

SPECIES SURVIVAL COMMISSION (SSC) STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING WCC 3.3

UNEP–WCMC (World Conservation Monitoring Centre),
Cambridge, United Kingdom, 3 – 5 May 2006

Minutes

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Decisions and Action Items Table.....	2
1 Welcome, Apologies, Introductions	4
1.1 Chair's welcome.....	4
1.2 Apologies	4
2 Adoption of the Agenda.....	4
3 Adoption of the Previous Minutes	4
4 Matters Arising	5
4.1 SG/TF Chair and RLA Focal Point appointments.....	5
4.2 Action items from WCC 3.2.....	6
5 Updates	8
5.1 Chair's update	8
5.2 Species Programme update.....	9
5.3 SSC Sub-Committees and SC member updates: feedback and discussion:	10
5.3.1 Marine Conservation Sub-Committee (C Campagna and Y Sadovy).....	10
5.3.2 Invertebrate Conservation Sub-Committee (M Samways)	10
5.3.3 Sustainable Use Sub-Committee (J Hutton).....	11
5.3.4 Biodiversity Assessments Sub-Committee (S Stuart).....	12
5.3.5 Biodiversity Indicators Sub-Committee (G Mace).....	15
5.3.6 Plant Conservation Sub-Committee (M Maunder).....	17
5.4 SSC Task Force updates: feedback and discussion	18
5.4.1 Restructuring TF (L Boitani)	18
5.5 Other SSC SC member updates: feedback and discussion.....	18
5.5.1 Vet SG (R Kock).....	18
5.5.2 Invasive Species SG (MC's report in pack, H Dublin)	20
5.5.3 Reintroduction SG (F Launay).....	21
5.5.4 Conservation Breeding SG (R Lacy)	22
5.4 SSC Task Force updates: feedback and discussion (continued...)	22
5.4.2 Strategic Planning TF (C Imboden)	22
6 SSC Governance issues	23
6.1 Deputy Chair nomination.....	23
6.2 New TF on Species Conservation Planning (R Lacy and H Dublin).....	23
6.3 Status of Climate Change TF	24
6.4 Future of Communications TF.....	25
6.5 Members Emeritus and Award nominations.....	26
7 SSC Finances	26
7.1 COF 2006 (H Dublin)	26
7.2 Fund-raising (J Smart and H Dublin).....	27
8 External liaisons: discussion points	27
8.1 Bilateral MOUs with the Red List Partners (J Smart)	27
8.2 Possible new relationship with UNEP-WCMC (J Hutton)	28
8.3 SSC Participation in the Conservation Commons.....	28
8.4 Potential for collaboration with WWF's Species Programme	28
9 Brainstorming and Sharing	29
9.1 SIS – prioritising issues for the future.....	29
9.2 Update on joint WCPA/SSC conservation planning initiative	30
9.3 Inputs to IUCN Change Management Projects and Leveraging Initiatives.....	30
10 SSC success stories	32
11 Timing and venues of October 2006 SC WCC 3.4 meeting.....	32
12 Any Other Business	33

DECISIONS AND ACTION ITEMS TABLE

Decisions made at WCC 3.3:

- S Butchart will take over from A Stattersfield as the Focal Point for the Bird RLA.
- The SSC SC and IUCN should provide guidance on the content and delivery of the GSA2, while other partners may contribute technically, but not exercise editorial control.
- Clive Jermy will be invited to become a Member Emeritus.
- The restructuring Task Force were encourage to continue thinking along the lines presented and bring a further discussion document to WCC 3.4.
- The work achieved during the Strategic Planning session will form the work plan for the next two years (2006-2008) and also be used to inform the development of the next SSC Strategic Plan and our input to the IUCN 2009 – 2012 programme.
- Nominations for the Harry Messel Award for Conservation Leadership and the Sir Peter Scott Award for Conservation Merit were made and accepted by the Steering Committee.
- Each Sub-Committee will pay for their representative to BASC to attend one BASC meeting per year and BASC will pay for the other.

Action Items Table:

<u>Who</u>	<u>Action Item</u>	<u>Agenda Item</u>	<u>Timeline</u>
Whole SC	Notify the Chair's office if you have contact with Chairs who need assistance in appointing RLA Focal Points. Chairs of the taxonomic Sub-Committees should assist C Poole in asking the SGs to appoint RLA Focal Points.	4.1 Chair and Focal Point appointments	Ongoing
JC Vié	Liaise with WI regarding a new Chair for the Duck SG	4.1 Chair aptmnts	asap
R Lacy	Send out cross-referenced list of Zoo Association people to taxon SGs, send complete list to Chair's Office	4.2 WCC 3.2 Action points	asap
Relevant Sub-Committee Chairs	Explain to their SGs the need to inform members that CoReg is the formalisation of their invitations to enable the web-based registration for all Commission members.	5.2 SP Update	asap
MCSC	Produce a strategy, including details of the bridges to be formed within IUCN; and appoint MCSC rep. to BASC.	5.3.1 MCSC Update	asap
M Samways	Consider separating out FPs for taxonomic groups to be included under a GIRLA & for other activities to be articulated before being represented in ICSC organogram.	5.3.2 ICSC Update	asap
SUSG	SUSC is to be formed and grapple with how to go back to basics and push issues, while actively involving relevant players from other SGs.	5.3.3 SUSG Update	asap
Whole SC	Give S Stuart thoughts on what GSA2 should contain.	5.3.4 BASC Update	asap
S Stuart & M Samways	Include JC Vié to talk about the Global Dragonfly Assessment and ensure their use of the DEM.	5.3.4 BASC Update	asap
S Stuart & J Ragle	Supply a schematic of how assessments, the DEM, the Red List Database and the SIS all fit together.	5.3.4 BASC Update	asap
M Maunder, G Mace, S Stuart & J Hutton	Work on a short document for the Red List website to articulate the appropriate uses of the Red List; the modified Scientific Collection Guidelines could be annexed to this. S Stuart should then forward them to the IUCN Environmental Law Centre for comment before posting on the web.	5.3.4 BASC Update	asap
BASC then to BISC	Compile document on what SRLI can/cannot do, which way to plot trends, and ideas on what to call the index, keeping in mind the difficulties of a name change at this stage.	5.3.5 BISC Update	Before WCC 3.4
H Dublin	Put G Mace in touch with CEM's indicators focal point.	5.3.5 BISC Update	asap
G Mace	Constitute and convene BISC in consultation with H Dublin.	5.3.5 BISC Update	asap
J Smart & M Maunder	Ask Craig to look at the Plant Database at UNEP-WCMC, M Maunder is to comment on its more general utility.	5.3.6 PCSC Update	asap
H Dublin	Go to the PPC to request another look at the relationship between IUCN and ISSG and clarification on the institutional relationship between IUCN and GISP.	5.5.2 ISSG Update	
Whole SC	Assist H Dublin to identify & nominate a new Deputy Chair	6.1 Deputy Chair	asap

R Lacy	Ensure proper articulation of the intent of our species conservation planning approach in the final ToRs.	6.2 TF on Cons. Planning	asap
R Lacy	Develop a list of proposed people for the Species Conservation Planning TF.	6.2 TF on Cons. Planning	asap
H Dublin	Liaise with J Hutton re meeting the EU point person on climate change & biodiversity.	6.3 Climate Change TF	asap
H Dublin	Speak to E Lahmann and S Maginnis in the margins of the upcoming IUCN Council.	6.3 Climate Change TF	asap
G Mace	Send minutes of the ZSL meeting to H Dublin for reference.	6.3 Climate Change	asap
S Stuart	Look at potential to set up a review group for GSA2's climate change components.	6.3 Climate Change TF	asap
J Smart	Ask JC Vié to put together a document on what the IUCN is doing from their side.	6.3 Climate Change TF	asap
Species Programme	Begin work on the following activities - Overlay species data with areas that will be impacted by climate change (scenario maps from IPCC) - Characterize species that are most vulnerable to cc by establishing vulnerability traits; code these into the AFs	6.3 Climate Change TF	
H Dublin	Ask R Pethiyagoda for the two communications documents discussed at the SSC SC WCC3.2 and the comments made there and work on their improvement.	6.4 Future of Communications TF	asap
C Poole	Google incomplete Members Emeritus list	6.5 M. Emeritus	asap
C Poole	Prepare an appointment letter for C Jermy with M Maunder's assistance	6.5 Members Emeritus	
H Dublin	Prepare and bestow the agreed awards.	6.5 Awards	
J Smart	Ask D Zivkovic to develop a list of all recipients of the Sir Peter Scott award using information from the archives.	6.5 Awards	asap
All Sub-Committees	Budget for the participation of their representative to BASC.	7.1 COF 2006	
H Dublin & J Smart	Review all current BirdLife International MOUs	8.1 Bilateral MOUs	asap
H Dublin	Talk to A Rowles-Anobile on issues pertaining to SSC SC concerns with regard to the possible merger with UNEP-WCMC and to the Conservation Commons	8.3 Conservation Commons	asap
H Dublin	Continue to talk to WWF about the potential for future partnership on a communications approach to raising the profile and understanding of the relevance of species to human livelihoods and wellbeing.	8.4 WWF Species and People publication	asap
J Smart	Let J Ragle know that, further to his query, the SSC SC feels the following should be incorporated in SIS: - Improvements & modifications on climate change - Identification & impact of alien invasive species - Human-wildlife conflict - Disease - The volumes of trade and harvest - Habitat loss, fragmentation, land conversion - Addressing the issue of taxonomic updating - Possible linkages to WIKIE Species.	9.1 SIS	asap
Whole SC	Through the Chair, become involved in the Change Management Projects and Leveraging Initiatives, as well as to provide ideas regarding potential SSC engagements and contributions or other individuals who might be involved on behalf of the SSC.	9.4 IUCN Change Mgmt & Leveraging Initiatives	asap
M Samways, M Maunder, R Kock, Y Sadovy	Put a document together on biodiversity, productivity, resilience, web-of-life, etc. and have it ready for the pack for next SSC SC meeting.	9.4 Change Mgmt & leveraging initiatives	For WCC 3.4
Whole SC	Email any success stories to the SP office	10 Success Stories	ongoing
C Poole	Make arrangements for WCC 3.4, liaising with R Mittermeier on logistics / a social event; & M Maunder regarding the potential for SC members to do guest lectures at the University in Antananarivo.	11 WCC 3.4	asap
H Dublin	Invite someone from the CEC to assist our communication needs at a future SSC SC meeting.	12 Any other business	asap

DAY 1: WEDNESDAY 3 MAY

1. WELCOME, APOLOGIES, INTRODUCTIONS

1.1 Chair's welcome

At 8:40am S Douglas-Whitehead of UNEP-WCMC welcomed everyone and gave house-keeping announcements regarding health and safety, signing in and out, and refreshments.

H Dublin then welcomed all present and reminded them about the drinks function that evening at The Möller Centre – to which the Species Programme staff had also been invited, affording a good opportunity for all to mingle. J Hutton then welcomed everyone to the UNEP-WCMC.

1.2 Apologies

The following members attended the meeting:

SSC Steering Committee: H Dublin, C Campagna, Y Sadovy, L Boitani, F Launay, R Kock, G Mace, M Maunder, J Robinson, J Hutton, M Samways, C Imboden, R Lacy

Species Programme: J Smart, S Stuart

SSC Chair's Office: C Poole

Apologies were received from: R Mittermeier, T Brooks, M Clout and L Bennun. H Dublin mentioned that as R Mittermeier and T Brooks were extremely tied up with meetings in Washington DC, S Stuart joined the meeting in T Brooks's place.

2. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

H Dublin mentioned that contrary to some concerns about having another Steering Committee meeting so close to the last, she had had no problem filling the agenda. She also said she appreciated that this meeting was timed to link with IUCN Council meetings and that she would generally like to continue with this timing twice per year.

H Dublin then asked for any additions to the agenda and added the following items herself:

- a) External Liaisons (Item 8.4): The potential for collaboration with WWF's Species Programme
- b) Any Other Business (Item 12): filming project to highlight Chairs and members

There were no further alternations to the agenda, and it was therefore adopted.

3. ADOPTION OF THE PREVIOUS MINUTES (WCC 3.2, PUERTO MADRYN, PATAGONIA, ARGENTINA, 7 – 9 DECEMBER 2005)

H Dublin mentioned that the SSC Chair Office did make the requested changes to the minutes of WCC 3.1, and the minutes had been re-loaded onto the SSC website. She then reiterated that the minutes of WCC 3.2 had been distributed at the time of their completion and people had been given the opportunity to comment, and therefore hoped there would not be many changes required at this stage.

There were no comments on the minutes of WCC 3.2 and therefore they were adopted.

4. MATTERS ARISING

4.1 Specialist Group (SG) / Task Force (TF) Chair and Red List Authority (RLA) Focal Point appointments

H Dublin took those present through the latest update on the SG Chairs as well as the progress in appointing Focal Points for the RLAs. The following was noted:

- i) Chiroptera SG Co-Chairs, Dr Rodrigo A Medellin and Prof Paul A Racey, have been appointed and are already engaging with many issues – including the relationship between bats and Ebola. H Dublin thanked S Stuart for his input into this matter.
- ii) An interim Asian Rhino SG Co-Chair, Dr Tirtha Man Maskey, has also been appointed. He is a retired Director of Wildlife in Nepal.
- iii) The newly-appointed Shark SG Co-Chair, Walter Andrés Domingo Balestra, has signed his Letter of Agreement.

H Dublin also noted that the following SGs, TFs and RLAs are still without Chairs or Focal Points:

- Carnivorous Plant SG
- Sirenia SG
- Duck SG (WI) – H Dublin mentioned that Dr James Robinson's resignation had been expected, and that JC is currently talking to WI on this issue.

ACTION: JC Vié is to liaise with WI regarding a new Chair for the Duck SG.

- Climate Change TF. H Dublin mentioned that this issue has been very delicate and on-going for some time, but that she has achieved a proper engagement with the former Chair, Dr Camille Parmesan, who has declined the position. Further discussion followed under Agenda Item 6.3.
- Legume RLA

H Dublin reported that so far only 23 of the 73 SGs that should establish RLAs have sent in details of their designated Focal Points. Only three of the stand-alone RLAs have signed the Letters of Agreement. H Dublin commented that this is very administrative, and also raises the question of what we do about non-compliance. She felt that this is not a particularly favourable situation, however commented that she could not find any record of the previous SSC Chair's success in this regard. H Dublin also mentioned that the Chair's Office is finding it time consuming to deal with all the requests from the Chairs and Focal Points who approach the Chair's Office with technical queries on Red Listing, and ultimately have to be passed on to Red List Programme office.

J Robinson queried whether people are just too busy or whether they do not want to be involved and H Dublin answered that she assumes they are just busy, but perhaps people do not want to take on the task of RLA FP. S Stuart commented that reminders have come a bit fast and that in many Groups major discussions are underway and it is likely to be some time before they answer. H Dublin asked the relevant Sub-Committee Chairs to follow up with their people regarding the designation of RLA Focal Points and to ask them to file their replies or to let her office know if there are issues or if there are any difficulties. Although the need to appoint RL Focal Points is clear in the SG Chairs and RLA's Terms of Reference (ToRs) and the ToRs have been set out well in advance, it is possible that some of the groups do not know what to do – especially where new Chairs are at the helm.

ACTION: Whole SC should notify the Chair's office if they have contact with SG Chairs or RLAs who need assistance in appointing RLA Focal Points. Chairs of the taxonomic Sub-Committees should assist C Poole in asking the SGs to appoint RLA Focal Points.

H Dublin mentioned one final discussion point – that Ali Stattersfield, current RLA FP for the Bird RLA, has asked that the FP be Stuart Butchart.

DECISION: S Butchart will take over from A Stattersfield as the Focal Point for the Bird RLA.

4.2 Action Items from WCC 3.2

H Dublin mentioned that the Action Point table had been sent out a few weeks ago with no reply, and suggested that SC members should declare if and when they need reminders of their action points from her office. The following is the Action Points Table from WCC 3.2, with the status column indicating the comments given at WCC 3.3 on progress.

Who	Action	Status
SSC Chair's Assistant	Make changes suggested by L Bennun in the WCC3.1 minutes and post corrected version on web	Completed
H Dublin	Contact IUCN ARO to follow up on the Asian vulture issue, ask whether they feel a TF is necessary and to ensure liaison amongst SSC, IUCN ARO and the DGO.	Ongoing. Good meeting at CBD COP8; letters to go from the IUCN DG to Indian Prime Minister; plans to use the IUCN network in Pakistan. Differing opinions on the need for a TF; government process will operate alongside the technical process (IUCN is involved at each level)
H Dublin	In subsequent updates from the Chair to the SSC SC, find a balance between no reporting on single species matters and a summary of relevant undertakings.	Noted
H Dublin with N Lopoukhine	A joint initiative is to be convened with WCPA to develop a unifying framework for systematic conservation planning	Ongoing; first meeting is planned for 5-7 June in London
H Dublin	Continue to investigate ways to integrate the best of all the available species planning tools and approaches, within and outside SSC, into an improved, standardised strategic planning process for the SSC network	Draft Species Conservation Planning ToR were in the Meeting Pack for discussion under Item 6.2.
J Smart	Support for climate change to be incorporated into ToRs of a staff position in the SP	J Smart discussed this under Item 5.2.
J Smart	Consult with IUCN Legal Counsel regarding the liability of those volunteering for the SSC, such as Red List assessors or members of the SPWG	J Smart has asked the legal team for advice on this matter.
J Smart/M Maunder	Discuss nomination of Clive Jermy to Members Emeritus list and report back to SSC Chair	M Maunder proposed that he be nominated and a decision was taken.
J Smart	Action Plan guidelines to be sent to the SGs as "new draft guidelines" and SGs to be informed that the SSC species AP process is under review and that there are resource limitations to publishing APs	SP staff to finalise the new draft guidelines for distribution to SGs who are currently developing Action Plans (APs).
J Smart	Pass on press material for the AZE launch to SP communications staff for further transmission	J Smart stated that this was done immediately after WCC3.2.
JC Vié	Contact the proposed Chair of the Climate Change TF to discuss its reconstitution, ToR and grant proposals	J Smart stated that JC Vié has been assisting here. Further discussion followed under Item 6.3
L Bennun	To work with SSC on developing objective criteria for the establishment of new bird SGs	H Dublin stated that nothing has been received.
T Brooks	Correspond with R Pethiyagoda on the possible need to provide potential petitioners with more information to guide them on deciding whether or not filing a petition is appropriate	H Dublin and S Stuart agreed that this item is now incorporated under other items.

T Brooks	Form a committee to review and revise the Guidelines on Implementing the "IUCN Policy Statement on Research Involving Species at Risk of Extinction", with special reference to scientific collection of Threatened Species and bring them back to the SSC SC	S Stuart stated that this is ongoing and that he would report on this issue in agenda Item 5.3.4
BASC	Provide H Dublin with a process for dealing with individual complaints on implementation of the Petitions Process	S Stuart stated that he has corresponded with H Dublin, but it was agreed that you cannot plan for every eventuality
BASC	Technical details and definitions of the proposed "fast track" plants assessment process to be further detailed by BASC and reviewed by the SPWG prior to adoption.	S Stuart stated that he will cover this in Item 5.3.4. A paper has been written and is being reviewed; M Maunder and G Mace are also a part of the process
J Hutton	Appoint an SUSC membership and then explore and define the primary roles for the SUSC and SUSG	J Hutton stated he does not want to appoint until he is clear on the focus required. H Dublin reiterated that progress is needed, and asked J Hutton to find people to assist him. J Hutton's PA is making progress with the list of suggested people. He explained that that the Sub-Committee will consist of people who are members of SUSG and others who are brought in for their knowledge on SU issues.
C Imboden	Prepare a draft plan grouping the targets into the four categories of funding availability	C Imboden said that Item 5.4.2 will be a continuation of this item.
C Imboden	Lead a strategic planning exercise in the half day set aside at the next SSC SC meeting to further work on the revision of the Strategic Plan	Item 5.4.2
C Imboden	Liaise with the SSC sub-Committees and Restructuring TF and bring various scenarios to be discussed at the next SC meeting	Item 5.4.2
C Imboden	Prepare a "soft" revision of the Strategic Plan for period 2006-2008 (based on the outcomes of the sub-Committee meetings and the next SSC SC discussion on the topic)	Item 5.4.2
R Kock	Alert SSC of emerging threats to West African vultures	Office Internationale Exotique (OIE) is helping to deal with the situation in SE Asia. There are plans to pass a regulation on the banning of Diclofenac at the next meeting. R Kock noted that this will take many years to take effect, and that there are many remaining concerns (such as the effect on other species). It is a trans-boundary process with very ad-hoc timing.
R Lacy	CBSG to produce a contact list of Chairs of Taxon Advisory Groups in regional zoo associations, and then to forward those names and contact information to the SSC Special Group Chairs with responsibilities for those taxa.	R Lacy's staff have put together a cross-referenced list of zoo association people and SSC SGs, which will be distributed. R Lacy will send entire list to SSC Chair's Office and to thematic SG Chairs.
R Pethiyagoda	Circulate 1) a revised key communications messages paper and 2) a document on how to communicate these messages internally and externally	H Dublin has had contact with R Pethiyagoda, but he did not respond on this issue for this meeting. H Dublin cautioned the SC to look to his tasks as part of the Deputy Chair position. H Dublin also mentioned that Council has must approve the nomination of a new Deputy Chair.

5. UPDATES

The Steering Committee (SC) was presented with detailed written updates for each item hereunder, so only the main discussion points are captured in these minutes.

5.1 Chair's update

H Dublin stated her quarterly reports to the donors are being well-received and she will continue to do them. The main points from H Dublin's update were as follows:

Administration and Fundraising:

- A new Chair's Assistant (C Poole) has been appointed, but the appointment of the Senior Commission Officer is not imminent due to the uncertainty of guaranteed funding.
- Formal gifts to Sultanate of Oman are being prepared and will be delivered via the IUCN WESCANA office. Dr Andrew Spalton, of the Diwan of the Royal Court in Oman, says H Dublin has gone a long way to repair the relationship, but they are not interested in funding more SSC work at this time (although this can be revisited in future).
- The GEF is in state of flux and this will likely continue until the replenishment negotiations for GEF4 are complete.
- The Skoll Foundation had over 500 applicants for funding and has informed H Dublin that her application was unsuccessful.
- The Indianapolis Zoo Award winner has not yet been announced, but H Dublin is due in Nairobi for some promotional filming after the SC meeting.
- Conservation International (CI), although cautious about guaranteeing money for the next half of the year, are confident that there should be no problem.

Governance:

- CoReg, the Commission on-line registration system, has been quite problematic as there are so many members in the SSC and there have been some glitches with the system.
- A constructive meeting between Commission Chairs, the Director General and the Global Directors of IUCN was held at the end of February 2006.
- The search for the new DG of IUCN is underway and a selection committee (including R Mittermeier) is trying to move quickly on this issue.

Programmatic and Partnership Meetings:

- The SSC put a lot of resources into indicators work and IUCN delegation work at the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) Conference of the Parties (COP) 8. The SSC hosted two side events, which were well received, and a report-back has been drafted for each and distributed to participants. The SSC also worked with other delegations to attain a mandate for IUCN on biodiversity indicators for measuring progress towards the CBD's 2010 target. H Dublin mentioned that even if the WCMC 2010 Biodiversity Indicators Partnership proposal to the GEF is approved, there will still only be nominal resources for SSC, although the Commission is in a unique position to deliver on the development, testing and delivery of the indicators. To this end, considerable time was spent on fundraising before, during and since the COP8.

Species-specific issues:

- H Dublin commented that specific species issues are continuous and take time. She highlighted a few specific issues such as: new activities on the Chinese tiger bone trade; the fact that the elephant poaching situation in Garamba has improved, but the status of the Northern White Rhino is dire; continuing efforts on behalf of the South Asian vulture situation and the challenges in funding a Secretariat to oversee the Amphibian Action Plan.

5.2 Species Programme (SP) update

Referring to her detailed written report, J Smart gave an update explaining how the SP is delivering against each Key Result Area (KRA) in the IUCN Programme. Attention was drawn to certain points, including the fact that case studies are being done under KRA 5 (Ecosystems and Sustainable Livelihoods) and the fact that online CoReg is working and it is necessary that all members are registered.

ACTION: All relevant Sub-Committee Chairs are to explain to their SGs the need to inform their membership that CoReg is simply the formalisation of their invitations to enable the web-based registration for all Commission members.

J Smart also explained that there has been a Review of the Species Programme by Price Waterhouse Coopers via interviews, electronic questionnaires, and interactive dialogue. The report has been published and the SP is required to do a Management Response, which is divided into three input streams:

- A task force (including representatives from donor relations and Human Resources)
- Senior staff
- The SSC SC

J Smart summarised the results of the Review as follows:

- The SP objectives and mandate should be redefined.
- The rules of engagement between SP and SSC should be articulated
- More focused engagement between the SP and regional offices is required
- Structural adjustment – a Senior Species Scientist position has been proposed, role of SP Deputy should be redefined.
- Need a new management tier within in the SP
- Redistribute support staff capacity
- Strengthen financial management capacity, fundraising, access to technology, and communications (e.g. standardise the diverse identity of email addresses)

There was some expression of concern that the Review did not look in-depth at the linkages of the SP and the Commission, or how Commission members communicate with the SSC and the SP. J Smart said that that was not within the stated Terms of Reference (ToR) of the Review, but that the Review did consider ways in which support for the Commission could be optimised in relation to a new management structure. H Dublin mentioned that the funding model is problematic as often money is raised for projects and the staff are project-dedicated, therefore they are not free to provide support to the Commission. She reiterated that she feels there should be better definitions of roles and responsibilities, so that the SP will know exactly what the agreed support functions should be.

J Hutton stated that the TRAFFIC relationship is also difficult to fully understand. J Smart agreed that it does need to be further defined and articulated. H Dublin said that the review of TRAFFIC was important and gave new direction, but it seems the cyclical swing has happened as they now seem closer to WWF and further from IUCN. She suggested that we need to more closely define the relationship between the TRAFFIC programme and the SSC's work on sustainable use and species in trade.

C Imboden commented that the SP Review addresses the symptoms of some issues that have so far proven irresolvable (i.e. SSC–SP linkages), and suggested that the SC make a proposal to the IUCN on how to move forward. He explained that the SP might struggle to solve some issues in the Review as they are linked to this greater issue. H Dublin commented that one of the most fundamental discussion points in the meeting between Global Directors and Commissions was the agreement to deliver a single programme; the problem being how to operationalise and implement this. S Stuart agreed with C Imboden's point but also stated that there were major problems within the SP that had nothing to do with the SSC-SP linkage issue. He further added that J Smart had inherited some very serious management issues and that since her arrival staff morale had increased significantly.

L Boitani noted that there is a logical inconsistency among the recommendations. Recommendation 1 says that the IUCN is to redefine the mandate of the SP, yet the following recommendation is to redefine the structure of the SP. In effect one has to take Recommendation 1 seriously first or one could do all the structural changes without supporting the SSC's mandate. J Smart agreed to take this into consideration in the Management Response, and C Imboden cautioned that wording is important.

J Smart commented that she thinks the SP Review has given her what she needs to improve the support function and sort out the management issues. She says she feels positive although it is a lot to implement. H Dublin explained that IUCN Senior Management have asked that the SC provide input to the Management Response and she will let the SC know how this is to take place. She thanked J Smart for her feedback and expressed pleasure that J Smart feels that it has helped.

5.3 SSC Sub-Committees and SC member updates: feedback and discussion:

5.3.1 Marine Conservation Sub-Committee (MCSC) (C Campagna and Y Sadovy)

C Campagna commented that the SSC MCSC strategic planning will take place after the SSC Strategic Planning session at this meeting. Y Sadovy then commented on the following new items:

- Species assessments: in touch with K Carpenter who has money to start this; also regarding an Authority Files TF on habitat and a document on trade.
- Want to do over-exploitation segment that links to indicators
- Will be taking information from Sub-Committees for strategic plan re 2010
- Need to establish who on the MCSC will be on the BASC.
- Intend to have a meeting between now and WCC 3.4

H Dublin suggested that producing something quickly on what the MCSC process is would be useful, and also requested something more formal on the bridges to be formed within IUCN. She commented that there are also a number of things on the marine invasive species side that creates confusion because the Marine Programme has become more involved with the ISSG than the Species Programme. She recommended that the sooner the SSC marine strategy is done the better. She also commented that C Campagna and Y Sadovy are doing things very diplomatically, collaboratively and cohesively.

J Robinson enquired as to whether there is funding available to bring the Chairs of the Marine SGs together this year. C Campagna commented that some people should be able to cover their own costs, but the MCSC would have to fundraise for specific actions. Y Sadovy commented that they will discuss when this SG Chairs meeting will happen at their next MCSC meeting.

ACTIONS: MCSC is to produce a strategy, including details of the bridges to be formed within IUCN, and to appoint a MCSC representative to the BASC.

5.3.2 Invertebrate Conservation Sub-Committee (ICSC) (M Samways)

M Samways opened the discussion by saying that he needs advice from the Restructuring TF. He mentioned that much work-shopping has occurred on the structure diagram, but that the consensus is that a Global Invertebrate RLA (GIRLA) of some sort is needed as this would deal with the species which belong to taxa and which may be too small to have their own SG. He suggested that a new model is needed with geographic, taxonomic and special ecosystems specialists feeding into the GIRLA. He went on to mention that the taxonomic specialists would always be considered higher up, and that many focal experts have already been identified. He expounded on the importance of having people to drive the RLA portfolio and explained that some groups and issues still need a focal expert (e.g. invertebrates in special ecosystems such as caves, islands, soil) as these are the ones where Red Listing is needed. The old Chairs of invertebrate geographical areas want to be involved again, and he feels there is no harm in having

focal experts from particular areas. He clarified that all these are complementary and there should not be clashes.

C Imboden queried why the diagram was so complicated, in particular why there are groups on the diagram when they should be individuals. M Samways clarified that the focal experts are individuals. C Campagna asked if there is any institutional support in order to help organise this (like a BirdLife International for invertebrates). M Samways replied saying that the Xerces Society exists, as do organisations for butterfly conservation, as well as for invertebrates in general under the Expanding the Ark Coalition (a group dedicated to invertebrate conservation, emanating from the American Museum of Natural History), but there is no institutional support as such. H Dublin commented that this is a significant problem as the number of species is so large.

J Robinson commented that staff support will be a problem given the complexity of the overlapping structure and it will also be hard to run it as it is a voluntary network. He explained that most Red Listing activity needs to be as simple as possible so that there are no overlapping sets – therefore there should be either a hierarchical taxonomic subdivision or some other, but not both. He said that it would be best if people were in one of a small number of groupings with a hierarchical structure and focussed on the Red Listing. M Samways agreed that there are a vast number of people who are dedicated to specific interests and therefore it is best to work with people's strengths and in the foci which motivate them.

G Mace said that she feels that it is best to look at it as a set of priority tasks so that some priorities override others. She commented that everything presented involves Red Listing and that it might be good to address more issue-based priorities in some areas and reflect these on the diagram. M Samways responded saying that the invertebrate conservationists need assistance on Red Listing, but there are no resources for research projects (all these individuals have their own research programmes and feed back into this system, but the primary role is to Red List). C Imboden commented that the focus should be beyond Red Listing, as we have to sell the services of biodiversity, including invertebrates.

H Dublin commented on the GIRLA idea saying that a next iteration was needed on how it would finally appear and how activities other than Red Listing would be represented. R Lacy commented that the geographic groups on the diagram seem more important for communications at a local level, while the taxonomic groups are more important for Red Listing. S Stuart reminded everyone that if any of the groups are going to become RLAs, it should come through the BASC first.

H Dublin suggested that the RLAs referred to in the diagram are actually individual people and should be called Focal Points, and that the GIRLA should be formed to be consistent with the SSC norms. H Dublin then summed up by saying that it would be best for the next version to separate the Red Listing functions from any other activities the ICSC may intend to undertake. She encouraged M Samways to think about this a little more and get back to the Restructuring TF if he needed further guidance.

ACTION: M Samways to consider separating out Focal Points for taxonomic groups to be included under a Global Invertebrate RLA and for other activities to be articulated before being represented in the ICSC organogram.

5.3.3 Sustainable Use Sub-Committee (SUSC) (J Hutton)

J Hutton mentioned a few things that have occurred recently:

- The Precautionary Principle (PP) project now has products (a book of Guidelines on the Application of the PP).
- The WCMC 2010 Biodiversity Indicators Partnership (BIP): a recent meeting reviewed what the CBD requires in the way of sustainable use indicators and how to proceed with their development, testing and delivery.
- The SUSG has a new website (visible soon), and a newsletter edited by Robin Sharp, Chair of the European Chapter of the SUSG.
- There was a preparatory meeting for the symposium "Recreational Hunting, Conservation and Rural Livelihoods: Science and Practice" – which will take place at the Zoological Society of London (ZSL) in October 2006.

- The SUSG membership list is almost finalised and consists of a couple of hundred people.

J Hutton commented that the PP work puts a different tilt onto the PP than is currently used by CITES and others, and stated that there is an application to the EU to fund a further phase and distribute the book.

M Maunder asked how the plant groups could have access to J Hutton's information. J Hutton replied saying that there is an MOU with the Global Tree SG already, but that the problem is that there is no Programme Officer serving the SUSG and more capacity is needed. H Dublin commented that many taxonomic SGs have expertise on sustainable use and that SUSG needs to coordinate and collaborate with them. M Maunder rejoined saying that although there are many experts, they are not always easy to tap – particularly as the vocabulary of sustainable use is difficult and there is a capacity building need. H Dublin agreed that the vocabulary is different, linkages with CITES are different, and linkages between Conventions are also confusing – but that unfortunately there are resource limitations to assist in capacity building. She commented that perhaps there is a need for a TF within the group to focus on the capacity building issues.

M Maunder enquired as to whether there is an "idiot's guide" to sustainable use for the SGs. J Hutton responded to say that there is more and more information coming out about sustainable use, sustainable management and sustainable trade and that this mixing of terms causes confusion and people struggle to understand what sustainable use actually is. His inclination is that we need to focus on the big thinking as this is what underpins sustainable use as a concept

J Robinson commented that members of other groups should be involved so their perspective can be built into the Sustainable Use ideas, and the Sustainable Use SG must also ask for assistance from other SGs. Y Sadovy said she would look at their list of members, as they need someone from the MCSC to participate on the SUSG. H Dublin said that there is a need to go back to basics and suggested that J Hutton should have the SUSC grapple with this and then give more guidance to everyone. M Maunder commented that people are not even reading appropriate literature on Sustainable Use and suggested that perhaps Species should have an item on SU.

ACTION: SUSC is to be formed and then grapple with how to go back to basics and push their issues, while actively involving relevant players from other SGs.

C Campagna commented that the SUSG should have the profile to affect how GEF is thinking and how they are strategically investing money. J Hutton answered that he has a bit of influence as he was asked to sit on the review panel for GEF work in this field, looking at the impact of the GEF projects on livelihoods and local benefits.

5.3.4 Biodiversity Assessments Sub-Committee (BASC) (S Stuart)

S Stuart summarised issues as follows:

- The 2006 Red List website launched on 4 May 2006 and the hit rate is at approximately 3 million per year (this is up from last year's rate of 2 million hits for the year). There is therefore a need to look at the capacity of the site, especially because there are many applications that could make the site more interesting. Thanks to C Hilton-Taylor and C Pollock for their hard work and meticulousness.
- Amphibians - the Global Amphibian Assessment (GAA) website is also to be updated – the first update of assessment information. S Stuart showed the SC copies of certain chapters of the draft of the "Amphibians of the World" book.
- Mammals - the Global Mammal Assessment completion date has been delayed until mid 2007.
- Marine – a core grant starts in July (thanks to R McManus) and covers the secretariat support. More fundraising is being done for projects. The Shark SG started their assessment of sharks and rays at least 4 years ago and there is also a grant for mapping. The Food and Agriculture Organisation (FAO) are donating all the shark maps to the Shark SG.
- Plants – there is a grant from CI for the Cycad SG for all Cycad assessments, mapping and documentation to be completed by the end of 2006. The Global Tree SG has finished work on the Magnoliaceae and oaks for the 2007 Red List. Funding is required for the mapping of

oaks. The Global Preliminary Assessment of Plants will be discussed at the upcoming BASC meeting as the exact methodology needs to be developed and agreed.

- The new DEM is being pioneered in a number of SGs successfully and will be rolled out in the second half of this year more fully.
- NaRLiWoG (National Red List Working Group) has just enough money to write a Darwin Initiative proposal for a September / October deadline for a support officer to replace R Miller.
- Authority Files Task Force – A Stattersfield has helped people to agree on how to classify threats. The major task has been to seek linkages with the Conservation Measures Partnership. New Authority Files will be ready for next BASC meeting, although much work is needed on how to improve these Authority Files so that there can be more sophisticated interrogation of the data (e.g. more focus on life-history issues and links to livelihoods and ecosystem goods and services).

S Stuart highlighted other issues that need further discussion and thought:

- The need for an SSC policy on the use of Red List data that one can download from the website and an introductory paragraph on the download page. A team is working on this within the overall Conservation Commons, but the question is whether there is a need to track specifically what people use the Red List data for.
- Authorship of assessments - as people want to cite their inputs so that they can add it to their lists of publications. BASC is investigating the options and implications.
- Adapting the criteria for climate change impacts is complicated, particularly for short generation time species, because 10 years is the minimum time frame for measuring further declines for short generation time species and this is too short for the climate change models (i.e. species are the missing from the list when we know they should be on).
- Second Global Species Assessment (GSA2): BASC is discussing the outline at their next meeting, but the idea is to do basic reporting in Section 2 and then have a deeper look at some issues – such as major threats or drivers (e.g. climate change, use or invasives). S Stuart asked the SC to provide guidance on what GSA2 should look at. There was some discussion on distinguishing between what the IUCN wants and how this may differ from what the partners want, but S Stuart stated that previously the partners did not have editorial control and it would be best if this continues.

DECISION: The SSC SC and IUCN should provide guidance on the content and delivery of the GSA2, while other partners may contribute technically, but not exercise editorial control.

ACTION: The SC is to give S Stuart their thoughts on what GSA2 should contain.

C Campagna commented that the Census of Marine Life databases are different databases than the Red List database and queried whether it would be possible to put it all together and create one large database that everyone can contribute to. S Stuart answered that he was not sure if this will work as the Census of Marine Life's Ocean Biogeographic Information System (OBIS) is all quite complicated and some of the databases were set up for different reasons. He feels that it might not be possible to come up with one database, but that some standards are needed to make it easier to share data.

M Samways queried the status of the Global Dragonfly Assessment, and S Stuart said he was finding it hard to obtain details, but that apparently it is going ahead. He reiterated the importance of using the DEM and said he had discussed this with the Odonata SG.

ACTION: S Stuart and M Samways are to include JC Vié to talk about the Global Dragonfly Assessment and ensure their use of the DEM.

J Hutton then had a few questions, which were answered by S Stuart:

- Have the DEM and Species Information System (SIS) been tested, and how do you moderate the checks and balances for the entry of these data into the Red List? Can we have a one-page schematic on how it all links together with examples and samples?

S Stuart explained that the data are moderated within RLAs, at the regional or taxonomic level (e.g. mammal), and then finally checked by a series of queries that the Red List Programme

runs. All SIS data has to be brought in table by table at the moment, but next year should be easier, due to the enhanced inter-operability between the SIS Data Entry Module and the new Red List Database. There will always have to be checks on data quality, and some things will still need to be done manually (though every effort is being made to minimize these). He explained that, due to increased use by the network of the DEM, there is a big decrease in the administration of copying and pasting data. However, set against this there is an ongoing increase in the time devoted to checking the data, as the overall volume of the data flow has increased. J Hutton mentioned that rapidly changing taxonomy is also a problem, so perhaps we need to supply a standard taxonomy up-front like CITES. S Stuart stated that such major shifts are currently taking place in taxonomy that it is probably not possible to agree taxonomies up-front. The field is moving too fast.

ACTION: S Stuart and J Ragle are to supply a schematic of how assessments, the DEM, the Red List Database and the SIS all fit together.

- Mapping is important, but they are all PDF files which cannot be used by others – why? S Stuart answered that the maps are all GIS-based, but that only a PDF picture of the map appears on the internet. He also commented that it would be nice if people could download the maps, but there are so many (~8,000) – so it is best if they do this via NatureServe, who are better equipped to provide this service.
- Caveats of data quality are important and the PDF file that is downloadable should be upfront about the limitations of the data. Is there a plan for a review of what users need? S Stuart agreed saying that there are plans for a review. H Dublin queried if this is an action item and cautioned that it needs resources. J Smart agreed and said that it needs to be delayed until the SP is fully staffed. J Hutton commented on the possibility of social bookmarking so that people can comment or leave feedback on the databases for others to see.

J Smart mentioned that she feels that the IUCN has flagship knowledge products and needs to have a grand plan to merge these databases. H Dublin agreed saying this is something being discussed at Senior Management level in IUCN. J Hutton commented that open access is an important issue as people can brand information as theirs – and how does one raise money if one's data are being used by others without restriction? H Dublin agreed that this was definitely a problem and reiterated that it was also being discussed in the IUCN. S Stuart commented that we do control the update process, so others cannot keep their downloaded data current. G Mace then commented that we need to make our unique data work better for us, as well as ensuring the right branding. H Dublin agreed saying that developing ways to capture the value of our data is directly linked to enhancing our ability to secure resources.

Y Sadovy then asked whether (with the ramping up of global assessment projects and the GIS data) the information is being cross-checked by SGs. S Stuart stated that all the data, including map data, goes to SGs, and that it is very time consuming. M Samways asked what the channel of support for the DEM/SIS is, and S Stuart answered that there is a new network support person.

Scientific Collection Guidelines

S Stuart explained that many Red List assessors are worried that if a species is listed as threatened it will inhibit scientific collection (which many assessments and experts are utterly dependant on). S Stuart further explained that the Guidelines are not dealing with transporting elsewhere, only with collection. He mentioned that the concerns with the Guidelines are as follows:

1. Access and benefit sharing issues in the CBD that are leading to tighter controls on intellectual property rights
2. Developing country scientists are increasingly concerned that governments over-regulate their collecting activities as a result of red list activities
3. Grammar and wording must be cautious so as not to make the Guidelines too prescriptive

4. While making it clear that we share the SSC member's concerns of not closing down their ability to collect, it is not clear who the Guidelines are trying to influence.
5. Is this likely to be effective without a communications strategy? It might go through countries and governments and never get out to the people.
6. Very few countries are already deciding on collecting permits based on IUCN listings alone. However, they do make such decisions based on their national listings, and because IUCN listings do affect national listings, there are inevitable knock-on consequences between the IUCN Red List and the issuance of scientific collecting permits.

H Dublin opened the discussion by saying that this has major policy ramifications as we are not only doing it for the SSC members, but also governments, including IUCN State Members. BASC will give feedback and members of IUCN staff are well aware of the issues regarding intellectual property, but we need to be honest with the members of the SSC about what these Guidelines mean and what power they will have to influence the issue as a set of Guidelines. It is also important to establish the context accurately so that IUCN does not get complaints from government members.

R Lacy queried who we are trying to keep happy, as there seem to be three tiers to the problem and we need to be sure that we do not get confused:

1. SSC members – to reassure them that they need not be as worried as they are?
2. SSC members – to educate them that they should be more worried about certain issues?
3. Governments – to convince them that there is a problem and they should make policy?

M Maunder commented that they had circulated the draft to PCSC and the first reaction was that access and benefit sharing issues must be included. He also reiterated that the first three lines must state who the document is serving. H Dublin followed up that it should state both who the document is serving and who it is guiding, as the governments are the target of the Guidelines, but it should also educate SSC members. J Hutton reminded everyone that this was part of a resolution at World Conservation Congress (WCC) 3 and clarified that the message we need to give is that mandatory action on the basis of listing categories is not an appropriate use of the Red List – action must be appropriate to the threat. M Samways commented that it is confusing at government level as there is both national Red Listing and global IUCN Red Listing.

S Stuart pointed out that the NaRLiWoG paper is under review and has much on the correct use of the Red Lists at national and regional levels. He commented that the problem with scientific collecting is the disincentive to the Red Listing process, but there is also the counter concern of doing nothing. J Hutton commented that as the members of IUCN have adopted a resolution, this be distributed and then followed by the Scientific Collection Guidelines. H Dublin postulated that perhaps there should be caveats on appropriate use within the bigger picture, as one does not want to be too prescriptive. S Stuart summarised that when dealing with the Red List users should look at type of threat and work accordingly.

J Hutton said we should develop a short document to go on the Red List website, which explicitly describes the appropriate use of the Red List and discourages inappropriate uses. This lead document could refer to the Scientific Collection Guidelines, which could be annexed. H Dublin agreed saying that the Guidelines would be a more detailed companion document that could help to both educate and serve the SSC members.

ACTION: S Stuart, M Maunder, G Mace and J Hutton are to work on a short document for the Red List website to articulate the appropriate uses of the Red List; the modified Scientific Collection Guidelines could be annexed to this. S Stuart should then forward them to the IUCN Environmental Law Centre for comment before posting on the web.

5.3.5 Biodiversity Indicators Sub-Committee (BISC) (G Mace)

G Mace highlighted the following from her report:

- There has been much work put into the 2010 Biodiversity Indicators Partnership (BIP) project that is being coordinated by UNEP-WCMC.

- Work was carried out to determine which species-based indicators could be used to measure progress towards the CBD 2010 target , and what could add value to what is in the CBD from our datasets. This is being turned into funding proposals.
- A priority has been put on the development and testing of sustainable use indicators, particularly those based on species data.
- Invasives species indicators – working with the ISSG and the Global Invasive Species Programme (GISP). It might be possible to use existing data sets to develop indicators but with a bit of money it could be better and so it should be easy to fundraise for this.
- Although they are not on the CBD indicators list, it would be interesting to look at climate change and disease indicators as drivers of species declines.
- Last week J Baillie gave a workshop on the Sampled Red List Index (SRLI). Money has come from NERC (National Environmental Research Council) for technical workshops looking at sampling and statistical reliability of sampling (i.e.: looking at how many species must be sampled in a taxonomic group). Many people attended and lots of work was done. Participants also talked about how to present the SRLI (the question is what you put on the Y axis). The Y axis should be something related to the rate of extinction. Further work will be done on sampling and testing recommendations. There is funding for two more workshops and all information will be fed to BASC. Concern was expressed that the SRLI is not the right name for this index.

Y Sadovy explained that she had outlined the criteria that the MCSC uses for the GMSA at the last Steering Committee meeting and that G Mace had felt that it was quite a good way to look at fish species, but that it would not necessarily assess the status of species across biomes and habitats. Y Sadovy then queried whether there any tools to do this or is the SRLI enough? G Mace answered that there is one thing clear from testing so far - determining changes in state requires a smaller sample size than determining changes in rates and is therefore easier to measure. G Mace also commented that they had sampled bird data over and over again to see how the samples fall out compared to known trends. The rate issue is very difficult and one needs better data sets to test for change.

H Dublin enquired as to the procedure on SRLI and G Mace answered that the next workshop will tidy up technical issues (by end May 2006), then work on the documentation later. H Dublin asked for a small document that ties it all together for the SC. G Mace reiterated that there needs to be a decision on what to call this index and how to plot it. She suggested laying out some choices of names for the SC. H Dublin commented that there are major risks in changing the index name mid-stream. It is not quite as simple as it seems as the SRLI name has already been picked up in official documents of the CBD and therefore it might have to maintain the SRLI name in the context of the CBD.

ACTION: BASC (then to BISC) to compile document on what SRLI can and cannot do, which way to plot trends, and some ideas on what to call the index, keeping in mind the inherent difficulties of a name change at this stage.

H Dublin then asked what the plan was for convening this Sub-Committee and establishing its membership, and G Mace answered that she wants a relatively small Sub-Committee to include users of the index – e.g. someone from the BIP, CBD and International Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) Secretariats. She stated that she is waiting to hear about the COF allocation for BISC and then will ask for space in diaries for a meeting. H Dublin said she might be able to give some potential names from IPCC. H Dublin then explained that the attempts to secure funds from the IUCN 3IC. While these funds are currently frozen this will not be forever and IUCN does want to play a role in indicators work. She also suggested that she might use some of the reserve money to keep the momentum, keep being positive and remind IUCN that it needs to be done. The Commission on Ecosystem Management (CEM) is tasked to work on the ecosystem services side of indicators, but they may be waiting for a lead from the SSC so we need to think of constructive ways to start this engagement.

ACTION: H Dublin is to put G Mace in touch with CEM's indicators focal point.

ACTION: G Mace is to constitute and convene BISC in consultation with H Dublin.

H Dublin commented that it is clear that when 2010 arrives it will be clear that the target has not been fully met, and then the target and indicators will be revised. She suggested that the SSC leads on the development of new indicators in this regard as it seems that we have the ability and a clear mandate. H Dublin then closed the discussion by asking G Mace to thank N Kumpel and J Baillie for their work on indicators to date.

5.3.6 Plant Conservation Sub-Committee (PCSC) (M Maunder)

M Maunder highlighted the following points:

- Members of the PCSC have been chosen – mostly new people, so the first meeting in Miami in September 2005 was primarily scene setting and reviews.
- There is a relationship between PCSC and the Global Plant Strategy, which has opened opportunities. However, there is a clear need to revise the existing strategy for the PCSC and therefore the PCSC will be retooling the existing one before the next SC meeting.
- Red Listing priorities include conifers, magnolias and oaks, while ebonies are planned for some time in the future. The Critical Ecosystems Partnership Fund (CEPF) and IUCN funded projects in the Caucasus, Latin America and East Africa and include close to 200 species assessments with maps and backup documents using GIS systems. Priority taxonomic groups for further assessments include Crop Wild Relatives, while geographical priorities are Madagascar, Ethiopia, and Meso-America.
- There is active and positive dialogue with BASC to make preliminary Red Listing simplified and workable. Kew and the Smithsonian have their own protocols that they use for preliminary Red Listing and these will need to be harmonised with the IUCN approach.

After a discussion on the Smithsonian and Kew (see below), M Maunder continued with his feedback:

- There is discussion about revising David Given's book (still the best general book on the conservation of plant biodiversity) to honour him.
- Funding is being sought from GEF to look at Red Listing in six high-diversity countries.
- A joint Cycad SG and CBSG meeting is to be held in South Africa soon.

A general discussion on the preliminary assessment approaches by Smithsonian and Kew began with G Mace commenting that they are testing their databases for internal viability and would like to link them to the Red List, but we need to see how consistent their process is with ours for preliminary assessments. S Stuart said that we must ensure compatibility between the systems being developed by the various botanical institutions and the IUCN Red List process.

J Hutton asked what the value is of the old plants database that has been maintained at UNEP-WCMC for years. G Mace claimed that the IUCN Red List does not recognise it and the data are not used for plant Red Listing, but M Maunder clarified that it is useful but will need a lot of tidying up of nomenclature. J Smart stated that some SGs want to use it to cross check, and G Mace commented that we would need to see if it is viable to fix it.

ACTION: J Smart is to ask C Hilton-Taylor to look at the Plant Database at UNEP-WCMC. M Maunder is to comment on its more general utility.

S Stuart clarified that many of the world's herbaria want to prove that their collections are valuable and they have watched the progress of the Red List and the debate on preliminary listing, and seen that their software has linkages with our ideas. But we need to see if their data are compatible with the global standard of Red Listing. J Robinson asked for clarification on whether the Smithsonian and Kew use different standard nomenclatures. S Stuart stated Smithsonian and Kew are using the current IUCN Red List system, but the old WCMC plants database uses the old 1963 IUCN categories, which makes it incompatible with everything else.

M Maunder then stated that the Smithsonian and Kew do want to do things properly, but they will need to hone their systems after we have assessed them. C Imboden then said that preliminary

listings should be seen as providing a “candidate list” for Red Listing. G Mace cautioned that the preliminary list was not a candidate list. A candidate list should be conservative and err on the side of the Precautionary Principle, and therefore might list more species than should be listed. She said that the Kew approach, for example, can both exclude species that should be listed as well as include species that should not be listed. This is why both the preliminary listing and the other approaches being developed need careful scrutiny before we adopt them.

Following further general discussion on the preliminary assessments approach, H Dublin enquired whether the PCSC strategy will follow closely on the SSC strategic planning. M Maunder confirmed, saying that a meeting was planned for late November, and that they would also be running a one-day workshop on Red Listing.

J Hutton enquired about GBIF (Global Biodiversity Information Facility) which has been a pilot project up until now with only minimal data going online. G Mace commented that C Hilton-Taylor has had lot of discussion on this and J Hutton commented that the British Government has provided funding to renew GBIF for another 5 years, running at \$10 million per year. H Dublin then commented that there is confusion as some people are not aware of the use of our data by GBIF. J Smart then said that they have an appointment to talk to J Ragle and her in summer.

5.4 SSC Task Force updates: feedback and discussion

5.4.1 Restructuring TF (L Boitani)

L Boitani explained that the first Restructuring Task Force meeting in Rome (8-9 April 2006, attended by H Dublin, L Boitani, M Stanley Price and J Smart) was to brainstorm ideas that could be discussed at this SC meeting, then refined during summer and submitted to the next SC meeting in October for further discussion. He made sure that everyone understood that the final decisions on restructuring do not have to be implemented in this quadrennium, so the SC should not be constrained in their thinking by issues around implementation.

L Boitani stated that form must follow function – and the function is defined by the strategic plan. Work is being done to define the function of the structure more clearly, but the broad structure of the SSC has 3 levels –

Level 1 is what we believe is mostly done by Red List Authorities and SGs

Level 2 is the intellectual level and done by the SC and Chair, supported by the SP

Level 3 is implemented by operational task forces, ad-hoc working groups

Attention at the first meeting was on level one and two broad functions within the network were identified as being primarily Red Listing assessments and other conservation function activities (such as processes (e.g. conducting threats analysis; providing technical advice; facilitating and convening) and products and deliverables (e.g. technical guidelines; Species Conservation Plans; newsletters; databases; websites).

L Biotani described several options for the way forward and a lengthy discussion followed. It was agreed that the RTF should continue with their work, with the intent of bringing the next phase of thinking to the SSC SC meeting in October.

DECISION: The restructuring Task Force were encouraged to continue thinking along the lines presented and bring a further discussion document to WCC 3.4.

5.5 Other SSC SC member updates: feedback and discussion

5.5.1 Vet SG (R Kock)

R Kock gave the meeting an update on

- **Avian Influenza:** Still 90% focused on SE Asia, which fits with the virus surviving in cold, moist climates. There is no evidence of a major outbreak in Britain after the recent case in a swan in Scotland, a number of outbreaks did occur in Europe but these were contained and

the outbreak in Africa appears to be associated with poultry only (but because conditions are hot and dry the virus is not well supported). Fresh outbreaks are expected amongst wild birds during the next migration season later this year. B Karesh has raised significant finance to look at the epidemiology of the H5N1 virus in wild species and assess if possible the risk of wild bird carriers being a major source of infection to other birds (domestic or wild) and other species. There is likely to be a focus on mallards. The current evidence suggests that the role of wild migrating bird species is overplayed by the media and others. This has led to media hype and this misinformation has led to some ill thought out actions, including a ban on hunting in certain countries but worryingly in Russia, effectively transferring the hunting rights to governments with a policy to cull. Human cases are still rare (about 100 out of the 200 confirmed cases died); however, there is still the known risk of it translating into human influenza virus. The main health authorities such as the WHO and FAP are advising a focus on poultry and its husbandry and are not blaming wild birds for the core problem. The issue of the loss of wetlands has been raised as a possible driver for this disease with increasing mixing of wild and domestic birds on agricultural land and in urban areas. The role of modern transportation of poultry and even the bird trade need to be assessed and risks identified.

- **Asian Vultures:** Royal Society for the Protection of Birds (RSPB), Zoological Society of London and the Bombay Natural History Society (BNHS) and other partners are active on the issue of diclofenac contamination of the environment – but things had slowed down in relation to official banning of the product. The drug is still being used and decisions are complicated because of vested interests, the numbers of animals being treated, the complex network of manufacturers and retail outlets, and the fact that much of the drug crosses borders illegally. H Dublin has helped draft and send letters from the IUCN Director General to the Prime Minister of India. Even with a ban it will take years for the drug to come off market, and for it to be replaced by Meloxicam (the proposed alternative). The original producers say they are no longer responsible because generics are now being made – which shows that we need to look at mechanisms to address this apparent irresponsible attitude from the producers. The fact that drugs have not been tested on all species when first patented is clearly a problem and most legislation on drug use does not take this into account. Unfortunately vultures can also be considered bad luck, so cultural issues can also influence the problem. Progress is expected on the veterinary products with a concerted and internationally moderated approach but there is a much larger human product market and the likelihood to these entering the food-chain or environment needs to be assessed. Other potentially affected regions need to be explored and means to ban the drug globally for veterinary use or at least in vulture range states although its full potential toxicity amongst various species is not well determined.
- **EBOLA in fruit bats in Africa:** since the suggestion that fruit bats are an important reservoir of the EBOLA virus there has been some talk about attempting to control the virus by destroying nesting trees of fruit bats. The Vet and Chiroptera SGs and others have expressed their serious concerns over this being impractical and likely ineffective. There is no scientific justification for this as the epidemiological role of fruit bats is unknown.

H Dublin then opened the discussion by commending the Vet SG on its great responsiveness and communication via email, which results in things happening quickly. She reiterated the importance of demonstrating that we can provide knowledge and information quickly, so that we can demonstrate the relevance of our work, that we are well informed and providing much-needed technical knowledge to help influence decisions.

C Campagna commented that public communication is as important as understanding the epidemiology and therefore one expert in this area should work with the Vet SG. He recalled the press (when talking of Avian Influenza) being over-reactive with regard to the need to kill wild birds to prevent the spread of the disease and creating scares of person-to-person transmission, and suggested linking with groups that do public communications at a global level. R Kock responded that people were translating the discussion at meetings into a form that could be put out to media, but agreed that communication is still a problem as it is difficult to get the correct message across.

Technically-speaking, R Kock commented that sample size in relation to proposed research on the infection in wild birds is critical as given indicative data on prevalence potentially huge samples sizes are needed to detect the Influenza virus. Governments make decisions on all sorts of information – and our communications must just carry on trying to influence their decisions. H Dublin commented that communications is a service that may be provided through the Commission on Education and Communications (CEC). C Campagna commented that people are not paying enough attention because it has not killed enough people and H Dublin agreed saying that we need to work better with media and make sure that they come to the SSC for more informed technical briefing.

5.5.2 Invasive Species SG (ISSG) ref: M Clout's written report in pack (H Dublin)

H Dublin reported that she has been speaking at different levels of IUCN on the issue of support for the ISSG. She explained that the ISSG is used by the IUCN as the source of technical knowledge on invasive species, but because ISSG is voluntary and has financial/time limitations it cannot always engage or serve all the needs of the IUCN. The IUCN has no dedicated resources for invasives at present and therefore they rely on the ISSG, but the ISSG has no resources either. She commented that she is hoping to see the Minister when visiting New Zealand to try and secure additional resources for IUCN's work on invasive species. H Dublin commented that the ISSG has been applying for small project grants to support their core functions, and that many of those involved have their own jobs as well and cannot spend time to fundraise. She mentioned that GISP (based in Cape Town) have also had to start project implementation to raise money and as a result are now inadvertently competing with IUCN and other partners for resources. She concluded that as a result of resource constraints, the IUCN has been unable to establish a dedicated programme on invasive species, but also prefer that the ISSG not become involved in programmatic activity (as opposed to providing technical support), an unintended outcome of the current funding model available to most SGs.

M Samways suggested that they charge for people to use their database which has statistics on habitat loss and GDP loss, and H Dublin responded that perhaps they could not because of donor requirements. G Mace commented there are good national datasets (used by the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment (MEA)) and yet it is impossible to get a global assessment on invasives. ISSG has focused on case studies and this does not help with the global picture. H Dublin agreed, but stated that this was driven by donors. J Hutton offered a suggestion of creating a "Black List" in the same structure of the Red List, and also suggested that they form an institution – called "AlienLife" to assist in fund-raising efforts and raising the profile of invasive species impacts. M Samways commented that some research grants for invasives look at the control aspects, but maybe we need a more positive spin so that donors will be more willing. M Samways suggested that the ISSG needs to collect success stories that the press can use, but H Dublin again said that this was one more task that will not help them to meet the resource needs of the ISSG.

H Dublin explained that a SG can only do so much, and it would be better to pass strategic ideas on to IUCN – making it clear that the ISSG cannot handle it all – as well as offer advice to the ISSG. She queried whether we think that IUCN should take a programmatic approach. J Smart stated that one of the new positions in the SP could support the ISSG and help fundraise. H Dublin answered that the dream would be for IUCN to have a dedicated programme for invasive species. The ISSG is doing a service for the IUCN via small programme funding to ensure their short-term survival, but this inevitably leads to a drifting from what the SC think the ISSG should be focusing their energies on.

M Maunder then asked for a clarification on logic – if we acknowledge that invasive species are a major problem, then we should also look at other threats like habitat loss having a programme. He commented that the ISSG has proved their value as a consultant and should capitalise on this. G Mace then commented that it is fundamentally different with invasives than with other threats – because other threats are not focused at the species level. She queried why there are not generic data on invasives on the SIS, leaving ISSG to gather expert knowledge – as ISSG are trying to do a core activity for the SSC as well as a cross-cutting function for IUCN. S Stuart commented that

initial core funding from the New Zealand Government had lasted for three years but ever since it ended ISSG had to operate in project fund-raising mode.

J Hutton commented that we need a strategy for CBD to agitate for action on invasives so that GISP can become more functional in its secretariat role to assist the ISSG and others working on the issue. H Dublin answered that GISP has just had an external evaluation completed. Although GISP's original mandate was to provide the functions of a secretariat and have ISSG supply the technical information, they also began undertaking technical project implementation work to fund the core activities of the secretariat. She agreed that GISP should work according to its original mandate, but the issue is who pays for the GISP secretariat, because it is hard to find funding for core secretariat costs.

ACTIONS: H Dublin is to go to the Programme and Policy Committee (PPC) to request another look at the relationship between IUCN and ISSG and clarification on the institutional relationship between IUCN and GISP.

5.5.3 Reintroduction SG (F Launay)

F Launay highlighted the main points on the work of the Reintroduction SG (RSG) as follows:

1. Members have been reappointed and the Group restructured into a mix of taxonomic and geographic sections. Section Chairs are chosen on the basis of their practical knowledge, their ability to mobilise resources, their availability to work on RSG matters, as well as their good networking skills. Members are a balance of people who can act as advisors and people to target (e.g. park managers, government staff). Additional recruitment will occur in regions where the RSG is not well represented.
2. RSG has launched Task Forces within the Group, created set of tools for reintroduction, and a database for reintroduction projects (as they are often difficult to track).
3. Main aims are to communicate better, fund-raise better and market better.
4. RSG is working with several SGs to develop guidelines regarding particular taxa.
5. RSG is frequently asked by welfare groups, zoos and sanctuaries to look at various issues such as the rehabilitation of confiscated animals, development of sanctuaries, and public awareness and education needs – with increasing importance in Asia, the Middle East and parts of Africa. The IUCN SSC Reintroduction Guidelines have been a success within conservation organisations, however the percentage of animals released following these guidelines is small compared to the many ongoing releases by welfare organisations, governments and private land owners. Often the RSG starts a workshop on reintroduction, realises that reintroduction is not a viable conservation option for that species and ends up doing a more general species conservation plan. It is rewarding to see that people are willing to share what they are doing... unfortunately they often just go ahead with ill-advised reintroductions anyway as they are under pressure from governments and others.

H Dublin suggested not spending too much time on trying to stop bad practice but instead trying to reinforce good practice. She commended the group on their linkages with taxonomic groups and asked F Launay to make sure that they link to the relevant taxonomic SG every time an issue comes up. She commented that zoos have their own motivation as they are under pressure to perform because their captive breeding and reintroduction programmes have not all worked, and she cautioned F Launay to be clear on prioritising activities for the RSG.

C Campagna asked if the RSG dealt much with marine species and F Launay answered only on salt-water crocodile to date and, although there was talk about sharks, the RSG is not active there. C Campagna commented that he experienced governments just doing reintroduction without proper consultation and technical advice, and F Launay agreed that the level of understanding about reintroduction for conservation purposes is negligible as people are often saying it is for conservation, when it is not.

5.5.4 Conservation Breeding SG (CBSG) (R Lacy)

R Lacy briefed everyone on the activities of the Conservation Breeding SG (CBSG):

- Building capacities in networks is paying off (e.g. The CBSG Japan Network ran conservation planning workshops for the governmental authorities on several species earlier this year).
- 50% of our activities are the result of being invited to participate or advise. We do not instigate much and are more reactive and responsive to requests. Although many “CBSG” workshops might appear, by their names, to be in competition with other SGs, those workshops are usually convened by the appropriate taxonomic SG, with the CBSG being invited to help facilitate and provide specialized expertise.
- Partnering with the Amphibian SG as well as with WAZA on the amphibian crisis. Zoos have a big opportunity to assist with amphibians and have responded really well but even this will be inadequate because there are so many species involved. E.g.: Atlanta Zoo and Botanical Garden rescued approximately 40 species, placed them in protected care and are making plans to get them back into Panama. They also want to build a captive breeding centre in Panama – unfortunately the timing is not quite right as all frogs there are dying from Chytrid fungus. A significant individual donor wants to create a conservation breeding centre in the United States. CBSG is also involved in raising the alarm for amphibians by giving talks at conferences and getting information distributed through the web and newsletters. CBSG has been partly successful with raising funds and have hired a part-time, dedicated programme officer for amphibian issues. CBSG also helps at strategic planning level, and by training more amphibian field biologists. CBSG also advises on how to build facilities which can protect from an invasive epidemic and also against the escape of diseases into the surrounding environment.

R Lacy then pointed out three problems with addressing the global amphibian crisis:

1. Trying to coordinate multiple bodies (who controls who, how things are centralised) and how *ex-situ* needs to fit within the big picture (which is not there yet).
2. Capacity building - zoos cannot handle it all and have no places to send the “results” of their successful breeding programmes. Releases back to the wild often cannot take place because of Chytrid. The debate is should we even bother to try and save the amphibians, as most species are affected.
3. Funding issues are also a problem, but CBSG will help as much as possible.

M Maunder queried if there are any cryogenic banks for frogs and R Lacy said that there is some discussion, but even the mention of this creates a fear that all money will go into genetic banks. S Stuart agreed, but said some banking will have to be done. S Stuart and R Lacy agreed, saying that although some species cannot be reintroduced because of Chytrid, it is still expensive to keep frogs. J Robinson commended the CBSG on their good communication about the crisis and encouraged zoos to keep up the good work even if the species needing help have little exhibit value.

DAY 2: THURSDAY 4 MAY

5.4 SSC Task Force updates: feedback and discussion

5.4.2 Strategic Planning TF (C Imboden)

C Imboden led the Strategic Planning session for the whole day on Thursday 4 May. The day consisted roughly of the following exercises:

- Identifying what characteristics of other organisations relate to their success
- Identifying conservation issues for the SSC to focus on
- Making a table of the drivers of loss of biodiversity and function and how the SSC can contribute to reducing pressures
- Looking at what SSC is good and bad at – a mini-SWOT analysis
- Identifying high level targets for the SSC

- Identifying how SSC will input and integrate into the new IUCN programme for 2009 – 2012
- Identifying priorities for the current programme over the next two years, reorganising these according to SSC Objectives and noting if funding is available

C Imboden is to produce a report of the day and take the Strategic Planning forward.

DECISION: It was agreed that the work achieved during our session would form the work plan for the next two years (2006-2008) and also be used to inform the development of the next SSC Strategic Plan and our input to the IUCN 2009 – 2012 programme.

DAY 3: FRIDAY 5 MAY

6. SSC GOVERNANCE ISSUES

6.1 Deputy Chair nomination

H Dublin announced that she had sent an email to the SC and further afield, but that only one name has been suggested and this person wasn't appropriate. She commented that she wants to take the issue to the November Council meeting, as the May one has a full agenda. M Samways asked for clarification on what she is looking for and whether we could draw on the ranks of the SG Chairs. H Dublin explained that the person must be appointed by IUCN Council, that it is not a salaried position, that SG Chairs normally have an overly-full workload and that preferably the person should fill a gap on the SC – e.g. leading on the communications portfolio. She suggested the possibility of someone from the former MEA team who was strong on the promotions side, but asked the whole SC to use their networks to assist her.

ACTION: All members of the SSC SC to assist H Dublin to identify and nominate a new Deputy Chair.

6.2 New Task Force on Species Conservation Planning (R Lacy and H Dublin)

H Dublin stated that following discussions in the two previous SC meetings, she and R Lacy discussed the need to establish a Task Force to revisit our approaches to species conservation planning and those of others, including WCS' Range-Wide Priority Setting (RWPS) approach. She commented that a first meeting could probably be financed, after which there would have to be a lot of work via email.

H Dublin explained that they have also been discussing a Multi-Species Database (with J Blanc / S Stuart) for those species with a greater depth of information and knowledge than many of the species in the Red List database. To this end, she has been in touch with all the data-rich, large mammal groups, and has been talking to S Stuart and J Ragle about how to ensure interoperability with SIS. G Mace commented that she feels there is some confusion between prioritising things for species and between populations of species – e.g. taking a whole taxon and an entire range, as they might be conceptually different, which should you do first? R Lacy agreed saying that prioritisation of actions for one species is a different process than setting priorities among species, and that the Species Conservation Planning TF would focus on conservation planning for one species or a closely-related group of species. G Mace then suggested that the first paragraph of the ToR is rewritten to include both things as WCS' RWPS is joining the two together. She commented that the other alternative was to take out the reference to the SSC action planning. H Dublin agreed that they will rethink and make sure it articulates things clearly. M Maunder asked whether anyone wanting to do an action plan from scratch, should follow the original guidelines. H Dublin clarified that the intention was not to halt SGs which are midstream in the traditional Action Planning process, and therefore SGs should continue as they are for now and the SP should try to get the revised AP Guidelines out as soon as possible.

ACTIONS:

1. R Lacy to ensure proper articulation of the intent of our species conservation planning approach in the final ToRs.
2. R Lacy to develop a list of proposed people for the Species Conservation Planning TF.

6.3 Status of the Climate Change TF

H Dublin explained that the former Chair of the SSC's Climate Change TF had finally written to her after months of delay to say that she felt unable to take up the role of the Chair as she did not want to be involved in fundraising. Although she made a number of constructive suggestions, further discussion on this issue was required by the SSC SC to determine if a TF is needed at this time. H Dublin explained that she has been in touch with a number of the key people in this field with regard to chairing this TF and they each recommend one another. H Dublin then stated that if the SC feels that we still do need a Task Force at this time, then the search for a Chair must continue. She also mentioned that IUCN also has a higher-level Climate Change TF which is working on positioning the entire organisation with regard to this issue. She further mentioned that the MacArthur Foundation is planning to focus their climate change initiatives in Africa and potentially there are financing opportunities for SSC. We have already provided them with some possible ideas but have not formally applied for funding.

M Samways opened the discussion by stating that it is one of the things we should be working on, but perhaps we need a TF to decide on what we are going to do – bearing in mind the other initiatives that have already started. G Mace commented that she feels we do not need a TF, just someone to do the four action items – as there are some things we could do that others cannot do (such as pulling together data, overlaying it with various climate change scenarios, looking at case studies, etc). She reiterated that she knows of many global initiatives relating climate change to economics and land use, but the biodiversity side has been left behind – so a group of people is needed to decide where to place our value-added knowledge (in-house, not new, information).

H Dublin queried whether a staff member could begin pulling together information on what is currently being done in our SGs relative to the species and climate change issues and whether J Smart could spare some resources for this person who would be guided by the SC. J Smart agreed that one of the two new recruits could have this as part of their portfolio but that this might still be some ways off. H Dublin reiterated that the SSC should not step on the toes of the IUCN Climate Change Task Force, but rather contribute to their work. J Hutton agreed saying that we should make our GIS maps available, as well as draw up criteria for more vulnerable defining what characteristics of species make them more or less vulnerable to climate change. S Stuart commented that BASC will be looking at climate change and developing the necessary modifications to allow for the complexity of capturing the impacts of climate change on species with short generation times as well as establishing a measure of vulnerability to climate change.

H Dublin summed up that we have a plan with several actions which need to be done; it is a question of who can do them. S Stuart queried whether it is the sort of thing that could be put into a fundable proposal, and G Mace reiterated that this is what was put to the MacArthur Foundation. H Dublin asked for agreement that the Task Force be put on hold and that we keep a community of conversation, as well as keep in touch with those individuals recommended to us. G Mace agreed that the Task Force should be put on hold, but commented that someone should take the lead immediately on this issue for the SSC. There was general consensus that a network support function is needed as opposed to a TF. J Hutton commented that the EU is increasing its work on climate change and recently have taken a dedicated biodiversity person on board. The SC discussed modalities for engaging the EU and others regarding our future work on the topic.

M Samways commented that overseeing this work would be an ideal task for the Senior Commission Officer, but H Dublin explained that this was possibly still a year away. J Smart commented that the IUCN Forest Programme is recruiting a new person and perhaps H Dublin could discuss this recruitment with S Maginnis. H Dublin agreed that she would try and meet the Forest Programme when next in Gland to discuss mutual needs and interests.

S Stuart commented that some issues were brought up in the Strategic Planning session suggesting that we need to examine some drivers of biodiversity loss in greater depth and that GSA2 will likely include an analysis of threat impacts, including climate change. It was agreed that it might help to pull together some key experts on species and climate change and ask them to review what we come up with – i.e. treat their input as a specific external review role to start with. G Mace reminded the SC of an earlier meeting in ZSL with a group of experts (where there was a set of actions and ideas that are a bit outdated now) that would be a natural group of people to consult. J Hutton suggested a once-off meeting with these people to see what the SSC can contribute. S Stuart suggested that we convene them to review the GSA2 draft and engage them by correspondence and H Dublin suggested that a group of external technical experts actually be set up as a review group for this section of the GSA2. J Smart said she will ask JC Vié to put together what is happening from IUCN side for the SC. H Dublin agreed to talk to E Lahmann, who is in charge of the IUCN CCTF and S Maginnis in the margins of the upcoming IUCN Council meeting.

S Stuart and G Mace agreed that the activities highlighted in the minutes of the 2 March 2006 meeting on assessment priorities could be taken up within the Species Programme workplan.

ACTIONS:

1. H Dublin is to liaise with J Hutton re meeting the EU point person on climate change and biodiversity.
2. H Dublin is to speak to E Lahmann and S Maginnis in the margins of the upcoming IUCN Council.
3. G Mace to send the minutes of the ZSL meeting to H Dublin for reference.
4. S Stuart will look at potential of setting up a review group for GSA2's climate change components.
5. J Smart is to ask JC Vié to put together a document on what the IUCN is doing from their side.
6. Species Programme to begin work on the following activities:
 - Overlay species data with areas that will be impacted by climate change (scenario maps from IPCC)
 - Characterize the species that are most vulnerable to climate change by establishing vulnerability traits and code these into the Authority Files

6.4 Future of Communications TF

H Dublin opened the discussion stating that this was a difficult issue because of the big gap that R Pethiyagoda left. She noted that the Strategic Planning session revealed major opportunities and therefore the need for bigger scale communications. It has not been really possible to look at assistance from the staff as A Knee is on maternity leave and A McMullin has been busy with the 2006 Red List launch.

J Smart commented that internally the SP has decided to be much more active within HQ (e.g. J Ragle gave talk on SIS, JC Vié gave a brown bag lunch on Red Listing) and has set an internal target of four meetings per year to keep other IUCN staff informed. The SSC website has also been revamped and is constantly being revised and updated. She also commented that the SP now has better links with the Global Communications Unit.

H Dublin commented that the staff seem to struggle with communicating the relevance issue, which is why R Pethiyagoda was asked to do further work on the two documents discussed at WCC3.2. She reiterated that there were both content and delivery problems in the documents and promised that she would try to get the documents from him but added that this would not take care of the overall problems of the communications and getting across the relevance of our message. H Dublin emphasised that she will be looking for Deputy Chair to have the skill to assist the SP and the SSC with communications work.

ACTION: H Dublin is to ask R Pethiyagoda for the two communications documents discussed at the SSC SC WCC3.2 and the comments made there and work on their improvement.

6.5 Members Emeritus and Award nominations

- Members Emeritus

An up-to-date list of the Members Emeritus was produced for the SC and C Poole asked whether anyone present knows about those who have not responded. It was agreed that it is likely some have passed away or their contact details have changed. There was a suggestion that C Poole Google the names for information. As per Item 4.2, M Maunder agreed to write a few lines on C Jermy before H Dublin sends the letter of appointment for him as a Member Emeritus.

ACTIONS:

1. C Poole is to Google incomplete Member Emeritus list.
2. C Poole to prepare an appointment letter for C Jermy with M Maunder's assistance.

- Harry Messel Award for Conservation Leadership

J Hutton proposed an officer of the Sustainable Use SG for the Harry Messel Award or the Chair's Citation. There was unanimous support and H Dublin is to decide which award would be appropriate.

- Sir Peter Scott Award for Conservation Merit

The proposed nomination for a Sir Peter Scott Award was unanimously agreed by the SSC SC.

ACTIONS:

1. H Dublin is to prepare and bestow the agreed awards.
2. J Smart is to ask D Zivkovic to try and develop a list of all former recipients of the Sir Peter Scott award using information from the archives.

7. SSC FINANCES

7.1 Commission Operations Fund 2006 (H Dublin)

H Dublin drew everyone's attention to the Commission Operations Fund (COF) budget. She explained that the Commission Chairs managed to secure a 10% increase to the COFs, but that there are still issues with the SSC's 2005 balance which need to be sorted out. She then explained that she feels that BASC does not have enough support funds in the proposed budget, but she is unsure of where to find additional funds in the COF – even as it stands with R Mittermeier assisting with WCC 3.4, there is still likely to be a deficit with the SC budget line.

J Hutton queried whether *Species* needs to be produced in hard copy. H Dublin felt that this would not really cut costs because most of the cost is in the production, and asked if anyone can reduce their budget. G Mace suggested that she use some of the BISC money for BASC. S Stuart explained that BASC meets twice a year, has four internal workings groups and one TF. While many people cover their own costs, the meetings are still expensive because of the representation from other Sub-Committees – so perhaps those relevant Sub-Committee participants can use money from their own Sub-Committee allocations for their attendance at one of the meetings each year. M Samways and Y Sadovy agreed that this sounds fair, and M Samways commented that the location of the meetings will then be important because flights are the biggest cost. S Stuart agreed, saying that all the meetings would be in the UK or Switzerland.

DECISION: Each Sub-Committee will pay for their representative to BASC to attend one of the two BASC meetings per year and BASC will pay for the other.

ACTION: The sub-Committees will receive their full allocation and will need to budget for the participation of their representative to BASC.

H Dublin then summed up by saying that the Sub-Committees should also think about using teleconferencing, whenever possible, to reduce travel costs. She encouraged everyone to go ahead with budgeting and spending on the 2006 COF – ensuring that their entire budgets are spent by the end of the calendar year.

7.2 Fund-raising (J Smart and H Dublin)

J Smart began the discussion by saying that the SP Review had revealed the need for a fundraising strategy. She commented that she is not finding enough time to do fundraising (including the time to write proposals), but that this would have to change as soon as the recruitment has finished. H Dublin acknowledged that fundraising is complex, time consuming and requires specific skills. She stated that she will keep working on GEF and will continue to talk about corporate and foundation fundraising with IUCN, although the IUCN is not well positioned to help access private funds in the United States. H Dublin reiterated the need for contacts and how difficult it can be to identify contacts in the private foundation world.

C Campagna queried whether we have an idea of the money value of the work of the SSC, and H Dublin answered that a survey of shadow resources in 2002 revealed that funds raised by the SGs amounted to US\$5.9 million, but that the actual value of voluntary time contributed by the SGs was around US\$29.5 million – but this was probably underestimated. SSC argued to IUCN Council that the in-kind contributions were in the region of \$15 – 20 million per Commission. C Campagna commented that this figure is very small and probably underestimated if you think about the responsibility that the Commission has and all the work that is being done for that money.

M Samways queried how much the SGs could fundraise and H Dublin responded that all the SG Chairs received the guidelines and tools for fund-raising. The only stipulation at present is that they must report any fundraising approach greater than CHF100 000. The idea is that SGs should let the SP know where they are making significant fundraising approaches so as to ensure that the same organisation is not approached many times. She also commented that the IUCN Council was worried about everyone raising money in the name of IUCN without it going through IUCN and were concerned about protecting the IUCN brand.

S Stuart then commented that donors often will not give money directly to IUCN but sometimes prefer that the money runs through the CI books and this makes CI look like a massive donor, even though the proposals are sometimes prepared by SP staff. Allowing funds to be raised and run through other conservation organisations provides an easy way to make them more comfortable with the process and more willing to help.

8. EXTERNAL LIAISONS: DISCUSSION POINTS

8.1 Bilateral MOUs with the Red List Partners (J Smart)

J Smart explained that she plans to organise a meeting (which B Jackson has offered to Chair) with the existing partners (CI, Birdlife, NatureServe, ZSL, and University of Virginia) to formalise the relationships through bilateral MOUs. Thereafter any other potential MOUs will be negotiated on a bilateral basis. She explained that they had meetings last June to review the response to the Red List Consortium Review – such as branding and they will be discussing this again. J Robinson commented that the SSC needs to be a lot less timid in establishing these MOUs and suggested SSC develop basic MOUs that set out very simple, very specific objectives wherever relationships are budding – as this gives SSC the ability to claim and brand the product of the relationship. H Dublin stated that there has been a question raised about why IUCN needs to sign any MOUs with members of IUCN, and it was decided that it was specifically needed with regard to the exchange of funds and the commitment of deliverables.

J Hutton commented that he suspects ownership is more important and that we actually need to call it a contract – as MOUs are not legally binding. G Mace responded that lawyers become too involved with contracts, so it is better to have very simple MOUs per project. H Dublin commented that the problem is that there are too many MOUs, contracts and other instruments currently being used in IUCN and this causes confusion. J Robinson stated that he is against contracts because they are too complicated, and S Stuart agreed that it is not important to have a contract where money does not change hands. He mentioned that there are at least three MOUs between the SSC and BirdLife.

M Maunder commented to J Smart that the number of MOUs might be large because of all the new groups that will be helping with Red Listing. J Smart said that they would keep this in mind when drafting and finalising the MOUs with the current partners.

ACTION: H Dublin and J Smart are to review all the current Birdlife International MOUs.

8.2 Possible new relationship with UNEP-WCMC (J Hutton)

J Hutton explained a bit about the history of the WCMC and some ideas for the future of the centre. He mentioned that IUCN and UNEP are re-negotiating partnership relationships with regards to the centre. His vision for the centre is that it moves away from being a custodian of data and becomes a centre that can create and influence knowledge through cutting-edge research and the analysis of data.

The Steering Committee had a lengthy discussion about the centre and its potential, concluding that more thought and discussion is needed from financial, technical and programmatic points of view. H Dublin closed the discussion by saying that this issue is not generally public knowledge as yet and wished J Hutton well with the deliberations.

8.3 SSC Participation in the Conservation Commons

H Dublin opened the discussion saying that she was approached before the CBD COP8 in Curitiba to formally endorse the Conservation Commons (CC) on behalf of the SSC but hesitated because it was confusing to be asked to sign on an initiative where IUCN already played an institutional role. The three Principles enshrined in the CC are not hard to understand or agree to, but it is not clear what the full intent of endorsing the CC actually means. H Dublin also confirmed that the CC has begun involvement in project implementation, apparently pilot projects, though this was not initially envisioned by those asked to endorse the CC.

A lengthy discussion about the CC followed, with the following being the main concerns raised:

- Why the pamphlet names organisations who have endorsed the Principles as “CC Partners”.
- Why many of parts of IUCN are considered independent “Partners” (such as WCPA, ISSG, SIS, etc.) under the CC when IUCN itself has signed on to the Principles.
- Why the CC is taking on activities which are programmatic in nature and not acting to simply promote the agreed Principles.
- Whether there is dialogue at government level (i.e. are governments endorsing the Principles?)
- What are the implications for SSC data and how will it be made available (i.e. who owns the data).
- What are the implications for the databases that are actively used for raising funds (e.g. WCMC makes users pay if they require the WDPA for commercial purposes)

H Dublin concluded the discussion by stating that our role is to comment and raise these issues with the IUCN. She reiterated that the Principles themselves are not problematic, just the fact that the CC seems to be evolving into something other than the promoter of the three Principles. J Hutton agreed but said that there is also an issue of governance in the CC that needs to be resolved. H Dublin agreed and said she would talk to A Rowles-Anobile to request a briefing about what is actually happening.

ACTION: H Dublin is to talk to A Rowles-Anobile on issues pertaining to SSC SC concerns with regard to the possible merger with UNEP-WCMC and to the Conservation Commons.

8.4 Potential for Collaboration with WWF’s Species Programme

H Dublin showed everyone the publication by WWF called “Species and People: Linked Futures”, and commented that S Lieberman and her team in the WWF Species Programme have asked H Dublin if there are ways to work together to get the message of species relevance to human

livelihoods and wellbeing across. H Dublin explained that although WWF is working on a more restricted number of “flagship” species, they also want to talk about China as a major footprint on global biodiversity. WWF’s Species Programme has a full time Communications Officer who would appreciate assistance with formulating the right messages and so wants to partner with the SSC (for which S Lieberman can possibly find more resources).

Y Sadovy suggested linking via case studies as there had been suggestions in the Strategic Planning of the need for case studies, but H Dublin explained that the whole book was case studies and that we should look at using the skills of the WWF communicator because we lack skills in that area. J Robinson suggested that we talk to S Lieberman about a joint communication programme on the importance of species with regard to our specific needs. J Hutton agreed saying that we have a communication problem, but we have a power to convene all partners. R Kock commented that the publication may be more credible from us, and H Dublin agreed that WWF had thought the same and acknowledges that the booklet needs some more momentum – so she encouraged everyone to think about a publication for 2008.

J Hutton commented that the world is not against species, but the SSC is perceived as being obsessed with the risk of species extinction while the rest of the world is interested more about use and livelihoods. G Mace queried whether we would provide content ourselves and H Dublin answered affirmatively that WWF’s communicators could work with content from the SSC. G Mace then suggested that any future attempts should start with the people and look backwards to ecosystems instead of highlighting a few species and linking them to communities. She also cautioned that the MEA had tried to go down to species level, but the information just was not available – nobody is convinced unless there is hardcore data, but it is really hard to trace it back to species.

H Dublin summed up that the basic message is not being told, so the idea of linking with WWF is so that we can benefit from their communications skills and that they can benefit from our help in defining the messages and providing the supporting information.

ACTION: H Dublin is to continue to talk to WWF about the potential for future partnership on a communications approach to raising the profile and understanding of the relevance of species to human livelihoods and wellbeing.

9. BRAINSTORMING AND SHARING

9.1 SIS – prioritising issues for the future

H Dublin referred to the brief document that J Ragle had put together for this SC meeting and reiterated that his purpose was to seek the SC’s advice on strategic issues for consideration. H Dublin mentioned that the Strategic Planning session of the previous day had already provided some ideas, but asked if there were any further comments or advice.

M Maunder queried the need for the proposed multi-species database that holds more in depth data on a sub-set of species, and asked if there is a space limitation in SIS. H Dublin answered that the databases will be designed to dovetail, and she was not aware that there was any lack of space in the Red List database but that we need to work with the SP to ensure compatibility and interoperability.

R Kock asked whether the current Authority File on threats considers disease and S Stuart confirmed that it does but noted the need to visit that Authority File and see if it needs further modifications given the issues around emerging infectious diseases and their impacts on species.

R Lacy commented that ISIS (International Species Information System) has all the zoo data (life history characteristics of species in zoos) in their database, but that ideally everyone should be able to access these data directly through SIS. J Hutton said that he could understand that maintaining the data on life history characteristics was not a major undertaking, but queried how SIS will manage things like changes in taxonomy and listings on the CITES and Convention on Migratory Species (CMS) Appendices. S Stuart commented that the CITES listings are recorded in

SIS and easily updatable but the CMS listings are not currently in the system. M Mauger answered that TROPICOS (the world's largest database of plant information) said they will provide these updates, and J Hutton then further queried whether it would have to be copied across physically or it would be automated. S Stuart answered that changes can be uploaded, but that taxonomy is always complicated and name changes have to be tracked very carefully. J Hutton gave advice that it should be in a decentralised way as the staff requirements would be huge if taxonomic updating was centralised. S Stuart stated that each taxonomic group has standards that we follow, and for the ones we are actually tracking we try and keep the species lists up to date. S Stuart said that he knows that C Hilton-Taylor, J Chanson and J Ragle are discussing these issues but need more input from the major taxonomic groups. S Stuart confirmed that out-of-date data are flagged but not taken off the Red List database.

Y Sadvoy commented that there should be trade and production data in the Authority Files as this is a major issue, especially with fish. S Stuart answered that it is not in the old system, but he thinks it is in the AF update. However, S Stuart confirmed that statistics on the volume of trade or the volume of harvest are not currently recorded.

J Hutton commented that the SSC needs to take on something like the social bookmarking on WIKIE so that when a WIKIE species does not have much on it we could link it to ours. H Dublin said that there is a current debate on such linkages on the Conservation Commons listserve and we just need to check that J Ragle is involved. J Hutton suggested that it would be best if SSC could run WIKIE Species.

ACTION: J Smart is to let J Ragle know that, further to his query, the SSC SC feels the following should be incorporated in SIS in future:

- Improvements and modifications on climate change
- Identification and impact of alien invasive species on others
- Human-wildlife conflict
- Disease
- The volumes of trade and harvest
- Habitat loss, fragmentation, land conversion
- Addressing the issue of taxonomic updating
- Possible linkages to WIKIE Species.

9.2 Update on joint WCPA/SSC conservation planning initiative

H Dublin commented that there is a meeting on 5-7 June at Zoological Society of London and that a draft agenda has gone to all participants. The proposed output of the meeting will be a first draft document, after which it is unknown how many steps there will be. H Dublin is to feedback to the SC about the meeting. H Dublin, L Boitani, G Mace, J Robinson and R Mittermeier will be attending.

9.3 Inputs to IUCN Change Management Projects and Leveraging Initiatives

H Dublin explained that the outcome of the meeting with the Commission Chairs and Global Programme Directors was that the Commissions should become more involved in the three main IUCN Change Management Projects, each being handled by one of the three IUCN Global Directors.

She went on to overview the Change Management Initiatives as follows:

1. Decentralisation and Regionalisation, phase 2 (Lead: GD for Programme): IUCN is continuing to work on strengthening the decentralised and regional functions of the Union. A TF has been established to work on this and the Commissions will be able to input at certain stages along the way. The Commissions are not actually clear, yet, on what "it" is and how we can do more. Earlier in the year IUCN held a meeting in The Hague for all regional and national committees. Although the Commissions were not invited, it is understood that some of the national and regional committees expressed the desire to have closer linkages with the

Commissions. How this will be operationalised remains unclear but the Commissions are continuing to engage on the issue.

2. Knowledge Management (Lead: GD for Strategies): IUCN have put significant resources into managing IUCN's knowledge and there is now a strategy document which is somewhat academic and an accompanying plan for implementation. H Dublin has given written comment on both. H Dublin explained that they acknowledge that a substantial component of IUCN's knowledge is coming from SSC. Massive effort and major cultural changes will be required to implement the new Knowledge Management Strategy and IUCN is in the process of hiring someone to oversee this. Many projects will roll out of it. The operational/IT side has been separated and is under A Rowles-Anobile, the Global Director for Operations).
3. Performance Assessments (Lead: GD for Operations): Other branches of the Secretariat have been looking at performance of projects, but this change initiative is looking at performance of IUCN as an institution. To date, they have conducted a staff survey to canvass views and opinions on staff perceptions of IUCN and they are planning to ask for ideas on how to appraise the performance of a Commission.

H Dublin explained that there are also two Leveraging Initiatives underway. These are as follows:

- Conservation for Poverty Reduction: The initiative is comprised of three components: Landscapes and Livelihoods, Mangroves for the Future and a Pan-African component. M Maunder has offered to assist in identifying how SSC might contribute and benefit from this initiative and others are urged to contribute if possible. H Dublin is to find out what form they want to contribute in, and as we currently have limited staff support for fundraising, it is hoped that just short concept papers will suffice.
- Energy and Biodiversity: H Dublin explained that she had been approached to appoint a person from the SSC to the newly-established TF overseeing this initiative in IUCN. She distributed copies of the document and commented that there is lots of opportunity for the SSC. She explained that this is coming out of the Business and Biodiversity Unit, with which we have a good relationship and they are keen for our involvement. It will take some time to identify who could be involved from our side, so H Dublin asked that SC members provide the names of people who have a focus on any aspect of energy and biodiversity covered in the initiative and who might like to be involved. She elaborated that this TF will produce outputs through a step-by-step process as defined in the document.

H Dublin explained that the IUCN decided to have these very large initiatives where everyone can get involved. She asked everyone to become involved if they have a particular interest, and to let her know if there are any ideas of new leveraging initiatives as this might be better than just letting others direct us.

ACTION: Through the Chair, SC members are invited to become involved in the Change Management Projects and Leveraging Initiatives, as well as to provide ideas regarding potential SSC engagements and contributions or other individuals who might be involved on behalf of the SSC.

Y Sadovy suggested that there should be an initiative about maintaining links between biodiversity, systems and productivity – i.e. the hypothesis that more diverse systems are more productive... "The sum of biodiversity and how it relates to productivity". M Samways agreed that there could also be an issue on how biodiversity begets resilience. He stated that this is a current area of debate and SSC could really get involved. J Robinson commented that it could be related to livelihoods issues, but the relationships are not linear.

ACTION: R Kock, Y Sadovy, M Samways, M Maunder are to put a document together on biodiversity, productivity, resilience, web-of-life, etc. and have it ready for the pack for next SSC SC meeting.

10. SSC SUCCESS STORIES

H Dublin called for success stories since WCC 3.2, and the SC members gave them as follows:

- J Smart said that during this week we have had 6-times as many website hits as usual. (She also mentioned that a colleague at HQ had asked that JC give his successful “brown bag lunch” on Red Listing to the IUCN Council.)
- M Samways commented on the removal of aliens and recovery of water resources, and how (by using the Biotic Recovery Index) two species of Damselflies have returned on Table Mountain.
- Y Sadovy commented that with regards to species on the CITES Appendices – within a year from the listing, we have gone from a situation whereby a CITES listing for fish was so new that authorities could not decide what to do, to a situation where the Indonesian Government is collaborating (with an IUCN Specialist Group) on censusing towards non-detriment findings for the Napoleon wrasse.
- R Kock commented on the anthrax outbreak recently reported from Northern Kenya affecting endangered Grevy’s zebra. The managers of the problem on the ground had benefited from IUCN SSC support in bringing information and experts together to advise. The rapid attention to the problem which led to vaccination of Grevy’s zebra is a model for intervention, although the real impact on this disease needs to be evaluated and this recent case in Kenya has provided a rare opportunity. There have been a series of anthrax events in Africa (such as the discovery of anthrax in chimps) and the apparently increasing frequency of outbreaks in other game species may relate to changing livestock management and reduced veterinary capacity on the continent (i.e. reduced vaccination coverage). Other factors like climate change also need to be considered as possible drivers for re-emergence of this disease.
- S Stuart noted that an NGO in Colombia looked at the Global Amphibian Assessment website and found there were many species on a certain mountain, so they purchased some private land there to safeguard these species. C Gascon, Co-Chair of the Amphibian SG, has helped Colombian herpetologists in this regard.
- S Stuart also noted that there are six endemic frogs in a forest in Sri Lanka, and there are plans to buy portions of land for the Forestry Department to run. R Pethiyagoda is involved.
- H Dublin mentioned that an important aim of the SSC is to be more responsive to the recommendations of the 2001 Voluntarism Study. One issue raised was the need for greater individual recognition for contributions made to SSC. To this end, the last issue of *Species* highlighted SG Chairs, asking them to provide their own written profile and photo. This has been well received and therefore we are going to continue to do the others in the next issue.

H Dublin concluded that this was the best feedback of success stories yet.

ACTION: All SC members are to email their success stories to the Species Programme Office so that they can go in the SSC e-bulletin.

11. TIMING AND VENUES OF OCTOBER 2006, SC WCC 3.4 MEETING

H Dublin expressed gratitude that R Mittermeier had offered to co-host the October WCC3.4, SC meeting in Madagascar. To fit his schedule, the meeting will need to start as close as possible to 21 October 2006. There was some discussion about the difficulties of getting to Antananarivo, but it was made clear that there are daily flights from Johannesburg and Paris. It is unlikely that J Robinson, C Campagna and M Maunder will attend, while R Lacy may be able to attend.

J Hutton suggested that as Madagascar has a large conservation community, it would be a good idea to have a function to meet the local conservation community. H Dublin agreed if such a function could be made affordable and said that R Mittermeier also had suggested that we use the occasion to visit a field site and make other contacts.

M Maunder mentioned that the Biology Department at Antananarivo University might want to make use of the SC being there to give guest lectures and asked people to decide if they would do this as a good will gesture or if and how much they would charge.

ACTION: C Poole is to make arrangements for WCC 3.4, liaising with R Mittermeier on logistics and the organisation of a social event with the local conservation community and M Maunder regarding the potential for SC members to do guest lectures at the University in Antananarivo.

H Dublin confirmed that future SC meetings would be in May and October in order to fit in with the Council meetings. She stated that a spreadsheet of possible dates for May 2007 will be circulated as soon as the Council meeting dates have been finalised.

12. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

Recognition for SSC's unsung heroes and heroines – a possible filming project:

H Dublin reiterated her desire to bring recognition to the SSC network of volunteer experts and explained her idea of trying to develop a television project. She has been in contact with the BBC Natural History Unit, Vie La Monde, Off the Fence and others who may be interested in film projects designed to highlight the work of the SSC and its members. A group called Wildscreen (of which she is on the Board for an initial period of one year) recently did an event called WildTalk, in South Africa, which was opened V Moosa. H Dublin said that the filmmakers are all clamouring for access to good stories and interesting people, so hopefully we will be able to form a partnership of some kind. There are options for packages of 1, 6 or 13 programmes, and they are interested in starting with one pilot that might not cost a lot of money but could test the market for such a product. She asked for ideas for the first pilot as a person who is cooperative and patient would be needed, and reiterated that she would hope that if we can establish an appropriate partnership, it may become a series as some of SSC's prime stories are already on the news (e.g. Vet SG).

Other business

H Dublin asked whether the SC members would like to complete individual evaluation forms following each SC meeting as WCPA's SC does. She commented that while she does not feel it is our style to do something so formal, it is important that people feel they can freely comment, criticise and provide feedback. There was a brief discussion around the point and the SC agreed that the meetings were good and that they would give suggestions when they felt the need but that formal meeting evaluations were not wanted. H Dublin concluded that overall she thinks it is a fantastic SC and has commented so in her appraisal, and the only remaining gaps in our composition are the Climate Change and Communications Task Forces.

H Dublin called for comments on the system of brief written reports in the meeting pack instead of presentations at the meeting, and urged people to have their reports ready well before-hand. The general consensus was that it was good to have the written reports.

C Campagna asked whether experts on specific issues, like communications, could be invited to address the SC. H Dublin replied that she has a meeting with the Chair of the CEC at the upcoming Council meeting and will discuss the possibility of bringing someone to a future SC meeting. She stated that there is pressure to have better linkages with the other Commissions and the CEC could act in an advisory role – perhaps running a ½ day workshop with us. She noted that it would be good to have an expert communicator to facilitate our discussion, help us to articulate our messages, while ensuring that our messages are not contradictory.

ACTION: H Dublin is to invite someone from the CEC to assist our communication needs at a future SSC SC meeting.

H Dublin then thanked J Hutton for hosting the meeting at UNEP-WCMC and asked him to thank his staff on the SC's behalf. She said she hopes to see everyone in Madagascar, and closed the meeting at 15:00 by thanking C Poole for all her assistance.