



**SSC STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING WCC 4.1
GLAND, SWITZERLAND, 3-5 JUNE 2009**

MINUTES

1. WELCOME, APOLOGIES, INTRODUCTIONS

1.1 Chair's Welcome

SSC Chair Simon Stuart welcomed the Species Survival Commission (SSC) Steering Committee members to the first meeting of the 2009-2012 IUCN Quadrennium. Each person present introduced themselves.

1.2 Attendees and Apologies

The following people attended the meeting:

SSC Chair's Office:

Simon Stuart, Rachel Roberts

SSC Steering Committee:

Jon Paul Rodríguez, Luigi Boitani, Topiltzin Contreras MacBeath, John Donaldson, Brahim Haddane, Mirza Kusri Frédéric Launay, Danna Leaman, Patricia Medici, Russell Mittermeier, Anders Rhodin, Michael Samways, Xie Yan

Institutional Observers:

Alison Stattersfield, Thomas Brooks, Jonathan Hutton, Susan Lieberman, John Robinson, Jonathan Baillie

IUCN Species Programme:

Jane Smart, Jean-Christophe Vié, Dena Cator, Jim Ragle, Wendy Foden

Invited Guests:

Nicolas Heard, David Olson

Apologies were received from the following Steering Committee members: Hans de longh, Bob Lacy, Yvonne Sadovy and Stella Simiyu.

2. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

The Steering Committee adopted the agenda, but added several items of Any Other Business (item 11).

3. PREVIOUS MINUTES (WCC 3.8, 4-5 October 2008, Barcelona)

The minutes of WCC 3.8 were adopted by the Steering Committee. The minutes for this meeting go up on the website, making them available to SSC members, and IUCN members and partners.

4. MATTERS ARISING

Action Items table from WCC 3.8 with update on progress.

	<u>Who</u>	<u>Action Item</u>	<u>Agenda Item</u>	<u>Time line</u>	<u>Update</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	In-hand but J Smart noted that time constraints made it difficult to follow-up
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	as above
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	JC Vié noted that in 2004 the name was changed to the Sir Peter Scott Fund for Conservation Action. No further action required.
4	Comms Team	Investigate sponsorship for the distribution of <i>Species</i> 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	S Stuart confirmed that there was no budget to print hard copies, but it was agreed that a PDF file of <i>Species</i> would be electronically distributed. R Mittermeier enquired as to number of items for printing and estimated costs as he would still keen to pursue the printing of hard copies. ACTION: R Mittermeier to discuss further with J Smart. J Smart also committed to making all past copies of <i>Species</i> available as PDFs. A Rhodin enquired as to whether <i>Species</i> had been committed to an official on-line publication to ensure correct measures are put in place. ACTION: To be discussed within the scope off all communication issues to be addressed as a collective agenda item at the next Steering Committee meeting.
5	BASC	Consider creative ways to ensure that all IUCN Members receive the Guidelines on Appropriate Uses of Red List Data.	5.4.1 BASC WCC 3.8	asap	Guidelines on the Appropriate Use of the Red List are already up on the website but finding them is not intuitive (so need to ensure these are

					disseminated with a better strategy for locating them on the website). This relates to ongoing discussions on the difficulty of finding specific documents of the website. ACTION: To be discussed within the scope of all communication issues to be addressed as a collective agenda item at the next Steering Committee meeting.
6	BASC	Send RapidList report and completed table to M Samways, T Brooks, L Boitani and D Leaman for comment.	5.4.1 BASC WCC 3.8	asap	J Smart and S Stuart had previously discussed this matter and felt that further action on this was not necessary. ACTION: J Smart to take up with interested Steering Committee members outside the meeting. No further action necessary.
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 WCC 3.8	asap	J Hutton has an impending meeting with J Ragle to discuss all data issues. Some progress has been made on the IUCN Data Policy but it has not been completed.
8	J Ragle	Write the text to accompany the schematic diagram depicting the Pre-publication Use policy.	5.4.1 BASC WCC 3.8	asap	J Ragle has completed this text. It is currently awaiting publication on the appropriate web pages. No further action necessary.
9	D Leaman	Put together her personal views on the plant network for consideration by the new SSC Steering Committee.	5.4.4 PCSC WCC 3.8	asap	Completed
10	SSC Chair & J Smart	Revisit the main communications tools of SSC (<i>Species</i> and the e-bulletin) and explore possible new tools such as blogs.	6.3 SSC Comms WCC 3.8	asap	ACTION: To be discussed within the scope of all communication issues to be addressed as a collective agenda item at the next Steering Committee meeting.
11	SSC Chair & J Smart	Discuss options for improving the Species website.	6.3 SSC Comms WCC 3.8	asap	There has been extensive discussion between S Stuart and L Labanne (and others) which has produced lots of good ideas. S Stuart reaffirmed the problem of finding the Species website, which is not intuitive. ACTION: To be discussed within the scope off all communication issues to be addressed as a collective agenda item at the next Steering Committee meeting.
12	SSC Chair	Ensure that the Global Voice for Species Conservation wiki is revised and continued into the new Quadrennium.	6.3 SSC Comms WCC 3.8	asap	It was agreed to close this issue due to lack of use.
13	SSC Chair	Ensure that the SSC SharePoint platform is launched.	6.3 SSC Comms WCC 3.8	asap	J Smart commented that this is tied in with the Enterprise Resource Management System which is awaiting a vendor. ACTION: To be discussed within

					the scope off all communication issues to be addressed as a collective agenda item at the next Steering Committee meeting.
--	--	--	--	--	--

5. BRIEFING FOR THE NEW STEERING COMMITTEE

5a. Background to IUCN

J Smart gave an overview of the background to IUCN (its 'triple helix' of Members, Commissions and Secretariat), including on IUCN's mission and 'value proposition'. The list of IUCN Commissions was detailed together with an outline of the IUCN Programme – the 'One Programme' approach'. J Smart wished to emphasise that the IUCN Core Programme Area was about conserving biodiversity and there was a continued need to stress that this is IUCN's core business, including through communications with Council Members.

An outline of the Species Programme (SP) was given together with its relation to the SSC. The structure was outlined detailing specific members of the team that supported the SSC Specialist Groups (Dena Cator and Julie Griffin) and J Smart provided a list of the support mechanisms behind those offered to the SSC by the SP (e.g communication, marketing and branding). The newly launched Red List logo was presented as an "immensely powerful brand" with details of how the Red List Scale was to be rolled out with WAZA and others (as labels on exhibits in zoos, aquariums and botanic gardens thus increasing visibility of the brand). J Smart acknowledged that Red List Assessments could not be achieved without the knowledge and expertise of the SSC.

The Species Information Service (SIS) was detailed showing the tools in place from the point of data collection to publication. J Smart outlined the new groupings ("clusters") of programmes within the IUCN Secretariat, which she offered to discuss on an individual level to those people who are interested. The joint strategic plan between SSC and the SP was highlighted together with details of the IUCN Network Approach.

J Smart finished by revealing that the Red List training centre in the new IUCN building will be named the 'The IUCN Russell A. Mittermeier Red List Training Centre', and that the priorities ahead included expansion of the Red List Partnership, rolling out of the Network Approach, and providing more focus on training and communicating internally between IUCN programmes. J Smart acknowledged that that the Species Programme lacked projects on plants and invertebrates and that hopefully this will be addressed in the forthcoming Quadrennium.

S Stuart enquired as to how SSC members should now register themselves in the Commission registration ("CoReg") system. J Smart explained that the registration was still being carried out on the member's behalf (by the SP importing Excel sheets from Specialist Group (SG) Chairs into the IUCN Knowledge Network (KN)). The system should improve when the new IUCN Enterprise Resource Planning system is up and running (hopefully later in the year).

A Rhodin commented that he did not know how to access the Knowledge Network (of which he had no previous knowledge). J Smart acknowledged that this needed to be addressed to allow access to the KN for all SG Chairs and SC members. **Action: D Cator to follow up.**

S Stuart noted that the post of Head of the Protected Areas Programme was no longer in existence (and that Pedro Rosabal is now the focal point for this Commission). Because of effective fundraising, the support of the SSC from the Secretariat was probably more than that given to all the other Commissions put together. **Action: J Smart offered to clarify (through a handout) how the new Secretariat groupings (“clusters”) are arranged to support the Commissions.**

J Hutton commented that the 6 Commission Chairs are all on IUCN Council and can therefore voice an opinion when necessary. S Stuart advised, however, that it must be remembered that the role of Councillors was to look after the interests of the IUCN as a whole. There are four members of the SSC Steering Committee now on the IUCN Council: R Mittermeier, S Stuart, B Haddane and H de longh.

M Kusrini asked about the relationship between the SSC and the IUCN regional offices. J Smart responded that it varies between the regions but historically the offices have been project funded and therefore not always in a position to involve the Commissions to a significant degree. However, J Smart said that there now a push for stronger links with IUCN regional offices; there is also flexibility for SSC to work with other organisations, not just IUCN.

5b. Background and history of SSC

S Stuart provided an overview of the SSC (including reporting lines, operational structure and details of the Bath office staff). He explained that the IUCN Council is elected at the IUCN Congress and Ashok Khosla is the new president of that Council.

S Stuart outlined the IUCN/SSC vision and goals which are included in the Mandate formally adopted at Congress (and cannot be changed now for the next 4 years). S Stuart, wished to stress that future Congresses must advance the agenda of the SSC.

He concluded with an overview of the history of the SSC since its founding in 1949.

6. KEYNOTE ADDRESS – CONFRONTING THE BIODIVERSITY CRISIS

S Stuart presented his keynote address on confronting the global biodiversity crisis. He emphasised the need to figure out what the SSC’s focus should be, and where efforts should be directed. He highlighted the percentage of assessed species which are threatened and the aim to make the Red List more genuinely representative of biodiversity. The issues of habitat loss and climate change were detailed in respect of their impacts on biodiversity, and Asia was highlighted as the region where large animal losses are most serious.

S Stuart noted that the CBD 2010 Biodiversity Target will not be achieved partly because the information on how to achieve it was not available. There is a need to develop a

global biodiversity agenda leading up to the IUCN World Species Congress, possibly to be held in 2014. In preparing for this Congress, it is important to ensure global stakeholder participation, in part through linking with and supporting national Red List programmes.

JP Rodríguez commented that the development of the Red List was a success story that should perhaps be told formally. S Stuart agreed that this could be possible, perhaps focusing on the mammals and the amphibians. He suggested it would be good to look at what the IUCN Red List Index (RLI) might show if conservation action had not been taken. Although the RLI shows a deteriorating trend, it might be possible to show that it would have been even worse without past and ongoing conservation efforts.

R Mittermeier felt that there is a need to focus on timelines to get the Species Congress underway.

S Lieberman noted that key focus (and true advocacy) needs to be brought back to species conservation. S Stuart agreed that IUCN had come along away on this but that much more emphasis was required on species. He added that there is a dilemma with the SSC in that they are required to demonstrate impartiality and neutrality as the assessor of species and identifier of threats, but that it should also be advocating conservation (the SSC is currently rather weak on this).

J Hutton commented that the world has moved away from a focus species and, indeed, that some discussions on the post 2010 Biodiversity Target have suggested that species should not be included. J Hutton believes that we are naive to think that the SSC can change this due to the inherent nature of the species approach (most species can be protected in relatively small areas through protected areas). He suggested that the Red List should provide more focus on provisioning services (such as medicinal plants and food) and associate these services with particular species.

J Baillie announced a symposium on biodiversity monitoring being held at ZSL on 18-19 June. This would explore the toolkit of approaches that countries need with regard to the CBD 2010 commitments.

J Robinson commented that the main strengths of the SSC are in assessments and analysing threats. However, the SSC is weak on making the interventions that are required to address these threats. Perhaps an increased focus on ecosystem services would help to engage on issues that many people care about.

T Brooks highlighted that peaks in the number of hits on the Conservation International (CI) website were, in nearly every case, associated with species conservation stories. There is a real 'hunger' for species conservation out there.

S Stuart agreed that the general public do relate to species and that this is an advantage for SSC. It is easy to hit the headlines with species stories, but it is much harder to get political action as a result of these headlines. S Stuart therefore felt that the SSC needs more help in terms of formulating effective communications and political strategies.

JP Rodríguez noted another dimension: small NGOs have often been founded on species-specific issues. Species are a common motivator for such organisations.

A Rhodin commented that the SSC does not seem to be greatly involved in lobbying the various international species funding programmes established by the US Congress. There has been a struggle to encourage the US government to fund more international species work. Can the SSC help promote this? S Stuart replied that the SSC has not been greatly involved in this in the past, except with regard to the current effort on amphibians.

JC Vié commented that most people are not convinced that we need to conserve all species.

R Mittermeier added that there is a good opportunity to reinforce biodiversity now as our core business with regards to the focus of IUCN. He felt that the linkages between species and ecosystem services need to be developed and understood more – particularly for developing funding proposals.

7. REPORTS

7a. SSC Chair

This item was covered in agenda item 5b.

7b. Species Programme

The report is available on page 42 of the agenda pack. No further discussion took place.

7c. Biodiversity Assessments Sub-Committee (BASC)

The report is available on page 47 of the agenda pack.

S Stuart reported that the new Red List Partnership Agreement is almost ready for signature. There are a number of new organizations that are ready to join and the Partnership: University of Rome, Texas A&M University, Royal Botanic Gardens Kew, Botanic Gardens Conservation International, Wildscreen (ARKive), and the Zoological Society of London (ZSL). This is in addition to the existing Partners: BirdLife International, Conservation International and NatureServe. As part of the renegotiating of the Agreement, the Biodiversity Assessments Sub-Committee will now be renamed the Red List Committee (RLC), still reporting to the SSC Steering Committee. The RLC will be made up of five representatives from the Red List Partners, five from SSC, five from the IUCN Secretariat (including some regional and country people), all of these people being appointed by S Stuart. In addition, the chairs of the following two RLC working groups will be RLC members. ZSL has agreed to help support the National Red List Working Group to be chaired by Ben Collen. The former Users, Classification Schemes and the Red List Index Working Groups are being merged into Red List Technical Working Group to be chaired by Stuart Butchart from Birdlife. The Chair of the Standards and Petitions Sub-Committee will also be an RLC member. The Chair for the RLC is vacant and names are being sought, preferably of someone who is independent from any of the Red List Partners. There is a lot of business that needs to be taken forward and dealt with from the old BASC (e.g., work on taxonomic issues, climate change guidelines, etc.)

7d. Invertebrate Conservation Sub-Committee (ICSC)

M Samways is continuing as Chair of the ICSC and he presented a verbal report to the Steering Committee meeting. He showed the structure of the Invertebrate Conservation Sub-Committee and added that the Marine Invertebrate Red List Authority (MIRLA) and the Terrestrial and Freshwater Invertebrate Red List Authority (TIRLA) are a key part of the Sub-Committee. The group was formed because of the need for a global network of specialists to inform the work required for these species. It was decided not to appoint a large number of invertebrate Specialist Groups in the SSC at this time, so instead Focal Points for particular taxonomic groups have been appointed to deal with queries that arise. The model that is now in place works well for dealing with invertebrate issues.

R Mittermeier asked whether invertebrates should be linked with broader issues (e.g. pollination), particularly for fundraising. Another good way to justify work on this would be biomimicry.

M Samways explained that the work of the ICSC is really to serve as a clearing house for species that need to be assessed for Red List status, which could include pollinators.

D Leaman emphasised the need to focus on services, for example, 'Bugs for Drugs'.

The proposed membership of the committee was adopted.

The Terms of Reference for the Invertebrate, Marine and Plant Conservation Sub-Committees were approved.

7e. Marine Conservation Sub-Committee (MCSC)

Y Sadovy and C Campagna are continuing as co-chairs of the MCSC. Y Sadovy will represent the MCSC on the SSC Steering Committee and provided a written report (see page 56 of the agenda pack for summary).

A Stattersfield suggested that a BirdLife global seabird representative should sit on the committee, and all were in agreement with this **(A Stattersfield to follow up with Y Sadovy and C Campagna).**

T Brooks and T Contreras proposed creating a Freshwater Conservation Sub-Committee since there was a clear niche for one following the freshwater assessments.

S Stuart commented that this would create a budgetary challenge for the funding of regular sub-committee meetings. **T Contreras agreed to collaborate with W Darwall, B Haddane and T Brooks on developing the case for an SSC Freshwater Conservation Sub-Committee, including an investigation of possible funding sources for the sub-committee given the severe limitation on available funding in the Commission Operations Fund. A report will be provided for the next meeting of the Steering Committee.**

The proposed list of the MCSC members was approved by the Steering Committee.

7f. Plant Conservation Sub-Committee (PCSC)

The previous chair of the PCSC, Dr Mike Maunder, stepped down at the end of the last IUCN quadrennium. Dr J Donaldson has recently agreed to take over as the new PCSC Chair.

There is a planned meeting of the PCSC September or October of this year.

The proposed list of members was approved by the Steering Committee.

7g. SSC Specialist Group update

S Stuart referred participants to pages 58-67 of the agenda pack for an overview.

S Stuart has appointed all Specialist Group (SG) Chairs as listed on pages 60-62, but there are still a number of acceptances outstanding. A number of new SGs groups have formed, e.g., the Tuna and Billfish Specialist Group. S Stuart then provided more background on the SGs for which appointments were still pending (see pages 58-59 of the agenda pack).

Appointments are still pending with four plant SGs, and follow-up is continuing in each case. Carlos Villamil has just agreed to continue as chair of the Temperate South American Plant SG.

Concerning non-volant small mammals (essentially rodents and insectivores), L Boitani noted that a task force had been appointed to come up with a recommendation on how SSC should handle these species. The task force would be meeting at the International Mammalogical Congress in Argentina in August, and would produce a report and recommendations for the Steering Committee.

The Wolf SG was discussed with regards to SSC Chair's proposal that it should be merged with the Canid SG (CSG), forming a working group under the CSG. However, this proposal had experienced some resistance from the WSG membership. **It was decided that there should be a process of gradual integration of the Wolf SG into the Canid SG, during the current quadrennium, with complete integration in the next quadrennium. To facilitate this process, it was agreed that L Boitani would join the existing WSG chair, Dave Mech, to act as co-chairs of the Wolf SG. L Boitani will take the lead on negotiations during the quadrennium with Claudio Sillero of the Canid SG.**

S Stuart reported that there should soon be agreement on the new co-chairs of the Shark SG. He also noted that the new Freshwater Crabs and Crayfish SG would almost certainly be chaired by Neil Cumberlidge.

Following on from a discussion on the proposal to re-establish the Bustard SG, there was a debate regarding the criteria for the establishment of new bird SGs. A Stattersfield wanted to know what institutional support would be available to support to this Group.

F Launay noted that the focus of this group should be balanced, covering all species, not just the high-profile ones. He felt that the institutional support could be easily resolved.

J Hutton commented that there need to be clear criteria as to why one group is accepted and another is not.

It emerged in discussion that draft criteria for the establishment of bird SGs had been prepared a few years ago, but these had never been adopted. **S Stuart requested that A Stattersfield circulate these criteria so they could be considered and adopted at the next Steering Committee meeting.**

A Stattersfield added that some groups do not feel well supported and so there when a new SG is established it must be clear what support is available and what the expectations are. BirdLife may not be in a position to offer support due to its own needs and constraints.

S Stuart pointed out that no bird SG should expect support from BirdLife but agreed that revisiting the criteria on forming new SGs would be useful.

A Rhodin asked if institutional support was an issue considered for SGs more generally, and wanted to know why it was considered to be such an important issue for the Bustard SG.

S Stuart confirmed that institutional support issues are important and there is a need to address these if there is an expectation that, for example, BirdLife would provide such support for any bird SG that might be established.

S Lierberman felt that the Bustard SG should be established first and then institutional support should be found.

A decision was reached that the Bustard SG would be established in principle but that this would only take effect in practice once a suitable chair had been identified.

Additional proposals for bird SGs will be considered following the adoption of the criteria for the establishment of bird SGs at the next Steering Committee meeting.

R Mittermeier suggested that this could open the door for many more SGs and that the situation with birds was unique.

S Stuart reported that the formal appointment of the bird SGs that are shared with Wetlands International (WI) would take place once a new Memorandum of Understanding had been concluded with WI. S Stuart would be visiting WI headquarters soon to finalise this agreement.

J Hutton will be stepping down as Chair of the Sustainable Use SG once the SSC-CEESP consultation had been completed (see item 8e).

R Mittermeier also mentioned that there is a potential to form a new Lizard and Snake SG which could come with a substantial amount of funding. S Stuart agreed that global reptile assessments were still an ongoing important priority and he will discuss this

further with R Mittermeier. A Rhodin also knew of a different person wishing to create a snake SG. S Stuart noted that a SeaSnake SG had been formed but added that there was often a poor success rate with SGs covering many species. **It was agreed that a more general proposal for lizard and snakes SGs would be presented to the next Steering Committee meeting.**

7h. Red List Authority update

A short update was provided (see page 68-71 of the agenda pack). No further action was required. The Sturgeon RLA Focal Point will be appointed after their meeting in October 2009.

7i. IUCN Council

This item was covered in greater detail further into the agenda (item 8n). R Mittermeier noted that the new IUCN Council was of high calibre, with excellent leadership from IUCN President Ashok Khosla.

8. SSC ISSUES AND PROCESSES

8a. SSC Restructuring

The SSC restructuring process will not be continued any longer, but there are some issues still to be addressed. The independence of the assessment process arose during the discussions in the last Quadrennium. As one part of addressing this issue, the SSC Chair will now appoint the Red List focal points, rather than being done by the SG Chairs. One major change is that, for any particular species, the assessor can no longer be the same person as the evaluator, and that the term 'evaluator' is to be replaced by 'reviewer' (this is important for translating into other languages). S Stuart referred participants to page 107 of the agenda pack for clarification of the RL process.

A Rhodin enquired if all Red List assessments could be tracked for each group. S Stuart noted that the focal point is not signing off on assessments, it is the reviewer that signs it off, before going to the Species Programme.

S Lieberman raised the issue of advocacy with regards to conservation and that decisions should be made in the best interest of the taxa. SGs do not just provide data but also make recommendations.

A Stattersfield supported S Lieberman's comment and felt that there was a need to be more proactive in putting forward suggestions, but that they should be 'science -based' recommendations rather than 'emotion-based' recommendations. For example, BirdLife reviews its Red List and then puts forward proposals for CITES and other meetings. Could these recommendations be channelled through the SSC and could they be more proactive with the Red List data?

J Robinson commented that one part of the SG is assessing independently, the other can make recommendations, but that there are no standards or guidelines on how such recommendations should be made.

R Mittermeier stated when we are doing 'advocacy', the preferred term for him would be 'conservation action'.

M Samways noted that it is the SSC mission to not just observe, but to act on the scientific data.

L Boitani outlined three steps of activity in SSC: assessing the threat – we are good at this; giving recommendations – very bad; implementing recommendations – varied. Therefore, there is a need to focus on giving recommendations and be more prescriptive and assertive.

J Smart added that this should be the quest of IUCN as a whole, i.e. to be more 'policy prescriptive'. There is a real need to do this – to speak out, but always to do so underpinned by science.

J Robinson commented that the Red Listing process is not advocacy and that there is a need to be careful of this. It is the assessment of the threats which is advocacy.

J Hutton agreed and stated that the Red List should not be used as an advocacy document as it may affect the integrity of the Red List. Care needs to be taken with the use of the word 'advocacy'.

S Stuart noted that the stakes were higher now and should the SSC be more proactive but 'distinctly true to IUCN'. The more effective SGs are often good at the advocacy level, but the challenge for SSC is to be proactive above the level of the SGs and there is nothing currently in place. He suggested that there may be a need to re-establish the SP Species Trade and Use Unit in this regard and have a much more interactive input into CITES and other fora.

M Samways commented that part of making this happen is to focus more on positive newsworthy stories and getting them out there.

8b. Revision of SSC Bylaws

The Steering Committee had a responsibility to revise the existing SSC Bylaws (pages 73-78 of the agenda pack) and adopt the final version as the SSC's 2009-2012 Bylaws.

A set of proposed revisions to the Bylaws had already been prepared by S Stuart, and are available on pages 79-83 of the agenda pack. **These changes were adopted by the Steering Committee.**

In addition there was discussion of the process by which SSC members propose potential candidates for the position of SSC Chair. Among the issues to be considered are: 1. ensuring the confidentiality of proposals so the SCC members can put forward their ideas without fear of the consequences; and 2. whether the Steering Committee should make recommendations on candidates.

J P Rodríguez carried out consultations on the margins of the meeting and proposed the following new additional text to come at the end of Section VI on the Bylaws:

(3) *Proposal of candidates to the SSC Chair*

- a. *According to Regulation IV.30 of IUCN, “[a]t least six months prior to a meeting of the Council taking place no less than four months before the date set for the opening of an ordinary session of the World Congress ... [c]ommission members shall be invited ... to make their proposals for Chair of their Commission.”*
- b. *The SSC Steering Committee shall select three of its members, excluding the Chair, to form an ad hoc committee, and invite Commission members to submit names to be considered for Commission Chair, at least one month prior to the date indicated in IV.30 of the Regulations. The committee shall be composed of members who are not candidates themselves. All submissions to the committee shall remain confidential. The list of proposed candidates shall be submitted by the ad hoc committee to the Council, highlighting especially qualified candidates, with prior endorsement by the Steering Committee at large.*
- c. *Commission Members are encouraged to present their proposed candidates to the ad hoc committee, though they may also present them directly the Council (Regulation IV.30 of IUCN).*

The Steering Committee adopted this new text.

It was further noted that the current drafting of the IUCN Regulations does not seem to guarantee the confidentiality of Commission members who propose candidates for Chairs of the Commissions, once the proposals have been received by the Council Nominations Committee. **It was agreed that S Stuart and J P Rodríguez would propose amendments to the Regulations at the next meeting of IUCN Council.**

8c. Future of Species Conservation Planning Task Force

S Stuart referred participants to page 127 of the agenda pack. He noted that there was a proposal for a new Specialist Group to continue the work of the Species Conservation Planning Task Force (perhaps the Species Conservation Strategies Specialist Group (SCSSG)). A meeting will take place at Bristol Zoo (25-26 June) to discuss the options of the new network (some members of the Steering Committee were invited to attend). J Robinson noted that the possibility of WCS hosting this process had been discussed internally within WCS. However, it was felt that there would be an issue with independence and perception if the Species Conservation Planning Task Force sat within another NGO.

8d. Revisions to Re-introduction Guidelines and Policy Statement on Translocation of Living Organisms

F Launay outlined the plans for redeveloping the IUCN Policy Statement on the Translocation of Living Organisms and the IUCN Re-introduction Guidelines. Both documents need to be revised to stay relevant and to reflect modern realities, for example, climate change and extreme habitat disappearance. There is also a need to redefine some issues (such as habitat range). It was proposed that a dedicated full-time coordinator should be allocated to this issue.

It was felt that this policy work on re-introductions was necessary during this quadrennium and that the issue of assisted migration should be included. S Lieberman noted that there are a number of ways in which input could be obtained on assisted migration (e.g., a discussion paper at CITES CoP next year and other venues). S Stuart

agreed more flexibility was required with the Reintroduction Guidelines. R Mittermeier expressed concern that countries like China are buying land in biodiverse areas (e.g., Madagascar) and that there is a need to keep ahead of the game with this issue. F Launay would like to see more engagement and support across the SSC for this work. **S Stuart requested that a progress report should be presented on this item at each Steering Committee meeting.**

8e. SSC-CEESP Consultation on Sustainable Use and Human-wildlife Interactions

J. Hutton provided the background to this issue. A resolution was passed at the IUCN Congress in Barcelona calling for inter-commissional collaboration on sustainable use and human-wildlife interactions, especially between SSC and the Commission on Environmental Economics and Social Policy (CEESP). S Stuart and Aroha Mead (Chair of CEESP) had invited H Dublin, who is a member of both Commissions, to lead the consultation and to carry out a review of the options available for linkages between the SSC and CEESP on this issue. H Dublin has already circulated a targeted questionnaire on this and is moving forward to develop an analysis of the results. S Stuart noted that the survey had received over 200 responses and that it went to a broad diversity of people in IUCN. A workshop of key SSC and CEESP stakeholders will take place to plan next stages but, at present, a date for this has not been confirmed.

J Hutton mentioned that the work on indicators of sustainable use might inform this discussion.

8f. Criteria for Key Biodiversity Areas

The SSC has a mandate from the Bangkok World Conservation Congress to convene and lead the process for the development of criteria for Key Biodiversity Areas (KBAs). T Brooks has outlined a proposal (see agenda pack pages 167-169) for moving ahead with this work.

T Brooks noted that one of most striking patterns that comes out of Red List data is the predominance of destruction of habitats where threatened species live. The conclusion of this is that clearly these places should be saved. This is key work for the SSC and the World Commission on Protected Areas (WCPA). There are multiple examples of site-based conservation strategies (e.g., BirdLife Important Bird Areas (IBAs), Plantlife Important Plant Areas (IPAs), etc.) and, in the last 10 years, an overall framework has been developed for identifying sites for conservation – KBAs. The World Parks Congress in 2003 highlighted this issue, and resolution RESWCC3.013 “The uses of the IUCN Red List of Threatened Species” from the WCC3 in Bangkok formally requested it. The intent of KBAs would be something analogous to the Red List with regards to the development of standards and criteria for identification of sites of global biodiversity conservation significance. It was noted that KBAs do not claim to tackle all biodiversity issues, since not everything can be addressed at the site scale

A Stattersfield explained the policy side of IBAs and the importance of them – particularly in reaching wider audiences. IBAs are central to the work of BirdLife and raising their profile has been very important to further key policy decisions (e.g., EU Birds Directive, Ramsar Convention). The Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species (CMS) is now listing sites (IBAs) for its work. BirdLife would be keen to have their work reflected under the IUCN, as is already the case with the Red List, and had

suggested that it would be hugely helpful if globally acceptable criteria could be agreed through this IUCN process. The EU Energy Directive will be setting 20% of energy from biofuel so there will be a need to develop sustainability criteria (no-grow areas); KBAs could play an important role in identifying these. Therefore, this is a process for developing the standards and criteria rather than identifying sites on the ground, which would be undertaken at national and local levels through locally owned processes.

S Stuart noted that the Species Programme has secured some funding for this for the KBA consultation process, but more is needed.

M Samways asked how climate change issue will be addressed through the KBA criteria process? T Brooks suggested that KBAs can be part of the plan for allowing adaptation and dealing with climate change impacts.

D Leaman proposed that Plantlife would be a good partner for this work regarding plants and also indicated that it would be worthwhile collaborating with UNESCO Biosphere Programme.

Discussions on this item and on item 8g continued in break-out group, reported in Annex 1.

8g. Collaboration with the World Commission on Protected Areas (WCPA)

L Boitani introduced this topic. The focus of the collaboration with WCPA is on area-based conservation planning (as in 8f above). The WCPA recently concluded a process to revise the protected area categories, and had requested input from the SSC regarding species data (the SSC Steering Committee did contribute to this). A concern from the SSC was that the current WCPA categories are not very useful for defining biodiversity objectives. L Boitani and some colleagues published a paper proposing the establishment of new protected area categories with a focus on biodiversity objectives, but this proposal has not gained momentum elsewhere. Following this, the SSC and WCPA proposed a task force to deal with the issue (see pages 171–175 of the agenda pack). A meeting in January this year looked at the feasibility of a project looking at conservation outcomes in relation to protected areas (this is the metastudy proposal referred to in Annex 1). L Boitani noted that the SSC really needs to engage with WCPA in this work.

J Smart suggested that there was a need to clarify in more detail to WCPA how the SSC proposes to respond to the options for collaborating with WCPA. Discussions on this item and on item 8f continued in break-out group, reported in Annex 1.

The Steering Committee adopted the report and decisions of the break-out group. Specifically it was agreed that J Smart would be the focal point within the Secretariat, and would communicate the results of the Steering Committee discussions with Nik Lopoukhine, Chair of WCPA, J Baillie, T Brooks, J Hutton and Kent Redford (from WCS) are willing to participate from SSC on item 1 (the metastudy). L Boitani will lead on item 2, if and when there is a sufficient groundswell on interest for this project to be viable. T Brooks and A Stattersfield on item 3 (KBA criteria consolidation).

8h. Invasive Species

JC Vié and S Stuart provided a brief report. It was noted that Michael Browne is no longer working for the Invasive Species Specialist Group (ISSG) because the management of the Global Invasive Species Database (GISD) has been moved from New Zealand to Italy to be closer to the new Chair of the ISSG, Piero Genovesi. There is also an invasive species initiative in the IUCN Secretariat run by Geoffrey Howard, who is based in Nairobi; this initiative has recently been integrated into the Species Programme. G Howard has also been serving as the main IUCN link to the Global Invasive Species Programme (GISP), an inter-institutional partnership of which IUCN is a member. A teleconference recently took place to discuss how to build closer synergies between ISSG, G Howard, and GISP, as there have been problems with all three programmes competing for funding. It was felt GISP should focus on global policy work, especially in the context of CBD. However, the future funding of GISP is now very uncertain. A meeting will take place in September to agree the way ahead for IUCN on invasives, and to identify sources of funding to carry things forward. There is probably need to link climate change with invasives for fundraising.

J Donaldson questioned whether a species-based approach was the best way forward for invasives. He also said that there were links between trade and invasive species pathways, and so collaboration with bodies such as CITES might be helpful.

R Mittermeier commented that there had been rifts between the three groups working on invasives which has made working with them difficult, so there a clear need to strengthen the linkages between them.

A Stattersfield stressed that there was a need to identify priorities for action and to ensure that projects were linked closely to what is happening on-the-ground. JC Vié noted that there was a need to discuss what kinds of tools are really needed for invasive species management.

J Smart proposed that the SSC should be asked about how to control invasive species, for example, new protocols for dealing with them.

A report will be given to the next meeting of the Steering Committee giving proposals on priorities for moving ahead with work on invasive species.

8i. SSC Archiving Project

S Stuart clarified that this project is to collect and archive all the important papers and publications from the SSC throughout its history. There is a real need to put all the information somewhere safe, and in this regard it might be necessary to make an agreement with Cambridge University or some other academic institution. The suggestion is that we move ahead with this proposal, and invite Elaine Shaughnessy to take the lead.

R Mittermeier said that he felt it would be better for the IUCN to handle its own archives and thought that it should be stored in the IUCN headquarters office.

J Smart felt that this could be a possibility in the new headquarters building providing that a request to this effect is made soon. **It was agreed that J Smart would explore options on this.**

It was proposed that the IUCN Library should be checked for completeness of SSC publications.

8j. IUCN Red List – 2009 Updates, Handling of Backlog and Overall Progress on Assessments

C Hilton-Taylor and C Pollock of the IUCN Species Programme Red List Unit supplied a report to the Steering Committee (pages 177-181 of the agenda pack).

The backlog currently being experienced at the Red List Unit is partly a result of being a victim of their own success. The Unit is also very short staffed with a log jam of data, much of which accumulated from submissions received before the Congress. J Smart went through the issues that were causing the backlog (as detailed in the report above) and mentioned that the underlying software, the Species Information Service (SIS), was being introduced in an iterative way and was constantly being approved. However, the greatest area of concern for the Red List Unit is the sub-standard quality of many assessments being received – some of these should have been returned immediately to the sender due to their poor standards. Because if this, there is a need to ensure that the instructions for assessments require wider circulation. To aid in this, a new document entitled “Documentation Standards and Consistency Checks for IUCN Red List Assessments and Species Accounts” has been produced and is now being circulated to Red List Authorities, the Species Programme staff, and Red List Partners.

M Samways enquired after the African freshwater assessments. S Stuart clarified that there were very few in of these in the backlog because most of them have not yet been submitted to the Red List Unit. S Stuart also noted that a change needs to be made to the point at which consistency checking is carried out, and to ensure that everyone is working to the same standards by using the documented instructions.

M Samways commented that the downside of putting assessments in lock, stock and barrel was that this could lead to biases i.e. in that big assessments could tilt the boat.

A Rhodin noted that C Hilton-Taylor and C Pollock are overworked as consistency checkers and could volunteers not be ‘certified’ to do assist in this process? J Smart said that this had been considered and clarified that C Hilton-Taylor and C Pollock carry out the spot checks only. Consistency checks should be carried out by other Species Programme staff, Red List Partners. M Samways added that this assistance may not be entirely voluntary. A Rhodin added that the data can be appropriately assigned to the categories and criteria via the tool in SIS and that here should be a move towards using the expert system to do this. However, S Stuart said that there is a need to look at how consistent we are in the interpretation of the data between different taxonomic groups. The new document called “Documentation Standards and Consistency Checks for IUCN Red List Assessments and Species Accounts” is the first step down this road. J Smart commented that people do not like using the expert system. S Stuart agreed that it may be naive to think that the expert system will solve all the problems, especially in data poor situations. The issue is more about applying the uncertainty guidelines in such situations.

X Yan explained that the China Species Red List Assessments involved much feedback from experts. A second evaluation was paid for by the Chinese Government. The Chinese Red List is being updated, partly to avoid conflicts between experts. The data are kept open to everyone. S Stuart added that workshops had been invested in as an arena to debate differences of opinion between experts, and draft species accounts emerging from workshops are made available for comment. S Stuart agreed that it would be useful for the China experience to be discussed further with C Hilton-Taylor, C Pollock and others in the Species Programme to integrate these experiences into the IUCN Red List process. X Yan also mentioned that a specific committee had been established to deal with the Red List applications.

D Leaman wished to note that everyone in the network hugely appreciates the work C Hilton-Taylor, C Pollock and the Species Programme does on the Red List. She wanted to express the concern that the staff may be on the defensive due to the pressure of work, and she asked if there is anything that could be done to assist with pushing the plant assessments through? Also, what was happening with a Plants Officer?

J Smart noted that there were taxonomic coverage issues in the Red List, and that the plants were lagging behind; plants are a priority, and Melanie Biltz was now in the Red List Unit team to assist. Training would eventually be addressed through the Russell Mittermeier Training Centre, but the Species Programme would in any case soon be adding a training officer to the Red List Unit in Cambridge.

R Mittermeier asked if the bottleneck was principally a funding problem, and he wanted to know if the new Red List Partnership be contributing to the pot. S Stuart noted that part of the problem was changed roles in the Species Programme, and the need to train more people and to spread the capacity to do consistency checks properly, in both the Species Programme and the Red List Partnership. He noted that all of the existing Partners, and some potential news ones, were already contributing significant resources to the Red List. There is also an SIS design issue contributing to the backlog that J Ragle is working to fix. J Smart agreed that fixing SIS will help to ameliorate some of the problems, but that people nevertheless must stick to the consistency check rules. M Samways noted that the vision should be for more people on the staff to train trainers and to certify trainers. M Samways also enquired whether the SIS would filter out the 'troublemakers' and send poor quality data back. S Stuart said that the processes were being looked at in detail. He mentioned taxonomic issues, in particular the problem of matching names across assessment done over multiple years. Some of the staff have questioned whether or not this is necessary to do this, given the considerable amount of work involved. As a result, the Global Biodiversity Information Facility (GBIF) has agreed look at this issue and will advise us on options.

J Baillie stated that timings are important and it would help to have better clarification on how long things will take in the future. Will it be a first-come-first-served basis, or will assessments be prioritised? S Stuart clarified that there will be a move away from annual updates to more frequent ones so that there is no longer a deadline or a pre-publication issue. In principle, it will be on a first-come-first-served basis for assessment that are genuinely completed and up to standard.

A Rhodin asked how the information is to be communicated to the public. S Stuart replied that an annual report would be a good way of presenting annual statistics, or

reporting could focus on individual species groups that are the focus of a particular update. J Smart suggested that releases should be planned to tie in with key policy events. S Stuart agreed with this, and noted that some SGs may want to slow down data releases to coincide with the publication of high-impact papers. This is currently the case with the Shark Specialist Group.

With reference to the backlog table, S Stuart pointed out that the backlog was now down to a relatively small number of datasets, and the size of the backlog is likely to be reduced significantly over the next few months.

J Baillie suggested that the amount of funding required for large assessments should be factored into proposals.

M Samways asked which was the best way for data to go to the Red List Unit: in trickles, floods or batches. J Smart suggested that is best for all the data to be sent at one time, completed perfectly, and with notice given to the Red List Unit of its impending arrival.

8k. Red List Partnership Agreement

The need to conclude a new Red List Partnership Agreement (RLPA) is one of the outstanding items carried forward from the last IUCN Quadrennium. S Stuart and J Smart have been working on this and have fine-tuned the existing agreement. The new agreement is still to be confirmed so any questions on the draft were welcomed.

S Stuart noted that very little work had been done on IUCN's data policy (also outstanding from the previous quadrennium), but that this would be carried out separately beyond the scope of the RLPA. He did not want to hold the RLPA hostage to IUCN completing its data policy.

J Baillie asked how the bilateral MOUs between each Partners and IUCN would be added to the RLPA (they are supposed to be Annex 7 of the RLPA). J Smart agreed that a timeframe for completing the MOU's was required, and she would get to this the moment the main text was agreed, which was almost the case.

A Rhodin asked if species accounts in the Red List were considered to be formal publications. Do they have a formal Digital Object Identifier (DOI® – "*a digital identifier for any object of intellectual property*")? S Stuart noted that this was an item still to be dealt with and that standards on authorship need to be agreed (this will be on the agenda of the next Red List Committee meeting). **It was agreed that J Ragle should be asked to look into the cost of acquiring DOI numbers for each species account.**

J Smart noted that there had been a keen interest in the Russell Mittermeier Training Centre from colleagues in the IUCN Commission on Education and Communication (CEC): Keith Wheeler (CEC Chair), Fritz Hesselink, Harriet Nimmo, Cristina Mittermeier and Brahim Haddane (also on the SSC Steering Committee). B Haddane emphasised the need for training. D Leaman suggested that part of the strategy might be to link in with the regional partners and institutions, and possibly look at who could manage a training component. JP Rodríguez enquired as to the time frame for the training centre. J Smart replied that the classroom should be ready in January 2010 and that the IUCN office should be fully moved across to the new building by June 2010. S Stuart noted that the Red List Training Officer position had been incorporated into the Species

Programme budget. JC Vié added that a proposal for half a million Euros for Red Listing in the Caribbean was currently under consideration, and this includes a major Red List training element.

J Smart noted that the Red List should be used to make money and that in the regard more use should be made of the Red List brand. This will be considered at the next Steering Committee meeting when communications issues will be on the agenda). She noted that Jeff McNeely had suggested having at least US\$10 million of project proposals ready to go when a Red List update takes place so that they can be marketed to potential donors.

8l. Species Information Service (SIS)

J Ragle presented an overview of SIS from its conception to its current stage of development. The short and long term objectives of SIS were presented, together with its features (outlining some of its functionality). The present position of SIS was discussed with regards to roll-out (approximately 4-5 new users coming on daily), and the plans for moving the system forwards (it is currently partially in use and evolving in an iterative way). A summary was also provided of the challenges currently faced, which included funding, capacity, taxonomy, timings, and a need for Red List Committee guidance.

D Leaman enquired if she should delay on transferring the 20,000 species of medicinal plants into the SIS. It was agreed that she would discuss directly with J Ragle.

A Stattersfield asked how the system managed more than one person working on the same species. J Ragle clarified that only one person can work on the same species at the same time. If two groups are assessing the same species, only one draft global assessment is allowed at a time, but this could change in the future.

X Yan noted that SIS was used in China three years ago for the Global Mammal Assessment, but it was not supported by the Chinese version of Windows. J Ragle noted that this should no longer be a problem as SIS is now web-based, but he will check this is when he is in China for a workshop later in June.

J Baillie enquired about the possibility of having an SIS at the regional / national level. J Ragle agreed that this should be a possibility but an estimated cost for putting it out nationally would be needed.

S Stuart pointed out that a simple SIS users' manual had been written by Ariadne Angulo, and that this should be put on the website and circulated to all registered SIS users. **It was decided that J Ragle would put the SIS users' manual on the website and send it to all registered SIS users.**

8m. SSC and Species Programme Finances

JC Vié presented an update of the SSC and Species programme finances. He noted that the BAU was not mentioned in a summary table of the budget as it is currently being run as a project. There is a decrease in the core allocation this year so there is a need to generate extra funds through projects (in particular, to secure funds for climate change work next year). This year's Commissions Operations Fund (COF) is the same amount as last year.

J Robinson suggested that graphing the figures with a trend line would be useful to depict growth of project support and the decline in core support over time. **It was agreed that the long-term trend in the financial picture should be presented to the next Steering Committee meeting, comparing core and project income and expenditure in each year, going back to 1996.**

JC Vié noted that the core allocation is now being taxed. But, he emphasised that this year the finances were secure and a small reserve is being formed.

S Stuart wished to add that the SSC Steering Committee meetings were costing more and that this could affect whether or not a second meeting can take place this year. There was also an increase in the costs relating to the Chair's Assistant, as salaries are lower in Cape Town compared to Bath. The cost of the newly advertised Senior Scientific Officer post in the Chair's Office will not be covered by the COF.

8n. Species-related Resolutions and Recommendations from the World Conservations Congress, Barcelona

S Stuart presented the species-related resolutions that were adopted at the Barcelona Congress (on pages 198-241 of the agenda pack). He noted that the IUCN Council had prioritised seven resolutions (on page 202 of the agenda pack) for implementation. These include three species-related resolutions:

- 4.016 Development of climate change guidelines for Red List Assessments
- 4.017 Stopping the amphibian crisis
- 4.019 The World Species Congress

For the remaining species-related resolutions and recommendations, S Stuart said that there should be a coordinated plan to communicate them to key stakeholders in the SSC and the IUCN Membership. **It was agreed that D Cator and J Griffin would go through the entire list of Barcelona species-related resolutions and recommendations, and provide proposals to S Stuart and J Smart on who each one should be communicated to.**

S Lieberman suggested that some resolutions (such as 4.059) that give tasks to IUCN, also need to involve other parties that are very sometimes very powerful in the broader conservation world. It would be good for resolutions to go out to relevant SSC SGs and to be communicated more broadly, even though they are already on the Congress website. S Lieberman has offered to provide background on what has happened already with particular resolutions. D Cator and J Griffin should therefore communicate with S Lieberman when carrying out the task listed above.

D Leaman asked why Resolution 4.014 on plants was omitted from the Council's priority list, given that it relates to reporting on Target 2 at CBD Global Strategy for Plant Conservation (GSPC). S Stuart clarified that the Programme and Policy Committee (PPC) of IUCN Council voted to come up the list of priorities, and there was no way of knowing how individual PPC members had voted.

After discussion, the Steering Committee decided that it was necessary to agree priorities among the remaining species-related resolutions that did not emerge as

priorities from IUCN Council. **The Steering Committee agreed on the following five SSC priorities (in addition to the three IUCN-wide priorities noted above):**

- **4.012 Biodiversity data and information**
- **4.014 Conservation of global plant biodiversity**
- **4.015 Guidelines regarding research and scientific collecting of threatened species**
- **4.020 Quantitative thresholds for categories and criteria of threatened ecosystems**
- **4.039 Cross-Commission collaboration on sustainable use of biological resources**

On resolution 4.012, S Stuart asked how this could be taken forward. J Smart noted that a draft data policy had been written but was inadequate. **J Ragle was asked, with the agreement of IUCN Assistant Director General Bill Jackson, to take this forward and to consult with the Red List Partners and UNEP-WCMC. J Hutton proposed a meeting between the various institutions to take this forward and offered to work with J Ragle to make this happen.**

Progress reports will be provided on the three species-related resolutions prioritised by Council, and the five additional resolutions prioritised by the Steering Committee, at each future meeting of the Steering Committee this quadrennium.

T Brooks noted that follow-up on resolutions should be less about prioritisation and more about how to respond to each of them in varying ways.

B Haddane mentioned that the IUCN Mediterranean office is already working on the monk seal resolution (4.023). S Stuart agreed to follow up with B Haddane on this directly.

9. MAJOR CHALLENGES

9a. Reducing Biodiversity Loss and Extinction Rates: SSC's Niche and Priorities

S Stuart noted that much had already been discussed on this under earlier agenda items. He reiterated the major issue: how can SSC be more effective in responding to the results of our assessments and analyses? There is a need to be much smarter in terms of our political strategy and how we advocate for biodiversity protection in general. There is still an issue of how to do conservation action in the field, and SSC has no response mechanism for multi-species issues. But how does the SSC want to be addressing these issues on a long-term basis?

L Boitani noted that with regards to conservation responses there are two things we need to do: 1) identify the responses that need to be taken and be more specific (e.g. when, how and who should be doing this); and 2) deal with the responses. The SSC should be more proactive and bold and worry less about being unbiased and apolitical. J Smart agreed and added that this wouldn't necessarily require a lot of money.

M Samways asked how far down the line should the SSC work on conservation responses. For example, should there be a task force dealing with how assessments should be turned into action (e.g., either communication or political – international, national, local). How much capacity is there?

S Stuart suggested that the SSC should go further than it currently does when a species is listed as threatened; this could include listing in more detail the actions that are needed, so that these can be monitored and followed up on. A Stattersfield discussed the BirdLife example and said that they are already doing this, but the IUCN Classification Scheme for Actions is difficult, and perhaps more work needs to be done with refining the classification scheme. However, BirdLife does investigate what actions are needed (e.g. species specific action, site-based action, policy mechanisms, landscape solutions, etc.). There has also been a focus in BirdLife on collecting information on how much action is currently taking place, to help with advocacy work (e.g., for areas that need more work). A Stattersfield would also like to see more interpretation of SSC's species information with regards to multilateral environmental agreements (MEAs) and Conventions (e.g. what are the species that would benefit from CMS listing?). This is part of being more proactive in feeding our information into the policy arenas.

J Robinson mentioned the Nick Salavsky paper from 2002 and suggested that the ideas in there of codifying conservation measures in a standardised way could be replicated by SSC. S Stuart noted that this had already been done and that A Stattersfield had collaborated with N Salavsky and the Conservation Measures Partnership to produce the current IUCN Conservation Actions Classification Scheme.

P Medici noted that there is a need to be much more specific with regard to making suggestions for actions. There are a number of action plans out there and the Tapir SG has a task force in place to implement these actions. Therefore, part of the solution is to enforce the implementation of the action plans and support SGs in that work.

R Mittermeier added that not enough time was spent on getting funds to do projects in the field and everyone in the network could be a fundraiser; less time should be spent on processes. CI spends more time on raising funds than on other things, and this has been successful. There is a need to talk more about getting species-related information into the climate convention; even when working on ecosystem services and policy responses such as Reduced Emissions from Degradation and Deforestation (REDD), there is still the need to deal with species issues (e.g., if there is no species focus in saving tropical rainforests, then we shall end up with empty forests).

S Stuart felt that there was a dilemma in working in new ways with MEAs like CITES and CMS. There is a need to be more proactive in promoting conservation, but we have to be very careful on how this is achieved without compromising the scientific quality and impartiality of our assessment work. With regards to raising funds for field conservation projects, there is a problem in devolving this completely to the SGs. With some SGs, there is a clear understanding of how to address conservation problems and promote activities in the field (like the Tapir SG, for example). However, some other SGs require more assistance. This is why the responsibility cannot be devolved completely.

S Lieberman agreed. With REDD, even if it is successful, there can be a lot of carbon conserved in the trees, but there may be not be any large animals left in the forest. WWF

works with SSC SGs in developing all of its species-related action plans; there is a need to build on this and articulate the options to SGs (options on how to engage on conservation action). It would be good to illuminate how SGs are already working well in this regard (e.g. rhinos and elephants). There is also a need to communicate information to the SGs on how to engage in the policy arena (citing the recent example of crowned cranes at the CITES Animals Committee).

J Baillie noted that ZSL has just produced a paper on the state of conservation action for particular taxonomic groups. It shows that 75% of mammals and 90% of amphibian species are not receiving any conservation attention.

S Stuart emphasised that care needed to be taken to follow up on all these suggestions and some answers should be reached by the end of the meeting through addressing more specific issues on the agenda. J Robinson suggested that these issues could also be addressed at the upcoming meeting to discuss the next stage with the SCPTF.

9b. Climate Change: SSC's Niche and Role

W Foden presented an overview of the SSC's and SP's climate change work focusing on four main issues:

1. Results of the SSC Specialist Group Climate Change Survey
2. The Species Vulnerability to Climate Change Project
3. Revision to the Red List Guidelines to include climate change
4. Keeping Biodiversity on the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) Copenhagen Agenda

The SSC SG Climate change survey had received 50 responses from 40 different SGs. The objective was to find out more about the SGs perception of climate change and what they are doing on it. For example, the Lagomorph SG agrees that some pikas are potentially at risk from climate change but thinks that listing as threatened on the Red List due to climate change would be premature. About half of the SGs are not doing anything on climate change right now and 35% do not have any future plans. However, some do have future plans, such as some of the fungi groups. The SGs would like information products summarising the relevant scientific information, and they would like coordination and leadership. They also wanted to know what each other are doing.

New climate change flagship species are needed, not just polar bears. W Foden has been working on the development of a simple tool for assessing individual species' climate change vulnerability, dividing vulnerability into three parts: 1. high exposure; 2. high susceptibility; 3. low adaptability. Climate change susceptibility traits were identified (over 90 of them), from which a subset was selected to be used for coding species. Birds, amphibians, warm-water reef-building corals and South African proteaceae were chosen as sample groups for coding. W Foden presented the initial results from this work.

There was wide recognition by the Steering Committee that biodiversity needs to be included in the UNFCCC-COP15 negotiations in Copenhagen.

R Mittermeier noted that W Foden's presentation should be given in Copenhagen, possibly during the Forests Day. Also, assuming that REDD goes through Copenhagen,

there will be a need to look at species values, e.g. what value would you get for flagship species under REDD? CI is starting to look at this.

JP Rodríguez asked how to consider listing species? W Foden is now looking at climate change exposure and comparing to base-line vulnerability to determine the threat of extinction.

L Boitani commented that there is a need to know how SSC should respond to all of this; assisted migration might be one idea to explore. Again there will be a need to focus more on responses.

S Lieberman suggested that SSC should investigate climate change modelling which, combined with species vulnerability traits, will determine how threatened species will be. WWF is working on this currently. There is a need to recognise that there are differences in climate change models around the world (e.g. very good in South Africa, not good in some other regions), and SGs should deal with fact that climate change adaptation is going to threaten species. Here is an area where we could be acting and communicating on. W Foden responded that exposure data from climate models was being used in relation to the species vulnerability traits, but in a somewhat different way.

The discussion continued in a breakout group, the deliberations of which are reported in Annex 2. The Steering Committee adopted the report of the breakout group, and made the following decisions:

- **Select 5-6 species flagship species with good geographic, taxonomic and ecosystem spread, cover a range of mechanisms of impact, and including species that could benefit from REDD (action: W Foden working with SGs)**
- **Feedback to the Specialist Groups on the results of the survey should be provided (action: W Foden)**
- **IUCN and SSC should support for REDD+ which gives explicit consideration of biodiversity and livelihood values of forest (action: J Smart and S Stuart to communicate to IUCN Climate Change Team)**
- **Investigate the possibility of W Foden giving a talk on species biodiversity, forests and climate change. (Action: W Foden to talk to Stewart Magginis and liaise with CI to arrange this)**
- **Ensure that IUCN position papers clearly reflect biodiversity concerns (action: J Smart and S Stuart to communicate to IUCN Climate Change Team)**
- **Identify SSC SG members that might be on national delegations in Copenhagen by sending out a specific message to the network. For these people, advise on biodiversity issues, prepare a report describing the framework of the Copenhagen COP, and send to SG chairs for input (action: W Foden)**
- **The SSC and Species Programme should be included on the IUCN delegation in Copenhagen (action: J Smart and S Stuart to communicate to IUCN Climate Change Team)**
- **The work to develop the climate change guidelines for the Red List should be prioritised, and a report should be brought to the next meeting of the Steering Committee (action: Standards and Petitions Sub-Committee)**

- **In terms of adaptation strategies, SSC will prioritise guidelines on assisted migration in the first instance in the context of re-developing the Re-introduction Guidelines (action: F. Launay).**

9c. Amphibian extinction crisis

S Stuart reported on this issue. Following the shocking results of the Global Amphibian Assessment (GAA) in 2004, the Global Amphibian Summit was convened in 2005 which led to the Amphibian Conservation Action Plan (ACAP). The budget for the implementation of ACAP is 400 million and many initiatives have already started. The AmphibianArk which is trying to push forward ex-situ work and CI has been one of the main organizations implementing in-situ work. The Amphibian SG website documents all work being carried out, but across the board much less has been achieved than hoped. Another action was to keep the GAA up to date and there have been two partial updates since 2004. The most significant progress has been research on amphibian declines and whether they can be explained by the chytrid fungus, or by other threats too. The role of climate change is being debated, though this looks like it might not be a major factor. Also there is a lot of research on species that were almost wiped out by the fungal disease. An increasing number of tiny remnant populations are being in areas where some individuals appear to be resistant to the disease.

The bottom line, however, is that not enough is being done to implement the Amphibian Action Plan, and in particular it has proved very hard to raise anything like enough money for it. An Amphibian Mini-summit is being held on 20-21 August at ZSL to chart a more effective way forward.

M Kusrini noted that there needs to be acknowledgement that some people still do not accept that there is a problem with amphibians globally, let alone in their own country (e.g., Indonesia). There is a real need to educate people more and to carry out more research in South-east Asia (including more capacity building).

R Mittermeier added that at the national level, some actions have been good. This was profiled well at the World Herpetological Congress. There is a need to publicise the many new amphibian species that are being discovered, though that this does not compensate for losses of species.

S Stuart concluded that on the positive side, it looks as if fewer species are actually going extinct than had originally predicted. **A report on the Amphibian Mini-summit will be presented at the next meeting of the Steering Committee.**

9d. Asian large animal crisis

S Stuart presented an overview of the severe conservation situation of large animals in Asia. This was highlighted especially by the Global Mammal Assessment (GMA) released in 2008. The high profile species are well known conservation problems (tiger and Asian elephant), but almost all groups of large animals are seriously affected, such as turtles, deer, wild cattle, pigs, primates, cetaceans, large freshwater fishes, etc.

A WCS meeting in White Oak (May 2009) discussed this issue which was defined as a "large extinction debt waiting to be paid". The main causes are over-utilization for meat

and medicine and rapid loss of forest habitat. Most of the big NGOs are working on these issues, but does the SSC need to do anything further on this? S Stuart felt that the SSC does have a responsibility, but actions need to add value to ongoing efforts.

M Kusrina stated that mammals in Indonesia are high-profile for communication purposes, but only for some species such as tigers, elephants, etc. However, the Ministry of Forest of Indonesia is developing Action Plans.

X Yan added that China had a meeting on CBD a month ago and concluded that any species subject to use has decreased, but protected species are increasing. Notably, species dependent on water are decreasing fast and the majority of decreases are related to trade and unsustainable use. These threats have not been properly addressed.

D Cator commented that at the CITES Animals Committee meeting a delegate from Indonesia had enquired as to how they could interact more with IUCN.

R Mittermeier suggested adding 'prestige' to animals to increase the profile of species. IUCN and the Red List can be used to do this. X Yan agreed and said that China has funding for this.

S Lieberman concluded that members and partners in regions need to do a better job of working together, and also use policy interventions where regionally they would make a difference. There is also need to communicate on issues such as the role of captive breeding and intensive farming, and S Lieberman suggested the SSC work on this issue.

The discussion continued in a breakout group, the deliberations of which are reported in Annex 3. The Steering Committee adopted the report of the breakout group, and made the following decisions:

- **A new Task Force of the IUCN SSC should be formed to take this forward.**
- **Key people from NGOs active on the ground need to be brought into the initiative (for example Christy Williams and Barney Long from WWF; Liz Bennett and Simon Hedges from WCS; BirdLife, FFI, David Emmett and Jatna Supriatna from CI, Asian Turtle Conservation Network, etc).**
- **Key SG chairs/co-chairs and other experts should be involved: Asian Rhino SG, Asian Elephant SG, Cat SG, Primate SG (gibbons/Geissmann), Tortoise and Freshwater Turtle SG, Deer SG, Wild Pig SG, Tapir SG, Freshwater Fish SG, Chris Shepherd (TRAFFIC), Eric Meijaard, Will Duckworth, Tony Lynam, Rob Timmins**
- **Key government people need to be included from the outset.**
- **Someone is needed to convene this Task Force (1 person, or 3 people working together). There is an urgent need to find funds to hire someone for 6 months initially to get it started. This should be someone with good relationships with governments and NGOs across the region. A small group should draft terms of reference for the coordinator to enable us to move forward.**
- **The small group would consist of the breakout group (L Boitani, M Kusrini, X Yan, S Lieberman, S Stuart) and it was agreed to invite Liz Bennett from WCS to join this small group.**

- **As a matter of priority, S Stuart should inform Aban Marker Kabraji in the IUCN Asian Regional Office (ARO) on this initiative, and seek ARO engagement.**
- **Once the six-month coordinator is in place, there is a need to develop a scoping paper and budget for the larger initiative.**

9e. Achieving broader taxonomic coverage of the Red List

S Stuart noted the importance of expanding the taxonomic coverage of the Red List so that it is more broadly representative of biodiversity as a whole. The priorities and costs of doing this (US\$48 million) are outlined on pages 259-260 of the agenda pack. S Stuart is trying to explore avenues for major funding to speed up the taxonomic expansion process, and to reduce the complications of managing large numbers of projects, as is currently the case. S Stuart wanted the funding needs of the Red List to be taken care of as quickly as possible so that that his time could be devoted other priorities, many of which are emerging in this meeting.

J Baillie discussed the Sampled Red List Index – a random sample of species is taken from agreed taxonomic groups, and Red List assessments are carried out of the species in the sample to establish the overall conservation status of the taxonomic group. This has been started with fishes and reptiles (total of 1,500 species chosen to assess consistently throughout time) so the status of all vertebrates (terrestrial and marine) can now be evaluated (mammals, birds and amphibians already have been comprehensively assessed). There has also been some work on broadening the coverage of the invertebrate assessments (1,500 dragonflies have been completed), and freshwater crabs, corals, crayfish, butterflies and cephalopods are either being worked on or work will commence this year. There is a collaboration with the Royal Botanic Gardens Kew on the plants, and most of these assessments are to be completed by end of year.

M Samways mentioned that there is to be a major symposium in February of next year – ‘Conserving the foundations of biodiversity’ which will focus on invertebrate conservation.

T Brooks discussed the Biodiversity Assessment Unit (BAU) which has existed for nine years as a shared programme of work between IUCN and CI. It has delivered global assessments on amphibians, mammals and corals. The BAU has moved its focus away from single assessments to support comprehensive assessments more broadly (e.g. freshwater, marine, plants, reptiles and smaller groups). The BAU is managed within the IUCN Species Programme.

R Mittermeier noted that the focus of the BAU should be on big groups such as reptiles, but clear links should be made between ecosystem services and the benefits towards human well-being. This would open the door for major funding resources. S Stuart agreed that it should not be hard to make those links and would make for some major stories (e.g., the freshwater data and the threats to human livelihoods). D Leaman noted that linking on the livelihoods side, is the 2010 CBD indicator for species important for food and medicines, which is being developed with the collaboration of TRAFFIC (20,000 species of medicinal plants have been identified). Thomasina Oldfield is doing the same but for animals. This would be a good basis for looking at how these stories could be put together.

JC Vié noted that links were being made between the freshwater assessments and ecosystem services, but he added that what we think we are doing and the perception of what we are doing might not necessarily be the same. There is a widespread, but incorrect, assumption that the SSC is not looking at ecosystem services.

M Samways stated that the mindset should be changed from single species to groups of species and the services they provide.

T Brooks wanted to emphasise two angles: 1. the direct benefits (e.g. fisheries, medicinal plants, etc) which are easy recognisable links; and 2. assessing biodiversity comprehensively to support ecosystem services. A focus on the latter makes it easier to demonstrate benefits in spatial dimensions (e.g. measuring the benefits of KBAs to humans).

J Smart noted that the results of the freshwater assessments in relation to ecosystem services had not yet been delivered to their full capacity within policy arenas.

J Baillie wished to note that ZSL is planning on doing a report on status of the world's vertebrates by the end of the year.

9f. Linking with National Red Lists

JP Rodríguez started his presentation with a slide showing an assortment of new Venezuelan bank notes bearing images from the recent Venezuelan Red Data Book. JP Rodríguez had talks with the Central Bank to reach agreement over their use, but it is a very good example of how to publicise the Red List!

At least 109 countries have produced red lists for at least one taxon, at least 70 of them carried out in the last 10 years. However, there are major gaps in Oceania, most of Africa, and the Caribbean, and of taxonomic groups such as the invertebrates, fungi and lichen. It was noted that the comprehensiveness of coverage is positively correlated with GDP, but is negatively correlated with species richness and threatened species richness (demand is highest where resources are lowest). Some of the challenges were highlighted including: the data from national red lists is not readily available to SSC Specialist Groups; IUCN Red List Criteria and Regional Guidelines are little known in certain countries; there is a high demand for training in Red Listing; and there is a need for quality control of national Red Lists and assessors. The primary activities proposed for IUCN's role in national / regional Red Lists 2009-2012 can be found in the agenda pack on pages 263-273. The launch date for National and Regional Red List website is 20 June. The site is hosted by ZSL, and SSC is a partner in this. A suggestion had been made to list trainers (people who have already done assessments) and assessors on this website. In mid September 2009 a major planning meeting on national red lists would be held at ZSL.

S Stuart noted that the Red List Index is now an officially recognised indicator at the national level for Millennium Development Goal 7 on environmental sustainability. This provides a huge opportunity for SSC to help with capacity building at the national level.

X Yan commented that red listing has developed in many countries, but only in a few is it very well used. In China some NGOs do use the Red List, but it would be helpful to issue

guidelines on how the Red List can be used. JC Vié confirmed that guidelines for the use of Red List data have already been produced and are on the Species website.

J Hutton noted that there was an agreement for IUCN and UNEP-WCMC to work together on post 2010 indicators. In this context, it would be good to develop a strategy for capacity building, and to explore how the Red List will relate to the post 2010 indicators.

A Rhodin noted that the national Red List publications were not IUCN products and asked whether or not a stamp of approval be therefore given by IUCN to those meeting IUCN's standards. JP Rodríguez agreed that proper use of the criteria should be promoted. S Stuart stated that this had been discussed in the previous quadrennium, and that it had been decided that IUCN would certify Red List trainers, not national Red Lists.

J Donaldson commented that a very clear message was needed regarding the need to follow IUCN criteria and guidelines for national Red Lists to avoid bad lists be created within a country. T Contreras stated that some national Red Lists are based on totally different criteria.

The report and recommendations of the national red list meeting in September will be presented to the next meeting of the Steering Committee.

9g. SSC and Priority Setting

JP Rodríguez gave an overview of this topic. A schematic representing the recommended procedure for setting priorities for conservation action was shown with the variables considered: extinction risk; distributional and biological factors; societal values; logistical, economic and other factors. Separating risk assessment from priority setting was deemed especially relevant for national red lists, since countries may hold only a part of the global range of a species and island countries tend to have a large proportion of their species listed. The following activities were proposed for 2009-2012: development of guidelines for the definition of conservation priorities for threatened species; workshop(s); preparation of a manual; and writing of a scientific article.

S Lieberman enquired about prioritisation at the national level – was this included? Governments should be involved and their international commitments should be taken seriously.

R Mittermeier noted that there may be a problem lumping biological considerations with others. What would be the priority for the SSC?

A Stattersfield suggested that from a practical point of view there is a need to look at the country level. What would the ideal be – a country or a site approach? A framework action approach can be taken to focus on important flagship species which in turn 'mops up' the lesser important ones.

F Launay asked what the ultimate goal is. If priorities are to be given, what are the key questions needed, for example a 'menu/recipe' that experts have the right to decide from.

L Boitani felt that going in this direction was accepting a 'triage' approach. T Brooks did not agree with this, arguing that prioritization (what to conserve first) and triage (what to give up on) were different things. Objectives have to be clearly laid out and the relevance to conservation planning needs to receive increasing attention.

JP Rodríguez proposed convening of a smaller group to collect more thoughts in framing a way ahead. T Brooks, R Mittermeier, L Boitani, A Stattersfield, and J Robinson expressed interest in taking part. A report will be provided to the next meeting of the Steering Committee.

9h. Red List of Ecosystems

JP Rodríguez presented an overview of the process to develop criteria for a Red List of Ecosystems. This is a joint activity of the SSC and the Commission on Ecosystem Management (CEM). The CEM has formally begun to work on WCC resolution 4.020 (see agenda pack, page 278). JP Rodríguez has been named as the CEM Thematic Group Leader for the Red List of Ecosystems (equivalent to an SSC SG Chair). Nine thematic groups have been formed in CEM. The current activities of the Red List of Ecosystems Thematic Group have been detailed, including a 'manifesto' currently in review for publication and a workshop and oral presentation at the next Society for Conservation Biology meeting in Beijing (11-16 July). Categories and criteria are under development, based on indicators of changes in extent, composition, structure and/or function of ecosystems. Most work to date has focused on terrestrial ecosystems, but analogous thresholds and criteria for freshwater and marine ecosystems are under development.

Primary activities proposed for 2009-2012: a joint SSC-CEM workshop for identifying the major conceptual challenges and designing a plan (late 2009, early 2010); establishment of working groups, integrating leading species and ecosystem scientists, to assure solid grounding of categories and criteria on ecological theory and field research; draft and test system prior to next WCC (the IUCN Regional Office in Quito is very interested in South America serving as a test case).

S Stuart proposed that someone from the SSC Standards and Petition Sub-Committee should be involved (perhaps Georgina Mace).

D Leaman noted the practical application with regards to medicinal plants (fragmentation, pollution). JP Rodríguez agreed that there were different ways of considering function and degradation.

T Brooks wished to make a cautionary note that when the process works itself through, he suspects that it will reveal few places or threats that are not known already from the Red List of Threatened Species. But he agreed there is a need to actually know that this is the case, and not to assume it, so it is a very important process. There will be common datasets between this process and the Red List, and there will be important links with the KBA work.

S Stuart asked what would be needed from the SSC and concluded that this issue needed to be regularly reviewed by the Steering Committee, to seek input and report on progress.

9i. World Species Congress

R Mittermeier spoke to this topic. The original rationale for a World Species Congress came from the ten-yearly World Parks Areas Congresses. The Congress would provide a target for the activities of the SSC as a whole. It has been proposed that the Congress should happen once every ten years and last six to ten days. It is probably now roughly three to four years down the line to inception. R Mittermeier suggested that a small working group should be set up to look at all the issues in more detail.

S Stuart noted that this relates to the recurring issue of how we communicate/advocate in a wider context on species issues.

J Smart commented that many people are asking when the Congress will happen. The World Parks Congress is tentatively scheduled for 2014.

A suggestion was put forward for 2013, 65 years after the founding of IUCN. This topic will be addressed in greater depth at the next meeting of the Steering Committee.

10. SSC IN MAJOR INTERNATIONAL PROCESSES

10a. 2010 Target, including Global Biodiversity Outlook 3

JC Vié introduced this topic. The SSC has a major role in the reporting against the CBD's 2010 Biodiversity Target. IUCN is a member of the 2010 Biodiversity Indicators Partnership (2010 BIP), and through that it has played a major role in at least two of the reports that have been prepared for the 3rd Global Biodiversity Outlook (GBO3) (see pages 281-303 of the agenda pack).

S Stuart asked if IUCN/SSC be doing more in relation to the 2010 Target, beyond participating in the GBO3. Should a larger analysis be considered? If so, would this be a publication by the Red List P?

JC Vié suggested that it might be possible to do a new publication taking into account the new information available. However, he advised doing something with more of a policy focus which might have a bigger impact than a large analytical book along the lines of the 2004 Global Species Assessment.

R Mittermeier suggested that we should be making the loudest noise and produce something significant in 2010 – possibly video material as this is a huge media opportunity. The world will be focused on biodiversity in 2010 and this must be exploited. Perhaps something broad in scope, but not a full scale analysis and choose something of relevance which the media are more likely to pick up.

A Stattersfield noted that the GBO3 will generate some information which could be presented in other products and publications. However, it is necessary to consider where this should be targeted. Should we launch a publication at the CBD Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice (SBSTTA) meeting in May 2010 or at the CBD Conference of the Parties in October 2010?

D Leaman suggested revisiting the results of the assessments and launching a set of action-related projects.

J Smart commented that SBSTTA has a key policy focus and that, worryingly, any mention of 'biodiversity' was being left out. There is a need to meet the challenge of species and biodiversity being centre stage, and to ensure that these words are not removed.

S Stuart noted that the Red List Index results will get a lot of publicity and noise next year. The species approach can be shown in its capacity to inform a policy agenda. There is a need to do something but it should not be massive and has to be cleverly targeted for maximum impact.

J Hutton felt that something should be delivered at the COP, particularly on the indicator for food and medicine that Thomasina Oldfield is currently working on. He added that more money needs to be allocated to the indicator on food and medicine to get it finished. This would provide a convincing story on the importance of wild species for human livelihoods. In addition to participating in the GBO3 launch at SBSTTA, SSC should release a policy-oriented analysis of the Red List at the COP.

R Mittermeier noted that species underpin ecosystem services and this needs to be demonstrated in 2010. An updated Red List is also needed.

J Smart argued that SBSTTA does need to be targeted as this where some key decisions are made. However, J Hutton suggested although something could be done for SBSTTA, a publication from SSC and its partners would get very significant exposure at the COP.

JC Vié asked what could be done based on ongoing assessments. Could more be done on climate change as major datasets come in? The importance of species can be justified; success stories can be told; climate change stories provided; and links to ecosystem services can be given. But all this is best done in short publications of only one or two pages each. This is a good opportunity for videos and beautiful photos. Perhaps there should be a short update on Red List profiling success stories – new stories from new datasets, or older stories retold. The Red List Committee and partners should be involved with this.

J Baillie suggested focusing on a world without invertebrates, perhaps focusing on certain aspects of biodiversity and what they would be like without certain invertebrate species.

J Donaldson suggested looking at a framework of how biodiversity fits in with the ecosystem services debate, as this debate will set the framework for the next 10 years. There is a need to review and inform this policy debate.

T Brooks suggested a light and brief product which demonstrates the relevance of our work, e.g., on extinction rates.

M Samways noted that care should be taken when thinking about the value of rare species in relation to ecosystem services.

J Smart noted that this was the time to do more plant assessments, as this is the time to show that we are serious about plants and their importance as food and medicine.

S Stuart summarised the discussion noting that such a broad array of views had been expressed that it was clear that more needed to be done before a decision could be made on how to proceed. **It was therefore agreed that JC Vié should follow up with M Samways, T Contreras, A Stattersfield, B Haddane, R Mittermeier, D Leaman, J Donaldson, T Brooks, J Baillie, J Hutton and J Robinson, and with the Red List Committee if it meets in time, and pull together a proposal on how to proceed in relation to products in 2010 to be released at CBD meetings. This proposal should be sent to the Steering Committee by the end of September 2009.**

10b. Post 2010 Target

The post 2010 Target that CBD sets will have a very significant impact in the SSC's work over the coming decade. J Hutton reported on discussions that have taken place at recent meetings focusing on the post-2010 Target. Some of these reports can be found on pages 303-311 of the agenda pack. There is a series of meetings still to take place and from this a 'road map' is emerging which J Hutton will distribute to Steering Committee members once it is completed by UNEP-WCMC staff.

J Hutton noted that there has been a notable shift away from speaking about diversity in the discussions that have taken place, with species not normally being mentioned at all. In some quarters the feeling is that some key aspects of biodiversity should sit alongside ecosystem services. This is now very a political process, and IUCN is in a good position to influence the outcome of this process but a clear strategy is required. There is also an indicator issue – money has been focused on under-developed indicators that were never going to work. There is a group of people now working on improving the indicators in the framework of the 2010 BIP.

JC Vié noted that a paper has been drafted by Matt Walpole and others which reviews the set of 2010 indicators and makes proposals.

J Hutton said that if SSC feels the need to influence IUCN to bring species to the forefront and also to help IUCN influence political decisions then it is certainly in a good position to do this, but again a clearly considered strategy would be needed.

JC Vié proposed to using the word 'wildlife' to avoid SSC be cornered in debates through always using the word 'species'.

The discussion continued in a breakout group, the results of which are provided in Annex 4. The Steering Committee adopted the report of the breakout group, and noted the following decisions:

- **A roadmap of events leading up the the CBD COP will be circulated (action: J Hutton)**
- **The report of the breakout group will provide a conceptual basis for SSC's input into the various meeting related to the post 2010 Target**
- **SSC will seek to influence the IUCN policy on the post-2010 Target, specifically to ensure that the species focus is not lost (action: J Smart and S Stuart)**

10c. Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES)

There is an IUCN Council task force on IPBES, and S Stuart and R Mittermeier are members of it, but nothing has been done so far. J Hutton provided the background to the origin of IPBES (emerging from the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment and from the International Mechanism of Scientific Expertise on Biodiversity (IMOSEB) process). The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) has been extremely influential in raising the profile of climate change so it was thought that something similar was needed for biodiversity. There is likely to be a consensus later in the year to take this forward under UNEP, but the mechanics of its operation need to be worked out. For example, who should be on it and who should pay for it? It was noted that the Governments of Malaysia and South Korea are keen to step forward to host the Secretariat, and IUCN has also made such an offer. More will be reported on IPBES in future Steering Committee meetings.

10d. Global Strategy for Plant Conservation

J Donaldson introduced this topic. The 10-year CBD Global Strategy for Plant Conservation (GSPC) ends in 2010 and there was recently a meeting in Dublin (26-28 May) to discuss this. This was a very positive meeting with 40 people represented. The focus was on re-working the introductory text and the 16 targets. There was no change to the overall focus, so the discussion was more of a re-wording exercise. The direct link with the SSC is GSPC Target 2, to assess the threat status of plant species. There was a strong concern that the current target, focusing on a preliminary assessment of all plant species, is impractical and of limited use. The alternative is to agree to assess representative smaller subsets of species to gain an understanding of the global status of plants at the IUCN level of detail. The conclusion of the Dublin meeting opens the way to a more flexible Target 2. There were also discussions in Dublin on rewording the target on invasives. The next step is to present a document arising from the Dublin meeting at the next meeting of SBSTTA.

J Smart noted that there was a chance to get the GSPC Target 2 to say exactly what we want it to say. How much Red Listing do we actually need to do? Should there be a focus on the assessment of useful plants (e.g., for food, medicine and livelihoods) which would create a good basis for fundraising?

It was agreed that the report from the Dublin meeting should be circulated to the SSC Steering Committee (action: J Griffin).

10e. The Economics of Ecosystems and Biodiversity (TEEB)

S Stuart introduced this topic. TEEB is a major ongoing international initiative which is strongly supported by the European Commission and various European countries. It is designed to look at the economics of ecosystem services and biodiversity. It has a tight 14-month deadline and the biodiversity aspect of it is not covered very well due to the lack of agreement on what it is, how it should be measured, and most especially how it should be valued. It has been suggested that a Mean Species Abundance model could be used, but there are issues with this approach.

J Hutton noted that it has been very useful to get an economist involved in conservation. TEEB is lead by Pavan Sukhdev from Deutsches Bank, and he has been discussing with Georgina Mace and S Stuart on how to factor in biodiversity more effectively. S Stuart is now reviewing two chapters of TEEB.

T Brooks asked whether a name change should be proposed from TEEB to TEE if biodiversity is no longer being tackled. However, S Stuart said that he thought it was extremely doubtful that this could be achieved, and causing upset with TEEB would not be helpful. A further report will be provided at the next meeting of the Steering Committee.

10f. Integrated Biodiversity Assessment Tool (IBAT)

This topic was introduced by J Hutton. IBAT is a tool to provide key biodiversity-related data at a site scale to interested user communities, initially the corporate sector. The initial IBAT partners were BirdLife International, CI and UNEP-WCMC, and IUCN has now decided in principle to move its status from an observer to a full member. S Stuart noted that there have been discussions with M Sneary (IBAT Manager) to develop a species layer in IBAT. A further report will be provided at the next meeting of the Steering Committee.

10g. Mohammed bin Zayed Species Conservation Fund

F Launay gave a presentation on the Mohammed bin Zayed Species Conservation Fund (MBZSCF). The Fund largely draws on the belief that direct species conservation is essential and is increasingly neglected. The MBZSCF is an endowment fund of 25 million Euros initially, with the initial Fund being a private donation from the Abu Dhabi Crown Prince. Two million Euros will be distributed as grants in 2009 and one million Euros has been set aside for the operational requirements.

The objective of the fund is to support experts, individuals and organisations focusing directly on species conservation in the field. It aims to be a fast-response funding body, targeting threatened species, species of importance at the local level, and those species that are Data Deficient. The Fund will provide two types of grants: up to Euros 5,000 and between Euros 5000 and Euros 25,000, with the grants going directly to conservation practitioners in the field. The grants are disbursed on a genuinely global level, covering any animal or plant species without discrimination; if the proposal/project is good and in line with the Fund's objectives, it will be supported. Applications to the Fund are made online. A total of US\$937,540 in grants had been committed by June 1, 2009

10h. Save Your Logo / Threatened Species Partnership

JC Vié introduced this topic. At the IUCN Congress in Barcelona, an announcement was made on the formation of threatened species fund, built around a Save Your Logo Campaign. The Global Environment Facility and World Bank each committed US\$5 million to this initiative and additional contributions are being sought from private corporations using species in their logos. D Olson has been appointed to draft the initial project plan and IUCN will manage and select the projects. Among the issues being discussed are the provision of an emergency fund (but what would qualify as an emergency?), and what kind of indicators that could be used for monitoring the success of the project.

M Samways suggested that it would be great to focus on declining species that people are losing services from.

T Brooks proposed capitalising on the value of cultural ecosystem services, noting that many companies are making a lot of money drawing directly from species.

R Mittermeier suggested that smaller medium-sized grants should be focused on. The term 'rapid action fund' should replace the use of 'emergency fund'.

J Robinson asked whether this could be branded with the SSC name rather than IUCN due to having 'species' in the title.

JC Vié reported that there were discussions focusing on the proportion of the contributions from corporations that would go to the species on the logos, and the proportion that would go into the general fund. S Lieberman suggested that it would be more realistic to expect companies with a logo to want all monies they contributed to go directly to that species. T Brooks added that if taxonomy was harnessed in the framework, there may be creative ways of maximizing the efficiency of this (e.g., through broadening investment from a gecko logo to lizards generally).

The discussion continued in a breakout group, which is reported on in Annex 5. The Steering Committee adopted the report of the breakout group. **A further update will be provided at the next Steering Committee meeting.**

10i. Global Tiger Initiative

J Robinson introduced this topic. An initiative to develop a global tiger strategy began in 2000 to set priorities for tiger conservation. More recently, Bob Zoellick, President of the World Bank, expressed an interest in providing direct help to conservation, in particular tigers. Therefore, in June 2008 the World Bank committed to saving the tiger, to support country dialogues in tiger range states, and to look at the impact of infrastructure on tigers. All this will lead to a Global Tiger Summit in 2010.

In response to the CITES COP resolution in 2007, IUCN was charged with helping to develop a global tiger strategy in partnership with the Global Tiger Forum and the CITES Secretariat. The GEF has funded a Tiger Futures Medium-sized Proposal (MSP) to build national and regional commitment and also to build national capacity on tiger trade issues. The next stage will be a meeting in Kathmandu in October to follow up on the CITES resolution - presumably the result will be an agreed global tiger strategy with prioritized actions. The World Bank Global Tiger Initiative project is not clearly sorted out yet, but the convening power that the World Bank has is strong. Holly Dublin is leading for IUCN for IUCN on tigers, working closely with the Cat Specialist Group. There will be a meeting in July, in Gland, between S Stuart, H Dublin and the World Bank to try to sort out processes in relation to the Kathmandu meeting.

S Lieberman noted that this was the first time that someone very senior had actually asked what can be done for the tiger. But the challenge is to keep communicating especially with those people working on the ground. R Mittermeier added that it was very important to keep the World Bank President regularly involved by direct contact if possible. **A further update will be provided at the next Steering Committee meeting.**

10j. CITES Update

D Cator gave a presentation on how IUCN has been engaging in CITES, and additional information provided by S Lieberman. D Cator works with the SGs ahead of CITES meetings to invite comments from them relevant to the agenda items. It was noted that working with the SG Chairs at these meetings is very successful and can be achieved by actual physical presence or contact via Skype/email (ensuring that they are on-line as the meeting is taking place).

S Stuart noted the importance of maintaining a good relationship with the Secretariat of CITES.

D Leaman commented that there was some interesting work coming from the plant network in relation to CITES.

A Stattersfield suggested inviting the SGs to contribute proactively to CITES COP15, perhaps by preparing CITES listing proposals. S Stuart noted that it was important to maintain the objectivity of SSC's analyses of CITES listing proposals, and it is obviously not possible for the author of a proposal to review that proposal. There is a need to find out what is already working well regarding the involvement of the SGs with CITES.

10k. CMS (Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals) Update

JC Vié introduced this topic. CMS has grown significantly over the past few years and has become increasingly complicated with a growing number of agreements and memoranda of understanding. The SSC should consider interacting more with CMS, perhaps through participating on the CMS Scientific Council. It was noted that the CMS needs to consolidate and focus on truly migratory species.

The question was asked what SSC should do collectively for CMS. CMS has expressed an interest in the SSC's participation in the reviewing of submissions/proposals for listing on the CMS appendices. It was suggested that since many fish species are poorly covered in CMS, there could be some input here, and also on climate change impacts on migratory species.

S Lieberman noted that the tiger was proposed to be listed as a migratory species, but with interventions from WWF, IUCN, and others, it was agreed that this was not a priority for the CMS CoP, and it was not pursued further (as sufficient other fora and bodies are dealing with the tiger, and the CMS should focus on truly migratory species).

F Launay commented that since 'species' was in the name of the convention, the SSC should seek ways to interact with CMS.

11. Any Other Business

On the request of B Haddane, a minute's silence was held in memory of three of his work colleagues – Dr. Fouad Haddour, Dr. Rajae Tazi Moukha and M. Ahmed Faouzi –

who tragically lost their lives in the Air France accident from Rio de Janeiro to Paris, on 1 June.

Holly Dublin had proposed a motion to the SSC to recognise an SSC member for major efforts in African rhino conservation over many years. S Stuart agreed with H Dublin's proposal, and mentioned the name of the person to the Steering Committee. He suggested that a Peter Scott conservation medal could be used to honour this person's achievements. However, with regard to the SSC's awards and medals, it was decided that **a summary paper was first required to clarify what each award was for and who should be receiving them. This paper will be presented at the next Steering Committee meeting (action: SSC Chair's Office).** The SSC Steering Committee will then decide on those individuals who should receive an award. J Hutton and S Lieberman also added their support for H Dublin's proposal.

R Mittermeier wished to make a comment on the unstable political situation in Madagascar. Due to the unrest and breakdown in law and order, aid agencies have suspended all but humanitarian aid to the country. R Mittermeier has issued a complaint about this, as environmental aid is at risk. R Mittermeier would like to be supported by IUCN on this issue, and perhaps the IUCN Director General could send a letter to the US State Department stating that cutting aid would be counter-productive at a time when it is needed now more than ever. **R Mittermeier to follow up with J Smart and S Stuart on a possible letter from the IUCN Director General to Madagascar.**

R Mittermeier announced the arrival of the first copies of the Handbook of Mammals of the World; the first volume is on carnivores. Two copies were presented, one to J Smart and one to S Stuart.

T Contreras asked what the SSC is doing with regards to a freshwater perspective. There is a need to engage more with worldwide forums and address the bigger issues of freshwater ecosystems. S Stuart agreed that should be included in the agenda of the next Steering Committee meeting. **T Contreras will prepare an options paper for the work of SSC on freshwater.**

J Smart presented a handout to the Steering Committee on engaging with zoos. This will be discussed further at the next meeting under the item on communications.

12. Date and Venue of Next Meeting

S Stuart explained that the decision to proceed with a second Steering Committee meeting this year would be based on the cost of the present one. There was a discussion on possible venues and a request for suggestions on where further funds could be found to add extra support. R Mittermeier requested an approximate costing and stressed the importance of holding a meeting twice a year and preferably at a venue which has some conservation significance. **Action: S Stuart to provide R Mittermeier with approximate costing for a Steering Committee meeting.**

A Rhodin commented on the success of the Specialist Group Chair's meeting in Al Ain in 2008. Such meetings create community, provide feedback and are inspirational for the SG Chairs. However, there is a need to repeat this more than once every quadrennium. S Stuart was in agreement with this in principle but added that again cost would need to be taken into account.

T Brooks suggested that timing the Steering Committee meetings with other relevant conferences and internal gatherings would make more impact.

J Smart noted that IUCN would begin its programme planning shortly and there was a need to be proactive. S Stuart agreed that there was an issue with SSC's response and in the next meeting there needs to discussions on being more prepared and focused.

13. Closing

The meeting was closed at 17:00. The Chair thanked everyone for their attendance and noted that it had been a very constructive and successful meeting. Thanks were also given to those who helped with the organisation and logistics (both leading up to and during the meeting), and also to the guest presenters.

ANNEX 1

Key Biodiversity Areas and Collaboration with World Commission on Protected Areas

Report from the Breakout Group:

Facilitator: J Smart
Rapporteur: J Hutton

Objective: To review joint work between SSC and WCPA and make a recommendation to SSC of the priorities between the following options for future joint work:

1. A metadata study of Protected Area conservation outcomes.
2. Investigate ways that Protected Areas could be categorized according to biodiversity objectives.
3. Consolidate the criteria for the identification of KBAs as sites of global biodiversity conservation significance, forming a “fourth axis” of Protected Area classification.

History: The current SSC/WCPA Area-Based Conservation Planning collaboration will come to an end later in 2009 when Bob Pressey and Madeleine Bottrill complete their report. This Task Force has looked at broad approaches to conservation planning.

With respect to the suggested future collaboration, the group agreed as follows:

1. **A metadata study of Protected Area conservation outcomes.**
This is in part a response to pressure from human rights groups in questioning the biodiversity conservation outcomes of protected areas and WCPA has a strong interest in the project. A key question is whether or not biodiversity can be effectively conserved through protected areas. This is an interesting and important issue and some members of SSC have expressed an interest in collaborating with WCPA on the research in a pilot phase. However it was recognised that there is quite a lot of work already going on in this general area. Perhaps SSC and WCPA can help pull this together?
2. **Investigate ways that Protected Areas could be categorized according to biodiversity objectives.**
It was agreed that biodiversity objectives could be strengthened in Protected Area categorisation, but there are significant challenges, not least the fact that many Protected Areas were not established primarily for biodiversity conservation. While agreeing that this was an important issue, the breakout group did not prioritize this work highly for immediate follow-up.
3. **Consolidate the criteria for the identification of KBAs as sites of global biodiversity conservation significance, forming a “fourth axis” of Protected Area classification.**
KBAs are sites of global biodiversity conservation significance; they are important because they provide an approach to move species assessments to site-based conservation action directly based on the Red List. They form an overlapping set with Protected Areas: many Protected Areas are also KBAs, while some (maybe

half of all) KBAs are also currently Protected Areas (all should be Protected Areas, especially under the new WCPA Protected Area definition which better encompasses private, community, indigenous, etc reserves). The working group recognised that KBAs will not be adequate to protect species that migrate, or which have large area requirements such as top predators etc. The group also noted that there are other equally valuable ways to implement conservation (such as flagship species). However, because KBAs are based at least in part on Red List species, IUCN was considered to have an obligation to provide standards and guidance. In addition, KBAs occur across the globe and probably in every country. It was recognised that in the absence of total knowledge, it is possible that some KBAs will not be identified, so any work in this field needs appropriate disclaimers regarding errors of omission. It was agreed that fact sheets on KBAs, addressing their strengths and also criticisms, are needed.

The results of the process between SSC and WCPA should therefore:

- a) Support the incorporation biodiversity considerations into protected area objectives and selection criteria.
- b) Develop standards and guidance that will encourage and more easily allow the global conservation community to identify and highlight “KBAs” as a standard approach to identifying sites of global biodiversity conservation significance.
- c) Develop a standard that is adopted by Governments such that they become custodians of their “KBAs” as a key part of their protected area gap analysis.
- d) Improve the listing of critical sites for biodiversity in the context of relevant Multilateral Environmental Agreements, and the activities of the private sector and of civil society.

The process should involve:

- a) The establishment of a formal joint SSC/WCPA Task Force.
- b) Joint fundraising for financial support to the Task Force and an IUCN-Secretariat -based position.
- c) An assessment of the global cover of “KBAs”, their state of development in different countries and their overlap with protected areas.
- d) The production of an introductory working document that deals with the key issues and all the expected results.
- e) A series of technical workshops with key stakeholders to discuss the working documents, establish a common understanding and develop a more inclusive Task Force with responsibilities clearly allocated.
- f) Consultation with all the key biodiversity-related MEAs.
- g) Regional consultations with governments and other key stakeholders.
- h) The consolidation of standards and guidance based on broad consultation.
- i) The consolidation of biodiversity response indicators based on “KBAs”.
- j) Introduction of “KBA” standards into WCPA and SSC processes and training, such as that associated with national level Red Listing.
- k) Introduction of the results of consultations to Ministers through mechanisms such as the UNEP Minister’s meetings.

It was agreed that J Smart would be the focal point within the Secretariat, and would communicate the results of the Steering Committee discussions with Nik Lopoukhine, Chair of WCPA, J Baillie, T Brooks, J Hutton and Kent Redford (from WCS) are willing to

participate from SSC on item 1 (the metastudy). L Boitani will lead on item 2, if and when there is a sufficient groundswell on interest for this project to be viable; T Brooks and A Stattersfield on item 3 (KBA criteria consolidation).

ANNEX 2

Climate Change: SSC's Niche and Role

Report from the Breakout Group:

4. Results of the SSC Specialist Group Climate Change Survey

The breakout group noted the following issues for follow-up from the survey:

- There are clearly some “undersold” stories / new flagship species in relation to climate change
 - Encourage new stories from SGs who have not yet responded
 - Select 5-6 species flagship species with good geographic, taxonomic and ecosystem spread, cover a range of mechanisms of impact, and including species that could benefit from REDD
 - Possible additional species groups: pinnipeds; eels
 - Do we tell the positive stories of species that might benefit from climate change?
- Feedback to the Specialist Groups on the results of the survey should be provided
- Gather stories from other meetings (e.g., Society for Conservation Biology (SCB))
- Invasive species and diseases: can SSC deliver a message on how these threats are impacted by climate change?
- Provide information on the trends and impacts on flagship species, indicating how SG work on these species can/does contribute to the CBD and UNFCCC agendas

2. Keeping Biodiversity on the UNFCCC Copenhagen Agenda

Entry points for promoting biodiversity conservation at UNFCCC-COP15:

1. Motivation for setting appropriate mitigation targets and taking swift action to prevent biodiversity loss
2. Alignment with Multilateral Environmental Agreements including CBD, UN Convention to Combat Desertification, Ramsar Convention etc.
3. MITIGATION: Reduced Emissions from Degradation and Deforestation (REDD)
“More than just Carbon”; “More than just forests”
4. ADAPTATION: Ecosystem-based adaptation (EbA) – Ecosystem services and biodiversity

Factors to consider in relation to the SSC Presence in Copenhagen

- Press releases: New flagship species – from the SG network
- Press pack online including video footage
- Publicise species, SSC and SG members

Biodiversity value of REDD

- Protection of forests will not necessarily protect species

- IUCN and SSC should support for REDD+ which gives explicit consideration of biodiversity and livelihood values of forest

Forest Day 3 side event at Copenhagen:

This is a full day of presentations on forests and climate change

Investigate the possibility of W Foden giving a talk on species biodiversity, forests and climate change. Talk to Stewart Magginis and liaise with CI to arrange this.

Ensure that IUCN position papers clearly reflect biodiversity concerns

Also in relation to UNFCCC-COP15:

- Use other earlier meetings (e.g. SCB meeting in China) to draw attention to the need for biodiversity to be on the agenda in Copenhagen
- Identify SSC SG members that might be on national delegations in Copenhagen by sending out a specific message to the network. For these people, advise on biodiversity issues, prepare a report describing the framework of the Copenhagen COP, and send to SG chairs for input
- The SSC and Species Programme should be included on the IUCN delegation

3. Revision to the Red List Guidelines to include climate change

This is one of the priority resolutions (4.016) agreed by IUCN Council (see item 8n).

- This will be lead by the Standards and Petitions Sub-committee chaired by Resit Akcakaya, collaborating with W Foden, C Hilton-Taylor and others. Plans in place to advance this work, but more funding needs to be raised.

4. The Species Vulnerability to Climate Change Project

It had previously been agreed to carry out vulnerability assessments of new species groups. These are on track, and should provide information of relevance to climate change adaptation strategies, from which it will be possible to make some recommendations. In particular, this work should:

- Show that species work can be very relevant to current hot issues such as:
 - Impacts of climate change on species of economic value, and hence on livelihoods (e.g., through the new Albertine Rift project)
 - Impacts of climate change on species of importance for the delivery of ecosystem services (methodologically more difficult)
- Use the climate change hook to raise funds for work on Red List assessments,
 - e.g., the Albertine Rift project
 - Planned work on Himalayan medicinal plants

5. Global Indicators of Climate Change Impacts on Species

- Should SSC set up and support monitoring of indicators of climate change impacts on species?
- Once climate change is fully and adequately incorporated into the Red List, this can be used in existing indices (such as RLI)
- The Species Vulnerability Project outputs can be used as a global indicator of climate change and species.

6. When we know which species are vulnerable to climate change, what do we do about it?

The whole conservation community struggling with the need to find tools to use to help species adapt to climate change. The SSC needs to show leadership, but should be cautious about giving legitimacy (appearance of IUCN endorsement) to unproven tools. However, if the SSC can agree on legitimacy of proven tools, this could be very powerful. Are we just developing the tools, or are we moving our network into implementing adaptation / mitigation measures?

Options include research and data gathering:

- Contact SGs to find out what actions they're doing/recommending
- Collect information on examples of these actions for species across taxa and geographical areas
- Partner with relevant research institutions
- Consider the impact of non-linear responses to climate change (e.g. coral bleaching)
- Considering interactions between climate change and other threats

The following potential conservation tools were discussed:

- Assisted migration. This will be considered as part of the process to redevelop the Re-introduction Guidelines (agenda item 8d). The Re-introductions Specialist Group will lead on this.
- Ex situ conservation (captive breeding and re-introduction). This might be the only short-term option in certain cases. The Conservation Breeding and Re-introduction Specialist Groups will lead on this.
- Ex situ conservation (seed and genome banking)
- Increase protected area connectivity, establish corridors
- Ecosystem-based adaptation
- Minimise other threats

It was agreed that the SSC will prioritise guidelines on assisted migration in the first instance in the context of re-developing the Re-introduction Guidelines.

7. SSC structures to support work on Climate Change

The previous SSC Climate Change Task Force failed because the task was too broad, not specific. It has simply been asked to “do something on climate change”. Rather than trying to set up another broad task force, the agreed priority actions on climate change for the SSC can be addressed through appropriate existing structures, including the Re-introductions Specialist Group (on assisted migration), The Standard and Petitions Sub-Committee (on the Red List climate change guidelines), and other Specialist Groups, the Species Programme, the Steering Committee and the SSC Chair's office as appropriate.

ANNEX 3

Asian Large Animal Crisis

Report from the Breakout Group:

Situation: The whole group agreed that there is a huge threat across all taxa, and an enormous enforcement problem in Asia. It was felt that the focus needed to be on addressing over-exploitation through anti-poaching on the ground. The risk of habitat conversion for oil palm, etc, was acknowledged, but it was agreed that the greatest threat is over-exploitation, and addressing this has the greatest potential return on investment. The focus must therefore be on the poaching, which is threatening species — in and outside of protected areas. This includes virtually all Asian large animals (reptiles, mammals, fish). The focus will be on terrestrial and freshwater initially, as the species and threats are to some extent different in the marine environment.

IUCN SSC has a convening role, which should include range state governments, SG scientists, and NGOs with projects in the field.

Anti-poaching work is already ongoing in a number of places, but it must be scaled up across the region. The initial focus, because of the complexities in the region, will be in Southeast Asia, and the parts of China that border Southeast Asia. Northeast Asia will be focused on as soon as possible thereafter, followed by South Asia. The initiative should not only focus on anti-poaching (such as snare removal), but also on alternative livelihoods for local people, addressing the root causes of poaching, providing alternative protein sources, capacity building and training.

What will be done?

There will be a focus on on-the-ground enforcement. A workshop should be held to prioritize the top 10 places in Southeast Asia to target for on-the-ground enforcement with the maximum chances of success in terms of preventing species' extinctions. This initiative is not a focus on trade enforcement, but on anti-poaching. It will include a region-wide campaign to highlight how critical this issue is. The initiative would also need a strong communications element.

One option is an Asian region-wide workshop to agree what needs to be done in general terms, followed by sub-regional workshops. We need to see if there are any dates of events or meetings in Southeast Asia (ASEAN?) that could be piggybacked on to "launch" this initiative.

As a result of the sub-regional workshop, we need to come up with a list of priority sites/places for immediate anti-poaching work.

The group agreed that there is a need for guidelines on enforcement/anti-poaching in protected areas. WCPA could/should work on this, as no such guidelines currently exist to the knowledge of the group.

Next steps:

- A new Task Force of the IUCN SSC should be formed to take this forward.

- Key people from NGOs active on the ground need to be brought into the initiative (for example Christy Williams and Barney Long from WWF; Liz Bennett and Simon Hedges from WCS; BirdLife, FFI, David Emmett and Jatna Supriatna from CI, Asian Turtle Conservation Network, etc).
- Key SG chairs/co-chairs and other experts should be involved: Asian Rhino SG, Asian Elephant SG, Cat SG, Primate SG (gibbons/Geissmann), Tortoise and Freshwater Turtle SG, Deer SG, Wild Pig SG, Tapir SG, Freshwater Fish SG, Chris Shepherd (TRAFFIC), Eric Meijaard, Will Duckworth, Tony Lynam, Rob Timmins
- Key government people need to be included from the outset.
- Someone is needed to convene this Task Force (1 person, or 3 people working together). There is an urgent need to find funds to hire someone for 6 months initially to get it started. This should be someone with good relationships with governments and NGOs across the region. A small group should draft terms of reference for the coordinator to enable us to move forward.
- The small group would consist of the breakout group (L Boitani, M Kusriani, X Yan, S Lieberman, S Stuart) and it was agreed to invite Liz Bennett from WCS to join this small group.
- As a matter of priority, S Stuart should inform Aban Marker Kabraji in the IUCN Asian Regional Office (ARO) on this initiative, and seek ARO engagement.
- Once the six-month coordinator is in place, there is a need to develop a scoping paper and budget for the larger initiative.

ANNEX 4

Post 2010 Target

Report from the Breakout Group:

There were four areas of discussion:

- 1) Framing the high level target beyond “significantly reduce the rate of biodiversity loss by 2010”
- 2) Ensuring a framework for the indicators post-2010
- 3) Setting criteria for indicator selection post-2010
- 4) Identifying post-2010 indicators

1. Framing the high level target:

Issues with the current target:

- “significantly reduce” is under-ambitious
- “rate” is unnecessary and leads to distortions
- likely need mention of ecosystem services as well as biodiversity per se
- However, framing is much preferable to that used in UNFCCC (“not exceed dangerous limits”), which would be impossible to define for biodiversity in any case.

Based on these issues, the general form of a post-2010 target might be:

- “Maintain current (2010?) biodiversity and ecosystem services, and restore as feasible that lost already (over what time period?)”

Note that progress should be reported frequently and regularly (COPs) against indicators for the target (short time-frame for reporting 2015/2020, long vision 2050)

Process points:

- SSC needs to be well organized for the Reading workshop;
- A calendar of events leading up to Nagoya in October 2010 needs to be circulated;
- Target key people/constituencies to influence (Germans, UNEP, etc)
- Link to existing NGO position paper
- Strongly inform IUCN options document (in providing arguments for or against the various options, and recommending the preferred one)

2. Framework for post-2010 indicators

- Current indicators are not organized according to any conceptual framework
- Recommend using DPSIR framework (Drivers, Pressure, State, Impact, Response)

3. Criteria for post-2010 indicators

Indicators need to be:

- Measurable
- Relatively sensitive over time
- Scaleable between global and national levels
- Based on data that already exists?

- Try to minimize number of indicators, although political tradeoffs here; at least strive to make them measurable

4. Post-2010 indicators themselves

A possible framework might be:

DRIVERS

- Human footprint
- Governance
- Population?

PRESSURE

- Agriculture/agricultural conversion
- Fisheries sustainability
- Nutrient loading
- Invasives
- Carbon emissions/climate change?

STATE

- Extinction risk (RLI)
- Change in net habitat extents
- Populations/LPI
- Land/seascape?

IMPACTS

- Biodiversity in food and medicine
- Environmental conflicts

RESPONSE

- Protected area coverage (of important sites)
- Financing
- Ex situ

ANNEX 5

Save Your Logo/Threatened Species Partnership

Report from the Breakout Group:

- Component 1: Threatened Species Program with a Rapid Action Fund Component
- Component 2: Support Red List updates and Profiles
- Objective: Conserve diversity through helping Red List species and their critical habitats and landscape species that act as umbrellas
- Open to World Bank-eligible countries, civil society, governments, but not IUCN directly (though IUCN Members can apply). Multi-donor projects OK

Targets:

- Base criteria on the IUCN Red List, but not exclusively
- Species priorities within their taxa can be developed by SGs and target projects/organisations (threatened, Data Deficient, declining...), not all Critically Endangered or Edge species
- Criteria are needed for species that have no SG
- Criteria for threatened phenomena, congregations, etc
- Keep flexibility and do not go too deeply into details when developing criteria
- Focus on direct conservation action, surveys, assessments, targeted research, salaries, equipment, enforcement, targeted awareness and education, no tuition or land purchase or relocation of people
- Link to Action Plans, National Biodiversity Strategies, etc
- Earmarking OK due to matching funds from GEF, Bank

Grant niche:

- US\$20K to US\$100-200K = empty niche in the funding market
- Keep the number of large projects to a low number
- Projects up to 2 years and renewable
- Do not shy away from risk
- Rapid Action Fund, up to US\$5K at the discretion of Secretariat, rapidly mobilized
- Guided heavily by SSC planning and guidelines

Monitoring:

- A lot of self monitoring
- Engage SGs to assist in monitoring
- Not too much on-the-ground evaluation
- Put a ceiling to the number of evaluations
- Core issue is protection of overall biodiversity
- Follow SSC guidelines for conservation planning, with some way to measure outcomes

ANNEX 6

Action Points from WCC 4.1

	<u>Who</u>	<u>Action Item</u>	<u>Agenda Item</u>
1	D Cator	All Chairs and SC members to have access to the KN.	5a
2	J Smart	A handout to be written to provide clarification on how the new Secretariat groupings (“clusters”) are arranged to support the Commissions.	5a
3	A Stattersfield	BirdLife global seabird representative to sit on the MCSC – discussion with Y Sadovy and C Campagna	7e
4	T Contreras	Collaborate with W Darwall, B Haddane and T Brooks to develop the case for an SSC Freshwater Conservation Sub-Committee (including an investigation of possible funding sources for the sub-committee). A report will be provided for the next meeting of the Steering Committee.	7e
5	L Boitani	Gradual integration of the Wolf SG into the Canid SG, during the current quadrennium. L Boitani to join the existing WSG chair, Dave Mech, to act as co-chairs of the Wolf SG. L Boitani will take the lead on negotiations during the quadrennium with Claudio Sillero of the Canid SG.	7g
6	S Stuart	Draft criteria for the establishment of bird SGs to be circulated for consideration and adoption at the next Steering Committee meeting.	7g
7	S Stuart	A general proposal for lizard and snakes SGs would be presented to the next Steering Committee meeting.	7g
8	S Stuart; JP Rodríguez	Amendments to be proposed to the IUCN Regulations, with regards to the confidentiality of Commission members who propose candidates for Chairs of the Commissions, at the next meeting of IUCN Council.	8b
9	F Launay	A progress report to be presented on redeveloping the IUCN Policy Statement on the Translocation of Living Organisms and the IUCN Re-introduction Guidelines at each Steering Committee meeting.	8d
10	J Smart; L Boitani; T Brooks; A Stattersfield	The results of the Steering Committee discussions on the collaboration with the World Commission on Protected Area to be communicated to Nik Lopoukhine, Chair of WCPA, J Baillie, T Brooks, J Hutton and Kent Redford (from WCS) are willing to participate from SSC on item 1 (the metastudy). L Boitani will lead on ways that classification of PA biodiversity objectives; T Brooks and A Stattersfield on KBA criteria consolidation).	8g
11	JC Vié	A report to be given to the next meeting of the Steering Committee giving proposals on priorities for moving ahead with work on invasive species.	8h
12	J Smart	Explore options for the IUCN archives to be housed in the new IUCN headquarters.	8i
13	J Ragle	Investigate the cost of acquiring DOI numbers for each species account.	8k
14	J Ragle	To put the SIS users’ manual on the website and send it to all registered SIS users	8l
15	JC Vié	The long-term trend in the financial picture should be presented to the next Steering Committee meeting, comparing core and project income and expenditure in each year, going back to 1996.	8m
16	D Cator; J Griffin	To examine the entire list of Barcelona species-related resolutions and recommendations, and provide proposals to S Stuart and J Smart on who each one should be communicated to.	8n
17	J Ragle; J Hutton	J Ragle to take resolution 4.012 (Biodiversity data and information) forward and to consult with the Red List Partners and UNEP-WCMC. J Hutton to work with J Ragle on initiating a meeting between the various institutions to take this forward.	8n

18	SSC Chair's Office and Species Programme	Progress reports will be provided on the three species-related resolutions prioritised by Council, and the five additional resolutions prioritised by the Steering Committee, at each future meeting of the Steering Committee this quadrennium.	8n
19	W Foden W Foden J Smart; S Stuart W Foden J Smart; S Stuart W Foden J Smart; S Stuart Standards and Petitions Sub-Committee F Launay	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Select 5-6 species flagship species with good geographic, taxonomic and ecosystem spread, cover a range of mechanisms of impact, and including species that could benefit from REDD • Feedback to the Specialist Groups on the results of the survey to be provided • IUCN and SSC should support for REDD+ which gives explicit consideration of biodiversity and livelihood values of forest. Communicate to IUCN Climate Change Team • Investigate the possibility of W Foden giving a talk on species biodiversity, forests and climate change. Follow up with Stewart Magginis and liaise with CI to arrange this. • Ensure that IUCN position papers clearly reflect biodiversity concerns. Communicate to IUCN Climate Change Team. • Identify SSC SG members that might be on national delegations in Copenhagen by sending out a specific message to the network. For these people, advise on biodiversity issues, prepare a report describing the framework of the Copenhagen COP, and send to SG chairs for input. • The SSC and Species Programme should be included on the IUCN delegation in Copenhagen. Communicate to IUCN Climate Change Team. • The work to develop the climate change guidelines for the Red List should be prioritised, and a report should be brought to the next meeting of the Steering Committee. • SSC to prioritise guidelines on assisted migration in the first instance in the context of re-developing the Re-introduction Guidelines. 	9b
20	S Stuart	A report on the Amphibian Mini-summit will be presented at the next meeting of the Steering Committee.	9c
21	S Stuart S Stuart; J Robinson; S Lieberman S Stuart S Stuart S Stuart S Stuart	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A new Task Force of the IUCN SSC should be formed to take this forward. • Key people from NGOs active on the ground need to be brought into the initiative (for example Christy Williams and Barney Long from WWF; Liz Bennett and Simon Hedges from WCS; BirdLife, FFI, David Emmett and Jatna Supriatna from CI, Asian Turtle Conservation Network, etc). • Key SG chairs/co-chairs and other experts should be involved: Asian Rhino SG, Asian Elephant SG, Cat SG, Primate SG (gibbons/Geissmann), Tortoise and Freshwater Turtle SG, Deer SG, Wild Pig SG, Tapir SG, Freshwater Fish SG, Chris Shepherd (TRAFFIC), Eric Meijaard, Will Duckworth, Tony Lynam, Rob Timmins. • Key government people need to be included from the outset. • Someone is needed to convene this Task Force (1 person, or 3 people working together). There is an urgent need to find funds to hire someone for 6 months initially to get it started. This should be someone with good relationships with governments and NGOs across the region. A small group should draft terms of reference for the coordinator to enable us to move forward. • The small group would consist of the breakout group (L Boitani, M Kusriani, X Yan, S Lieberman, S Stuart) and it was agreed to 	9d

	S Stuart Co-ordinator	<p>invite Liz Bennett from WCS to join this small group.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> As a matter of priority, S Stuart should inform Aban Marker Kabraji in the IUCN Asian Regional Office (ARO) on this initiative, and seek ARO engagement. - Once the six-month coordinator is in place, there is a need to develop a scoping paper and budget for the larger initiative. 	
22	JC Vié	To follow up with M Samways, T Contreras, A Stattersfield, B Haddane, R Mittermeier, D Leaman, J Donaldson, T Brooks, J Baillie, J Hutton and J Robinson, and with the Red List Committee (if it meets in time), and pull together a proposal on how to proceed in relation to products in 2010 to be released at CBD meetings. This proposal to be sent to the Steering Committee by the end of September 2009.	10a
23	J Hutton J Smart; S Stuart	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A roadmap of events leading up the CBD COP to be circulated SSC will seek to influence the IUCN policy on the post-2010 Target, specifically to ensure that the species focus is not lost 	10b
24	J Griffin	The report from the Dublin GSPC meeting to be circulated to the SSC Steering Committee.	10d
25	JC Vié	A further update of the Save Your Logo / Threatened Species Partnership to be provided at the next Steering Committee meeting.	10h
26	S Stuart	A further update Global Tiger Initiative will be provided at the next Steering Committee meeting.	10i
27	SSC Chair's Office	Clarify all available awards and who should be receiving them. Paper to be presented at the next Steering Committee meeting.	11
28	R Mittermeier	To follow up with J Smart and S Stuart on a possible letter from the IUCN Director General to Madagascar, to support the continued provision of aid to Madagascar during the current climate of political instability.	11
29	T Contreras	To prepare an options paper for the work of SSC on freshwater. To be included in the agenda of the next Steering Committee meeting	11
30	S Stuart	To provide R Mittermeier with approximate costing for a Steering Committee meeting.	12