of the IUCN Red List Categories and Criteria, it will be returned to the petitioner by the RLPO with an explanation as to why the petition cannot be considered. This response will be sent to the petitioner within one month of the original receipt of the petition by the RLPO.

Discussion Between Parties

3. If the petition is made on the basis of the IUCN Red List Categories and Criteria, it will be referred by the RLPO to the RLA or particular assessor/s (if there is no

RLA) responsible for the taxon assessment in question (the RLA or assessor/s are hereafter just termed the RLA). Within one month of the original receipt of the petition, the RLPO will request the RLA and the petitioner to discuss the petition with the objective of reaching an agreement between them. The RLA and the petitioner will be given four months to reach agreement from the date that the RLPO refers the petition to them. In seeking to reach agreement, the RLA and the petitioner should determine whether or not they are using the same underlying data. They should clarify whether or not the disagreements are due to factual discrepancies, as opposed to differences of either interpretation or application of the IUCN Red List Categories and Criteria.

4. If the RLA agrees with the petition, or if the petitioner and the Red List Authority come to agreement, then any changes to the listing will be accepted. The change will appear in the following update of the IUCN Red List.
5. If the petitioner and the RLA are unable to agree within the time period set in no. 3 above, the petition will then enter the next stage in the process.

Justification Preparation and Submission

6. Within one week of the expiration of the time period set in no. 3 above, the RLPO will notify both the petitioner and the RLA that each of them should submit justifications for their case to the SPWG via the RLPO. The justifications should reach the RLPO within four months from the date that the RLPO issues this notification. These justifications should not be longer than 8 sides of A4 (excluding the list of references), 12-point print, and should provide the data to support their position. The justifications should include a synopsis of the failed negotiations, a brief statement of the reasons for the dispute, and a clarification of any factual discrepancies (e.g., different sources of data or information used). All data used in these justifications must either be referenced to publications that are available in the public domain, or else be made available to the SPWG. The data provided should be clearly linked to the use of the IUCN Red List Categories and Criteria. If the petitioner fails to submit a justification within the set time period and in the required format, the petition will be dropped, and the RLPO will inform the SPWG of this. If the RLA fails to submit a justification within the set time period and in the required format, the petition will go forward. Requests for an extension to the deadline for submitting justifications will not normally be considered, unless there are exceptional circumstances. Any request for such an extension should be submitted to the RLPO at least two weeks before the deadline, who will refer it to the Chair of the Biodiversity Assessments Sub-Committee. Generally, the maximum time limit to any requested delay is one month, with only one such request being considered from each party. However, in unusual circumstances, such as multiple petitions directed to the same RLA, a longer extension may be granted, at the discretion of the Chair.
7. The RLPO will send the justifications of each party to the other within one week of the time period set in no. 6 above, or within one week of both justifications having been received. Both parties have three weeks in which to provide a 1-page addendum to their justifications, should they choose to do so. Any addendums received after the three-week period will not be considered. The parties may not make any changes to the original justifications.
8. At the end of this three-week period, whether or not an addendum is received, the RLPO will send the justifications to all members of the SPWG for review and confidential comment. The SPWG may choose to circulate the justifications to

other independent expert reviewers for confidential comments. The Chair of the SPWG should if at all possible receive these comments within two months of the date of receipt of the justifications. If needed, the SPWG may seek clarification of particular issues from the RLA and the petitioner. In instances in which the RLA failed to submit a justification, the SPWG will make every effort to obtain a balanced set of confidential comments from reviewers.

Deliberation and Ruling

9. The SPWG will consider the justifications and the confidential reviews. It will make a ruling on each petition within four months from the time that the petitions were circulated to the SPWG members by the RLPO. In the case of multiple petitions, a longer period may be granted, at the discretion of the Chair of the Biodiversity Assessments Sub-Committee. The SPWG will issue a notification that will include a full rationale and explanation of each ruling, but will not include a record of the deliberations that the SPWG made to reach its decision, and the names of any reviewers will be kept confidential. The SPWG will send this notification to the RLPO.

Notification and Publication of Final Ruling

10. The RLPO will send the SPWG's notification to the petitioner and to the RLA. Any changes will appear in the next update of the *IUCN Red List of Threatened SpeciesTM*. The notification of the ruling on any petition, and any resulting change in listing, will be placed on the IUCN SSC Web Site.

Petitions Against Listings Based on an Old Version of the IUCN Red List Categories and Criteria

If a petition is made against a listing based on an old version of the IUCN Red List Categories and Criteria, and the petition is based on the Categories and Criteria, then the RLA in question will first be requested to update the listing so that it is based on the version of the Categories and Criteria currently in force. The RLA will be given six months to do this from the original receipt of the petition by the RLPO. The RLA should consider the additional information provided by the petitioner. Once the RLA has updated the listing, the petitioner will be so informed and asked whether or not they wish to proceed with the petition against the new listing. If the RLA fails to meet this deadline for updating the listing, the petition will proceed according to the process outlined in paragraphs 5-9 above, and the final ruling of the SPWG will provide an updated listing for the taxon in question, using the version of the Categories and Criteria currently in force.

General Principles

Acknowledging Communications. During the formal petitions process, the petitioner, the RLA, the SPWG, and the RLPO should acknowledge the receipt of all correspondence among them as soon as possible after arrival, so that any failure in delivery is detected as early as possible.

Confidentiality. While a petition is being considered, the associated documents (including justifications made by the petitioner and the RLA) are confidential documents that are not made available to third parties. The SPWG will circulate the justifications only to independent expert reviewers who agree to adhere to the confidentiality of the process and accept that their reviews will eventually be made public, but not attributed. Final rulings on petitions made by the SPWG will include

both justifications, and the reviews (without the names of the reviewers), in the documentation placed on the IUCN SSC website.

Repeated Petitions. In order to prevent continuing petitions on the same species, the SPWG will not accept a petition, subsequent to the first petition, if it is not based on new information.

Reassessment of Species Following a Petition. The first time that a species is reassessed following a petition, the reassessment will be reviewed by the SPWG.

Impartiality. The SSC Biodiversity Assessments Sub-Committee and the RLPO are responsible for ensuring that the process for handling petitions is adhered to, and that evaluations of petitions are carried out professionally and impartially. Prior to publishing the ruling on a petition, the Chair of the SPWG will send a brief report to the Chair of the Biodiversity Assessments Sub-Committee confirming that the above process was followed to reach the decision, or outlining any deviations from the process that had to be made. The SSC Biodiversity Assessment Sub-Committee (excluding the SPWG), the SSC Steering Committee, the SSC Chair, and the IUCN Secretariat (including the staff of the Red List Programme), have no rights to intervene in the petitions process, or to involve themselves in the substance of any petition.

Special Cases

Deviations from the Process. Every effort will be made to avoid deviations from the process as laid out, above. However, any petitions requiring such deviations should be approved in advance by the Chair of the Biodiversity Assessments Sub-Committee.

Complaints about the Petitions Process. If there is an assertion that the above procedure has been violated, then a formal and documented complaint may be submitted to the SSC Chair.

Flow Diagram of Formal Red List Petitions Process

- All timelines noted in the diagram below are based on the deadlines outlined in the petitions process. The actual timeline for a petition will depend on response times and requests for deadline extensions. Please refer to the petitions process document for details.
- Figures noted within the diagram refer to the steps outlined in the petitions process document (see *The Formal Petitions Process*).

