

Preparatory meeting to form the IUCN/SSC  
Marine Conservation Sub-Committee and Agenda  
December 4-6, 2005  
Puerto Madryn/Península Valdés, Patagonia, Argentina  
*Co-Chairs: Claudio Campagna and Yvonne Sadovy*

**Present (Contact details in Annex 1)**

Claudio Campagna  
Yvonne Sadovy  
Nicolas J. Pilcher  
Kent Carpenter  
Randall Reeves  
Terry J. Donaldson  
Imene Meliane  
Mabel Augustowsky  
Sonja Fordham  
Jane Smart  
Jean-Christophe Vie  
Leon Bennun  
Jon Hutton  
Mike Samways  
Holly Dublin

**Apologies:**

Mick Clout  
Steve Broad

***Convenors:* Claudio Campagna, Yvonne Sadovy**

***Administrative support:* Ana Carla Galli, Amy Spriggs**

***Rapporteurs:* Randall Reeves, Kent Carpenter, Leon Bennun, Nicolas Pilcher**

## Executive Summary

The need for a Marine Conservation Sub-Committee (MCSC) within the SSC has been identified, given the growing focus on marine issues and an increasing number of specialised and cross-cutting marine initiatives arising within IUCN. A preparatory meeting for the MCSC was held in December 2005, to discuss possible ways of integrating and coordinating efforts relevant to the marine realm, identify major issues of shared concern, and discuss how to align and integrate marine activities both within the SSC, with other IUCN initiatives as well as with those outside IUCN, where appropriate.

The MCSC should remain compact and will advise the Chair of the SSC on marine issues. It is not intended as an implementation body. Rather, its role is to focus and guide existing activities, identify opportunities for funding, outreach and representation, and, if relevant, seek means to address emerging issues. It may recommend to the Chair of the SSC the creation of new specialist groups and red-list authorities to meet current and anticipated needs. It may also recommend cross-cutting groups or task forces to address specific issues that may arise. An important part of its activities will be to oversee the development of the Global Marine Species Assessment (GMSA).

Presentations were received from all marine Specialist Groups, from relevant cross-cutting groups and from other relevant IUCN programmes. Major issues were identified, and the composition of the MCSC was discussed. It was, however, recognized that several important matters (e.g., introduced species) could not be discussed due to absence of expertise present. Also, climate change and associated species losses was identified.

*Key focal areas for the MCSC should be:*

1. Species assessments: oversee GMSA and communicate relevant funding opportunities to marine groups
2. Bycatch: especially across taxonomic groups
3. Overexploitation: special attention to 2010 sustainability indicators
4. Trade data; improve data records and foster incorporation of trade data into the Species Information System (SIS)
5. Promote documentation of Life history spectacles i.e. life history phases that are of critical importance for species or populations persistence, and especially when these are exploited or otherwise impacted.

*Anticipated activities/achievements for the MCSC in the next triennium include:*

- Representation on the Biodiversity Assessment Sub-Committee (BASC) for marine issues
- Advisory role for GMSA, including the possible recommendation of additional Specialist Groups and of Red List Authorities
- Focal unit for 2010 indicators (and possibly other key IUCN issues such as climate change) in relation to marine groups and issues
- Focal point for special cross-cutting issues such as bycatch and vulnerable/threatened life history phases. In particular the fostering of cross-group

- collaborations, identification of specific gaps in knowledge with respect to bycatch, such as invertebrates, for further action, and identification of possible funding opportunities for marine work
- Greater representation of marine issues in various policy forums
  - Engage with FAO to improve trade data for marine species and incorporate appropriate trade data into SIS

*The next steps are to:*

- Advise the SSC Chair on start-up membership for the MCSC
- Hold a strategic planning meeting for the MCSC
- Identify any relevant task forces (=advisory group) to be formed that address focal issues identified
- Advise on possible additional Specialist Groups relevant to the GMSA and provide GMSA oversight. Special attention and oversight are needed for controversial species (such as those of major commercial importance)
- Appoint a representative from the MCSC to represent marine issues on the BASC
- Hold a first MCSC meeting to further integrate outcomes of the Puerto Madryn funding effort with ongoing and emerging higher level IUCN objectives as necessary
- Continue discussion of relevant issues that were not represented at the Puerto Madryn meeting (esp. invasives, diseases, climate change).
- Approach FAO regarding trade data for threatened species

## **Introduction**

The purpose of the preparatory MCSC was to develop a focused marine agenda within the SSC to ensure the effectiveness and relevance of conservation work conducted by the SSC across a wide range of marine taxa, cross-cutting issues and existing IUCN programmes and initiatives. The meeting was convened to discuss internal IUCN and SSC institutional matters and to make recommendations on the appropriate final form that the SSC's Marine Conservation Sub-Committee (MCSC) should take. In the first instance, we wanted to identify and build upon current marine strengths and interests within the SSC, and identify gaps and weaknesses. The aim was to focus on a well-delimited set of issues, so that the MCSC can strive for small successes rather than large failures. Activities developed are to be aligned with SSC and IUCN strategic plans, which aim to:

- Influence decisions and policies affecting biodiversity by providing recommendations and guidelines based on sound interdisciplinary scientific information;
- Encourage users of natural resources to adopt modes of production and consumption that promote the conservation of biodiversity;
- Increase capacity to provide timely, innovative and practical solutions to conservation problems.

Planning for the pMCSC involved identification and invitation of representatives of all marine Specialist Groups and all relevant cross-cutting groups. Other IUCN participants were invited from the IUCN Marine Programme, Species Programme, WCPA (World Commission on Protected Areas) and TRAFFIC. Those participants who could not attend, or could not send an alternative representative, were invited to provide a summary of relevant activities. These were presented during the meeting, along with short talks from each invitee. The text of submissions is summarized (Appendix 1). Presentations were also given on previous initiatives to develop a marine programme in SSC, and on relevant current and developing marine initiatives (Shatter the Myth and the Global Marine Species Assessment [GMSA]).

Following the presentations, discussions focused on three areas, (a) the role of the MCSC as determined by participants, (b) key marine issues of concern and interest and priority areas, and (c) possible MCSC composition, bearing the preceding discussions in mind. On completion of the meeting, (d) Terms of Reference for the MCSC were revised and submitted to the SSC SC.

#### **(a) Roles of the MCSC**

The need for a MCSC within the SSC had widespread recognition and support. The lack of communication and networking within and among SGs, within and among SGs and SSC, and all the way up through other IUCN commissions and regional offices, in particular, was recognized. The need to reach higher-level policy forums on marine issues was also recognized. Specific areas in which the MCSC could be active need to keep in mind that, because the MCSC is voluntary, the scope of the agenda to be undertaken should be scaled accordingly.

In order to achieve the vision of increasing the global effectiveness of the marine agenda related to the SSC in IUCN, the MCSC has three general functions:

- 1) Help coordinate and integrate work across marine components of IUCN and SSC and with higher-level forums.
- 2) Tackle specific issues not being covered by other marine components of IUCN and SSC, not by implementing a project to tackle the specific issue but by identifying the most suitable forum or by facilitating connections. In this way, the MCSC will act as a focal point and conduit for marine issues.
- 3) Provide advisory roles for certain IUCN marine projects

More specific areas in which the MCSC could engage were also discussed. These included:

- The development and oversight of the GMSA, including identification of priority groups (already addressed in part), and recommendations for new SGs, and RLAs. Assurance of quality control for Red List assessments.

- The MCSC can help to ensure that marine issues conform to IUCN standards of data quality and strategic planning, while maintaining impartiality and tempering advocacy.
- The need for a specific and clear niche for the MCSC, which should be developed whereby it clearly adds value while minimizing overlap or duplication. This should enable the MCSC to seek niche areas for funding or capitalize on its unique focus of expertise to address and advise on specific problems. Specific or urgent issues could be addressed using task forces/advisory groups tailored to the issue(s).
- The opportunity for the MCSC to play a role as independent observer at major conventions/meetings, providing input on behalf of the IUCN and SGs, and providing a holistic approach to data presentation at these meetings. As a UN observer and inter-governmental agency IUCN carried weight in the policy arena, thus giving potential impact to the work of the MCSC.
- The important function the MCSC could play in helping with reverse information flow i.e. from SGs and cross-cutting groups up to relevant convening bodies and in the integration across groups. An example of the latter would be the need by WCPA for species level data in MPA planning.

### **(b) Focal issues for the MCSC**

Given the clear need for the MCSC, discussions identified key issues of concern within the marine environment, and particularly those of relevance to the SSC mandate and strategic plan. Initially a brainstorming session was conducted to identify a wide array of issues (Annex 2). Major priorities of interest to IUCN were then discussed in detail and priority areas identified according to various criteria, including immediacy/urgency, relevance to SSC mandate and capabilities, feasibility (Annex 2).

Based on these discussions, key priority areas for the MCSC were determined to be (see details in table of Annex 2):

1. Species assessments: oversee GMSA
2. Bycatch: especially across taxonomic groups and with invertebrates
3. Overexploitation: special attention to 2010 sustainability indicators and exploited vulnerable life history phases
4. Trade data: improve data records and incorporate trade data into SIS
5. “Life history spectacles”: some life history phases may be particularly vulnerable to fishing or other impacts and may be critical for populations persistence. These should be documented for possible follow up action by task force activity.

Anticipated achievements for the MCSC in the next triennium include:

- Representation on the BASC for marine issues
- Advisory role for GMSA, including the possible recommendation of additional Specialist Groups and Red List Authorities

- Focal unit for 2010 indicators (and possibly other key IUCN issues such as climate change) in relation to marine groups and issues
- Focal point for special cross-cutting issues such as bycatch and vulnerable life history phases (wildlife ‘spectacles’). In particular the fostering of cross-group collaborations and identification of specific gaps in knowledge with respect to bycatch, such as invertebrates, for further action
- Greater representation of marine issues in various policy forums
- Improvement of trade data for marine species in collaboration with FAO and incorporation of trade data into the IUCN SIS. FAO as an IGO is obligated to respond to data collection needs.

Conveners suggest preparing a regular column in SPECIES on MCSC activities.

### **(c) Proposed MCSC composition and next steps**

A discussion on the sequence of formation of the MCSC indicated no strong bias regarding the pros and cons for first forming the MCSC within IUCN and then bringing in outside partners. Arguments for first establishing the MCSC within IUCN were that members could establish and / or strengthen working relationships, identify future needs in relation to IUCN and then further clarify the MCSC agenda. Arguments for developing the MCSC with all IUCN members and outside partners simultaneously were that partners may not engage so strongly if brought in later or may feel there is a lack of transparency, more people provides a greater diversity of opinions, opinions from outside of IUCN are needed to define MCSC niche.

In terms of MCSC composition, potential membership was discussed, but a further meeting will be needed to finalize membership. The need to keep the group small was acknowledged for efficiency and cost reasons. It was also considered important that members be good facilitators and communicators. This group could establish task forces or advisory groups to address specific or urgent issues. Key members could be:

- MCSC Co-chairs
- Invertebrate SG representative
- Sustainable Use SG representative
- Academic advisor (this could be on an as needed *ad hoc* basis)
- Pew Institute for Ocean Science (because of emphasis on academic excellence)
- TRAFFIC
- 1 or 2 IUCN Commissions (e.g. WCPA)
- FAO
- UNEP
- CITES
- IUCN Regional Representative

*In addition: IUCN Species Programme and IUCN Marine Programme staff should be in attendance*

The next steps for the IUCN SSC pMCSC are to:

- Advise the SSC Chair on start-up membership for the MCSC
- Identify any relevant task forces (advisory groups) to be formed that address focal issues identified
- Advise on possible additional Specialist Groups relevant to the GMSA and provide GMSA oversight. Special attention and oversight are needed for controversial species (such as those of major commercial importance)
- Appoint a representative from the MCSC to represent marine issues on the BASC
- Hold a first MCSC meeting to further integrate outcomes of the Puerto Madryn meeting with ongoing and emerging higher level IUCN objectives as necessary
- Continue discussion of relevant issues that were not represented at the Puerto Madryn meeting (esp. invasive species, diseases, climate change).
- Approach FAO regarding trade data for threatened species

**(d) Terms of Reference for the MCSC**

Revised Terms of Reference were developed on completion of the meeting (Annex 3) and submitted to the SSC SC.

\*\*\*\*\*

**ANNEX 1**  
***List of participants and draft agenda***

**Mabel Augustowsky**

Biological oceanographer, MSc.  
Head of IUCN/WCPA-Marine/Brazil  
[mabelaug@uol.com.br](mailto:mabelaug@uol.com.br)

**Dr. Leon Bennun**

SSC SC member -IUCN  
BirdLife International Representative  
BirdLife International  
Cambridge, UK  
[Leon.Bennun@birdlife.org](mailto:Leon.Bennun@birdlife.org)

**Dr. Claudio Campagna**

IUCN SSC pMCSC - Co-chair  
SSC SC member -IUCN  
Research Biologist  
Consejo Nacional de Investigaciones Científicas y Técnicas  
Centro Nacional Patagónico - Puerto Madryn, Argentina  
[cvz\\_puertomadryn@speedy.com.ar](mailto:cvz_puertomadryn@speedy.com.ar)

**Prof. Kent E. Carpenter**

IUCN/CI/CABS & Biological Sciences, Old Dominion University  
Global Marine Species Assessment Coordinator  
[kcarpent@odu.edu](mailto:kcarpent@odu.edu)

**Dr. Terry J. Donaldson**

Dr. Terry J. Donaldson, Ichthyologist  
University of Guam Marine Laboratory  
Mangilao, Guam USA  
Chair, IUCN/SSC Coral Reef Fishes Specialist Group  
Board Member, Society for the Conservation of Reef Fish Aggregations

[donaldsn@uog9.uog.edu](mailto:donaldsn@uog9.uog.edu)

**Dr. Holly T. Dublin**

SSC Chair -IUCN  
c/o South African National Biodiversity Institute  
Cape Town, South Africa  
[holly.dublin@ssc.iucn.org](mailto:holly.dublin@ssc.iucn.org)

**Sonja Fordham**

International Fish Conservation Program Manager  
The Ocean Conservancy  
[SFordham@OCEANCONSERVANCY.ORG](mailto:SFordham@OCEANCONSERVANCY.ORG)

**Dr. Jon Hutton**

SSC SC member -IUCN  
Director for Africa  
Fauna and Flora International Cambridge, UK  
[jon.hutton@fauna-flora.org](mailto:jon.hutton@fauna-flora.org)

**Imène Meliane**

Marine Programme Officer  
IUCN Global Marine Programme  
IUCN Regional Office for South America  
[imene.meliane@iucn.org](mailto:imene.meliane@iucn.org)

**Dr. Nicolas James Pilcher**

Director, Marine Research Foundation, Malaysia  
Co-Chair, IUCN SSC Marine Turtle Specialist Group  
[pilcher@tm.net.my](mailto:pilcher@tm.net.my)

**Dr. Randall Reeves**

Consultant affiliated with Okapi Wildlife Associates in Hudson, Quebec.  
[rreeves@total.net](mailto:rreeves@total.net)

**Dr. Yvonne Sadovy**

**IUCN SSC pMCSC - Co-chair**

SSC SC member

Associate Professor at the Department of Ecology & Biodiversity, The University of Hong Kong,  
Chair of the IUCN Specialist Group of Groupers and Wrasses,  
Director of the Society for the Conservation of Reef Fish Aggregations (SCRFA)  
[yjsadovy@hkucc.hku.hk](mailto:yjsadovy@hkucc.hku.hk)

**Dr. Jane Smart**

IUCN

Head of the Species Programme

Policy Issues

[Jane.Smart@iucn.org](mailto:Jane.Smart@iucn.org)

**Prof. Michael Samways**

SSC SC member -IUCN

Department of Entomology and Centre for Agricultural Biodiversity

Faculty of Agricultural and Forestry Sciences

University of Stellenbosch - South Africa

[samways@sun.ac.za](mailto:samways@sun.ac.za)

**Dr. Jean-Christophe Vié**

IUCN - The World Conservation Union

Deputy Coordinator of the Species Programme

[jean-christophe.vie@iucn.org](mailto:jean-christophe.vie@iucn.org)

## **Materials presented to attendees**

(1)

### **Purpose of the pMCSC**

The purpose of the meeting is to forge and activate a focused marine agenda within the SSC to ensure the effectiveness and relevance of conservation work conducted by SSC across a wide range of marine taxa, cross-cutting issues and existing IUCN programme and initiatives. This is a meeting to discuss internal IUCN and SSC institutional matters and to make recommendations on the appropriate final form the SSC's Marine Conservation Sub-Committee (MCSC) should take. These recommendations will then be taken from this meeting to the SSC SC meeting for endorsement before moving forward to formally establish the MCSC.

(2)

### **Objectives of the IUCN-SSC**

1. To influence decisions and policies affecting biodiversity by providing recommendations and guidelines based on sound interdisciplinary scientific information.
2. To encourage users of natural resources to adopt modes of production and consumption that promote the conservation of biodiversity.
3. To promote among the scientific community a greater commitment to the conservation, sustainable use and management of biodiversity and increased integration of findings across disciplines.
4. To increase the capacity to provide timely, innovative and practical solutions to conservation problems.

## **IUCN Species Survival Commission Preparatory Marine Conservation Sub-Committee (pMCSC) Agenda Revised November 22<sup>nd</sup>, 2005**

*Day 1 – December 4<sup>th</sup>*  
8.30-6.30

8.30-9.15 General Introduction – Background to development of MCSC within IUCN SSC. Self-introduction of invitees  
Holly and Claudio

9.15-9.45 IUCN Marine Programme – Marine issues covered by the Marine Programme of IUCN: objectives and long-term plans  
Imene

9.45-10.15 WCPA – Summary of marine issues in WCPA

Mabel

10.15-10.30 – The IUCN Species Programme: working in support of SSC  
Jane

10.30-10.45 – Historic overview of initiatives within the SSC-IUCN to prioritize and focus marine issues; '*Grey Rocks*', '*Shatter the Myth*' and *GMSA*  
Yvonne

10.45-11.15  
B R E A K

11.20-11.40 – Species initiatives 1. Marine mammals  
Randall and Claudio

11.45-11.55 – Species initiatives 2. Turtles  
Nick

12.00-12.10 – Species initiatives 3. Marine birds in relation to the SSC  
Leon

12.15-12.25 – Species initiatives 4. Sharks  
Sonja

12.30-12.40 – Species initiatives 5. Groupers and wrasses  
Yvonne

12.45-12.55 – Species initiatives 6. Other coral reef fishes  
Terry

1.00-2.00  
L U N C H

2.00-3.00 – Summary and discussion of primary issues identified by specialist groups  
Yvonne and Claudio

3.00-3.10 – Specific issues 1. Sustainable use, consumer and fishery issues  
Jon

3.15-3.25 – Specific issues 2. *GMSA* initiative between CI and IUCN  
Kent

3.30-3.40 – Specific issues 3. Invertebrates and *GMSA*  
Samways

3.45-4.30  
B R E A K

4.30-4.40 – Specific issues 4. Invasives  
Mike

4.45-4.55 – Specific issues 5. Bycatch – workshop summary  
Nick

5.00-5.30 – Reports submitted in writing – TRAFFIC, Fishery Working Group and MPA work of the ESUSG, new Salmonid SG  
Yvonne

5.30-6.00 – Summary and discussion of primary issues identified by cross-cutting groups or special initiatives, and other emerging marine issues not yet addressed  
Claudio and Yvonne

6.00-6.30 – Procedure for remaining day and a half for developing a strategy for the MCSC and establishment of the composition of the MCSC  
Claudio

*Day 2 – December 5<sup>th</sup>*  
10.30-5.00

Early morning, participants move to the field

10.30-11.00. Reiterate procedures and outcomes from yesterday. Summarize and tabulate key identified marine issues. Outline and discuss structure for brainstorming.  
Claudio

11.00-12.00 – Formation of two subgroups to work in parallel, each with a designated chair, to establish priorities and develop a possible programme and timeframe for marine work within IUCN-SSC, given strengths and capacities available, and the issues identified.

12.00-1.00  
L U N C H

1.00-1.30 – Presentation of summaries of subgroup discussion.  
Sub-group 1

1.30-2.00 - Presentation of summaries of subgroup discussion.  
Sub-group 2

2.00-3.00 – Prioritize issues – identify additional specialist/cross-cutting groups or task forces that could be established. Harmonize with IUCN Marine Programme  
Discussion – Claudio chair

3.00-3.30 – Comments from IUCN Marine Programme

3.30-4.00  
B R E A K

4.00-5.00 Discuss MCSC composition and include possible non-IUCN partners  
5.00 Walk in the field

*Day 3 – December 6<sup>th</sup>*  
8.30-1.00

7.00-8.30 Walk in the field

8.30-9.00  
B R E A K F A S T

9.00-11.00 Marine structures continued

11.00-11.30  
B R E A K

11.30-12.30 Funding considerations and co-ordination

12.30-1.00 Wrap-up

## ANNEX 2

### *Catalogue of issues identified in brainstorming-table shows those items discussed in more detail*

- Translating knowledge into actions to avoid extinction: could bridge the gap with information campaigns such as the ‘Shatter the Myth’ campaign.
- A need is recognized for (1) a review of Regional Fishery Management Organization effectiveness and (2) the extent of implementation of Code of Conduct for Responsible Fisheries
- Specialist Group input was requested in respect of marine protected areas and the species to be protected and managed – it was identified that sometimes this information is difficult to obtain but often essential for MPA development.
- Access to quality data on marine species is required for a range of issues, from food trade (live and dead fish and invertebrates, for example).
- Bycatch: risk assessment and across-species approaches to mitigation; problems and issues. Bycatch of invertebrates is a clear niche area. View Nick Pilcher’s bycatch model as a Decision Support System rather than a solution
- Major marine problem are overexploitation and lack of management
- Need to know more about bioprospecting and its effects on biodiversity
- Need to expand on and improve Red List Assessment timeframes
- Climate change: if dealing with climate change it is important to be specific about what aspects are being addressed and what impacts. For example, relevant to the SSC prevention of extinction could be a specific objective within climate change issues
- Need to be proactive and to address monitoring issues in the marine realm
- Need to understand and better utilize species as indicators of issues such as climate change, overexploitation, indicators of sustainability (an important example is the 2010 target)
- Impacts of toxic chemicals and noise on the marine environment
- Promote responsible / Sustainable Use and roles of consumers
  - Identification of important life history areas, such as breeding or nesting locations that might be particularly vulnerable to exploitation or habitat degradation
  - Issues related to aquaculture
  - Consolidate and cross-reference marine-related databases for easier access
- Habitat destruction (e.g. coral bleaching)
- Risk assessment methodology and valuation
- Issues related to marine invasives

- The role of marine protected areas in mitigation and management; just one aspect of the approach to conservation and management

<b>ISSUE (<i>how issue addresses IUCN/SSC objectives</i>)</b>	<b>DISCUSSION AND POSSIBLE ACTION(S) ON MAJOR ISSUES IDENTIFIED</b>
Insufficient marine spp. Red List Assessments ( <i>needed for conservation planning and 2010 indicators</i> )	<p>Global Marine Species Assessment needs appropriate prioritisation to help to detect patterns of threat and effectively characterize overall status of marine organisms in a representative manner. Need to consider the SRLI and how the GMSA can contribute to the development of indicators.</p> <p>Oversee GMSA – to include establishment of relevant new SGs and RLAs</p>
Bycatch can threaten species – a subset of unsustainable practices; ( <i>activities should lead to bycatch reduction and, therefore, reduction of threats to species posed by bycatch</i> )	<p>Need to better understand bycatch. As one example, compile dataset on bycatch of invertebrates through literature/photo records, research, engagement of onboard observers, etc.</p> <p>SSC could be particularly effective in addressing mitigation measures that address issues relevant to a wide range of taxonomic groups, and also seeks to coordinate/integrate with other initiatives both within and outside of IUCN.</p> <p>Consider modelling approach as a decision support system; need to specify gear types (e.g. attention needed for coastal and midwater gillnets/deepwater nets) and geographic region.</p>
Unsustainable resource use threatens species; particular focus on input to 2010 indicators ( <i>activities should contribute to sustainability indicators; indicators enable proactive interventions and planning</i> )	<p>MCSC input to SUSG for 2010 indicators for sustainability and rational resource use, risk assessment and valuation.</p> <p>Possible need to focus on species that are not obviously subjects of attention e.g. less valuable or with vulnerable life history parameters that should be incorporated into indicators</p> <p>Other considerations are for indicators to include cascades, to discuss establishment of a marine SUSG, to identify <u>goals</u> for recovery and to discuss tools for sustainability, such as MPAs.</p>
Congregating species can be particularly vulnerable at certain life-history phase (bottlenecks/ecological processes) ( <i>activities should lead to threat reduction</i> )	Address/document critical (life history) congregations (feeding, pupping, egg laying, breeding, migrations etc.) that overlap with fisheries or other threats: document these across a wide range of taxa and relate to threat overlay. Could contribute to ongoing critical habitat work within IUCN and by partners.
Paucity of high resolution trade data compromises ability to assess volumes and regional patterns of	Add resolution to international trade data for marine invertebrates and vertebrates (e.g. harmonized codes, import and export data collection, reporting units, mortality rates for live trade). Could develop identification manual. Request FAO assistance for more

trade ( <i>better data can assist in proactive – ‘Early Warning’ - intervention</i> )	trade data. Possible links with WCMC, FAO, TRAFFIC, and could consider a trade focal person for relevant SGs. Add trade data to SIS.
---	---

## **ANNEX 3**

### ***DRAFT Terms of Reference (rev. Dec. 9. 2005)***

#### **IUCN SSC Marine Conservation Sub-Committee**

##### *Composition*

The SSC MCSC is a technical advisory body chaired by two co-Chairs nominated by the Chair of the SSC and will include representatives of the SSC-SC, other IUCN units with expertise in marine issues, as well as relevant non-IUCN members. The MCSC, in consultation with the SSC Chair and Species Programme, will invite members who will exercise specific, collective and institutional responsibilities in relation to marine issues within the IUCN/SSC.

##### *Main duties*

Building on IUCN/SSC strengths and advancing its mandate, the MCSC will concentrate on marine issues that are achievable, time-sensitive, focus on priorities that integrate across taxa, regions, and problem areas, and that consider emerging issues of relevance. The MCSC should be proactive whenever possible and use its technical expertise and membership to build on IUCN's power to convene in marine issues and to facilitate action. The MCSC should:

1. develop a strategic approach, with clearly identified targets, priorities and time-frames for the marine component of SSC's work, consistent with the SSC Strategic Plan visions and goals and in respect of the SSC's contribution to the IUCN programme 2005-2008;
2. provide a strategic umbrella to coordinate and integrate actions for the pertinent SGs, task forces and cross-cutting groups for marine-related issues of relevance to the SSC;
3. develop links with the SSC, and between the SSC and other pertinent SSC subcommittees, IUCN Commissions and Programmes regarding marine issues and external partners;
4. advise on priorities and provide guidance for the IUCN Global Marine Species Assessment;
5. advise the SSC on marine issues, including the need for new potential SGs and potential Red List Authorities in relation to training and capacity-building for the assessment of marine species.
6. provide a forum for technical information exchange, and for strategic and political support and facilitation for the decisions and actions pertinent to the Mission of

the SSC-SC on marine issues within the IUCN, and between IUCN and other relevant groups, committees, agencies, etc.

### *Operations*

The MCSC will set priorities through a process of consultation, participation and consensus shall aim to meet at least once a year, subject to available resources. Funds available to the MCSC of the SSC SC will be spent on:

1. Supporting MCSC workshops to address objectives, targets and priorities, and to advance specific aspects of these.
2. Communication of results to the SSC-SC, within the SSC, and beyond, as deemed necessary.
3. Develop strategy and identify critical players (either as individuals or institutionally), for the MCSC, for consultation or for specifically developed task forces to address priorities and/or emerging issues, and create and facilitate opportunities and links for integration and problem-solving.

## ***Appendix 1 Presentations***

Iméne Meliane spoke on the **IUCN Global Marine Programme**. The new marine team started work in 2001, with five staff in Gland and another eight in regional offices around the world, including two legal advisors. They were still working to define IUCN's exact niche in marine conservation and sustainable use. Focus was on knowledge of marine biodiversity and socio-economic processes, financial mechanisms, ocean governance systems and working with stakeholders. In practice, key themes were the high seas and deep seas (where IUCN took a global lead), fisheries (including large marine ecosystems and aquaculture), species issues (threatened species, invasives, bioprospecting and aquaria), coral reefs and climate change, Marine Protected Areas, and a range of cross-cutting policy issues. So far, interaction with the SSC has been *ad hoc*, largely through variety of specialist groups.

Jane highlighted the need to get the IUCN Marine Programme working more closely with the Species Programme and SSC – this was a challenge given the way IUCN was structured, with 40 different cost centres. Holly noted that the Marine Programme work seemed largely project-driven, with the specialist groups involved mainly to provide technical knowledge to fulfil projects. Iméne noted that the Marine Programme was feeding substantively into policy, and needed the advice and support of specialist groups to do so effectively.

Mabel Augustowsky outlined **marine issues in WCPA**. Species information was needed to plan, create and monitor marine Protected Areas, e.g. for migratory species. But this information was scattered. Closer links to SSC would be useful, for instance through the WCPA taskforces on small islands (needing information on marine invasive species) and management effectiveness (where species data could indicate the effectiveness of management approaches). Species data are also vital to design connected networks of MPAs.

Holly noted that the proposed joint WCPA/SSC conservation planning review should also include marine systems. Yvonne mentioned the need to bring together, in a standardised way, the many data that are presently scattered across a proliferation of databases. Jon cautioned against imposing too tight a framework on the disparate parts of IUCN, since this might risk killing energy and innovation. Jean-Christophe noted that the species programme could play a coordinating role here.

Jane Smart gave an introduction to the **IUCN species programme**. The programme has a complex structure, with 22 staff spread across three main offices (and in three places in the United States). A review of the programme's structure and operations is currently underway by Price Waterhouse Coopers. The programme supports SSC, including the marine specialist groups and related assessments, though its capacity to do so remains inadequate. The Global Marine Species Assessment, now underway, is supporting one existing specialist group, as well as working to generate income for others.

Responding to questions, Jane said there was presently no venue where the heads of global thematic programmes gathered together, but one was about to be established. The major taxonomic biases among existing marine specialist groups were being addressed by the SSC Steering Committee restructuring task force, on which Jane represented the species programme. The Price Waterhouse Coopers review was internal, but the results will be made available.

Yvonne Sadovy gave an overview of the **history of SSC marine initiatives**. There had been a series of these but with limited continuity or outcomes. In 1996, a marine red-listing workshop focused on fish, listing many commercial species. The resulting controversy led to criteria being refined, and there is now greater acceptance of commercially fished species being listed. The ‘Grey Rocks’ strategic planning workshop in 1998 was intended to develop an integrated fisheries programme for IUCN. A range of major issues was identified, but it proved difficult to focus since all were felt to be important and priorities were not clearly identified.

In 2001, the ‘Shatter the Myth’ meeting identified 40 targets, many more specific than those arising from the ‘Grey Rocks’ meeting. Eight key issues were highlighted as priorities: shattering the myth of no marine extinctions, impacts of non-selective gear, monitoring, mariculture, invasive species, spawning aggregations, identification of vulnerable life-history features (later refined into a susceptibility matrix) and co-ordination by the IUCN secretariat.

This was followed up in 2003 with a ‘Shatter the Myth’ workshop to develop clearer strategy and outcomes, including communication tools such as a popular publication and a poster series. Outputs are pending but a poster of one threatened fish species has been produced, and displays mounted at several meetings.

The Global Marine Species Assessment will address many of the issues that have arisen in the past (see below – Kent Carpenter).

Key lessons to be learned from this history included:

- Focus on key and relatively few goals
- Build on IUCN strengths
- Ensure wide consultation
- Build in SSC oversight
- Secure the funding needed for assessments.

Randall Reeves gave an overview of SSC work on **marine mammals** through what was now the Cetacean Specialist Group. This group had an initial focus on river dolphins and small coastal cetaceans. With 80 members from 30 countries, the group dealt with ‘only’ 85 species but many more populations. It had no institutional or funding base, but still had three regional co-ordinators in addition to the Chair. Cetaceans had large, passionate constituencies and this was a mixed blessing. The SG was able to bring impartiality and scientific authority to debates on issues such as fishery interactions, underwater noise and

trade, and to particular species of concern such as the Yangtze River Dolphin, the Vaquita and (recently) the Western Grey Whale (where there had been good collaboration with other parts of IUCN over the Sakhalin issue). Claudio Campagna spoke briefly about the **Pinniped** Specialist Group. This was being restructured, with a new Chair being sought. The SG covers 34 species, including some that are highly threatened, such as the Mediterranean Monk Seal and Steller's Sea-lion. Some species also have very limited ranges. The main conservation issues include habitat loss and bycatch (through entanglement).

Nick Pilcher spoke on **marine turtles**. The SG had seven species to deal with. Historically, there had been issues of bias and partiality, resolved now through a review of membership but leaving a lingering credibility problem. The group has set priorities across the broad range of turtle issues, focusing on a narrower set of these at one time. Currently the focus is on accidental mortality (from trawling, longlines, gillnets) and direct take (when is it sustainable?). A visioning meet in December 2003 helped to reinvigorate the group, and a recent multi-taxon bycatch workshop had also proved very valuable. Next year a sustainable use workshop is planned. The main message was that setting priorities really works!

Leon Bennun outlined work on **marine birds**. A range of relevant structures existed, including several international treaties. Little marine bird work was being carried by SSC specialist groups, this role being filled by BirdLife International. As the Red List authority, BirdLife was responsible for carrying out assessments and maintaining the Red List for marine birds. BirdLife's Global Seabird Programme was started in response to data showing serious threats from long-line fisheries for many species of albatrosses and petrels. The programme works at all levels, from local to global. It focuses mainly on improving seabird distribution and status data (through the Procellariiform Tracking Database and Marine Important Bird Areas identification); action for by-catch mitigation; and advocacy for better marine management. Key targets for action and advocacy are the Regional Marine Fisheries Organisations, one of which (CCAMLR=Commission for the Conservation of Antarctic Marine Living Resources) has already implemented effective steps to reduce marine bird bycatch. There is particular need for integration with approaches being taken for other taxa regarding bycatch and the identification of key biodiversity areas on the high seas.

Sonja Fordham reported on **sharks**. The Shark SG has 170 members from over 60 countries, with around 10 regional vice-chairs and (since 2001) a programme officer. Focal work areas include CITES, the FAO and Red List assessments for over 1,000 species. The SG has engaged constructively with CITES and FAO, and has usefully been able to bridge a gap between CITES and FAO on shark issues. Regional Red List workshops are now underway. However, some issues remain: the SG is regionally unbalanced, with a strong European and North American focus and feels somewhat isolated from other IUCN SGs (despite common issues, such as bycatch and unsustainable use). Current plans are to hold at least an annual regional Vice-Chairs meeting, earmark funds for wider regional work, build better links with other regional and/or marine SGs (including the Sustainable Use Specialist Group), and work on

expanding the IUCN presence at the meetings of Regional Fisheries Management Organisations and their scientific councils (where there are many shared issues and opportunities across a diversity of marine groups).

Yvonne Sadovy outlined the work of the **Groupers and Wrasses** SG. The SG, which is also a Red List Authority, now has 35 members from 15 countries. Membership has been re-organised to improve the diversity of geographies and ages represented. Main focal areas include species assessments, spawning aggregations, the international live reef-fish food trade, and a conservation/management programme for the Humphead Wrasse. Red List assessment is complete for the 50 top-priority species (out of c. 900) and is now focusing on groupers, which seem to be particularly threatened. Global data are being pulled together on sites where certain species gather in spawning aggregations, which renders them vulnerable, and on the food trade in live reef-fish and invertebrates (which is now spreading from south-east Asia, often for distant markets, and is little monitored or managed). On the CITES-listed Humphead Wrasse (Appendix II in 2004), the group has been working with governments, TRAFFIC and others to develop non-detriment findings and to deal with implementation, trade and consumption issues. This is a test case for the effectiveness of CITES and the sustainable-use approach for marine fishes. Cross-cutting issues being addressed include over-exploitation, monitoring of catches and trade, and vulnerable life-history attributes, such as breeding congregations. There is high public interest in, and therefore scrutiny of, Red List assessments for this group because of the commercial importance of many species: human and financial capacity for assessment work still need to be increased.

Terry Donaldson talked on **other coral reef fishes**, comprising c. 5000 species. The SG's geographic focus was in the Indo-Pacific and the East and West Atlantic. The group had historically been somewhat quiescent but new members were now being brought on board, especially from developing countries. They were involved in a range of policy activities, together with construction and testing of susceptibility matrices and with Red List assessments (through the Global Assessment of Reef Fishes, GARF). Both exploitation and habitat destruction (especially through coral reef bleaching) were major problems. The group was applying phylogenetic methods to infer status and susceptibility. A recent workshop in Norwich, UK, had refined the susceptibility matrix approach, ranking both intrinsic and extrinsic factors. Testing this against the current Red List suggested the approach worked well. Although the SG still lacked adequate funding, it was moving ahead well on publications, assessments and group restructuring.

Jon Hutton spoke about **sustainable use**, consumer and fishery issues and on the important links between the three and biodiversity.

Kent Carpenter discussed the developing **Global Marine Species Assessment (GMSA)** collaboration between CI and IUCN. He reported on a GMSA strategy meeting held in November 2005. Participants included representatives from IUCN/SSC Specialist Groups and Red List Authorities for various marine groups, CI, BAU, and the Fisheries Department of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. A vision, goals, and objectives for the GMSA were agreed upon during this meeting, and criteria

were developed to identify the priority taxa for the first phase of the GMSA. These criteria include: factors such as heavy utilization, high economic value, severe habitat deterioration, importance in community structure and function, intrinsically vulnerable life history regime, and feasibility of successful completion of a comprehensive Red List Assessment for the entire taxonomic group in question. Under these criteria 17 major taxa of fishes were listed as priorities, comprising approximately 8,000 species (out of a total of about 15,000 species of marine fishes).

Mike Samways presented on key issues and concerns for marine **invertebrates**, which represent a significant component of marine biodiversity. Many species and ecological processes involving them are threatened, and means must be sought to find ways of maintaining invertebrate diversity at current levels. Concerns regarding marine invertebrates include overharvesting (e.g. holothurians, lobsters, squid), bycatch issues, sea floor damage and coral reef deterioration. There needs to be a global Red Listing authority for invertebrates, which would be a major supplement to the taxonomic specialist groups. As regards the marine environment, the most efficient way forward would be for the SSC Marine Conservation Subcommittee and GMSA to drive the themes, which in the case of invertebrates in the marine environment, is mostly about functional attributes. Where the Invertebrate Conservation Subcommittee can assist would be in the Red Listing of particular, threatened species.

Nick Pilcher spoke on the issue of mitigation of **bycatch** in longline fisheries. He reported on a workshop held in Malaysia in 2005 which brought together a coalition of marine resource specialists from 14 countries, who worked together to identify, develop, and recommend applicable and integrated solutions to reduce interactions of birds, mammals, turtles and sharks with pelagic longline fisheries worldwide. Key outcomes discussed include commonalities, synergies and conflicts between species groups and mitigation measures for target (and non-target) species, through the use of a comparative matrix (or matrices), and identifies criteria for evaluating trade-offs in the application of bycatch mitigation methods. A second key outcome of the workshop was a preliminary concept of a mathematical model based on existing mitigation measures and intended for fisheries managers to assist in decision making. The group developed a concept modelling process through which decision-makers could determine the top priorities for mitigation, both in terms of the bycatch species and the mitigation options, and combinations thereof.

The presentation stimulated significant discussion on the advantages of using a decision matrix approach as well as concerns that what might be solutions to bycatch for one group, such as turtles, could pose problems for other groups, such as marine mammals. Bycatch was widely acknowledged as a cross-cutting issue of high relevance to many of the participants although it was also recognized that there are many non-IUCN bycatch initiatives.

## **NOTE**

**Since not all invited representatives or relevant marine/cross-cutting groups could be present, short presentations were given on their behalf, specifically for: Mike Clout on Invasives, for TRAFFIC on their work in relation to the SSC, for The FWG and the MPA work of the ESUSG, and for the Salmonid SG.**

*Summary copies of presentations are available on request.*