

SSC STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING WCC 3.5

BEIJING, CHINA, 13 – 16 OCTOBER 2007

MINUTES

TABLE OF CONTENTS

GLOSSARY OF ACCRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS USED.....	2
DECISIONS AND ACTION ITEMS TABLE.....	3
1. WELCOME, APOLOGIES, INTRODUCTIONS	8
1.1 Chair’s welcome	8
1.2 Apologies	8
2. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA	8
3. PREVIOUS MINUTES (WCC 3.5, CAPE TOWN, 11-13 APRIL 2007).....	8
4. MATTERS ARISING	8
4.1 SG/TF Chair appointments & RLA Focal Points appointments	8
4.2 Action items from WCC 3.5.....	9
5. UPDATES.....	13
5.1 Chair’s update.....	13
5.2 Species Programme update.....	14
5.4 SSC Task Force Updates	16
5.4.1 Species Conservation Planning Task Force (SCPTF)	16
5.5 SSC Sub-Committees updates: feedback and discussion.....	19
5.5.1 BASC and Assessment Updates (BASC)	19
5.5.2 Plant Conservation Sub-Committee (PCSC)	23
5.6 Other SSC Steering Committee Member Updates	24
5.6.1 Invasive Species SG (ISSG).....	24
6. SSC ISSUES	24
6.1 Form and Function for the Future.....	24
6.2 Specialist Group Chairs’ Meeting.....	27
6.3 World Conservation Congress Forum	28
6.4 China Session	28
7. FINANCES, FUNDRAISING AND COMMUNICATION.....	29
7.1 SSC Commission Operations Fund	29
7.2 Species Programme Finances.....	29
7.3 Fundraising	30
7.4 SSC/SP Communications.....	31
7.5 Branding with Red List Categories	33
8. SSC SUCCESS STORIES	33
9. TIMING AND VENUES OF 2008 STEERING COMMITTEE MEETINGS	34
10. ANY OTHER BUSINESS	34

GLOSSARY OF ACCRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS USED

AIS	Alien Invasive Species	MFF	Mangroves for the Future Initiative
BASC	Biodiversity Assessments Sub-Committee	MOU	Memorandum of Understanding
BGCI	Botanic Gardens Conservation International	PA	Protected area
BIP	Biodiversity Indicators Partnership	PCSC	Plant Conservation Sub-Committee
BISC	Biodiversity Indicators Sub-Committee	RL	Red List
BRAO	IUCN Region for West Africa	RLA	Red List Authority
CBD	Convention on Biological Diversity	RLU	Red List Unit
CBSG	Conservation Breeding Specialist Group	RLI	Red List Index
CEC	Commission on Education and Communications	RSG	Reintroduction Specialist Group
CI	Conservation International	SC	Steering Committee
CITES	Convention on the International Trade in Endangered Species	SCB	Society for Conservation Biology
COF	Commission Operations Fund	SCPTF	Species Conservation Planning TF
COP	Conference of Parties	SG	Specialist Group
CoReg	Commission online registration system	SIS	Species Information Service
CMS	Convention on Migratory Species	SP	Species Programme
CSWG	Classifications Schemes Working Group of BASC	SRLI	Sampled Red List Index
CSZ	Chicago Zoological Society	SSC	Species Survival Commission
DG	Director General	SUSC	Sustainable Use Sub-Committee
DEM	Data Entry Module (of the SIS)	TF	Task Force
GAA	Global Amphibian Assessment	ToR	Terms of Reference
GEF	Global Environment Facility	UAE	United Arab Emirates
GISD	Global Invasive Species Database	UN	United Nations
GISP	Global Invasive Species Programme	UNEP	United Nations Environment Programme
GMA	Global Mammal Assessment	UNSD	United National Statistical Division
GMO	Genetically Modified Organism	UWG	Users Working Group of BASC
GMSA	Global Marine Species Assessment	VSG	Veterinary Specialist Group
GSA	Global Species Assessment	WAZA	World Association of Zoos and Aquariums
ICSC	Invertebrate Conservation Sub-Committee	WESCANA	IUCN Region for West/Central Asia and North Africa
IMoSEB	International Mechanism on Scientific Expertise on Biodiversity	WCC	World Conservation Congress
ISSG	Invasives Species Specialist Group	WCMC	World Conservation Monitoring Centre
IUCN	The World Conservation Union	WCPA	World Commission on Protected Areas
LPI	Living Planet Index	WCS	Wildlife Conservation Society
MCSC	Marine Conservation Sub-Committee	WG	Working Group
MDG	Millennium Developmental Goals	WI	Wetlands International
MEA	Millennium Ecosystem Assessment	WWF	World Wide Fund for Nature

DECISIONS AND ACTION ITEMS TABLE

Decisions made at WCC 3.6:

- The Sciaenid (croakers and drums) and the Caucasus Plants RLAs are formed, and will remain in place until the end of the Quadrennium.
- The name of the Veterinary SG has been changed to the Wildlife Health SG
- The species conservation planning guidelines should be guidelines for an endorsed SSC process rather than an endorsed SSC product.
- BASC is to develop a draft policy on taxonomic standards for consideration by the SC.
- The June 2008 deadline for the GMA is accepted. The expectation is that all the mammal data will be in the 2008 Red List. There will be a peer-reviewed paper submitted between then and the WCC4, and a GMA-related product will be launched at the WCC4.
- The next GSA (GSA2) should be produced for 2010 allowing plenty of lead time to plan the document, identify target audiences, determine how impact will be measured, and secure funds and commitments.
- A number of fact sheets should be produced for WCC4 (including those for which there are contractual obligations to deliver a product or publication). These sheets should be stand-alone, attractive documents that can be contained in a folder. The entire set should be launched at the first SSC session of the Forum. The launch should take the goal for a reduced-paper WCC4 seriously and therefore delegates should be given an option of what sheets they would like to take away
- Regarding the backlog at the RLU, the SC agreed that the Red List process should be improved as per the guidance in the SSC redesign proposal. The onus should be on the RLA to oversee both the assessments and the evaluations of assessments. The ideal situation should be that the assessments are evaluated and then submitted to the RLU with all the appropriate documentation. This will help to ensure that the primary role of the RLU is that of consistency checking for adherence to the Red List Categories and Criteria, and attempt to prevent further backlogs at the RLU.
- The Key Species Results (as per the modified draft submitted to the Global Programme Team) were accepted with several agreed modifications.
- The proposed redesign of the Commission as presented by the Restructuring TF was accepted with the agreed modifications. The SC agreed to be leaders in the change process.
- All documentation regarding the redesign should be available online for the SG Chairs' Meeting by 15 December 2007.
- The session on transboundary marine PAs must be submitted for a normal alliance workshop slot and one of the SSC six slots will be used a session on climate change as per the agreement with the MacArthur Foundation.
- A document detailing the current and future scope of "SIS" will be made available to the SC in order to ensure that the SC can all refer to the tool in the same way.

Action Items Table:

<u>Who</u>	<u>Action Item</u>	<u>Agenda Item</u>	<u>Timeline</u>
C Poole	Send appropriate Letters of Agreement to the Focal Points of the newly established RLA and include them in the SG Chairs' Meeting arrangements.	4.1 SG and RLA appointments	Immediately
M Maunder	Talk to L Boitani about restructuring as it relates to plant portion of SSC network. Assistance should be sought from P McLagan if necessary.	4.2 Action item from WCC3.5	asap
BASC	Continue thinking on the GISD and follow the fundraising discussions between JC Vié and G Howard.	4.2 Action item from WCC3.5	asap
J Smart	Further discuss the issue of the Conservation Commons with W Jackson.	4.2 Further Action Item from WCC 3.5	asap
Species team (through J Smart)	Interview M Chouchena-Rojas and G Mace regarding the outcome of the consultative process towards an IMoSEB for the June 2008 edition of <i>Species</i> .	4.2 Further Action Item from WCC 3.5	Before June 2008 <i>Species</i> deadline
J Smart	Talk to the Director of Operations about the indemnity of assessors and evaluators.	4.2 Further Action Item from WCC 3.5	asap
J Smart	Ensure that the exact number of SSC members in CoReg is announced to the SC.	5.2 SP Update	asap
C Poole	Liaise with C Thouless and P McLagan as to how to present the findings of the Chairs' Consultation to the SG Chairs' Meeting and explore what follow up could be possible there.	5.3 Chairs' Consultation	Immediately
R Lacy	Complete species conservation planning guidelines; then send them to B Pressey and a select group of SG Chairs for comment and testing. The guidelines should be presented at the SG Chairs' Meeting for further comment, endorsed by the SSC SC at their next meeting and then launched at the WCC together with the draft "how to" manual.	5.4.1 SCPTF	asap If in Chairs' Meeting Pack, then by 31 December
J Smart and R Lacy	Work with J Ragle, J Blanc and S Hedges on how SIS can incorporate the new data that will be collected as part of the species conservation planning processes.	5.4.1 SCPTF	asap
BASC	In the context of the proposed RL Journal, research the desires of the individuals of the SSC network in terms of whether a journal would best address how they wish to be recognised and whether a journal would, in fact, create incentives for an expansion of Red List assessments in a broader taxonomic realm.	5.5.1 BASC issues	asap
BASC	Develop a draft policy on taxonomic standards for consideration by the SC.	5.5.1 BASC issues	asap
J Smart and JC Vié	Immediately begin work on the fact sheets and folder for the WCC4.	5.5.1 BASC issues	asap
J Smart	Take steps to begin planning for the 2010 GSA2	5.5.1 BASC issues	asap
RLU (through J Smart)	Provide a full analysis of the entire backlog at the RLU.	5.5.2 PCSC issues	Next SC meeting
RLU (through J Smart)	Undertake an analysis if which RLAs are functioning and which are not.	5.5.2 PCSC issues	asap
RLU (through J Smart)	Undertake the following with regards to the current backlog: - If the current backlogged assessment has been evaluated and approved by the RLA, it can be entered into the RL database. There should be some practical flexibility regarding the format of these assessments as some may have been done before the DEM was functional.	5.5.2 PCSC issues	asap

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - If the assessment has been evaluated by an RLA and there is a functioning RLA, but the RLU still has some concerns over its accuracy, the assessment should be entered into the RL database and the RLA informed of any concerns. - All other currently backlogged assessments should be returned to the relevant RLAs or Sub-Committee if there is no functioning RLA for further action. - Currently backlogged assessments that are incorrect and there is no functioning RLA or Sub-Committee should be forwarded to the SSC SC for further guidance. 		
J Smart and H Dublin	Assist the RLU in those instances where there may be sensitivities when assessments are sent back to the RLA or assessor(s).	5.5.2 PCSC issues	When relevant
BASC	As per their ToR, must consider all the assessment work it is recommending and actively think of the implications for the SP staff and the SSC network, keeping in mind the need for adequate resources to support the work called for.	5.5.2 PCSC issues	Ongoing
BASC	Work closely with PCSC regarding the various options for the prioritisation of plant assessments so that a clear way forward is presented at the next SC meeting.	5.5.2 PCSC issues	asap
C Imboden and KSR team	Update the Key Species Results as follows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Ensure that none of the KSR have a specific taxonomic focus (especially KSR 5.1), - Ensure that the wording of 1.1 incorporates other organisations as well as the IUCN regions - Remove any references to the “how” in the KSR – i.e. the KSR should be shortened and should not include activities or SMART wording. 	6.1 Form & Function for the Future – strategic planning	asap
C Imboden et al (Chair's Office and SP Office)	Following feedback from the Programme Planning meeting at IUCN Headquarters, fill out the targets in the Species Component Plan and send it out for comment to the SC. The Component Programme and Strategic Plan framework are to be approved at the SC meeting in Abu Dhabi. A draft Strategic Plan could be included in the pack for SG Chairs' Meeting (not as agenda item), and the Chairs should be invited to read it and comment on any refinements they wish to see.	6.1 Form & Function for the Future – strategic planning	asap
C Imboden	Tturn the three main points of State, Pressure, Response into the SSC Mandate for approval at the February SC meeting. The mandate will then go to the March Council meeting. Care should be taken that the wording in the aspirations are correct (i.e. the use of the words “a” and “the”).	6.1 Form & Function for the Future – strategic planning	Next SC meeting
C Imboden	When drafting the targets, pay attention to whether there are resolutions for the WCC4 that would bolster or facilitate the mandate of the SSC.	6.1 Form & Function for the Future – strategic planning	asap
J Smart, T Brooks, M Samways, Y Sadovy + possibly M Maunder & L Bennun	Look at and further clarify the specific issues and needs related to the Red List assessment side of the redesign – particularly in terms of monitoring the current Red List Authorities and noting how functional they are.	6.1 Form & Function for the Future – Redesign	Immediately

H Dublin, R Kock and C Thouless	Further clarify and address specific issues and needs relating to the conservation action side of the redesign. This should mainly involved looking at the terminology used in the document.	6.1 Form & Function for the Future – Redesign	asap
Restructuring TF	Prepare a Redesign Statement, which includes the key features of the redesign and a rationale for each element.	6.1 Form & Function – Redesign	asap
Restructuring TF	Prepare two documents for the Chairs' Meeting: a) A Question & Answer document that will be a short précis on the main features of the redesign. b) An updated version of the document provided for the SC meeting pack for the Chairs to download and read before the meeting.	6.1 Form & Function for the Future – Redesign	15 December
P McLagan & C Thouless	Finalise a draft agenda.	6.2 Chairs' Meeting	Online by 15 December
All SC members	Send through comments on the design and ideas for the agenda to the meeting organisation team	6.2 Chairs' Meeting	asap
All SC members	Think about what Congress Resolutions might be appropriate to be raised at the SG Chairs' Meeting.	6.2 Chairs' Meeting	asap
All SC members	Those who are submitting Forum proposals should send CP their reference numbers	6.3 WCC4	asap
R Kock	Talk to the International Institute for the Environment and Development (IIED), as they are looking for ways to engage and they could be an appropriate partner for the species and livelihoods session.	6.3 WCC4	asap
C Campagna	Work with T Sandwith (of WCPA) to submit their session on transboundary marine PAs as an additional alliance workshop proposal.	6.3 WCC4	asap
C Thouless and W Foden	Put together a short paragraph on the MacArthur Foundation climate change work and submit it as one of the six SSC session by 31 October. They should have a creative list of partners for the session.	6.3 WCC4	asap
All SC members	Send C Thouless any innovative ideas they may have to make the six SSC sessions as interactive and engaging as possible.	6.3 WCC4	asap
All Sub-Committee Chairs	Inform the Chair's Office of their plans for next year and whether they will require a similar allocation to 2007 for their 2008 budgets.	7.1 SSC COF	asap
C Poole	Send out detailed instructions on how to claim from the COF, as the IUCN Headquarters finance department has issued some new instructions.	7.1 SSC COF	Early 2008
H Dublin	Send out the article in Science on meeting travel in the science sector.	7.1 SSC COF	asap
J Smart	Double-check if there is a local nature of Google Adsense adverts (i.e. whether adverts are different if you are logging on from different parts of the world) and, if so, how this will affect the monitoring of content that is needed during the first part of the trial period.	7.3 Fundraising	asap
J Smart	Go ahead with trial period for website advertising via Google Adsense and return to the SC at the next meeting with an analysis of the money generated.	7.3 Fundraising	asap
R Mittermeier	Put J Smart in touch with the department at CI that manages their online donation facilities.	7.3 Fundraising	asap
J Smart	Investigate the wording of the site for maximum impact and to find ways to optimise the use of the button with advice from CI's marketing department.	7.3 Fundraising	asap
J Smart	Showcase the online donation facility at the SG Chairs' Meeting. Ask for feedback on how to optimise its use, and for help with content and compelling copy to encourage people to return to the site regularly.	7.3 Fundraising	At SG Chairs' Meeting

J Smart	Ensure that the Network Support Officers share the fundraising tracking spreadsheet with the Chair's Office when there have been significant updates	7.3 Fundraising	Ongoing
J Smart	Ensure that the webpage for the Sir Peter Scott Fund is modernised with news of current projects and in line with the SSC redesign ideas for profiling and enhancing our conservation work.	7.3 Fundraising	asap
SP and SSC Chair's Office	Consider the name of the Sir Peter Scott Fund so as to clarify the fund's focus on conservation action.	7.3 Fundraising	asap
R Mittermeier	Investigate the publications costs if <i>Species</i> were to be printed and distributed from Colombia	7.4 Communications	asap
F Launay and J Smart	Investigate the possibility of approaching a courier company to sponsor the distribution of <i>Species</i> for a contracted time period. F Launay to particularly investigate whether the current arrangement with the Reintroduction SG newsletter could also incorporate <i>Species</i> .	7.4 Communications	asap
J Smart and <i>Species</i> editorial team	Review the suggestions mentioned by the SC regarding <i>Species</i> and look at ways to improve the content of <i>Species</i> .	7.4 Communications	asap
SG Chairs' Meeting Organisers	Set up a suggestion desk at the SG Chairs' Meeting to collect more ideas on improvements to <i>Species</i> .	7.4 Communications	asap
J Smart and e-bulletin editorial team	Review the SC members' suggestions regarding the e-bulletin and investigate ways to optimise its content and distribution. Most importantly, the e-bulletin should be distributed to all SSC members on Co-Reg.	7.4 Communications	asap
H Dublin	Contact Chair of CEC for more information on how they produce their e-newsletter.	7.4 Communications	asap
J Ragle (Through J Smart)	Draft one page document on what the "SIS" is now, what it is not, what it will become and what it will never become. This should be distributed to the SC members as soon as possible and then become part of the pack for the SG Chairs' Meeting.	10. Any other Business - SIS	For SG Chairs' Meeting pack
All SC members	Familiarise themselves with the document drafted by J Ragle so that they can answer pertinent questions that may arise at the SG Chairs' Meeting.	10. Any other Business - SIS	Before SG Chairs' Meeting
J Smart and J Ragle	Allocate time at the SG Chairs' Meeting in the SP session towards making it very clear to all present exactly what has been achieved with regards to the vision that is SIS.	10. Any other Business - SIS	asap
J Smart and J Ragle	Ensure that the ESRI donation of software is one that includes regular version updates to software and service agreements.	10. Any other Business - SIS	asap

1. WELCOME, APOLOGIES, INTRODUCTIONS

1.1 Chair's welcome

At 08:40 on Saturday 13 October 2007, the SSC Chair welcomed all the SC members to the sixth SSC Steering Committee meeting of the quadrennium. H Dublin noted that the agenda for the meeting contained some of the most substantive issues of the quadrennium and thanked everyone for being so involved.

H Dublin congratulated G Mace on being awarded the Cosmos Prize.

1.2 Apologies

The following people attended the meeting:

SSC Steering Committee: H Dublin, F Launay, R Kock, G Mace, M Samways, Y Sadovy, T Brooks, R Lacy, C Imboden, J Robinson, L Boitani, R Mittermeier (15-16 October only).

Species Programme: J Smart

SSC Chair's Office: C Poole, C Thouless

Change Management Advisor: P McLagan

Apologies were received from Steering Committee members: M Clout, M Maunder, J Hutton, C Campagna and L Bennun; as well as JC Vié from the Species Programme.

H Dublin commented that those SC members who were unable to attend the meeting had been asked to give feedback in writing prior to the meeting on certain issues – particularly the issue of the redesign.

2. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

H Dublin commented that the timing of the agenda needed to be flexible, although some items had definite timings allocated – such as the China Session – due to the attendance of other colleagues and partners. The agenda was adopted, with an additional item on the Species Information Service (SIS) being added under Any Other Business.

3. PREVIOUS MINUTES (WCC 3.5, Cape Town, 11-13 April 2007)

H Dublin noted that the minutes of WCC3.5 had been adopted by the SC and the final version had been uploaded to the SSC website. She also commented that improvements to the Executive Summary will continue. She implored everyone to assist C Poole in capturing action items and decisions correctly while matters remained fresh in their minds.

4. MATTERS ARISING

4.1 SG/TF Chair appointments & RLA Focal Points appointments

C Poole gave a brief update on the status of SG Chair and RLA Focal Point appointments, as follows:

- Ms D Raimondo has been appointed as the Chair of the Southern Africa Plant SG
- Dr B Talukdar has been appointed as the Co-Chair of the Asian Rhino SG
- Two Specialist Groups remain Chair-less: The SSC/WI Duck SG and the Sirenia SG.
- Four Chairs have yet to sign their Letter of Agreement (M Fay – Orchid SG; B Eichhorst – SSC/WI Grebe SG; J Beekman – SSC/WI Swan SG; D Stroud – SSC/WI Wader SG); and the latter three groups have not sent in their membership lists for registration on CoReg.

The appointment of RLA Focal Points is completed. H Dublin mentioned that the BASC has made a recommendation for the establishment of two new RLAs – one from the marine sector of the network and one from the plant sector. After a brief discussion where T Brooks assured the SC that Focal Points for these RLAs have been identified and that the RLAs are definitely deemed necessary by BASC, the SC agreed that these two RLAs should be formed.

DECISION: The Sciaenid (croakers and drums) and the Caucasus Plants RLAs are formed, and will remain in place until the end of the Quadrennium.

ACTION: C Poole to send appropriate Letters of Agreement to the Focal Points of the newly established RLAs and include them in the SG Chairs' Meeting arrangements.

4.2 Action items from WCC 3.5

The following is the Action Items Table from WCC3.5 with the status column indicating the comments given at WCC3.6 on progress. Where a lengthy discussion took place, it is recorded below the table, as are follow-up action items.

<u>Who</u>	<u>Action Item</u>	<u>Agenda Item</u>	<u>Status</u>
C Poole	Draft Executive Summary of minutes as separate document	3. Prev Minutes	Completed
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 apmnts	Completed. H Dublin noted that this was a good appointment as the other Co-Chair is ill.
H Dublin / C Poole	Send formal letter of invitation to the proposed Sirenia SG Chair	4.1 SG/TF Chair apmnts	H Dublin to meet members at Marine Mammalogy Conference in late November in Cape Town.
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	Abigail Powell has in hand, currently in progress
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	Manuscript in review
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	Known for most regional initiatives that contribute to Global Red List but not on NatureServe regional assessments or CAMP workshops or National assessments. Very few initiatives are not directly implemented by SP. Regional RL coordinators are with the SP (Mediterranean, future European and Oceania coordinators). H Dublin said that although a number of regional offices have put regional red listing as a target in their programme plans, many do not understand the implications. J Smart said J Griffin and D Cator have been briefed to talk to the regions on this issue.
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 bring up the item at the PPC again.	4.3 Further Action Item from WCC 3.4	J Smart was unable to attend the meeting, therefore this matter is still pending. H Dublin noted that much is still unclear about the governance and mandate of this body.
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 Item from WCC 3.4	Completed
H Dublin	Continue discussions with C Hails and J Baillie regarding the linkages between SIS and the LPI	Further item from WCC 3.4	Ongoing, C Hails will respond shortly. WWF International is also going through restructuring.
H Dublin	Ask M Chouchena-Rojas to write an article for Species regarding IMoSEB.	4.3 Further item from WCC 3.4	A McMullin made request and M Chouchena-Rojas was willing but no article was written. H Dublin suggested that the Species team interview her and G Mace for the June 2008 edition of Species, as by then the consultative process will be over.

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	Completed. R Mohammed provided a weblink for further information. H Dublin reiterated that the concerns of the SC were that the biodiversity outcomes of this agreement are not well defined. She said that this issue would be raised in Council and that business and biodiversity should possibly be an item on the agenda for the next SC meeting.
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	Done and submitted
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	Did send out, had three responses. It is moving through.
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	Complete; no internal consistency issues have been found.
J Smart, G Schatz & PCSC	Revise Red List review document to incorporate comments received, modifying it to include five assessment approaches discussed	5.3.3 PCSC	Not done; superseded by other events. Not best use of limited resources.
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	Done
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 Red List website, including how visitors will be referred to herbaria links.	5.3.3 PCSC	Sent from S Stuart (BASC) to M Maunder (PCSC)
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	Ongoing. Correct procedures are being defined for moving issues through the Sub-Committees to the SC.
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	Done; document in information pack. Further discussion under 5.5.2.
RLU (through J Smart)	Inform the SSC SC as to the time line and plan for processing the backlog.	5.3.3 PCSC	Done; document in information pack. Further discussion under 5.5.2
RLU (through J Smart)	Prepare a statement to be sent to assessment providers regarding an honest indication of the time needed to process submitted Red List assessments.	5.3.3 PCSC	To be done
M Maunder / L Boitani	Talk to L Boitani about restructuring as relating to plant portion of SSC network	5.3.3 PCSC	Not yet done
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	C Pollock sent to N Ash

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	Addressed by e-mail from S. Stuart to M Maunder
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	Not done – assuming no major concerns
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	Changes to RLA ToR pending as other ongoing processes will also require revisions (pre-publication data access, guidelines of data use). May be delayed right through to next quadrennium.
BASC	Establish a process for linking the CSWG work on utilisation schemes with the relevant taxonomic SGs and SUSG.	5.3.5 BASC	Current work on Utilisation CS completed by CSWG. Ongoing fundraising effort for further work involving SUSG and other SGs. Funding being sought for workshop.
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	The specifics of the issue need to be taken up with IUCN's insurance broker. The adequacy of IUCN's general liability insurance coverage worldwide has come under spotlight and is being reviewed by Global Operations. The management of the risk associated with the Red List process should be part of this review, but it is not clear whether it will be. H Dublin noted that this issue is being pushed as much as possible and the redesign will require full explanations as it relates to this issue.
BASC	Inform SSC SC regarding progress and plans for the Guidelines for Collection.	5.3.5 BASC	Scientific collecting guidelines will be an annex to broader guidelines being prepared on use of the Red List.
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	5.4.1 SCPTF	This was discussed at the SCB and B Pressey has agreed to include comments in the guidelines. Further liaison with SCPTF will occur as necessary.
H Dublin	Circulate her PowerPoint on restructuring (used at the Madagascar SC meeting) to the SC.	5.4.2 RTF	Completed
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	Meeting was held with the UK pharmaceutical representatives on 27 July 2007. IUCN is now accepted as the main convener of this process. International pharmaceutical associations and other NGOs are becoming involved.
R Kock	Initiate change in the name of the SG and finalise the new website and appropriate hyperlinks.	5.5.1 Vet SG	Ongoing. Membership was contacted and comments collated. A decision was taken to change the name of the group to the Wildlife Health SG. Discussions on the Website will take place.
BASC	Discuss the GISD to investigate the improvement of linkages with the Red List database in order to better serve current and future needs.	5.5.2 ISSG	Ongoing fundraising discussion between JC Vié and G Howard. H Dublin noted that BASC should take note of this issue as there will be changes to the current ISSG. At present the database cannot necessarily be used for what SSC requires.
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	Current arrangement satisfactory
M Maunder	Bring Amphibian story to the attention of the Gore climate change team.	5.5.4 CBSG	Done
H Dublin & R Mittermeier	Take the SSC concerns about the draft IUCN 2009-2012 Programme to the May Council meeting.	Strategic Planning	Done. H Dublin commented that some of the diagrams were changed, but the actual programme framework remained the same. She noted that it would likely be brought up in Council in November.
C Imboden	Redo Strategic Planning Table in electronic form and send it out to all SC members and relevant senior SP staff	Strategic Planning	Done Discussed under item 6.1

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	Ongoing
C Imboden & C Poole	Focus on the targets/outcome that are not catered for under the Sub-Committees (e.g. disciplinary groups).	Strategic Planning	Ongoing
C Imboden	Present a draft Strategic Plan at the October SC meeting	Strategic Planning	Ongoing – Discussed under Item 6.1
C Imboden	Have further draft Strategic Plan ready for presentation at Chairs' Meeting	Strategic Planning	Ongoing – Discussed under Item 6.1
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	BC list submitted in information pack. Discussion under Item 7.2
J Smart/ H Dublin	Look for ways to set up a system whereby online donors can choose whether they would like to support to Red List 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 Fund-raising	Done. For the Red List launch donors had a choice between Red List and SSC SG support. Flexibility is required. Further discussion under Item 7.2
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 Comms	Draft document has been developed. Further discussion under Item 7.5
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	B Lacy polled the CBSG SC regarding the branding of SSC Red List categories and found enthusiastic support. J Smart thanked R Lacy for his efforts and noted that the comments and suggestions are very helpful.
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	Done
J Smart	Investigate what other programmatic work has contractual obligations with 2008 deadlines for outputs or deliverables.	8.1 GSA2	GMA is not a contractual obligation but needs to be completed for reputation reasons. Possibly some European assessments. Some African freshwater assessment. The GMSA. The climate change MacArthur Foundation project. H Dublin noted that the MacArthur Foundation do want a session at WCC.
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	In hand, JC leading
H Dublin	Send out the WCC information to the SC and SG Chairs as soon as it has been released.	8.4 WCC4	Completed
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	Completed. WCC is already absorbing much of the time in the Chair's Office and in the SP. Much collaboration taking place on the reviewing, and it seems we have quite a large amount of influence as to what is accepted for the WCC Forum.

DECISION MADE REGARDING ACTION ITEMS FROM WCC3.5:

- The name of the Veterinary SG has been changed to the Wildlife Health SG

REMAINING ACTION ITEMS FROM WCC3.5:

- M Maunder to talk to L Boitani about restructuring as it relates to plant portion of SSC network. Assistance should be sought from P McLagan if necessary.
- BASC to continue thinking on the GISD and follow the fundraising discussions between JC Vié and G Howard.

FOLLOW-UP ACTION ITEMS FROM WCC3.5:

- J Smart to further discuss the issue of the Conservation Commons with W Jackson.
- *Species* team (through J Smart) to interview M Chouchena-Rojas and G Mace regarding the outcome of the consultative process towards an IMoSEB for the June 2008 edition of *Species*.
- J Smart to talk to the Director of Operations about the indemnity of assessors and evaluators.

5. UPDATES

5.1 Chair's update

H Dublin gave a short presentation about the activities of the last six months:

Administration

- C Thouless has been appointed as part-time SSC Senior Commission Officer and all the SC members are encouraged to interact with him as much as possible.
- S Vosse, the George B Rabb Intern in the office of the SSC Chair, will be moving on to further her career. A new intern will be sought.

Governance

- There are many ongoing activities of the IUCN Council, which is delving into issues in more substantial ways.
- BASC has only had one meeting this year, but a number of BASC issues and processes have been dealt with, thanks to the hard work of S Stuart and T Brooks.
- SUSC had a good meeting in White Oak, Florida. There are two main areas of interest: one to continue working on understanding the factors involved with making use sustainable, while the other focuses on more conceptual undertakings, including resilience theory and socio-ecological systems. In future, it might be necessary to undertake the latter in close collaboration with other parts of IUCN.
- H Dublin attended the CBSG meeting and gave keynote address at the WAZA meeting. WAZA was extremely grateful and much positive feedback was received. CBSG will need to make some changes in response to the changing needs of the SSC, but R Lacy has an excellent core group of motivated people and they are feeling positive about the appropriate roles of CBSG.
- The SCPTF meeting was very energetic, constructive and productive.

Programmatic and Partnership meetings

- H Dublin attended the WCPA Protected Areas Categories Summit. The new category definitions under debate more closely align the categories to the needs of conserving biodiversity. In line with a resolution of the WCC, WCPA plan to modify the guidelines for application of the categories, but do not want to change the categories.
- The African Elephant Range States Dialogue at the CITES COP14 was an unhappy and unproductive meeting and there is a possibility IUCN may be asked to again facilitate these meetings in future.
- The role of the SSC and its SGs was recognised CITES CoP14 and things are progressing well on joint work with the CITES Secretariat.
- There are ongoing issues with the 2010 BIP project, mostly because funding for IUCN's participation is limited and too much IUCN time is being invested. The MDG indicator

process is progressing and the proposal for the RLI to be accepted as one measure of the new biodiversity indicator under MDG7 target 9bis will be put to the UN General Assembly in early 2008. The draft MOU between IUCN and UNEP includes this issue.

- The Society for Conservation Biology meeting in Port Elizabeth was good and the SSC/SP booth was a success. Many links with the IUCN and SSC were showcased.
- The Wetlands International CEO, J Madgwick, has been contacted and the SSC redesign discussed. WI currently has a consultant looking at their Expert Network, which includes the joint WI/SSC SGs, but little is known about their plans. H Dublin commented that she feels it is essential to make sure the Chairs of the joint SGs are not feeling uncomfortable about where they stand in the SSC redesign process and she hopes J Madgwick will join her in sending a joint message out to these Chairs soon.
- The Encyclopaedia of Life / GSIS (EU) discussions are ongoing and a big effort has been made to inform the European Commission about our SIS. They definitely want a link with IUCN / SSC regarding the conservation content of these initiatives. This will most likely necessitate an MOU so that IUCN can be considered an institutional partner in both.
- H Dublin attended the Cheetah Conservation Fund annual fundraising dinner as guest speaker and sat next to the Namibian President - an interesting dinner companion. She also attended the Leadership for Conservation for Africa Initiative meeting – which is an initiative to link private sector with government conservation efforts in Africa.

Internal Consultations and Meeting preparations

- The SC meeting, SG Chairs' Meeting and IUCN Council meeting preparations have all taken considerable time.
- The programme planning for the 2009-2012 Quadrennium was successful in that there was excellent collaboration with the SP, with other global thematic programmes and with the IUCN Regional Offices.

External consultations and meeting preparations

- The Biodiversity Information for Development (BID, the longer term vision of IBAT/Proteus) discussions are continuing and a new meeting date has been set for 26 November 2007.
- The UNEP – IUCN MOU continues to be discussed in detail.

Work with the regions

Work with IUCN Region and country offices continues, including: work with the Tata group (Headquartered in Asia) on flamingos and marine turtles; antelope issues in the WESCANA and BRAO regions; tiger issues in Asia; the northern white rhino and mountain gorilla issues in the Democratic Republic of Congo; Cape fur seals in Namibia; and hunting concessions in Tanzania.

5.2 Species Programme update

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

Assessment Work

- The GMA team was reformed and many staff reassigned to ensure completion. There is a shortfall in funding and some of the team are working on fundraising. Thanks to L Boitani and G Mace who have offered staff time to assist with the processing of data. J Smart noted that there will be credibility issues to be faced if the final GMA is not delivered by the WCC4.
- Although some reptiles are scheduled to be entered into the 2008 Red List, the GRA and the GAA are on hold because of the staff reallocation to the GMA. The book "Threatened Amphibians of the World" is in press.
- The plants assessments will progress through a "plants for people" approach. The six country workshops for the original GEF-sponsored plants projects have gone well, and there are discussions ongoing with BGCI with regard to what a new project, entitled "Plants for Posterity" would contain. A demonstration of RapidList and a presentation on the SSC SG's contributions to the GSPC were given at the SBSTTA meeting in Paris.

- The GMSA is proceeding well and has excellent linkages with the MCSC. The marine representation on the 2008 Red List will be substantially larger.
- The Freshwater Biodiversity Assessments continue and a small amount of funding is needed to leverage a large amount from the EU. There are excellent linkages with the Freshwater Fish SG.
- Some invertebrates are being captured through freshwater assessments and the SRLI.

Trade and Use, and Climate Change

- The Species Trade and Use Unit put a large amount of work into the Analyses of the Proposals to Amend the CITES Appendices. The work of SSC was highly commended from the floor at the CITES CoP14. The STUU, with TRAFFIC, have been contracted by CITES to carry out Review of Significant Trade for 23 selected species. The STUU is also involved in development of the use and livelihoods components of the species assessments through the CSWG. Funding was raised through the partnership with University of Cambridge to continue work on the Sustainable Use Project, to identify factors that contribute to sustainable utilisation of species
- The new Climate Change Programme Officer, W Foden, has taken up her position in Cambridge. A first workshop will be hosted at Imperial College on 22-26 October 2007.

The Launch of the 2007 IUCN Red List of Threatened Species

- The 2007 Red List was launched on 12 September with press conferences in Washington, DC and Paris. Press coverage was extremely good and the live launches worked well. At IUCN Headquarters, all staff were encouraged to wear red and SP staff conducted quizzes – a successful way to raise awareness of the Red List within IUCN.
- The Red List website (www.iucnredlist.org) has had major improvements to bring it in line with the IUCN visual identity. A separate page has been added to specifically highlight the Red List sponsors, while users have better control over what they can search for on the web site and can even search on species currently under petition.
- The Red List Corporate Support Group is growing and has the following five members: Holcim, Oracle, EDF, Statoil, and Chevron. It is expected that the desired 10 companies will be reached by the end of the year. The IUCN Red List Corporate Support Group funds will be used to support the ongoing improvement of our data collection and evaluation tools and Red List website enhancements that make the information more accessible to corporate decision-makers.

SSC Network Support work

- D Cator and J Griffin began work as SSC Network Support Officers in July and their areas of work include:
 - The SG Chairs' consultation
 - The Red List launch
 - Fundraising – currently developing a strategy and calendar of opportunities
 - Communications – working with L Lew and A Powell and also developing some internal communication tools for the SSC network (e.g. contact guide)
 - Projects – managing and supporting various projects with SSC SGs
 - Liaison activities – gaining recognition as key contacts between Species, SSC and other IUCN programmes, offices and commissions
 - Representational duties – IUCN species work at CITES; CBD and more
 - Programme planning and monitoring; development of Species Strategic Plan
 - Red List training and planning of SGs meeting

They are keen to hear of further ideas to improve support to the SSC network

J Smart concluded by saying that the exact numbers on CoReg will be announced shortly. She noted that IUCN Headquarters is aware of the design problems of the system. H Dublin concluded by thanking J Smart for the useful update on the SP activities, and noted that the meeting would return to fundraising and SIS later in the agenda.

ACTION: J Smart to ensure that the exact number of SSC members in CoReg is announced to the SC.

5.3 SSC Specialist Group Chairs' Consultation Feedback

C Poole gave a brief presentation on the results of the Chairs' Consultation, as follows:

- The telephone calls were in general much appreciated and gave an excellent opportunity for the Chairs of SGs to talk in a relaxed manner. A total of 54 calls were made.
- Some immediate biases were identified, including: the fact that there were a number of different callers asking the questions in different ways; the fact that some of the callers knew the Chairs they were calling very well; the fact that the WI bird SG Chairs were not contacted because of the ongoing discussions with WI; and the fact that the whole consultation was designed before the major thoughts on the redesign were in place.
- In terms of the activities being undertaken by the SSC SGs and the relationship to these activities and the three SSC Objectives, the results were mostly obvious: the groups are doing assessments work, publishing guidelines / conservation strategies, tackling sustainable use issues, and holding workshops to discuss pertinent issues. There were, however, some interesting departures from the obvious such as work on taxonomy, population genetics, dispersal and demography, cooperation with the private sector on certain issues (e.g. sustainable harvest), and the promotion and support of training.
- The Shadow Resources probably need more in-depth analysis for various reasons, including: the conundrum of whether groups are more successful at fundraising because they have more staff and time or do they have more staff and time because they are successful at fundraising; some Chairs might not have included the in-kind donations into the annual operational costs; the answers to the "how many days to you spend on SG activities per month" were very varied and not clear, making the data difficult to analyse; trends and Best Practice are difficult to interpret because there are huge discrepancies between groups in certain answers.
- The main message from the feedback on SSC's communications tool was that there is room for improvement – particularly on the members' page of the SSC website. A team is needed to analyse comments in more detail and perhaps even re-interview some select people (possibly at the Chairs' Meeting). A brainstorming team is needed to highlight how each tool can be improved
- Despite a clear gender bias towards males, gender issues are not considered a problem in the SSC, and member selection is done first and foremost on technical ability and merit. Some Chairs noted that race and regional balances were more important factors than gender when they invited members.
- There is major confusion between the various offices of the SP and SSC. There is a valuable opportunity to clarify this confusion at the Chairs' Meeting and it is vital that material should be provided for the Chairs' to distribute to their members.
- There remains a general feeling that we are "taking" without giving back. There are some opportunities to correct this now – particularly through the thanks and recognition we will give at the SG Chairs' Meeting, but also through the searchable DEM.

H Dublin thanked C Poole and the SP staff who had put effort into the Chairs' Consultation and concluded that this is an ongoing process and that some individual follow-up is probably necessary.

ACTION: C Poole to liaise with C Thouless and P McLagan as to how to present the findings of the Chairs' Consultation to the SG Chairs' Meeting and explore what follow up could be possible there.

5.4 SSC Task Force Updates

5.4.1 Species Conservation Planning Task Force (SCPTF)

R Lacy commented that a very productive meeting was held in Budapest, and that the TF has prepared a report from the meeting and a working draft of the documentation for strategic species conservation planning and implementation. The TF feels they have

SSC SC Meeting WCC 3.6 – MINUTES

developed a framework that will really help the SSC to create plans that will make a difference on conservation impacts, whereas plans in the past were very varied and often not implemented. The SG Chairs at the meeting commented that often there is a lack of knowledge on how to prioritise, how to fundraise and other aspects of implementing the plans, so the TF has concluded that any future role should provide this kind of assistance.

R Lacy noted that the TF has identified four broad sections that should make up a strategic species conservation plan: the species status review/report; the global conservation vision for the species; regional conservation objectives (strategy) for the species; and an action plan for achieving the objectives. All of these sections are important, but not all the SGs or other bodies who are developing a species conservation plan will necessarily do all sections at once. The order of the sections is not important; however an effective conservation plan will require all these sections or components in the process.

R Lacy then noted that there had been a discussion about terminology so as to make the guidelines internally consistent. The guidelines will contain a long glossary of terms and the TF will ensure that these definitions are consistent with Red List terminology. The TF also discussed broad conceptual issues that might be a problem – such as the audience, format for products, the taxonomic scope, etc. There is a sliding scale between species-based conservation planning and area-based conservation planning and therefore the guidelines for the two approaches will have some similarities. As one moves towards more speciose groups, then a shift towards area-based planning will likely be needed. G Mace and T Brooks agreed that the two approaches have similarities. T Brooks noted that the biggest difference related to the nature of the threats to species rather than the number of species per se – e.g. where the threat is habitat destruction, there will be a need for an area-based approach; whereas species under other threats such as species-specific trade demands may require a species by species response. H Dublin commented that the TF had definitely seen the planning this way and identified the appropriate bifurcation place.

The SC then discussed the following two issues:

How prescriptive should the species conservation planning framework be?

R Lacy explained that the options are to put a very rigid and defined structure for an SSC endorsed plan, or to leave it looser and explain what is recommended – i.e. rigid requirements vs. general guidelines of process. More structured requirements will lead to a more consistent approach, but guidelines will allow more freedom and flexibility and allow for the differential nature of species needs. The sense of the TF was to provide a lot of guidance and examples, but to provide little in the way of strict requirements as the needs of taxa are so diverse and being too prescriptive would undermine their value. R Lacy mentioned briefly that the products of the planning process would most likely be electronic with back-up material, but that certain sections would possibly be printed. The exact format and content is still to be decided. Some of the guidelines will be advice on printing, packaging and distribution – and CI has offered to help with this aspect. Other guidance provided in the accompanying “how to” manual will be directed towards working with the relevant partners on implementation of the plan. Some discussion on this issue followed, which can be summarised as follows:

- there is a recognition that the previous Action Planning process became too broad and the plans ended up being too different. The SP staff requested clear guidance be provided to them in terms of what will be needed from their side and in the management of network expectations in terms of assistance from the SP must be clear
- the guidelines cannot be too prescriptive as the context of the plan is important – the plan is not a single point, it is a continuum
- SSC may give the authority and guidelines to begin with, but in the best-case scenarios governments and NGOs should own and brand the process and the plans.

- it is far more important to guide the process not the products, as the issues for different species are so diverse
- a minimum standard in terms of content would be useful.
- it should be made clear that it is not essential to publish a hard-copy document (particularly not in the previous black-coloured covers, which were felt to portray a rather depressing image)
- the planning process should cross cut SGs and the planners should make use of the skills in the thematic groups, not recreate these skills in their own SG. Another example would be for predators and prey species to be planned for together rather than in separate silos.
- the process must include a “reality check” – i.e. the cost implications of the different aspects or analyses or interventions must be considered.

R Lacy concluded that the idea is to empower the SGs to endorse their own process, but there is also a possibility to form a species conservation planning SG – which could advise SGs undertaking a planning process, support facilitation needs and training and also review and endorse the processes undertaken by SGs. There will need to be clear ideas on this before the Chairs’ Meeting so that this can be presented as a service. L Boitani noted that it could be a “Conservation Planning SG” so that it incorporates all possible tools. F Launay noted similarities to the RSG, who wrote the original, broad-based reintroduction guidelines and became the custodians of the process, but now play an assisting and endorsing role.

DECISION: The species conservation planning guidelines should be guidelines for a SSC endorsed process rather than a SSC endorsed product.

Products:

R Lacy explained that two documents are being developed:

- An overview document with the key features – which is a short (perhaps 10 pages) document that might be published like the Red List Categories and Criteria booklet.
- A “how to” manual – which will provide guidance on technical skills, how to integrate spatial data, examples of vision statements and other components of strategic plans, descriptions of range-wide priority setting, advice on marketing and implantation, etc. It will be a substantial manual that is cross-referenced to other documents (such as the area-based planning documents). CI has offered some staff time to assist with the sections on fundraising and communication, while WCS has offered staff time for editing. Members of the TF will be providing further background materials.

The overview doc will be completed in time for the SG Chairs’ Meeting, along with an outline of the manual. Both will be launched at WCC4. At the SG Chairs’ Meeting, one or two of the Chairs who have been involved in the process will explain it to the other Chairs. Other suggestions on how to raise this at the SG Chairs’ Meeting are welcome.

ACTION: SCPTF to complete species conservation planning guidelines; then send them to B Pressey and a select group of SG Chairs for comment and testing. The guidelines should be presented at the SG Chairs’ Meeting for further comment, endorsed by the SSC SC at their next meeting and then launched at the WCC together with the draft “how to” manual.

R Lacy then explained that the planning will take the kind of data collected for red listing, but will expand it – making it deeper in terms of population level or regional level datasets pertaining to species. It is obviously important for SIS to support this new level and J Ragle will be asked to start thinking about how this can be made possible, as a follow on to earlier discussions which took place regarding the establishment of a multi-species database with interoperability to SIS. J Smart noted that J Ragle does know the general aim, but there will need to be a separate discussion on this issue so as to ensure that the expectations from the announcement at the Chairs’ Meeting can be managed.

ACTION: J Smart and R Lacy (together with J Ragle, J Blanc and S Hedges) to communicate on how SIS can incorporate the new data that will be collected as part of the species conservation planning processes.

R Lacy concluded by saying that there is a last issue on terminology that will need further thought as some people want to include the word “strategic”. A suggestion has surfaced that the process would be called “Strategic Planning for Species Conservation” and that the product would be a “Strategic Plan for Species Conservation”. The TF will revisit this issue.

J Robinson noted that some donors may want to become involved in funding strategic planning and implementation processes just as others are interested in supporting the RL process. Therefore this process stands to become another important and fundable component of the SSC stable of outputs – thus diversifying the donor pool.

H Dublin thanked R Lacy for his efforts on this matter and concluded that there is a large amount of energy and excitement in the network for this issue – so the opportunities of the Chairs’ Meeting and the WCC should be optimised.

5.5 SSC Sub-Committees updates: feedback and discussion

Note: Due to time constraints, the only Sub-Committees that were discussed in detail were the BASC and the PCSC. Documentation from the other Sub-Committees was included in the meeting pack, and the SC members were encouraged to have bilateral discussions outside the main meeting with the relevant people on any matters that they wished to raise.

5.5.1 BASC and Assessment Updates (BASC)

T Brooks gave a short presentation on the BASC activities of the last six months. He noted that there would not be another BASC meeting in 2007, but that the CSWG and the UWG will meet before the end of the year. T Brooks’s presentation can be summarised as follows:

There are two major streams of **climate change** work:

- Guidelines on the use of the criteria for the listing of short-generation species affected by climate change (R Akcakaya). A first workshop held in London developed a research plan for this work, involving metapopulation modeling of target species (Imperial College, Centre Population Biology funding). A second workshop planned with EU funding.
- Traits of species susceptible to climate change (MacArthur funding). W Foden joined the SP at the beginning of September and a major workshop is being planned for late October to look at general traits of vulnerability across taxa.

The CSWG has developed new **Classification Schemes** on threats and actions in collaboration with the Conservation Measures Partnership. A Habitats Classification Scheme is still being developed. Systems to facilitate cross-walking of data from the old Authority Files to the new Classification Schemes are under development by CSWG. The CSWG priorities for fundraising are:

- Utilization (with SUSG)
- Invasive Species (with ISSG)
- Life History (with ZSL; workshop in Aug)
- Livelihoods and Ecosystem Services (Freshwater Assessment Unit and SUSG)

There is an open question from BASC to the SC as to whether and how to proceed with the idea for a **Red List Scientific Journal**. The Red List is now in the phase where the major focus of biodiversity assessments is moving from large charismatic species to less charismatic species, and where the bulk of the data providers live in developing countries. The issues of incentive and credit for these data providers are becoming more important. It is assumed that the major incentive for many of these data providers is scientific publication, though has not yet been established.

The leading editor of PLoS Biology joined the last BASC meeting and gave some insight into how such a journal could take shape. Two major strands of questions were identified:

- o Mechanics: How it would relate to existing online database. The BASC discussion concluded that a paper in the journal would be a time stamped PDF from the online Red List database. Addition of information for the existing 42,000 species in the Red List would not automatically trigger a publication. Attribution of the database remains with IUCN, but the authorship of the papers would be by individuals – i.e. the assessors.
- o Logistics: partnership with publisher. The major question is whether it should be done in partnership with an existing publisher and if so, which one. The advantage would be credibility, while the disadvantage will be cost and the need for a sustainable business model. It would be imperative to partner with an open access publisher. There are many emerging open access publishers in the developing world.

There was a lengthy discussion on the matter of the potential Red List Scientific Journal. The advantages were summarised as:

- The ability to monitor what changes over time is valuable – particularly with information on species that are changing categories.
- It helps highlight that the Red List data is scientific and valuable
- The journal could have a section about the Red List processes - this might make it more valuable to other a broader audience and might encourage readership. Alternatively, there could be a merger with one of the journals that already does this.
- A scientific publication rather than a page in a database may provide greater incentive to data providers.
- The Red List and SIS are species-specific and as such do not have the ability to discuss trends in more than one species in a single location or between species
- The full SIS and Red List databases are not available to everyone.
- The scientists in the underdeveloped countries may not have the resources or confidence to go for publications in Nature. The SSC provides an important forum to encourage other options.

The disadvantages or concerns that the SC members were summarised as:

- There are implications for staff time
- There are substantial implications for funding over the long-term
- It is possibly a duplication or repackaging of existing material that is published in the Red List database
- One paper per species could be problematic when a whole group of species is submitted to the Red List – e.g. if someone assesses the 300 plants of Reunion, then it would trigger 300 articles.
- This is not a rigid peer review journal and therefore not a high impact publication.
- It is not entirely clear whether this is really what the data providers want – there needs to be further research into what the assessors want and if this idea would be addressing a real or perceived need
- This is not SSC's area of expertise, so collaboration with another journal is important
- Perhaps SIS could be adapted to give people a web-address citation
- This is not high up on our list of priorities and staff are already over-extended

T Brooks concluded the discussion by saying that the capacity needed would depend on the business model. Whether it is a priority or not depends on how serious we are on attracting assessors for the mega-diverse taxa. J Smart commented that it might also be worth talking to an established publisher for support as the Red List is considered very sexy.

ACTIONS:

- BASC, in the context of the proposed RL Journal, research the desires of the individuals of the SSC network in terms of whether a journal would best address how they wish to be recognised and whether a journal would, in fact, create incentives for an expansion of Red List assessments in a broader taxonomic realm.

T Brooks then mentioned that the SSC has no **nomenclature standard or policy on taxonomy**. The need for such policy has recently come to the fore in the freshwater realm where the taxonomy proposed to be followed by the Salmonid SG is divergent from the Freshwater Biodiversity Unit. At present, BASC has no means to arbitrate this issue. As it is anticipated that disagreements on taxonomy will become more common in future, BASC is proposing to develop a policy on taxonomic standards – which will then be returned to the SC for comment. There was brief discussion on whether Evolutionarily Significant Units could be used as a basis for the standards, but it was concluded that BASC needs to give all options serious consideration as a matter of urgency.

ACTION: BASC to develop a draft policy on taxonomic standards for consideration by the SC.

Two further BASC-related topics were then discussed in detail:

Global Mammal Assessment (GMA)

T Brooks summarised that it has been a difficult year, but a new leader is in place in the SP and the GMA will be delivered through a full Red List database of all mammal species, along with a publication, by the WCC4. June 2008 is the deadline for completion. The remaining work comprises two workshops, data clean up, consistency checking, and the writing and publication of a product. SC members expressed major concerns regarding the GMA – the balance between the potential compromise of other priority products that might not be delivered because all available staff are largely dedicated to the GMA and unavailable for other assignments versus the credibility risk for SSC and IUCN if the GMA is not completed after so much time, money and effort has been committed to this project over the years. T Brooks clarified that at present the SP staff working on the GMA are all funded by CI support to the GMA and, therefore, are not available to work on other priority products.

Concern was also expressed that given the long delay in completion, there is a likelihood of petitions being filed. T. Brooks confirmed that there will be an opportunity for petitions after the GMA's release as per the usual procedures, as the petitions would probably not change the emerging picture across 5,000 species. He also clarified that although the evaluation role has been with the staff (something we are trying to avoid in future), where there are divergences in the data the staff will be contacting those SGs who were involved in the workshops.

G Mace then started a debate on the fundamental issue that large-scale assessments have detracted from the main goal of entering more species into the Red List – a drift that has not followed a deliberate strategy and has perhaps simply evolved and gone unnoticed. She noted that the Red List has always had two objectives: (1) is to highlight and bring conservation attention the world's most endangered species and (2) to provide an assessment of the overall status of species. The Red List Categories and Criteria were designed as a set of quick, consistent tools to allow listing, not to provide detailed conservation information about each species. She said that the drift to comprehensive global taxonomic assessments has required a labour-intensive review at each individual species – including non-threatened species. The concern is that the SP staff are focusing on these large assessments and not focusing on, for example, updating the amphibian or mammal data in the Red List on a more regular basis. The balance and tradeoffs of these comprehensive assessment projects and the addition of new entries and updating of earlier assessments in the Red List needs to be examined. Y Sadovy commented that there is a need for both approaches, but she is concerned that people taking part in large assessment workshops are obtaining the wrong perspective – i.e. that the process is simple enough to allow the assessment of a large number of species in just a few days at a workshop. L Boitani agreed that the GMA has been an important lesson for the future. M Samways commented that in the next phase of large-scale assessments, more care must be taken regarding over commitment. He provided a good example of the global dragonfly assessment being done in pieces without any promises of final deadlines being made – with a launch only being arranged when the dataset is complete.

SSC SC Meeting WCC 3.6 – MINUTES

H Dublin agreed, saying that some clear decisions will need to be taken in the near future on these strategic matters, but that for now there is a need to focus on the reputation issues of finishing the GMA. H Dublin also noted that the staff will need some practical guidance on the acceptable quality of the assessments for the GMA, as there might not be sufficient time for all the appropriate checks and balances.

Further discussion followed on the actual product for the GMA, with T Brooks concluding that the GMA must deliver the world's mammals into the Red List database (including spatial distribution data) and a scientific paper that will discuss the threats as well as the data. J Smart said that there will also likely be a communications element to the delivery. T Brooks confirmed that there are contractual obligations to CI for delivery of the paper. J Smart said that the staff need to be given support and encouragement.

DECISION: The June 2008 deadline for the GMA is accepted. The expectation is that all the mammal data will be in the 2008 Red List. There will be a peer-reviewed paper submitted between then and the WCC4, and a GMA-related product will be launched at the WCC4.

A Product for WCC: Global Species Assessment 2 (GSA2) or Similar Publication

J Smart led the discussions by saying that the first GSA was well-received. The proposal for this second edition is for a shorter, lighter, stand-alone document; while something bigger is proposed for 2010. JC Vié is leading this project for WCC4. H Dublin commented that the GSA terminology is being used, but perhaps we should talk generically about a product that will be published at the WCC4. She noted that the partners in the GSA were not convinced about the conservation impacts of the previous GSA, so there is a need to be mindful of this aspect when preparing future versions of the GSA – to articulate target audience(s) and objectives and to identify ways to measure conservation outcomes. She further noted the need for caution that the profile of the "Global Species Assessment" label is not inadvertently degraded due to inadequate resources and staff time for a product of similar scale.

An in-depth discussion on the possibilities for a product for the WCC followed, with the main concerns that the proposal before the SSC SC was unachievable in the time-frame, particularly given the current overload on staff resources and as most of the mammal data will only be available from the end of June 2008.

G Mace suggested that the aspirations should be reduced to a series of 4-sided sheets that summarise the Red List as of July 2008, with some key figures and graphs to support the findings. Y Sadovy agreed, saying that the 4-pager could contain some key messages – ones that we are confident of. M Samways said that energy should be conserved for the main GSA2 in 2010, but perhaps these smaller documents could link to the later one. There was general consensus that the 2010 publication is an important priority and that planning should commence immediately – particularly in terms of fundraising and marketing opportunities. G Mace and H Dublin noted that there is a commitment for outputs from the SRLI to be a product for the WCC, as well as the climate change project to have a product. G Mace suggested a family of glossy documents – one on the SRLI, one on the climate change project, one on the 2008 Red List one on indicators and perhaps even one on the conservation status of Mediterranean species. Perhaps an attractive folder could be produced to contain these sheets. It was expressed that this could lead to a better approach with people taking only what they wanted instead of taking all and later casting them aside.

DECISIONS:

- The next GSA (GSA2) should be produced for 2010 allowing plenty of lead time to plan the document, identify target audiences, determine how impact will be measured, and secure funds and commitments.
- A number of fact sheets should be produced for WCC4 (including those for which there are contractual obligations to deliver a product or publication). These sheets should be stand-alone, attractive documents that can be contained in a folder. The entire set should be launched at the first SSC session of the Forum. The launch should take the goal for a reduced-paper WCC4 seriously and therefore delegates should be given an option of what sheets they would like to take away.

ACTIONS:

- J Smart and JC Vié to immediately begin work on the fact sheets and folder for the WCC
- J Smart to take steps to begin planning for the 2010 GSA2

5.5.2 Plant Conservation Sub-Committee (PCSC)

Two main items were discussed under the PCSC agenda item, as follows:

J Smart explained the documentation on the **plant Red List backlog**, which was in the meeting information pack. She noted that the ideal situation is when an assessment arrives at the Red List Unit in the DEM and already evaluated by the RLA. Unfortunately this is not happening often enough and the RLU has to take on too much work to upgrade the assessment to a state in which it can be entered in the Red List. There was some discussion about the proposed way forward and it was agreed that although the SSC redesign will alleviate some of these problems, there should be an immediate process for the existing backlog. The SC agreed to a set of actions.

DECISION: Regarding the backlog at the RLU, the SC agreed that the Red List process should be improved as per the guidance in the SSC redesign proposal. The onus should be on the RLA to oversee both the assessments and the evaluations of assessments. The ideal situation should be that the assessments are evaluated and then submitted to the RLU with all the appropriate documentation. This will help to ensure that the primary role of the RLU is that of consistency checking for adherence to the Red List Categories and Criteria, and attempt to prevent further backlogs at the RLU.

ACTIONS:

- RLU (through J Smart) to provide a full analysis of the entire backlog at the RLU.
- RLU (through J Smart) to undertake an analysis of which RLAs are functioning and which not.
- RLU (through J Smart) should undertake the following with regard to the current backlog:
 - If the current backlogged assessment has been evaluated and approved by the RLA, it can be entered into the RL database. There should be some practical flexibility regarding the format of these assessments as some may have been done before the DEM was functional.
 - If the assessment has been evaluated by an RLA and there is a functioning RLA, but the RLU still has some concerns over its accuracy, the assessment should be entered into the RL database and the RLA informed of any concerns.
 - All other currently backlogged assessments should be returned to the relevant RLAs or Sub-Committee if there is no functioning RLA for further action.
 - Currently backlogged assessments that are incorrect and there is no functioning RLA or Sub-Committee should be forwarded to the SSC SC for further guidance.
- J Smart and H Dublin are to assist the RLU in those instances where there may be sensitivities when assessments are sent back to the RLA or assessor(s).
- BASC, as per their ToR, must consider all the assessment work it is recommending and actively think of the implications for the SP staff and the SSC network, keeping in mind the need for adequate resources to support the work called for.

T Brooks proposed that the **priorities for plant assessments** discussion not take place in great detail as the Chair of the PCSC was not present at the meeting. The priorities discussion is in flux, but a definite timeline is needed. The suggestion from the PCSC included the idea that the “plants for people” concept should provide contribute to the criteria used for prioritisation.

T Brooks commented that there is little funding in hand for plant assessments in any institution, so the priorities are likely to be determined by whatever funds are raised and suggested simply putting together a matrix of what and where, and start filling it in.

H Dublin noted the following minute from the PCSC minutes and the report of the PCSC Chair: “**M. Maunder & working group** (February 2008) - polish and test criteria with respect to an assessment priority list of (a few) genera; and polish and apply economic and sustainability criteria to select subsets of the legume and palm families.”

H Dublin noted that various options had been put forward to the PCSC, including:

- Obtain a list of species that have begun, and hold another workshop to continue with what they have agreed on in the PSCS.
- Start out at much higher level, similar to the GMSA. Look at it from a broader scale and try to apply criteria

She further stated that BASC should continue to work with the PCSC to make sure that the SC is presented with a very clear way forward at the next SC meeting.

H Dublin concluded that whichever method is used will have ramifications for the next Quadrennium regarding the establishment of plant components of the SSC network. She called on the SC to put forward their ideas for prioritising. C Imboden commented that he continues to be amazed that the conservation community is not motivated for plant conservation issues even though plants are the basis for life on earth. He suggested that this matter be addressed in the strategic plan.

H Dublin concluded the plants discussion by advising the SC members that they would shortly be receiving a revision of the Medicinal Plant Conservation Guidelines for their comment and endorsement.

ACTION: BASC to work closely with PCSC regarding the various options for the prioritisation of plant assessments so that a clear way forward is presented at the next SC meeting.

5.6 Other SSC Steering Committee Member Updates

Note: Due to time constraints, only the ISSG was discussed. Documentation from the other SG Chairs represented on the SSC SC was included in the meeting pack, and the SC members were encouraged to have bilateral discussions outside the main meeting with the relevant people on any matters that they wished to raise.

5.6.1 Invasive Species SG (ISSG)

H Dublin noted that M Clout has decided that he will step down as Chair of the ISSG at the end of the Quadrennium. This will likely have implications for some of the ISSG staff members. Mick has provided a suggestion to take over the Chair role. The IUCN global invasive species programme is being lead by G Howard out of Nairobi, and GISP has also moved there. Two other suggestions for future Chairs were put forward to H Dublin by members of the SC.

6. SSC ISSUES

6.1 Form and Function for the Future

This session took the majority of the time at the Steering Committee meeting and had two main aspects:

- The SSC Strategic Plan and SSC/Species Component Programme Plan
- The SSC redesign

Strategic Planning and the SSC Component Programme Plan

H Dublin gave an introduction, saying that the intention of IUCN is to move towards the implementation of the IUCN “One Programme” approach, noting that tensions and SSC SC Meeting WCC 3.6 – MINUTES

uncertainty remain as IUCN grapples with putting the One Programme idea into operation. She noted that IUCN is not structured to deliver the “One Programme” at present, and the planning for the 2009-2012 Intersessional Programme has been both intense and extremely complex.

C Imboden then explained that SSC/SP has been a bit ahead of most of the other Programmes and Commissions and have learnt to cut through the complexities, be clear about rationales and focus on the actual targets – making them really good, SMART targets. It should therefore be easy to create an operational plan from our new Strategic Plan, as it is being designed. He reminded the SC members about the discussions at the last SC meeting where it was shown that the SSC work can be neatly depicted by the State-Pressure-Response model, which can also be cut by the issues of generating knowledge; communicating and creating awareness; providing higher level analyses and providing advice, facilitating and guidelines for action. He explained that the species planning team (including C Imboden, staff from HQ and staff from the Chair’s Office) has worked extremely hard over the last few months to collect targets from as much of the network, the global thematic programmes and the regions as possible and bring them together into some higher-level **Key Species Results** (KSR). The main Programme Planning meeting is taking place this week in IUCN Headquarters and the KSR have been delivered to the head of the Global Programme Team.

C Imboden explained that the KSR are composed in a general form and under these will be the individual SMART targets that the SSC/SP will commit to achieving within the next four years. C Imboden noted that the KSR focus on the collective action of the SGs and the SSC not on the work of individual SGs. H Dublin then asked the SC to comment on the KSR, particularly as to the wording and whether there are any commitments known for the 2009-2012 Quadrennium that cannot be accommodated under these proposed KSR.

An in-depth discussion followed. While giving some guidance on how they could be improved or made clearer, the SC expressed their general agreement with the KSR and thanked C Imboden for the good work.,.

DECISION: The Key Species Results (as per the modified draft submitted to the Global Programme Team) were accepted with several agreed modifications.

ACTIONS:

C Imboden and the species planning team to update the Key Species Results as follows:

- Ensure that none of the KSRs have a specific taxonomic focus (especially KSR 5.1),
- Ensure that the wording of 1.1 incorporates other organisations as well as the IUCN regions
- Remove any references to the “how” in the KSR – i.e. the KSR should be shortened and should not include activities or SMART wording.

- C Imboden and the species planning team, following feedback from the Programme Planning meeting at IUCN Headquarters, will fill out the targets in the SSC/Species Component Plan and send it out for comment to the SC. The Component Programme and Strategic Plan framework are to be approved at the SC meeting in Abu Dhabi. A draft Strategic Plan could be included in the pack for SG Chairs' Meeting (not as agenda item), and the Chairs should be invited to read it and comment on any refinements they wish to see.
- C Imboden to turn the three main points of State, Pressure, Response into the SSC Mandate for approval at the February SC meeting. The mandate will then go to the March Council meeting. Care should be taken that the wording in the aspirations are correct (i.e. the use of the words “a” and “the”).
- C Imboden, when drafting the targets, pay attention to whether there are resolutions for the WCC4 that would bolster or facilitate the mandate of the SSC.

The SSC Redesign

This session was primarily led by L Boitani and P McLagan, with an introduction to the strategy and design process by H Dublin. P McLagan explained how she conducted interviews with as many people as possible and what emerged was a picture of IUCN being an organisation poised for a major leap forward. She commented that tensions are inherent in the IUCN system and the focus should be on maintaining the balances necessary for optimal performance.

L Boitani then gave an in-depth explanation about the proposed redesign – its rationale and main implications. He reiterated that the structure should be such that it supports the State, Pressure, Response function. He summarised that the main thinking in the Restructuring TF was to have a complete operational separation of the red listing process from other activities that the SSC might undertake. The rationale for this is that it will ensure the independence and objectivity and improve the scientific credibility of the red listing process, allow for easier management of the red listing process, and allow important partnerships to form with external partners. The other activities of the SSC can then be focussed on by Specialist Groups specifically designed for that purpose – some may focus on specific species conservation work, while others will focus on threats and others on tools for conservation action. Overall, the SSC network will be more “purpose built” to deliver on our goals and objectives and contribute to the IUCN “One Programme” approach.

P McLagan led a discussion on the implication of the redesign for the SP, others in IUCN (such as the IUCN DG and the Global Programme Team) and the SSC Specialist Groups. She then led the SC through an exercise listing the likes and dislikes of the redesign, with the result being the conclusion that the redesign has many positive aspects and makes a great deal of sense for a way into the future. Some issues were identified for resolution and more thought, and the SC split into working groups to tackle the most important of these issues in more detail.

P McLagan then spoke about managing the change and encouraged the SC members to be change leaders. She also noted that the SG Chairs’ Meeting is an excellent opportunity to encourage more change leaders from within the SSC network, who will then help to move the change forward in the easiest, most efficient and effective manner possible.

In conclusion to the redesign discussion, P McLagan and L Boitani proposed a “Redesign Statement” which they had been working on over a break in the meeting. This statement is as follows:

SSC Redesign in Brief....

The SSC is redesigning itself in order to rapidly respond to changing conservation challenges and opportunities

Why is SSC Re-designing itself?

- Because of the increased *demand for and use of* its information and expertise
- To ensure our *structure better supports our core function* in assessing species status, identifying *threats*, and facilitating effective *responses*.
- To reaffirm and maintain the centrality of species conservation as the heartland of IUCN
- To take advantage of *IUCN’s unique positioning* in the conservation world
- To ensure the absolute *independence and consistent quality* of our species and biodiversity information
- To respond to the expressed *needs of our volunteers*

What are the **salient features** of the redesign?

- *Separation* of assessment from the conservation work
- *Streamlined* number and more differentiated structure of Red List Authorities, focused at a high taxon level and clearly reporting within the SSC/IUCN structure

- *Separation of Red List evaluation (peer review) from assessment*
- *A clear mandate and focus for Specialist Groups to engage exclusively in conservation action*
- *Clarification of the relationship between SSC and its partners*

By redesigning now, the **SSC ensures that it...**

- provides the world's leading biodiversity experts with clearer role opportunities within SSC
- takes charge of its future and leads rather than follows changes
- Maintains its clear and dominant positioning in global conservation
- provides more coherent messages and opportunities for donors and partners
- safeguards its scientific reputation
- Ensures that SSC's programme is central to IUCN's
- Clarifies SSC and SP roles and responsibilities and complementarities

Ultimately the redesign positions SSC to have a bigger impact on global conservation.

DECISIONS:

- The proposed redesign of the Commission as presented by the Restructuring TF was accepted with the agreed modifications. The SC members agreed to be leaders in the change process.

ACTIONS:

- A task team of J Smart, T Brooks, M Samways, Y Sadovy and possibly M Maunder and L Bennun is to look at and further clarify the specific issues and needs related to the Red List assessment side of the redesign.
- A task team of H Dublin, R Kock and C Thouless is to further clarify and address specific issues and needs relating to the conservation action side of the redesign related to future Specialist Groups. This should mainly involve looking at the terminology used in the document.
- The RTF must prepare a redesign Statement, which includes the key features of the redesign and a rationale for each element.
- The RTF is to prepare two documents for the Chairs' Meeting:
 - a) A Question & Answer document that will be a short précis on the main features of the redesign.
 - b) An updated version of the document provided for the SC meeting pack for the Chairs to download and read before the meeting.

6.2 Specialist Group Chairs' Meeting

C Poole gave an overview of the logistical arrangements for the Chairs' Meeting and F Launay commented that the Environment Agency – Abu Dhabi is looking forward to hosting the meeting in February. It was agreed that the main documentation for the Chairs' Meeting should be available online by 15 December 2007.

DECISION: All documentation regarding the redesign should be available online for the SG Chairs' Meeting by 15 December 2007.

C Thouless then gave an overview of the strategic thinking behind the meeting and the meeting objectives. There followed some discussion about the design objectives and the SC members agreed that the proposed design objectives were a good way forward. A short brainstorm of design ideas followed, which allowed P McLagan and C Thouless to put together a rough meeting agenda.

ACTIONS:

- P McLagan and C Thouless to finalise a draft agenda.
- All SC members are to send through comments on the design and ideas for the agenda to the meeting organisation team as soon as possible.
- All SC members must think about what Congress Resolutions might be appropriate to be raised at the SG Chairs' Meeting.

6.3 World Conservation Congress Forum

H Dublin explained that previous Commission meetings at the WCCs had been done before the Forum, but it is intended that this time the meetings would be part of the forum to enhance attendance. SSC has been given six, 90-minute slots, but are also involved in a number of the secretariat-led sessions. H Dublin explained that the six sessions that are being considered are two to celebrate SSC (one to celebrate past achievement and one to look towards the future), a session on species-based indicators, a session (forming part of a bigger slot with WCPA) on the area-based conservation planning guidelines, a session on species and livelihoods in the "healthy environments – healthy people" stream, and a session on transboundary Marine Protected Areas. H Dublin is currently in discussions with film-makers to make short films from footage taken at the SG Chairs' Meeting for the two "celebrating SSC" sessions. H Dublin then noted that there is a need for a session on the MacArthur Foundation-funded climate change work, and there might be a possibility to submit the transboundary session separately in order to free that slot for a session on climate change. There was general agreement to this suggestion, and R Mittermeier noted that CI is going to launch a book on climate change at the WCC and SSC is welcome to link to their session.

DECISION: The session on transboundary marine PAs must be submitted for a normal alliance workshop slot and one of the SSC six slots will be used a session on climate change as per the agreement with the MacArthur Foundation.

ACTIONS:

- All SC members who are submitting Forum proposals should send C Poole their reference numbers
- R Kock to talk to the International Institute for the Environment and Development (IIED), as they are looking for ways to engage and they could be an appropriate partner for the species and livelihoods session.
- C Campagna to work with T Sandwith (of WCPA) to submit their session on transboundary marine PAs as an additional alliance workshop proposal.
- C Thouless and W Foden to put together a short paragraph on the MacArthur Foundation climate change work and submit it as one of the six SSC sessions by 31 October. They should include a creative list of partners for the session.
- All SC members to send C Thouless any innovative ideas they may have to make the six SSC sessions as interactive and engaging as possible.

H Dublin concluded the discussion by explaining that the Theatre for Africa group is hopefully going to be at the WCC to do impromptu theatre pieces with actors from the Mediterranean habitats around the world. She also noted that the two SSC sessions on celebrating the SSC will be good opportunities to profile the recent work of the SSC – including the species conservation planning – as well as opportunities to work with IUCN members on possible resolutions for the Members' Assembly.

6.4 China Session

A very interactive and engaging afternoon was spent on discussions on China.

The IUCN China Office Coordinator, S Cook, and other staff from the office joined the Steering Committee for the first part of the session to discuss the IUCN China Programme. He explained that IUCN has 10 members in China, and the office's niche should be to serve as a technical advisory body on policy, legal and economic issues. Currently, the office's main focus is on projects on logging and forestry, PA law, the Countdown 2010 initiative, and various roles for two EU Biodiversity Programme projects. S Cook then took the SC members in detail through the proposed China Component Plan for the 2009-2012 Quadrennium and noted that because the office does not receive much core financial support from IUCN, they will be forced to "projectise" most of what they plan to do in order to finance the staff and office. The SC and the staff from the China Office then brainstormed on ways for further integration between the SSC and the China office. This resulted in a number of ideas, particularly the need to encourage more Chinese experts to join the SSC and the need for the China Office to make use of the SSC experts for their work.

Later in the afternoon session, colleagues from WCS, CI and TRAFFIC joined the SSC SC and China Office staff. A most interesting round table discussion was held on various topics, particularly specific species issues in China and China's impact on species in other parts of the world. Much of the discussion revolved around wildlife trade issues, while some environmental education work, work on consumption of endangered species and some protected area work is also being done. The 2008 Beijing Olympics has been identified as an important event for work on education of the basic consumer about their footprint.

7. FINANCES, FUNDRAISING AND COMMUNICATION

7.1 SSC Commission Operations Fund

H Dublin explained that the 2007 COF budget has been adjusted as not all the Sub-Committees made use of their full allocations. She also explained that there will be some discussion in Council on the allocations to the Commissions for 2008, and asked the Sub-Committee Chairs to let the Chair's Office know what their plans are for next year and whether they will require a similar allocation to 2007.

H Dublin referred to the report of carbon emission offsetting that was in the pack, and said there should also be a drive to encourage all the Specialist Groups to offset their travel as much as possible. She concluded by noting that all the Steering Committee meetings for next year have been scheduled in conjunction with other meetings so as to reduce travel.

ACTIONS:

- All Sub-Committee Chairs should inform the Chair's Office of their plans for next year and whether they will require a similar allocation to 2007 for their 2008 budgets.
- C Poole is to send out detailed instructions on how to claim from the COF, as the IUCN Headquarters finance department has issued some new instructions.
- H Dublin to send out the article in Science on meeting travel in the science sector.

7.2 Species Programme Finances

J Smart, as per the action item from the previous SC meeting, provided an organigramme of the SP staff and indicated which staff positions are core funded, which are project funded and which are funded by a combination of both. She reiterated that the SP funding is particularly complicated as most other IUCN cost centres do not have so many projects.

H Dublin thanked J Smart for the organigramme and commented that she does bring up this issue of the SP and SSC being under funded at every opportunity possible. Unfortunately it is not seen as a priority as the SP allocations are already bigger than other IUCN Programmes and Commissions. She reiterated that she and her fellow Commission Chairs will continue to try and bring important funding matter to the attention of Council, focusing on

the role of the Species Programme and the Commission in delivery of IUCN flagship products and the need for core costs to be covered by IUCN. C Imboden queried whether the funding model will change to implement the “One Programme” approach, and H Dublin answered that there are efforts afoot to try and increase the unrestricted funding – as this will be the only way for the One Programme to truly be implemented. R Mittermeier agreed, commenting that this matter is bound to come up in the November Council meeting.

In conclusion, the SC agreed that it is absurd and inappropriate that the SP and SSC contribute to at least one third of IUCN’s reputation, but are not given the funds to reflect this reality. There was agreement that this fact may be leverage enough to encourage resolutions to be passed at the WCC. J Smart commented that the SP has been allocated the same amount for 2008 as they were for 2007 – which will result in further fundraising efforts being required.

J Smart also presented a detailed list of all the fundraising efforts in terms of projects – which is called the “BC” list, where “C” stands for signed projects and “B” stands for nearly signed projects. She gave the SC a short explanation of the list and noted that the B list is only allowed to be 30% of total income to ensure that the programme’s exposure to risk is not too high. She concluded that the core income is 1 in 4 of the total, and will soon become 1 in 5.

7.3 Fundraising

J Smart gave an interesting presentation about the fundraising endeavours currently underway in the SP. These new endeavours include:

Website advertising through Google AdSense. The SP is recommending a trial period where the adverts will be placed on the photo-gallery page of the Red List website (with the photographers’ permission). During this trial period, the adverts would be monitored daily at first to ensure that unwanted advertisers are removed. Google pre-screens advertisers and the SP would also have the ability to block inappropriate adverts (NB: later clarified to mean that they can only be blocked by specific URL after they have been detected). It was mentioned that webads could vary greatly across the world and that there is a need to figure out some way to monitor and screen unwanted advertisers around the globe. There was some discussion on the overall idea, but the SC were generally in favour and congratulated J Smart for the lateral thinking in terms of fundraising. One area of caution was that there is a reputation risk involved and some of the SSC members may have adverse feelings about the idea. It is therefore important to be able to measure its financial success and decide whether the funds raised are worth the reputational risk. At a later stage, the disbursement of the funds raised will need to be discussed to ensure that some of the money goes to the SSC network, which provides the data and photographs for the Red List website.

ACTIONS:

- J Smart to double-check if there is a local nature of Google AdSense adverts (i.e. whether adverts are different if you are logging on from different parts of the world) and, if so, how this will affect the monitoring of content that is needed during the first part of the trial period.
- J Smart to go ahead with trial period for website advertising via Google AdSense and return to the SC at the next SC meeting with an analysis of the money generated.

The **online donation button** on the Red List website was also discussed and J Smart showed a graph of the donations that have been made so far (a spike in the donations was very definite after the launch of the Red List). Donors have the option to donate to the Red Listing process or to the conservation activities of the Specialist Groups (via the Sir Peter Scott Fund). A short discussion on this scheme followed, with the SC members again being supportive of the initiative. There was some agreement that the website should be updated regularly with stories to bring people back to the site (examples given were video clips and profiles of endangered species). R Mittermeier agreed that this was an excellent opportunity and commented that CI has benefited enormously from their online donation facilities. He

SSC SC Meeting WCC 3.6 – MINUTES

agreed to put J Smart in touch with the department at CI who manages their facilities. J Smart agreed that now that the facility was available, it is important to look at the wording on the site and ways to optimise the use of the button.

ACTIONS:

- R Mittermeier to put J Smart in touch with the department at CI that manages their online donation facilities.
- J Smart to investigate the wording of the site for maximum impact and to find ways to optimise the use of the button with advice from CI's marketing department.
- J Smart to showcase the online donation facility at the SG Chairs' Meeting and ask for feedback about how to optimise its use, and for help with content and compelling copy to encourage people to return to the site regularly.

J Smart noted that the Network Support Officers are **tracking funding opportunities** and initiatives within the SP so as to ensure that there is coherence and an increased chance of working together.

ACTION: J Smart to ensure that the Network Support Officers share the fundraising tracking spreadsheet with the Chair's Office when there have been significant updates.

J Smart then mentioned the **Sir Peter Scott Fund**, saying that a new round of submissions had just been received and are being reviewed. H Dublin commented that the Fondation Ensemble's requirements are quite onerous and finding suitable matching funds has been somewhat problematic. She encouraged everyone to think of ideas for raising more money for the Fund. She also noted the need to discuss a possible renaming of the fund to more accurately reflect its focus on "conservation action" - one suggestion being "The Peter Scott Conservation Action Fund". There was agreement that the reporting back of the current projects being funded should be better so that the website can be constantly updated with news of the projects. This would enhance its effectiveness in profiling our work and securing more funds.

ACTIONS:

- J Smart to ensure that the webpage for the Sir Peter Scott Fund is modernised with news of current projects and in line with the SSC redesign ideas for profiling and enhancing our conservation work.
- SP and SSC Chair's Office to consider the name of the Sir Peter Scott Fund so as to clarify the fund's focus on conservation action.

H Dublin concluded the fundraising session by noting that discussions with the GEF regarding funding for priority Red List assessments are continuing.

7.4 SSC/SP Communications

H Dublin began the discussion by noting that although the Communications Task Force is no longer functioning, it is definitely required. She commented that the Chairs' Consultation has revealed that the Chairs consider some aspects of the SSC/SP communications good, but other aspects need some improvement. She called for a Communications Team, consisting of staff from both the SP and the Chair's Office, to make the E-bulletin and *Species* more dynamic and cutting edge. She reiterated that she feels the network want to be given something rather than continually being asked to contribute. She also noted that the Chairs' Consultation revealed some interesting contradictions in that some Chairs felt they needed the general updates, while others felt they did not want updates. She suggested that the current tools are improved as far as possible for the remainder of this Quadrennium, and that potential new tools are explored for the new Quadrennium and that the Chairs' meeting might provide a good opportunity to explore ideas. A short brainstorm of ideas from the SC members for both Species and the E-bulletin then followed.

Species:

The SC agreed that hard copies of *Species* are generally liked and that their greatest value is in the remote areas of the world where downloading from the internet is not possible. There was agreement that printing it in a developing country may be much cheaper, but the postage remains a consideration. F Launay suggested that a courier company be approached for a sponsorship of the delivery of hardcopies as part of their Corporate Social Responsibility. M Samways suggested that there should be a tear-off insert in each edition that the reader must then return in order to receive their hard copy of the next edition. Suggestions for ways to improve the content of *Species* were as follows:

- Feature interviews with some of the media or corporates to give background on how to make use of the press or how to raise funds. A feature on how to connect to these sectors would be well-received.
- A central theme around which people can be asked to contribute should provide more incentive for people to put forward their thoughts and views than the historical reporting of meetings and general activities.
- Interviews with key people in IUCN to create features on activities and possibilities for collaboration with other parts of organisation.
- Have a desk at the Chairs' Meeting where suggestions can be collected for feature articles or general improvement.
- Think about how the readers can flag us as to what they want to know (perhaps as part of the tear-off-and-send-in card).
- Have an "extinction" page, or "new species discovered" page as a regular feature.
- Have a permanent section about what is happening in the IUCN regions of interest to SSC members.
- Create a list of media contacts who should receive *Species* regularly.
- The SP/SSC updates are wanted and useful.

ACTIONS:

- R Mittermeier to investigate the publications costs if *Species* were to be printed and distributed from Colombia.
- F Launay and J Smart to investigate the possibility of approaching a courier company to sponsor the distribution of *Species* for a contracted time period. F Launay to particularly investigate whether the current arrangement with the Reintroduction SG newsletter could also incorporate *Species*.
- J Smart and *Species* editorial team to review the suggestions mentioned by the SC regarding *Species* and look at ways to improve the content of *Species*.
- A suggestion desk should be set up at the SG Chairs' Meeting to collect more ideas.

H Dublin and M Samways concluded the discussion by agreeing that there are a number of new things that could be tried, but that it is also essential to do an analysis of the purpose and needs of *Species* and the desires of the SSC members with regard to the future of *Species*.

E-bulletin:

H Dublin opened this discussion by mentioning that the CEC has an excellent e-bulletin, in which someone actively sifts through all the news from IUCN and outside and produces a really concise and interesting overview of recent news and happenings. J Smart agreed that it is a superb example. Some suggestions for the improvement of the E-bulletin were as follows:

- Link to other parts of IUCN and pull their stories across to SSC's E-bulletin
- Send the E-bulletin to environmental journalists
- Focus on really catchy content (e.g. interesting news stories such as the links between ebola and gorillas)

- Perhaps try it as an attachment so as to avoid fire wall problems
- Try to arrange to send it out to all SSC members rather than just the Chairs
- Arrange for a generic email address such as species.e-bulletin@iucn.org so that the E-bulletin can be sent from this address and so that any bounce-backs go to this address and do not clog up a staff member's inbox.
- Monthly is good, but every second month would not be a problem if there is difficulty finding stories or editorial time.
- Futuristic online options should be considered, such as virtual social networks (myspace.com or facebook.com)

ACTIONS:

- J Smart and E-bulletin editorial team to review the SC members' suggestions regarding the E-bulletin and investigate ways to optimise its content and distribution. Most importantly, ways should be found to distribute the E-bulletin to all SSC members on Co-Reg.
- H Dublin to contact Chair of CEC for more information on how they produce their e-newsletter.

H Dublin closed the communications discussion by thanking everyone for their important suggestions and reiterated the need for a leader for the Communications TF to be a member of the SC in the next Quadrennium.

7.5 Branding with Red List Categories

J Smart explained that the SP is looking at the Red List brand in detail since the idea from BirdLife to show the categories in a book they are producing and the incredible interest shown by the botanical garden and zoo communities. She said that IUCN Communications Unit is funding an exercise to develop the brand – to position it correctly, look at the attributes of the brand and roll out some products related to the brand. It is hoped that an update will be available before the next SC meeting. J Robinson commented that the Red List process is core to our identity, but unfortunately the process itself is not exciting. The product that will sell is the conservation action. J Smart agreed, saying that it is vitally important to highlight the voluntary nature of the network and all the conservation action that is achieved.

8. SSC SUCCESS STORIES

The following success stories were highlighted by members of the SC:

- On the day of the Red List launch, all staff in Headquarters wore red and quizzes were held. It was a fun and important means of highlighting the Red List within IUCN.
- An amphibian breeding centre is operational in Panama. They have collected 42 species and almost all of them have recovered and are breeding. Some of the species are extinct in the wild. The centre is run with outside funding, but the manpower is all from Panama.
- The Napoleon humphead wrasse has become a model for CITES Appendix 2 listings as the recommendations were adopted in Indonesia, and their sea exports have stopped. Hopefully other countries will follow.
- The Large Carnivore Initiative for Europe WG has a contract with the European Commission to hold a number of workshops with governments in Europe to discuss the guidelines that were produced in 2006. The WG will therefore meet all government officials dealing with large carnivores. There will be a session at the WCC reserved for government officials.
- Cousine Island in the Seychelles has undergone a restoration project for 15 years. Reintroductions are being successful, plants have recovered, there is reforestation, and

birds, insects and lizards have increased. The island would like to showcase their successes.

- A bear has been found in Switzerland after more than 100 years. C Imboden says it has roamed about 2km from his house and has been in Switzerland for three months.
- The Hirola, the world's most endangered antelope genus, seems to have passed the threshold of real danger through the commitment and dedication of the local communities and some SSC SGs. The local communities are very involved in the long-term survival of the species.
- Madagascar has had some recent successes with the President declaring more hectares as Protected Areas, the highway of baobabs being declared a national monument, and with two new species of lemur being discovered.
- In a novel idea for fundraising, the names of 10 new species of fish were auctioned and US\$10million was raised for the conservation of those species in Indonesia. This method of fundraising is also being used in the invertebrate sector.
- The IUCN DG has picked up on the resolution regarding cherishing volunteers and we look forward to the positive outcomes.
- A ninth botanical garden has been declared in South Africa.

9. TIMING AND VENUES OF 2008 STEERING COMMITTEE MEETINGS

As per the decisions at the previous SC meeting, the 2008 SC meetings will be just before the Chairs' Meeting and just before the WCC4 in Barcelona.

10. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

The only matter to be added to the agenda was that of the SIS.

Species Information Service (SIS):

L Boitani noted that there is a fundamental problem with SIS. Until now, it has been a Red List assessment tool, but it now collects far more data than is necessary for the purpose of assessments. G Mace agreed, saying that much more data than previously required is now required for an assessment and care needs to be taken not to make all fields mandatory for Red List assessments in order not to hinder the Red List process. J Smart and H Dublin agreed that there is a desire for much more species information to be put into SIS, and there is some confusion as to what it is now and even what to call it. C Imboden commented that the project of SIS began some 12 years ago, and yet there is still no clarity on some very fundamental questions. He noted it is possible that we tried to accommodate the changing world too much, and did not focus on what was originally decided. Important lessons can be extracted from our experience with SIS over the years. J Smart noted that the current version is basically in support of the Red List processes, as J Ragle did concentrate on first fixing the data entry system so that the assessment process is functioning well. Version 3 will embrace other databases and therefore the name SIS is probably incorrect.

There was general consensus on this matter and it was concluded that there should be one voice when talking about what SIS is now and what future versions may be. J Smart agreed that J Ragle should draft a one-page document on what SIS is now and mention briefly what the future plans are – what it is, what it is not, what it can become, and what it will definitely not become. This document should be included in the pack for the SG Chairs' Meeting, but should be circulated to the SC before the SG Chairs' Meeting. It was also noted that J Smart and J Ragle should investigate the ESRI software donation to ensure the donation includes updates.

DECISION: A document detailing the current and future scope of “SIS” will be made available to the SC in order to ensure that the SC can all refer to the tool in the same way.

ACTIONS:

- J Ragle to draft a one-page document on what the “SIS” is now, what it is not, what it will become and what it will never become. This should be distributed to the SC members as soon as possible and then become part of the pack for the SG Chairs’ Meeting.
- All SC members must familiarise themselves with the document drafted by J Ragle so that they can answer pertinent questions that may arise at the SG Chairs’ Meeting.
- J Smart and J Ragle to allocate time at the SG Chairs’ Meeting to make it very clear to all present exactly what has been achieved regarding the vision that is SIS.
- J Smart to ensure that the ESRI donation of software is one that includes regular version updates to software and service agreements.

H Dublin closed the meeting on Tuesday 16 October at 13:00 by thanking all those present for the time and effort put in to this meeting and the massive amount of material that was covered. She said she looked forward to seeing the SC members again in Abu Dhabi in February 2008.