



**SSC STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING WCC3.8
BARCELONA, SPAIN, 4-5 OCTOBER 2008**

MINUTES

TABLE OF CONTENTS

GLOSSARY OF ACCRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS USED	2
DECISIONS AND ACTION ITEMS	3
1. WELCOME, APOLOGIES, INTRODUCTIONS	4
1.1 Chair's Welcome	4
1.2 Apologies	4
2. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA	4
3. PREVIOUS MINUTES (WCC3.7, AL AIN, 9,10,15 FEBRUARY 2008).....	4
4. MATTERS ARISING	4
4.1 Action Items from WCC3.7	4
5. UPDATES.....	7
5.1 SSC Chair's Update.....	7
5.2 Species Programme Update	8
5.3 Feedback on Restructuring and Red List Processes.....	10
5.4 SSC Sub-Committees: Final Recommendations and Decisions.....	13
5.4.1 Biodiversity Assessments Sub-Committee (BASC)	13
5.4.2 Biodiversity Indicators Sub-Committee (BISC)	19
5.4.3 Sustainable Use Sub-Committee (SUSC)	19
5.4.4 Plant Conservation Sub-Committee (PCSC)	21
5.4.5 Marine Conservation Sub-Committee (MCSC).....	22
5.4.6 Invertebrate Conservation Sub-Committee (ICSC)	22
5.5 SSC Task Forces: Final Recommendations and Decisions	23
5.5.1 Species Conservation Planning Task Force (SCPTF).....	23
5.6 SSC Disciplinary Specialist Groups: Final Recommendations and Decisions	23
5.6.1 Reintroduction Specialist Group	23
5.6.2 Conservation Breeding Specialist Group (CBSG)	24
5.6.3 Wildlife Health Specialist Group (WHSG).....	24
5.6.4 Invasive Species Specialist Group (ISSG).....	24
6. SSC FINANCES AND COMMUNICATIONS	25
6.1 SSC COF and Reserves	25
6.2 Funding	26
6.3 SSC Communications.....	26
7. IUCN / SSC DISCUSSION POINTS.....	27
7.1 World Conservation Congress	27
8. SSC SUCCESS STORIES	27
9. ANY OTHER BUSINESS	27

GLOSSARY OF ACCRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS USED

BASC	Biodiversity Assessments Sub-Committee
BIP	Biodiversity Indicators Partnership
BISC	Biodiversity Indicators Sub-Committee
CBD	Convention on Biological Diversity
CBSG	Conservation Breeding Specialist Group
CEESP	Commission on Environmental, Economic and Social Policy
CHF	Swiss Francs
CITES	Convention on the International Trade in Endangered Species
COF	Commission Operations Fund
CoP	Conference of Parties
DG	Director General
GEF	Global Environment Facility
GISD	Global Invasive Species Database
GMA	Global Mammal Assessment
GMSA	Global Marine Species Assessment
GSA	Global Species Assessment
ICSC	Invertebrate Conservation Sub-Committee
ISSG	Invasives Species Specialist Group
IUCN	International Union for Conservation of Nature
MCSC	Marine Conservation Sub-Committee
MDG	Millennium Developmental Goals
PA	Protected area
PCSC	Plant Conservation Sub-Committee
RLA	Red List Authority
RLI	Red List Index
RLU	Red List Unit (of the Species Programme)
SC	Steering Committee
SCPTF	Species Conservation Planning TF
SG	Specialist Group
SIS	Species Information Service
SRLI	Sampled Red List Index
SSC	Species Survival Commission
SUSC	Sustainable Use Sub-Committee
TF	Task Force
UN	United Nations
UNEP	United Nations Environment Programme
WCC	World Conservation Congress
WCMC	World Conservation Monitoring Centre
WCPA	World Commission on Protected Areas
WCS	Wildlife Conservation Society
WHSG	Wildlife Health Specialist Group
ZSL	Zoological Society of London

DECISIONS AND ACTION ITEMS

Decisions made at WCC3.8:

- The Guidelines for Appropriate Uses of Red List Data were adopted on the understanding that they will continue to be improved, including the agreed additions under Actions.
- The SSC Steering Committee adopted the proposed Pre-publication Data Use policy, which is to be articulated in text.

Action Items Tables:

ACTIONS FROM PREVIOUS STEERING COMMITTEE MEETINGS

	<u>Who</u>	<u>Action Item</u>	<u>Agenda Item</u>	<u>Timeline</u>
1	J Smart	Be in touch with R Mittermeier / the department that manages CI's online donation facilities to find ways to optimise the use of the online donation button.	4.1 Action Item from WCC3.6	asap
2	J Smart	Investigate the wording of the online donation button to make clear the dual options for contributing – to Red List assessment or conservation action	4.1 Action Item from WCC3.6	asap
3	SP&Chair's Office	Consider the name of the Sir Peter Scott Fund so as to clarify the fund's focus on conservation action.	4.1 Item from WCC3.6	asap
4	Comms Team	Investigate sponsorship for the distribution of Species in hardcopy (possibly through F Launay's office) and contact R Mittermeier re the possibility to print <i>Species</i> in Colombia	4.1 Action Item from WCC3.6	asap
5	J Smart and JC Vié	Continue thinking on the GSA2 2010 publication, with a full outline of content to be discussed at first 2009 SC meeting.	4.1 Item from WCC3.7	asap

ACTION ITEMS FROM WCC3.8

	<u>Who</u>	<u>Action Item</u>	<u>Agenda Item</u>	<u>Timeline</u>
1	H Dublin	Circulate signed version of agreement with WCPA on new joint SSC-WPCA Task Force to T Brooks.	5.1 Chair's Update	asap
2	BASC	Consider adding the following issues to the Guidelines for Appropriate Uses of Red List Data: sustainable use, the application of the Red List to national legislation, consumer choice (with help from Y Sadovy), inappropriate scientific uses (with help from L Boitani), sustainable wild collection.	5.4.1 BASC	asap
3	BASC	Consider creative ways to ensure that all IUCN Members receive the Guidelines on Appropriate Uses of RedList Data.	5.4.1 BASC	asap
4	BASC	Further elaborate on recommendations for the way forward for national and regional level Red Listing.	5.4.1 BASC	asap
5	BASC	Send RapidList report and completed table to M Samways, T Brooks, L Boitani and D Leaman for comment.	5.4.1 BASC	asap
6	SSC Chair	The first Steering Committee meeting of the next Quadrennium should consider a feasibility study for increasing the frequency of Red List updates and releases and put together a timeframe for this study.	5.4.1 BASC	asap
7	SSC Chair	Ensure that J Hutton becomes linked into the IUCN Data Policy discussions with regard to defining the meaning of "commercial use".	5.4.1 BASC	asap
8	J Ragle	Write the text to accompany the schematic diagram depicting the Pre-publication Use policy.	5.4.1 BASC	asap
8	D Leaman	Put together her personal views on the plant network for consideration by the new SSC Steering Committee.	5.4.4 PCSC	asap
9	SSC Chair & J Smart	Revisit the main communications tools of SSC (Species and the e-bulletin) and explore possible new tools such as blogs.	6.3 SSC Comms	asap
10	SSC Chair & J Smart	Discuss options for improving the Species website.	6.3 SSC Comms	asap
11	SSC Chair	Ensure that the Global Voice for Species Conservation wiki is revised and continued into the new Quadrennium.	6.3 SSC Comms	asap
12	SSC Chair	Ensure that the SSC SharePoint platform is launched.	6.3 Comms	asap

1. WELCOME, APOLOGIES, INTRODUCTIONS

1.1 Chair's Welcome

On Saturday 4 October 2008, SSC Chair H Dublin welcomed all the SC members to the eighth and final SSC Steering Committee meeting of the Quadrennium. She mentioned that G Mace, D Leaman and R Mittermeier would join the meeting later in the day.

1.2 Apologies

The following people attended the meeting:

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

Species Programme: J Smart, JC Vié

SSC Chair's Office: C Poole, C Thouless

Other Attendees: S Stuart for BASC, D Leaman for PCSC

Apologies were received from Steering Committee members: C Campagna, C Imboden, J Robinson, F Launay and M Maunder.

2. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

H Dublin requested the following changes on the agenda:

- a) That the Red List Data Policies should be added as an agenda item under BASC. An additional document was provided for consideration by the Steering Committee;
- b) That there was a slight mistake in the Agenda in the meeting pack – the document on page 38 pertained to the Guidelines for Appropriate Uses of Red List Data;
- c) That a whole group of documents be discussed together once G Mace had arrived at the meeting. This grouping of documents was as follows: G Mace's letter to H Dublin and S Stuart, L Boitani's report on the Restructuring TF, the meeting report from the September 2008 Red List Process meeting, H Dublin's memo to W Jackson and J Marton-Lefèvre pertaining to the meeting between H Dublin, L Boitani, J Smart and S Stuart in July and S Stuart's document to all SC members on 3 October 2008.

The Steering Committee adopted the revised agenda.

3. PREVIOUS MINUTES (WCC3.7, AI Ain, 9,10,15 February 2008)

H Dublin noted that the minutes of WCC3.7 had been adopted by the Steering Committee and the final version had been uploaded to the SSC website.

4. MATTERS ARISING

4.1 Action Items from WCC3.7

The following Action Items Table from WCC3.7 includes comments given at WCC3.8 on progress:

	<i>Who</i>	<i>Action Item</i>	<i>Agenda Item</i>	<i>Timeline</i>	<i>STATUS</i>
1	H Dublin & S Stuart	Discuss terms of the contract and funding that is available for palm assessments given the changed circumstances of the Palm SG Chair.	4.1 SG Chair appointments	asap	S Stuart said the funding was reallocated due to there being no Chair. H Dublin noted there is commitment from SG members to continue with the SG in the new Quadrennium.
2	M Clout, S Stuart and JC Vié	Talk regarding moving forward the relationship between invasive species data and the IUCN Red List	4.2 Action Items from WCC3.6 still needing attention	asap	Discussion initiated and meeting planned at WCC
3	J Smart	Be in touch with R Mittermeier / the department that manages CI's online donation facilities to find ways to optimise the use of the online donation button.	4.2 Action Items from WCC3.6 still needing attention	asap	Unable to move in the time available before WCC4 – remains a priority
4	J Smart	Investigate the wording of the online donation button to make clear the dual options for contributing – to Red List assessment or conservation action	4.2 Action Items from WCC3.6 still needing attention	asap	Needs attention from new Marketing & Comms staff member
5	SP & SSC Chair's Office	Consider the name of the Sir Peter Scott Fund so as to clarify the fund's focus on conservation action.	4.2 Action Items from WCC3.6 still needing attention	asap	Not done.
6	Comms Team (thru' J Smart)	Investigate how to make use of the CEC model for e-bulletins.	4.2 Action Items from WCC3.6 still needing attention	asap	Investigated but no final decision taken. Some changes to e-bulletin made.
7	Comms Team (through J Smart)	Investigate the possibility of a sponsor for the distribution of Species in hardcopy (possibly through F Launay's office) and contact R Mittermeier re the possibility to print <i>Species</i> in Colombia	4.2 Action Items from WCC3.6 still needing attention	asap	Not priority due to paperless WCC. Strategy for 'Species' requires review overall.
8	J Ragle	Compile the feedback on the draft Red List Data Provider Agreement and send it out for broader consultation.	5.4.1 BASC – Draft RL Data Provider Agreement	asap	New drafts prepared following feedback. Sent to BASC members in August 2008
9	All SC members	Send in detailed comments about the Pre-publication Data Use Guidelines to S Stuart via email.	5.4.1 BASC – Pre-publication Data Use Guidelines	Before end April 2008	Completed. Document in pack
10	H Dublin	Suggest a means of consulting and gaining clarity on post-publication data use issues.	5.4.1 BASC – Pre-publication data use guidelines	asap	Ongoing. Discussed under BASC.
11	J Ragle	Bring the pre- and post-data use guidelines under the umbrella of the Data Provider's Agreement	5.4.1 BASC – Pre-pub data use guidelines	asap	J Ragle working with H Dublin and work almost completed.

12	S Stuart	Send the report on RapidList testing to the Chair and SC	5.4.1 BASC – Preliminary Assessments	After BASC meeting	Discussed under BASC
13	S Stuart, J Smart and J Griffin	Talk further on the strategy to ensure that there can be no confusion between preliminary and full Red List assessments	5.4.1 BASC – Preliminary Assessments	asap	Some action taken.
14	S Stuart	Ensure that the report on SSC/SP engagement on national and regional level Red Listing is prepared according to the TORs and that feedback is given to the SSC Chair and SC after the BASC meeting.	5.4.1 BASC – National and Regional Red Listing	asap	Completed. Document in pack
15	G Mace	See if there is an opportunity to join DIVERSITAS in their work on post-2010 targets.	5.4.1 BASC – GSA2 2012	asap	Ongoing.
16	H Dublin	Discuss how to present SSC thoughts on the post-2010 target-led approach with the IUCN policy unit	5.4.1 BASC – GSA2 2012	asap	Completed
17	J Smart and JC Vié	Continue thinking on the GSA2 2010 publication and preparing further briefing documents for the next SC meeting, with a full outline of content to be discussed at first 2009 SC meeting.	5.4.1 BASC – GSA2 2012	asap	First stage completed. 2008 Review currently absorbing energy.
18	J Ragle	Update the two-page document on SIS to ensure that the servicing of the two processes - input of data and output of data - are clearly separated.	5.4.1 BASC Issues - SIS	asap	Completed
19	R Mittermeier & H Dublin	Discuss the charitable status of IUCN in the UK at Council or Senior Management level where possible.	6.2 SP Finances	asap	Have attempted when possible but this is still being taken up by IUCN Legal Counsel
20	J Smart	Ask MAVA whether their grant can be used as a challenge grant on the online donation system to help leverage funds to support SG's Red List work	6.3 Fundraising	asap	Meeting with Mava Foundation after the Congress
21	All SC members	Send their suggestions for awards through to the Chair's Office.	6.6 SSC awards for WCC	Before end June 2008	Completed
22	C Poole	Send a reminder to SC members about their paragraph for the Progress & Assessment Report (2005 – 2008).	7.1 WCC	Complete	Completed
23	C Poole	Send out a message to all SC members once registration for the Congress has opened.	7.1 WCC	When reg opens	Completed
24	J Smart	Clarify whether the SSC/SP has any slots in the plenary sessions of the Forum and inform the SC	7.1 WCC	asap	JC Vié will present main results of the 2008 Red List Review in opening of Biodiversity stream.
25	JC Vié	Continue his leadership on the set of fact sheet publications for the WCC4.	7.1 WCC	asap	Ready by Congress
26	All SC members	Send their comments on the Strategic Plan for Species Framework and proposed targets to the Chair's Office, C Imboden or D Cator	7.2 Species Strategic Plan	By 29 February 2008	Completed

H Dublin concluded the discussion by saying that some items are still pending and those that are were most likely delayed due to Congress preparations. These items from previous SC meetings should be carried forward into the new Quadrennium for consideration by the new SSC SC.

FOLLOW-UP ACTION ITEMS FROM PREVIOUS MEETINGS FOR NEW SC:

- J Smart to be in touch with R Mittermeier / the department that manages CI's online donation facilities to find ways to optimise the use of the online donation button.
- J Smart to investigate the wording of the online donation button to make clear the dual options for contributing – to Red List assessment or conservation action
- Species Programme & 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.
- Communications Team (through J Smart) to investigate the possibility of a sponsor for the distribution of Species in hardcopy (possibly through F Launay's office) and contact R Mittermeier re the possibility to print *Species* in Colombia
- J Smart and JC Vié to continue thinking on the GSA2 2010 publication and preparing further briefing documents for the next SC meeting, with a full outline of content to be discussed at first 2009 SC meeting.

5. UPDATES

5.1 SSC Chair's Update

H Dublin opened her update by explaining that the Quadrennial Report for the SSC had already been submitted in February 2008 – which meant that the report in the Members' Assembly documentation was already outdated. She noted that preparations for the WCC have been very time-consuming, but that one excellent result was that support had been made available for many SSC members to attend. To this end, H Dublin had developed a set of criteria for funding eligibility and these were adhered to for funding from the COF and from a €20,000 fund raised by the Congress Organising Team. There also remained a possibility of funding from the Belgium government, but the result of this application could only be known after Congress – which meant that commitments had to be underwritten by the COF.

H Dublin went on to say that the IUCN Council was intending to have a short meeting before Congress to close the Quadrennium, but many detailed issues were on the table for discussion. Some of these issues were as follows:

- The One Programme Working Group had resulted in a motion being submitted to Congress by the IUCN Council. In response, the IUCN DG has established a change management process. The primary hurdle to change remains the IUCN funding model and the IUCN Secretariat's dependence on project funding – although the DG is doing her best to explain the IUCN value proposition to the framework donors so that less funding is earmarked for project work. Much discussion is taking place and the Secretariat is keen to move on this issue, but the funding model remains a problem in the short to medium term.
- The focus of the IUCN Programme is being questioned. IUCN Members are saying that the IUCN Programme for 2009-2012 was not developed in a consultative manner, thereby leading to many motions before Congress. There were concerns about what was seen as an artificial separation of work on energy from the overall thrust on climate change mitigation and adaptation. There were also questions about the IUCN UN Observer Status, its cost, the future plans for the IUCN Multilateral Office in Washington, DC and how this might all be done better to serve the needs of the Union. There were also issues remaining with regard to IUCN's future role in the Antarctic and the direction and extent of its work on climate change.

- IUCN's engagement with the private sector is also under scrutiny. In 2007, two Councillors agreed to examine the agreements with the private sector, and this revealed that there were many more agreements at all levels than Council actually knew about and many additional considerations needed to be taken into account, in addition to the guidance for private sector engagement that had already been adopted. Some Members still feel strongly that the relationships are unbalanced and that in some cases the private sector may be using IUCN. These concerns were reflected through motions such as the one to dissolve IUCN's current agreement with Shell. The Governance TF of Council looked at several options for IUCN-private sector engagement, including the establishment of a Commission on business and biodiversity, the development of a less formal expert network and provisions for private sector to secure affiliate membership of IUCN – and it was decided that an expert network would be the most appropriate way forward for now. It was mentioned that the motions at Congress dealing with private sector issues were likely to be among the most controversial.

H Dublin then went on to explain some other initiatives she had been working on that were not in the Quadrennial Report. These included:

- A newly signed agreement with the Chair of the WCPA to establish a joint Task Force on Protected Area Management Categories and Biodiversity Outcomes. Terms of Reference for this TF, which has an initial two year time frame, have been drafted and signed by the two Chairs of the two Commissions.

ACTION: H Dublin to circulate signed version of agreement with WCPA on new joint SSC-WCPA Task Force to T Brooks.

- An unexpected approach from the World Bank to establish a Global Tiger Initiative. H Dublin attended a meeting in Washington, DC in June 2008 where the President of the World Bank made a number of commitments to supporting tiger conservation, including reviewing the necessary environmental safeguards. They have recently commissioned an independent study to examine the Bank's performance in implementing the environmental and social safeguards that will be used to inform any need for policy reform in this regard. H Dublin shared her view that this Global Tiger Initiative could provide support for the implementation of the mandate of IUCN and the Global Tiger Forum under CITES Decision 14.70 to develop a global tiger conservation strategy, but there remain some issues to be resolved. The Bank has established an office dedicated to coordinating its relationships and actions on behalf of tigers, so there is hope that the relevant NGOs can still hold the Bank accountable for the commitments made by their President.

H Dublin concluded her update by saying that the Red List Process meeting held in September had been very productive and constructive, and that this would be discussed later in the agenda.

5.2 Species Programme Update

J Smart gave a brief update about the Quadrennium as a whole, saying she did not need to talk too much about the actual work of the Species Programme as much will be rolled out in sessions at Congress. She then mentioned a few of the main successes and challenges of the Quadrennium and priorities for the future as follows:

- Increasing support for the SSC Network was a headline item of this Quadrennium. At the start of the Quadrennium, there was a funding cut and performance issues that had to be dealt with, but now there are two people in the Network Support positions who are SSC "evangelists" and are making excellent progress.

- The entire Species Programme staff team is possibly too large and this issue will need to be tackled, in relation to the funding models. However, it is important to note that all the Species Programme staff have gone beyond the call of duty for Congress.
- The Species Programme has increased its income and fundraising capacity, but the funding model is a big constraint. The Species Programme would like to leverage more support for the Specialist Groups, and has been trying to do this through building opportunities for the SGs into the projects they develop.
- The Red List Process is a major issue for more discussion and relates to the whole way the Species Programme operates. The September meeting on the process was extremely good and it was excellent to have Red List Partners, SG Chairs, Steering Committee members and Species Programme staff all in the same room to discuss the issues. More than 32,000 assessments were submitted for the Red List this year and the RLU has not been able to put them all on the 2008 Red List due to both time constraints and to the poor quality of some incoming assessments. The evaluation and review phase of the assessment process needs more discussion. The roll out of the new SIS tools have also been a challenge, but will eventually help make it easier to do assessments and make sure those that are submitted are of good quality. There is now a new website for the Red List and a new database. A key challenge for the future is training on the use of the Red List tools – training for partners, IUCN members, SSC members and IUCN staff.
- The Red List brand/logo is an excellent step forward to increase the power and protection of the Red List. The IUCN Membership Unit is excited about what this may mean for the IUCN Membership and there are many avenues to be explored with the zoo, botanical garden and aquarium communities.
- The new IUCN building is being built quite fast. Other news is the Cambridge Conservation Initiative – where a campus is being built. Both UNEP-WCMC and Species Programme staff are involved.

H Dublin thanked J Smart for her report and commented that she and J Smart are in touch on many of these issues. She noted that they both understand the stresses and strains that lead to limitations in work rollout. The current structure is not adequate for handling all the needs of the Commission. More thought needs to be put into diversifying the funding and activities beyond the Red List. There is much debate about having an overly ambitious programme or undertaking to do well on a smaller commitment that feels more achievable. Even the new 2009-2012 Strategic Plan for Species has some new issues for which we are not currently prepared. The programme planning process itself was challenging, as there was little opportunity to engage with the regions and the component plans. However, the 2009 - 2012 Programme will now be adopted by the IUCN Congress and it is also likely that there will be a move to make fundamental changes to the direction of the programme less frequent in future. So, we will likely continue to be torn between what we aspire to do and what we can do.

S Stuart commented that the Global Mammal Assessment, which had been a concern, was completed in time and will be launched at the WCC. A paper, with 130 authors, will be published in **Science** during the Forum. The assessments for coral are also completed. J Smart noted that although corals and mammals are finished, there are many other groupings of assessments waiting and a fair queuing system needs to be developed. L Boitani commented that it is important to highlight the new web-based SIS as a vital step forward that will provide better links between the SSC network and the Species Programme. H Dublin agreed, saying it has become even more important to manage expectations of the SGs so that the volunteers who work so hard to do assessments are not angry and disappointed when their work does not appear on the Red List within their expected timeframes.

5.3 Feedback on Restructuring and Red List Processes

Note: although taking place later in actual time during the meeting and not on the original agenda, this discussion was most appropriately minuted here.

H Dublin opened this discussion by reminding the Steering Committee that this was a combined discussion covering L Boitani's Restructuring Task Force (RTF) report, H Dublin's memo to W Jackson and J Marton-Lefèvre after the meeting between herself, L Boitani, J Smart and S Stuart in July, the Red List Process meeting report, the letter from G Mace to S Stuart and H Dublin, and S Stuart's comments on this letter sent to all SC members on 3 October 2008 (the day before this SSC SC meeting). H Dublin explained that a very difficult but positive meeting had been held in July, attended by J Smart, L Boitani, S Stuart and H Dublin. She then wrote a letter to W Jackson and J Marton-Lefèvre to inform them of some suggested ideas for allowing the SSC and Species Programme to work more effectively together. The September Red List Process meeting then took place, and the minutes of this meeting had been circulated. She welcomed a free and open discussion on these different but related topics in order to put all opinions on record for the incoming SSC Steering Committee.

L Boitani started the discussion by saying that he would like some feedback and reactions to his report, which is a very brief summary of what happened after the Al Ain meeting and why the RTF decided to stop working on the redesign documents. He explained that he had felt they had now entered a realm much bigger than the RTF's mandate, so he had asked the Chair of the SSC and the Head of the Species Programme to work on a solution. He noted that it is important to have guidance on the way forward for the next Quadrennium.

M Samways asked whether the Chairs' Advisory Group (CAG - the five SG Chairs selected at the Al Ain meeting to represent the network in redesign discussions) were representative of the network. L Boitani stated that his opinion was that most of them were not representative. D Leaman noted that the plant network had felt that the plant representative did present the voices of the plant network effectively. H Dublin commented that while the CAG members had represented the network in the process that followed immediately after Al Ain, the dynamic had shifted after L Boitani's next draft of the redesign document and individuals in the CAG were no longer representing the whole network at these later stages in discussions.

L Boitani explained that the status of the redesign is that it is currently stalled and it will be up to the next Chair of the SSC to determine whether s/he would like to reopen the process. He summarised that there is much experience and ideas amassed, and that there is a feeling that some ideas from the original redesign document should be taken forward together with some additional work on redesign. He concluded that before any work on redesign is reopened, there should be a clearly articulated process decided upon between the leadership of the SSC and the Species Programme. He commented that it is not only a matter for the two heads, but also a matter for IUCN Senior Management to consider. S Stuart agreed, saying that the July meeting did produce some results for consolidation of the SSC and Species Programme. He noted that the question of imbalance between the Programme and the SSC does need to be grappled with. R Lacy commented that he appreciates the "IUCN Species" label coined by G Mace, but that care should be taken that this label is not then seen as one party having power over the other.

H Dublin commented that all the issues around redesign, the relationship between the SSC and the Species Programme and the Red List processes are, to one extent or another, interlinked. Although there were many different consultative processes, there are still a variety of perceptions that have not been reconciled – e.g. that the network has one set of priorities and staff the other, mostly due to the funding model and the resource-poor environment in which we operate. To reduce this tension, there should have been an agreed set of priorities between the SSC and the Species Programme for fund raising, but this was never achieved in this Quadrennium. Both the Species Programme staff and the SSC network were within their rights to have a strong reaction... and although no consensus on the way forward has been reached, at least the discussions have been opened. The Red SSC SC Meeting WCC3.8 – MINUTES

List process was one area where it was felt some progress could be made in this Quadrennium, and the September Red List Process meeting was, indeed, very fruitful. In terms of the SGs and the SSC network for the new Quadrennium, there will be a full report produced on the proposals for modifications to the groups and Chairs. It should be understood that many issues that arose this Quadrennium arose due to the fact that a network with a number of complex and unresolved issues had been inherited.

J Smart thanked the Steering Committee members for their interesting comments and agreed that the issues were, indeed, all interlinked. She put forward that in her opinion, the Species Programme and the SSC should be equal partners and work together as complementary equals. She said she did not agree with G Mace's belief that the SSC and Species Programme should be indistinguishable. In fact, she felt that more clarity is needed on the roles and responsibilities of each party, but that it should be on a partnership basis not the SSC telling the Species Programme what to do.

JC Vié commented that many of the Species Programme staff are in fact members of the SSC and are very loyal to the SSC. He noted that the Programme does work on projects because it needs to finance itself and this causes some discomfort with the Network. He concluded that the Species Programme should be better at packaging what it does to include better support for the SSC in a more seamless way.

Y Sadovy commented that as a SG Chair involved in assessments, she is unhappy with the current model. She noted that the funding model should have an overhead for the Species Programme and contracted work, but it should also include money to be given directly to the SGs for assessments and evaluations. Additionally, she expressed her concern that there have been no SGs established through the Global Marine Species Assessment workshops to date and that the process done in this way was not strengthening the SSC network. She felt this was wrong and that the focus should be on building capacity within the SGs and SSC. The overhead being more inclusive of SG needs would assist in this endeavour. There has been no real attempt to date to build new RLAs or capacity for evaluation work in the marine realm. There should also be capacity building to enable the SG to do more conservation work. Currently, there is money, but the quick way of doing the project has been to bring in consultants and staff – instead of building the capacity in the SSC network. She felt that the model she described would serve to bring the SSC and Species Programme closer together.

H Dublin agreed, saying that the demands from donors usually include delivery dates and contractual matters – which can sometimes be challenging with a volunteer network and this is why consultants are often used. However, this is not in the long-term interests of the SSC or the quality and objectivity of the assessments. D Leaman commented that many SGs could manage a contract well and perform on time. There has to be some way to deal with the “haves” and “have nots” to make sure that even when there is no project funding, there is still support for the SSC network.

M Samways commented that often we are considering things in an IUCN-centric manner, but in fact we should consider that what emerges from the IUCN work is, in fact, more projects and more conservation work. We are catalysts for other projects that individual SSC members are interested in. The network is far more than what we see. Y Sadovy agreed, saying we need to build those opportunities.

S Stuart commented that in terms of the Red List process meeting, the conclusion that was reached was that although there is a problem with the evaluation phase, there is actually a need to invest much earlier in the process – during the pulling together of data, the compilation stage. The lack of investment here leads to the system not working smoothly. If there is investment in the upstream phase, the cost of and time involved in the evaluation and consistency checking will decrease. There is already funding available, but it is not sufficient and not being spent on the right steps or on the right level of training.

R Lacy commented that there is a perception that the current approach has been investing in capacity replacing, rather than capacity building; that the Species Programme staff have more or less replaced the SSC network.

M Samways noted that it is interesting that there is embarrassment about an over emphasis of work on Red Listing. It should be remembered that the Red List is a launching point – many things spin off from the Red List, including much practical conservation. H Dublin agreed, but said that sometimes the Red List is seen as an end in itself – particularly by the IUCN Secretariat as the Red List creates such a high profile, focus and notoriety to the organisation. For many it is a tool for other conservation activities, but for some it is an end in itself. The different perspectives can and do lead to complications.

R Kock noted that things happen rapidly in conservation, and the SSC/SP should re-examine strategies so as not to become myopic. Now that the SSC and Species Programme are examining their links, the links to the higher level have become important. J Smart noted that communicating what the Red List is has improved, but the backlog of assessments does need to be resolved so that conservation action can result. She noted that it is her role as the Head of the Species Programme to solve these problems, but that IUCN Senior Management is also now more aware of the problems due to better communication. In this crowded community of conservation organisations, the Red List process needs to be sorted out so that the work of all those who contribute to it is ultimately protected. The process issues, if not sorted, threaten the viability of the Red List itself. H Dublin noted that IUCN's governance is a complex issue – often Council feels they have taken a decision, but then nothing happens; the Steering Committee might feel it has made a decision, but nothing happens; the SG Chairs might feel they make a decision and then nothing happens. How the resources are allocated, who sets the priorities, and who writes the proposals – these things happen in the Secretariat due to the current funding model. The Secretariat is motivated by concerns other than the needs of the volunteer experts or how to keep a volunteer network motivated. The regions may want to work with the Commissions, but their first priority is to answer on their balance sheet. This is an impediment to synergy and enhanced conservation effort but there is great desire from the Regional Programmes to engage with the SSC network, and we have moved on some things this Quadrennium. There is a growing awareness that things can be solved, but most feel that realistically the “One Programme” approach will take five years to fully implement because it means changes in our institutional *modus operandi*.

M Clout commented that the letter from G Mace was thoughtful. He noted that the over-dominance of the Red List is a problem, particularly for those SSC members more focussed on action. More should be done to link the many cross-cutting issues with each other and raise funds to support this important work. The Red List should be a tool to identify threats to individual species, and then money should be raised for work on those threats. We should remember that it is not the “Species Assessment Commission”.

Y Sadovy added that the SGs are perhaps currently made up of individuals who find the assessment work very tangible, but many younger people coming into SGs are focussed on action. Improving the quality of the information right from the collection point is very important and will help with the evaluation process. IUCN is very lucky as SSC's SG's have some of the world's leading experts – yet somehow their contributions remain undervalued.

L Boitani noted that this and many other discussions can continue, but nothing can change because the network is not currently suited for action. Our products and assessments are used by others – and this is acceptable, but there is a need to reshape the network so that it can be better suited for action. However, there seems to be some resistance to this need.

T Brooks noted that there is much work between the Red List work and actual on-the-ground work, and a large amount of this work can fall within the capacity of the SSC – such as the SCPTF. L Boitani agreed that the connections need to be better. He concluded that the SSC and Species Programme should have a more proactive role in defining platforms for projects and commented that *ad hoc* groups are usually very successful.

D Leaman commented that the posters from the Al Ain meeting showed that there is much conservation action happening within the SSC. It is easier to note the bigger picture with the Red List because it is global, but it is harder to see the spin-off action within the individual

SGs. L Boitani agreed, saying that so much more could be achieved if there was better coordinated between the SSC and the Species Programme, both working to the same agenda.

H Dublin closed this section of the meeting by thanking L Boitani and G Mace for their letters and reports, and S Stuart and J Smart for the very useful conversations that had taken place on the need for greater synergy between the Species Programme and the SSC.

5.4 SSC Sub-Committees: Final Recommendations and Decisions

5.4.1 Biodiversity Assessments Sub-Committee (BASC)

S Stuart pointed out that the BASC report was in the meeting pack. He mentioned that he had not understood the request from the SSC Chair to prepare a report covering the Quadrennium but that more detail can be found in all the minutes of the BASC meetings. A few items not covered in the report are:

- The contributions by BASC to the development of the SIS were very successful. The Red List process should be much more efficient and versioning problems should be minimised in this new online system.
- Earlier in the Quadrennium some problems were discovered with regard to the formula used to calculate the Red List Index. The mathematical issues were resolved and the new formula was published.

The main issues BASC has covered this Quadrennium, include:

The 2008 Red List Review

This is not a Global Species Assessment, but a very useful compilation. JC Vié was commended for his excellent work in overseeing its production for the WCC. There are plans to bring all the fact sheets together into a single document after Barcelona.

Red List User Guidelines

The Red List User Guidelines have been dealt with by the Standards and Petitions Working Group at every BASC meeting. Version 7 of the guidelines was uploaded onto the website a few months ago. Possible extinction guidelines are still under debate.

Classification Schemes

This Quadrennium saw major progress in upgrading the Classification Schemes and A Stattersfield is to be thanked for doing a magnificent job as the Chair of this WG. The Threats Classification Scheme has not yet been fully implemented, and much data still has to be cross-walked manually. The Utilisation and Livelihoods Classifications Schemes were a huge amount of work and are not yet ready. The linking of the utilisation and livelihoods has been a large group effort. H Dublin noted that the utilisation scheme links directly to harvest records, focusing on individual products, while the livelihoods module would only be completed at a case-study level due to the detailed knowledge required to complete the fields. There is still some debate over where in the commodity chain, from harvest to final sales, the assessment can and should be made.

J Smart noted that every time the data required for an assessment is modified, it has implications for the SGs. She queried how often changes to the requirements are made and when they become compulsory. S Stuart answered that the RLA Terms of Reference are usually set at the beginning of a Quadrennium. He also noted that it may be worth considering that there is an overloading of the documentation requirements. There could perhaps be a compromise between what is required the first time an assessment is done and what is required thereafter. J Smart agreed, saying this would be a most useful discussion that should take place at the beginning of the Quadrennium involving all the speciose groups who battle with the requirements for assessments. H Dublin agreed, saying that the sequencing of decisions taken in the new Quadrennium with regard to the assessment process will be important.

G Mace commented that much of the data now being gathered are not really central to Red Listing, but may be very useful for other studies. She noted that there are two issues requiring caution: firstly, that the chances of placing species onto the Red List are not prejudiced by making the documentation requirements too difficult; and secondly, that the right people are brought into discussions and work on Classification Schemes. S Stuart agreed, saying that it is important to garner the right expertise in completing Classification Schemes and this requires further consideration.

S Stuart pointed out that it confuses some people that the percentage of species on the Red List in the Threatened categories is going down. However, this is because there are more species on the Red List, particularly in the Least Concern category. Although it can still be called the Red List process, assessments now also include many additional things. D Leaman agreed, illustrating that, for example, it is important for the Red List to also cover species that are not threatened but are in use so that sustainable collection can be allowed under scientific guidance.

R Lacy commented that the original vision of SIS was felt to be too broad, so it was collapsed into a smaller set of required data. But over time the Red List database has become bigger and bigger, requiring an expanded SIS, yet again. In effect, the Red List assessment process has once again become what SIS was originally intended to be and this is confusing to many.

There was general agreement that the terminology issues remain problematic and need to be addressed carefully with a view to establishing a stable nomenclature around the Red List assessment process and the tools in use. It was agreed that this would best be done through a targeted discussion in the next Quadrennium.

Guidelines for Appropriate Use of Red List Data

S Stuart explained that these guidelines were lead by A Smith, Chair of the Lagomorph SG and member of BASC. Despite earlier concerns expressed by Members of the SSC SC, at the SC meeting in Al Ain, it was concluded that it was important to list inappropriate uses as it is a guideline not a policy. The guidelines will continually be improved and should be continually on the BASC agenda for consideration. It was agreed that the relationship of the Red List to matters regarding sustainable use, and the application of the Red List to national legislation, need to be included in the document. Creative ways of making people read this document will be considered – most likely including a mechanism that when people download data from the Red List website, this document automatically downloads as well.

L Boitani commented that the document was clear and concise, and agreed to help with some suggestions for adding some inappropriate uses of the Red List in scientific research. Y Sadovy noted that a section on consumer choice, standards and practices should be added and agreed to help draft some text.

H Dublin concluded the discussion by saying the Guidelines could possibly be put up on SharePoint, where people could then add and clarify the wording. She also noted that it would be essential to find a creative way to send these Guidelines to all IUCN members as many members do not understand appropriate uses of the Red List at this time.

S Stuart thanked A Smith and H Temple for all their hard work on these Guidelines.

<p>DECISION: The Guidelines for Appropriate Uses of Red List Data were adopted on the understanding that they will continue to be improved, including the agreed additions under Actions.</p>
--

<p>ACTIONS:</p>

- | |
|---|
| <p>1. BASC to consider adding the following issues to the Guidelines for Appropriate Uses of Red List Data:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- sustainable use,- the application of the Red List to national legislation, |
|---|

- consumer choice (with help from Y Sadovy),
- inappropriate scientific uses (with help from L Boitani),
- sustainable wild collection.

2. BASC to consider creative ways to ensure that all IUCN Members receive the Guidelines on Appropriate Uses of Red List Data.

National and Regional Red Listing

S Stuart introduced the report submitted to the SSC Steering Committee and explained that BASC had been requested to look at the potential options, including an assessment of pros and cons, of different levels of SSC involvement in national- and regional-level Red Listing. The document which resulted will serve as guidance for the new SSC Steering Committee. The document advises that it would be unwise for SSC or IUCN to become involved in the certification of National Red Lists, but that the feasibility of the certification of Red List Trainers should be investigated.

H Dublin commented that there had been a slight misinterpretation of the Terms of Reference for this request of BASC, and that further recommendations had been sought from BASC. As no other real recommendations were put forward more work on actual recommendations will therefore be required. She noted that it is important work because there is much already occurring in terms of national and regional level Red Listing and there are some very big questions to be considered. One such question was whether IUCN should be directly involved in the website launched by ZSL that captures the various National and Regional Red Lists.

J Smart commented that there are many implications to be considered. She noted that the Species Programme is recruiting a Red List Training Officer – who will be aimed at training for conducting assessments at the global level first, because there are many training challenges at that level too. She agreed that the national and regional levels also have some very difficult problems – including the platform for hosting. She noted that a proposal to the Darwin Initiative has been submitted and includes some funds for regional training and also some cost recovery for further website development. She concluded that the discussions in BASC were very helpful and that the report is a good resource for initiating further discussion in the new Quadrennium.

G Mace gave a note of caution, saying that national and regional level listings can become very problematic when there are small countries and species that move across borders. L Boitani agreed, and said that more research is needed as it would be impossible to take the current Red List assessment process as it stands and convert it directly to the national level.

The discussion was concluded by S Stuart saying that some further recommendations were obviously needed. J Smart agreed, saying particularly the institutional ramifications for IUCN should be considered, so BASC should work with the Species Programme on a next draft.

ACTION: BASC to further elaborate on recommendations for the way forward for national and regional level Red Listing.

Taxonomic Policy

S Stuart noted that the last BASC meeting had considered the issue of taxonomy and noted that it was not appropriate for IUCN to develop its own system, as taxonomy is not IUCN's primary work. However, there is a need for IUCN to be consistent in the use and application of taxonomic norms. BASC has essentially agreed an agenda for an expert workshop that will bring people from the taxonomy community together with those from SSC. This should be held as soon as possible in the new Quadrennium.

Recognition of Assessors

S Stuart reported that BASC did not feel that the consultation done with the SG Chairs at Al Ain had been adequate enough for decision-making. He further noted that a little progress

was made on this issue at the Red List Process meeting held in September, but more work is needed early in the new Quadrennium. There is more clarity now on the actual functional roles of providers, compilers and assessors, and this should help in exploring ways to provide the desired recognition.

At this stage it is not clear whether a Red List journal is the way to go or not. This is a matter for later discussion. It is essential that attributions on the Red List website and recognition provided on the current system are correct, and therefore a few people from BASC and the Species Programme will continue to tackle this issue.

S Stuart agreed with G Mace that the current diagrams used by the RLU to describe the Red List assessment process need modifying to reflect the fact that the same person can play various roles and often do.

Priorities for Plant Assessments

S Stuart report that no further progress had been achieved on this issue and that it will require attention in the new Quadrennium. There is a need to link the establishment of SGs to agreed priorities for assessments. Even though there is the over-arching “wild plants for food and medicine” priority, further prioritisation is required to come to a definitive list of species to be assessed. S Stuart noted that it would be wise for the plant network to follow similar lines to the marine network in further formulating priorities.

D Leaman said that she felt progress had, in fact, been made this Quadrennium in the line of broad priorities, but much of it will be contingent on finding funding and regional expertise – i.e. the practical side of carrying out these priorities is problematic. H Dublin agreed, saying that how the plant network is established in the new Quadrennium is vitally important – it is a question of whether to fundraise first and then establish the network, or establish the network first and then try to find funds to enable it. H Dublin asked D Leaman for her advice on this matter and D Leaman said she would recommend not making substantial changes to the current network, but would then fundraise to find the resources to undertake the priority assessments. She noted that there is a substantial amount of work happening in the plant network at a more local level that may not be entirely visible at the overall SSC level. It was concluded that further discussion is needed on the establishment of the plant network in the new Quadrennium.

Piloting of RapidList

S Stuart explained that BASC was asked to comment on the piloting of RapidList and J Griffin prepared and presented a report to BASC, which needs to be analysed further. He noted that BASC needs to consider the reasons why people do assessments and then look at the pros and cons of different assessment approaches – because the reason for doing assessments might reveal more about the kind of assessment that is needed. J Griffin and other members of the Species Programme will continue to look at this issue with some BASC members and will complete the details on the table that has been started before it is sent out for comment.

There followed some debate on whether the sampled approach should be included as a method for comparison, but it was decided that the sampled approach are comprehensive assessments of sub-sampled sets of species and therefore should not be compared to RapidList. However, the pros and cons of the sampled approach do need to be investigated in the future.

ACTION: BASC to send RapidList report and completed table to M Samways, T Brooks, L Boitani and D Leaman for comment.
--

Periodicity of Red List Releases

S Stuart explained that with the move to the new web-based SIS, there should be greater flexibility to have more regular Red List updates. He explained that there could be enormous benefits to more regular updates, but there are also practical implications – such as

SSC SC Meeting WCC3.8 – MINUTES

versioning issues. The main benefit would be that it would shorten the time between submissions and publishing of data and, thus, reduce the tensions between assessors and the RLU over the length of time taken for placement of assessments on the Red List. H Dublin suggested that a feasibility study is done to examine the positives and negatives of more frequent versioning, and J Smart agreed that this should be done, but that other priorities such as the backlog take precedent. L Boitani commented that such a study would be important and there are many considerations – including how and on what timing the Red List end products would be communicated, which may differ from the actual updating of the Red List itself.

ACTION: The first Steering Committee meeting of the next Quadrennium should consider a feasibility study for increasing the frequency of Red List updates and releases and put together a timeframe for this study.

Red List Backlog

S Stuart noted that the Red List backlog has occurred for a number of reasons, including poor quality of submissions, the late submission of data, the challenges of conversion to the new online system, and updates which have problems relating to taxonomic matters.

H Dublin noted that it is important for the right message to be given: that a permanent solution might not be possible as these same issues may crop up again and backlogs may continue regardless due to some being inherent in the system. S Stuart agreed, but qualified that some of the issues can be resolved through correct use of the new online system and the potential for increasing of the frequency of Red List updates. He noted that the issue of data quality of incoming assessments is the one that will continue to be a problem. G Mace reiterated what she had said at the Beijing Steering Committee meeting: that the quality problem should not be handled in the RLU, but should be handed back to the Red List Authority or placed on the Red List and then opened for challenge. She noted that a peer review system would be best for the Red List as it allows positive feedback and gives the assessors an important sense of responsibility amongst their peers. H Dublin agreed, saying that she and J Smart have discussed the management implications of this issue. J Smart noted that there is a need to guide staff on how much effort they should put into an assessment before sending it back; as well as a need for everyone to become comfortable that some data in the Red List may not initially be of top quality but would be improved through a peer review system.

Red List Data Policies

H Dublin led this discussion on the document provided to the SSC Steering Committee, which she and J Ragle had prepared, including reference to: a) the IUCN Data Providers Agreement; b) the IUCN Red List Data Terms of Use and c) the Pre-publication Use policy (represented for the purposes of this discussion in a schematic diagram but with the intention that it will be accompanied by an articulated text to be prepared by J Ragle as soon as possible after the WCC). J Ragle sent apologies for not being able to attend the meeting. She noted that W Jackson has initiated an overall data and information policy discussion in IUCN, so it will be important for the Red List Data Policies to link to this broader umbrella. It was her understanding that W Jackson intended to release the policy at the upcoming Congress but there has been no verification of this.

J Ragle is nearing the end of finalising the Data Providers Agreement – which had many issues, such as whether there could be two types of agreements (a more extensive one for institutional partners and a simplified version for general people providing data via the website or at workshops). The Data Terms of Use document is also nearing completion; one issue remaining being exactly what constitutes commercial use. H Dublin explained that this was a matter of defining “commercial use” and establishing whether it refers to the data being used by a for-profit, commercial entity or whether it refers to the data being used for commercial purposes by any user. J Hutton commented that UNEP-WCMC should be included in the commercial use discussions due to the joint IUCN/UNEP-WCMC database. He noted that the concern is most valid where you have companies who sell data for a living.

SSC SC Meeting WCC3.8 – MINUTES

L Bennun agreed that commercial use should be defined quite tightly, and that companies wanting the data should know that they need to contribute tangibly to its collection and curation. Perhaps there can be a voluntary contribution from commercial entities through IBAT – they could be asked to contribute financially before they receive the data.

H Dublin described the components contained in the Pre-Publication Use of Red List Data policy (which would carry at the very least the same general Terms of Use for Red List data if not more restricted conditions, depending on the proposed use). She noted that the main issue concerns requests for the public release of data that have been peer reviewed (or, in some cases have not yet been reviewed), but not yet consistency-checked by the RLU. IUCN has been inconsistent on this issue – even in the recent past – and the policy requires urgent finalising. The diagram clearly shows that the default would be that such data are not released but that there should be a process for allowing the Chair of the SSC and the Head of the Species Programme to exercise mutual discretion against a set of clear criteria. For example, where there are strong conservation justifications for the release of pre-publication data. Obviously as upstream processes are strengthened and there is more confidence in the assessments themselves (even before formal peer review has taken place), pre-release of data could become easier. At present the criteria must be developed to provide the Chair and the Species Programme Head the necessary tools for making decisions on requests for pre-publication use of data. It remains to be decided whether assessments/data should be released publicly under any circumstances prior to the peer review being conducted.

R Lacy commented that “Red List Data” is a confusing term, as there is much data in the Red List database that is not required for a Red List assessment – e.g. if some of the data only becomes official “Red List Data” at the consistency checking stage, then this data could not be used for conservation planning in the interim before publication in the Red List. H Dublin qualified that the pre-publication use policy will apply only to the final Red List category and the required documentation to support the listing as this is what has caused problems in the past when changes in a species’ status, generally in the policy context, are being considered. This is where there has been inconsistency in how this information is released.

H Dublin concluded by asking the SSC Steering Committee if they were happy with the Pre-publication Data Use policy to be adopted and articulated in prose by J Ragle, as soon as possible. There was unanimous agreement.

DECISION: The SSC Steering Committee adopted the proposed Pre-publication Data Use policy, which is to be articulated in text.

ACTIONS:

- SSC Chair to ensure that J Hutton becomes linked into the IUCN Data Policy discussions with regard to defining the meaning of “commercial use”.
- J Ragle to write the text to accompany the schematic diagram depicting the Pre-publication Use policy.

S Stuart concluded the BASC discussion by thanking the BASC Working Group Chairs: JP Rodriguez, J Baillie, S Butchart, A Stattersfield, R Akçakaya and C Hilton-Taylor. He noted that H Dublin had attended the first and last meeting of the BASC this Quadrennium and so may have a better sense of what has been achieved than those directly involved in the details. He concluded that it is a lesson for the future that the most progress is achieved in the first part of the Quadrennium. As the preparations for Congress tend to absorb tremendous staff resources and energies later on, it is necessary to link the aspirations to the realistic timeframe.

H Dublin agreed, saying that the workload of BASC is very high and everyone involved should be commended for their contributions. She noted that she and J Smart had agreed that the exceptional situation of having a staff member as the Chair of BASC should be avoided in future, even though the BASC work is closely linked to the work of the Species Programme. She concluded that BASC probably needs Co-Chairs in future due to the work

load. She also noted that some members of the Steering Committee had expressed their views regarding over attention being paid to the extensive details on BASC issues at our meetings, and suggested that some thought needs to be given with regard to the possibility that some BASC issues could be pre-digested by a sub-set of the Steering Committee rather than having the time of the whole Steering Committee devoted to BASC at the main meetings. This may not be possible or desirable but should be investigated in future.

H Dublin closed the BASC discussion by thanking S Stuart for his efforts as Chair of the BASC. She also thanked T Brooks for being the intermediary between BASC and the Steering Committee, and thanked the Steering Committee for always being helpful in giving direction to the BASC.

5.4.2 Biodiversity Indicators Sub-Committee (BISC)

G Mace commented that it is an open question regarding how much the next SSC should work on indicators – whether it should be done in a larger manner or not at all. She explained that the RLI and SRLI are well-established, but there is much expansion possible in terms of other indicators and the mid-level involvement that has been attempted has not been optimal. H Dublin agreed, saying that if the engagement stays at the same level, it might not be worth it. She noted it is similar to Sustainable Use in that secretariat support is needed. She concluded that the work done this Quadrennium on indicators was important as it has opened doors for IUCN, and hopefully IUCN will do more indicator work in future.

G Mace clarified that she felt more could be done in terms of the BIP process, as indicators such as those for species affected by climate change and wildlife diseases are inputs that SSC could provide. H Dublin agreed, saying that IUCN would like to have this role, but that resources are lacking. There is also some debate over BIP as a process and it is unclear what its next phase will be.

G Mace noted that DIVERSITAS wanted to do some indicator work towards the CBD goal, but CBD said they did not want to make side arrangements with single organisations. H Dublin noted that this was not an isolated incident at CBD, and that it could be worth a paper to discuss the matter. G Mace agreed, saying there are many unfinished conversations. J Hutton noted that it is vital to link to CBD and it is important for both IUCN and DIVERSITAS to be involved in the BIP and strengthen it.

G Mace concluded the discussion by saying that if resources were available, BISC should continue its good work. H Dublin noted that there might be options through 3IC, but that a commitment from the Secretariat would be required. She concluded the discussion by thanking G Mace profusely for her efforts for BISC. She said that many people have been congratulatory on the fact that the RLI is now an accepted measure for the MDGs.

5.4.3 Sustainable Use Sub-Committee (SUSC)

J Hutton explained that the Sustainable Use SG had conducted a survey to provide insight into the way forward for SSC's approach to sustainable use for the next Quadrennium. The full report of the survey is available at <http://data.iucn.org/themes/ssc/susg/news/index.htm>

He noted that there is a diversity of opinions in the SUSG about a range of issues, and many feelings about the possible continuation of the historically regional structure of the Group (in fact until this Quadrennium, the regional chapters were actually SGs in their own right). He noted that when starting as Chair of the SUSG, he had inherited a group that had previously had 18 regions and a secretariat in Washington DC, but that funding had run out and the secretariat support had been dissolved. IUCN really focussed its efforts on sustainable use issues through TRAFFIC and therefore, ironically, the SUSG in its original form became unsustainable. Only two regions have flourished since that time – Europe and Southern Africa. At the recent CBD CoP, the leadership of the European region expressed dissatisfaction with how the SUSG was being run. A working lunch was organised during

which the complexities were discussed and the conducting of this survey was proposed by H Dublin. Z Holtsuk was enlisted to assist with the survey. It was widely distributed through the SSC network, to the staff and beyond and all were encouraged to respond, indicating which part(s) of IUCN they most closely identified with. The survey was designed to extract opinions on how IUCN deals with sustainable use, and how SSC should tackle it in the future. 400 people responded to the survey and the main results were that the majority of people did not think that SUSG had completed its job nor that it should be disbanded, although there remains large ambiguity around the broad concept of sustainable use.

J Hutton noted that the main findings of the survey should be communicated to the new SSC Steering Committee and also the IUCN Secretariat. H Dublin agreed, saying that the survey results have some very interesting points, particularly on how IUCN could better mainstream sustainable use. She noted that the new IUCN Programme does not include much on sustainable use, even through SSC tried to have some elements of the work incorporated in the Species Component Plan. J Hutton commented that the concept of promoting sustainable use as a conservation tool is perhaps too controversial for IUCN. He noted that the IUCN Secretariat probably feels they do a lot on sustainable use, and that the sustainable use community does not feel they have had adequate support. This is partly the fault of the SUSG, which has had less and less engagement with the broader sustainable use community due to lack of funds.

W Jackson then joined the Steering Committee for a short period and H Dublin explained the background to the SSC's sustainable use survey. She told W Jackson that many members of the Commissions want IUCN to be stronger on issues of sustainable use because their individual voices are not powerful enough. The results of the survey show that people do not feel IUCN is mainstreaming sustainable use issues enough and people expressed their concern that perhaps IUCN does not support sustainable use. J Hutton explained about the attention in previous years through the funding support and staff – which has now all withered away. This has depressed and discouraged many of the volunteers (who are still very active in the sustainable use community).

JC Vié noted that there may be some areas where a bigger role is needed – more funding and more linkages with taxonomic groups. The International Whaling Commission is one example. J Hutton agreed, saying that a huge majority of those who answered the survey think that the rest of the SSC should be more involved in sustainable use. There is a need for more cross-cutting to other SGs and the group would benefit from a Programme Officer to grow this aspect. H Dublin noted that there is also a feeling that the SUSG should be involved in global conceptual issues like resilience. This is a really good time to obtain all the feedback possible so that it can be moved forward quickly in the new Quadrennium. Regret was expressed that it is too late for a whole new thematic area on sustainable use to be brought into the IUCN Programme for 2009 - 2012.

S Stuart agreed with J Hutton that this issue could not be tackled without staff support. He noted that there has been reasonable success this Quadrennium in bringing in resources for Red Listing activities and assessments, but there is a lack of resources for other things that the SSC network want to be involved in. He noted that the issue of sustainable use has definitely been de-emphasised in the programme. H Dublin agreed, saying that even the two successful regions are having problems and need more support from their respective IUCN Regional Offices. J Smart commented that this issue does need to be addressed, as the de-emphasis has most likely been unintentional. She noted that there is much work on sustainable use occurring, but that it is likely not labelled as such. H Dublin noted that as a member of CEESP, she has heard similar conversations to the ones occurring in SSC – and there is a feeling that much cross-Commission work can be done in this field in the new Quadrennium. Y Sadovy noted she felt IUCN is well-placed to address the issue of sustainable use.

R Kock stated that many of the other thematic groups, like Wildlife Health, are suffering the same fate as sustainable use and perhaps surveys are needed for other thematic groups as well.

W Jackson then commented that one of IUCN's biggest challenges is to balance focus with diversity. In the past, too many interests were accommodated and resources became stretched too thin so some interests were marginalised. He noted that in the case of sustainable use, it was de-focused because: a) it was felt that sustainable use had been integrated and mainstreamed into other parts of the organisation, and b) that the financial viability was not secure. He stated that many projects are decided upon in terms of financial implications, and there is a drive to focus on fewer things that IUCN is good at rather than giving everyone a little – which then results in it not being enough for delivering what is required. He said he understood that the mechanisms for engaging on shaping the new IUCN Programme were not good enough. He concluded that there are decision-making problems in the organisation and that the system for setting programmatic priorities is lacking and therefore it is not entirely about funding issues.

J Hutton concluded that sustainable use is built into CBD as one of its three objectives, but it has dropped from the radar of the GEF and other organisations. There is a perception that most conservation organisations have moved on from sustainable use, and yet the community are saying that it is still a critical issue. IUCN is the only organisation that can stand up for this issue, even if others are letting it go.

5.4.4 Plant Conservation Sub-Committee (PCSC)

D Leaman stated that she had tried to be as honest as possible in the report in the meeting pack. She noted that the plant network had been doing much valuable work this Quadrennium, but the PCSC had never been good at linking with the network. She said the SG Chairs' Meeting was a wonderful opportunity for the Chairs of the plant SGs to get together and communications had been much better since that meeting. She noted that the PCSC had problems with leadership and representation – as the SGs, for the most part, were not represented on the PCSC. The PCSC was an important venue for individuals to come together from institutions, but the linkages with the network were not adequate. There were a few plant SG Chairs who were members of the PCSC (e.g. Medicinal Plants, Cycads and Cacti and Succulents), and as a result those SGs had a better idea of happenings within SSC than other SGs but it did not extend much beyond that.

H Dublin agreed, saying there is a history of disconnection where many players only represented their institutions and did not promote their link to the SSC network. The MCSC model had been a stronger model. M Samways commented that the marine and invertebrate networks spent a great deal of time at the beginning of the Quadrennium talking about various models for efficient and effective network functioning and there is a need to do the same in the plant network. H Dublin agreed, saying that the plant community is very disparate and there is much room to talk about options for improvement.

D Leaman noted that the enormous challenge for the plant network is also that of prioritising – particularly because not all taxa are represented as SGs. Many plants specialists are floristic specialists rather than taxa, and this is reflected in the fact that some plant SGs are regional. There is no standard and therefore how to structure the network and how to set work priorities are complicated issues.

H Dublin then thanked D Leaman for stepping in to represent the PCSC, and commended her on her achievements in the short time period. She noted that there is much conservation work happening for plants and there is definitely a need for the SSC to handle the plant interests of the network in a different way. She requested that D Leaman put together some of her personal views of the plant network for the new SSC Steering Committee to consider in the new Quadrennium.

ACTION: D Leaman to put together her personal views on the plant network for consideration by the new SSC Steering Committee.
--

5.4.5 Marine Conservation Sub-Committee (MCSC)

Y Sadovy said that the report in the pack is straightforward and offers a few recommendations for the way forward. The priority for the MCSC in this Quadrennium was to identify priorities that could be focussed on and then add value. She noted that one failing of the MCSC was that it could have done more networking with the marine SGs within SSC. She stated that one of the major priorities identified was the communication challenges within the marine world – which is why the main output of the MCSC this Quadrennium is the booklet “Adrift – Tales of Ocean Fragility”, which presents compelling stories about a variety of marine species and marine problems in a format that should be easy for readers to remember and tell to others. Already there is a desire to translate the book, and there have been suggestions that a similar booklet be done every few years. J Griffin is to be thanked for her efforts on logistics, but the publication is very much a team effort of the MCSC.

J Smart commented that the best thing about “Adrift” is that it is scientifically correct, and yet very visually appealing and simple. H Dublin agreed, saying that C Campagna’s and the MCSC’s creative thinking on communications issues was to be commended. She noted that a number of people have commented to her on the book already – and the Head of the IUCN Global Marine Programme has thanked SSC for their collaborative efforts on this and throughout the Quadrennium. She asked Y Sadovy to pass thanks to the whole MCSC for their efforts and contributions over the past four years.

Y Sadovy concluded by saying that the book would be launched at Congress, and would be available for sale in the Congress bookstore. She noted that funding for the book had come from a variety of donors, and printing had been a bit more costly than anticipated due to it being printed in Switzerland. She noted that there were many ideas for more efficiency next time round, as well as ideas to have web-related stories and possibly even a calendar produced.

5.4.6 Invertebrate Conservation Sub-Committee (ICSC)

M Samways noted that this Quadrennium was a major success for the invertebrate community, as the structuring of the network now allows for the Red Listing of any invertebrate in the world – with full mindfulness of the persistent Red List backlog problem. With invertebrates, the Red List is not the end point as many managers are using the Red List data to assess habitats, and it is also being used for biotic indices. The SSC structure for invertebrates is now globally accepted (for example, a workshop on TIRLA at the International Congress of Entomology was very well attended), robust and resilient and it will also be able to accommodate any structural changes in the SSC that may take place in future. He concluded by saying that many invertebrate biologists are not familiar with conservation, but the ICSC is now becoming the interface and creating more awareness. ICSC is the only forum for invertebrate species globally.

H Dublin thanked M Samways for his dedication and determination to find a solution for the invertebrate community through the SSC. She noted that many invertebrate biologist members of SSC had been unhappy at the start of the Quadrennium, but that now there was a great feeling of accomplishment. She also congratulated M Samways on his many personal achievements of the Quadrennium – most notably a number of awards for his contributions to invertebrate conservation.

J Smart commented that it would be excellent for the ICSC to write an article for a future edition of *Species* explaining in layman’s terms how they have succeeded in tackling the challenges of such a speciose group.

5.5 SSC Task Forces: Final Recommendations and Decisions

5.5.1 Species Conservation Planning Task Force (SCPTF)

R Lacy noted that at the time he submitted his written report for the meeting pack, it looked as though the TF might not reach conclusion on the documents. But just a few days before Congress, consensus was achieved on the both the Guidelines and the Handbook, and everyone in the TF is pleased with the outcome. He recommended that the process as outlined should now be put to use so that lessons can be learned and changes made as necessary. He expressed his confidence that this process will become a signature output of the SSC.

R Lacy clarified that there continue to be some small debates, but mostly people are concerned about small and specific issues rather than the overall process. One cautionary note is that some SGs have already said they will require help to implement the process. An ongoing mechanism that can provide help to SGs should be considered, such as a TF or SG with support from the staff in the Species Programme. Despite the attempts of the SCPTF to be totally inclusive, the process is presently biased towards charismatic species, so there is a need to incorporate the view of the more speciose groups in the next iteration. H Dublin agreed, saying that the process had been very intense and required extensive interactions and communications, apparently overwhelming some people who had originally wanted to contribute.

T Brooks enquired whether there had been thinking over how to track the use of the process and then feedback into refinement. R Lacy answered that there was definitely a desire to track use and feedback, but a mechanism is not yet clear. H Dublin commented that these documents might also be appropriate to be shared on SharePoint for commenting and revision.

R Mittermeier enquired whether there are plans for producing a hard copy version of the documents and R Lacy answered that publication is the long term plan, and noted that the documents had been formatted using the IUCN publication guidelines for this express purpose.

R Kock enquired whether there was thinking on how to have the process endorsed by government authorities, and suggested that the documents be sent to all IUCN members accompanied by a letter from the DG. R Lacy answered that there is currently a passive approach. Discussions on who the audience is for the Guidelines and Handbook concluded that they were primarily aimed at the SGs (though many are already working with governments in carrying out this planning process for various species), but it is intended that the process can be used widely outside IUCN once it is working within the SSC. H Dublin commented that the process for roll-out to a wider audience would likely follow that of the Reintroduction Guidelines – which were very general and along the way had to be targeted for certain audiences. R Lacy noted that several government body representatives have signed up for the Learning Opportunity at Congress.

H Dublin concluded the discussion by thanking R Lacy profusely for all his efforts in leading this process. She noted that WCS had played a huge role in the final product as well, particularly in the editing process, and they should also be thanked. Thanks should also go to the many dedicated and passionate species experts who were involved in SPCTF. The final outputs of this TF are definitely one of the major achievements of the Quadrennium.

5.6 SSC Disciplinary Specialist Groups: Final Recommendations and Decisions

5.6.1 Reintroduction Specialist Group

No written report was received and F Launay was not present at the meeting, so no update was provided.

5.6.2 Conservation Breeding Specialist Group (CBSG)

R Lacy stated that CBSG has perhaps been active in too many directions instead of being more active in certain focus areas. It should perhaps have fewer, but more active members; and more highly trained professional volunteers instead of more staff. CBSG in the future will be prioritising more, forming more partnerships with other SGs and returning to its roots: *ex situ* methods for conservation. There are many challenges, including the changes between the *ex situ* community of a decade ago and today, and there is a need to explore how to actively involve the captive breeding community with *in situ* conservation.

R Lacy also noted that CBSG has done some work with the Reintroduction SG on improving techniques for reintroductions and translocations, noting that well-intentioned projects can sometimes lead to problems such as introducing *Chytridiomycosis* into places where it had not previously occurred. J Smart commented that it would be good to look at more *ex situ* and *in situ* linkages – particularly in the plant world. H Dublin commented that reintroduction issues are not always technical in nature, but often political too. Some reintroductions are not done for conservation purposes and much education is needed.

H Dublin noted that R Lacy has been dedicated to trying to affect change in a group that has been very set in its ways for a long time and has the challenge of having salaries to pay. She also noted that the staff are dedicated and creative, having begun to use some innovative technological advances in social networking software to enhance communication within the group. There have been many positive happenings in CBSG this Quadrennium, and she commended R Lacy for his efforts on behalf of the SSC.

5.6.3 Wildlife Health Specialist Group (WHSG)

R Kock summed up the Quadrennium by saying that the WHSG Co-Chairs had done their best to keep communicating with their portion of the network. He expressed the view that there is a need to take the WHSG network forward into the future and develop some SG products. At present ideas are already being generated along these lines – including thinking about indicators of emerging disease. At Congress there will be a workshop on pharmaceuticals in the environment, and there is hope for further engagement on this issue with the IUCN Business and Biodiversity Programme once a new Head of Programme is in place.

H Dublin noted that she has seen a high demand for immediate help on specific health-related issues and that the WHSG has done everything possible to assist. She noted that perhaps there could be a fund providing for members of the WHSG to respond on such issues in future – especially for technical advice that might involve mission travel, or perhaps the provisioning of letters to relevant policy and decision makers. She concluded the discussion by thanking R Kock and W Karesh for all their hard work on behalf of the SSC and the greater IUCN, for being so responsive each and every time they have been asked and noted their outstanding achievements in this Quadrennium.

5.6.4 Invasive Species Specialist Group (ISSG)

M Clout noted that invasive species are a major and growing threat that is becoming worse with globalisation. He expressed his view that the ISSG has continued to drive awareness of this threat both within and outside IUCN. The ISSG's Global Invasive Species Database (GISD) now contains over 500 species and is a major resource used by people all over the world. ISSG has had a focus on islands because they are often worst hit in terms of changes to whole systems because of invasives. Invasives can be linked to climate change, habitat loss, livelihood issues and much more. But it has been hard to run a programme, requiring constant finance to support staff and in recent years it has become even harder. ISSG has failed to raise substantial and sustainable international funding, although there is support

from some IUCN staff including the Coordinator of the Invasive Species Programme, G Howard.

M Clout noted that he would be stepping down as Chair, and made suggestions as to who might succeed him as Chair. He said there will be many challenges for the new Chair – particularly with regard to fundraising, but also with linking the GISD and other work on invasives to the Red List. There may be opportunities to do something on invasives like the MCSC has done with “Adrift”. In terms of the network, strengthening the regionalisation will be key – there must be a passionate local person to lead and coordinate the efforts. IUCN and SSC should give serious thought on how important invasive species are and how the ISSG might work more closely with the other Commissions. He commented that the issue is bigger than a SG – in fact it is bigger than a Commission! M Clout concluded by thanking H Dublin and JC Vié for their support over the years.

H Dublin said that she has also been frustrated about how difficult it has been to foster willingness and maintain support for the ISSG’s work. She shared her view that IUCN is definitely not tackling threat issues at the level it should be and that in order to do this significant new investments in staff and resources would need to be made. G Mace agreed with the comments by H Dublin in terms of what would be required for IUCN to work in earnest on the issue of mitigating threats. R Mittermeier noted that climate is now the obsession of the big NGOs, but there is definitely more needed at a higher policy level. H Dublin concluded that the new IUCN Programme may bring about some of the necessary changes as several of the key thematic areas are targeted at threats and actions to mitigate or adapt to their impacts. It remains to be seen how this will roll out.

H Dublin concluded that it is important for issues like invasive species not to become absorbed and lost under the overall umbrella of climate change, but rather retain its own identity. She thanked M Clout for his dedication for so many years, and also thanked M De Poorter, the former ISSG Coordinator. J Smart added her thanks and congratulated M Clout on tackling the One Programme approach.

6. SSC FINANCES AND COMMUNICATIONS

6.1 SSC COF and Reserves

H Dublin explained that the final COF finances for end-of-Quadrennium cannot be finalised at this stage, because many bills from the Congress will need to be paid after it is over. She noted that due to diligent saving against the COF allocation over the Quadrennium, the SSC was able to sponsor the largest number of its members in history to attend the Congress. After the Congress expenses have been concluded, it is likely that the 2008 COF allocation will have been fully utilised, as planned, and any shortfall will be covered from the Reserve. Even with this, there will still be a substantial SSC Reserve carried into the new Quadrennium.

She noted that it remains a problem that the COF cannot be used for programmatic work, only for governance. However, with the One Programme approach there may be more creative ways to secure programmatic funding for the SSC. She also reiterated how there is much SSC work that is marketable in the United States, but that the fundraising efforts through the IUCN US office have not come to fruition. She expressed hope that this may change in future.

H Dublin concluded that the Quadrennium had been very successful in terms of financial management and fund-raising. She noted that the idea of a Commission Support Unit, as a part of the existing Constituency Support Unit at IUCN Headquarters, is still under discussion and that things may change in the coming four years. She ended by thanking H Ruiz Lozano on behalf of the Commission for handling the financial administration for the SSC so admirably.

6.2 Funding

J Smart noted that the “BC” project list was provided in the pack, reminding the SC members that this list only represents money run through IUCN Headquarters. H Dublin noted that the oversight team at IUCN Headquarters are considering showing more of the projects being run through the regions on the BC lists to provide a better idea of the overall financial position of the Union. She concluded the discussion by suggesting that the best way forward in the new Quadrennium would be for a more coordinated fund-raising strategy for the SSC and the Species Programme, with full agreement on what the priorities are, what proposals are to be written and by whom.

6.3 SSC Communications

H Dublin said that there was an attempt early in the Quadrennium to establish a Communications Task Force, but it had unfortunately folded after the departure of R Pethiyagoda and it had not been possible to reallocate the responsibility to another Steering Committee member. She reiterated that a TF for communications is vitally important and should bring together strengths from the Steering Committee, the Species Programme and the SSC Chair’s Office. She noted that a future TF could tackle the following issues:

- The *Species* publication and e-bulletins – it was pointed out that the AI Ain meeting initiated valuable discussion on the desirability and role of the SSC’s two current communication tools. It is important for the Species Programme and the SSC Chair’s Office, under the leadership of a member of the SSC Steering Committee revisit these tools and plan their future.
- The IUCN Species website. There is some debate over whether the SSC website should be hosted on the IUCN platform, as the new Content Management System is quite restrictive. Some of the other Commissions are having their websites hosted externally and independently. J Smart agreed, saying the current website is a disgrace, and many of the Regional Offices have also suffered due to this migration. H Dublin mentioned that the perverse effects of the migration were quite devastating for the Commission in a Congress year; greatly reducing our ability to communicate with and about our SSC members. She emphasised that there is a great need to sort this out properly early in the new Quadrennium and concluded by thanking C Poole and H Boulden for all their efforts to try and get the website into better order in the run up to the Congress.
- Wikis, blogs and other modern means of networking within and outside the SSC and the SGs. Discussions at the AI Ain meeting began to explore the many new opportunities that could be explored as a result of enhanced networking. These new networking technologies must be considered in the next Quadrennium to help bring SSC members, partners and friends into closer contact on matters of mutual interest and concern.
- Using Wiki technology to create a Global Voice for Species Conservation. Much work was done with the Director of the CBSG to launch a wiki – with the aim of creating a statement on the relevance of species and articulating their many values. The wiki established a voting system to allow assessment of the respondents’ views on these values and their respective importance. Approximately 150 people participated in this exciting and very valuable learning experience on how to manage and utilise such networking technologies. H Dublin noted that the wiki should be revised and the effort picked up again after Congress, and thanked C Thouless and O Byers for all their efforts.
- SharePoint. One of the outcomes of the AI Ain meeting was that many people wanted to have proactive follow up – particularly on the general questions that needed answering and the sharing of lessons from the meeting. C Thouless spent a considerable amount of time to try and make this happen within the new IUCN SharePoint platform. SSC was the first to make use of this platform and the creation process has been very frustrating, but the responsible IUCN Headquarters staff were extremely keen and helpful. It is now ready to be shared with the SSC SG Chairs and members. Many more documents (e.g. the Guidelines for Appropriate Uses of Red List Data, the Species Strategic Planning

documents and the draft Guidelines on Systematic Conservation Planning) could be loaded onto the system to be shared for comment. H Dublin thanked C Thouless for his tireless efforts on this project, and concluded that the advice to the next SSC Steering Committee is that SharePoint should be launched as soon as possible after Congress.

ACTIONS:

- SSC Chair/ SP Head to revisit the main communications tools of SSC (Species and the e-bulletin) and explore possible new tools such as blogs.
- SSC Chair / SP Head to discuss options for improving the Species website.
- SSC Chair to ensure that the Global Voice for Species Conservation wiki is revised and continued into the new Quadrennium.
- SSC Chair to ensure that the SSC SharePoint platform is launched.

7. IUCN / SSC DISCUSSION POINTS

7.1 World Conservation Congress

H Dublin commented that the whole Steering Committee is well aware of all the SSC and Species Programme-related sessions at Congress. She encouraged the Steering Committee members to attend as many of the SSC or SSC SG sessions as possible, particularly the two main SSC sessions (both of which will feature awards for service to the SSC) and the SSC social function on the first night of the Forum. J Smart commented that the Species Programme has worked well with the SSC Chair's Office to organise 11 joint sessions. There are also a number of events in the Species Pavilion, as well as a Red List Journey. She asked the Steering Committee members to particularly support the "meet the SSC experts" at the morning coffee break each day, as well as the launch of the Global Mammal Assessment and the Review of the 2008 Red List. H Dublin commented that memory sticks had been purchased as another of the SSC contributions to the "paperless" green Congress and would be distributed at the Pavilion and at the main SSC sessions.

H Dublin concluded that the Congress preparations had absorbed much time, and congratulated all the staff – most notably C Poole, D Cator and J Griffin – for the excellent job they did keeping people informed and handling all the financial issues for the sponsored delegates. She further expressed her hopes to all for a productive and interesting Congress.

8. SSC SUCCESS STORIES

A few main success stories of the Quadrennium were listed as follows:

- S Stuart mentioned that the Red List Index for mammals reveals more good news than expected.
- R Lacy noted that resulting from help by CBSG, the government of Aruba have closed access to certain caves and are also looking at conservation strategies for their marine conservation areas.
- R Mittermeier stated that two new funds for species conservation will be announced this week at Congress.

9. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

R Kock led a vote of thanks on behalf of the SSC Steering Committee to H Dublin for her leadership throughout the 2004 – 2008 Quadrennium.

There being no other business, the meeting was adjourned at 13:00.

SSC SC Meeting WCC3.8 – MINUTES