



SSC STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING WCC3.7
AL AIN, UNITED ARAB EMIRATES, 9,10,15 FEBRUARY 2008
MINUTES

TABLE OF CONTENTS

GLOSSARY OF ACCRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS USED	2
DECISIONS AND ACTION ITEMS TABLE	3
1. WELCOME, APOLOGIES, INTRODUCTIONS	5
1.1 Chair's welcome	5
1.2 Apologies	5
2. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA	5
3. PREVIOUS MINUTES (WCC3.6, BEIJING, 13-16 OCTOBER 2007)	5
4. MATTERS ARISING	6
4.1 SG/TF Chair appointments & RLA Focal Point appointments	6
4.2 Action items from WCC3.6.....	6
5. UPDATES.....	11
5.1 Chair's update.....	11
5.2 Species Programme update.....	11
5.3 SSC Task Force Updates	13
5.3.1 Species Conservation Planning Task Force (SCPTF)	13
5.4 SSC Sub-Committees updates: feedback and discussion.....	14
5.4.1 BASC and Assessment Updates (BASC).....	14
5.4.2 Plant Conservation Sub-Committee (PCSC).....	19
6. SSC FINANCES, FUNDRAISING AND COMMUNICATIONS	20
6.1 COF 2008	20
6.2 SP Finances	20
6.3 Fund-raising.....	20
6.4 SSC/SP Communications.....	22
6.5 Branding	22
6.6 SSC Awards for WCC	22
7. IUCN / SSC DISCUSSION POINTS.....	23
7.1 World Conservation Congress	23
7.2 Species Strategic Plan	24
7.3 Update on SSC Redesign.....	25
7.4 Chairs' Meeting Preparation and De-brief	28
8. SSC SUCCESS STORIES	32
9. TIMING OF FINAL STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING OF QUADRENNIUM	32
10. ANY OTHER BUSINESS	32

GLOSSARY OF ACCRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS USED

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

DECISIONS AND ACTION ITEMS TABLE

Decisions made at WCC3.7:

- The SIS needs another name that reflects the nature of what it strives to be.
- The printed material of the Fact Sheets for WCC4 should be lighter, catchier material with less text and should direct people to the website for a more detailed and referenced document. Some of the lighter printed material should contain information about the SSC/SP is and what we do, and should contain useful websites contacts.
- The SC supports the basic premise of the redesign – that it moves towards strengthening the assessment and evaluation processes and bringing the core functions firmly back into the network; that it enables greater conservation action; and that it will encourage a gradual move towards a stronger funding model. Implementing the process around the redesign cannot be immediate but will take place over the next few years.
- The principles of the redesign were agreed as follows:
 - The rationale for the redesign should be clarified and strengthened
 - It should be emphasised that the redesign should enhance conservation impact
 - There is a distinction of functions between Red Listing activities and other conservation activities
 - Capacity should be increased within the network for both functions
 - In Red Listing, the assessment and evaluation functions must be separated
 - The redesign will be done throughout the SSC network and with partners (old or new)
 - The final document should be ready before July 2008 and the new framework can be presented in Barcelona as a vision and recommendations for a way forward.

Action Items Table:

	<u>Who</u>	<u>Action Item</u>	<u>Agenda Item</u>	<u>Timeline</u>
1	H Dublin & S Stuart	Discuss terms of the contract and funding that is available for palm assessments given the changed circumstances of the Palm SG Chair.	4.1 SG Chair appointments	asap
2	M Clout, S Stuart and JC Vié	Talk regarding moving forward the relationship between invasive species data and the IUCN Red List	4.2 Action Items from WCC3.6 still needing attention	asap
3	J Smart	Be in touch with R Mittermeier / the department that manages CI's online donation facilities to find ways to optimise the use of the online donation button.	4.2 Action Items from WCC3.6 still needing attention	asap
4	J Smart	Investigate the wording of the online donation button	4.2 Action Items from WCC3.6 still needing attention	asap
5	SP & SSC Chair's Office	Consider the name of the Sir Peter Scott Fund so as to clarify the fund's focus on conservation action.	4.2 Action Items from WCC3.6 still needing attention	asap
6	Comms Team (thru' J Smart)	Investigate how to make use of the CEC model for e-bulletins.	4.2 Action Items from WCC3.6 still needing attention	asap
7	Comms Team (through J Smart)	Investigate the possibility of a sponsor for the distribution of Species in hardcopy (possibly through F Launay's office) and contact R Mittermeier re the possibility to print <i>Species</i> in Colombia	4.2 Action Items from WCC3.6 still needing attention	asap
8	J Ragle	Compile the feedback on the draft Red List Data Provider Agreement and send it out for broader consultation.	5.4.1 BASC – Draft RL Data Provider Agreement	asap
9	All SC members	Send in detailed comments about the Pre-publication Data Use Guidelines to S Stuart via email.	5.4.1 BASC – Pre-publication Data Use Guidelines	Before end April 2008
10	H Dublin	Suggest a means of consulting and gaining clarity on post-publication data use issues.	5.4.1 BASC – Pre-publication data use guidelines	asap

11	J Ragle	Bring the pre- and post-data use guidelines under the umbrella of the Data Provider's Agreement by	5.4.1 BASC – Pre-publication data use guidelines	asap
12	S Stuart	Send the report on RapidList testing to the Chair and SC	5.4.1 BASC – Preliminary Assess.	After BASC meeting
13	S Stuart, J Smart and J Griffin	Talk further on the strategy to ensure that there can be no confusion between preliminary and full Red List assessments	5.4.1 BASC – Preliminary Assessments	asap
14	S Stuart	Ensure that the report on SSC/SP engagement on national and regional level Red Listing is prepared according to the TORs and that feedback is given to the SSC Chair and SC after the BASC meeting.	5.4.1 BASC – National and Regional Red Listing	asap
15	G Mace	See if there is an opportunity to join DIVERSITAS in their work on post-2010 targets.	5.4.1 BASC – GSA2 2012	asap
16	H Dublin	Discuss how to present SSC thoughts on the post-2010 target-led approach with the IUCN policy unit	5.4.1 BASC – GSA2 2012	asap
17	J Smart and JC Vié	Continue thinking on the GSA2 2010 publication and preparing further briefing documents for the next SC meeting, with a full outline of content to be discussed in the first SC meeting of 2009.	5.4.1 BASC – GSA2 2012	asap
18	J Ragle	Update the two-page document on SIS to ensure that the servicing of the two processes - input of data and output of data - are clearly separated.	5.4.1 BASC Issues - SIS	asap
19	R Mittermeier & H Dublin	Discuss the charitable status of IUCN in the UK at Council or Senior Management level where possible.	6.2 SP Finances	asap
20	J Smart	Ask MAVA whether their grant can be used as a challenge grant on the online donation system to help leverage funds to support SG's Red List work	6.3 Fundraising	asap
21	All SC members	Send their suggestions for awards through to the Chair's Office.	6.6 SSC awards for WCC	Before end June 2008
22	C Poole	Send a reminder to SC members about their paragraph for the Progress & Assessment Report (2005 – 2008).	7.1 WCC	Completed
23	C Poole	Send out a message to all SC members once registration for the Congress has opened.	7.1 WCC	When reg opens
24	J Smart	Clarify whether the SSC/SP has any slots in the plenary sessions of the Forum and inform the SC	7.1 WCC	asap
25	JC Vié	Continue his leadership on the set of fact sheet publications for the WCC4.	7.1 WCC	asap
26	All SC members	Send their comments on the Strategic Plan for Species Framework and proposed targets to the Chair's Office, C Imboden or D Cator	7.2 Species Strategic Plan	By 29 February 2008.
27	H Dublin	Establish a timeline for delivery of next steps in the redesign process, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o L Boitani to prepare next draft of document and circulate it to the RTF, SC and then to the group of five Chairs who volunteered to comment on the redesign. o Following receipt and integration of input, a near-final version will be circulated to all SG Chairs for comment. o The final document should be ready before July and the new framework can be presented in Barcelona as a vision and recommendations for a way forward. 	7.4 SG Chairs' Meeting - debrief	asap
28	BASC	Suggest how the continued concerns regarding Criterion A can be addressed.	7.4 SG Chairs' Meeting - debrief	asap
29	All SC members	Send three statements about the rationale for the redesign and comment on particular strengths and weaknesses for follow-up by the RTF.	7.4 SG Chairs' Meeting - debrief	Before 29 February 2008
30	JC Vié	Put forward some suggestions on categories of expertise for CoReg.	10. Any Other Business	asap
31	H Dublin, J Smart & R Mittermeier	Re-emphasise to IUCN Council the need to reallocate resources and leadership to CoReg.	10. Any Other Business	At March IUCN Council

1. WELCOME, APOLOGIES, INTRODUCTIONS

1.1 Chair's welcome

On Saturday 9 February 2008, the SSC Chair welcomed all the SC members to the seventh SSC Steering Committee meeting of the Quadrennium. She mentioned that R Mittermeier, J Hutton, R Kock and R Lacy would be joining the meeting slightly later that morning, and that M Samways would join the meeting the following day. She also mentioned that L Bennun, T Brooks, M Samways and G Mace would not be available for the Friday portion of the meeting as they were due to leave during the week.

H Dublin also noted that M Maunder had given his apologies for not being able to attend the meeting, but fortunately D Leaman was able to join the SC meeting at late notice and would be available for the Sunday and Friday portions of the meeting as Deputy Chair of the PCSC.

H Dublin mentioned that the Co-Chair of the Asian Rhino SG, Dr N van Strien, had sadly passed away two days earlier after his brief battle with cancer.

1.2 Apologies

The following people attended the meeting:

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

Species Programme: J Smart, JC Vié, S Stuart, J Ragle for some of BASC agenda items

SSC Chair's Office: C Poole, C Thouless, S Hofmeyr for portion of meeting

Change Management Advisor: P McLagan

Apologies were received from Steering Committee members C Imboden and M Maunder.

2. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

H Dublin noted that this was the last substantial SC meeting before the last of the Quadrennium, which is to be held at the WCC in Barcelona and would effectively just be a one-day meeting. She noted that this may therefore require SC business to be conducted via email before the Barcelona meeting.

H Dublin also noted that this SC meeting was different in that the SSC SG Chairs' Meeting was during the upcoming week, with a closing day of SC meeting on the Friday after the end of the SG Chairs' Meeting.

H Dublin turned to the agenda, noting that the SP staff and P McLagan would be joining the meeting the following day for the briefing about the SG Chairs' Meeting. H Dublin explained that the Draft Red List Data Provider Agreement was listed under Any Other Business, but that she felt it more appropriate if this was discussed under the BASC section of the agenda – as then J Ragle, SIS Manager, could join the SC meeting for that section.

The SC agreed with this proposed change and the agenda was adopted with an additional item on the Draft Red List Data Provider Agreement being added under BASC.

3. PREVIOUS MINUTES (WCC3.6, Beijing, 13-16 October 2007)

H Dublin noted that the minutes of WCC3.6 had been adopted by the SC and the final version had been uploaded to the SSC website.

4. MATTERS ARISING

4.1 SG/TF Chair appointments & RLA Focal Point appointments

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

- The Philippine Plant SG was now without a Chair.
- The Palm SG Chair had resigned as he was moving to a new job. H Dublin agreed to talk to S Stuart individually on the issue of the contract and funding for palm assessments that needed to be finalised.
- The Sirenia SG remains without a Chair. H Dublin spoke to H Marsh during the Marine Mammalogy Conference in Cape Town and she has expressed interest in being the Co-Chair of the group along with someone from the developing world in order to provide a capacity building process for a future Chair.
- The Duck SG remains without a Chair. There has been no feedback from WI.
- Three other shared SSC/WI bird groups do not have a Letter of Agreement signed. H Dublin noted that this will require further discussion. She then proceeded to bring the SC members up-to-date on current correspondence with WI. She noted that there would be a separate meeting with all the shared SSC/WI SG Chairs who would be attending the SG Chairs' Meeting and that they would be asked to complete a feedback form about the possible ways forward for the groups.

ACTION: H Dublin and S Stuart to discuss terms of the contract and funding that is available for palm assessments given the changed circumstances of the Palm SG Chair.

4.2 Action items from WCC3.6

The following is the Action Items Table from WCC3.6 with the status column indicating the comments given at WCC3.7 on progress. Where a lengthy discussion took place, it is recorded below the table, as are follow-up action items.

Who	Action Item	Agenda Item	Status
C Poole	Send appropriate Letters of Agreement to the Focal Points of the newly established RLA and include them in the SG Chairs' Meeting arrangements.	4.1 SG and RLA appointments	completed
M Maunder	Talk to L Boitani about restructuring as it relates to plant portion of SSC network. Assistance should be sought from P McLagan if necessary.	4.2 Action item from WCC3.5	H Dublin noted that they had still not talked to each other. However, D Leaman's participation would allow further consultation.
BASC	Continue thinking on future GISD links to the Red List and follow the fundraising discussions between JC Vié and G Howard.	4.2 Action item from WCC3.5	S Stuart noted there has been no time to follow up since WCC3.6. M Clout stated his concern saying that two staff positions will be in jeopardy at end of March and the GISD will cease to be maintained. He said the main problem is funding for core support. He explained that funding from the SP for policy work needs to continue separately to GISD core support.
J Smart	Further discuss the issue of the Conservation Commons with W Jackson.	4.2 Further Action Item from WCC3.5	Some discussion has taken place, but the closure of the Canada Office has meant further complications for the Conservation Commons position.
Species team (through J Smart)	Interview M Chouchena-Rojas and G Mace regarding the outcome of the consultative process towards an IMoSEB for the June 2008 edition of <i>Species</i> .	4.2 Further Action Item from WCC3.5	Not achieved. M Chouchena-Rojas has left IUCN. The latest edition of <i>Species</i> focussed on Sustainable Use. G Mace noted that IMoSEB has ended and that, like the MEA2, has been handed to UNEP.

J Smart	Talk to the Director of Operations about the indemnity of assessors and evaluators.	4.2 Further Action Item from WCC3.5	IUCN's insurance company has stated they cannot insure non-employees. The issue is to be placed on the 'risk register' and the 'exposure is to be articulated'.
J Smart	Ensure that the exact number of SSC members in CoReg is announced to the SC.	5.2 SP Update	7,495 as of 18 January 2008, changing constantly. H Dublin noted CoReg is being discussed in the One Programme WG.
C Poole	Liaise with C Thouless and P McLagan as to how to present the findings of the Chairs' Consultation to the SG Chairs' Meeting and explore what follow up could be possible there.	5.3 Chairs' Consultation	Completed.
R Lacy	Complete species conservation planning guidelines; then send them to B Pressey and a select group of SG Chairs for comment and testing. The guidelines should be presented at the SG Chairs' Meeting for further comment, endorsed by the SSC SC at their next meeting and then launched at the WCC together with the draft "how to" manual.	5.4.1 SCPTF	Ongoing. Document on SG Chairs' Meeting website for background reading. Session to be held at WCC4 to launch the guidelines.
J Smart and R Lacy	Work with J Ragle, J Blanc and S Hedges on how SIS can incorporate the new data that will be collected as part of the species conservation planning processes.	5.4.1 SCPTF	J Ragle and B Lacy in discussion
BASC	In the context of the proposed Red List Journal, research the desires of the individuals of the SSC network in terms of whether a journal would best address how they wish to be recognised and whether a journal would, in fact, create incentives for an expansion of Red List assessments in a broader taxonomic realm.	5.5.1 BASC issues	A consultation of key network members will be organised shortly
BASC	Develop a draft policy on taxonomic standards for consideration by the SC.	5.5.1 BASC issues	Issue to be discussed at the next BASC meeting.
J Smart and JC Vié	Immediately begin work on the fact sheets and folder for the WCC4.	5.5.1 BASC issues	Work initiated; JC Vié to report
J Smart	Take steps to begin planning for the 2010 GSA2	5.5.1 BASC issues	No substantial progress. Discussions ongoing.
RLU (through J Smart)	Provide a full analysis of the entire backlog at the RLU.	5.5.2 PCSC issues	Completed
RLU (through J Smart)	Undertake an analysis if which RLAs are functioning and which are not.	5.5.2 PCSC issues	Completed
RLU (through J Smart)	Undertake the following with regards to the current backlog: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - If the current backlogged assessment has been evaluated & approved by the RLA, it can be entered into the RL database. There should be some practical flexibility regarding the format of these assessments as some may have been done before DEM was functional. - If the assessment has been evaluated by an RLA and there is a functioning RLA, but the RLU still has some concerns over its accuracy, the assessment should be entered into the Red List database and the RLA informed of any concerns. - All other currently backlogged assessments should be returned to the relevant RLAs or Sub-Committee if there is no functioning RLA. - Currently backlogged assessments that are incorrect and there is no functioning RLA or Sub-Committee should be forwarded to the SSC SC for further guidance. 	5.5.2 PCSC issues	Ongoing; outstanding issues addressed in the backlog paper
J Smart and H Dublin	Assist the RLU in those instances where there may be sensitivities when assessments are sent back to the RLA or assessor(s).	5.5.2 PCSC issues	Backlog paper refers; ongoing.

BASC	As per their ToR, must consider all the assessment work it is recommending and actively think of the implications for the SP staff and the SSC network, keeping in mind the need for adequate resources to support the work called for.	5.5.2 PCSC issues	H Dublin suggested that this issue is discussed at next BASC meeting.
BASC	Work closely with PCSC regarding the various options for the prioritisation of plant assessments so that a clear way forward is presented at the next SC meeting.	5.5.2 PCSC issues	BASC still awaiting new proposal from PCSC on way forward. Reminder has been sent. H Dublin called on all SC members to support D Leaman during the meeting to work with the plant SGs towards an agreed approach.
C Imboden and KSR team	Update the Key Species Results: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Ensure that none of the KSR have a specific taxonomic focus (especially KSR 5.1), - Ensure that the wording of 1.1 incorporates other organisations as well as IUCN regions - Remove any references to the “how” in the KSR – i.e. the KSR should be shortened and should not include activities or SMART wording. 	6.1 Form & Function for the Future – strategic planning	Completed. H Dublin noted that C Imboden has announced that this is the final time he is willing to help on SSC strategic planning, having distinguished himself with years of excellent voluntary contribution to this work.
C Imboden et al (Chair's Office and SP Office)	Following feedback from the Programme Planning meeting at IUCN Headquarters, fill out the targets in the Species Component Plan and send it to the SC for comment. The Component Programme and Strategic Plan framework are to be approved at the SC meeting in Abu Dhabi. A draft Strategic Plan could be included in the pack for SG Chairs' Meeting (not as agenda item), and the Chairs should be invited to read it and comment on any refinements they wish to see.	6.1 Form & Function for the Future – strategic planning	Ongoing. Discussed under Item 7.2
C Imboden	Turn the three main points of State, Pressure, Response into the SSC Mandate for approval at the February SC meeting. The mandate will then go to the March Council meeting. Care should be taken that the wording in the aspirations are correct (i.e. the use of the words “a” and “the”).	6.1 Form & Function for the Future – strategic planning	Completed.
C Imboden	When drafting the targets, pay attention to whether there are resolutions for the WCC4 that would bolster or facilitate the mandate of the SSC.	6.1 Form & Function – strategic planning	Progress is being made, but there is a need to engage the SG Chairs and ask them to contribute to the framework.
J Smart, T Brooks, M Samways, Y Sadovy + possibly M Maunder & L Bennun	Look at and further clarify the specific issues and needs related to the Red List assessment side of the redesign – particularly in terms of monitoring the current Red List Authorities and noting how functional they are.	6.1 Form & Function for the Future – Redesign	Completed
H Dublin, R Kock and C Thouless	Further clarify and address specific issues and needs relating to the conservation action side of the redesign. This should mainly involved looking at the terminology used in the document.	6.1 Form & Function for the Future – Redesign	Completed
Restructuring TF	Prepare a Redesign Statement, which includes the key features of the redesign and a rationale for each element.	6.1 Form & Function for the Future – Redesign	Completed
Restructuring TF	Prepare two documents for the Chairs' Meeting: a) A Question & Answer document that will be a short précis on the main features of the redesign. b) An updated version of the document provided for the SC meeting pack for the Chairs to download and read before the meeting.	6.1 Form & Function for the Future – Redesign	Completed

P McLagan and C Thouless	Finalise a draft agenda.	6.2 Chairs' Meeting	Completed
All SC members	Send through comments on the design and ideas for the agenda to the meeting organisation team as soon as possible.	6.2 Chairs' Meeting	Completed
All SC members	Think about what Congress Resolutions might be appropriate to be raised at the SG Chairs' Meeting.	6.2 Chairs' Meeting	Session has been arranged for the SG Chairs' Meeting. H Dublin said the IUCN 2009-2012 Programme structure has apparently changed to adopt the biodiversity theme on a higher level.
All SC members	Those submitting Forum proposals should send CP their reference numbers	6.3 WCC4	Completed
R Kock	Talk to the International Institute for the Environment and Development (IIED), as they are looking for ways to engage and they could be an appropriate partner for the species and livelihoods session.	6.3 WCC4	Mentioned in a meeting and recently followed up with email to D Roe; waiting for response
C Campagna	Work with T Sandwith (of WCPA) to submit session on transboundary marine PAs as an additional alliance workshop proposal.	6.3 WCC4	Completed. Proposal accepted. C Campagna is the lead.
C Thouless and W Foden	Put together a short paragraph on the MacArthur Foundation climate change work and submit it as one of the six SSC session by 31 October. They should have a creative list of partners for the session.	6.3 WCC4	Completed
All SC members	Send C Thouless any innovative ideas they may have to make the six SSC sessions as interactive and engaging as possible.	6.3 WCC4	Ongoing
All Sub-Committee Chairs	Inform the Chair's Office of their plans for 2008 and whether they will require a similar allocation to 2007 for their budgets.	7.1 SSC COF	Completed
C Poole	Send out detailed instructions on how to claim from the COF, as the IUCN Headquarters finance department has issued some new instructions.	7.1 SSC COF	To be done individually as the Sub-Committees/ Task Forces make their meeting plans for 2008.
H Dublin	Send out the article in Science on meeting travel in the science sector.	7.1 SSC COF	Completed
J Smart	Double-check if there is a local nature of Google AdSense adverts (i.e. whether adverts are different if you are logging on from different parts of the world) and, if so, how this will affect the monitoring of content that is needed during the first part of the trial period.	7.3 Fundraising	See update paper on Google AdSense
J Smart	Go ahead with trial period for website advertising via Google AdSense and return to the SC at the next meeting with an analysis of the money generated.	7.3 Fundraising	See update paper on Google AdSense
R Mittermeier	Put J Smart in touch with the department at CI that manages their online donation facilities.	7.3 Fundraising	No action to date
J Smart	Investigate the wording of the site for maximum impact and to find ways to optimise the use of the button with advice from CI's marketing department.	7.3 Fundraising	No action to date
J Smart	Showcase the online donation facility at SG Chairs' Meeting. Ask for feedback about how to optimise its use & for help with content/compelling copy to encourage people to return to the site regularly.	7.3 Fundraising	Included in a session at SG Chairs' Meeting
J Smart	Ensure that the Network Support Officers share the fundraising tracking spreadsheet with the Chair's Office when there have been significant updates	7.3 Fundraising	Submitted in SC meeting pack

J Smart	Ensure that the webpage for the Sir Peter Scott Fund is modernised with news of current projects and in line with the SSC redesign ideas for profiling and enhancing our conservation work.	7.3 Fundraising	Awaiting new design of IUCN website. J Smart noted that the SP intern A Powell has left, but had been a boon to the SP communications department. A new intern will be sought.
SP and SSC Chair's Office	Consider the name of the Sir Peter Scott Fund so as to clarify the fund's focus on conservation action.	7.3 Fundraising	To be followed up
R Mittermeier	Investigate the publications costs if <i>Species</i> were to be printed and distributed from Colombia	7.4 Communications	No action to date
F Launay and J Smart	Investigate the possibility of approaching a courier company to sponsor the distribution of <i>Species</i> for a contracted time period. F Launay to particularly investigate whether the current arrangement with the Reintroduction SG newsletter could also incorporate <i>Species</i> .	7.4 Communications	F Launay commented that P Soorae may be able to respond on this matter during the week as he would be attending the SG Chairs' Meeting.
J Smart and <i>Species</i> editorial team	Review the suggestions mentioned by the SC regarding <i>Species</i> and look at ways to improve the content of <i>Species</i> .	7.4 Communications	Awaiting SG Chairs' Meeting input
SG Chairs' Meeting Organisers	Set up a suggestion desk at the SG Chairs' Meeting to collect more ideas on improvements to <i>Species</i> .	7.4 Communications	Communications Session at the SG Chairs' Meeting organised, C Campagna to Chair.
J Smart and e-bulletin editorial team	Review the SC members' suggestions regarding the e-bulletin and investigate ways to optimise its content and distribution. Most importantly, the e-bulletin should be distributed to all SSC members on Co-Reg.	7.4 Communications	Options discussed and presented to H Dublin. The e-bulletin is being distributed to all SSC members now that CoReg is closer to complete.
H Dublin	Contact Chair of CEC for more information on how they produce their e-newsletter.	7.4 Communications	Completed. H Dublin noted that the CEC e-bulletin is done for US\$20,000 per year and SSC should look into using this model.
J Ragle (Through J Smart)	Draft one page document on what the "SIS" is now, what it is not, what it will become and what it will never become. This should be distributed to the SC members and then become part of the pack for the SG Chairs' Meeting.	10. Any other Business - SIS	Completed. In meeting pack.
All SC members	Familiarise themselves with the document drafted by J Ragle so that they can answer pertinent questions that may arise at the SG Chairs' Meeting.	10. Any other Business - SIS	Sent out to SC members in January 2008
J Smart and J Ragle	Allocate time at the SG Chairs' Meeting in the SP session to making it very clear to all present exactly what has been achieved with regards to the vision that is SIS.	10. Any other Business - SIS	At SG Chairs' Meeting
J Smart and J Ragle	Ensure that the ESRI donation of software includes regular version updates to software and service agreements.	10. Any other Business - SIS	No license fees payable; upgrades are not included. J Smart noted that ESRI does seem generous.

FOLLOW-UP ACTION ITEMS FROM WCC3.6:

- M Clout, S Stuart and JC Vié to talk regarding moving forward the relationship between invasive species data and the IUCN Red List
- J Smart to be in touch with R Mittermeier and the CI department that manages CI's online donation facilities to find ways to optimise the use of the online donation button.
- J Smart to investigate the wording of the online donation button
- SP and SSC Chair's Office to consider the name of the Sir Peter Scott Fund so as to clarify the fund's focus on conservation action.
- Communications Team to investigate how to make use of the CEC model for e-bulletins.
- Communications Team to investigate the possibility of a sponsor for the distribution of *Species* in hardcopy (possibly through F Launay's office) and contact R Mittermeier re the possibility to print *Species* in Colombia

5. UPDATES

5.1 Chair's update

H Dublin stated that she would not give a presentation, but would update the SC briefly on matters arising since the Beijing meeting.

She said that the IUCN Council meeting of November 2007 was held in Kruger National Park in South Africa – the first time a full IUCN Council meeting had ever been held outside of IUCN Headquarters. She noted that the meeting was a high-energy meeting and very productive. One of the major issues discussed was the recently-released IUCN Members' Survey, which reported that there is still a clear need and mandate for IUCN, but IUCN is not using its advantage to full potential. The conclusions at the Council meeting after the discussion were that the Secretariat should be supporting the Members and Commissions in delivering the programme rather than focusing on implementing the programme themselves; that the membership strategy needs to be re-examined; and that the Members and Commissions should be engaged more actively. H Dublin also noted that the findings regarding SSC in the report is that, while happy with the work of the Commission overall, the IUCN Members are struggling to engage with SSC and other Commissions on a regional basis (due to CoReg's limited usefulness as a database of expertise for the regions) and that SSC is seen to be aloof because of this difficulty to engage. H Dublin commented that P McLagan gave a presentation to Council on the "tensions" she had identified through her work with SSC and talks with the other Commission Chairs. There were many commonalities between what she said and the results of the Members' Survey. H Dublin noted that V Moosa had been provocative about the Commissions, saying that there were only two important Commissions – SSC and WCPA! The outcome was that now the Council knows that the Commissions cannot be lumped into one basket, and that the One Programme approach needs more concerted effort to operationalise its delivery. A One Programme Working Group was therefore established (consisting of H Dublin, N Lopoukhine, K Wheeler, A Gammell, M Niekisch, S Sanchez, as well as J Marton-Lefèvre, W Jackson, A Kabraji and G Lopez), and will present a document to the March 2008 IUCN Council meeting.

H Dublin then mentioned that IUCN has also just undergone an External Review, which again highlighted the problematic funding model of IUCN and the fact that IUCN should not be relying on implementing projects as its primary source of funds. There was a suggestion that the Commissions need to be given more access to core funding because they are contributing to the implementation of the programme. An external review of the Commissions is also underway, and will also be reported on at the Council meeting in March.

There was a brief discussion about the issues that H Dublin had raised, particularly with regard to the IUCN funding model. H Dublin noted that the Director General does have some flexibility in the use of core funds, and that W Jackson does think that there is an option to approach the framework donors to ask for more unrestricted funding. She concluded that as J Marton-Lefèvre and W Jackson were both attending the SSC SG Chairs' Meeting, that week would be a good opportunity for the SC members to approach them with their concerns or feedback.

5.2 Species Programme update

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

Assessment Work

- The Biodiversity Assessment Unit is currently focused on completing a number of large and urgent projects for the WCC and 2008 IUCN Red List release.
- The Global Mammal Assessment progresses with the last two workshops having been held and the team working solidly for the deadline of end June 2008.
- Reptile assessments are progressing with the endemic reptiles of the Philippines data undergoing a final review prior to inclusion in the 2008 Red List. Further data collection is ongoing in Melanesia, the former Soviet Union, and the Andes.
- Regarding amphibians, the *Threatened Amphibians of the World* is in press and the GAA 2009 update is progressing well thanks to support from CI for a consultant.

- The GMSA is progressing with the completion of large datasets of reef-building corals and sharks for inclusion in the 2008 IUCN Red List. Work continues on editing species accounts from workshops on Eastern Tropical Pacific coastal fishes, Mediterranean fishes, sea-grasses, and Caribbean primary producers.
- Plant Assessments continue with the cycad reassessment: expected to be included in the 2008 IUCN Red List. The PCSC has determined that priorities for plant assessments will be a subset of those plants which are of value to people – towards a Global ‘Plants for People’ Assessment. IUCN is working with BGCI to raise funds for a follow-on project to the GEF plants project: “Wild plants for Food and Medicine”. A report on global progress towards Target 2 by SSC Specialist Groups will be given at the CBD CoP9 in May 2008. A RapidList training workshop was held in Nairobi in December 2007 and a Keidanren Nature Conservation Fund funded project to support the Cuban Plant SG and Bryophyte SG in the use of RapidList.
- Freshwater Biodiversity Assessments continue with the current focus on African, European and North American fish, molluscs, dragonflies, crabs and aquatic plants. A consistency check of 1,280 freshwater crabs was undertaken for freshwater species input into the SRLI. The Darwin Initiative project (*Strengthening pro-poor wetland conservation using integrated biodiversity and livelihood assessment*) is progressing well.
- Invertebrate representation on the Red List will significantly increase through the SRLI, as dragonflies, corals and freshwater crabs have been completed; while butterfly and mollusc assessments are underway.
- Planning is underway for the European Red List Project – worth €1million – which is a three year project with the IUCN Regional Office of Europe.

Trade and Use

- The Species Trade and Use Unit, in conjunction with TRAFFIC, has carried out a Review of Significant Trade for 23 selected species.
- The Sustainable Use Project is identifying factors that contribute to sustainable utilisation of species. An analysis of 106 case studies from Asia has been completed.
- The strategic direction of the unit is under discussion as there is an effort to make closer linkages with the TRAFFIC Programme.

SIS Version 2 and the Red List Website

- Web-based SIS tools for conducting Red List assessments are approaching completion and the central Red List database has been migrated onto the new online system. The Red List Unit is currently testing functionality and making improvements to the central data management features. It will be launched as a “beta” version in late February.
- The GAA team will port their existing data to the online system and test the new features, including an integrated taxonomy manager. This will be a robust test due to the many recent changes in amphibian taxonomy. The tools will be further tested in the field at a mangrove workshop as part of the GMSA in March 2008, after which it will be launched to the whole SSC.
- The SP will be buying and managing an in-house GIS server for housing and analysing IUCN Red List spatial data and for serving spatial data to the Red List website.
- The Red List website will be further improved for the 2008 launch – particularly regarding search functionality. This includes an interactive map viewer to facilitate searching for species geographically and viewing spatial relationships between different species ranges.
- Six corporate partners have committed to the IUCN Red List Corporate Support Group - a joint initiative of the World Business Council for Sustainable Development and IUCN. Funds will be used to support ongoing improvement of data collection and evaluation tools, and Red List website enhancements that make the information more accessible to corporate decision-makers.

SSC Network Support and Other Staff Matters

- The key tasks of the two Network Support Officers have been assisting with the writing of the Programme / Strategic Plan, assisting with the SG Chairs’ Meeting and the WCC, and the helping with the drafting of the Progress & Assessment Report for the Quadrennium.

- The internship position in the SP is now vacant.

A brief discussion followed in which Y Sadovy raised the issue of how assessments are being conducted in the GMSA for taxonomic groupings not covered by a RLA. J Smart commented that the process often builds the RLA. S Stuart commented that where commercially important species are involved, it will be particularly important to identify the correct people – and perhaps preparatory workshops will be needed to discuss the way forward. He noted that when new species are being worked on, it is hard to identify people. H Dublin commented that the experience of the invertebrate community will assist for both marine species and plant assessments. She noted that it will necessarily lead to prioritisation due to the lack of resources to set up large networks and find people. Y Sadovy concluded by saying that the Chairs of the marine-related SGs are uncomfortable that they have not been engaged enough on the GMSA.

5.3 SSC Task Force Updates

5.3.1 Species Conservation Planning Task Force (SCPTF)

R Lacy noted that the overview document was in the SC meeting pack and was also available for download from the SG Chairs' Meeting website. He commented that it is still a draft, and that the team is hoping for good feedback from the SG Chairs at the upcoming meeting – particularly in terms of whether they feel the process outlined will work for their group, and what kind of assistance they will need to implement the process (more manuals, more training, etc). He reminded the SC members that a "how to" manual will accompany the guidelines and that both documents will be released at the WCC, but will keep evolving afterwards. The WCC session will include a workshop on what generally works well for implementing species conservation planning, and a Learning Opportunity for unveiling the guidelines and manual and to take them forward. He noted that the Task Force envisions the strategic planning for species conservation becoming a signature process of SSC, and a framework for re-energising an approach to conservation planning that will really lead to action. He concluded that one way to make sure this happens may be to form a consortium of partners who will contribute resources to implementation, possibly akin to the Red List partners.

J Robinson asked for a one sentence answer on how to distinguish this approach from previous action planning, and R Lacy answered that it ensures that the SGs involve all stakeholders, including implementers, and that the new approach is a process rather than a product. R Kock commented that capacity in the countries who are implementing the plans will be needed, so capacity building is paramount. T Brooks noted that this process is moving forward very well and is now slightly ahead of the area-based planning guidelines. H Dublin agreed, saying that unfortunately the Learning Opportunity at the WCC for the area-based planning has been denied, but fortunately there are still enough sessions available through efforts from SSC and WCPA to look at taking these guidelines from the theoretical to working with practitioners.

C Campagna commented on building in continuity within SGs, and R Lacy answered that this was an important issue and that they would be asking Chairs what kind of continuity they will be needing – both in terms of continuing to refine the process and in terms of finding out what support they need to tackle the process (and whether they will attempt it soon or later). J Robinson commented that the tight link between the budget and action in the plans makes the plans very close to a fundraising proposal for action. He commented that he is sure that many SGs will find this a very useful link. H Dublin agreed, saying that the *ex situ* community has long been looking for better ways to link up their donations to exactly what is needed. The *ex situ* community, through CBSG, have put a document together on their approach for matching institutional donors with important field projects that is available on the SG Chairs' Meeting website.

5.4 SSC Sub-Committees updates: feedback and discussion

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

5.4.1 BASC and Assessment Updates (BASC)

GMA Update

S Stuart briefly explained that the Global Mammal Assessment has had numerous problems, most of which are now solved. He noted that the SC members can request a full report on progress at any stage if they so wish. He stated that the team is tracking progress closely so that problems can be identified in advance. S Stuart said that the staff are making a massive effort to conclude the project and that the product will be something to be proud of. He concluded that the paper that will be published will be similar to the one on amphibians after the GAA, and reminded all the SC members to forward him eye-catching stories that could be sent to the media as part of the launch of the GMA.

Guidelines for Data Use

S Stuart stated that the SC members should send him detailed comments via email. He explained that a better name for this document would be the “Appropriate Uses of Red List Data”, and that the document is not focussing on the legal issues, more on the technical aspects. Its purpose is to be a work in progress and give practical examples under sensible headings so that any reader can follow the document. He noted that the detail will likely be made into a set of annexes – including an annex on the Scientific Guidelines, an annex on sustainable use, and more.

There was a discussion about the Guidelines, with the following suggestions being put forward:

- H Dublin commented that the annexes need to be compiled soon and sent around for comment. She also noted that the document should go to the IUCN policy and legal departments.
- J Robinson commented that the document should perhaps rather emphasise the appropriate uses, while making it clear that it is not a complete set of appropriate uses. The inappropriate uses should not be highlighted in the main text but rather be summarised in a box and covered in more detail in the annexes.
- L Bennun commented that reference to inappropriate uses is simply stating caveats, and this seemed helpful. He suggested that the document could be made still more useful if it was put online and linked to other more detailed explanation or examples of appropriate use.
- T Brooks suggested that the general principles of what is appropriate and what is not be drawn up in a table. He also noted that the preamble should make explicit reference to the resolution from the WCC3 on the uses of the Red List.
- G Mace noted that the phrase “species on the Red List” could be misinterpreted – does it mean all species, or only those in the threatened categories. H Dublin agreed that this lack of clarity was a general problem when using the terms.
- M Clout commented that the document could cover more than just the Red List data, as the SSC has other important sources of data (such as GISD).
- R Kock queried whether there is any quantification of the uses of the Red List data and T Brooks replied that there is information available for appropriate uses. R Kock noted that perhaps the proportion of appropriate use vs inappropriate uses needs to be mentioned in the document.
- JC Vié noted that this document will be most useful when talking to donors as it will block any discussion over the inappropriate use of Red List data before it can start. H Dublin agreed, saying a short annex on relevance of the Red List to policy and legislation would be useful to governments and donors.

- C Campagna commented that he felt that too many examples of inappropriate use would be off-putting and that people would be discouraged from reading the document thoroughly as it is too negative. There was general agreement that the document needs more positive statements and perhaps a link to a discussion forum or Frequently Asked Questions place where examples of inappropriate use can be shared.

Draft IUCN Red List Data Provider Agreement

J Ragle stated that he had been asked by W Jackson to investigate the issue of the rights of Data Providers as there is currently no agreement in place. There are currently some stated restrictions on the use of data when downloading them from the Red List website, but no agreement on the side of the provider. He explained that the agreement is meant to protect the provider, but still allow the data to be used for analyses, fundraising and other functions. Comments on the first draft agreement have been positive (it has been sent to a few SSC members and also SP staff), but there have been some issues raised around sensitive data and pre-publication use of data. The feedback will be compiled and the document will go out for a broader consultation.

A short discussion on the document followed, with the following suggestions being made:

- There needs to be a clear definition at the front of the document on what is meant by “publication”. There was general consensus that publication means the posting of data onto the Red List website.
- Similarly, what is meant by “Red List documentation in the public domain” needs to be clarified. There is much background documentation and knowledge supporting the species entries on the Red List website – so it needs to be clear that “Red List documentation in the public domain” means only the data published on the Red List website and not necessarily all the supporting documentation that was submitted with the assessment.
- There needs to be a consultation with legal professionals on the terms used due to the fact that terms could be used loosely, but may have strict meanings in a legal sense. H Dublin noted that the CEL is also keen to help on this issue.
- The delay in the publication of data is sometimes more of a problem than the data being used inappropriately or before publication. If there is a lengthy wait for publication, then the agreement may serve to hinder the process even more.
- With reference to this agreement itself, clarity is needed on exactly who the data provider is and who exactly signs this agreement.
- There was agreement that the default procedure is that ALL data are made available, unless data are provided with conditions attached or there are sensitive data. In this case the policy on the availability of sensitive data will become applicable.
- It should be clear that this agreement also applies to spatial data.

ACTION: J Ragle to compile the feedback on the draft Red List Data Provider Agreement and send it out for broader consultation.

Pre-publication Data Use Guidelines

Following on from the previous discussion, there was agreement on the following definitions:

Publication → uploaded to the Red List website

Data → everything on website (unless it is predetermined as given conditionally or it is sensitive)

It was noted that there is now a need to consolidate the various documents or make some into annexes of others – i.e. the Pre-publication Data Use Guidelines are related to the rules on the use of sensitive data and all are subsets of the Data Provider Agreement.

S Stuart noted that the model used for the GAA where individual assessments were completed and then held for publication until the global assessment was completed should not be used again. Some problems have occurred in the GMA with similar situations, but this should generally not be allowed to happen. The rule should be that as soon as the assessment is completed, the data should go online – it would be ideal to have a continual update of the Red List website so that the longest possible time to wait for data is one year,

hopefully far less. He also noted that the sections of the draft describing providers, managers, financiers, etc., should be made much clearer and listed according to functional roles; and the use of terms clarified. A clearer version of the document will be ready for the next BASC and SC meetings.

There followed some discussion on the draft document, and it was noted that the meaning of pre-consistency check and post-consistency check need to be defined, and it should be made clear whether there are instances where data may be used post-consistency check but pre-publication.

A discussion followed that emphasised the move towards continuous updating of the Red List should be paramount and resources should be allocated to this process. The turn-around time should be far less than one year and therefore bottlenecks must be identified and resources prioritised. R Lacy asked whether data gathered at assessment workshops could be termed pre-publication, and whether the use of this data immediately after the workshop for conservation planning is therefore incorrectly described in the draft Pre-publication Data Use Guidelines. He noted that although a species may have been assessed as Critically Endangered at a workshop, it is not strictly correct to call it such until it has been officially published on the Red List website. S Stuart agreed, saying this process needs further discussion. C Campagna commented that he would definitely tend to be proactive if the outcome of a workshop indicates that a species will be in a threatened category, even if the data were only published later. S Stuart commented that the assessment is the easy part, but that the evaluation and consistency checking can take much more time and this should be explained to those who are requesting to use the information before the full process of evaluation and consistency checking has been completed. He said that this is particularly the case with commercially important species, since in these instances no mistakes can be afforded. He noted that it is implicit that people can discuss a species and possible conservation action before publication if it looks like the outcome will be that the species will be listed in one of the Threatened Categories. S Stuart concluded by saying that it is only the communications people that love the annual update of the Red List, but it will be easy to persuade them that continuous updates are more beneficial.

T Brooks then commented that post-publication use of data is in fact more important (e.g. re-publication in other formats or commercial use of data), and SSC needs to be confident that it will maintain its edge as the premier provider of data because it provides these regular updates. There was some discussion over this, as some SC members felt that making something freely available would make it easy for other organisations to out-compete the SSC. There was agreement that there are a whole range of issues here that require clarification. R Mittermeier commented that the SSC itself should be more proactive in promoting the commercial use of its data.

The discussion closed with H Dublin asking all the SC members to send in comments on the guidelines to S Stuart via email as soon as possible. She agreed to investigate a way to do a consultation on the details of post-publication data use. Both pre and post-publication data uses then need to be brought together under the umbrella of the overall Data Provider's Agreement, which J Ragle is working to complete.

ACTIONS:

- All SC members are to send in detailed comments about the Pre-publication Data Use Guidelines to S Stuart via email.
- H Dublin to suggest a means of consulting and gaining clarity on post-publication data use issues.
- Pre and post-data use guidelines to be brought in under the umbrella of the Data Provider's Agreement by J Ragle

Red List Backlog

J Smart stated that the document in the current SC meeting pack was in addition to the last analysis of the plant backlog presented in Beijing, but fortunately there is not much additional backlog besides the plants. S Stuart noted that this could increase due to the quality of assessments being sent into the Red List Unit and the lack of prioritisation in speciose groups. He commented that funding and training for assessments also indirectly eventually affects the RLU. J Smart explained that the RLU does have one serious problem with the decisions taken in Beijing: they feel that if there are serious flaws in the data, then the data should not go into the Red List. H Dublin reiterated the thinking of the decision taken in Beijing saying that if even if the RLU were concerned over the data, if there has been an evaluation then the data should go into the Red List and the RLA should be flagged that they may be errors. S Stuart stated that it is only if the consistency check shows the evaluation to be inadequate that the RLU may refuse to enter the data on the Red List website. On occasions where the RLU's technical expertise exceeds that of the RLA and data passed through the RLA are determined to be deficient, G Mace recommended that the RLU should inform the SSC Chair's Office that the RLA is not functioning.

G Mace concluded saying that it is a continuous loop – the more data are in the public domain, the more people will challenge the validity of the data and thereby the problems will be self-correcting.

There was agreement that both the RLU and the SGs need resourcing. H Dublin commented that it had been made clear to her that if IUCN wishes to use the Red List as a flagship product, then they should take on more responsibility for it and assist at all levels in the fundraising efforts for both the RLAs and the RLU.

Preliminary Assessments

BASC has authorised the testing of RapidList for the purpose of conducting preliminary assessments, and a report will be produced after the next BASC meeting. J Smart noted that the system will be tested in Tunisia through the IUCN Mediterranean Office, and through the Bryophyte SG. There is a need for a strategy on the use of preliminary assessments so that people do not become confused between these and full assessments.

ACTION:

- S Stuart to send the report on RapidList testing to the SSC Chair and SC after the BASC meeting
- S Stuart, J Smart and J Griffin to talk further on the strategy to ensure that there can be no confusion between preliminary and full Red List assessments.

National and Regional Red Listing

H Dublin noted that this is another work assignment for BASC, and that a short Terms of Reference for the project had been drawn up and was in the SC meeting pack. The aim is a strategic vision regarding SSC's roles and levels of engagement on national and regional level Red Listing. BASC is to give the pros and cons of these levels of engagement. She noted that there are many "Red Lists" in the world and no collective branding – so some strategic decisions need to be taken on the SSC approach. There are opportunities to do more (particularly with the RLI being accepted as a measure for the MDG7 biodiversity indicator) as national governments will eventually have to do Red Listing using the IUCN Categories and Criteria and contribute this to the MDG process. The SSC/SP needs to state what its role is – perhaps it is training – and exactly where the cut off is of when and how the IUCN branding can be used. There are currently places where perhaps an IUCN regional office is involved or where IUCN has the lead on a regional or national level Red List, but even in these cases the Categories and Criteria are often not properly applied. SSC/SP needs to examine its position on all these matters.

G Mace then commented on the issue of endemic species – where an assessment at any level is in fact a global assessment. When a country has many endemics, this may be a way of increasing the number of assessments that go into the global Red List. The procedure for SSC SC Meeting WCC3.7 – MINUTES

passing an assessment of an endemic species straight through to the global level should be discussed. H Dublin and S Stuart agreed, saying this will be discussed further in the National Red List WG of BASC.

J Smart noted that there is every sign that the IUCN regional and national offices will want to continue their assessments, so they require some clarity on the SSC/SP role. R Mittermeier commented that we need to make sure that we are structured correctly to make use of the funding available for national level assessments. H Dublin agreed, saying that packaging of training and tools for groups of countries will be possible once the MDG7 indicator process is clearer. JC Vié commented that there is a serious lack of species-related capacity in the IUCN offices, so having some of the current regional assessments being run by the SP is really helping with resources and training.

ACTION: S Stuart to ensure that the report on SSC/SP engagement on national and regional level Red Listing is prepared according to the TORs and that feedback is given to the SSC Chair and SC after the BASC meeting.

The GSA2 2010

S Stuart noted that they are still on target with the GSA, as much work was done on the original outline for 2008, which can be carried forward to 2010. JC Vié agreed, saying that Island Press is still interested in publishing the 2010 book. The funding aspects still need to be discussed. The French government is currently funding the Red List update and publication for Barcelona and they may be interested in continuing their support if the 2008 products are good. JC Vie noted that they supported the 2004 product as well.

L Bennun commented that there is an issue regarding how IUCN approaches the 2010 targets and how findings are presented – i.e. the target has not been met, but there is a need to move forward despite this fact. The conservation community will develop its response over the next year or so, and SSC also needs to think about its stance. H Dublin agreed, noting that there are many opportunities with side events at the upcoming CBD CoP9. G Mace also noted that DIVERSITAS is working towards something at the CBD and perhaps SSC should join them. She also noted that perhaps the publications produced for Barcelona should already point towards the likely indicators for 2010 and start to address how SSC is going to present findings in 2010.

In returning to the discussion on the publication for 2010, R Mittermeier commented that it might perhaps be best if the publication comes out in 2009. JC Vié commented that it is dependant on the availability of new datasets. There was agreement that there are actually two steps; one is a publication about the global status of species, and the other part would be trying to influence the process post-2010. J Smart agreed, saying it is important for SSC/SP to position itself on the target-led approach as it may or may not continue. H Dublin noted that some of this discussion is impossible without input from the IUCN policy unit. There was agreement that the first SC meeting in 2009 should focus on the content of the 2010 GSA2, and that in the mean-time J Smart and JC Vié should continue to plan for the publication.

ACTIONS:

- G Mace to see if there is an opportunity to join DIVERSITAS in their work on post-2010 targets.
- H Dublin to discuss how to present SSC thoughts on the post-2010 target-led approach with the policy unit at IUCN.
- J Smart and JC Vié to continue thinking on the GSA2 2010 publication and preparing further briefing documents for the next SC meeting, with a full outline of content to be discussed in the first SC meeting of 2009.

SIS

H Dublin introduced the topic saying that there may be questions about SIS at the SG Chairs' Meeting and the SC members should all feel comfortable explaining what SIS is.

M Clout commented that GISD should be incorporated into SIS, and J Ragle answered that SIS is intended to improve the state of SSC information management overall so it could possibly eventually link to other datasets of SSC. H Dublin commented that the earlier focus of SIS was trying to feed data into the Red List assessments process. Over time more and more documentation requirements arose for the assessments so that now there are also spatial data and other SSC data sets to consider.

G Mace noted that she understands SIS to currently be a suite of tools, but there is large range of possibilities for what the next stage could be. J Ragle agreed, saying in the future more modules can be added, but currently SIS is basically the Red List database. Improvements are needed on how the DEM links to the website as the server for the website is still separate to the Red List database.

J Ragle then explained one problem that will arise when the Red List has more regular updates: the issue of "feeding up" – the manner in which other websites and systems relying on RL data receive updates. The current annual update works well, but for more regular updates a new system will be needed. J Hutton queried how we can ensure that all those using the data are using the most up-to-date version. It was agreed that this would pose challenges that required further investigation.

There followed some discussion on the name of SIS – with the main comments being that it makes no sense to call it SIS when the Red List is the main asset, and SIS already has a bad connotation due to its history. However, it was acknowledged that the SIS may eventually hold other data besides that for the Red List – such as invasive species or data in support of species conservation planning. It was acknowledged that branding it with the Red List brand will then negate the other aspects of what the SSC does and other data SIS holds. There was agreement that a new name is needed. J Ragle commented that in reality SIS does not have its own identity yet, as it is a structure that underlies the products.

C Campagna then commented that the document is confusing as it discusses both the support to the users (providers of data) and discusses making data available to the rest of the world. He noted that input and output on one system may not be too sensible, as it results in too many wishes for one system or proposal. H Dublin and J Ragle agreed, saying that it is never marketed to the different audiences as the same thing, but J Ragle agreed to update the document to keep the two processes clearly separate.

DECISION: The SIS needs another name that reflects the nature of what it strives to be.

ACTION: J Ragle to update the two-page document on SIS to ensure that the servicing of the two processes - input of data and output of data - are clearly separated.

5.4.2 Plant Conservation Sub-Committee (PCSC)

S Stuart opened by saying that BASC is waiting for feedback from M Maunder on the prioritisation of plant assessments. He reiterated his concern that the network does not have strong representation on the PCSC and therefore it is difficult to have a deep enough engagement with the plant network.

D Leaman agreed, saying that the SG Chairs' Meeting is a terrific opportunity for her, S Oldfield and H Hernandez to do the kind of networking with the Chairs that has not been done before due to the PCSC's majority institutional membership. But she reiterated that the make-up of the PCSC is not the only problem, the problem is also that the network has had a long-standing tendency to be particularly difficult to link with and this is too great a responsibility for a volunteer committee. She stated that the priorities decided upon at the

last PCSC meeting reflected the thoughts and wishes of the existing PCSC, for better or worse. She then queried the necessity of a complete prioritisation exercise through matrixing the taxa against a list of criteria – which would effectively be taking a step backwards. She noted that credit needs to be given for having arrived at the priorities of 2007 and queried the need to do further work (like in the GMSA).

J Smart commented that she has empathy with the problem as the funding model is dependant on project work – therefore the PCSC had suggested a “plants for people” approach to priorities as funding may then be more forthcoming. She concluded that the SP really would like to support the plant network in the new Quadrennium. H Dublin agreed, saying there is a lot of support for the plant network, and D Leaman should feel free to explore the views of the plant network while in Al Ain.

6. SSC FINANCES, FUNDRAISING AND COMMUNICATIONS

6.1 COF 2008

H Dublin explained that the IUCN Council wants more resources to go to the Commissions, but that there are currently no additional resources available. The COF has remained more or less the same for 10 years, except for a small increase given in 2007 and divided across the six Commissions. The same amount will be allocated to the COF in 2008 as in 2007. J Smart confirmed that IUCN does charge an overhead, and they have added this onto the allocation as with other cost centres. H Dublin noted that the SSC COF is in good shape due to planned savings in light of the cost demands of the WCC and the SG Chairs’ Meeting. She requested all the Chairs of Sub-Committees and Task Forces who receive money from the COF to inform the Chair’s Office if they are going to require more or less funds than allocated for 2008. She also noted that there are stricter requirements for the use of the COF money and urged all the Chairs to let C Poole know when their meetings are, so that instructions on how to claim from the COF can be sent through to them in a timely manner.

6.2 SP Finances

J Smart noted that the “BC List” was again in the SC meeting pack. She reminded all the SC members that C implies a signed contract, while B implies a project development in progress. She then noted that the charitable status of IUCN in the UK is still an issue and IUCN has not moved on this – which is very upsetting because it is preventing direct fundraising there. She pleaded with R Mittermeier and H Dublin to move this issue up to Council level.

ACTION: R Mittermeier and H Dublin to discuss the charitable status of IUCN in the UK at Council level or IUCN Senior Management level where possible.

6.3 Fund-raising

Google Adsense

J Smart noted that there had been no complaints about the Google adverts on the photo gallery page of the Red List website during the trial period (which is only seven pages out of the ~41,000 pages on Red List website). The trial started on 22 December 2007. There is a decent click through rate of 2.5% of visitors, but not much money has been made as the price per advert is very low. This could be due to the low number of words and the lack of the ‘right’ key words of the gallery pages. She concluded that the suggestion is to continue the trial period using the following means of improving the trial:

- Remove adverts from the photo gallery index page and make the most recent gallery page (2007) the landing page when visitors click on “Photo Gallery” from the main page.

- Expand the trial to select species summary pages (perhaps the 100 most-visited pages). These pages are highly referenced (linked to) externally. This section of the trial should be carefully monitored to determine the potential for the adverts to be placed on the remaining ~40,900 species pages.
- Place adverts on the Red List Overview static page (the most visited static page).

There was general agreement from the SC that the trial should continue.

C Campagna queried whether there is any agreement with National Geographic regarding photos for the Red List website. J Smart answered that this is not the case at present, although more photos are needed. H Dublin noted that ARKive is interested in managing the SSC photo gallery, but the photographs themselves must come from our network and there would be a need to fund-raise for a joint project.

Online donations:

J Smart noted that there was a peak in giving when the 2007 Red List was launched. More press releases should encourage more visitors to the site, so there is a compelling argument to do more media work. She noted that feedback from the projects that are being supported by the Sir Peter Scott Fund is essential as these will provide good content for stories. J Smart noted that she still needs to speak to R Mittermeier regarding Conservation International's experiences with their online donation programme. She reiterated how important it is not to lose visitors to other sites such as the Encyclopaedia of Life, and therefore reciprocal linking agreements should perhaps be put in place. JC Vié noted that the online donations have not been advertised, so there may be opportunities to improve the income through making better use of advertising the button on other SSC and SP material. J Smart said the following methods would be employed to improve the system:

1. More compelling copy and improvements to the website page
2. Revise website layout (will occur when IUCN content management system is online)
3. Continue to drive increased traffic throughout the year to the website by more frequent Species news stories, including stories from Sir Peter Scott Fund for Conservation Action recipients – not just the annual IUCN Red List launch
4. Include a link to the donation page on all communication materials as a call to action
5. Develop the IUCN Red List brand to increase overall brand awareness and to help communicate a motivation for consumers to donate

J Smart concluded that a portion of the funds raised has been used to send South American Camelid SG Chair, G Lichtenstein, to the Vicuña Convention in Bolivia. G Lichtenstein was most grateful for the support and submitted a report and pictures following her attendance at the conference.

MAVA proposal

J Smart explained that the SP has been given a commitment from the MAVA Foundation for CHF3.5 million over five years. A matching funding component of on average 37% is required. The proposal was developed in close association with the Foundation, which has also become a framework donor to IUCN. The funding is for improving Red List assessments through improving SIS – to equip SSC members with easy to use tools, and provide an efficient way to capture, organize and submit assessments for inclusion on the Red List. It will also be used for enhancements to the Red List website; preliminary assessments; a website template to facilitate the hosting of IUCN national and regional as well as project-based assessments; Red List training (SSC experts, members, regional office colleagues). It may also be used for support to species information on trade, use and links to livelihoods. The work is linked to the proposed space in the new IUCN building. C Imboden is on the advisory committee for the MAVA – IUCN relationship.

H Dublin noted that the delegates at the SG Chairs' Meeting may ask what portion of this funding goes to the network, and suggested that perhaps the MAVA funds could be used as

matching funds for leveraging money for the assessment work done by the network. J Smart commented that the training side of funding should be emphasised. R Mittermeier suggested using this sponsorship as a challenge grant on the website.

ACTION: J Smart to ask MAVVA whether their grant can be used as a challenge grant on the website online donation system to help leverage funds to support Red List work by Specialist Groups.

Other Fundraising

J Smart said that the Sir Peter Scott Fund funded 10 projects in 2007. She said that D Cator and J Griffin have begun a fundraising tracking spreadsheet that lists opportunities for funding.

6.4 SSC/SP Communications

H Dublin commented that the Communications session at the upcoming SG Chairs' Meeting will provide an opportunity for feedback from the network on what they want with regard to communications. She noted that IUCN is not a particularly good communicator – even at the time of the launch of the Red List, fellow organisations often obtain better press coverage than IUCN. She noted that the SSC/SP can definitely be better at communications, which is so often linked to fundraising. It is possible that having central IUCN support to the Commissions for communications would be a good solution, as the SSC/SP does not make enough use of IUCN for either communications or fundraising (e.g. the Regional Offices are constantly fundraising and we need better linkages with them for our Specialist Groups).

6.5 Branding

Branding

Due to the branding change within IUCN (the dropping of 'World Conservation Union' and the changing of the IUCN logo), there was a delay in the IUCN Red List brand development. The next steps for the agency are to do more interviews regarding feelings about the branding, after which a draft brand will be developed and brought to the SC. Development of the IUCN Red List categories logos has been challenging for the agency due to the need to convey the important message of varying degrees of threat within a graphic whilst taking into account the simplicity in which it needs to be reproduced.

H Dublin noted that it remains to be seen how the Commission logos will fit with the new IUCN logo. IUCN Communications Unit will be sending through some examples soon.

6.6 SSC Awards for WCC

H Dublin asked all the SC members to think about awards to be given out at the Congress. SC Members with ideas or interested in being on a sub-committee for this issue should contact the Chair's Office. The potential awards are:

- Sir Peter Scott Award for Conservation Merit
- Harry Messel Award for Conservation Leadership
- SSC Chair's Citation of Excellence

H Dublin concluded that the SC members should keep a look-out for potential award recipients at the Chairs' Meeting, especially for the Citation of Excellence.

ACTION: All SC members should send their suggestions for awards through to the Chair's Office.

7. IUCN / SSC DISCUSSION POINTS

7.1 World Conservation Congress

Reporting

H Dublin explained that the SSC Quadrennial report for the WCC was handed in on 1 February 2008 and will go to the March Council meeting for approval. There may be some slight changes to the report after the Council meeting. She then explained that the Progress & Assessment report, normally done annually, will also report on the whole Quadrennium. She called on the SC members to send a paragraph on their SSC-related work to the Chair's Office as soon as possible so that it could be included in the report.

ACTION: C Poole to send a reminder to SC members about their paragraph for the Progress & Assessment Report (2005 – 2008).

Logistics

H Dublin explained that it is essential that the logistical planning for the Congress begins now. She noted that the SC will be meeting either on Saturday 4 October or Sunday 5 October, and therefore the COF will pay accommodation for those who need support for the nights before and after the meeting. She then called on the SC members to give a show of hands of those who would be making their own accommodation arrangements for Barcelona. R Mittermeier, T Brooks and L Bennun answered affirmatively, while all other SC members will need accommodation arranged for them. H Dublin noted that accommodation for those who are running SSC-related sessions in the Forum would be discussed at a later stage. There is apparently a Delegate's Fund that can be applied to for financial assistance. She concluded that it is unlikely that the SC members will stay together for the whole Forum, as after the SC meeting the SC members might either stay on at the hotel booked for SC meeting or make other arrangements through their own organisations. She concluded that once the bookings have been made, there will be little allowance for changes due to the fact that Barcelona operates on approximately 90% occupancy year-round and the hotels are therefore demanding cash up front for bookings.

ACTION: C Poole to send out a message to all SC members once registration for the Congress has opened.

SSC-related sessions

C Thouless explained that he is continuing to keep track of sessions relevant to SSC/SP in a spreadsheet. The SP is to coordinate a few proposals pertaining to Red List-related work into consolidated sessions. C Thouless noted that he and D Cator will continue to track SSC-related sessions – particularly after the Congress Organising Team starts to return to proponents of sessions that have been accepted to see whether they are still planning on using their allocated sessions. J Smart commented that there is a waiting list for session slots. She also noted that not much progress has been made with the "journeys" idea, but it would be beneficial to design species-related journeys. She mentioned the Pavilion still needs funding, but there is no shortage of ideas for content. J Smart said she also still needs to clarify whether the SSC/SP has any slots in the plenary.

H Dublin said she will most likely have only 4-6 minutes to present the Quadrennial work of the SSC at the Members' Assembly. She reminded the SC that a film crew is attending the SG Chairs' Meeting to put a short film together to use in the SSC Forum sessions.

Publications for WCC

JC Vié explained that he and L Lew had worked on a template for the fact sheets proposed to be produced for the WCC, based on the IUCN visual identity. He asked that the SC comment on the template and suggested that it could be four pages or longer, and that it should be serious data and not light, popular reading material. He reminded the SC that there is a commitment under the French Framework Agreement to support a publication for WCC4, and that if this publication is good, they may continue support through to the 2010

publication. He noted that there could be as many as 16 fact sheets. There followed some discussion on the template and fact sheets idea, with the following being the main points:

- The template has too much text. There should be more graphs. However, there should be sufficient text to present the facts and evidence of worldwide trends properly.
- The purpose should be beyond WCC. The fact sheets and further, more substantive documentation should therefore also be downloadable from the website. The fact sheets should also refer to the website for more information.
- There will be very little space to give recognition to contributors, so there needs to be good links with the website and an upgrade to the website to ensure that all the contributors are listed.
- There should be a media event around these fact sheets. Perhaps they can be launched along with the GMA.
- The target audience needs to be identified and the outcomes should be monitored – what impact will it have and who will it influence?
- The stack of fact sheets will give the audience a good idea as to the depth of our programme. There are possibly two types of audiences – one wanting a relatively light piece on what SSC is doing and the relevance of species in IUCN, and one wanting more detailed fact sheets on specific topics.
- There could be three inter-linked products: a simple scientific publication that can be cited (given out in small numbers and downloadable); a fact sheet that is a single page with pictures, graphs and very little text, containing the overall findings of the Red List update; and the website, which would integrate these chunks together.
- One of the sheets should definitely target the local Barcelona area, and should be made available to local press, local schools and perhaps even the Congress attendees

H Dublin then concluded the discussion by saying that she was hearing two main opinions from the SC members – that the fact sheets should be briefer and more pictorial; and that the data should be given in detailed analyses on the web. She reminded the SC that the SSC/SP should not be contributors to the paper problem, but should also not disappoint staff and partners who really do want to publish their work. She concluded that this may mean reducing the length of fact sheets, having them more as flyers, and putting the more substantial analyses online.

There may be an opportunity to do a pocket publication about eating sustainably at the Congress, but it will be essential to first ensure that no one else is going to do this as well. The SC members agreed that the SP staff should now be charged with implementing these decisions.

DECISION: The printed material of the Fact Sheets should be lighter, catchier material with less text and should direct people to the website for a more detailed and referenced document. Some of the lighter printed material should contain information about the SSC/SP is and what we do, and should contain useful websites contacts.

ACTIONS:

- J Smart to clarify whether the SSC/SP has any slots in the plenary sessions of the Forum and inform the SC members
- JC Vié to continue his leadership on the set of fact sheet publications for the WCC4.

7.2 Species Strategic Plan

H Dublin explained that there is not any time at this meeting to go into the framework of the Strategic Plan in any great depth, but the targets are being filled in and the new Strategic Plan has been used as the basis for the Commission Mandate – which was also handed in by 1 February 2008 to be approved by Council in March. She mentioned that the One Programme WG has discussed the suggestion that Mandates should not have to be revisited

every Quadrennium but preferably once every 10 – 15 years. At present it is a statutory requirement to revisit the Mandates every four years, so it may be suggested that they are just re-submitted for adoption at each Congress but not necessarily revamped.

She noted that the Objectives of the SSC have changed to reflect the pressure, state, response model. L Bennun commented that the first Objective is a little too much of an aspiration and should say “a” instead of “the”. G Mace noted that the word could be “the leading authority” if the word “biodiversity” was changed to “species”. There was general agreement with the intent of these suggestions.

H Dublin reminded the SC that the Strategic Plan has been difficult to coordinate because the global programme might change. But several Key Species Results have been reworded and now the species targets are being added into the framework. The targets will be worded as generally as possible to encompass as much of the work of the network as possible. However, any opportunity to gain input from the network will be sought to ensure that the Strategic Plan is as all-encompassing of SSC work as possible. J Smart noted that a rationale column had been added into the framework to explain the reason behind each of the Key Species Results. She also stated that the operational results and targets have been included in a separate table below the main framework. H Dublin called for the SC members to give comments on the framework and targets within two weeks of the meeting.

J Smart said that special thanks should be given to C Imboden, who really helped in the formulation of this Strategic Plan Framework. H Dublin then shared that concern had been expressed within the larger debate that IUCN is over programming, in response to the requirements of the donors to see measurable results in four years. Unfortunately no changes are going to happen until the end of the next Quadrennium, as the 2009-2012 programme is already in motion.

ACTON: The SC members are to send their comments on the Strategic Plan for Species Framework and proposed targets to the Chair’s Office, C Imboden or D Cator by 29 February 2008.

7.3 Update on SSC Redesign

L Boitani explained that the two redesign documents had been circulated to the network early in December 2007. He said that very few comments were received (10 people responded), but that each and every comment was taken seriously and responded to. There were three kinds of negative reactions:

1. Concern over the separation of the Red List function from conservation action. The complaint was that many SGs do both and should be allowed to continue doing both.
2. Concern over the apparent top down approach of the redesign, without adequate consultation with the broader network.
3. Concerns relating to the RLA in that people do not want their assessment evaluated and possibly challenged by someone who may not be an expert in that species simply because they have a higher “authority” in the SSC.

L Boitani elaborated that some of these issues are just a matter of clarification, as the Chairs perhaps misunderstood the documents. The only truly valid concern is the first – the separation of the functions. One proposal for solving this concern is to have the Red List Assessment Group embedded into the SG, but the two sections responding to different Chairs – a Chair of the Red List Assessment Group and the Chair of the SG. The two Chairs would have to be two different people, and the Chair of the Assessment Group would not report to the Chair of the SG. H Dublin noted that it is a limited number of SGs who may have this problem – most groups fit into one category or the other.

A lengthy discussion on the redesign followed with H Dublin asking each SC member to comment on their main concerns and also state whether they supported the redesign as

proposed in the documents. The main concerns that were raised are listed below, along with the discussion around them.

- D Leaman said that the **rationale** for the redesign needs clarification. The word independence is used in different ways in different places in the document and this needs to be clarified. L Boitani answered that the model of the peer review system used in science should be used. At present the RLA is sometimes only one or two people and the credibility of the Red List data depends on them. The redesign presents a system of people to buffer the credibility – assessor, evaluator, coordinator – with all the functions in one group. There is a head of the group, but within the authority is a linear flow of data. In the absence of the coordinator, the Chair of the Assessment Group has the right to sign off on the data. This is what will happen in the immediate future, as the coordinator positions are not yet funded. H Dublin commented that the independence issue is paramount, particularly as clear objectivity is required as it would be very difficult to block a proposed development or harvest based on one person's opinion. Independence is important to understand. S Stuart noted that the context of the current times is different from the Red List in the 1990s. It is now web-based, contains more data, is used massively in conservation planning, etc. This has major implications for the data, and the origin of the data. The governments and statisticians want to get the best they can for their country, so the operation of the Red List needs to have no obvious flaws. It was agreed that it was necessary to plan for the future so as to be prepared for more complexity in a more litigious global community in future.
- The **existing model** does have an intermediate layer of people doing evaluations but this is not always obvious as currently it is often done by staff. Nonetheless, the model is there and should be used to explain to people that this is the model that is required.
- Regarding the **top-down approach** complaint, it was possibly the way the documents were circulated that caused this reaction, as many people did not pay the documents any attention when the announcement was first made.
- Support for the coordinator positions will require more discussion as raising these **funds** will be difficult. Y Sadovy noted that the long term success of the redesign will be about attracting funding. H Dublin agreed, saying that some donors may want to continue funding the larger projects such as global assessments, but the redesign model also allowed for support in smaller ways. This would mean a growth in partnerships of many sorts. She noted that a number of taxonomic groups, particularly the more speciose groups, are already struggling to find support for their assessment work, as the big organisations are not willing to fund them. The SSC/SP will therefore need to identify smaller institutions to support the neglected taxa. R Mittermeier commented that more lateral thinking is required, as much funding is directed away from species towards other issues such as climate change, and there may be opportunities to link with these issues in order to tap into new funding that may be available.
- JC Vié commented that in many parts of the network, but particularly in the Freshwater Fish work, the assessment team is basically **building the network** as the project rolls out. L Boitani agreed that sometimes this will happen, and the RLA could emerge out of an assessment project that could have been either taxonomically or geographically based. S Stuart agreed, saying that many of the global assessments are a good means of building the network, as building the network from scratch is very difficult. H Dublin noted that a slight mindset change is needed with regard to fundraising for large projects such as global assessments, to ensure that the funds cover the costs of the building the network – the costs at the bottom of the pyramid. G Mace noted that the GAA and GMA are not good models to show off the proposed redesign because a major purpose of the redesign is to enhance the ability of the network to support itself.
- G Mace noted that the **role of the partners** is important and needs further discussion. T Brooks agreed, saying that particularly the scientific and technical contributions of the partners should be discussed. L Boitani noted that the new structure will be open to

more partners and will hopefully remove the dependence on big organisations. Success will be dependant on bringing in partners at various levels. S Stuart noted that the incentives for such organisations need to be discussed at a later stage. G Mace stated that separating Red Listing from other conservation work will make it easier for academic institutions to become involved. Some partners may in future just want to provide assistance by taking on a role within a SG. She noted that we need many kinds of support - technical input, in kind support, funding, etc – so what is important is showing the potential partners that they can play any role in this important endeavour, not just in terms of providing funds. JC Vié noted that in some cases this is already happening, but in some parts of the world it is incredibly difficult to find partners. J Robinson noted that there should also be a move to involve other partners at different levels, even though this may not be through financial donations as it could be in-kind contributions through the staff of organisations becoming involved in the Red List process. T Brooks and R Mittermeier agreed. T Brooks also noted that the Red List Partnership Agreement is now inconsistent with the redesign and this issue needs attention.

- T Brooks asked for further clarity on the exact **role of the SP staff** in the redesign. L Boitani answered that in an ideal world, the SP should not be doing the major scientific work (assessments and evaluations) – but this is a tension that will have to be dealt with gradually. J Robinson noted that the redesign shifts the responsibility for the science from the staff to the network, but asks the staff to provide the assistance the network needs to deliver the Red List. He noted that this is a usual shift in projects – where capacity building will eventually lead to a shift in the initiator’s role. J Smart agreed, but said that the staff role should not be seen as merely supporting, as they have many years of technical and scientific expertise. S Stuart expressed disagreement with the notion that the SP staff need not have scientific capacity, and noted that the staff will still require technical and scientific knowledge for consistency checking and many other tasks.
- D Leaman stated that it was not clear or persuasive in the current documentation how the redesign will address the capacity and funding needs for the **neglected taxa**. H Dublin noted many fundraising and support efforts of the SP are towards supporting the neglected taxa. L Boitani suggested that the neglected taxa may have to be addressed through a regional focus, as the global assessment method may not be feasible in future and in fact was an exception in SSC history. In the absence of a donor to support a global assessment, the neglected taxa may be supported through other means in this redesign – like using the plants for people idea to prioritise and fundraise.
- C Campagna noted that the information on the status of many marine fish species is often owned by governments. If the governments are not partners, there might be open resistance to us trying to evaluate the species. How does SSC therefore **incorporate governments** as partners in the Red List process? H Dublin agreed, saying that the Shark SG has been through a process wherein at first their position was quite contrary to the governments they were dealing with, but now they are even approached by governments for advice. She noted that this is a good example of how perseverance through partnership can lead to two parties eventually coming to mutual understanding, even if from opposing sides. She then agreed with C Campagna’s sentiments and said that this is another reason it is vital that the governments are assured of the independence of the assessments and evaluations, and are involved in the process as and where relevant.

P McLagan commented that the debate was rich. She reminded the SC that the structure itself cannot carry the changes. She noted that the dialogue will continue for many SC meetings, and the structure will strengthen over time. R Kock commented that it was now imperative to think about the messages conveyed at the SG Chairs’ Meeting and make sure that the spirit was really positive, as it would be easy for the delegates to become side-tracked and critical. M Clout stated that it should be stressed that this redesign is empowering the conservation action side of the SGs. There was general consensus that the

SC was in support of the redesign, with the caveat that the role of the Red List partners in future would need to be discussed further.

DECISION: The SC supports the basic premise of the redesign – that it moves towards strengthening the assessment and evaluation processes and bringing the core functions firmly back into the network; that it enables greater conservation action; and that it will encourage a gradual move towards a stronger funding model. Implementing the process around the redesign cannot be immediate but will take place over the next few years.

7.4 Chairs' Meeting Preparation and De-brief

On late Sunday morning, 10 February 2008, the SC were joined by the SP staff members who had travelled to Al Ain to take part in the SSC SG Chairs' Meeting. H Dublin welcomed them and then briefly explained the rationale of the SG Chairs' Meeting, and introduced the film crew who were attending the meeting to prepare a short film to be shown at the Barcelona WCC to celebrate the SSC. H Dublin explained that most of the SC members had been given specific roles at the meeting. She also noted that there was not a great deal of leeway in the agenda as the agenda was designed to involve the SG Chairs as much as possible through table discussions, panels, question and answer sessions, etc. She also noted that the tea and lunch breaks were as long as possible to allow for informal networking. F Launay then provided a background to the Monday afternoon session on conservation in the UAE, and a briefing for the Gala Dinner on the Monday evening.

The SC meeting then ended for the day and was reconvened on Friday 15 February 2008, when the SC members and a few SP staff members gathered to review the SG Chairs' Meeting.

Second sitting of the SSC Steering Committee, WCC3.7 FRIDAY, 15 February 2008

General Feedback

H Dublin initially called for each person present to give their initial impressions of the meeting. The initial impressions can be summarised as follows:

Positive impressions:

- Congratulations to H Dublin and the meeting team for making the meeting happen, to F Launay for the resources to make it happen and for the extra functions and gifts to all delegates.
- The meeting should become a regular feature – possibly once per Quadrennium.
- It was an amazing group of people and demonstrated the diversity of approaches to conservation, and the incredible leadership skills available in the SSC.
- It created great enthusiasm for a Species Congress, and a unanimous agreement was reached that this would be worthwhile.
- There was excellent participation by the IUCN DG – who spent three whole days with the SSC. She now clearly understands the need for more resources.
- The buzz of the meeting was fantastic, and the SP feels excited about its role and is looking forward to following up with the other SP staff, the Regional Directors and other Thematic Programme representatives who were not present at the meeting.
- The SSC Chair's Office and the SP team worked very well together and there was good feedback about the network support.
- It was wonderful to finally meet people after merely corresponding with them by email for years.
- Although the SG Chairs may not easily accept being told what to do, they definitely perceived the value of joining forces for conservation.
- It was excellent to have more personal interactions with the SP staff.

- SSC is now on the cusp of great things. It was interesting that the outcome of the meeting could not be predicted, but what happened was very positive and it is now clear that a better process is required to reach formal common understanding.
- There are great people in the SSC network and the SSC needs to promote them.
- Many SG Chairs finally saw the connection with IUCN, and understood that they are not operating entirely on their own. They now feel that there are 120 SGs moving in one direction, with a programme and expectations. They understood the advantage of working collectively. SSC needs to build on this natural aggregation.
- Conversations are so important, and by the end of the week the delegates felt that they were part of the conversation. They started to self-aggregate to talk about how to join forces to address the common objectives for conservation. There were different opinions about what IUCN is, and the meeting helped in a major way to make it clearer, although it is perhaps not yet clear enough to everyone.
- The programmatic development at the meeting was excellent – such as showcasing the Red List and conservation planning. There was a large amount of information shared.
- The SSC was in the early stages of network formation before the meeting. Previously it was like a gaggle of groups with something in common, but it is now moving to the next stage of true network development.
- If it was not the redesign that caused some anxiety, it would have been something else. Human nature makes it inevitable that there is some kind of clash and then a coming together – it was excellent that this was allowed to happen. It is now the responsibility of the collective to make things happen.
- The word fun appears in many of the feedback forms, and many of the delegates commented on what an interesting meeting it had been.
- People mentioned how good it was to meet people outside their usual sphere – particularly the Disciplinary Groups and those Chairs outside their own taxonomic umbrellas.
- It was excellent to have the Chairs involved in presenting, and people wanted more such opportunities. The table discussions were an excellent way of bringing something personal back to plenary sessions.

Other impressions / issues needing more thought or follow-up:

- There is concern that the SSC is not seen as fundamental to the conservation world. There should be focus on getting the messages out about species being important.
- SSC needs to become better at “jumping on bandwagons” – e.g. use the climate change bandwagon. The SSC Chair should be used as a face for fundraising.
- IUCN needs to become better at garnering support for the Commissions in terms of finance so as not to bias against Commission Chairs from developing countries. The debate about support for full-time Chairs of the Commissions is currently ongoing. IUCN needs to become better at fundraising, but in the mean time, the SSC Chair and SC need to make better use of their current partners to raise money for the Commission.
- There is still a certain lack of clarity within the SSC network about the IUCN structure, about what IUCN is, and the fact that being a Commission member does not make one an IUCN Member.
- We may have raised some expectations about direct contact with the regions, so we need to ensure that we support this process going forward.
- SSC needs more big partners – such as WWF and TNC.
- There were some silent voices at the meeting and a mechanism is needed to hear these people. Language was a barrier in some cases, but in others it was just a matter of not wanting to speak up in plenary.
- There is a challenge for the leadership of the SSC in that it became clear at the meeting that the Chairs want a bottom-up approach, and yet they also want centralised thinking, leadership and a backbone. The SC needs to have a stronger discourse on how to lead the organisation, and then show a unified perspective.

There was a tendency for the SC members to not stand firm enough – as though voluntarism gives people the right to change their minds, or more of a right to be influenced by what others say.

- IUCN is supposedly good at consultation, but has not proven this. A mechanism of consultation with the SG Chairs in future needs to be discussed – e.g. each SC member is assigned 15 Chairs to talk to on a regular basis.
- IUCN is completely dysfunctional and is impairing SSC's ability to gather larger support. It takes too long to try and explain who IUCN is, and when one does, it is almost as though one is talking about a different organisation. It is important for SSC to look to outsiders to tell the Commission what it is doing or how it appears and how it is performing, as outsiders have a different perspective.
- The disconnect between the SGs and the SSC and the IUCN was easy to see. The Chairs felt that no-one should tell them what to do, as they have evolved their own best practices over the years in order to do what they want to do.
- There is a fundamental tension between what IUCN thinks it is (answering to donors, governments, etc) and what most of SSC thinks it is (a community of conservationists within an umbrella organisation). A conversation should be started about this issue.
- The underlying response in the plant network early on in the meeting was that if SSC did not see a SG as a priority, then it was simply dissolved, and people were angry about that. But by the close of the meeting, there was a complete change and people felt more part of a cohesive group and agreed that they needed to be part of everything.
- The SSC is more relevant to IUCN than ever before, but somehow the leadership of the SSC (the SC) appears to have left the network behind in some ways. This meeting shifted the way the SC thinks about its own internal processes and its efforts to engage the network. The matter of speaking for the SG Chairs and ensuring that we engage them in processes has been neglected.
- There is a huge inertia built into IUCN – so that even small incremental changes tend not to happen (such as moving away from being an implementing agency). This may be a leadership issue.
- There was not a strong connection between the SSC and the non-SSC delegates. We need more linkages with the other Commissions and Regional Offices.
- Though it was not possible to accomplish everything for everyone, it was felt that the meeting perhaps neglected the SSC members (those who are not Chairs of SGs) a bit. Perhaps there is some way to link SSC members in a region.

Plant Issues Feedback from SG Chairs' Meeting

D Leaman explained that the plant network had a private meeting on one evening of the SG Chairs' Meeting. She said she had made a commitment to them to bring their feedback on the redesign to the SC. She presented a document to the SC, which she said was an effort from the plant SGs to let the SC know that they are not in crisis, but they are concerned about certain things – particularly their representation on the SC (because it is hard for just one person to tackle all the plant issues). Another suggestion was that in future the PCSC should be re-constituted to include more plant SG Chairs. D Leaman noted that in the smaller plant meeting, there was less of a language barrier as all present felt free to participate.

She cautioned that the revisiting of Criterion A was tricky from the plant perspective as it would basically make many assessments obsolete and thousands of assessments would have to be revisited. J Smart noted that if the documentation requirements are to be adhered to, then the assessment process is very onerous for the plant network. H Dublin agreed, saying that in future BASC may need to have more discussion around the issues posed by the assessments for speciose groups.

On behalf of the SC, H Dublin thanked D Leaman profusely for stepping in at the last minute to participate and engage on these important matters.

Feedback from WI/SSC Joint Groups Meeting

H Dublin shared details of her earlier exchanges with the WI CEO, J Madgwick, saying that J Madgwick had expressed concern about the level of recognition given WI for their contribution to the Red List. She also spoke of wanting an MOU between IUCN and WI. H Dublin explained that while we should be willing to discuss an MOU, it was important to first determine what such an MOU would cover. To gain insights to this end, H Dublin explained that a small meeting had been held with all the joint SSC/WI SG Chairs who were able to attend the meeting in Al Ain. W Hagemeyer of WI was also at the meeting.

She then explained that at this small meeting of the joint WI/SSC SG Chairs present at the SG Chairs' Meeting, it became clear that the SGs felt that they had two main roles in data provision – the waterbird population counts that they supply to WI and the data they supply to IUCN SSC (via BirdLife) for the purposes of Red List assessments. The SGs themselves said that their primary focus was on conservation action and that they felt a strong affinity to the directions which SSC had laid out in Al Ain regarding a renewed emphasis on conservation action within the Commission. In the meeting and in side conversations, the Chairs expressed their general comfort with the thought that they could be able to choose where to affiliate – with WI, with SSC or with both; each SG probably having different considerations to take into account for institutional or historical reasons. They also acknowledged that the groups themselves are not structured in a totally rational manner and that they duplicate efforts over some species.

JC Vié noted that the relationship with WI goes beyond SGs, as IUCN contracted WI to do the entire project on freshwater biodiversity in West Africa, and that arrangement works reasonably well. He noted that difficulties are primarily on the joint SGs and network support side. H Dublin concluded the discussion by saying that input from the SC on the way forward would be most welcome. She noted that she would be following up with J Madgwick as agreed in their last conversation. Finally, she said that she was confident that the SGs involved would to some extent work out their own ways forward in terms of their affiliation to WI and/or SSC.

Feedback on the SSC Redesign

There was a frank discussion about the proposed SSC redesign with regard to the feedback received during the SG Chairs' Meeting. The SC gave feedback to the Restructuring TF and the TF agreed to consider all feedback when doing the next draft of the redesign documentation. There was agreement that a document should be ready by the WCC, to leave a legacy for the next Quadrennium, but that it was also important to recognise that this is just part of a longer process – providing a vision and some recommendations for the way forward. When the SGs are formed in the new Quadrennium, they should form with the new model in mind. This may lead to increased variability for a time within the Commission, but this transition phase needs to occur.

DECISIONS:

The principles of the redesign were agreed as follows:

- The rationale for the redesign should be clarified and strengthened
- It should be emphasised that the redesign should enhance conservation impact
- There is a distinction of functions between Red Listing activities and other conservation activities
- Capacity should be increased within the network for both functions
- In Red Listing, the assessment and evaluation functions must be separated
- The redesign will be done throughout the SSC network and with partners – old and new
- The final document should be ready before July 2008 and the new framework can be presented in Barcelona as a vision and recommendations for a way forward.

ACTIONS:

- H Dublin to establish a timeline for delivery of next steps in the redesign process, including:
 - o L Boitani to prepare next draft of document and circulate it to the RTF, SC and then to the group of five Chairs who volunteered to comment on the redesign.
 - o Following receipt and integration of input, a near-final version will be circulated to all SG Chairs for comment.
 - o The final document should be ready before July and the new framework can be presented in Barcelona as a vision and recommendations for a way forward.
- BASC to suggest how the continued concerns regarding Criterion A can be addressed.
- All SC members are to send three statements about the rationale for the redesign and comment on particular strengths and weaknesses for follow-up by the RTF.

H Dublin thanked the SC for the really useful discussion and requested that feedback be sent to the Restructuring TF via individual emails.

She then concluded the feedback from the SG Chairs' Meeting by saying that the recording at the meeting of action items and highlights would be followed up and a report of the meeting drafted.

8. SSC SUCCESS STORIES

The SC agreed that the SG Chairs' Meeting is the SSC's most important success story in recent years.

9. TIMING OF FINAL STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING OF QUADRENNIUM

The last SC meeting of the Quadrennium will be at the WCC4 in Barcelona – possibly on Saturday 4 October 2008.

10. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

Y Sadovy noted that she had an opportunity to speak with W Jackson during the SG Chairs' Meeting regarding the issue of indemnity for assessors of commercially valuable species. She stated that he now better understands the issue and she hopes progress will be made.

C Thouless noted that the proposal for the Species Congress was unanimously accepted and to improve CoReg as a place to register the basic fields of expertise was also paramount. H Dublin agreed, and asked JC Vié to put forward some suggestions on expertise categories. She also said that R Mittermeier, J Smart and herself would continue to reinforce how essential CoReg is.

ACTIONS:

- JC Vié to put forward some suggestions on categories of expertise for CoReg.
- H Dublin, J Smart and R Mittermeier to re-emphasise to IUCN Council the need to reallocate resources and leadership to CoReg.

H Dublin briefly explained that IUCN has signed a high-level agreement with Shell. An idea for an internal steering committee has been tabled – consisting of four senior people from Shell and four from IUCN. H Dublin explained that W Jackson has asked her to be on this steering committee, which is meant to guide what IUCN and Shell do together. She asked the SC members for their comments on this proposal, they gave their candid advice and she agreed to have further discussions with the relevant people in the IUCN Secretariat.

H Dublin thanked everyone for their comments and input during the whole week. The meeting closed at 16:30 on Friday 15 February 2008.

SSC SC Meeting WCC3.7 – MINUTES