

SSC STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING WCC 3.1

Meeting of the 2005-2008 SSC Steering Committee
Rolle, Switzerland, 5th-7th June 2005

Minutes

Present

Steering Committee Members: Dr Leon Bennun, Prof Luigi Boitani, Dr Thomas Brooks, Dr Claudio Campagna, Prof Mick Clout, Dr Jon Hutton, Mr Richard Kock, Dr Robert Lacy, Dr Frederick Launay, Dr Russ Mittermeier, Mr Rohan Pethiyagoda and Prof Michael Samways.

SSC staff: Dr Holly Dublin (SSC Chair), Dr Amy Spriggs

Species Programme staff: Dr Jane Smart, Dr Jean-Christophe Vié

Invited: Dr Yvonne Sadovy

Apologies

Dr Christoph Imboden, Dr Georgina Mace, Dr Mike Maunder, Dr Juan Rada and Dr John Robinson.

Acronyms used in this report

BL	BirdLife International
CAMP	Conservation Assessment and Management Plan
CI	Conservation International
ISSG	Invasive Species Specialist Group
RWPS	Range-Wide Priority Setting
RL	Red List
RLA	Red List Authority
RLI	Red List Index
SC	Steering Committee
SIS	Species Information Service
SG	SSC Specialist Group
SUSG	Sustainable Use Specialist Group
TF	Task Force
TOR	Terms-of-Reference
WCC	World Conservation Congress
WCS	Wildlife Conservation Society
WWF	World Wide Fund for Nature
ZSL	Zoological Society of London

Summary of key decisions and action items from the meeting

Decisions taken by the SSC Steering Committee

- The SSC By-Laws were approved with the final membership categories to be finalised by the SSC Chair's Office
- The Steering Committee Terms-of-Reference were adopted by the SC
- The following roles for individual SC members were agreed upon by the SC:
 1. Tom Brooks: To oversee SSC's work on biodiversity assessments
 2. Leon Bennun: To represent bird conservation issues
 3. Luigi Boitani: To provide advice on SSC network management, restructuring and governance
 4. Claudio Campagna and Yvonne Sadovy: To represent marine conservation and chair the Marine Conservation Sub-Committee
 5. Mick Clout: To represent alien invasive species issues
 6. Jon Hutton: To represent issues related to sustainable use
 7. Richard Kock: To represent veterinary and animal health issues
 8. Bob Lacy: To represent SSC's linkages with zoos, aquaria and the conservation breeding community
 9. Fred Launay: To represent re-introduction issues
 10. Georgina Mace: To oversee SSC's work on biodiversity indicators
 11. Mike Maunder: To represent plant conservation issues and chair the Plant Conservation Sub-Committee
 12. Russ Mittermeier: To assist in strategic packaging, marketing and fundraising and to contribute reptile conservation expertise
 13. Michael Samways: To represent invertebrate conservation issues and chair the Invertebrate Conservation Sub-Committee
 14. Rohan Pethiyagoda: Deputy Chair of the SSC
- The SC approved the SG/TF Chair ToR and Craig Hilton-Taylor is to make any necessary changes to the "Substantive Programmatic Contributions" section
- SGs will be asked to coordinate with the relevant Species Programme staff and/or the SSC Chair's Office approaches to prospective donors for projects over USD 100 000
- The SSC SG Restructuring TF needs to pay special attention to the overall handling of birds in the SSC
- The Sustainable Use SG is a single SG with Jon Hutton as Chair. The Group should have a regional structure that is in line with the structure of most of the other disciplinary SGs
- All proposed SG Chair renewals agreed by the SC
- All proposed new SG Chair appointments agreed by the SC
- All SGs proposed for dissolution are to be dissolved; the North Eurasian Invertebrate SG is under discussion

- As proposed, the Australasian Plant, Bamboo, Bulb and Pteridophyte SGs are to be dissolved until feasible to reinstate
- As proposed, the Arctic Plant and Crop Wild Relative SGs are to be formed
- As proposed, the Japanese Plant, East Africa Plant, European Plant, Legume and North American Plant SGs are to be changed to RLAs
- As proposed, the Central African Plant and New Zealand Plant RLAs are to be created
- The Climate Change TF is to be rejuvenated
- The Large Carnivore Initiative for Europe TF is to be changed to a “Working Group”
- The Asian Vulture TF is to be formed and have a higher-level IUCN lead
- The SSC Restructuring TF comprises Luigi Boitani, Mark Stanley Price, Perran Ross, Mick Clout, Jane Smart and Holly Dublin. Luigi Boitani will Chair the TF
- A Communications TF to be set up to evaluate and improve both SSC’s internal and external communications capacity. The Task Force comprises Rohan Pethiyagoda, Jon Hutton, Jane Smart, the Species Programme communications staff and the SSC Chair’s assistant
- Aim to hold a SG Chairs’ meeting in 2006/2007 with a view to convening a Species Congress in the next quadrennium
- If a Species Congress is agreed, it should link in with achievement of the CBD 2010 targets to provide a vision beyond 2010
- The SSC takes no stance on whaling and asks Justin Cooke of the Cetacean SG to monitor the situation

Action items

ACTION	WHO
Circulate minutes of this meeting prior to posting on the website	SSC Chair Office
Provide outcomes of the Red List meetings to SC Members	J Smart
Discuss archiving with Zenda Ofir	J Smart JC Vié
Ask John Burton to locate and determine the extent of the SSC Chair documents and to advise on setting up the SSC Chair’s office for archiving in the future	H Dublin

ACTION	WHO
Bring the conflict in the number of objectives in the SSC Mandate and Strategic plan to the attention of the Programme and Policy Committee.	H Dublin R Mittermeier
Incorporate L Bennun's comments into the By-laws	SSC Chair Office
Find addresses and CVs of all Members Emeritus	SSC Chair Office
Add a clause to the SSC By-laws stating that Members Emeritus may not speak on behalf of the SSC or IUCN and that their appointment is automatically carried forward each quadrennium	SSC Chair Office
Post Members Emeritus list on the website	SSC Chair Office
Inform Members Emeritus that the category is for life and that they cannot speak on behalf of the SSC or IUCN	SSC Chair Office
Look at the IUCN Statutes with regards inviting non-members to attend the WCC and then take a decision on the "Advisory members" category	H Dublin
Identify someone for the SSC SC to fill the freshwater gap	R Pethiyagoda H Dublin
Facilitate monthly media releases on key issues	R Pethiyagoda Communications TF
Incorporate suggested changes into SG/TF Chair's ToR	SSC Chair Office
Ask Craig Hilton-Taylor to look over the "Substantive Programmatic Contributions" section of the SG/TF Chair's ToR and incorporate any suggested changes	SSC Chair Office
Post IUCN Programme onto the new SG Chair's website	Species Programme
Try to have the SG/TF Chair's ToR translated into 3 languages	SSC Chair Office Species Programme
Incorporate suggested changes into Guidelines & Advice document	SSC Chair Office
Ask Craig Hilton-Taylor to ensure consistency between the "Contributions to Assessments and Indicators" section of the Guidelines and the SG/TF Chair's ToR	SSC Chair Office
Incorporate suggested changes into Fundraising Advice document	SSC Chair Office
Incorporate text on "facilitation versus implementation" under "Managing Money" in the Guidelines document and in the Fundraising Advice document	H Dublin
Provide text on the importance of integrity of SG Chairs under "Managing Money" in the Guidelines document	R Kock
Decide on a focal point for the Caribbean Island Plant RLA	M Maunder

ACTION	WHO
Liaise with Species Programme staff on the pending mammal SGs and report back to the SSC Chair with recommendations	J Smart
Provide feedback on the activities of the Declining Amphibian Populations TF	R Pethiyagoda
Discuss the activity of the Declining Pollination TF with its Chair, Dr Kevan	M Samways
Work on realistic ToR and deliverables for the CCTF	J Smart JC Vié
Write to Achim informing him of the need for higher-level IUCN input on the Asian Vulture issue	J Smart
Develop a fundraising strategy to be presented at the next SC meeting	J Smart
Send Saiga letter to Achim for approval and joint signing	H Dublin
Explore possibilities for an official letter of invitation to zoo community requesting action on amphibian conservation	H Dublin R Pethiyagoda
Ask SG/TF Chairs to send regular updates and stories	Communications TF
Approach members for additional stories	R Pethiyagoda
Form links between the Invertebrate Conservation and the Assessments and Indicators Sub-Committee	M Samways
Form links between the Plant Conservation and the Assessments and Indicators Sub-Committee	J Smart M Maunder
Tackle internal and external communications of the SSC	Communications TF
Propose venue (Cape Town, Argentina or Madagascar) and dates (early December) for next SC meeting as soon as possible	SSC Chair Office

1. Welcome, Introduction and Update

Holly Dublin welcomed everyone to the first SC meeting of the WCC 2005-2008 intersessional period and noted apologies from Dr Christoph Imboden, Dr Georgina Mace, Dr Mike Maunder, Dr Juan Rada and Dr John Robinson who were unable to attend the meeting. She invited each member of the meeting to introduce themselves and brief introductions followed.

1.1 SSC Chair's Update

H Dublin then provided an update of her activities to date as Chair of the SSC. The update covered the following points:

1. The **SSC Chair's Office**, which has been established at the SA National Biodiversity Institute (SANBI) located at the Kirstenbosch Botanical Gardens in Cape Town;
2. The last **IUCN Council** meeting, which focused on issues such as branding, the appointment of Vice-presidents, recommendations for nominated councillors, the approval of Commission Deputy Chairs and SC members, the establishment of Working Committees (H Dublin was placed on the Program and Policy Committee) and prioritising the WCC3 Resolutions. The meeting also covered IUCN's approach to the Tsunami follow-up and the IUCN SSC collaboration on the gray whale and Sakhalin Energy situation;
3. The **principles** that will guide her chairing of the SSC, as follows:
 - LISTENING to and RECOGNISING the constituency – being in touch with real people, real issues and real or perceived needs
 - UNDERSTANDING, articulating and communicating the big picture vis-à-vis global biodiversity loss
 - Being VISIONARY and far-sighted, anticipating new issues and tracking those which emerge
 - HELPING SSC continue to produce “global gold standards” in terms of our tools and products
 - MAXIMIZING leverage within available or limited, new resources
 - HELPING IUCN, through the SSC, to play the role of convenor, facilitator, mediator or catalyst for action, as and where appropriate
 - SEARCHING out and engaging in processes that affect change
 - MAKING the business case for conservation, where possible and without compromise
 - NURTURING a new generation of biodiversity conservation leaders
 - ENSURING the work and interpersonal interactions within the SSC are, open, collegial and always constructive
4. The new **SSC SC**, which is streamlined and has met with the approval of Council. H Dublin noted that there is no SSC EXCO at present, but that changes can be made to the configuration at a later date if necessary. She thanked R Pethiyagoda for accepting the position of Deputy-Chair of the SSC and noted that his role is particularly important as Council has made changes in the Statutes to allow Chairs to Deputise work;
5. Revision of the SC and the Specialist Group Chair **Terms-of-Reference**, drafting of a “SG/TF Chair's Operational Guidelines and Advice” document and a Fund-raising Summary and the construction of a SG Chair's web-site;
6. The Chair and the Species Programme staff have assessed SGs in order to appoint Chairs for the quadrennium. Minor adjustments to the SG structure

have been made to date. H Dublin intends to make more changes if necessary, taking advantage of early opportunities to consolidate and reform the Commission structure to move towards the “single programme” delivery and SSC mandate from Bangkok. The Statutes allow the SSC Chair to make changes within the 4 year intersessional period;

7. **Assessments and Indicators work**, drawing attention to the internal IUCN and external (with Red List partners BL, CI and NatureServe) meetings to follow the SC meeting. The meetings will revisit the Red List Partnership in light of the recent review, examine the larger context of biodiversity assessments and indicators, discuss the further development of SIS and consider RESWCC3.013: *The Uses of the IUCN Red List of Threatened Species*;
8. **Species-specific** issues, which the SSC office receives many requests to deal with. H Dublin provided background to the northern white rhino, South Asian vulture, Saiga antelope, Sudano-Sahelian antelope, Tasmanian devil, African lion and Asian elephant situations;
9. **Day to day SSC office** matters, which include liaising with JC Vié and more recently with J Smart, liaising with the other Commission Chairs and focal points (there has been substantial progress with the Chair of the World Commission on Protected Areas), extensive correspondences with some SG Chairs and members and addressing donor needs and managing funds.
10. **Recent events**, such as helping prioritise and implement relevant WCC3 resolutions, launching the South African Reptile Conservation Assessment, moderating Human-Wildlife Conflict discussions, attending the Southern African Sustainable Use SG meeting, addressing the IUCN South Africa National Committee and facilitating and providing technical backstopping to the Southern Africa Region Elephant Management Strategy Workshop in preparations for a Ministerial Dialogue
11. **Upcoming events**, such as NatureServe’s institutional strategic planning, initiating ideas for improved work with the global zoo community and convening a Task Force on SSC structure to optimise the delivery of the Commission against the mandate.

J Hutton asked what the relationship between the SSC and the Species Programme is, specifically in terms of ownership of the Red List. H Dublin answered that there is a line, but that it is difficult to define. What is important is how H Dublin and J Smart work together. On the Red List, this is something that requires clarification. The senior management of IUCN feel that the Red List belongs to IUCN.

R Kock pointed out that many SSC members do not really understand what the IUCN is about and that a stronger link needs to be created with the members in order to implement high-level ideas. C Campagna felt that people need to be brought in to solve both external and internal communication problems. H Dublin said that the IUCN is working on this within the organisation and that this feeds into the SSC.

1.2 Species Programme Update

J Smart reported on the Species Programme. She began by outlining the structure of the staff, who are situated in three offices (Gland, Cambridge and Washington) and are to be reviewed and restructured to more effectively deliver on the SSC’s purpose and vision. JC Vié added that the Cambridge office deals with the Wildlife

Trade Programme, the Red List and the Freshwater Biodiversity Assessment, the Washington office deals with biodiversity assessments and the Gland office contains the plant, animal and communication officers, the Species Information Service manager, the support staff and the Head and Deputy Coordinator.

J Smart provided brief updates on the **SIS database** and the **Wildlife Trade Programme**. A review of the SIS user needs has been funded by the Gordon and Betty Moore Foundation and interviews for the SIS Manager position will take place this month. The Wildlife Trade Programme has links to both TRAFFIC and CITES and an agreement has been signed to ensure that TRAFFIC remains part of IUCN and WWF.

JC Vié provided an overview of the biodiversity assessments, which relate to Objective 1 of the SSC Mandate and are taking up much of the Species Programme's time. He discussed the Red List Index and the Sampled Red List Index, which is now underway. He explained that **CAMP** (Conservation Assessment and Management Plans) is linked to the **Red List** but the two processes need to be better integrated, while maintaining their strengths. He observed that the regional assessments are moving forward, with a recent meeting in Malaga for the Mediterranean Assessment and a grant awarded for a Pan African Freshwater Assessment. The Plant assessments are about to start in six countries through a GEF project to address Targets 2 and 5 of Global Plant Conservation Strategy of CBD, and will extend coverage of the Red List.

T Brooks stated that, with regard to JC Vié giving one objective priority, it is important to see all the objectives as equal, as they were all agreed upon. H Dublin replied that the objectives delivered on depend on fundraising, but it is important to bear this in mind and work towards all objectives, which involves raising awareness of the mandate and its objectives.

J Hutton asked whether CAMP focuses on species that benefit from *ex-situ* conservation or whether they were more general, as he feels that if they are focused on conservation breeding (*ex situ*) then there is no problem. R Lacy answered that CAMP was originally focused on species that benefit from *ex situ* conservation, but have evolved beyond that and beyond the role of the CBSG. For now, they are directed towards where the invitations are more than species needs. He feels that this is a good time to evaluate where the CAMP process is going. R Pethiyagoda noted that the same people are involved in CAMP and the Red Listing process and that it should therefore not be difficult to build complementarities.

JC Vié noted that fundraising is a major problem and hopes that this year less resources will be consumed by major congresses and conferences. He stated that, in response to the volunteerism study, work has begun with the Peter Scott Small-Grant Fund to support members in the network.

J Smart informed the SC that Zenda Ofir has been hired on a two year contract to look at knowledge management. The IUCN's "Influencing Strategy", which was developed by external professionals over the last four years, is now in place and links in with knowledge management.

J Hutton requested that, in order to make meaningful inputs, the SC should be updated on the structure, governance and state of the Species Programme at the

beginning of each meeting. H Dublin answered that this is planned for the next meeting, but as J Smart is new, it could not be done for this meeting.

2. Adoption of the Meeting Agenda

H Dublin requested that any suggestions to change the meeting Agenda be brought forward. J Hutton requested a discussion on "Making the SSC relevant". T Brooks asked how the species-specific conservation issues under Agenda Item 7 were chosen. H Dublin answered that the selection is demand driven, but that it is open for discussion. J Hutton added that general issues, rather than species-specific issues, should be discussed. Y Sadovy requested that sustainable use be discussed under Agenda Item 7. H Dublin responded that this should come out of the discussion on "Making the message relevant". H Dublin stated that "CAMP" was to be added under Agenda Item 8.3 and "Making the message relevant" under Agenda Item 9. H Dublin adopted the meeting Agenda.

3. Adoption of the Minutes of the November 2004 SC and EXCO Meetings in Bangkok (WCC 2.7)

R Lacy asked how the minutes of the meeting were distributed and H Dublin responded saying they were posted on the website. She asked for comments on how this meeting should be minuted. R Pethiyagoda stated that dissents should also be recorded and T Brooks requested that the SC see the minutes before they are posted on the website. There were no further comments and the minutes of the 2004 meetings in Bangkok were adopted.

Action	Circulate minutes of this meeting prior to posting on the website	SSC Chair Office
--------	---	------------------

4. Matters Arising

H Dublin spoke on the action points from the Bangkok meetings. The "Review of the Implementation of the Red List Programme Agreement" has been completed; comments were received and incorporated into a final draft. The executive summary is included in the meeting pack and the whole document is available on request. The follow on action point was to invite the senior management of consortium partners to a strategic planning workshop to consider the results of the review and chart a way forward. This meeting is happening in the week following this meeting. H Dublin asked for comments from those not participating in the meeting next week. J Hutton suggested that a good strategy would be to outsource work so that the issues of ownership are clear, while the work is carried out by those who have the time to do it. H Dublin replied that different models will be explored. The outcomes of the meeting will be provided to SC members. There were no further comments.

H Dublin went on to discuss the archiving of SSC documents. John Burton, a conservation professional and archivist, offered to archive the papers of the SSC.

John Burton’s vision was to archive the SSC papers down to the SG Chair level, but it was agreed at the Bangkok meeting to archive to the level of SSC Chair. The papers of the first chair are with R Mittermeier. H Dublin asked for comments on the way forward.

T Brooks felt that archiving competes with other needs for resources and time and asked whether Zenda Ofir, who is employed to do knowledge management, could deal with the issue of archiving. He also said that we should consider document management now for the future. H Dublin agreed that J Burton should advise the SSC Chair’s office on archiving for the future. T Brooks said that current and future documents should be stored electronically. JC Vié remarked that space is limited at HQ and so a decision needs to be taken on what to keep. J Hutton and M Samways put forward that archiving is not a priority and that efforts should rather be concentrated on species extinctions. M Samways suggested that the boxes of information be stored in the new IUCN building for archiving at a later date. H Dublin replied that the information had not yet been gathered and M Samways said that the location of information should be put on record and the information left where it is. JC Vié agreed.

Actions	Provide outcomes of the Red List meetings to SC Members	J Smart
	Discuss archiving with Zenda Ofir	J Smart JC Vié
	Ask John Burton to locate and determine the extent of the SSC Chair documents and to advise on setting up the SSC Chair’s office for archiving in the future	H Dublin

5. SSC Governance Issues

5.1 Approval of the Revised SSC By-laws

H Dublin presented the current and revised SSC By-laws. The By-laws have been revised to bring them into alignment with the current SSC situation and an important change has been made with regards the categories of SSC Members. H Dublin asked for comments on the changes made.

M Samways asked whether all SSC Members have a copy of the SSC Strategic Plan and H Dublin replied that they have the SSC Mandate (in the By-laws), which is derived from the Strategic Plan. The Strategic Plan itself is available on the website. JC Vié asked whether the SSC should use the SSC Strategic Plan or the IUCN 2005-2008 Programme. H Dublin said that the SSC was ahead of IUCN on strategic planning and IUCN adopted the SSC’s vision and goal. As the SSC was instrumental in its development, its Strategic Plan fitted into the IUCN Programme and did not require review after the Programme was released. L Bennun felt that the SGs should use the SSC Strategic Plan, while the SSC governance should use the IUCN 2005-2008 Programme.

H Dublin pointed out that SGs resist packaging their work in terms of the SSC Strategic Plan's objectives, but that SG Chairs should be able to report on what objectives they are delivering on. F Launay agreed that objectives work well to focus SGs and that they give members a sense that they are contributing to a bigger picture. J Hutton felt that the objectives should not be imposed on members, but that they are important in tracking SSC progress. He pointed out that a new objective has been added to the SSC Mandate that is not in the Strategic Plan and asked whether the SGs must now change their objectives. H Dublin remarked that it is not clear where this additional objective came from and that the comments on this made at the April 2004 SSC EXCO meeting were apparently ignored. JC Vié added that the IUCN 2005-2008 Programme was accepted with only 3 objectives, and asked what the SSC is to accept. L Bennun recommended putting Objective 4 on ice, as the SSC Mandate does not have to be completed in the intersessional. H Dublin said that the SG Chairs should package their delivery against all 4 objectives. J Smart felt that there were overlaps between the objectives and that Objective 4 could be removed. R Lacy disagreed, saying that the objectives have different target audiences. R Kock suggested that to avoid confusion only 3 objectives should be given to the SG Chairs. H Dublin noted that there are even overlaps between the original 3 objectives, but that these were not important when looking at the deliverables. M Clout felt that it was better for SG Chairs to have the 3 objectives and that H Dublin can then package the deliverables as 4 if necessary. H Dublin stated that the 4 objectives must stay in the By-laws, as that contains the SSC Mandate, but 3 objectives can be sent in documents to the SG Chairs. J Hutton felt that it would be confusing for the SG Chairs to then see the 4 Objectives in the SSC By-laws. R Pethiyagoda stated that the conflict between the SSC Mandate and the IUCN 2005-2008 Programme needs to be brought to the attention of the Programme and Policy Committee. M Samways agreed and H Dublin said that it could be brought to Council for possible amendment. C Campagna asked whether delivery on the objectives is part of the SSC By-laws and H Dublin replied that it is, and that it is also an annual deliverable in the SG Chair ToR.

L Bennun provided structural and grammatical comments on the SSC By-laws.

H Dublin pointed out that the SSC Membership categories had been changed in the new By-laws. On investigation, it was found that there were no names on the "Roll of Honour" and that there seemed to be confusion between this and the "Members Emeritus" category. Members Emeritus are people who have served the SSC over a long period, for example an outgoing SG Chair. There is also a problem with Members Emeritus using their title to write on behalf of the SSC. J Hutton agreed that it may seem as if a Member Emeritus is writing on behalf of the SSC and suggested that the category be scrapped and "Roll of Honour" used instead. H Dublin pointed out that something given for life (Members Emeritus) cannot be scrapped. Y Sadovy suggested stating in the By-laws what a Member Emeritus can and can't do. L Bennun said that this was not necessary, as if you belong to a university for example, you don't speak on behalf of the university. He felt that the Members Emeritus should be scrapped and a different long-service award given that does not include the word "Member". C Campagna disagreed and said that these Members could be useful. T Brooks added that it is important who they are. He asked that a list of the current Members Emeritus be circulated and that the list be posted on the website.

J Hutton noted that the old By-laws say that the SSC Chair appoints the Members Emeritus, but doesn't state automatic re-appointment with each quadrennium, only

the Roll of Honour have automatic reappointment. R Lacy said that Members Emeritus is for life and H Dublin suggested adding “for life” to the Members Emeritus definition and qualifying that they do not speak on behalf of the SSC or IUCN. J Hutton agreed. H Dublin said that the Members Emeritus would each be informed that the category is for life and that they cannot speak on behalf of the SSC or IUCN.

H Dublin reported that the “Advisory Members” category had been removed because it was not objective and seemed to be a category for people who fall outside of SGs. M Samways said that it is a useful category for those who do not fit into specific SGs and C Campagna agreed that it is useful for those who are not part of SGs and for non-members who want to be invited to the WCC. H Dublin pointed out that a membership category cannot be created for people who want to attend the Congress as this would lead to a huge number of members, with implications for *Species* and other aspects of SSC. R Lacy said that the SSC should be allowed to invite advisors to the Congress, but that they should not become members. He suggested looking into the Statutes to find a method of inviting non-members to the Congress. J Hutton asked why it is necessary to restrict the number of SSC members, particularly as *Species* is now electronic. M Samways agreed, saying that there are so few members for invertebrates.

H Dublin suggested calling them “Associates” rather than “Advisors” and L Boitani suggested that they become “Ad-hoc Advisors” for one year. H Dublin did not want to have to administer that, but agreed to look at the Statutes to see what is allowable. She asked whether the SC would approve the By-laws without the final membership categories. The SSC office will get back to the SC on the categories. The SC agreed. R Pethiyagoda added that the time-scale of the appointment to a category should be included with the appointment letter.

Decision	The SSC By-Laws were approved with the final membership categories to be finalised by the SSC Chair’s Office	
Actions	Bring the conflict in the number of objectives in the SSC Mandate and Strategic plan to the attention of the Programme and Policy Committee.	H Dublin R Mittermeier
	Incorporate L Bennun’s comments into the By-laws	SSC Chair Office
	Find addresses and CVs of all Members Emeritus	SSC Chair Office
	Add a clause to the SSC By-laws stating that Members Emeritus may not speak on behalf of the SSC or IUCN and that their appointment is automatically carried forward each quadrennium	SSC Chair Office
	Post Members Emeritus list on the website	SSC Chair Office

	Inform Members Emeritus that the category is for life and that they cannot speak on behalf of the SSC or IUCN	SSC Chair Office
	Look at the IUCN Statutes with regards inviting non-members to attend the WCC and then take a decision on the “Advisory members” category	H Dublin

5.2 Adoption of the SC Terms-of-Reference

R Kock asked for a formal definition of the SSC SC. H Dublin referred him to the Statutes for the precise definition, but explained that the SC advises the SSC Chair, who then makes decisions. R Kock asked whether the SC carries a collective responsibility for decisions and H Dublin answered that the SC is advisory and the SSC Chair makes the final decisions and takes responsibility for them. J Hutton added that the SSC Chair holds authority, but that the SC holds a collective responsibility. He added that the SSC Chair needs to be able to make decisions without consulting the SC. H Dublin agreed saying that it is not always possible to reconcile different opinions within the SC.

L Bennun pointed out some typographical errors in the SC ToR.

Y Sadovy asked what was meant by Function 12 of the SC ToR: “Provide an internal forum for debating the role of the SSC in conservation and sustainable development within the IUCN.” H Dublin replied saying that there was previously limited engagement on what the role of the SSC should be. This Function encourages the SC to provide advice on this issue and on how to communicate that the SSC is about more than the protection of species. Y Sadovy asked whether this issue would be discussed later and H Dublin said that this Function was included in the SC ToR to allow this topic to be on future meeting agendas.

T Brooks asked whether SC Members have individual responsibilities and whether they are written. H Dublin replied that yes SC members have responsibilities formalised by each SC member’s acceptance by Council and that T Brooks’ responsibility is Assessments, but that SC Members will be more than focal points, they will be leaders. When resources are given to a SC Member by the SSC, a formal written agreement will need to be signed. There are no ToR for individual SC Members, but their roles will become clearer. J Hutton felt that Council may have been informed on why individual SC members were selected, but that the members have not. H Dublin suggested continuing the discussion after the individual SC Members’ presentations.

Decision	The Steering Committee Terms-of-Reference were adopted by the SC
----------	--

5.3 Individual Roles of SC Members

Tom Brooks (see background document “Assessments Sub-Committee Update” circulated prior to meeting)

T Brooks stated that his major responsibility is the Red List Assessments. He explained how Red Listing has a long history going back more than four decades and has shown four major evolutions over this time:

1. The development of quantitative criteria, with the Red List moving from depending on expert opinion to being based on available data.
2. The development of the Red List Consortium.
3. The development of supporting data associated with the species listed.
4. Progression of the Red List to a comparative assessment of entire taxa, not just threatened species.

He gave an overview of the Global Bird, Amphibian, Mammal and Freshwater Biodiversity Assessments and discussed the upcoming Global Reptile and Marine Species Assessments. He pointed out that invertebrate assessments need to be taken further and that the plant assessment has the strongest intergovernmental mandate through the global strategy for plant conservation. He provided estimates of the costs of assessing each taxonomic group, for example Birds (10 000 species) = US\$ 0.6 million (about \$60/species- re-assessment) and Amphibians (5,500 species) = US\$ 1.6 million (about \$290/species – first assessment). He added that these costs were within the abilities of intergovernmental and corporate investment.

He noted that the WCC3.013 resolution comprises four components, two of which require comprehensive global assessments - the development of indicators and the identification of key biodiversity areas as conservation targets.

T Brooks proposed that the Global Assessment challenges lie in deciding what collaborations are needed, in staffing the Red List office in order to tackle the large number of species moving onto the Red List, in creating a database that can handle spatial data and in highlighting the relevance and uses of the Red List.

Leon Bennun

L Bennun discussed how birds are the best documented taxonomic group in terms of the Red List. He added that BL is the Red List Authority for birds and acts in effect as an over-arching “SSC Bird Specialist Group”, as the SSC SGs only cover 10% of bird taxa. BL is a partnership of many NGOs working together. It updates the RL every 4 years and makes minor assessments annually. The Red List Index was developed using birds as a pilot taxonomic group.

Luigi Boitani

L Boitani explained that his role on the SC is to contribute to SSC governance. He will advise and support the restructuring process and provide advice on how to grow the SSC network of experts. H Dublin added that she asked L Boitani to help on governance because of his long history with and knowledge of the SSC.

Claudio Campagna and Yvonne Sadovy (see “Draft Marine Programme” on p.52 of the Meeting Pack)

C Campagna articulated that he and Y Sadovy represent marine biodiversity issues. He said that he and Y Sadovy met for the first time at this meeting and are thus still in the early planning stages, but that their proposed marine focus to date outlines a few funded initiatives that are easily translated into projects. He sees the following as important:

- To pay attention to what has already been covered.
- To promote awareness that marine areas are in trouble, due largely to over-fishing and over-exploitation.
- To consider trans-boundary issues and integrate efforts.
- To consider sustainable use issues
- To create new SGs to cover the gaps in marine conservation

Mick Clout (see background paper “Invasive Alien Species (IAS) as a cross cutting issue” on p.55 of the Meeting Pack)

M Clout elucidated how Invasive Alien Species (IAS) are a major threat for globally threatened birds, amphibians and freshwater fishes. He added that IAS are more than a species issue, as they link to protected areas and to livelihoods. He noted that IAS problems are similar around the world and thus require an international approach to their control.

He stated that he formed the Invasive Species Specialist Group (ISSG) 1994 and it has grown to become a globally active SG with 160 voluntary members in 40 countries and 8 staff members situated at the University of Auckland, New Zealand. The Group is funded through, among others US Voluntary Contribution, NZ Government and the US Geological Survey. ISSG’s major activities are mainstreaming and policy advice, networking and information exchange, and coordinating the Pacific Programme of the Cooperative Islands Initiative.

He asked how the ISSG could better assist SSC and improve contact with other SSC Specialist Groups, and how they should relate to the Global Invasive Species Programme. He said that the IUCN could continue to support the ISSG by, among other things, mainstreaming IAS issues into Commission and Programme activities and projects, assisting with ISSG fund raising, providing an SSC intern at the ISSG office and clarifying the relationship between ISSG and GISP.

Jon Hutton (see background paper by J Hutton circulated at the meeting)

J Hutton brought to the attention of the SC that the IUCN’s mission and Objectives 2 and 3 make reference to sustainable use, and that at WCC2 the IUCN adopted a Policy Statement on “Sustainable Use of Wild Living Resources”. He pointed out that the new ToR for SG/TF Chairs also make reference to sustainable use and require taxonomic SGs to include members with expert knowledge of the sustainable use of the species in their remit. He added that while much reference is made to sustainable use, the concept is not well understood or accepted by many of the Union’s members and that the IUCN is uncertain on how to deal with sustainable use and integrate it across Programmes and Commissions.

He put forward the roles and objectives of the SUSG over the next quadrennium as follows:

1. To improve our understanding of the social and biological factors that enhance the sustainability of uses of wild living resources;
2. To promote that understanding to IUCN's members, decision-makers, and others;
3. To assist IUCN members, partner organisations, and governments in the application of that understanding.

He said that the mechanisms for delivery are to establish links with other constituencies, expert networks and organisations and to engage with taxonomic SGs to exchange information and perspectives. He added that the SUSG were limited by a lack of financial and staff support.

He reported that the SUSG, which is based at FFI in Cambridge, currently has about 400 members and 15 Regional Groups. He outlined the Group's achievements, such as the CBD's formulation and adoption of the Addis Ababa Principles and Guidelines, a quantitative investigation of the different biological, social and economic factors that are thought to influence sustainable use and the development of Sustainable Use Indicators for the CBD's 2010 target.

J Hutton put forward the future needs of the SUSG, which include:

- Leadership from the Secretariat and concordance with the SSC;
- A dedicated IUCN Secretariat focal point;
- Coordinated IUCN inputs into key MEAs, notably the CBD and CITES;
- Resources for programme development;
- A dedicated Technical Assistant for the Specialist Group.

Richard Kock

R Kock reported to the SC that he represents the Veterinary Specialist Group (VSG), which has more than 150 members networked into 7 sub-regional groupings, each with a coordinator. He said that the VSG brings expertise from a wide range of sectors outside of the conservation field, and brings a realistic view to conservation issues.

He interacted with VSG members prior to the SC meeting to identify areas of priority on 6 themes: great apes, wildlife trade, disease, veterinary drugs, rangelands and carnivores. The VSG were in favour of supporting ongoing and new initiatives on great apes, of advising and promoting research on the causes of disease, of promoting good practices in the veterinary profession and pharmaceutical industry and of improving the epidemiological understanding of disease and ecosystem health and promoting the diversification of livelihoods. The VSG did not want to prioritise wildlife trade issues, but would support the activities of OIE and SSC.

R Kock outlined his role in the SC as follows:

- To bring terrestrial and marine veterinary and health issues to the table
- To promote IUCN policy encouraging conservation sensitive veterinary practices
- To lobby SSC SGs to be more realistic at the human/domestic animal /wildlife interfaces and to encourage mutually beneficial solutions to conflicts

- To promote the integration of VSG as an advisory body across the SSC network
- To support good governance and improved initiatives of the SSC

Bob Lacy

R Lacy stated that he is Chair of the Conservation Breeding SG (CBSG), the core constituency of which (zoos and aquaria) are not always conservationists, but rather see themselves as a link between captive breeding and the conservation community. He said that half of the CBSG's funding is the core operating budget (from zoos and aquaria) and half is private or project based. He described the CBSG as having 5 full-time staff at its HQ and 8 regional offices with paid staff, so it extends beyond a volunteer network, which can be a drawback if there is a disconnection between the paid staff and the 800 voluntary members. He noted a further disconnect with the CBSG core constituency with regards the direction the CBSG is moving – from *ex situ* conservation to *in situ* conservation. Some zoos want the focus to move back to the quality of animal care in zoos. He said another visible disconnect is that between the CBSG and the SSC.

To address the above “disconnects” the CBSG will attempt to:

1. De-centralize the CBSG and expand their regional offices
2. Re-engage with voluntary members
3. Re-engage with zoo associations
4. Re-integrate with the SSC, for example through the declining amphibian problem. CBSG will interact with the GASG, VSG and Re-introduction SG on this issue. The CBSG has been approached to help with the *ex situ* conservation of frog species

He welcomed input from the SSC on what they would like the CBSG to be.

Fred Launay

F Launay informed the SC that he is Chair of the Re-introduction SG (RSG), a thematic SG with government support for its core activities and salaries. He explained that to date the RSG is maintaining a balance between being reactive to requests (mainly from the captive breeding community) and being proactive in its undertakings. The RSG is increasingly asked to be involved in confiscated species or other rehabilitation programmes, but is unsure whether to engage in rehabilitations and also in restoration projects and ecosystem management.

F Launay explained that he holds full-time positions as both an NGO and a government representative. He brings to the SC regional knowledge of the arid zone, knowledge of the Middle East and knowledge of regional species-specific issues (such as the Sudano-Sahelian and Saiga antelope).

Georgina Mace (see brief on p.71 of the Meeting Pack)

H Dublin briefed the SC on G Mace's role in the SC, which is to help deliver SSC's contribution to the development of Biodiversity Indicators. She aims to deliver on the following:

1. Use the Red List to develop and implement methods for assessing biodiversity and measuring achievement of progress towards the CBD 2010 targets.

2. Liaise with the Species Programme, SSC Chair and Red List network as appropriate.
3. Work with the SSC and its consortium partners to direct and achieve the Assessments and Indicators portfolio.

Mike Maunder

J Smart briefed the SC on Mike Maunder's role on the SC. She said that the Global Strategy for Plant Conservation has 16 output targets for 2010 and that Target 1 is a world checklist of plant species by 2010. Target 2 is a preliminary assessment of the conservation status of all plant species. The SSC Plant Conservation Sub-Committee will put thought and effort into Target 2. Plantlife International and IUCN Species Programme submitted a GEF PDF-B proposal for US\$ 350 000 to develop a project to achieve Targets 2 and 5 at a national level in six countries (Cameroon, Cost Rica, Madagascar, Morocco, Philippines and Sri Lanka). She feels that the SSC has a major leadership role to play.

H Dublin added that the CBD is coming to life for plants and that the SSC is uniquely positioned to play an important role, but that it was frustrating to see that the SSC did not feature in the GEF Biodiversity Portfolio of projects.

Russ Mittermeier

R Mittermeier said that his role on SC is in strategic packaging and marketing and that he also brings to the table long years of SSC experience and expertise in reptile conservation. He feels that the SSC is poor on marketing, for example the missed opportunity of the "GEF Biodiversity Portfolio", and that they need to become an aggressive fundraiser. He added that it would be useful to have SC meetings in locations where the presence of the SC would be considered a media event, for example Madagascar or Sri Lanka.

H Dublin thanked R Mittermeier for the opportunities he has given the SSC and requested that he helps in opening further doors. R Mittermeier said that the SSC needs to look at how it presents its relationship with the IUCN when it approaches funders. He also pointed out that H Dublin was going to be SSC's best fundraiser. He offered her every support. H Dublin said that the best solution is to work together with the IUCN on thematic Programmes.

Michael Samways

M Samways reported that the invertebrate SGs have a wide variety of activities, as shown in *Species 42*, and that some invertebrate SGs have been very active, for example the Odonata and Mollusc SGs. He said that the geographical area Groups have been successful in covering taxa that were previously not covered. In terms of linking with other SGs, there is a lack of activity on marine invertebrates and work is being done on invasive species in collaboration with the ISSG. He said that there is collaboration with the Freshwater Programme and work is being done on rangelands to optimise output without compromising biodiversity. He noted a strong resistance in the SGs against becoming RLAs and said that a group of people are needed to do Red Listing on the invertebrates that do not fall under a SG.

He pointed out the active members of the Invertebrate Conservation Sub-Committee and recommended forming a new ICS with Justin Gerlach, Tim New, Sacha

Spector, Mary Seddon, Viola Clausnitzer and Jean-Christophe Vié. He felt that a “golden thread” is needed for invertebrates, with a focus on icons and recommended producing a book of threatened invertebrates of the world. He said that this would be discussed at an ICS meeting in Cape Town in November, along with the formation of new SGs, taxonomic groups having priority for Red Listing and the ICS being a global enabling facility for all RL activities.

Rohan Pethiyagoda

R Pethiyagoda stated that his role in the SC is to support H Dublin and A Spriggs in their activities and to fill the position of Deputy Chair. He said that there is much he would like to see done at the regional and country level and that the SSC should devise mechanisms to deliver products through improved communications with these offices, for example helping to develop national biodiversity plans as so far he has seen none that make reference to the RL. Countries struggle to deliver on the CBD and the SSC is well positioned to channel knowledge into this process. He suggested that monthly media releases be made on key issues and said he would be happy to facilitate this for the SSC.

R Pethiyagoda commented on the need to focus on freshwater fish, as many species are threatened and rates of decline are high, especially due to invasive species. He added that freshwater fish are economically important, yet none of the developing countries have national aquatic biodiversity action plans. He would like to support the relevant SGs to deliver on this over the next four years and is also available to do H Dublin’s bidding on other issues at any time.

H Dublin thanked R Pethiyagoda for accepting the position of Deputy Chair and asked him to help identify a person for the SSC SC to fill the freshwater gap.

Decisions	<p>The following roles for individual SC members were agreed upon by the SC:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Tom Brooks: To oversee SSC’s work on biodiversity assessments 2. Leon Bennun: To represent bird conservation issues 3. Luigi Boitani: To provide advice on SSC network management, restructuring and governance 4. Claudio Campagna and Yvonne Sadovy: To represent marine conservation chair the Marine Conservation Sub-Committee 5. Mick Clout: To represent alien invasive species issues 6. Jon Hutton: To represent issues related to sustainable use 7. Richard Kock: To represent veterinary and animal health issues 8. Bob Lacy: To represent SSC’s linkages with zoos, aquaria and the conservation breeding community 9. Fred Launay: To represent re-introduction issues 10. Georgina Mace: To oversee SSC’s work on biodiversity indicators 11. Mike Maunder: To represent plant conservation issues and chair the Plant Conservation Sub-Committee 12. Russ Mittermeier: To assist in strategic packaging, marketing and fundraising and to contribute reptile conservation expertise 13. Michael Samways: To represent invertebrate conservation issues and chair the Invertebrate Conservation Sub-Committee 14. Rohan Pethiyagoda: Deputy Chair of the SSC
-----------	---

Actions	Identify someone for the SSC SC to fill the freshwater gap	R Pethiyagoda H Dublin
	Facilitate monthly media releases on key issues	R Pethiyagoda Communications TF

5.4 Approval of the SG and TF Chair’s Terms-of-Reference, Operational Guidelines and Advice and Fundraising Summary Documents.

SG/TF Chair Terms-of-Reference

H Dublin explained that as Chair of a SG, she often found it unclear what the tasks of an SG were, as brief ToR were in place that did not give clear guidance. In this quadrennium, SG Chairs will be given a pack that includes ToR and a Guidelines and Advice document. These documents will be sent to them and posted on a SG Chair’s website. The SG Chair’s ToR outline deliverables expected and the intention is for SG Chairs to sign them to confirm that they have read and accepted them. The Chairs will then be given the procedure to follow for appointing their members; all former members are to be either re-appointed or removed and new members added. There will be a web-based registration of members. There was general agreement that such ToR were useful. R Mittermeier added that there must also be personal engagement with the Chairs on what is expected of them, particularly for new Chairs. H Dublin noted that the new Chairs are easier to direct than the old Chairs and that it is clear that many of the older Chairs did not refer to the previous ToR. R Mittermeier added that standardising how we deal with membership is long overdue.

R Kock asked whether SGs facilitate work or actually do the work, as he feels their most important function is the ability of the network to respond to requests when needed. He asked whether SG Chairs should focus on creating network strength for responsiveness or should encourage the implementation of projects. H Dublin responded that it is for the SG Chair to decide how to mobilise their membership but that SGs should not become too involved with project implementation.

T Brooks felt that more explicit language is required in the ToR with regards to incentives, for example if a SG contributes to assessments, they will be credited. He said that there should also be text covering the consequences of non-delivery. He provided draft wording to be incorporated into the ToR. L Bennun provided structural and grammatical comments on the SG Chair’s ToR.

H Dublin explained that there were some late comments from Simon Stuart on the “Substantive Programmatic Contributions” section of the SG ToR, which deals with contributions to the Red List and SIS. Craig Hilton-Taylor still needs to approve these changes. H Dublin asked whether the SC would approve S Stuart’s changes and allow C Hilton-Taylor to make minor adjustments if necessary. The SC agreed.

JC Vié felt that it may be easier to only refer to the “IUCN Programme”, which is an update of the SSC Strategic Plan (2001-2010). He also felt that the “Species Programme/SSC 2005 Annual Work Plan” is for the Species Programme staff and is not useful for the membership of the SSC. H Dublin said that the SSC/Species

Programme contribution to the IUCN Programme would need to be posted onto the website as it is difficult to find.

R Mittermeier stated that the ToR need to be more specific on the contributions for *Species*. In general, the SSC needs better communication globally, for example an “issue of the month” needs to go out to the media. H Dublin asked whether all press releases need to be approved by the IUCN and JC Vié replied that they do. R Mittermeier suggested that in the ToR, under “Communication and Networking”, contribution to each issue of *Species* should be a deliverable. H Dublin felt that we do not need contributions from every SG for each issue. R Mittermeier replied saying that the SGs need an incentive to contribute and that if contribution is a requirement, there will be a higher number of contributions, but not everyone will deliver. H Dublin was wary of losing Chairs to the *Species* deliverable and M Clout suggested “aim to produce an article every issue, but at least one article annually”. L Bennun added that the deliverables need to be taken seriously, as SGs will be judged against them. They must be realistic, clear and simple and one article annually is enough. R Mittermeier disagreed saying that the SG Chairs should deliver. H Dublin said that many SGs are active, but do not deliver to *Species* and it is therefore not a good indicator of a SGs activity.

F Launay noted that *Species* is an internal communication tool that is addressed to other SGs and not to the outside world. He said that the SSC needs a different tool for outside communication. H Dublin agreed, but said that the SGs cannot be asked to write for outside communication, this is the job of our communication staff, who are already overloaded. F Launay suggested that journalists be used to rewrite technical stories into news pieces. J Smart interjected that they will be looking at the communication strategy. JC Vié added that they have communication officers at HQ to do this work and that if articles are going onto the website or to the media, they must first be cleared.

R Mittermeier asked whether the ToR will be translated into 3 languages. H Dublin answered that the SSC office would try. L Boitani asked to strike reference to “Data Entry Module from the “Substantive Programmatic Contributions”, as the SIS will be running in less than a year. H Dublin agreed.

Decision	The SC approved the SG/TF Chair ToR and Craig Hilton-Taylor is to make any necessary changes to the “Substantive Programmatic Contributions” section	
Actions	Incorporate suggested changes into SG/TF Chair’s ToR	SSC Chair Office
	Ask Craig Hilton-Taylor to look over the “Substantive Programmatic Contributions” section of the SG/TF Chair’s ToR and incorporate any suggested changes	SSC Chair Office
	Post IUCN Programme onto the new SG Chair’s website	Species Programme
	Try to have the SG/TF Chair’s ToR translated into 3 languages	SSC Chair Office Species Programme

Operational Guidelines and Advice

H Dublin presented the Operational Guidelines and Advice document for SG/TF Chairs and thanked Perran Ross for helping draft the document. She explained that the Guidelines are less formal than the ToR, are written in a friendly tone and are a “welcome” to the Chairs. They come out of years of collective knowledge and some of the items, such as “Who speaks for the Group” are important. She said that the document was not for approval, but for comment.

L Bennun commented that the “Appointing Members” section encouraged exclusivity and said that younger members should be included. H Dublin felt that it is important to keep the network “expert” while including younger upcoming scientists. L Bennun put forward the following text:

“However, it is important also to balance experience with the need to build professional capacity and encourage the contribution of younger experts, especially those from less developed countries”.

H Dublin said that the SSC does not want to compromise SGs through total inclusion. Younger members must be qualified. R Mittermeier agreed that the SSC cannot be a training ground and R Kock remarked that it is the responsibility of the SG Chair to decide how to structure their Group. H Dublin added that some SGs automatically appoint all people who request membership and that it is best to maintain the SG as a functioning group of recognised experts. R Lacy felt that the SSC should reflect the desire to recognise the energy of young experts. Y Sadovy motioned to accept L Bennun’s wording and M Clout suggested changing “younger experts” to “younger *people*”. J Hutton recommended “specialists”, not “experts”. R Mittermeier said that “experts” is fine.

R Pethiyagoda asked what should be done if: 1. someone approaches the SSC saying they are an expert in a field but are not in a SG, and 2. if a member does not agree with a Chair. H Dublin replied that 1. they should be put in touch with the appropriate SG Chair and 2. happens often and the Guidelines document should help Chairs deal with this. JC Vié added that he receives many requests from people wanting to become SSC members. He asks them to send a CV and refers them to the appropriate Chair. On the main IUCN website there is a “get involved” button and then a menu explaining how to join a Commission; for SSC this information is not provided. He said that a standard response is needed and asked if it should come from the Species Programme or SG Chairs? H Dublin answered that it should come from the SG Chair.

R Mittermeier provided a comment on the SG and Democracy section and motioned to strike the sentence “Because all SG and TF members are volunteers, and therefore cannot be directed, alternative methods of persuasion and encouragement must be applied”, as he felt that the SSC and SG Chairs should be empowered to direct members. H Dublin felt that this would be seen as dictation. Y Sadovy said that it was only consistent with the pressure on SG Chairs to produce.

T Brooks added that C Hilton-Taylor needs to read through the “Contributing Data to Assessments and Indicators” section to ensure consistency with our changes to the ToR.

Actions	Incorporate suggested changes into Guidelines & Advice document	SSC Chair Office
	Ask Craig Hilton-Taylor to ensure consistency between the “Contributions to Assessments and Indicators” section of the Guidelines and the SG/TF Chair’s ToR	SSC Chair Office

Fundraising: A Summary for Specialist Groups

H Dublin presented the fundraising advice document commenting that it is an informal document. She requested inputs, particularly from R Mittermeier. L Bennun commented on the need to bring “facilitation” versus “implementation” into the documentation, as the SGs should not implement projects. H Dublin suggested that this be incorporated into the Guidelines document and L Bennun replied that it should be mentioned in both the Guidelines and Fundraising documents. She suggested putting “facilitation” versus “implementation” advice under fundraising, as it is central to what is being fundraised for.

R Mittermeier felt that SGs should not need to inform the IUCN of fundraising. JC Vié said that the IUCN must be aware of fundraising. R Lacy said that the CBSG approaches over 200 donors a year and asked whether the SSC and Species Programme want to be involved in all of these communications. H Dublin answered that they do, at the SSC and Species Programme level, but not at the SG level. JC Vié said that donors do not distinguish between SGs, SSC and IUCN. J Hutton suggested adding an amount, for example inform the staff of anything over US\$100 000. R Mittermeier asked why SGs have to notify the IUCN, when they do not approach the same donors for support. JC Vié replied that both the IUCN and its SGs both approach US foundations, so there is an overlap. T Brooks commented that SGs should do as the IUCN requests and no amount should be inserted into the text. R Mittermeier asked whether the Primate SG should inform the SSC and Species Programme whenever they approach their funders. If so, he asked for a list of IUCN funders. H Dublin said that the IUCN could not provide such a list. J Smart said that that was a Council-level decision. R Mittermeier felt that SGs need the list to avoid overlaps, as there are very few donors. JC Vié said that they are building a database of donors and could therefore produce such a list.

R Kock said that it is important to bring across the need for integrity in SGs with regards to fundraising, as corruption is possible at the SG Chair level. He offered to provide text on this for the Fundraising document.

Decision	SGs will be asked to coordinate with the relevant Species Programme staff and/or the SSC Chair’s Office approaches to prospective donors for projects over USD 100 000
----------	--

Actions	Incorporate suggested changes into Fundraising Advice document	SSC Chair Office
	Incorporate text on “facilitation versus implementation” under “Managing Money” in the Guidelines document and in the Fundraising Advice document	H Dublin
	Provide text on the importance of integrity of SG Chairs under “Managing Money” in the Guidelines document	R Kock

5.5 Review of SGs, TFs and their Chairs

H Dublin presented the SGs and TFs and their Chairs organised into the following tables:

1.1 Proposed Chair appointment renewals

1.2 Proposed new Chair appointments

2.1 SGs proposed for dissolution

2.2 SGs proposed for dissolution until feasible to reinstate

2.3 SGs proposed for formation

3.1 SGs proposed to change to RLAs

3.2 RLAs proposed for formation

4.1 RLAs for discussion

4.2 SGs for discussion

4.3 Pending mammal SGs

4.4 TFs for discussion

H Dublin explained that Tables 1, 2 and 3 had been through a deep process of consultation and required only approval from the SC. She put forward Tables 4.1, 4.2 and 4.4 for discussion.

Table 1.1 Proposed Chair appointment renewals

H Dublin explained that there was a suggestion of rolling the Wolf SG into the Canid SG, with Co-Chairs in Europe and North America, but that it was decided to leave the situation as it is for now, as the Group is meeting in October to discuss this.

A discussion ensued over how the bird SGs are structured. Regarding water birds, JC Vié stated that the SGs and their Chairs were chosen by Wetland International and endorsed by the previous SSC Chair. H Dublin enquired as to whether the SSC Chair has the power to change these bird SG Chairs or if only Wetlands International does. She commented that the groups are very active and L Bennun added that the bird SGs work well. R Mittermeier asked how the visible bird groups such as hummingbirds, toucans, hornbills were dealt with, as he felt they present huge opportunities. H Dublin said that some restructuring is necessary for the bird

SGs, as she has been approached to establish both a Pigeon SG and a Swallow SG, and the members of the Hornbill SG thinks the SG still exists, though it does not. H Dublin remarked that the formation of a task force to look at restructuring the SGs is to be discussed under Agenda Item 5.6. She commented that this TF needs to pay special attention to the overall handling of birds in the SSC.

Y Sadovy put forward the need for more fish groups, for example a Pelagic Fish SG and a Sciaenids SG. She asked what the procedure is for creating these. H Dublin said they need to be proposed in the review. R Mittermeier added that the freshwater eels are also threatened and need to be covered. H Dublin asked what the focus of these groups would be and Y Sadovy answered that it would be assessments and sustainable use. H Dublin reminded the SC that a SG should not simply be formed when there is an issue, their role must be carefully thought through before moving to establish them.

J Hutton explained the structure of the SUSG. He said that historically, the SUSG was set up as 18 separate regional SGs, each with their own chair and that there was a Chair of the whole group (a “chair of chairs”). He said that the European SUSG and Southern African SUSG have developed into large and active groups and there has been a suggestion of approving these two Regional Groups at SG level. He added that these groups operate with assistance from the SUSG office. H Dublin said that if the European and SA regional groups are made SGs, they must act in full capacity as SGs. R Lacy commented that all disciplinary SGs have regional structure and said the SUSG fits into that structure, with J Hutton as Chair. H Dublin agreed and suggested that the Regional Groups remain so. She thanked J Hutton for making efforts to link with taxonomic SGs. C Campagna noted that the SUSG does not address marine issues and J Hutton said that the group has no marine expertise and will rely on C Campagna and Y Sadovy to contribute on marine issues.

Table 1.2 Proposed new Chair appointments

H Dublin went through the list of new Chairs proposed for appointment and the SC approved all proposals.

Decisions	The SSC SG Restructuring TF needs to pay special attention to the overall handling of birds in the SSC
	The Sustainable Use SG is a single SG with Jon Hutton as Chair. The Group should have a regional structure that is in line with the structure of most of the other disciplinary SGs
	All proposed SG Chair renewals agreed by the SC
	All proposed new SG Chair appointments agreed by the SC

Table 2.1 SGs proposed for dissolution

R Mittermeier suggested that the reptile groups are not dissolved until the Global Reptile Assessment has run its course. H Dublin pointed out that the Reptile groups shown in Table 2.1 are not active and that the active groups have been retained in other tables. She said that a better structure should emerge from the GRA.

M Samways asked who made the decision to scrap the North Eurasian Invertebrate SG and JC Vié answered that this SG overlaps with the European Invertebrate SG. M Samways disagreed and said that the Chair interacts largely with the Russians. He motioned to not dissolve the SG. H Dublin asked whether the Chair would deliver on the new ToR and JC Vié asked whether he was an active Chair. M Samways said that he was active and that he had contributed to *Species 42*.

Table 2.2 SGs proposed for dissolution until feasible to reinstate

R Mittermeier drew attention to the importance of bamboo conservation and its sustainable use. He asked whether a Chair could be found for the Bamboo SG. J Smart took note of this and said she hoped that the dissolution process would bring up some names. H Dublin added that dissolution can be a positive process.

Table 2.3 SGs proposed for formation

H Dublin put the formation of the Arctic Plant and Crop Wild Relative SGs to the SC and they approved.

Decisions	All SGs proposed for dissolution are to be dissolved and the North Eurasian Invertebrate SG is under discussion
	As proposed, the Australasian Plant, Bamboo, Bulb and Pteridophyte SGs are to be dissolved until feasible to reinstate
	As proposed, the Arctic Plant and Crop Wild Relative SGs are to be formed

Table 3.1 SGs proposed to change to RLAs

The proposed changes of SGs to RLAs were approved by the SC. H Dublin commented that the formation of RLAs is not only for plant groups and said that the RLA route may function well for the marine assessments. She noted that there was a strong negative response to suggestions of changing SGs to RLAs from the invertebrate side.

Table 3.2 RLAs proposed for formation

The proposed RLAs formations were accepted by the SC.

Decisions	As proposed, the Japanese Plant, East Africa Plant, European Plant, Legume and North American Plant SGs are to be changed to RLAs
	As proposed, the Central African Plant and New Zealand Plant RLAs are to be created

Table 4.1 RLAs for discussion

J Smart explained that the Caribbean Island Plant RLA works well, but that a focal point is needed. H Dublin said that M Maunder needs to decide on a focal point following recommendations of the group.

Table 4.2 SGs for discussion

Each SG put forward for discussion table was considered by the SC and decisions taken.

Table 4.3 Pending mammal SGs

H Dublin explained that there were differences of opinion among the staff with regards to the mammal groups placed in Table 4.3 and that these differences could not be resolved before the meeting. She said that J Smart would liaise with the Species Programme staff on these SGs and report back to the SSC Chair. L Boitani added that Co-Chairs representing the Old and New Worlds need to be found for the Bear SG.

Table 4.4 TFs for discussion

R Pethiyagoda said that the **Declining Amphibian Populations TF** had built a substantial network but, because it is a time-bound TF, its future needs consideration. The TF either needs to be dissolved or given new ToR after the Amphibian summit in September. H Dublin asked Rohan Pethiyagoda to provide the SC with feedback on the DAPTF.

H Dublin noted that the **Declining Pollination TF** does not deliver on their ToR and M Samways commented that their work is eclipsed by the Pollination Initiative. He suggested the TF becomes a Pollinator SG. H Dublin asked M Samways to discuss the issue with Dr Kevan.

H Dublin said that there was a spike of interest in the **Climate Change TF** with no follow up. The Chair of the CCTF, Camille Parmesan, wants more direction and time

to deliver. H Dublin asked J Smart and JC Vié to discuss the CCTF ToR, deliverables and a time-frame with Brett Orlando. J Smart and JC Vié agreed. T Brooks added that the TF needs to look into how the Red List categories and criteria apply to climate change. H Dublin added that climate change is a key area affecting biodiversity loss and that the IUCN in general needs to agree on a strategy for climate change. R Mittermeier felt that the SSC should become a leader on climate change issues and H Dublin said that the IUCN is already moving on this and the SSC needs to define their role within that.

L Boitani explained that the **Large Carnivore Initiative for Europe TF** does not see itself as time bound, so they cannot remain a TF. They do not want to be a “Working Group”, as that title does not exist in the SSC structure. He said that they were willing to become a SG, but they bring together members from many SGs as well as outsiders. They could become a regional conservation group at the European level. H Dublin commented that the group should not be a TF, as it would send out the wrong message. She asked what the advantage to the group was in being part of the SSC. L Boitani explained that the SSC is the group’s institutional home. They want to remain part of the IUCN, as Europe does not need a new conservation organization. J Hutton felt that as the strength of the IUCN is its convening power, the group should be part of the IUCN. He said it is just a naming issue. R Mittermeier suggested making a new category and H Dublin said that a “Working Group” could become part of the SSC structure and that when the SSC is restructured some SGs could become Working Groups. T Brooks noted that the new ToR would have to include Working Groups and H Dublin said that as there is only one Working Group, this would not be necessary for now.

L Bennun explained how the South Asian Vulture issue has a long history, some of which is obvious in the IUCN resolutions. He added that the IUCN’s convening power is important in this issue as it is surrounded in politic. He put forward the need to form an **Asian Vulture TF** and to decide what size it should be. He said that while it is important to involve people, rather than alienate them, a large TF would not work effectively. He suggested a two-tiered structure for the TF and added that Chris Bowden of the RSPB is prepared to chair the TF.

H Dublin felt that the SSC needs to decide if it wants to be involved in the political or technical elements of this issue, or both. If both, then someone from a regional office (and high up in the IUCN) is needed to chair the TF, as Chris Bowden would not be able to handle the politics. R Mittermeier said that Council should be involved. JC Vié agreed, saying that SSC should learn from the gray whale and Sakhalin Energy solution and put higher-level IUCN staff in charge of the TF. J Smart said that this should have a Species Programme lead and that they could put to Achim that this is a higher-level IUCN issue.

L Bennun asked if it was thus decided that an IUCN member will lead the TF. F Launay said that it would be best to have someone from outside the region to broker the agreement at state level and that Chris Bowden could then be involved at the implementation stage. H Dublin asked if someone from BL or RSPB could take this on and L Bennun said it was possible if it has the IUCN stamp on it.

R Lacy suggested tackling the problem at national level rather than trying to get nations to work together. L Bennun agreed, saying that it is important to get individual countries to ban Diclofenac, which India has already done. He said that a

high-level IUCN approach is needed to get things moving and the SSC should then move in to do the work.

T Brooks noted that this was originally a South Asian problem, but that soon there will be no vultures left in South Asia and the problem will then be in other countries like Burma. L Bennun suggested calling it the Asian Vulture TF and involving other countries from the start.

R Kock added that this case is of importance to developing countries, where there is an increase in the use of veterinary drugs. The IUCN needs to use this as an opportunity to improve the practices of pharmaceutical companies.

Decisions	<p>Mike Maunder to decide on a focal point for the Caribbean Island Plant RLA</p> <p>The Climate Change TF is to be rejuvenated</p> <p>The Large Carnivore Initiative for Europe TF is to be changed to a “Working Group”</p> <p>The Asian Vulture TF is to be formed and have a higher-level IUCN lead</p>	
Actions	<p>Liaise with Species Programme staff on the pending mammal SGs and report back to the SSC Chair with recommendations</p>	<p>J Smart</p>
	<p>Provide feedback on the activities of the Declining Amphibian Populations TF</p>	<p>R Pethiyagoda</p>
	<p>Discuss the activity of the Declining Pollination TF with its Chair, Dr Kevan</p>	<p>M Samways</p>
	<p>Work on realistic ToR and deliverables for the CCTF</p>	<p>J Smart JC Vié</p>
	<p>Write to Achim informing him of the need for higher-level IUCN input on the Asian Vulture issue</p>	<p>J Smart</p>

5.6 Plans for a Task Force to look at rationalising and optimising the SSC network

H Dublin reported that there have been three external reviews of the SSC, all of which say that the SSC structure is problematic. She suggested that the SSC leads a process to revisit the restructuring issue and then brings together external experts to look at their suggestions. The first step is to have internal discussions. She said that she has already asked L Boitani to help in the restructuring process, as well as Mark Stanley Price (who carried out the Volunteerism Study) and Perran Ross. She asked if there were any SC Members who would like to be involved in the Restructuring TF and requested about four people in total make up the TF.

M Clout said that he was interested in having an input and willing to be a member of the TF. J Smart commented that the restructuring links with the review of the Species Programme staff and presented her interest in being a member of the TF. H Dublin summarised that the Restructuring TF will comprise Luigi Boitani, Mark Stanley Price, Perran Ross, Mick Clout and Jane Smart. L Boitani requested that H Dublin is part of the TF and she agreed.

Decision	The SSC Restructuring TF comprises Luigi Boitani, Mark Stanley Price, Perran Ross, Mick Clout, Jane Smart and Holly Dublin. Luigi Boitani will Chair the TF
----------	---

6. SSC Financial Report

6.1 SSC Commission Operating Fund

H Dublin referred to the budget and the current account balance sheets handed out at the meeting. She pointed out that the Commission Operating Fund allocation for 2005 was the same as that for the previous year (270 000 CHF). She added that not all Commissions receive the same amount and that the SSC may not receive this amount next year.

T Brooks asked whether the Sub-Committees have ToR and H Dublin replied saying that an agreement would be signed with the Sub-Committees when they receive funds from SSC. T Brooks asked why there were no bird or Invasive Species Sub-Committees. H Dublin answered that Bird SGs are represented on the SC and that Sub-Committees are formed in response demand. She added that this will be open to further discussion in the SC, but that these funds must be moved this year. J Smart pointed out that the Plant Sub-Committee call themselves a Committee. H Dublin explained that technically they are all Sub-Committees.

R Mittermeier expressed interest in covering the costs of SC meetings held in other countries.

6.2 Other Existing SSC Funds

H Dublin drew attention to the Sir Peter Scott Fund and the George Rabb Internship Endowment Fund. She said that the SSC does not want to use the Sir Peter Scott Fund for operations, but would rather direct the money to SSC members. Y Sadovy suggested using the money to hire a fundraiser. R Mittermeier disagreed, saying that CI has done this before and it did not work. H Dublin said that the last George Rabb internship went well. JC Vié explained that an intern is employed every two years using the interest on the George Rabb Internship Endowment Fund.

6.3 SSC Fundraising

JC Vié explained how the Species Programme staff have recently been stretched by large IUCN events, but that they should now have more time for fundraising. He said that the Red List Programme is particularly understaffed and fundraising needs to be

undertaken to provide them with staff. He feels that the SSC needs to move from small to larger grants like the GEF grant for Plant Conservation.

R Mittermeier suggested that the SSC focuses on the sustainable use stream of funds rather than on the biodiversity core. He said that much of fundraising is about packaging oneself to fit the criteria. H Dublin said that this is underway and that a 10 million Euro proposal was recently submitted to the DGIS on implementing the Addis Ababa Principles and Guidelines. R Mittermeier suggested that the running costs of the SSC should be brought as a proposal to a foundation. H Dublin pointed out that most donors do not cover core running costs and that only the Mava Foundation had committed for 4 years. M Clout offered to approach the New Zealand and Australian governments with SSC products that require funds.

R Mittermeier said that it may also be useful for SSC to join with its partners (such as WCS/CI) in approaching donors already known to them. J Smart offered to look into developing fundraising capacity and said that she is open to ideas from the SC. H Dublin proposed that a fundraising vision and a way forward be provided by the next SC meeting.

Action	Develop a fundraising strategy to be presented at the next SC meeting	J Smart
--------	---	---------

7. Continuing and Emerging Issues

7.1 Saiga Antelope

H Dublin spoke on the Saiga antelope situation saying that there is an IUCN recommendation on this and that the SSC has been asked to put forward a letter from Achim and the SSC Chair to the range and consuming states. She said that CMS have been working on an MOU, but they cannot get it through. R Mittermeier suggested that the Saiga issue needs international attention to move it forward.

7.2 Sudano-Sahelian Antelopes

H Dublin explained that CMS has approached SSC to assist putting together a technical document on the Sudano-Sahelian antelope situation and that this is a good opportunity for synergy with CMS.

7.3 Tasmanian Devil Extinction Threat

H Dublin said that SSC sent letters to the Tasmanian government regarding the Tasmanian devil extinction threat and that the Tasmanian government is doing what it thinks is best to solve the problem. What is important now is that the science moves forward to fill gaps in knowledge.

7.4 Amur Leopards

H Dublin described how the Cat SG alerted her that a pipeline route was to impact the habitat of the last remaining population of Amur leopards. The CSG wanted to issue a letter to the heads of state, and this was moved through the correct IUCN procedure -a letter signed by the DG was sent to the Russian Head of State.

Action	Send Saiga letter to Achim for approval and joint signing	H Dublin
--------	---	----------

7.5 Strategic Action Plan for Amphibian Conservation.

R Lacy put forward that the zoo community is ready to provide resources for the captive breeding side of the process, but that they need a high level invitation from IUCN as they don't want to be seen as capitalising on the process to gain exhibits.

Action	Explore possibilities for an official letter of invitation to zoo community requesting action on amphibian conservation	H Dublin R Pethiyagoda
--------	---	---------------------------

H Dublin asked whether the SC wants to be briefed on species-specific issues. R Mittermeier said that he did and that species-specific issues are essential to the SSC. L Bennun felt that there should be a balance and that H Dublin is achieving this, and that the longer-term vision is more important than single species issues. R Kock felt that what is important is how the species issues are packaged. He said that the root causes need to be addressed and individual species not given too much time. H Dublin agreed that press releases should focus on causes. She said that a balance must be found or single-species issues will take up most of the Commission's time. M Clout suggested that, in order to make the SSC more relevant, species must be chosen that tie in with issues of use, invasion and threats.

R Pethiyagoda pointed out that if the SSC focuses on species-specific issues they will need a platform to increase their profile in the media and that this visibility will benefit fundraising efforts. It was decided that a communications TF would be set up comprising the current communications staff, Rohan Pethiyagoda and Jon Hutton. L Boitani suggested asking SG Chairs to send regular updates to the team and H Dublin asked Rohan Pethiyagoda to approach members for additional stories.

Decision	A Communications TF to be set up comprising Rohan Pethiyagoda, Jon Hutton, the Species Programme communications staff and the SSC Chair's assistant	
Actions	Ask SG/TF Chairs to send regular updates and stories	Communications TF
	Approach members for additional stories	R Pethiyagoda

8. Brainstorming and Sharing

8.1 Science-based Information for Decision-makers versus Advocacy

H Dublin explained that there is disagreement within the SSC on their role with regards to policy prescription versus policy relevance. The SSC's role is not advocacy - they give scientific information only and do not dictate what decisions should be made. She said that many people, particularly within SGs, feel that the SSC should push advocacy.

8.2 Assessments and Indicators

T Brooks commented that further interactions are necessary between the taxonomic Sub-Committees and the Assessments and Indicators Sub-Committee. He said that the links are there for plants, but need to be developed for the Invertebrate Conservation and Marine Conservation Sub-Committees. In identifying key biodiversity areas, links could be made with marine biodiversity work, conservation breeding and amphibian conservation. He added that there was no mention of the Sampled Red List Index work in the invertebrate and plant focal point roles. H Dublin responded saying that M Samways must decide how to link with the assessments and indicators work at the Invertebrate Conservation Sub-Committee meeting in November.

Y Sadovy asked if there are ToR for the different species assessments. H Dublin replied that the assessments are in the structural development phase. She said that the structure in place for birds works well, that the GMA was more difficult (due to the deep existing network) and that the GAA was easier as there was no structure in place. She said that the SSC should work on the best structure for delivery, which will be advised on by the Sub-Committees. Y Sadovy commented that the conservation of many marine species is controversial and that the Red Listing process will therefore also be controversial, so it is important to get it right. T Brooks suggested mixed models, with a separate process for highly utilised species. H Dublin said that the following meeting would discuss how to set priorities and achieve them. She added that the RLAs must be a fundamental focus of the Restructuring TF and that the structure may need to be expanded to accommodate the marine assessments.

Actions	Form links between the Invertebrate Conservation and the Assessments and Indicators Sub-Committee	M Samways
	Form links between the Plant Conservation and the Assessments and Indicators Sub-Committee	J Smart M Maunder

8.3 to 8.5 Species Conservation and Management Planning Approaches

H Dublin said that a review of the action planning process showed a disconnect between the Conservation Assessment and Management Plans (CAMPs) and the

Action Plans for species. She pointed out that WCS has also started the Range-wide Priority Setting (RWPS), with many overlapping components. She said that a decision needs to be taken whether to promote CAMPs or Action Planning, or provide a clear way forward. R Lacy felt that it is best to wait and see what meets different needs, which may be different for different groups. T Brooks said that the RWPS, CAMPs and the RL overlap, except that RWPS and CAMPs go beyond the RL into prioritisation. H Dublin responded saying that SSC Action Planning is also a prioritisation process. R Lacy asked what happens after the RL. He feels that the RL process should be followed by a broader priority setting involving the RL data plus more new data. He added that CAMPs have historically been done to cover species not covered by SGs.

R Pethiyagoda said that with the RL process expanding, there will be many species requiring attention. He feels it is important that the IUCN looks at building national capacity for planning the recovery of threatened species as most developed countries have no national capacity. The IUCN Regional Offices have the capacity to do this and the staff in these offices should to be trained in conservation planning, as they are already involved in developing national conservation plans with governments.

8.6 Species Congress

H Dublin noted that the idea of a Species Congress was brought up at the last SC meeting, but with no resolution. R Mittermeier felt that a Congress is important, but not financially practical at present. He suggested aiming for a meeting of SG Chairs in 2006/2007 and then putting together a motion to WCC for a major Congress in the next quadrennium. He further suggested linking the Congress to the CBD 2010 targets to provide a vision beyond 2010. J Smart pointed out that the Millennium Development Goals are linked to a timeline of 2015 and that it was now desirable to set targets beyond 2010, especially given that the 2010 targets will not be met. She said there is an opportunity for SSC to show real leadership here, as the global conservation community has yet to decide how it is going to address this issue. The danger is that if the targets are not met the whole approach may be dismissed.

L Boitani suggested partnering the Congress with a scientific society meeting. He said that the Congress should cover species, science, conservation and sustainable use. R Mittermeier agreed as long as it does not become a biologists' meeting, but rather focuses on linking to issues of human health and indigenous people. T Brooks suggested the Congress be used to bridge the gap between scientists and the mainstream conservation world.

Decisions	<p>Aim to hold a SG Chairs' meeting in 2006/2007 with a view to convening a Species Congress in the next quadrennium</p> <p>If a Species Congress is agreed, it should link in with achievement of the CBD 2010 targets to provide a vision beyond 2010</p>
-----------	---

8.7 The International Whaling Commission

JC Vié presented IUCN's position regarding the IWC in light of the upcoming IWC annual meeting. IUCN stopped preparing position papers in 2003 considering the IWC impasse. Currently there is no position and IUCN is calling for the implementation of a Revised Management Scheme. He explained that Justin Cooke, in agreement with the previous SSC Chair, the CSG Chair and the Secretariat, has been representing IUCN at IWC meetings and has met with JC Vié and J Smart to discuss the role of the IUCN in unblocking the situation. H Dublin added that CITES are trying not to get involved and that this is an IUCN not a SSC issue. She said that many governments party to the IUCN are whalers. J Hutton suggested that the IUCN remains uninvolved and that if this is not possible, they should adhere to the science. He added that this is often an emotive issue and that some whaling is sustainable. It was decided that Justin Cooke will continue to monitor the situation.

Decision	The SSC takes no stance on whaling and asks Justin Cooke of the Cetacean SG to monitor the situation
----------	--

9. Any Other Business

H Dublin asked J Smart to pass on the best wishes for a speedy recovery from the SC to David Given.

9.1 Making the SSC Message Relevant.

J Hutton discussed the urgent need for the SSC to be made more relevant and said that this should trickle down to all levels, such as the e-bulletin. He gave the example of the SE Asian Vultures, which should have been packaged in a more relevant way. He motioned that the Communication TF deals with packaging SSC products for relevancy. He added that the SSC also needs a strategy to change how they are seen within the IUCN. H Dublin agreed that the Communication TF needs to tackle both external and internal communications of the SSC.

Action	Tackle internal and external communications of the SSC	Communications TF
--------	--	-------------------

9.2 Date and Venue of the Next Meeting

H Dublin pointed out that R Mittermeier suggested that, for public relations and fundraising purposes, SC meetings should be held in places where the SC can have an impact. She asked for suggestions of dates and a venue for the next meeting. There was general agreement that the next meeting be held in Cape Town, Argentina or Madagascar between the 1st and 12th December.

Action	Propose venue (Cape Town, Argentina or Madagascar) and dates (early December) for next SC meeting as soon as possible	SSC Chair Office
--------	---	------------------

H Dublin thanked the SC Members for their energy and inputs into the meeting and expressed her hope that the quadrennium will follow in a similar light.