



Species Survival Commission
Executive and Steering Committee Meetings WCC 2.7

Executive Committee

15 November 2004

Queen Sirikit Centre

Bangkok, Thailand

Executive Committee members present: David Brackett (Chair), Holly Dublin, Jon Hutton, Gustavo Fonseca, David Given, Yoshio Kaneko, Bob Lacy, Ling-Ling Lee, Mike Maunder, Roger McManus, Russ Mittermeier, Valery Neronov, Michael Samways, Jameson Seyani, Corazon Catibog Sinha

Guests: Carolina Caceres, Heather Creech, Ali Stattersfield (for Leon Bennun), Barry Richardson
Staff: Will Darwall, Mariano Gimenez-Dixon, Craig Hilton-Taylor, Nancy McPhearson, Marie-Andre Papineau, Corli Pretorius, Alison Rosser, Stuart Salter, Wendy Strahm, Simon Stuart, Jean-Christophe Vie, Doreen Zivkovic

Apologies: Leon Bennun, Luigi Boitani, Georgina Mace, Ramon Perez Gil, Cristian Samper

Key decisions and action items

The Executive agreed that there is a need for clarity on technical issues, on the management structure necessary to deliver the Red List, and on the governance roles of partners

The Executive agreed to pursue the addition of an SIS Annex to the Red List Agreement.

In addition to the discussion around issues identified in the Red List Review, the Executive agreed there is also need for a discussion of the strategic questions such as managing the linkage between the Red List and SIS, given their difference in scope and function.

The Executive recommended that IUCN invite senior management of consortium partners to convene a strategic planning workshop to consider the results of the Red List review and plan way forward.

The Executive noted the report on the IUCN Knowledge Management study and supported its importance as a key piece of work of IUCN in which SSC would like to be aware of and engaged in actions taken over the course of the intersessional period.

The Executive agreed there is a need for a concerted effort to conserve records, ideally in a central location with IUCN HQ. Immediate efforts might include identifying priority documents for the archive and the IUCN librarian, as a professional, might be able to recommend resources to assist with this task. The Executive suggested inviting the IUCN librarian to be an ex officio member of the Committee. The Executive agreed the questionnaire to Specialist Groups is premature and should wait until strategic direction and priorities are determined and key persons of relevance for collecting this information are identified.

Action	Who	Timeframe
Provide comments, via N McPherson, on the Red List Agreement Review	Executive Committee members via SSC Chair and Secretariat	By 10 December 2004
Suggest IUCN consider inviting senior management of Consortium partners to a strategic planning working to consider the results of the Red List Agreement Review	SSC Chair	Before next Executive Committee meeting

1. Introduction

D Brackett welcomed the Executive Committee. He announced an SSC reception would be held the evening of 15 November, with thanks to R Mittermeier and Conservation International for helping support the reception. He noted the Global Species Assessment would be launched on 17 November. D Brackett introduced M-A Papineau, who is currently assisting him in Ottawa.

1a) Adoption of the Agenda

J Hutton noted a correction was needed in the date of the meeting and the agenda as follows was adopted by the Executive Committee.

1. Introduction
 - a) Adoption of the Agenda
 - b) Adoption of the minutes of the March 2004 Executive Committee Meeting (WCC 2.6)
2. Management Issues
 - a) State of the SSC Review
 - b) Red List Agreement Review
 - c) SIS Consortium Agreement
 - d) IUCN Knowledge Management Study
 - e) History and Archives Committee report
3. Review of Specialist Groups and Task Forces
 - a) Review of Specialist Groups and Chairs
4. Any other business
 - a) Awards to be presented at Commission meeting and Congress

1b) Adoption of the minutes of the March 2004 Executive Committee Meeting (WCC 2.6)

The Executive Committee adopted the minutes with no changes.

2. Management issues

2a) State of the SSC Review

D Brackett introduced the SSC report he would be delivering to the 3rd IUCN World Conservation Congress for Executive Committee comments. The report touched on the people supporting SSC and highlighted some key activities in the past quadrennium. J Seyani asked if the incoming Chair would be introduced to the Members. D Brackett noted the elections take place after the report is delivered. G Fonseca suggested adding remembrance of Marcio Ayres. R McManus congratulated the Chair and Specialist Group Chairs on the extraordinary record of the past four years. Responding to V Neronov, D Brackett noted it was not possible to translate the contributions to *Species 42*.

2b) Red List Agreement Review

D Brackett introduced the review of the implementation of the Red List Programme Agreement, through the monitoring and evaluation unit of IUCN HQ managed by N McPherson. N McPherson

introduced the rationale of the review on behalf of the reviewers. Motivating factors included increasing recognition of and demands on the partnership, a need for improved management of the partnership and a feeling of unequal contributions to the partnership. She introduced the key concepts for partnerships and the key findings of the review. The conclusion was that the rationale for the consortium was still valid but changes are needed to improve governance, management and long term sustainability. In conclusion, she noted this was a draft with the final report available by end of December. Comments on factual errors or gaps were requested by 10 December, 2004. D Brackett suggested the Executive consolidate the SSC comments by that deadline.

R Mittermeier asked for clarification on how reviewers thought the consortium branding policy might compromise the Red List credibility. N McPherson noted the reviewers felt there was a lack of clarity on what is a “consortium product” and who “owns” it. R Mittermeier added it is still not clear how the ownership of “products” related to credibility. D Brackett added that when the consortium was created, it was not intended to be viewed as a separate entity or new institution, yet it appears to be taken as such in the review. If there is a presumption of a new institution, then you can see how questions on the personality of the consortium as separate from partners and questions on ownership and what is an IUCN/SSC Red List product arise. The branding and credibility issues come to the fore depending on the use of the product; if members use the product for advocacy campaigning does that detract from it as a source of objective scientific information? It is clear the consortium members see the Red List as a source of credible information and see the need for actions based on the information. The questions being asked is when and how to distinguish advocacy action as separate from the product (the Red List) and it is this strategic question that needs clarification. R Mittermeier agreed the intent was not to create a “new institution” but also cautioned against over-regulating the consortium and limiting the reach of the Red List.

S Stuart commented on the usefulness of the review in focussing thoughts. He noted a basic assumption that the consortium is different from the Red List Programme but that is not explicit in the agreement. It may be that having begun having separate meetings of the consortium and Red List committee created separate tracks that were not intended and resulted in the arising question of whether a strategic consortium “team” separate from the Programme is needed. The answer to this is not necessarily clear. As an example, he noted in producing the Global Species Assessment there were no “ground rules” on who had what authority in the product and decisions, and that had created a number of difficulties.

D Given noted the recommendation on guidelines for growth of the consortium and its relevance to activities being undertaken for plants in the Missouri Botanic Gardens and related to the CBD Global Strategy for Plant Conservation. M Maunder clarified he had raised some of these actions with the reviewers.

H Dublin asked about the recommendations regarding the governance of the Consortium and noted this governance is distinct from the management of the Red List Committee. She added it is clear there is still some confusion and it is clear that the ground rules are needed. N McPherson noted the reviewers heard a need to separate strategic governance and technical issues. She added that consortiums do grow into something greater than the individual parts and the choice to be made is whether the group wants to recognize this separate identity.

The Consortium started meeting separate from the Red List Committee, the question to resolve is there a clear need for separation?

The Executive agreed that there is a need for clarity on technical issues, on the management structure necessary to deliver the Red List, and on the governance roles of partners

Action	Who	Timeframe
Provide comments, via N McPherson, on the Red List Agreement Review	Executive Committee members via SSC Chair and Secretariat	By 10 December 2004

2c) SIS Consortium Agreement

D Brackett introduced the SIS Annex to the Red List Agreement proposed for signature by partners. He noted that linked to this agreement are support from Oracle, Dell and work with the World Business Council on Sustainable Development. S Salter noted this agreement is, fundamentally, a fund raising vehicle picking up from the identification of SIS that already exists in the Red List Agreement. Although the timing, given review of Red List Agreement, may not be ideal, the rewards in terms of fundraising, are great.

G Fonseca agreed on the need to understand SIS in context of the Red List Agreement. He added a difficulty in communicating the power of SIS has been communicating its sustainability over time, and in terms of how IUCN sees SIS developing in the framework of other networks or agreements. He added, branding issues need to be discussed in the context of specific examples rather than through the creation of bureaucracy that “straight-jackets” the consortium members.

H Dublin asked what donors would think if they were presented with the Red List Consortium review? Are we convinced that our corporate responsibility is in place with regards to the donors? D Brackett noted that this point is key for moving ahead with SIS Annex. Regarding the first question, donors can see we recognize the issues that are present and are moving towards settling these issues. He added he would suggest there is a need to move quickly with members of the consortia (Red List/SIS) and have a senior level meeting to consider the strategic questions. This is needed not to create an overly prescriptive body of law but to answer some of the expectations being placed on the consortium, and to set the ground rules.

B Lacy recognize the benefits of merging SIS more explicitly into the Red List Agreement but raised a concern regarding knowledge management in that the Red List is controlled for the sake of credibility whereas SIS is meant to be a more “unfiltered” platform for sharing of information. There may appear to be a perceived conflict as the two systems come together. Questions on ownership of data may arise, with differences in approach between the Red List and SIS. S Stuart noted it is for this reason that the Red List and SIS developed separately, but we have since noted that the lack of connection between the two has also been a drawback, recognizing there is no perfect fit given the broader scope of SIS. B Richardson also emphasized the Red List and SIS are filling two different roles and IUCN will need to be clear about how these interact. D Brackett added this is another strategic consideration to put to the Consortium.

G Fonseca commented that the Red List is a subset of SIS. He noted that the credibility of the Red List also bears on transparency, and this requires accessible information. The Red List needs to be transparent and available for outside scrutiny. R McManus added that there also remains a question on how to ensure SIS continues to grow and provide for other functions beyond Red Listing, thus meeting the needs of SSC Specialist Groups. D Brackett agreed that SIS is more than just the information management arm of the Red List but is also a tool for interaction among and between the Specialist Groups and cannot lose touch with this role.

D Brackett noted that one possible recommendation from the Executive would be to suggest SSC and IUCN management consider an invitation to the senior management of consortium partners to convene a strategic planning workshop considering the results of the review and plan way forward.

The Executive agreed to pursue the addition of an SIS Annex to the Red List Agreement.

In addition to the discussion around issues identified in the Red List Review, the Executive agreed there is also need for a discussion of the strategic questions such as managing the linkage between the Red List and SIS, given their difference in scope and function.

The Executive recommended that IUCN invite senior management of consortium partners to convene a strategic planning workshop to consider the results of the Red List review and plan way forward.

Action	Who	Timeframe
Suggest IUCN consider inviting senior management of Consortium partners to a strategic planning working to consider the results of the Red List Agreement Review	SSC Chair	Before next Executive Committee meeting

2d) IUCN Knowledge Management Study

C Pretorius and H Creech introduced the knowledge management study which aimed to look at where IUCN is in terms of knowledge management and provide some recommendations. The study proposed four strategic moves for IUCN to begin to create an “influencing strategy”. The first move is to begin by identifying what IUCN would like to influence, recognize who is in the position to make that change and build relationships. Once identified, the institution can be organized to transfer knowledge. The next strategic moves are to make better use of IUCN's unique structure and to pay more attention to relationships and communications internally and externally. Finally there needs to be a strong IT backbone for IUCN.

M Samways noted the actions of national bodies with regards to red listing are not connected to IUCN actions, creating a communications gap. D Given noted the triple helix model seems to be fragmented in practice. He added there is also a role for mentoring of young professionals.

H Dublin noted the potential resource implications for implementing the recommendations of the study and asked about where resources are necessary and where is it more of a cultural change that is needed? H Creech noted the information technology component – putting the tools in place – is likely the most resource-heavy recommendations. However, the other recommendations for strategic moves require more of a cultural change.

D Brackett noted undertaking this study is a key action towards shaping IUCN's future in the short term. Without getting the knowledge management issue “right”, there will be problems in managing the institution. He notes the positive moves within IUCN to put a stronger focus on knowledge management issue.

C Pretorius noted the IUCN Director General has made Knowledge Management a top priority for the next intersessional period. Senior management is committed to building this foundation, noting it will take time. As a first step, a knowledge advisor has been appointed to IUCN.

The Executive noted the report on the IUCN Knowledge Management study and supported its importance as a key piece of work of IUCN in which SSC would like to be aware of and engaged in actions taken over the course of the intersessional period.

2e) History and Archives Committee

D Brackett introduced a draft archives policy provided by J Burton and supporting documents. D Brackett asked if the Committee agrees on circulating the proposed questionnaire to Specialist Groups.

D Given commented on the importance of people in an organization, as well as structures and programmes, and suggested it would be important to record and archive the tacit knowledge held by SSC individuals. R Mittermeier commented on the importance of this activity and noted there will be an issue on where to store such an archive. He also agreed with the importance of keeping records

on tacit knowledge. JC Vie noted the need for space and asked if there is a role for staff to take on an archiving role. M Samways noted this would be an interesting project for a Masters student. J Seyani added, in reference to knowledge management, there is value in the historical information for students. M Gimenez-Dixon suggested there needs to be guidance on what information should be archived.

H Dublin noted the paper is on best practices for archiving, but overall it is not clear on what sort of information SSC wishes to collect. She suggested there is a need to be realistic and focused in the information being requested. S Stuart agreed with R Mittermeier that it is important to act fast before materials disappear and suggest prioritizing collecting the papers of the Chairs of SSC. In addition, there is also interesting information already held in IUCN HQ. R Mittermeier agreed that realistically, the archive can aim to collect the papers of the SSC and Specialist Group Chairs, Specialist Group newsletters, Committee meeting packages and SSC publications. He recognized the effort and “space” this would take up but emphasized its importance. V Neronov suggested that regional and national offices may be able to take part in storing information.

The Executive agreed there is a need for a concerted effort to conserve records, ideally in a central location with IUCN HQ. Immediate efforts might include identifying priority documents for the archive and the IUCN librarian, as a professional, might be able to recommend resources to assist with this task. The Executive suggested inviting the IUCN librarian to be an ex officio member of the Committee. The Executive agreed the questionnaire to Specialist Groups is premature and should wait until strategic direction and priorities are determined and key persons of relevance for collecting this information are identified.

3. Review of Specialist Groups and Task Forces

3a) Review of Specialist Groups and Chairs

The Executive considered the existing Specialist Group network and Chairs, and provided their advice to the incoming SSC Chair on reconstituting the Commission.

4. Any other business

a) Awards to be presented at Commission meeting and Congress

The Executive moved discussion of the awards to be presented during the SSC Commission-wide Meeting and 3rd IUCN World Conservation Congress to the agenda of the Steering Committee Meeting.

Steering Committee Meeting

15 November 2004
Queen Sirikit Centre
Bangkok, Thailand

Steering Committee members present: David Brackett (Chair), Natalia Anajeva, Rebecca DeCruz, Holly Dublin, Brahim Haddane, Jon Hutton, Gustavo Fonseca, David Given, Yoshio Kaneko, Bob Lacy, Ling-Ling Lee, Mike Maunder, Roger McManus, Russ Mittermeier, Elena Kreuzberg-Mukhina, Valery Neronov, Jorge Rabinovich, Barry Richardson, Michael Samways, Jameson Seyani, Corazon Catibog Sinha

Guests: Carolina Caceres, Nick Pilcher

Staff: Will Darwall, Mariano Gimenez-Dixon, Craig Hilton-Taylor, B Jackson, S Mainka, Marie-Andre Papineau, Alison Rosser, Stuart Salter, Wendy Strahm, Simon Stuart, Jean-Christophe Vie, Doreen Zivkovic

Apologies: Leon Bennun, Luigi Boitani, Cristian Samper, Georgina Mace, Ramon Perez Gil

1. Introduction

1a) Adoption of the Agenda

The agenda was adopted without revision as follows.

1. Introduction
 - a) Adoption of the Agenda
 - b) Report on Executive Committee meeting WCC 2.7
2. Management Issues
 - a) State of the SSC Review
3. Review of Specialist Groups and Task Forces
 - a) Report from Regional Vice-Chairs
 - b) Review of reports in *Species 42*
4. SSC at the World Conservation Congress
 - a) Review of the IUCN Programme and SSC meeting agenda
 - b) Focus on Motions of interest to SSC
 - c) Awards to be presented at Commission meeting and Congress

1b) Report on Executive Committee meeting WCC 2.7 and

2. Management Issues

2a) State of the SSC Review

D Brackett reviewed the discussions of the WCC 2.7 Executive Committee meeting including a report on SSC activities which will be delivered to the Congress.

3. Review of SSC Activities

3a) Reports from Regional Vice-Chairs

N Anajeva reported on activities regarding North Eurasian flora. She also noted activities of the North Eurasian invertebrate group and contributions to the global amphibian and mammal assessments. She added comments on the work of the North Eurasian Reptile Specialist Group.

E Kreuzberg-Mukhina reported on joint projects in the region as well as a number of regional red data books that were published. She also described the preparation of a multi-media CD to draw general public attention, particularly youth, to species conservation issue. She noted the SSC agenda includes a discussion on regional use of Red List Criteria. Also noted contributions to ensuring national legislations address the requirements under CITES among other activities undertaken. V

Neronov asked about connections to other regions and noted the regional structure may need further consideration in IUCN given changes in the “European” region.

Rebecca DeCruz noted the challenge of being a Regional Vice-Chair given she has no institutional home. She also noted a lack of response from networks in the region and wonders if Chairs need better advice on the questions to ask the network. Thus, the approach in her region has been to take SSC issues into the work undertaken with regional and country IUCN offices among others. She noted that the communications problem may be more on deciding what we want or need to communicate and understanding the differences in approaches taken regionally. She commented on the regional meeting in Colombo where discussion were good, but it is not clear if they were effective alone. She added the suggestion that the SSC look for more opportunities to convene small groups of SSC members wherever possible.

Jorge Rabinovich took the opportunity to highlight issues that have been brought to his attention from within SSC and by non-members. These included an interest in South America for capacity building in areas such as red listing, sustainable use aspects, impact assessments (rapid assessments) and so on. A second area of interest is related to the precautionary principle and how IUCN is dealing with this issue. Finally, issues on IUCN work related to Sustainable Use given that, in S America, IUCN is perceived as conservative or “conservation-protectionist” minded. Finally, he commented on the opportunities in conferences, for instance, for members who are present to highlight SSC activities.

B Haddane reported on activities in the North African region including joint projects with the Malaga IUCN office. He noted challenges with specific species in the region. Future plans are to create a regional red list for Northern Africa. B Haddane added that a workshop on important plant areas for the region was recently held.

B Richardson agreed on the difficulty in knowing exactly what to do as a Regional Vice-Chair. He added his approach was to introduce the work of SSC to regional members of IUCN. He noted it was difficult to have members see the value of SSC activities to their work. He also noted a key area of innovative action in the region is around invasive species. There are also questions being asked about short-range endemics, particularly invertebrates, and how to manage these in terms of conservation. He commented there is likely benefit in Regional Vice-Chairs communicating closely with each other and transfer of knowledge. He also described his involvement in IUCN Oceania Committee which is looking towards having a role in training in the region and noted the difficulty in finding the SSC experts who could assist the Oceania Committee. In summary, challenges are not being clear on the mandate of a SSC Regional Vice-Chair.

D Brackett summarized that the general areas of concern raised include:

- lack of clear direction
- a feeling of lack of empowerment
- funding issues
- regional structure and disconnect with other regional structures within IUCN
- need for institutional support
- issues around using Commission as a vehicle for delivering capacity building
- use of members in representation of IUCN in other fora

H Dublin asked about the relationships or links between SSC and IUCN regional offices? S Mainka noted interactions (positive and negative) between regional directors and IUCN programmes or Commissions are related to personalities but there is an overall change for the better. Notably, the placement of George Rabb Interns in regional offices has been positive. The adoption of the “one programme” decision will also make a difference as Commissions become more visible as an integral part of programme implementation. Finally changes within the IUCN programme team including a new position responsible for overseeing integration of Commissions as a whole and seeking areas for cross linkages.

JC Vie was surprised about the perception of IUCN being only about species conservation as in many regional offices the focus is more on sustainable use of biodiversity. J Hutton added that the species approach is being seen as irrelevant and perhaps there is need to consider re-packaging approach. M Samways agreed more work may be warranted, but he is not convinced this is truly the case. R McManus added it may be that species issues may appear to conflict with other policy agendas within the Union, thus problems arise. G Fonseca said that there are opportunities in other fora and Commissions for “re-packaging” and SSC needs to keep reinventing itself. R DeCruz agreed but noted it is important to consider the reaction of membership. In Southeast Asia, there is a species focus and members may not be comfortable with some “re-packaging” efforts. She added that, while approaches have evolved, species have remained as important components. E Kruzberg-Murkhina agreed and added there is also need to communicate better why species matter to poverty alleviation.

H Dublin commented on the CBD and how it drives governments to produce and report on certain outcomes. This can be expected to come back to SSC as a recognized source of information. If Parties turn to IUCN regional representatives for support, we may expect more contact from regional offices. She added what SSC needs is another approach for regional work as the current structure has clearly not worked.

4. SSC at the World Conservation Congress

4a) Review of the IUCN Programme and SSC meeting agenda

D Brackett introduced B Jackson who presented the IUCN Programme going forward to the Congress. In particular, he commented on the consultative process that resulted in this programme and added the task to take up now is for SSC to form better links with other IUCN Programmes. However, he sees excellent opportunities within the overall programme for input from SSC. He added IUCN will be undertaking an orientation for incoming Chairs and the Council is also undertaking to develop policy frameworks on voluntarism.

R McManus said the integration of commission and the Programme is key as he has often wondered why IUCN HQ created programmes without consideration from Commissions. This points to a need for clear communications to also ensure the Members know what IUCN is doing on their behalf. B Jackson responded noting the past few years have been spent focussing IUCN and as part of that effort, a membership strategy was initiated to better understand the Members and what benefits they see in being Members.

R Mittermeier noted the challenge of fundraising for the Programme and urged IUCN to give thought on how to stimulate, rather than stifle, Commission fundraising. He cautioned against overly micro-managing fundraising opportunities. B Jackson also noted an increasing move to a partnership approach in delivering the Programme and fundraising.

4b) Motions of interest to SSC

D Brackett presented the motions of particular interest to SSC. S Mainka noted in reviewing past motions that gaps identified were in addressing genetically modified organisms and climate change, which may change at this Congress. She added that motions on marine issues, taxonomy issues, and the precautionary principle are of interest. Also noted the Addis Ababa principles are on the table for discussion. There is additionally a motion on ethical hunting that had already raised considerable email discussion. Finally, a motion on cherishing volunteers is of interest, noting it calls for a “signed agreement” for every volunteer which would be a significant workload for SSC.

S Stuart pointed to two resolutions on the IUCN Red List as being of interest. He commented that, overall, he can see a more strategic approach from membership in motions on species. J Hutton also commented that there is a group of members who are concerned with language in the Red List motion supported by the Red List Committee and there may be a contact group necessary.

H Dublin asked about the motions dealing with ethical issues, and the call to have SSC work “framed in this context”. S Mainka noted there are a suite of ethics-based resolutions which may have a significant impact on programme.

4c) SSC Awards

D Brackett announced the new award structure and awards being presented at the Congress.

On behalf of the Steering Committee, R Mittermeier thanked D Brackett for his commitment and leadership in the past eight years.