

Final report: Strategic Planning Meeting for the SSC Marine Conservation Sub-Committee, November, 2006: C. Campagna & Y. Sadovy: 35 pp.

Strategic Planning Meeting for the SSC Marine Conservation Sub-Committee

Wattens, Austria, 2-4 August 2006

Final Report: November, 2006



Table of contents

Acronyms

1. **Background to the Wattens meeting**
 - Precedents to the MCSC
 - MCSC Planning stage: December 2005 Patagonian workshop
 - Objectives of the SSC of relevance to the MCSC
2. **Methodology used in the Wattens Strategic Planning Meeting**
 - Guidelines for discussion
 - Marine related initiatives of the IUCN
3. **Proposed activities/synergies for the MCSC**
 - Operational principles of the MCSC
 - Supporting functions
 - Synergies with other organizations and programmes
 - Priority Targets for the MCSC- SSC
4. **Concluding remarks and next steps**
5. **Acknowledgements**

Endnotes 1-2

- Discussions on key identified targets as outcomes of Wattens meeting
- Information Presentations to the Strategic Planning Meeting in relation to other Marine-Relevant IUCN Programmes and Initiatives

Appendices 1-4

- Letter of invitation and list of participants with contact details
- Executive Summary of the December 2005, Patagonian meeting
- ToR MCSC (December 9th, 2005)
- Complete list of targets (a) higher ranked (b) lower ranked

Acronyms

BASC:	Biodiversity Assessment Sub-Committee
BD:	Biodiversity
BISC:	Biodiversity Indicator Sub-Committee
CI:	Conservation International
CITES:	Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Flora and Fauna
FAO:	Food and Agriculture Organization
GMSA:	Global Marine Species Assessment
MCSC:	SSC's Marine Conservation Sub-Committee
NDF:	Non-Detriment Finding (under CITES)
RL:	Red List
RLAs:	Red List Authorities
RO:	Regional Office
RSG:	Reintroduction sustainable group
SIS DEM:	Species Information System Data Entry Module
SGs:	Specialist Groups
SRLI:	Sampled Red List Index
SSC:	Species Survival Commission
WCC:	World Conservation Congress
WCPA:	World Commission on Protected Areas

1.0 Background to the Wattens meeting

Precedents to the MCSC

The SSC has had a relatively limited focus on marine organisms, compared to terrestrial animals and plants. Specialist groups cover marine mammals, sharks and turtles, but fishes and invertebrates receive much less attention. In 1996, a marine red-listing workshop on fishes incorporated many commercially important species at different levels of threat. The resulting controversy led to certain IUCN Red List criteria being refined to better encompass marine organisms (especially commercially important species), and there was a growing realization of the need for a greater focus on marine groups in general.

Several initiatives since the mid-1990s moved to establish a stronger marine focus within IUCN, but none were established within the SSC. The IUCN now has an active Marine Programme but this does not have the strong species focus of the SSC. Earlier IUCN initiatives to develop a marine agenda included the 'Grey Rocks' strategic planning workshop in 1998, intended to develop an integrated fisheries programme for IUCN. The meeting could not establish specific targets because of the large range of issues identified to be in need of attention. In 2001, a SSC meeting in Washington (SSC) identified 40 targets. Eight key issues were then highlighted in a prioritizing exercise: key areas identified were shattering the myth that marine extinctions cannot occur (top priority), impacts of non-selective gear, monitoring, mariculture, invasive species, spawning aggregations, identification of vulnerable life-history features (later refined into a susceptibility matrix to identify species for priority work), and improved co-ordination of marine issues by the IUCN secretariat.

In 2003, a SSC 'Shatter the Myth' workshop was held to develop clearer strategy and outcomes for this priority issue, including communication tools such as a popular publications and a poster series. Outputs are still pending but a poster of one threatened fish species was produced, displays mounted at several meetings, and a panel discussion was held at the IUCN WCC 2004, which was well-attended.

More recently, the Global Marine Species Assessment (GMSA), in partnership with Conservation International was initiated in August 2005. It is hosted at the biodiversity assessment unit of the IUCN Species Programme. Conservation International wants to see Red List assessments completed to use them for Hot Spot assessments (i.e. compile distribution maps according to species and threat and identify overlaps). The GMSA can assist SSC in accelerating marine species assessments and analyses of assessment outcomes. The vision, goals, and objectives for the GMSA were agreed at a meeting in Washington in late 2005 with strong input from SSC SGs, and criteria developed to identify 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.

Key lessons learned from this history include:

- Need to focus on key and relatively few goals
- Need to build on IUCN strengths
- Need to ensure wide consultation
- Need to build in SSC oversight and network support
- Needs to promote and communicate funding opportunities to increase the capacity for conducting species assessments
- Need to deliver on agreed outputs / be realistic about outputs
- Need for strong SSC Chair/staff support

MCSC Planning stage: December 2005 Patagonian Workshop

The strategy planning meeting in Wattens, Austria, was a follow up to the preparatory SSC Marine Conservation Sub-Committee (MCSC) meeting held in Puerto Madryn, Argentina, in December, 2005.

The December meeting was the first step to establishing the MCSC. It was held to develop a focused marine agenda within the SSC to ensure the effectiveness and relevance of conservation work conducted by an SSC MCSC across a wide range of marine taxa, cross-cutting issues and existing IUCN programmes and initiatives. The December meeting was convened to explore internal IUCN and SSC institutional relationships, and those between the SSC, IUCN and outside partners, to make recommendations on the appropriate final form that the SSC's MCSC should take, and to identify key issues within marine conservation that SSC members and interests could best serve.

At this meeting, we identified and built upon current marine strengths and interests within the SSC, and discussed specific gaps and weaknesses. The aim was to focus on a well-delimited set of issues, so that the MCSC, once formed, could strive for small, meaningful successes rather than large failures. The Executive Summary from the Puerto Madryn workshop is in Appendix 1. Composition, main duties and operation of the MCSC-SSC, approved by SSC-SC at its meeting in Puerto Madryn in December, 2006, are in Appendix 2.

Based on this, and in order to achieve the vision of increasing the global effectiveness of the marine agenda related to the SSC in IUCN, the MCSC will have 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, by identifying the most suitable forum or by facilitating connections and synergies. In this way, the MCSC will act as a focal point

Final report: Strategic Planning Meeting for the SSC Marine Conservation Sub-Committee, November, 2006: C. Campagna & Y. Sadovy: 35 pp.

and conduit for marine issues rather than conduct specific projects (but see note on task forces below); and

- 3) Provide advisory roles for certain IUCN marine projects (such as the GMSA).

Objectives of the SSC of relevance to the MCSC

The SSC has a mandate to:

- Analyze the factors threatening biological diversity;
- Inform the world about the status of biological diversity (raise the red flag through the input of the network);
- Provide conservation community with means of measuring the impact of its work.

At a broader level, the work of the SSC is to:

- Compile information and analyse effects of pressures on biological diversity (status, indicators, predictions);
- Develop tools and methods for mitigation;
- Give advice on and facilitate implementation of mitigating measures.

In relation to marine issues, the SSC has established the Marine Conservation Sub-Committee to focus marine conservation initiatives and activities within the SSC.

Additional considerations which the SSC now needs to address through the MCSC are:

1. Key marine conservation issues included in new SSC and IUCN Programme
 - where species are affected
 - where SSC, through its marine species expertise, can make a special contribution
2. Specific marine conservation targets for SSC until the new IUCN Programme is in force (2008), and
3. Organisational issues
 - Key roles of SSC MCSC and IUCN Marine Programme
 - Non-IUCN Partners

2.0 Methodology used in the Wattens Strategic Planning Meeting

Guidelines for discussions

Participants were selected for expertise and experience in a range of marine issues identified at the Puerto Madryn meeting, as well as from organizations, partners and programmes with relevant and complementary links to the SSC in marine issues, to contribute to brainstorming sessions. The purpose of the meeting was to prioritize and

structure a number of achievable target activities and areas to shape the work of the MCSC through the membership, once this is established. Christoph Imboden facilitated the meeting, while Yvonne Sadovy and Claudio Campagna served as co-chairs for some of the discussions. The rapporteur was Renata Visotschnig (an environmental science student by invitation of Christoph Imboden). Amanda Vincent organized the prioritization exercise. For background communications and list of participants see Appendix 3.

As for the Puerto Madryn meeting, we were unable to find representation for marine invasives, diseases or climate change, despite considerable efforts to do so. We were also unsuccessful in representing sustainability indicators. We will address these shortcomings whenever possible and acknowledge that a comprehensive marine agenda cannot be completed without this additional input.

Discussions followed several guidelines:

- The MCSC is within the SSC, thus has to be focused on species
- The MCSC is not an implementing body
- Critical topics were identified in the December 2005 consultation meeting that should guide the discussion, while remaining open to fresh input from the new participants at Wattens as a means of building and refining the December deliberations
- The MCSC must be compliant with the framework of SSC: specifically the focus on:
 - Status of biological diversity
 - Pressure on biodiversity, and
 - Responses to threats to biodiversity

Within each of these three themes, sub-components were identified by Christoph Imboden as part of SSC strategic planning which should be taken into account by the MCSC when formulating its agenda, as follows:

a. Status of Biodiversity

- Observing species on global, regional, national, local levels
- Assessing status and trends of the world's globally threatened species
- Compiling status and trends of threatened sp. on regional and national levels
- Assessing status and trends of selected taxonomic groups on global level
- Assessing status and trends of selected taxonomic groups on regional levels
- Documenting key species phenomena
- Developing indices for the status of biodiversity
- Analysing species data for integrated conservation action planning

b. Pressures on biodiversity

Main threats have been identified:

Final report: Strategic Planning Meeting for the SSC Marine Conservation Sub-Committee, November, 2006: C. Campagna & Y. Sadovy: 35 pp.

- Unsustainable resource use
- Climate change
- Habitat loss (con-version)
- Invasives
- Disease
- Contaminants
- Human-wildlife conflict

c. Responses to threats to biodiversity, and the SSC's role related to these:

- Compile information and analysing effects of this pressure on biodiversity
 - Status of species
 - Indicators
 - Predictions
- Develop tools and methods for mitigation
- Give advice on and facilitate implementation of mitigating measures

Other marine-related initiatives of IUCN

Within the IUCN, there exist several major marine-related initiatives (not including several commissions that may address marine-related work in certain contexts) that the MCSC is mindful of:

- a. SSC Marine SGs and Red List Authorities (species-focused)
- b. IUCN Global Marine Programme (ocean governance, high seas, policies, channel/represent marine IUCN issues, invasives in mariculture, bleaching, climate change, green business links, build marine capacity)
- c. WCPA marine (protected areas/spatial/habitat within IUCN mission)
- d. Shatter the Myth campaign (conceptual/outreach)

3.0 Proposed activities/synergies for the MCSC (see Endnote sections 1 & 2 for detailed background discussions)

The desire to produce a succinct and focused report did not allow us to capture the lively and highly constructive nature of the discussions, and the fluidity and cohesiveness of the deliberations. It is also noteworthy that many of the targets parallel those identified in the 2001 meeting in Washington (p. 5), indicating not only that these continue to be issues but also that we have probably captured many of the key pressing concerns; this time refining targets, actions and timelines (the latter being added by Claudio and Yvonne).

One discussion that is not captured in the targets is the need for communication and outreach in many aspects of MCSC activities. The importance of identifying the best communicators and getting the 'message' out was stressed in many contexts and must be an underlying aspect of much of the work conducted.

Proposed activities were discussed and identified within the guidelines and operational principles identified according to three categories: (a) Supporting functions; (b) Suggestions-recommendations concerning synergies with other organizations, and (c) Priority targets.

Operational Principles of MCSC

A discussion on operational principles, in addition to the December ToR and in order to maximize effectiveness, concluded that the MCSC should be mindful to:

- Develop capacity to measure effectiveness of SSC marine action
- For all work, identify a specific target audience and direct outputs to that group (e.g. NOT "general public")
- For all work, rigorously clarify whether it should result in an output, outcome or impact.
- Maintain open communication with other groups (esp. within IUCN) working on similar/related issues so, as to maximise coherence in conservation action
- Keep the IUCN Red List Partnership in mind in developing and implementing MCSC work.
- Involve industry and other stakeholders in MCSC activities as and where appropriate
- Stay up to date on interventions with respect to changes in fisheries. (In discussions, this had its origin in concern for the need to: "try to stay ahead of the curve in anticipating effect on species of evolving gear, breeding, and genetic modification, etc.")
- Form RLAs and SGs as appropriate/necessary to support the GMSA, mindful of the relative costs and benefits in terms of capacity building, function, and effectiveness. In order to ensure it meets its responsibilities, the MCSC will advise the SSC Chair on the need for new RLAs and SGs.
- Challenge received wisdom creatively

Supporting functions within IUCN

The MCSC has several potential supporting functions. The following were identified as priorities and build upon the existing ToR developed in Patagonia, Puerto Madryn, for the MCSC:

- Cooperate with the GMSA to accelerate the rate at which the latter can complete its work
- Place a member of the MCSC on the BASC
- Liaise and coordinate between Red List Index and GMSA initiatives
- Ensure meaningful and pragmatic input into the Red List Index and Sustainability Index and associated targets from marine perspective
- Share information with WCPA to build a stronger relationship between marine species information, MPA proposals and wider measures that may be needed through marine spatial planning, ocean governance or other relevant means.
- Make MCSC/SSC marine information available to other elements of IUCN (e.g. Species and Marine Programmes, WCPA) in order to advance mutual conservation goals
- Endorse the notion of a SSC marine species desk officer in Gland
- Encourage SSC to consult MCSC before initiating new programmes that have implications for its work
- Support the Deep Sea Coalition by providing information as requested

Synergies with other organizations and programmes

This list captures communication and strategic aspects relevant for the MCSC/SSC in linking with other pertinent organizations, as addressed by workshop participants.

- The GMSA should carefully consider and be prepared to decline opportunistic grant offers for non-priority species IF they compromise the capacity to complete priority species, nor should the GMSA accept granting that would commit the MCSC, Red List staff, etc., to do non-priority work, whether in establishing SGs or RLAs or requiring Red List management. The only exception would come in situations where the overheads / indirect support / core support is sufficient to cover all new costs incurred by all partners in the process.
- MCSC could advise the GMSA with respect to achieving maximum conservation results and should consider defining criteria for success indicators. The MCSC should also act as a focal point to avoid redundancies between GMSA and BASC sampled Red List Index work.
- SSC should consider setting up broad RLA which has experience in Red Listing criteria to catch all the ‘stray’ species (i.e. those not now covered) since there will be a big need under the GMSA to evaluate species assessments from a diverse range of fish families but not necessarily the need for SGs to be formed for all. This RLA could also be used as a means to conduct urgent species assessments.

Final report: Strategic Planning Meeting for the SSC Marine Conservation Sub-Committee, November, 2006: C. Campagna & Y. Sadovy: 35 pp.

- SSC should analyse conservation changes resulting from global amphibian species assessments in order to enhance GMSA effectiveness
- At a regional level, MCSC could foster the use of SIS DEM data to help evaluate species status, species use, and species ecosystem roles
- Encourage SSC to find patrons for species assessment work (adopt a ‘taxon’?)
- SSC should prompt members/collaborators to incorporate assessment results in their plans
- IUCN Secretariat to consider the desirability of placing one marine officer in each IUCN regional office, or, at least to identify a focal point for marine issues within each office to be in contact with MCSC
- SSC to disseminate results to IUCN members in appropriate and accessible ways; in general there is not a strong appreciation of SSC competencies outside of the SSC and this would be one way to improve visibility
- SSC to enhance connections and communications between regional offices and SGs working in that region
- MCSC to identify means for greater input into relevant international policy forums (also to be identified) on marine issues, especially in respect of provision of scientific data in collaboration with relevant SGs, to enhance access to information and strategic use of data.

Priority Targets for the MCSC- SSC

Following the discussions and identification of a range of possible targets for the MCSC (Appendix 4 a & b), a prioritization exercise was conducted according to a ranking of the following criteria:

Conservation success – the chance of an actual conservation success by achieving the target; 0-3

Species-focused – the extent to which the target is species-focused; yes/no

Value adding – does the SSC add value; yes/no

Fits with IUCN – is the target consistent with IUCN/SSC mandates; yes/no

Resourcing – whether or not funding the necessary work is easy. yes/no

Initially, there were two additional : could it be done in 3 years, and did it fit within the December 2005 outputs/discussion? These two areas were later dropped because the first is related to Conservation Success and the second added nothing to the outcome, i.e. all were consistent with the December outputs/discussions.

For the targets that emerged as highly ranked, we next evaluated them according to:

Ease – the degree of difficulty in achieving the target (easy/medium/difficult);

Priority targets identified following the agreed criteria are given in bullets 1-4 below. The complete list of targets (both high and low ranking) as well as the scores is given in Appendix 4 a & b, and incorporate identified synergies.

It was decided to cut the list at the top 20 targets (separating those attaining ≥ 5 from those attaining ≤ 4) which provided the MCSC with 5 difficult, 8 medium and 6 easy targets, considered a good balance for a 3 year plan. The remaining, lower ranked (< 20) targets were briefly reviewed with a general agreement that setting them aside at this stage was not a concern, given that enough high priority targets were identified and that they could be revisited later.

We were also mindful to be realistic about the initial set of targets in our aim to work towards possible successes rather than possible failures. We then removed "BASC standards and petitions / TRAFFIC to assess utility of (fisheries and) trade data as a proxy for population assessments. Final number of targets is 19.

1. SPECIES

- - The range of exploitation pressures is captured in a suite of sexy (charismatic) spokespecies.
- The implications of SSC's recommendations are understood within an ecological context, especially on conservation of species at which the work is not directed (*examples: protection of one species, from bycatch for example, by certain measures might expose another species to new threats; reduced take of bushmeat increases fishing pressure*)
- A global inventory of species with life history phenomena (small areas in time and space where one charismatic or many species gather); i.e., wildlife 'spectacles'
- A special issue of Species on marine issues.
- Trade and use components on Red List DEM are fully populated.
- Species assessments (GMSA, SGs...) have made a measurable difference in marine conservation. This means that the information must be effectively mobilized.
- For every major taxon covered by the GMSA, at least two flagship species have been identified.
- MCSC and WCPA data are integrated in a formal system for better conservation planning and information transfer and access. Develop synergies. T
- The WCPA has been alerted to GMSA species assessments that bear on species with small areas of occurrence (temporal or spatial) at particular life history stages (i.e. 'wildlife spectacles').
- Species interests and area-based management (e.g. through WCPA) for marine conservation are linked within IUCN; mobilize species data in relation to area-related protection.

Final report: Strategic Planning Meeting for the SSC Marine Conservation Sub-Committee, November, 2006: C. Campagna & Y. Sadovy: 35 pp.

- All GMSA assessments have been exposed to and received input from experts in socioeconomic disciplines.

2. FISHERIES

- CITES Parties have access to MCSC input in making NDFs (non-detriment findings).
- Fisheries and stock enhancement exercises reflect (revised) RSG (reintroduction sustainable group) guidelines (*possibly by production of a publication*)
- New tools are developed and made available to assist with management of multi-species fisheries in data poor situations (synergies/links with FAO)
- TRAFFIC has been alerted to the need to collect trade data on marine species of concern. Opportunities for synergies with SSC work

3 INDICATORS

- The work of the BISC on indicators reflects, among other things, MCSC technical input on aquaculture issues.

4. BYCATCH

- An active and effective bycatch / trawled species task force has been established.
 - IUCN member organisations are aware of the effect of shallow water trawling on the ‘stuff in the bottom of the net’ (*an allusion to the extensive bycatch associated with many trawling operations*).
 - A briefing with working title of “ten things you did not know about bycatch” (*to highlight bycatch-related issues not obvious to a wider public*)

4.0 Concluding remarks from co-Chairs and next steps

The co-chairs of the MCSC, Drs. Yvonne Sadovy and Claudio Campagna, will submit this report for consideration by the Chair of the SSC, Dr. Holly Dublin. Results and identified priorities will be discussed during the October 2006 meeting of the SSC-SC in Madagascar.

If approved by the Chair and the SSC SC, the co-chairs will invite candidates for MCSC membership by the end of 2006. The fully constituted MCSC will meet for the first time in early 2007. MCSC to initiate a review of outcomes/progress pertinent to marine-related resolutions from IUCN Congresses and plan for for the Barcelona IUCN World Conservation Congress.

Final report: Strategic Planning Meeting for the SSC Marine Conservation Sub-Committee, November, 2006: C. Campagna & Y. Sadovy: 35 pp.

Once the MCSC membership has been established, critical targets will be selected from the priority list for follow-up action and several key follow-up items addressed as priorities as identified by co-Chairs and on the basis of perceived urgency and likely capacity:

- appoint BASC member,
- appoint RLAs for GMSA needs,
- establish a bycatch task force;
- establish means to make relevant data available for NDF and WCPA;
- encourage trade data entry into DEM and its collection by FAO on threatened species;
- consider possible activity at the 5th WCC.

Moreover, not captured in targets but discussed as a general issue was the need for better communication and outreach in general. For this the co-chairs recommend enhancement of the MCSC website in terms of information and links using remaining funds for the MCSC for 2006.

There is recognition that the MCSC still requires input on marine matters regarding invasives, climate change, indicators and disease; membership will have to address these areas at some level. Ongoing priority issues such as the GMSA and membership on BASC have to be addressed soon.

5.0 Acknowledgements

We are extremely grateful to Swarovski for sponsoring participants for this meeting, and for providing excellent meeting facilities and logistical support. We are also grateful to Renate Visotschnig for her assistance as rapporteur for this workshop. Many thanks go to Christophe Imboden for hosting us in Wattens. Nick Pilcher and Amanda Vincent provided constructive comments on the draft report.

ENDNOTES 1

Discussions on key identified issues as outcomes of Wattens meeting

Recommendations on Regional Offices of IUCN:

Background: Regional IUCN Offices (ROs) usually do not have the staffing to consider marine issues in general. Therefore collaboration between the SG and the ROs shall be increased when it comes to marine issues

Recommendations: Improve and enhance collaboration/contact between marine Specialist Groups and IUCN ROs. Aim to have at least 1 marine officer in each regional office as a focal point

Most probably money will be needed because often well-qualified people are overworked and do not have the capacity to do it on a voluntary basis

Alternatively, in each RO there is already one officer or person who can be identified as a contact point for marine issues to enable information flow and coordination. Could there be one nominated contact person for the MCSC on marine issues in each RO, or other persons that can be nominated that already exist within IUCN?

Recommendations on biodiversity assessments - regional listings:

Regional issues concerning marine assessments: problem of regional listing is big in marine realm since IUCN will only accept genetically distinct species to be regionally listed. MCSC needs to consider an advisory role to resolve this issue and thus make listing possible.

Recommendations on indices:

Indices are important within SSC so how can MSCS contribute? How can we assure that marine issues are properly represented in this work? GEF funded project for indicators is running.

2010 target. the problem is that not many evaluation possibilities have been identified and the development of these indicators is still at a very early stage. Nonetheless, the starting points are full species assessment (i.e., red list assessments). However, many discussions on indices are very much driven by terrestrial issues and the marine issues are often very different.

There is an urgent role for the MCSC to step in and coordinate the parallel processes of data gathering between red list assessments and BASC/GMSA to avoid redundancies. First, must identify the sustainability indicators and then identify the species that need to be assessed generally.

Other issues for consideration include:

- aquaculture indices and their limitations– where is aquaculture leading to releases - is genetic mixing involved and, if so this probably compromises full assessment of species in the wild.
- setting priorities in terms of areas and species or trophic chains? Also, what might be the role of deep sea species or seamount communities?
- How to consider the acute human need of developing countries (where most fish stock is and will come from).

Targets: MCSC should initiate a process to make sure that the marine inputs into Sustainability Index and SRLI are meaningful and practical.

Recommendations on wildlife spectacles:

Concept: history spectacles can be important biologically, highly vulnerable to exploitation but often not included in conservation planning like hotspots (e.g. spawning aggregation, turtle nesting beaches).

Highly harmful effects can act quickly and the areas might be very restricted in time and or in space.

Recommendation: MCSC to collect data and use these to raise awareness of these phenomena which are often little known in the marine environment. They can also help in public relations exercises because they are spectacular and easy to understand and appreciate and may attract funding.

- MCSC will facilitate exchanges between experts and encourage dialogue and coordination between red list assessments and GMSA
- MCSC should pro-actively compile information on this issue to catalogue and publish
- MCSC shall mobilize wildlife spectacle information with WCPA

ENDNOTES 2

Information Presentations to the Strategic Planning Meeting in relation to other Marine-Relevant IUCN Programmes and Initiatives

1. Kent Carpenter – Global Marine Species Assessment

GMSA is only 1 year old (started in August 2005). The Assessment is based in the BD assessment unit of the IUCN Species Programme. CI wants to see the BD assessments done to use them for ‘hot spot’ assessments (i.e. combine the red list assessment outcomes and spatial overlays for ‘hot spot’ identifications of species in relation to threat).

There are about 1 million marine species and a need to cover groups that have not yet been addressed by any specialist group. As such, there was a need to prioritize species for attention and resource focusing and this was done according to a series of 10 criteria in 2005, including biomass extracted, bycatch, importance in community structure and function, etc. Also included were habitat-forming primary producers (sea grass, algae) and invertebrates (e.g. heavily exploited sea cucumbers etc.).

Funding: 6 years operating funds now available for core activities; other funding sources are sought. In this way, can work with the MCSC to create more priority groups (e.g. as for tuna) and to develop a relationship with the (Sampled Red List Index).

However, at the moment the GMSA takes “opportunistic funding” is done (e.g. assessment of Galapagos was done) and sometimes funding opportunities evolve even though they do not fit the priorities. This can lead to possible conflicts. Comment from Amanda: do not lose focus and decrease capacity of the focus taxa (= ensure maintenance of core costs for priorities and don’t be just led by opportunities)

The GMSA does not work through specialist groups but rather through individual experts (RLA, as well as through existing specialist groups).

Discussion

Christoph: What can the MCSC add to this process?

- Communicate relevant funding opportunities
- GMSA would like to join in synergies: RL assessments are not the difficult task, the evaluation of the assessment is. Therefore the basic data can be used for several different outputs
- MSCS should make a powerful statement on where these are
- MCSC shall oversee the priority list of GMSA – but since there are large numbers of species, the question is how to do it.

Final report: Strategic Planning Meeting for the SSC Marine Conservation Sub-Committee, November, 2006: C. Campagna & Y. Sadovy: 35 pp.

What is the legacy of the GMSA assessment: press, awareness, capacity-building and use of people in the field, make outsiders “owners” of the conservation process; address the political aspect.

Did the process of RL assessments (amphibians) actually make a difference on the ground (conservation impact)? If not, the GMSA process should be adjusted. One outcome was that the amphibian protection was put onto a conservation agenda.

Amanda: we are entering the realm of commercially relevant species now in the assessment process – so we need to be very well-prepared. So far BD assessments have not all been focused on that.

How can MSCS leverage/capitalize on GMSA?

Targets and Recommendations for GMSA as an outcome of the MSCS meeting:

Targets:

- Establish RL authorities to assist GMSA process including capacity-building
- (Specialist Groups are not necessarily species-focused, they can be also geographical);
- MCSC shall advise the GMSA to achieve maximum conservation results; then the MCSC can define the criteria for success indicators;
- MCSC can evaluate the programme of assessments and provide input
- MCSC can act as an advisory group shall provide tools to speed up assessments, and help to identify groups where there are opportunities for success. For example, promote particularly threatened species of which conservation is very likely nevertheless
- GMSA to conduct assessments spontaneously if MCSC considers e.g. a species in urgent need of assessment and help the GMSA to install a “rapid assessment team”
- MCSC (and also GMSA) to engage FAO fisheries in a way that they might be interested to be part of the RL assessment process
- MCSC shall engage in communication and needs a marketing strategy e.g. every species assessed by GMSA will seek support from a celebrity/wealthy person assigned for communication and financing issues
- MCSC shall come up with legacy ideas for the GMSA including the identification of social scientists and economists to help develop effective responses to the assessment evaluations and recommendations and thus ensure effective response
- Select some GMSA species as flagships for outreach

Recommendations:

- 1) come up with a RLA to take care of all the “stray species” that are not being covered

Final report: Strategic Planning Meeting for the SSC Marine Conservation Sub-Committee, November, 2006: C. Campagna & Y. Sadovy: 35 pp.

- 2) meeting recommends to SSC to question the outcome and the value of Global Amphibian Assessment – the GMSA process cannot be questioned; the question is how can the maximum output be achieved
- 3) to ensure that assessments have a higher direct conservation impact, assess the workshop compositions
- 4) divide species assessments into 2 categories: those of ecosystem value and those of direct economic value
- 5) MCSC to SSC: try to find a patron for each assessment
- 6) assessment data must be made accessible to the outside world by the GMSA and SSC Species Programme
- 7) GMSA shall incorporate capacity-building into its workshops

Claudio: GMSA input for the WCPA for the establishment of MPAs will be species. Then there will be measurable shared targets e.g. number of established or proposed MPAs drawn on species information by MCSC

2. Andrew Hurd – IUCN Marine Programme

IUCN Global Marine Programme's (GMP) primary areas of action include:

- Global Ocean Governance – Policy and High Seas
- Invasive species: field activities in Seychelles; Chile also in context of aquaculture
- Tropical reef ecosystems

There is also engagement with fishing industry; GMP tries to keep an open dialogue;

GMP has not engaged in the following areas:

- Coastal management
- Land based pollution
- Consumer awareness

Because others do this... (e.g. MSC by WWF)

Other relevant GMP missions:

- Engagement with private sector:

Engage with business: trying to improve company operations and advise them on marine issues; has noted an increase in the private sector wanting to work with IUCN

- There is a clear role for IUCN for making an impact; livelihood assurance is one such example
- Goal: build marine capacity in every RO (Regional Office). A challenge but the Marine Programme is working on it; some ROs already have full time marine staff (e.g. Malaga,

Final report: Strategic Planning Meeting for the SSC Marine Conservation Sub-Committee, November, 2006: C. Campagna & Y. Sadovy: 35 pp.

Nairobi, Colombo, Mozambique, Mauretania, Vietnam, Poland (High Seas policy advisor); currently rethinking the process within IUCN and its strategic direction.

Potential links of the Marine Programme to the MCSC:

- Science
- Coordination
- Invasives
- Building capacity
- Representation at international forums (more representation is needed on some levels for the MCSC)

Suggestions by Andrew to MCSC:

- GMP would benefit from bringing more scientific data to their discussions on policy issues
- GMP is developing an engagement strategy for Regional Fisheries Management Organizations (RFMO) and would need assistance in identifying the right people and issues to bring to the table for discussions (networking, connections)
- Marine invasives: this field is lacking people working on it; IUCN can take the lead; not enough funding at the moment; Secretariat may appoint an invasives coordinator

Suggestion to Andrew from Wattens meeting: at the next strategic IUCN Marine Programme meeting bring up issue of cooperation with MCSC

2. Despina Symons - ESUSG

ESUSG (European Sustainable Use Specialist Group): experts groups, pan-European, about 25 experts, multidisciplinary, incl. policy makers

- Analyzes mainly EU policy – common fisheries policy revision.
- Deals mainly with fisheries management issues but now also with species (sharks) and recovery plans and gives recommendations to CITES
- Deals also with MPAs
- Works closely with the IUCN Marine Programme
- Workshops with fishermen - analysis on what has worked and what not

Potential for cooperation with IUCN/SSC/MCSC

- Technical matters – conservation and use of resources
- Selectivity to control by-catch
- Closed areas linked to MPAs
- Species-oriented areas
- Management recovery plans for depleted stocks

Final report: Strategic Planning Meeting for the SSC Marine Conservation Sub-Committee, November, 2006: C. Campagna & Y. Sadovy: 35 pp.

- Management plans for certain species
- Bring people together
- Stakeholder participation processes and working with fishermen - Bring them all together (incl. politicians...)
- Need for advice on management plans and data – also for CITES proposals
- Advice from SSC needed for high seas.
- UN fish stocks agreement – SSC could provide more advice there
- **MCSC should focus on the species aspect and then feed into the ecosystem process with data. Still an ecosystem approach is more or less a multi-species approach. There is not so much difference – just a few additional interactions and physical characteristics. Ecosystem is just a well-phrased catch-word.**

3. Dan Laffoley - WCPA Marine

There is a strategic plan in WCPA, a global network, but the marine plan is at the moment poorly developed; part of the development process is to put together partnerships.

Marine Protected Areas in particular are attracting more money, more people are becoming involved, and more information is becoming available impacts (i.e. effectiveness).

We work on a concept of “3”:

3 actions:

- membership – more depth needed
- communication – inward and outward: need to come up with what WCPA marine is all about, and partnerships
- strategy – develop a plan of action: build understanding within membership and partnerships in terms of how to engage; look at what WCPA marine is actually contributing to achieving BD conservation processes; find out what are the key partnerships – and also identify the capacities available

3 themes:

- improving recoverage of what we have
- conservation of what we have
- improving things for the future

3 levels of governance:

Final report: Strategic Planning Meeting for the SSC Marine Conservation Sub-Committee, November, 2006: C. Campagna & Y. Sadovy: 35 pp.

- appoint senior advisory group to advise WCPA (people with appropriate knowledge)
- regional structure – biogeographical regions in the seas
- membership

Interaction with MCSC:

- **have the species data and then implement in WCPA**
- **join up on info**
- **shared targets**

Discussion:

Kent: GMSA is producing concrete data and “products”/analysis that could directly feed into decision making and evidence on MPA planning. MCSC shall help to coordinate the GMSA and WCPA activities – hot spots, key BD areas, threats to BD

Andrew: how to do this in terms of structure/governance? SIS?

Jane: Interorganizational question. Data management tool in SIS is needed – this is the first goal

Amanda: need to find evidence if MPAs actually help the goal of MCSC

Nick: the strength of the MCSC is already obvious just by analyzing the interactions the participants are already taking in coordinating and facilitating information transfer. The MCSC will focus on the marine aspect of the SSC and thus set up the network and thereby facilitate the linkage of information flow not the flow of data itself. The strength of the MCSC is to be the focal point.

Claudio: integration IS the MCSC

Nick: communicate and get the info to the right place is the central issue

Dan: (alluding to the need to address climate change issues) rather than work on climate change itself, the MCSC should identify the people working on it anyway and then just include into the MCSC strategy the facts how these issues are affecting marine conservation.

APPENDIX 1

Executive Summary of the December 2005, Patagonian meeting

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

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

Final report: Strategic Planning Meeting for the SSC Marine Conservation Sub-Committee, November, 2006: C. Campagna & Y. Sadovy: 35 pp.

- 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

APPENDIX 2

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.

Final report: Strategic Planning Meeting for the SSC Marine Conservation Sub-Committee, November, 2006: C. Campagna & Y. Sadovy: 35 pp.

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 3



Marine Conservation Sub-Committee (MCSC)

Strategic Planning Meeting *Wattens, Austria, 2-4 August 2006*

Invitation: A meeting to develop a strategic plan for the MCSC will take place from 2-4 August in lovely Wattens, Austria. As co-chairs of the MCSC, we are pleased to invite you to participate. The objectives of this meeting are to move forward with priorities identified at a preparatory meeting in December 2005 (report to be sent shortly), with the aim of developing a clear and practical strategy for a marine agenda within the IUCN SSC. This agenda should serve the current strengths and mandate of the SSC, as well as complement existing marine initiatives within the larger IUCN family.

We are very grateful to Swarovski for their support of this meeting.

Claudio Campagna and Yvonne Sadovy

Follow-up email prior to meeting:

Dear participants,

The Austria meeting to develop a strategy that will enable the formation of, and establish an agenda for, marine initiatives for the Marine Conservation Sub-Committee within the SSC is now less than one month away.

You should all by now have received a copy of the report from the preparatory MCSC meeting, held in December, 2005 (please advise me if you need a copy), and an invitation briefly outlining the objectives of the August meeting and travel details. Please be sure to get your travel schedule to Christoph Imboden as soon as possible.

Christoph will be facilitating and, along with Claudio and myself, will forward to you some guidelines for the meeting later in July.

This is intended as a brainstorming session to move into action the priorities identified during the December meeting (rather than identify new ones, although we still need to consider issues related to climate change and invasives which were not covered in December) in a way that ensures that the MCSC responds to the SSC mandate. We also

Final report: Strategic Planning Meeting for the SSC Marine Conservation Sub-Committee, November, 2006: C. Campagna & Y. Sadovy: 35 pp.

need to think about how to make the best use of our experience, knowledge and capacities within the SSC, as well as develop our partnerships and links outside the SSC, both within and outside of IUCN. So, it will be important to leave our various SG or other institutional hats at Austria's border.

We very much look forward to seeing you all in Austria and to what promises to be a most interesting meeting. Safe travels,

Yvonne Sadovy and Claudio Campagna

Name		Affiliation/expertize
Mary Seddon	Mary.Seddon@museumwales.ac.uk	Invertebrates, esp. molluscs
Anna Willock	awillock@traffico.org	TRAFFIC
Marcelo Vasconcellos	Marcelo.Vasconcellos@fao.org	FAO, fisheries
Jane Smart	Jane.Smart@iucn.org	IUCN Species Programme
Andrew Hurd	andrew.hurd@iucn.org	IUCN Marine Programme
Amanda Vincent	a.vincent@fisheries.ubc.ca	Academic- University of British Columbia, fishes, livelihoods
Despina Symons	despina.symons@ebcd.org	Sustainable use
Kent Carpenter	kcarpent@odu.edu	GMSA
Dan Laffoley	Dan.Laffoley@English-Nature.Org.UK	IUCN/ WCPA
Nicolas Pilcher	pilcher@tm.net.my	Marine turtles, bycatch
Yvonne Sadovy	yisadovy@hku.hk	SSC SC, coral reef fish
Claudio Campagna	ccvz_puertomadryn@speedy.com.ar agalli@modelo-mar.org	SSC SC, marine mammals
Christoph Imboden	Ch.imboden@bluewin.ch	Facilitator
Renate Visotschnig	renate.visotschnig@gmx.at	Observer/Rapporteur

APPENDIX 4

Identified targets

(a) higher ranked priority targets from the MCSC strategic planning meeting

Target	Actor	Easy / Medium / Difficult	consvn success	species- focused	SC adds value	3 years	fits with IUCN	easy resourcing	SCORE
			0-3 (low- high)	1 = yes	1 = yes	1 = yes	1 = yes	1 = yes	
<i>SPECIES</i>									
A global inventory of species with life history spectacles (small areas in time and space).	MCSC	E	2	1	1	1	1	1	7
The WCPA has been alerted to GMSA species assessments that bear on species with small areas of occurrence (temporal or spatial) at particular life history stages.	MCSC	E	2	1	1	1	1	1	7
The range of exploitation pressures is captured in a suite of sexy (charismatic) 'spokespecies'.	MCSC / SUSG	M	2	1	1	1	1	1	7
For every major taxon covered by the GMSA, at least two flagship spp have been identified.	MCSC / GMSA	E	1	1	1	1	1	1	6
<i>FISHERIES</i>									
CITES Parties have access to MCSC input in making NDFs.	SGs	D	3	1	1	1	1	0	7

Fisheries and stock enhancement exercises reflect (revised) RSG guidelines	RSG	M	2	1	1	1	0	1	6
New tools are developed and made available to assist with management of multispecies fisheries in data poor situations.	SUSG / SGs	D	3	1	1	1	0	0	6
<i>SPECIES ASSESSMENTS</i>									
The GMSA species assessments have made a measurable difference in marine conservation.	MCSC (SSC steering cttee)	D	3	1	1	0	1	0	6
All GMSA assessments have been exposed to and received input from experts in socioeconomic disciplines.	MCSC	D	2	1	1	1	1	0	6
Trade and use components on Red List database are fully populated.	GMSA / SGs / RLAs	M	1	1	0	1	1	1	5
<i>SYNERGIES WITH OTHER IUCN</i>									
TRAFFIC has been alerted to the need to collect trade data on marine species of concern	MCSC / SGs	E	1	1	1	1	1	1	6
MCSC and WCPA data are integrated in a formal system for better conservation planning.	MCSC (WCPA)	M	1	1	1	1	1	1	6
Species interests and area-based management (e.g. through WCPA) for marine conservation are linked within IUCN.	MCSC (WCPA)	M	0	1	1	1	1	1	5

The work of the BISC on indicators reflects MCSC technical input on aquaculture issues.	MCSC (BISC)	M	1	0	1	1	1	1	5
A special issue of Species on marine issues.	MCSC / SGs (SP)	E	0	1	1	0	1	1	4
<i>JOINED UP THINKING</i>									
The implications of SSC's recommendations are understood, especially on conservation of species at which the work is not directed.	MCSC / SGs	D	2	1	1	1	0	0	5
<i>BYCATCH</i>									
IUCN member organisations are aware of the effect of shallow water trawling on the stuff in the bottom of the net.	BTF (new Bycatch Task Force)	M	2	1	1	1	0	0	5
An active and effective bycatch / trawled species task force (BTF)	MCSC / SUSG / ICSC	M	1	1	1	1	0	1	5
A briefing with working title of “ten things you did not know about bycatch”	BTF	E	1	1	1	1	0	1	5

(b) Lower ranked targets

Target	Actor	Easy / Medium / Difficult	consvn success	species- focused	SC adds value	3 years	fits with IUCN	easy resourcing	SCORE
			0-3 (high)	1 = yes	1 = yes	1 = yes	1 = yes	1 = yes	
GMSA responds adaptively and quickly to emerging issues in marine conservation because of MCSC input.			0	1	0	1	1	1	4
IUCN member organisations are aware of the intractability of developing trawl bycatch mitigation devices for many nontarget spp.			1	1	1	1	0	0	4
IUCN member organisations are aware of sustainability issues arising from trawling.			1	1	1	1	0	0	4
A statement (& other outputs) on why we are doing the GMSA and how it can serve conservation			0	1	0	1	1	1	4
The SSC family (SP, SG, RLAs) is aware of the GMSA findings and their implications.			0	1	0	1	1	1	4
Develop and maintain an up to date list of invert and small vert spp in bycatch			0	1	1	1	0	1	4
A briefing about the ties between spp and ecosystems.			0	1	0	1	1	1	4
SSC family is up to date with marine conservation issues.			0	1	0	1	1	1	4
CITES Parties have access to information on the legality of sourcing in making NDFs.			1	1	1	1	0	0	4

IUCN members have information on the socioeconomic and biodiversity benefits of reduced trawl pressure.			1	1	1	1	0	0	4
FAO is aware of the need to collect trade data on species of conservation concern.			0	1	1	1	0	1	4
A suite of case studies on the socioeconomic impacts of nonselective gear.			2	0	0	0	1	0	3
Each IUCN Regional Office has a designated focal person for marine issues.			1	0	0	1	1	0	3
The impacts of fisheries on species not otherwise examined is understood.			1	1	0	0	0	0	2
A socioeconomic/cultural analysis of a sample small-scale data-poor fisheries is available.			2	0	0	0	0	0	2
Landings from small-scale multispecies fisheries will be understood.			1	1	0	0	0	0	2
Analytical capacity to infer trends and fates for exploited species under different management measures			1	1	0	0	0	0	2
FAO has all available data for the full geographic range of all species it is tracking.			0	1	0	0	0	0	1
The WFC and FAO indicators on the status of data poor fisheries reflect MCSC input.			0	0	0	0	0	1	1
The species assemblages around FADs have been documented.			0	1	0	0	0	0	1

