



SSC STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING WCC 4.2 CHORONI, VENEZUELA, 27-29 JANUARY 2010

MINUTES

1. WELCOME, APOLOGIES, INTRODUCTIONS

1a. Chair's Welcome

SSC Chair Simon Stuart welcomed the Species Survival Commission (SSC) Steering Committee members to the second meeting of the 2009-2012 IUCN Quadrennium. He remarked on the success of the SSC Symposium on 26 January, organised by Jon Paul Rodríguez at the Instituto Venezolano de Investigaciones Científicas (IVIC), Caracas, where 12 members of the Steering Committee gave presentations to over 200 people. In the future, similar symposiums will be arranged to coincide with the SSC Steering Committee meetings, so that the host country receives some benefit from the meetings.

Jon Paul Rodríguez and Rachel Roberts were thanked for organising the meeting.

It was agreed that the agenda packs for future Steering Committee meetings would be made available on the SSC FTP site, as this worked well for distributing the agenda pack for the current meeting WCC 4.2.

1b. Attendees and Apologies

The following people attended the meeting:

SSC Steering Committee:

Luigi Boitani, Topiltzin Contreras MacBeath, Brahim Haddane, Hans de longh, Mirza Kusrić, Bob Lacy, Frédéric Launay, Danna Leaman, Jeff McNeely, Patricia Medici, Russell Mittermeier, Anders Rhodin, Jon Paul Rodríguez, Yvonne Sadovy, Michael Samways, Mark Stanley Price, Simon Stuart, Xie Yan

Institutional Observers:

Jonathan Baillie, Elizabeth Bennett, Thomas Brooks, Alison Stattersfield

SSC Chair's Office:

Michael Hoffmann, Rachel Roberts

IUCN Secretariat:

Steve Broad, Jane Smart, Jean-Christophe Vié

Apologies were received from the following Steering Committee members and observers: John Donaldson, Maj De Poorter, Jon Hutton, Amanda Nickson, John Robinson, Stella Simiyu

2. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

The Steering Committee adopted the agenda.

3. PREVIOUS MINUTES (WCC 4.1, 3-5 June 2009, Switzerland)

The minutes of WCC 4.1 were adopted by the Steering Committee. The minutes of the Steering Committee meetings are posted on the IUCN Species website, making them available to SSC members, and IUCN members and partners.

4. MATTERS ARISING

The matters arising from the Steering Committee meeting WCC 4.1 that are listed below, with an update on progress.

	<u>Who</u>	<u>Action Item</u>	<u>SSC 4.1 Agenda Item</u>	<u>Time line</u>	<u>Update</u>
1	D Cator	All Chairs and SC members to have access to the KN.	4.1 Agenda item 5a		Done
2	A Stattersfield & Y Sadovy	BirdLife global seabird representative to sit on the MCSC – discussion to take place	4.1 Agenda item 7e	asap	Done
4	T Contreras MacBeath	Collaborate with W Darwall, B Haddane and T Brooks to develop the case for an SSC Freshwater Conservation Sub-Committee (including an investigation of possible funding sources for the sub-committee).	4.1 Agenda item 7e		Report provided, please see item 6m below
5	L Boitani	Gradual integration of the Wolf SG into the Canid SG, during the current quadrennium. L Boitani to join the existing WSG chair, Dave Mech, to act as co-chairs of the Wolf SG. L Boitani will take the lead on negotiations during the quadrennium with Claudio Sillero of the Canid SG.	4.1 Agenda item 7g		In progress, item 5h
6	S Stuart	Draft criteria for the establishment of bird SGs	4.1 Agenda item 7g		Item 5h
7	S Stuart	A general proposal for lizard and snakes SGs would be presented to the next Steering	4.1 Agenda		Item 5h

		Committee meeting.	7g		
8	S Stuart; JP Rodríguez	Amendments to be proposed to the IUCN Regulations, with regards to the confidentiality of Commission members who propose candidates for Chairs of the Commissions, at the next meeting of IUCN Council.	4.1 Agenda 8b		To be taken to the next IUCN Council meeting, June 2010
9	F Launay	A progress report to be presented on redeveloping the IUCN Policy Statement on the Translocation of Living Organisms and the IUCN Re-introduction Guidelines at each Steering Committee meeting.	8d		Item 6a
10	J Smart; L Boitani; T Brooks; A Stattersfield	The results of the Steering Committee discussions on the collaboration with the World Commission on Protected Area to be communicated to Nik Lopoukhine, Chair of WCPA, J Baillie, T Brooks, J Hutton and Kent Redford (from WCS) are willing to participate from SSC on item 1 (the metastudy). L Boitani will lead on ways that classification of PA biodiversity objectives; T Brooks and A Stattersfield on KBA criteria consolidation).	8g		Item 6c
11	JC Vié	A report to be given to the next meeting of the Steering Committee giving proposals on priorities for moving ahead with work on invasive species.	8h		Item 6d
12	S Stuart	Explore options for the SSC archives to be housed in the new IUCN headquarters.	4.1 Agenda item 8i		No space exists for the SSC in the new IUCN building. S Stuart to explore options with Elaine Shaughnessy
13	J Ragle	Investigate the cost of acquiring DOI numbers for each species account.	8k		Items 5c and 6g; referred to the Red List Committee
14	J Smart	To put the SIS users' manual on the website and send it to all registered SIS users	4.1 Agenda item 8l	asap	Action still required
15	JC Vié	The long-term trend in the financial picture should be presented to the next Steering Committee meeting, comparing core and project income and expenditure in each year, going back to 1996.	8m		Item 6j
16	D Cator; J Griffin	To examine the entire list of Barcelona species-related resolutions and recommendations, and provide proposals to S Stuart and J Smart on whom each one should be communicated to.	8n		Item 6k
17	J Ragle; J Hutton	J Ragle to take resolution 4.012 (Biodiversity data and information) forward and to consult with the Red List Partners and UNEP-WCMC. J Hutton to work with J Ragle on initiating a meeting between the various institutions to take this forward.	8n		Item 6k
18	SSC Chair's Office and Species	Progress reports will be provided on the three species-related resolutions prioritised by Council, and the five additional resolutions	8n		Item 6k

	Programme	prioritised by the Steering Committee, at each future meeting of the Steering Committee this quadrennium.			
19	W Foden W Foden J Smart; S Stuart W Foden J Smart; S Stuart W Foden J Smart; S Stuart Standards and Petitions Sub- Committee F Launay	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Select 5-6 species flagship species with good geographic, taxonomic and ecosystem spread, cover a range of mechanisms of impact, and including species that could benefit from REDD Feedback to the Specialist Groups on the results of the survey to be provided IUCN and SSC should support for REDD+ which gives explicit consideration of biodiversity and livelihood values of forest. Communicate to IUCN Climate Change Team Investigate the possibility of W Foden giving a talk on species biodiversity, forests and climate change. Follow up with Stewart Magginis and liaise with CI to arrange this. Ensure that IUCN position papers clearly reflect biodiversity concerns. Communicate to IUCN Climate Change Team. Identify SSC SG members that might be on national delegations in Copenhagen by sending out a specific message to the network. For these people, advise on biodiversity issues, prepare a report describing the framework of the Copenhagen COP, and send to SG chairs for input. The SSC and Species Programme should be included on the IUCN delegation in Copenhagen. Communicate to IUCN Climate Change Team. The work to develop the climate change guidelines for the Red List should be prioritised, and a report should be brought to the next meeting of the Steering Committee. SSC to prioritise guidelines on assisted migration in the first instance in the context of re-developing the Re-introduction Guidelines. 	9b		<p>Done</p> <p>Done</p> <p>Included in IUCN policy statement to UNFCCC, Copenhagen</p> <p>Done in Copenhagen</p> <p>Done</p> <p>An enquiry was sent out, but little response came</p> <p>Done</p> <p>Item 8a</p> <p>Item 6a</p>
20	S Stuart	A report on the Amphibian Mini-summit will be presented at the next meeting of the Steering Committee.	9c		Item 8b
21	S Stuart S Stuart; J Robinson; S Lieberman	<p>Asian Large Animals</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A new Task Force of the IUCN SSC should be formed to take this forward. Key people from NGOs active on the ground need to be brought into the initiative (for example Christy Williams 	9d		<p>Still pending, item 8c</p> <p>Item 8c</p>

		specifically to ensure that the species focus is not lost			
24	J Griffin	The report from the Dublin GSPC meeting to be circulated to the SSC Steering Committee.	10d		Item 7e
25	JC Vié	A further update of the Save Your Logo / Threatened Species Partnership to be provided at the next Steering Committee meeting.	10h		Item 7i
26	S Stuart	A further update Global Tiger Initiative will be provided at the next Steering Committee meeting.	10i		Item 7j
27	SSC Chair's Office	Clarify all available awards and who should be receiving them. Paper to be presented at the next Steering Committee meeting.	11		Item 6l
28	R Mittermeier	To follow up with J Smart and S Stuart on a possible letter from the IUCN Director General to Madagascar, to support the continued provision of aid to Madagascar during the current climate of political instability.	11		Not done
29	T Contreras MacBeath	To prepare an options paper for the work of SSC on freshwater. To be included in the agenda of the next Steering Committee meeting	11		Done, item 6m
30	S Stuart	To provide R Mittermeier with approximate costing for a Steering Committee meeting.	4.1 Agenda item 12		The cost is hugely variable depending on location, but there isn't enough money in the COF to hold 2 SC meetings a year. Doodle poll to be used to obtain most appropriate dates for next meeting.

5. REPORTS

5a. Report of the SSC Chair

Full details to be found on pages 61-72, WCC 4.2.agenda pack. Y Sadovy asked for clarification of the definition of a 'Reviewer' and 'Evaluator' with the respect to their roles in Red Listing. S Stuart replied that the roles were defined in the Terms of Reference for the RL Authorities. The term 'Evaluator' had proved confusing, and was now replaced with the term 'Reviewer'.

D Leaman corrected that she was not able to attend the Global Strategy on Plant Conservation (GSPC) Liaison Group Meeting, in Dublin, May 2009, as wrongly stated on page 66 of the agenda pack.

5b. Report of the Species Programme

J Smart presented a reminder of the structure of the Species Programme, and reflected on a few highlights. The emphasis of the freshwater biodiversity assessments is shifting

from Africa to Asia, as the former is coming to completion, and as collaboration with Conservation International (CI) is generating new funding for Asia. She noted that the new IUCN building will house the RL training centre.

J Smart emphasised the need to fully explore a much wider use of the 'powerful' RL brand. The RL scale, presented at the WAZA Congress in October 2009, received much interest from zoos and aquaria, but there is still a need to work with botanical gardens on this (as well as being more proactive generally in rolling the scale out). R Mittermeier suggested using different colours for different levels of threat. J Smart acknowledged that this had already been given consideration, but the priority must be to get it rolled out quickly and widely. J Smart asked all those SC members with connections to zoos to spread the word about using the RL scale in their signage and on their displays. Y Sadovy commented that this would be great for the Ocean Park in Hong Kong as an educational tool, but that the use of colours would be important for different cultural reasons at the national level. It would be good to get an understanding of the significance of this. It was agreed that A Rhodin, Y Sadovy, E Bennett, B Lacy and P Medici would constitute a group from the Steering Committee to work with J Smart on rolling out the RL branding.

J Smart described the newly launched Species of the Day (SOTD) project which has received an amazing response since it went on-line in January. Due to this response, J Smart feels there is a real need to re-think the on-line donation button on the Red List website. With respect to Commission registration, approximately 70% of members now registered. J Smart is currently working on a 60 million USD funding proposal for biodiversity assessments; in addition, the proposed RL Training Centre has a heavy price tag associated with it. There is a key need for increased flexible funding for IUCN Species, since the Species Programme 2010 core funding has been cut by 68.5 thousand CHF. IUCN UK will very shortly have its new charity status, and although this will help with fundraising in the UK, there will be a great deal of administration work associated with this, which will fall almost entirely on the Species Programme. In terms of funding, project fundraising is increasing but the total framework allocation (i.e., flexible funding) is falling.

J Smart discussed the new structure of IUCN Secretariat, specifically the Biodiversity Conservation Group and the Network Approach. J Smart commented that the latter was working very well to break down the "silos" in the organisation. Wendy Foden successfully promoted 10 new climate change flagship species at UNFCCC CoP15. J Smart will be attending the Trondheim meeting, Norway, February 2010, which is to be the last major informal consultation on the CBD post 2010 targets before the SBSTTA meeting in May 2010.

L Boitani asked if there any was any means to allow for joint strategic planning for better integration of the Commissions. J Smart commented that the previous Head of the Protected Areas (PA) programme had left, and that a review of the PA programme has been initiated with a particular focus on biodiversity issues. It was already clear that there was strong support for recruiting a new PA programme head. S Stuart added that the Head of the PA programme really needs to be in HQ as the PA programme is fundamental to IUCN.

B Haddane noted the proposal from Monaco to list the bluefin tuna on Appendix 1 of CITES. The IUCN/TRAFFIC analysis indicates that the species meets the criteria for

Appendix 1 listing, and TRAFFIC is also in support of this listing. B Haddane asked if IUCN should attempt to make a stand on a particular listing by providing technical advice and a reference to scientific analysis; what is the IUCN position on this? S Stuart responded that IUCN has had a long-standing policy of not taking positions on CITES listing proposals, but rather on providing impartial scientific advice to the CITES Parties. A number of SSC and IUCN members have expressed unhappiness over this approach, and it would probably be necessary to revisit IUCN's work on CITES after the March CITES COP.

H de longh asked about the staff in the European RL team of the Brussels office. JC Vié answered that people were working on the assessments there, but this would finish in 2010 after the projects that they are working on had been completed.

5c & 6g. Report of the Red List Committee and Red List Partnership Agreement Update

The two agenda items were taken together. S Stuart report that the RL Committee had not yet formally been formed, as it depended on the conclusion of the Red List Partnership Agreement (RLPA). The RLPA was now almost completed, and all partners had now signed off on it, except Texas A&M University. J McNeely had been appointed as chair of the RLC, and the first meeting would take place in the next few months. Discussions were already underway to determine the membership of the RLC, according to the formula laid down in the draft RLPA. Meanwhile, although the RLC was not officially formed, its two working groups were already active. The National Red List Working Group is covered under agenda item 8d. The Red List Technical Working Group's first meeting of the quadrennium was taking place on exactly the same dates as Steering Committee WCC 4.2, in Cambridge, UK.

In the ensuing discussion, it was agreed that M Hoffmann would follow up with Texas A&M University for a resolution of the legal issues raised by their lawyers, and for completion of their MOU with IUCN.

J McNeely suggested that the profile of the RL needs to be maintained more effectively. For example, in association with a RL launch, there should be a package of projects addressing key issues identified in the launch. The RL needs to become more of a stimulus for conservation action, and could be used to raise money for those species identified in the assessments. The Red List Committee was asked to come up with a proposal on how this might be achieved. J McNeely noted that Peter Schei, the president of BirdLife, would like to work more closely with the SSC on using the Red List to inform global policy. It was generally agreed that many things are happening at an international policy level where species need to be a larger part of the discussions than is currently the case.

A Rhodin stated that the RL website has the appearance of an advocacy-type document, and that species accounts in the format of authoritative scientific papers cannot, at present, be downloaded from it. He noted that J Ragle is looking into this from an SIS perspective, and the Red List Technical Working Group will also be addressing these issues. R Mittermeier commented that the idea of a scientific journal based on the RL is long overdue. There also needs to be better public promotion of species conservation issues. The taxonomic policy used in the RL is very important and the Primate SG, for example, considers itself to be the taxonomic authority on its species. T Brooks agreed

that there is a perception that the RL is an advocacy tool, so there needs to be a greater focus on the analysis and synthesis of data based on the RL. A DOI number and a clear citation for each RL account would be a major step forward, and would provide a much greater and clear credit and incentive for data contributions to the RL process (i.e., they would receive something more tangible in return for contributing to the process). The RL accounts could be made into a more reader-friendly format, possibly through a connection with Species of the Day.

A Stattersfield suggested a reviewing of the RL in terms of its effectiveness in guiding policy, and providing feedback to technical people to inform policy processes. Outputs, publications, and papers, from the RL have to be guided at a higher level. S Stuart noted that the newly appointed RL training officer, Rebecca Miller, based in Cambridge, and Caroline Pollock, will be prioritising fundraising for RL training. J Smart asked if a RL training strategy could be discussed at the next SSC SC meeting. It was agreed that the development of the training strategy would first be referred to the RLC.

L Boitani noted that the support of the mammal RLAs and SGs has now moved from CI to the University of Rome. L Boitani is confident that money can be raised to maintain the mammal assessments. The main task is to update all the mammals in five years and try to reduce the number of Data Deficient mammal species.

5d. Report of the Invertebrate Conservation Sub-Committee (ICSC)

M Samways presented the report of the ICSC Meeting in Bath, UK, in October 2009. Justin Gerlach has replaced Sacha Spector as the Terrestrial Invertebrate Red List Assessment (TIRLA) Focal Point (FP). The marine invertebrate community has a stronger link with the Marine Conservation Sub-committee (MCSC) than the ICSC, so the FP of the Marine Invertebrate Red List Assessment (MIRLA) is now sitting on the MCSC rather than the ICSC (Alex Rogers is still the MIRLA FP). The preceding year (2009) saw much activity among the invertebrate SGs and RLAs: the Mediterranean Dragonfly Assessment was completed, and the Dragonfly and the Freshwater Crab and Crayfish SGs are thriving. Newly proposed red listing groups (under TIRLA) include the Bumblebees and European Saphroxilic Beetle RL Groups (see agenda item 5i). The 'Foundations of Biodiversity: Saving the World's Non-Vertebrates' Symposium will take place at ZSL in February 2010, but the publication with Wiley-Blackwell is on hold until the exact aims and structure are re-worked (contrary to what had been stated on page 98 of the WCC 4.2 agenda pack).

H de longh asked if there is a red list coordinator for ants. It was agreed that M Samways would circulate a list of all red list coordinators in TIRLA to SC members for their information (and this will also shortly be available on the website). M Hoffmann added that there was a large expression of interest for ants from CI. It was agreed that M Hoffmann would provide the contact details of Leeanne Alonso in CI to be passed to M Samways.

5e. Report of the Marine Conservation Sub-Committee (MCSC)

Y Sadovy outlined the five focal areas chosen as the MCSC priorities. To highlight the range of exploitation pressures, 'sexy' and appealing marine "spokespecies" have been selected to tell stories of the marine environment. Publications like 'Adrift: Tales of

Ocean fragility' and films have been very good in dispersing the message to youngsters, especially using web tools like Facebook and YouTube.

Y Sadovy stated that there needs to be much more information on trade and use of marine organisms in the RL assessments. The major pressure on the marine environment is over-exploitation, so focus has to be on this. This would mean that the results of the marine RL assessments could make a difference in the real world, for example, in the marine PA planning process, or in fisheries agreements. The marine RL assessments can make an important contribution to the work of the Food and Agriculture Organisation of the United Nations (FAO), and so the MCSC will prioritise this linkage in future. Y Sadovy also mentioned that marine invertebrate species are not being sufficiently addressed, and therefore stressed the urgent need for an SSC by-catch initiative.

The MCSC meeting in Cambridge, UK, in July 2009, focused on species conservation in relation to fisheries; outreach and communications; and trade and use. With regard to the latter, it had been proposed to take a selection of species by trade, and to map the trade routes for these species. S Broad stated that TRAFFIC would be keen to be represented in these discussions, in particular on how information on trade and use can be assembled and promoted.

M Samways asked how involved the MCSC was with damage to the sea floor through trawling and its impact on marine species. Y Sadovy agreed that there is a need to be focused on these issues. JC Vié commented that appropriate data on trade and use was not being collected. He suggested that the marine people should draw on the experience of those who had conducted the freshwater fish assessments, which had the issues of ecosystem services and poverty alleviation issues.

J Smart suggested that it would be useful to find out much more about what the IUCN Global Marine Programme is doing. Josephine Langley from the IUCN Biodiversity Conservation Group, who liaises with the Global Marine Programme, is to be invited to the next MCSC meeting.

J Baillie asked if there could be an emergency strategy on the coral crisis, and how communities should respond, leading up to Ngoya. S Stuart added that it should definitely be advocated for at the CBD COP. J Smart is to clarify what the Global Marine Programme is planning to do on this, and to provide feedback to J Baillie and Y Sadovy. It was also suggested that links should be made with Helen Pippard in IUCN Oceania as part of the Pacific 2020 initiative.

M Hoffmann asked if there was much liaison between the mammal marine SGs and the MCSC. For example, by-catch would be an issue on which all the major SSC marine-related groups could benefit from working more closely together. It would be useful if the minutes of the MCSC were distributed to all of the marine-related SGs and RLAs. Y Sadovy agreed to do this. It was also noted that the MCSC website needs improving, and Y Sadovy indicated that an SSC marine newsletter might be considered. A Stattersfield added that BirdLife has an active programme on by-catch, and that IUCN should get more involved with the regional fisheries management organisations. S Broad emphasised the need to ensure that existing projects are collecting the right information for the RL. JC Vié is to liaise with K Carpenter, Y Sadovy, S Broad and Mike Hoffmann on ensuring better collection of data on the use of marine species in the RL.

5f. Report of the Plant Conservation Sub-committee (PCSC)

D Leaman outlined the four priority areas of the PCSC for the current quadrennium (supporting the Global Strategy for Plant Conservation, raising the profile of plant conservation, prioritising plant RL assessments, and building the SSC plant network). D Leaman reported that good progress had been made in bringing the network together, but now the momentum has to be maintained. The PCSC is doing much better at raising the profile of plants, with more stories now appearing in IUCN external communications. However, a strategy needs to be developed for fundraising, linking in with the RL team and others to move forward on the PCSC's priorities. There has to be a concerted effort to make sure that funding efforts are integrated with other appropriate fundraising opportunities such as RL training.

S Stuart commended the PCSC for the coherent way in which the plant assessments have been prioritised. This clarity has allowed an advanced concept note on economically valuable species to be developed, and steps were now being taken to find donors for this work.

J Smart suggested that a specific skilled person is required to write the funding proposals for the plant work. S Stuart agreed that the plant side of SSC needs funded staff support in the Species Programme, as is the case for the work on marine and freshwater species. It was agreed that a few additional SSC SGs might be needed to cover economically valuable species such as legumes, bamboos and rattans. M Hoffmann will work with the PCSC to identify leaders for such SGs.

5g. Report of the Species Planning Sub-Committee (SPSC)

M Stanley Price presented an overview of the SPSC. The SPSC arose out of the work of the former Species Conservation Planning Task Force. In June 2010, the Conservation Breeding Specialist Group (CBSG) is having a conservation planning tools workshop. This is aimed at getting everybody up to speed on the tools. The plan is start with a small core group to get the activities initiated.

B Lacy stated that the CBSG will continue to work very closely with the SPSC, but added that it would be helpful to figure out how best to implement and broaden the initiative in order to bulk the capacity, increase training, and explore what can be done with the SGs. There is also another workshop planned in April 2010 dealing with a number of conservation breeding initiatives in the ex-situ world: what needs to be done; what are the goals and visions; what are the barriers to success; and what should be done in future. It was agreed that B Lacy would report back at the next SC meeting on the results of the April workshop.

T Brooks added that the parallel work area-based conservation planning, together with the work of the Species Conservation Planning Sub-Committee, and the ex-situ planning process, all should be informed by the data on the threats faced by species and on the conservation actions in place and needed which are incorporated into the RL Classification Schemes. B Lacy agreed that datasets from the SSC are critical for their support to programmes, and the threat classification scheme in the RL could be used. Part of the impetus for the April workshop is to examine if what is being said about ex-

situ breeding in the conservation world matches the actions of the ex situ community. The future of zoos and aquariums in species conservation needs more detailed investigation. For example, should there be a focus on specific groups like amphibians and corals? J Smart asked if there would be botanical representation at the April workshop. B Lacy agreed that this needed to be discussed.

P Medici suggested that the SPSC needed to develop mechanisms for the SGs to implement the conservation plans. M Hoffmann added that there needed to be encouragement of the SGs to link more closely with zoos and aquariums, specifically in seeking champions for the SGs.

F Launay commented that there was interest in getting the planning guidelines translated for target groups - how they can they use them and what for? They could be applied more widely for zoos and aquariums for use in in-situ conservation. Increasingly, zoos are being managed by non-biologists and in-situ conservation planning is seen as a cost centre in a zoo.

J Baillie agreed that it would be good to examine the effectiveness of zoos in conservation, together with the possibilities and commitments they could make, so long as they are brought along positively in these discussions. B Lacy stated that zoos, especially in Europe are increasing their in-situ conservation work but that the latter is becoming disconnected from the ex-situ work; this needs repairing. R Mittermeier added that when representing SSC, he frequently includes the links between zoos and SGs in presentations at zoo meetings.

J Baillie asked if specific taxonomic groups were going to be identified for clear global strategies for zoos across the board. S Broad suggested that members of the Commission of Environmental Economics and Social Policy (CEESP) could be interested in the species conservation planning tools, particularly in relation to the Sustainable Use SG (SUSG) which will be shared between SSC and CEESP (see agenda item 6b) M Stanley-Price agreed that more needs to be explored with SUSG, in particular, how the conservation planning tools can be further developed. At present, the tools are rather prescriptive and might therefore insufficiently flexible to deal with certain situations. There is a limit to the number of species that can be handled by the SSC in the early stages of this process, but the current appeal of the conservation planning handbook is its logical sequence. Priorities for selecting species for conservation planning have to be made on both a regional and taxonomic basis.

JP Rodríguez added that with respect to multi-species conservation planning, how do we factor in extinction risk when setting conservation priorities?

A Rhodin suggested that the next SG Chairs' meeting would be a perfect venue to workshop to showcase the work on species conservation planning. S Stuart requested that this, and other suggestions for the next Chairs meeting, should be on the next SC meeting agenda.

5h. SSC Specialist Group Update

S Stuart introduced this agenda item, and drew attention to the extensive documentation on pages 111-137 of the agenda pack. These many issues under this item would be taken in turn.

i) Membership

S Stuart noted that 5,000 SSC members were now registered, and he offered a special thanks to Claire Santer in the Species Programme for putting together a summary of registered members, and for all her hard work in following up the registration and for being proactive in making things happen.

An internal discussion is to be held as to how the SGs can report to the SC. A Rhodin suggested selecting a few of the SGs to attend the SSC SC meetings as observers. Y Sadovy suggested inviting SGs to submit success stories. M Samways added that more SGs need to be encouraged to contribute to the Species newsletter.

ii) Bird Conservation and the SSC

S Stuart noted that there have been a number of proposals for bird SGs, but there has been no means of evaluating them. As a result, a set of draft guidelines was presented in the WCC 4.2 agenda pack. A Stattersfield stated that these guidelines are not necessarily specific to birds and so could have a wider application to the SGs in general. B Lacy commented that the guidelines gave an impression that prospective SGs were being filtered or blocked, but the SSC needs to encourage and embrace enthusiasm for new SGs to be formed. The development of new groups for conservation should not be discouraged, but guidance should be given on how to form effective groups.

T Brooks noted that at the level of taxonomic aggregation, BirdLife functions as the bird SG. S Stuart stated that for each SG formed, the conservation benefit has to outweigh the cost of support. T Brooks commented that with bird conservation, a very large community of experts exists which is not closely engaged with the SSC. The question, therefore, is how do you bring the communities together?

M Stanley Price asked if the present compliment of SGs reflects biodiversity needs, and suggested that perhaps some must go if we need to bring one on board new ones to match emerging priorities. Is the size of SSC driven by demand, size or history? S Stuart said the number of groups is the key and not the size of them. R Mittermeier stated that there should be no magic number of SGs, and that excited and enthusiastic people should be encouraged to bring in funds (and should not be limited by the strains on IUCN support staff). S Stuart acknowledged that the level of support for SGs is not at breaking point, but if growth continues it could get that way. JP Rodríguez stated that there is a need to build capacity in the SSC network so that more SG Chairs could come from developing countries. There is a strong bias for Chairs to come from Western countries. In particular, there are few Chairs in Africa, and there is a tendency for the Chairs to be based where there are institutional resources are located. R Mittermeier suggested out-resourcing Species Programme support staff to places where the costs are not as expensive, e.g., Africa, Asia, Latin America, and look at the possible options available at IUCN regional offices. The Species Programme to report back on at the next SSC meeting on the possibilities of outsourcing staff to support SGs.

S Stuart stated that there needs to be a way of evaluating groups when they are proposed. A Stattersfield noted that there are lots of enthusiastic bird “groups” out there, but the initial investment of support from the SSC, Species Programme and BirdLife is

likely to raise an expectation that cannot be fulfilled. S Stuart commented that he did not think that there should be an expectation placed on BirdLife to provide support for bird SG. R Mittermeier added that what is true for birds is not necessarily applicable across all other species groups.

It was agreed that those proposing new bird SGs should make formal applications, answering a set of questions. Following discussion, the following questions were agreed (to which a pre-amble will be added), to evaluate the merits of each SG proposal. The formal applications would be sent to the SC for consideration.

- 1) What are the key conservation issues facing the taxon or group?
- 2) Why is this taxonomic level and / or geographic scope considered to be the most appropriate level at which to address these conservation issues?
- 3) Is there a clear gap for the group to fill, and a value-added benefit that the formation of the group would deliver, rather than duplicate efforts of existing Specialist Groups or IUCN partner institutions?
- 4) What are the key activities / outputs that the group would undertake / deliver to better understand and address these issues, and how will these activities / outputs contribute to the SSC Strategic Plan?
- 5) Is there a unique/core group of relevant experts willing to dedicate energy and time towards furthering a conservation agenda around a particular taxon or group of species?
- 6) Is clear leadership available?
- 7) Is there an institutional source for support and co-ordination?

It was realised that these questions really compose guidelines, rather than criteria, for the establishment of new bird SGs. The applicants would not necessarily need to answer all of these questions satisfactorily in order to be approved by the SC. It was noted that these questions/guidelines should be adopted for taxa, not just for birds. The SSC SC adopted the above questionnaire to be used in all future proposals for new SGs (not just bird SGs).

Two further decisions were taken with regard to incorporating more ornithologists into the SSC:

1. Experts contributing to bird RL assessments will be given the opportunity to join the bird RLA. A Stattersfield, Claire Santer, M Hoffmann and S Stuart will communicate on this to design a practical means of enabling this decision to be implemented.
2. There will be a proactive programme to integrate experts from BirdLife's network into cross-sectoral parts of the SSC, including the: Species Conservation Planning Sub-Committee; SSC-WCPA Task Force on Biodiversity and Protected Areas; Conservation Breeding Specialist Group; Invasive Species Specialist Group; Wildlife Health Specialist Group; Re-introduction Specialist Group; and Sustainable Use Specialist Group. T Brooks will link with A Stattersfield, Claire Santer and other to help this happen.

iii) Report of the Small Non Volant Mammal Task Force (SNVMTF)

S Stuart introduced this item. The SNVMTF has finished its work, and has put forward a proposal for a new SSC Small Mammal SG (SMSG), including a regionally structured RLA. The SMSG will cover rodents, shrews, hedgehogs and their relatives, and will set up thematic sub-groups to work on small mammals requiring specific conservation attention. R Mittermeier asked if Tree Shrews are to be added to this group, and it was agreed that the new SMSG would be asked to take on these species. However, it was suggested that the colugos will be included in the Primate SG.

The SC supported the proposal for a new Small Mammal SG, covering rodents, shrews, hedgehogs, and tree shrews. S Stuart will identify potential chairs/co-chairs.

The SC agreed the colugos would come under the purview of the Primate SG.

The SC expressed its sincere thanks to Giovanni Amori in recognition of his hard work in driving forward the work of the SNVMTF.

iv) Proposal for a Chameleon Specialist Group

S Stuart introduced this item, and recommended support for this proposal. R Mittermeier said that CI would be interested in supporting this group in Madagascar. He asked if *Uroplatus* geckos could be added to this group. This latter point will be clarified later.

The SC adopted the proposal for a Chameleon SG, with Richard Jenkins as chair, and Krystal Tolley as RLA FP.

iv) Proposal for a Viper Specialist Group

S Stuart introduced this item, and recommended support for this proposal. R Mittermeier expressed some disappointment that this was not a proposal for a full snake SG. A Rhodin suggested that the initial goal could be to start with the vipers, and gradually build to a snake SG over the years. S Stuart felt that an SG covering all snakes would be too much for a single SG to cover. However, the Viper SG could eventually be expanded to become a Venomous Snake SG. B Haddane added that the production of serum should to be included among these issues to be covered by this SG.

The SC adopted the proposal for a Viper SG, with Chris Jenkins as chair, and the RLA FP still to be appointed.

iv) Proposal for a Grasshopper Group

M Samways introduced this item, and recommended support for this proposal. He noted that Orthoptera assessments are already taking place, and that there are some very interesting monitoring and captive breeding programmes and conservation action plans being put in place. S Stuart noted that this was a re-establishment of a former SG

The SC adopted the proposal for a Grasshopper SG, with Axel Hochkirch as chair, and the RLA FP still to be appointed.

v) Other Specialist Groups

M Samways noted that a number of complaints have been received concerning the disbanding of the South Asian Invertebrate SG in the previous IUCN quadrennium. He explained that in the past the SSC had had a number of regional invertebrate SGs, but these had been disbanded in the 2004-2008 quadrennium because of general inactivity and lack of strategic approach. However, the South Asian Invertebrate SG, unlike the others, had become very active, and had remained so, despite no longer having formal SSC status. The SG now wanted to be reintegrated back into the SSC. JC Vié commented that the Species Programme work is expanding its assessment work in South Asia which would be covering several different taxonomic groups. Therefore with respect to a South Asian Invertebrate SG, conflicts in assessments would have to be avoided.

The SC agreed that the South Asian Invertebrate SG should be reintegrated back into the SSC, and M Samways was asked to identify who the appropriate chair or co-chairs should be.

M Samways also reported that the ICSC had proposed the re-establishment of the Butterfly SG, though a possible chair had not yet been identified. For the Butterfly SG, S Stuart requested that the ICSC should proceed with developing a formal proposal following completion of the newly designed SG questionnaire. D Leaman added that the new questionnaire will be really useful for these types of situations.

S Stuart pointed out the consultations are ongoing to identify a new chair for the Arabian Plant SG. This will be reported back to the SC, after consultation with the PCSC.

S Stuart also pointed out that the future of the South Atlantic Island Plants SG remains undecided. A recommendation will be brought back to the SC, after consultation with the PCSC.

The SC agreed that the Butterfly SG should be re-established, and M Samways was asked to identify a chair/co-chairs, and submit formal proposal to the SC.

5i. SSC Red List Authority Update

S Stuart reported on this item. Most RLA FPs had now been appointed. It was noted that most reptile assessments are operating in an RLA vacuum, so there is a need for a Snake and Lizard RLA and to identify a focal point to lead on this.

The SC noted the new RLA FPs are needed for:

Madagascar Plants

New World Marsupials

Australasian Marsupials and Monotremes

Snakes and Lizards (for the species for which RLAs do not already exist)

Vipers

Sharks

Grasshoppers

5j. Report of SSC and Fungal Conservation

S Stuart introduced this item. There are five new fungi SGs, and Dave Minter is acting as the unofficial coordinator of these. An important meeting of all five of the fungi SGs took place in Whitby, UK, in October 2009, and this was important in charting the way head for the SSC's work on these species. S Stuart noted the great importance of fungi in the provision of ecosystem services.

6. SSC Issues and Processes

6a. Revisions to Re-introduction Guidelines and Policy Statement on Translocation of Living Organisms

F Launay introduced this item. He noted that due to generous support from the Al Ain Wildlife Park and Resort, M Stanley Price had been brought on to lead the process of re-developing the Re-introduction Guidelines, particularly in the light of the challenges that climate change is likely to present. Practical new guidelines are needed and the key Re-introduction (RSG) people have to be involved. F Launay added that it was also essential to gather input on these issues from beyond the SSC, especially from the wider IUCN family, including the Species Programme and the other Commissions. Should S Stuart also raise this as an issue at the forthcoming Council meeting? R Mittermeier asked if it should be inserted on the CBD agenda? S Stuart was not clear what CBD is doing in this area. J McNeely felt that there was a good opportunity for a pre-emptive strike by SSC bringing the matter into the CBD arena. It was agreed that J Smart would discuss this further with Sonia Pena Moreno in IUCN headquarters, to seek advice on how best to handle this in the CBD context.

X Yan asked to what extent the Re-introduction Guidelines covered confiscated animals. For example, would the Chinese Government find these guidelines useful in dealing with confiscated tigers? F Launay stated that this is a critical problem in Asia, and a different set of IUCN guidelines had been adopted in relation to confiscated animals (IUCN Guidelines on the Placement of Confiscated Animals, adopted in 2000). The review of the Re-introduction Guidelines would not be addressing the issue of confiscated animals. S Stuart noted that there is also an issue with regards to translation of these guidelines into different languages. M Samways enquired as to whether the guidelines on confiscated animals also cover confiscated plants? S Stuart responded that they did not. S Broad responded that CITES guidelines do exist for confiscated plants and that there are in multiple languages. X Yan, Y Sadovy and S Broad are to review the current guidelines on confiscated animals (adopted in 2000), with a view to making possible recommendations for changes.

6b. SSC-CEESP consultation on sustainable use and human-wildlife interactions

S Stuart reported on the results of the consultation workshop that took place in Cambridge, UK, in October 2009. At this workshop, it had been decided that the SUSG will report to SSC and CEESP, but that other Commissions will also be involved (for example with representatives on the SUSG Steering Committee). The SUSG Chair will sit on both the SSC and CEESP Steering Committees. A suitable chair had been identified, but the appointment will not be made until sufficient funding can be found to reinvigorate the SUSG. S Stuart is currently working on raising the funds for this. Part of

the aim is to re-activate regional SUSG networks. The Cambridge workshop had outlined a clear set of priorities for the SUSG's future work. S Broad suggested clarifying the scope of the SUSG's work, whilst maintaining the good work that is already being done by the regional networks. D Leaman added that the PCSC would like the plant network to be more involved in the SUSG. H de longh asked if an interim Chair should be appointed. S Stuart answered that a long-term fix was required, rather than a short-term solution.

J McNeely referred to the focus on human-wildlife interactions, and suggested changing the name, as the current name (SUSG) alludes to a different topic. He thought that the topic of human-animal relationships should perhaps be covered by a separate SG. S Stuart clarified that his introduction to this issue had indeed just been on the topic of sustainable use. The Cambridge workshop did not make as much progress on the issue of human-wildlife interactions, which indeed could not fall under the remit of the SUSG. He said that the topic of human-wildlife interactions would be reviewed at the next SSC SC meeting. S Broad added that there are some resources on this issue on the web (<http://www.humanwildlifeconflict.org/>), but that a concerted focus from SSC is long overdue. X Yan commented that in China human-wildlife conflict is a big. J McNeely added that the Wildlife Health SG (WHSG) is already working on some of these issues, so the WHSG would need to be involved.

6c. SSC-WCPA Joint Task Force on Biodiversity and Protected Areas, and Criteria for Key Biodiversity Areas

T Brooks introduced this item, and reported that the SSC-WCPA Joint Task Force on Biodiversity and Protected Areas had now been established. M Samways stated that he was not happy with the binary approach of a protected area, and not a protected area, as many species use softer matrices to move between the two. J McNeely suggested that the Task Force could start to introduce the concept that PAs are dynamic rather than static, and that boundaries need to be considered. T Brooks stated that the work of the Task Force is focused on a site scale. A softer matrix will be important for biodiversity and this task force process does not imply that this is not the case. Y Sadovy asked how the KBA criteria would relate to marine areas, as a binary approach would also create problems for marine and aquatic habitats. T Brooks stated that the KBA process is intended to be neutral with respect to biomes.

D Leaman enquired if Plantlife International had been approached to join the Task Force. The PCSC felt it was important for the plant network to be involved. B Haddane stressed the importance of PAs for plants. T Brooks agreed that Plantlife does have to be closely involved in the work of the task force, and that discussions to this effect have been already started. J Smart added that IUCN was planning a programme for this with Plantlife International.

S Stuart concluded that the WCPA broader community, with its expertise on practical management, needs to be engaged in the work of the Task Force. J Smart added that the new Head of the PA programme needs to be an expert on biodiversity, who can then be asked to take it up this issue with WCPA.

6d. Invasive Species

JC Vié reported on this item. An important planning meeting on invasives species was held in IUCN Headquarters in September 2009. This had involved the three main entities work on the topic: the SSC Invasive Species SG (ISSG), the Invasive Species Initiative in the Species Programme, and the inter-institutional Global Invasive Species Programme (GISP), of which IUCN is a member. Historically, these three elements have not worked closely together, and all are very short funding. The September meeting was successful identifying the roles of the three elements, and issues on which they could collaborate. There is a need to co-ordinate between the three programmes, to initiate some important policy work. The lack of funding is partly a result of the low profile given to invasive species in the donor community at present, despite the increasingly serious problems posed by invasives, and severe economic consequences of biological invasions. From the SSC viewpoint, there is a need to redevelop the Global Invasive Species Database (GISG) to make it more useful as a management support tool. H de longh added that he has developed a fundraising proposal for 300,000 Euros for invasive species, and in April he will find out whether or not it has been successful. R Mittermeier noted that the problem was down to the three entities not collaborating. A Stattersfield suggested developing the RL for priority-setting for work on invasive species, to an island level in particular, for fundraising purposes.

6e. Species newsletter and e-bulletin

It has been planned to give more attention to this issue at SSC 4.2, but because the Communications Officer in the Species Programme, Lynne Labanne, was on maternity leave, this had to be postponed. The Species newsletter is now only produced electronically, and this might allow for publication more than twice in a year. M Hoffmann suggested the possibility of rebranding the monthly e-bulletin as Species, thereby having this a monthly e-newsletter.

The following people will develop a coherent proposal for the future of Species and the e-bulletin for the next SC meeting, involving key SC members in the process: Dena Cator, Julie Griffin, M Hoffmann, K Pintus, Lynne Labanne, R Roberts, Leigh Ann Hurt.

6f. IUCN Red List – 2009 and 2010 updates, handling of backlog and overall progress on assessments

J Smart reported that the RL backlog is being reduced, and that the SIS tools are being designed to make it harder to break the rules in terms of submitting substandard assessments. There is now a de-facto queuing system for RL submissions, and a lock-down period for the six weeks before a RL launch; during which no additional assessments can be incorporated in the update. J Smart pointed out the four planned RL release dates for 2010. However, the RL Unit is aiming for more regular updates than this. M Hoffmann expressed concern that a six-week lock-down could be perceived as a deadline for submitting assessments. The deadline for submission should be well before the lock-down period. J Smart to clarify that the RL Unit is working with both the RLAs and RL partners to agree the specific deadline dates in the case dataset being submitted. She added that if these procedures work, the backlog down should be reduced and a more streamlined process will then be in place.

J Smart suggested that the freshwater biodiversity assessments could be used to support inland waters work of the CBD. J McNeely noted that SGs tend to work as separate entities but that analysing the data on the RL could be a way of synthesising the work of different SGs, or of different taxa sharing similar habitats. This could be used as a rallying point to make a policy impact on the way, for example, freshwater biodiversity is managed. A Rhodin suggested tying groups to the ecological service that freshwater is providing. M Samways agreed that this would also indirectly pick up those groups that don't have SGs.

6h. Collaboration with ARKive on images for the Red List

R Roberts introduced this item. The SSC is working with ARKive on a big push in 2010 to find images of every threatened species on the RL. Following a request from R Roberts to all SG Chairs, some of the SGs are now providing imagery for ARKive. A Rhodin asked whether it should be a requirement of submitting the RL accounts that images should be supplied. S Stuart noted that some people are very protective over imagery, so it could be encouraged but not enforced.

6i. Species Information Service (SIS)

J Smart reported that the work on enhancing the SIS is going well, but SSC members, staff and RL Partners all need training. J Ragle is currently log-jammed because of this, and recruitment of an additional staff member is a priority to provide him with assistance. Recommendations for priority enhancement to the SIS are made by the SSC Red List Technical Working Group, and these are then sent to J Smart and S Stuart review and approval.

A Stattersfield noted that BirdLife has still not transferred its database to SIS. This is due to a number of modifications that need to be made to accommodate the bird data. Further discussions are needed on this. D Leaman added that the plant groups have started working with SIS, but there is a barrier in that the taxonomic list isn't on the system. D Leaman is to refer this issue to Craig Hilton-Taylor and Caroline Pollock in the RL Unit. A Rhodin stated that the RL is the face of IUCN and the backbone, and is therefore dependant on SIS working well. Why aren't more resources being directed to it to improve its functioning? S Stuart noted that all funds for SIS have to be raised from outside IUCN, and it is not easy to raise funds for an information system; advice on this would be welcomed. J Smart suggested incorporating SIS costs into training budgets, which could perhaps assist with fundraising. R Mittermeier asked if the costs of SIS development could be outsourced to another region, so that capacity could be improved at more affordable rates. S Stuart responded that this had been done previously in India, but that this had not been successful.

6j. SSC and Species Programme Finances

JC Vié reported on the overall financial situation. Fundraising had been more successful than ever before, and total income continues to grow. However, this has been matched with a further cut in the core allocation from IUCN. He noted that 2 million CHF a year needs to be raised to support IUCN staff in both Gland and Cambridge (more when the staff in the US are considered). S Stuart drew attention to the ten-year financial trends provided in the meeting pack. The IUCN core allocation to the Species Programme and SSC Commission Operations Fund declined from 2001 to 2005, increased sharply until

2007, and then declined sharply, such that the 2010 level is similar to that in 2000. Over the same time period, project expenditure has increased almost five-fold between 2001 and 2009. The IUCN core allocation to the Programme and SSC Commission Operations Fund has declined from over 60% of total expenditure in 2001 to probably less than 20% in 2010. Because of these trends, and because of the strains on the senior staff in the Species Programme, S Stuart had challenged the 2010 reduction in core allocation, and a response on this was awaited.

6k. Species-related resolutions and recommendations from the World Conservation Congress, Barcelona

S Stuart introduced this item. He pointed out that the meeting pack focused only on those Congress resolutions that had been prioritised by IUCN Council, and by the Steering Committee. Resolution 4.014 was covered in agenda item 7e, 4.016 in item 8a, 4.017 in item 8b, 4.019 in item 8g, 4.020 in item 8f, and 4.039 in item 6b. Discussion of these was therefore not repeated here.

The draft IUCN data policy called for in Resolution 4.012 is under preparation, and J Ragle is leading on this for the Species Programme. A consultation process on the draft policy is expected in 2010. Concerning resolution 4.015 on scientific collecting of threatened species, it was agreed that M Hoffmann and J McNeely would follow up, using the draft guidelines which had been reviewed by SSC SGs in the previous quadrennium.

H de longh noted that there is an interactive website where IUCN and Commission members can update their contributions to the Resolutions.

6l. SSC Awards and Members Emeritus

This subject was introduced by S Stuart. He pointed out that there had been a lack of clarity on the purposes of the different SSC awards. For example, how did one know if a worthy person was eligible for the Peter Scott Award or the Harry Messel Award? He also noted that the SSC Members Emeritus category of membership has fallen into disuse. This had been intended to give life membership to SSC members who had given long and distinguished service to the Commission, but who were no longer in a position to be as active as once they were. Furthermore, the SSC used to have a Roll of Honour for the most distinguished leaders in its history. This appeared to have been forgotten. S Stuart was concerned that the SSC no longer had a means of recognizing appropriately its long-serving, hard-working members. The matter was therefore referred to a breakout group, the report of which is given in Annex 1.

SSC awards

J McNeely suggested that the awards should be presented before the whole of Congress, so that everyone recognises the work being done on species. The issue financial compensation attached to particular awards was discussed. This needs to be looked at to make sure it can be sustained in the long-term.

A Rhodin was interested to know if a financial stipend associated with an award enhances or detracts from it. Depending on the latter, should the SSC strive to create a monetary aspect to all of its awards? S Stuart stated that the breakout group had

discussed this, but had not had time to come to a firm recommendation. R Mittermeier noted that awards needed to attract greater publicity and, in such a context, money does make a difference to the way that the award is perceived to the outside world. S Stuart agreed that more publicity around the awards could be created. M Stanley Price noted that the publicity is an important part of the award and it could get lost in the noise of the IUCN Congress.

It was agreed that this issue of financial compensation of SSC awards would be considered further at the next meeting of the Steering Committee.

The SC adopted the proposals on the breakout group on SSC awards (Annex 1). This includes the establishment of a new George Rabb Award. S Stuart will check the George Rabb agrees to the establishment of this new award.

Members Emeritus

The breakout group's report on this issue is included in Annex 1. It was suggested that the name Members Emeritus should be change to Distinguished Service Members. S Stuart noted that, since this membership category has long been in disuse, research is needed to identify important SSC players from previous times who should be included in the list. H de longh asked if any SC member could propose an individual for this membership category. S Stuart said that this should be encouraged, and added that SG Chairs could do this too. D Leaman enquired if it would be possible to include posthumous additions to the Distinguished Service Members. S Stuart agreed. M Stanley Price nominated Mike Woodford as a DSM. S Stuart noted that formal nominations could be made at any time and that all SC members have a right to nominate an individual providing they meet the criteria of the awards.

The SC adopted the breakout group's recommendation on Distinguished Service Members (DSMs). SC members, SG Chairs and others would be invited to propose candidates to become DSMs (action R Roberts).

R Mittermeier agreed with the breakout group that the 'Roll of Honour' should be re-established and added to the website. The SC adopted the breakout group's recommendation on the Roll of Honour. Furthermore, Sir Peter Scott, George Rabb, Ralph Daly, Lee Talbot and Hal Coolidge were added to the SSC Roll of Honour.

A list of all members of the SSC Roll of Honour, and Distinguished Service Members would be added to the website.

6m. Possible SSC Freshwater Conservation Sub-Committee

T Contreras MacBeath introduced this topic. Steering Committee meeting WCC 4.1 had requested a proposal on the establishment of the SSC Freshwater Conservation Sub-committee (FCSC), and this proposal had been included in the meeting pack. The matter was referred to a breakout group, the report of which can be found in Annex 2.

The SC adopted the recommendation of the breakout group. It was noted that external funds would be needed to cover the costs of the FCSC meetings, and the SSC Commission Operations Fund does not have the resources to cover this work. T

Contreras MacBeath was asked to draw up terms of reference for the FCSC, based on the discussions held in the breakout group.

7. SSC in Major International Processes

7a. SSC products for the International Year of Biodiversity (IYB)

JC Vié opened this topic. He stated that findings presented in 'Wildlife in a Changing World' could have a key role in influencing the policy agenda in 2010. Two kinds of IUCN product are envisaged for IYB: scientific papers; and targeted documents for policy makers. A major scientific paper drawing on the headline findings of the RL is to be written, led by M Hoffmann. and other scientific papers are underway or planned on topics such as: the need to expand the taxonomic base of the RL; the invasives indicators; an overall summary of all of the CBD 2010 indicators; mammal trends; climate change impacts on species; the overall status of sharks; freshwater biodiversity in Africa. There is also a proposal to publicise conservation success stories. M Hoffmann added that the planned high-impact, multi-author paper, on which he is leading, is set to target the date of the UN General Assembly meeting in September 2010. Its content is likely to be based on datasets of the current state of biodiversity and trends, RL indices, and mapping improvements and deteriorations in species status.

S Stuart agreed that scientific papers are good to tie in with relevant CBD and other meetings. Concerning the proposed targeted publications for policy-makers, these should be short, well-illustrated, and focused on particular CBD decisions to be taken in Ngoya. R Mittermeier asked if CI could join forces with SSC for this.

S Stuart expressed concern that IUCN was not getting the right messages out to the places where it has influence. J Smart suggested a possible leverage of IUCN's observer status at the UN General Assembly, to raise IUCN's profile. J McNeely added that whilst scientific papers establish our credibility, broader publicity should also be sought, such as television coverage. There should also be greater focus on what high-level people are saying about species, and ensuring that IUCN is feeding the correct information to them. Other promotional tools should be explored such as YouTube and Twitter.

J Baillie noted that the status and trends of the world's invertebrates ('Evolution Lost'), is to become a supporting document for a scientific paper, as well as supporting the ZSL Foundations of Biodiversity symposium, which is taking place in February 2010. S Stuart commented that great work was being done but that the message was still not getting out properly. M Hoffmann suggested focusing on highlighting successes rather than messages of doom and gloom. J Baillie proposed that a small group should be formed to look at a wide spectrum of publicity issues – media, marketing, retail – and report back to the SC with some ideas. J Smart added that Twitter was being used to promote Species of the Day, and an iPhone application was also being explored (which would also increase traffic to the RL website).

Because this discussion expanded into broader communications issues beyond the IYB, it was decided to form a breakout group to take matters further. The breakout group also covered issues arising from agenda item 7b, and so it is reported on under that item.

7b. SSC Communications for the International Year of Biodiversity

J Smart introduced this item, drawing attention to the communications plans described in the meeting pack. There will be four Red List updates in 2010, in March, May, September and October, each tied to particular events. There will also be major enhancements to the IUCN Species website during 2010. Other key communications projects in 2010 are Species of the Day (encouraging as many other organizations as possible to display SOTD on their websites), and promulgated the uses of the Red List scale in zoos and botanic gardens. S Stuart expressed concern that there was still an issue navigating to the IUCN Species page from the homepage of the IUCN website. The issue has been taken up with IUCN Global Communications, but they have so far been resistant to implementing any changes (despite being requested to do so by IUCN Council at its November 2009 meeting).

Y Sadovy commented that a number of environmental firms utilise PR agencies to reach out to wider audiences. Also, tools like Facebook should be considered. M Stanley Price proposed the use of a specialised environmental communicator to advise the SSC. He had had very good experiences with one particular consultant, and offered to supply the contact details. JC Vié agreed that wider opportunities needed to be explored to profile species work, which would also help to attract more attention and donors. The use of factsheets (in association with a RL publication) as used in 2008 could be revisited.

Two decisions were taken:

1. S Stuart was asked to continue his discussion with IUCN Global Communications with a view to improving the navigation from the IUCN homepage to the IUCN Species page.
2. M Stanley Price was asked to provide the contact details of the specialised environmental communicator with whom he had worked.

L Boitani stated that the problem the meeting was grappling with was not so much about communicating as about influencing decisions and behaviour. He suggested creating a small breakout group to discuss. The report of the breakout group is provided in Annex 3.

In the report back to plenary, X Yan stated that it was important to identify the correct audience, and suggested looking at what the law enforcement people do. In China the give species enforcement awards which help a lot. SSC needs to select specific groups of people to work with who can make a real difference. J Smart agreed with the suggestion of the breakout group to work more with CEC. J McNeely felt that discussions with organisations such as WWF and Greenpeace would be useful as they have already invested a lot of money in this area, and have a lot of experience. T Contreras MacBeath suggested defining what the objectives are, as the focus needs to be trying to change people's behaviour which goes beyond scope of SSC. Perhaps alliances could be formed with other organisations that can bring their experience of similar issues to the table. S Broad suggested inviting some people from WWF UK who have looked into the area of behavioural economics, to take part in the SSC communications process. J Smart added that it would be essential to involve Species Programme staff, and this was agreed. E Bennett commented that IUCN is very good at communications for specific issues, but the overall message still is not being conveyed

properly. B Haddane added that it was not just about how to communicate but how to market the product.

The SC adopted the recommendation of the breakout group, specifically to hold a one-day brainstorming session with external experts to reach a clear starting point for develop a new communications approach in IUCN Species (SSC and SP). The session will be kept small and be facilitated. SSC will also engage with the IUCN Commission on Education and Communication (CEC) on this. The output would be a clear guidance upon which to build a strategy.

7c. CBD Post-2010 Targets

T Brooks and J Smart presented this item. The SC meeting WCC 4.1 provided strong guidance on the importance of retaining a focus on species for the CBD's post-2010 target framework. In addition, the notion that biodiversity has intrinsic, as well as economic, value must be emphasised. However, since then, a lot of ground had been reclaimed as a result of a long series of informal negotiating meetings held around the world. S Stuart thanked T Brooks and J Smart for leading for SSC in these meetings, and for playing a major part in bringing about what appeared to be a much-improved situation (though the negotiations are still far from over). Early indications were that the draft CBD strategic plan, which would contain the proposed post-2010 vision, mission and targets, would contain most of what the SSC had been pushing for.

The main task for SC meeting WCC 4.2 was to provide detailed comments on the draft IUCN position paper on the CBD strategic plan, entitled "A New Vision for Biodiversity Conservation". A breakout group was assigned with the task of going through the IUCN position paper, and numerous changes were agreed. The changes were too numerous and detailed to be sensibly recorded in these minutes. Those interested in receiving the detailed work can obtain them from T Brooks. The breakout group presented these changes back to the SC. The SC adopted the proposed changes, and requested that J Smart include them in the preparation on the final draft of "A New Vision for Biodiversity Conservation".

7d. Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES)

S Stuart and T Brooks introduced this item. IPBES is intended to be a scientifically independent, inter-governmentally-mandated platform to bring together the latest scientific understandings to inform national and international policy processes. IPBES provides a great opportunity for the SSC to provide its knowledge and data into the heart of decision-making. The SSC should therefore seek to be a key player in IPBES, should it be formed. So far, two international negotiating sessions have been held to establish IPBES, and the third is expected in June 2010, at which it is expected that the ground rules will be formally agreed for establishing IPBES. R Mittermeier noted that if IPBES does go forward, the SSC should be proactive in leading on the supply of species information. S Stuart agreed that IUCN needs to be more specific on what it can bring to IPBES. J Baillie added that there are other avenues that IUCN should be feeding into, such as GLOBE International. S Stuart suggested that J Baillie could be empowered to represent SSC in engaging with the GLOBE process.

It was noted that IUCN already has a position paper on IPBES, but it is lacking any specific reference to data and knowledge that IUCN can bring to IPBES. Some more specific wording should therefore be added to the position paper to cover IUCN's expertise and knowledge on both species and PAs. J McNeely suggested setting up a SSC task force on IPBES to include J Hutton. T Brooks added that the role of IUCN is to make sure it is on hand to bring data and expertise to the table, and to ensure that it keeps an eye on the interaction between IPBES and the GEO BON biodiversity monitoring group (in which the SSC also needs to be more actively engaged). R Mittermeier stated that it was very important for IUCN Councillors to be more active on IPBES, and present the case for IUCN to be the principle adviser to IPBES on biodiversity information. J Smart agreed that S Stuart was in a strong position to write to the Director General on this matter.

A small breakout group (T Brooks, J McNeely, J Baillie and J Smart) worked on some text to add to the IUCN position paper, and this is presented in Annex 4. The SC adopted the wording in Annex 4 and asked S Stuart to pass it on to Neville Ash in IUCN headquarters, who is co-ordinating IUCN's work on IPBES.

7e. Global Strategy for Plant Conservation (GSPC)

J Smart introduced this item. A revised version of the GSPC will be adopted at Nagoya. The SSC and SP had worked hard to help craft a stronger text for the GSPC, and there had been notable improvements. In particular, the PCSC had worked hard on the GSPC, and Liz Radford's leading role in this was recognized. However, it was noted that some of IUCN's comments presented to the Secretariat of the CBD were not taken on board, and in particular IUCN's rewording of Target 2 (on plant RL assessments) was ignored. It was felt that it was not worth fighting on these points at this time, but rather to emphasise them in the IUCN position paper on the GSPC for SBSTTA. J Smart will be leading on producing this position paper, and the PCSC will work closely with J Smart on this.

7f. The Economics of Ecosystems and Biodiversity (TEEB)

S Stuart reported briefly on this item, and stated that alliances need to be built with TEEB. Indeed, Pavan Sukhdev, who heads TEEB, is very open for collaboration. S Stuart noted that many in the SSC have major problems with TEEB's use of Mean Species Abundance as a biodiversity measure. This could be something that SSC could advise on in the future, with a view to helping to develop a better alternative. A Stattersfield added that Stuart Butchart is looking at ways in which the RL can be brought into TEEB. J Baillie, J Smart, S Stuart, J McNeely and A Stattersfield to liaise with each other on how to obtain a closer interaction with TEEB, and any successor to TEEB.

7g. Integrated Biodiversity Assessment Tool (IBAT)

S Stuart briefly presented this item. This partnership between BirdLife, CI, UNEP-WCMC and IUCN bring together key datasets, such as the World Database on Protected Areas, Important Bird Areas, Key Biodiversity Areas and the Red List, and presents them as overlays on a single website in order assist corporation, banks and others to take informed decisions on developments that might impact on biodiversity. S Stuart outlined his role on IBAT's Governance Committee. The four partners have developed, and are

close to adopting, a business plan, and also a formal legal agreement between them to establish IBAT properly. SSC's involvement will be with the threatened species layer, which has not yet been implemented. J Baillie noted that national RL data is being used in a parallel project and that this is being looked at for integration with IBAT (he will follow up with Martin Sneary, the IBAT Coordinator). D Leaman added that the global list of medicinal plants should be used by those private sector companies using plants, as a basis for risk analysis assessment for product lines. M Hoffmann will follow up with J Baillie and D Leaman to see how their points can be linked to IBAT.

7h. Mohamed bin Zayed Species Conservation Fund (MBZSCF)

F Launay gave an overview of the MBZSCF, which has been created as a result of the Abu Dhabi Crown Prince's commitment to stimulate active species conservation work in the field, in particular, by encouraging and supporting individuals. To date, the spread of funds across the taxonomic groups is, as expected, biased towards the better known groups (mammals and birds), but the aim is to adjust the balance to ensure an even spread across all the groups. Multiple applications can be made. F Launay felt that it would be good to increase funding allocation to Data Deficient species on the RL. The MBZSCF seeks to address critical needs and is very practical. It is gratifying to report an increasing number of applicants from developing countries. The MBZSCF is also linking directly with ARKive, so that a photo is picked up photo when an application is accepted. The fund is also a conduit for media exposure. A number of SSC members and SGs have made successful applications to the MBZSCF, and information on the fund had been sent to all the SG Chairs. Some SGs have been very good at spreading word about the MBZSCF, whereas others have not. M Hoffmann to follow up with Nicholas Heard to obtain information on how effective each SG has been on passing on information about the MBZSCF to its members.

7i. Save our Species (SOS) Initiative

JC Vié provided an update. Since SC meeting WCC 4.1, the name of this initiative had changed from Save Your Logo to Save Our Species (SOS). The full proposal to the GEF and World Bank (WB) was now completed, and detailed negotiations were taking place on the details of how the fund would be managed. The GEF and WB are committing US\$5 million each; IUCN will manage the fund, and the SSC will provide the scientific guidance. Indeed, the SOS concept relies heavily on SSC branding and expertise. IUCN is also taking the lead in finding private sector donors to match the contributions from the GEF and the WB. J Baillie stated that the SSC needs a strategic approach to fundraising; this would make it easier for donors to support its work. For example: what exactly are the key species groups needing funding the future? What is the strategy for working on Data Deficient species? What are the regions needing most attention? What are the actions plans and what is cost of all of these? S Stuart suggested an overview of funding needs and priorities should be added as an agenda item for the next SSC SC meeting. S Stuart stated that, in order to fulfil its advisory function to the SOS properly, the SSC needed to establish an SOS working group, with a regionally-balanced membership and a wide taxonomic spread of expertise. The priorities of where the funding should be distributed could be quite controversial, and the SSC process might be undermined if it was perceived to be biased.

J Smart stated that it was important to ensure that under-represented species on the RL were not left behind in the allocation of funds, and that clear priorities needs outlining for

different groups. S Stuart agreed but noted that although an approach could be taxonomically neutral, the RL is not which might create an issue. JC Vié added that some companies might want to fund a particular species and, in doing so, will create an unavoidable bias. D Leaman suggested that corrective direction needs to be employed at the outset to avoid any bias starting. T Brooks added that proposals need to be encouraged from all groups – marine, invertebrates, plants, etc. S Stuart agreed but also recognised that the communities behind SGs tend to be very different. The bird and mammal people, for example, have a long history of successful fundraising, whereas as many others still have a lot to learn in this regard. It is therefore about changing the mindset of the different groups of SSC experts. L Boitani felt that the concern does not need to be about the bias of the RL, as SOS is more about conservation action rather than assessments. M Kusriani noted that non-English speakers take longer to write proposals, so this also needs to be taken into account to avoid bias. T Brooks said it would be useful for SOS to relate to Conservation Leadership Programme with respect to donor co-ordination, and also on improving the overall efficiency of funding mechanisms for species.

The development of an SSC SOS working group was referred to a breakout group. The report of the breakout group is given in Annex 5. The SC agreed to form the SOS working group with the terms of reference as given in Annex 5.

S Stuart requested that SC members send him their nominations for membership of the SOS working group by 10 February. J Smart suggested that it would be helpful if each SSC Sub-Committee could nominate someone to participate in this.

7j. The Global Tiger Initiative (GTI)

J Smart noted that this year is the Chinese Year of the Tiger. The Global Tiger Summit, being organised by the GTI (which is itself led by the WB) is scheduled for 12 September 2010. There are questions on IUCN's role in the GTI, and on how IUCN can add value to the GTI. S Broad asked if the Global Tiger Forum could be rejuvenated, as this might allow IUCN to advise on tiger issues in a constructive way.

X Yan highlighted the three actions presently being undertaken in China on tiger protection: 1) strengthening tiger law enforcement and wild population conservation; 2) tighter management of all institutions involved in captive breeding of tigers; and 3) officers in charge of tiger conservation must respond to public reports. These actions are to be implemented at a governmental level, to actively demonstrate their seriousness in tiger conservation. S Broad agreed that there were important new signals from Chinese State Forestry Administration. L Boitani commented that the World Bank could start to change the ways it deals with infrastructure developments, by not making such investments in core wildlife habitats.

7k. CITES update

S Stuart introduced this item, and drew attention to the excellent work being done by SSC and the SP, much of it in collaboration with TRAFFIC, in preparation for the CITES COP in March 2010. Key materials on this work were provided in the meeting pack. One key issue that needs to be considered after the CITES COP is the extent to which IUCN is an impartial advisor, as opposed to advocating positions on specific concerns. At present, there is unhappiness amongst certain IUCN and SSC members that IUCN

restricts itself to this impartial position. S Stuart acknowledged that there is need to revisit the way in which IUCN and SSC function in the CITES process. There is probably a need to be more proactive rather than too reactive. J Smart noted that the CITES could not function effectively without SSC; however, our work for CITES is an unfunded mandate and IUCN staff are constantly working to raise money to support CITES process.

A Stattersfield suggested that it would be much more effective to improve the information fed into CITES – the trade data in particular. A strategic view needs to be taken on this so money can be raised to fund it. Y Sadovy commented that the neutral and scientifically objective position of IUCN has been both useful and powerful. S Broad noted that it was necessary to bear in mind the positive issues, such as timber and fisheries, which are progressing well in CITES. IUCN needs to engage at a strategic level; CITES has a strategic vision and IUCN needs to explore this in terms of where it is best placed to offer support. The SSC is engaged with writing proposals for CITES, but it is not co-ordinated within the Commission itself. S Broad suggested analyzing the RL data to see where use is a major international threat. This could form the basis of a more proactive engagement S Stuart asked if a strategic focal mechanism needed to be created within SSC that would be responsible for CITES across the SGs (and supporting the work of Thomasina Oldfield in the SP/TRAFFIC). S Broad felt that a new structure was not necessary, but that it would be good to look at a more strategic approach to the SSC's ambitions and medium-term engagement with CITES. After the CITES COP, S Stuart and J Smart to follow up with Dena Cator, S Broad and Thomasina Oldfield on developing a new strategic approach to CITES.

7I. CMS update

This item was not taken, due to lack of time.

8. Major Challenges

8a. Climate Change

JC Vié introduced this item. He updated the SC on progress since SC meeting WCC 4.1. The report of ten flagship species affected by climate change had attracted huge publicity at the UNFCCC meeting in Copenhagen in December 2009. Work on revising the IUCN Red List Guidelines to include climate change (as called for in WCC Resolution 4.016) is underway. The SSC Standards and Petitions Sub-Committee is leading on this work, and hopes to complete interim climate change guidelines at its meeting in Cambridge (taking place simultaneously with SC meeting WCC 4.2). The work on assessing species' vulnerability to climate change is continuing, led by Wendy Foden. Several scientific papers are currently being written, and a new project, focusing on the Albertine Rift, has started. The revision of the IUCN Re-introduction Guidelines to take account of climate change was reported under agenda item 6a.

The key proposal to be considered by the SC is the proposed establishment of an SSC Task Force on Climate Change. A breakout group was formed to discuss this, and its report is provided in Annex 6. The SC adopted the report of the breakout group, and approved the formation of the SSC Task Force on Climate Change, with terms of

reference as given in Annex 6. JC Vié will work with Wendy Foden and S Stuart to identify a chair and task force members.

8b. The amphibian extinction crisis

S Stuart introduced this item. He reported on the results of the Amphibian Min-Summit held in London in August 2009. The mini-summit agreed that progress in implementing in Amphibian Conservation Action Plan (ACAP) was very unsatisfactory. The most important priorities with the ACAP were agreed and prioritised for fundraising. It was decided to go ahead and form an inter-institutional Amphibian Survival Alliance (ASA), convened by SSC, with the responsibility of driving ahead the implementation of the ACAP. The relationship between the ASA and the SSC Amphibian Specialist Group was also clarified. S Stuart stated that the SSC had received funding pledges of US\$125,000 per years, with several other pledges currently under negotiations. He expected that the SSC would soon be in a position to launch the ASA.

8c. Asian large animal crisis

S Stuart reported on this item. He stated that progress since SC meeting WCC 4.1 had been less than had been hoped. This was in part because the attempt to have a senior conservationist seconded to IUCN to lead the Crisis Asia initiative had failed. Nevertheless, a fundraising brochure for Crisis Asia had been prepared, initial seed funding had been provided by the European Association of Zoos and Aquariums (EAZA). Fundraising is now the priority for the Crisis Asia initiative. S Broad noted that a special WWF task force has been formed to address the poaching crisis in Asia. The key question is how to link in work on trade with work done at a site level. Enhancing and supporting the work already being implemented by WWF and others could be the answer. S Broad and S Stuart will follow up on engaging WWF in Crisis Asia, working with Carlos Cruz after he has taken over a Director of Species Conservation at WWF International. It was further agreed that T Contreras MacBeath would seek to engage Zeb Hogan in Crisis Asia, in view of his focus on large freshwater fishes.

8d. Linking with National Red Lists

JP Rodríguez and J Baillie reported on this item, The drew attention to the successful workshop on national red listing held in London in September 2009, which resulted in some clear, fundable priorities for this SSC to address, in collaboration with ZSL. JP Rodríguez noted that the SSC Rational Red List Working Group needs to meet once a year to monitor and guide progress. X Yan commented that in China the national RL was very difficult to use, so how are the national RL promoted over the use of global lists? Currently the global list does not link closely to the national lists. J Smart suggested that this needed to be discussed further to so that complimentary (or similar) approach could be made.

8e. The SSC and priority setting

JP Rodríguez reported on this work, which has not yet started, but would be prioritised for 2011. This initiative aims to fill the gap between the Red List and species conservation planning. How do we set priorities among the threatened species on the RL for conservation planning? This initiative could give rise to guidelines, perhaps entitled "Systematic Priority Setting for Threatened Species Conservation Planning". S Stuart

noted that extinction risk not only issue for SSC to address. JC Vié suggested taking advantage of existing processes e.g., looking at the overlap with the SOS working group. B Lacy added that there was a related working group addressing similar issues within the CBSG which already had a specific set of activities. Collaboration on these issues would be useful and important. J McNeely suggested focusing on an institution that has already established its own priorities. How do they decide what to do? This would at least avoid the well-trodden ground.

F Launay asked who the intended target of this approach was, as there are some organisations that do not have a conservation mandate but which are involved in conservation action. It is important to capture this. J Smart added that not enough connection was being made between the RL and the next necessary steps. R Mittermeier and E Bennett will liaise with JP Rodríguez on the development of this initiative.

8f. Red List of Ecosystems

JP Rodríguez reported on this activity, which is now starting, being led from within the IUCN Commission on Ecosystem Management (CEM). He is leading on this activity which is mandated in WCC Resolution 4.020, and is seeking SSC support in the project. The aim is to have criteria developed for testing by the time of the 5th WCC in Korea in 2012. F Launay asked if the notion of ecosystem services was being included in the RL of ecosystems. L Boitani expressed concern with the use of word 'ecosystem'. A Stattersfield asked how work done on species can inform this approach and how it can inform conservation planning. Ecosystem assessments could provide an early warning system of significant environmental problems.

8g. World Species Congress

S Stuart emphasised that this is a priority resolution from the Barcelona Congress (Resolution 4.019). There was very little time left to discuss this matter properly, and R. Mittermeier, the chief proponent of the Species Congress, had had to leave the meeting early. JP Rodríguez asked if the Species Congress could be extended from next SSC Chair's meeting. J McNeely suggested that the Congress should be held in this quadrennium, if IUCN is serious about what is happening to species. L Boitani was in full support this proposal. JC Vié asked if it would be acceptable to have the next WCC in Korea focused on species. J Smart, however, cautioned that this Congress needs a lot of thought and suggested a possible joint approach with WCPA. JP Rodríguez proposed the Society for Conservation Biology (SCB) as a potential partner. S Stuart noted that a realistic approach and amount of time was needed to secure funding and create a successful high profile event. L Boitani suggested an approach away from large congress centres, to set an example for holding events at less high profile venues. J McNeely suggested making it an invitation only. A Stattersfield asked if tickets could be sold.

T Contreras MacBeath suggested approaching the people behind the unsuccessful Mexican bid for the next IUCN Congress, and exploring with them the options for holding the World Species Congress. T Contreras MacBeath is to follow up with the Mexican Government.

J McNeely proposed that a preparatory meeting be held before a larger congress; such a preparatory meeting could be linked to the SG Chairs meeting. J Smart expressed concern that fundraising for a Species Congress is likely to detract from other fundraising activities needed for the SSC and Species Programme. There are also IUCN procedures that need to be followed for these Congresses. There was little time left to discuss all these ideas further, and so it was agreed that S Stuart, J Smart, JP Rodríguez and M Hoffmann would discuss them further, and involve R Mittermeier, with a view to coming back to the SC with more concrete proposals.

9. Any other business

B Haddane asked if the problems in the IUCN Office in Malaga would have a negative impact on Plantlife's work on identifying Important Plant Areas in the Mediterranean. He considered this work to be extremely important. S Stuart stated that, as far as he knew, Plantlife's work would not be affected. He suggested that B Haddane check with the Director General.

T Brooks questioned what was being done about Korean biodiversity conservation issues, especially given that the next IUCN Congress would be held there. S Stuart commented that a number of SSC members had raised concerns about the serious effects that major development projects in Korea were having on a number of groups of species. S Stuart had been following this, and that a formal fact-finding IUCN mission would be going to Korea in the coming months (dates not yet set). The Asia Regional Office was leading on this initial mission, and was keeping the SSC involved. J McNeely added that the DMZ (De-Militarized Zone) forum would like to have IUCN more involved. S Broad suggested that wildlife trade issues in Korea also need to be checked out before the Congress. S Stuart will bring a report and recommendations to the next SC meeting.

J Smart noted that J Hutton wanted the SSC's advice on what to do with the old plant database at UNEP-WCMC. S Stuart said that this matter should be referred to the PCSC.

JC Vié reported that the World Health Organisation (WHO) has approached IUCN in search of expertise on emerging zoonotic diseases. The question is: does IUCN need to fill this gap? J McNeely noted that the issue of emerging infectious diseases is likely to increase. The SSC Wildlife Health SG (WHSG) has an important role to play but lacks resources, so it would therefore be useful for IUCN to get involved on a broader level to support the WHSG. B Haddane, J Baillie, Richard Kock (WHSG) and JC Vié to discuss further and agree a way forward.

10. Date and Venue of next meeting

It was agreed that the next SC meeting would be held in Indonesia, date to be agreed but likely to be after Ramadan in September 2010.

11. Closing

S Stuart closed the meeting thanking JP Rodríguez his magnificent work in organizing the meeting in an excellent location, and with supreme efficiency. He also thanked R Roberts for her hard work taking the minutes and organising the air flights. And he thanked J Smart and JC Vié for excellent staff back-up, and all participants for what had been a very full, but most productive, meeting.

ANNEX 1

SSC Awards

Report from the Breakout Group:

The breakout group proposed the following SSC awards (including a new George Rabb Award). These are described as follows:

The Sir Peter Scott Award for Conservation Merit

Description

This is the senior SSC award dating back to 1984. It is presented to individuals in recognition of exceptional service and leadership to species conservation over many years through their work with the SSC.

Recipients are decided by the SSC Steering Committee. Awards may be made at any time, but formal ceremonies will take place once an IUCN quadrennium, most likely at the SSC Specialist Group Chair's meeting.

The George Rabb Award for Conservation Innovation

Description

This is an award for outstanding innovation and creativity in species conservation in the context of the SSC. It is given to individuals in recognition of delivering transformational advances in conservation theory and practice.

Recipients are decided by the SSC Steering Committee. Awards may be made at any time, but formal ceremonies will take place once an IUCN quadrennium, most likely at the SSC Specialist Group Chair's meeting.

The Harry Messel Award for Conservation leadership

Description

This award, established in 2004, recognizes emerging leadership in the SSC, especially from individuals who have made a specific contribution to species conservation on the ground through their leadership, as part of an SSC Specialist Group or Task Force.

Recipients are decided by the SSC Steering Committee. Awards may be made at any time, but formal ceremonies will take place once an IUCN quadrennium, most likely at the SSC Specialist Group Chair's meeting.

The SSC Chair's Citation of Excellence

Description

The SSC Chair's Citation of Excellence, created in 2004, is awarded at the end of each IUCN quadrennium in recognition of outstanding to SSC during that quadrennium.

Recipients are decided by the Chair.

The breakout group then considered the issue of honorary life membership categories in the SSC. It was proposed to rename the Members Emeritus as Distinguished Service Members, as described below. It was also decided to revive the SSC Roll of Honour.

SSC Distinguished Service Members

The Commission Chair may appoint individuals as Distinguished Service Members in recognition of significant service to the Species Survival Commission (SSC). Distinguished Services Members are automatically re-appointed in each quadrennium. Distinguished Service Membership encourages continuing activity in the SSC. Examples of possible Distinguished Service Members include:

- Former active Specialist Group, Task Force Working Group Chairs, and Red List Authority Focal Points
- Former active Steering Committee or Sub-Committee members
- Long-serving and particularly active Specialist Group, Task Force, Working Group and Red List Authority members
- Outstanding staff in the Species Programme, SSC Chair's Office and Specialist Groups

A list will be retained of deceased DSMs.

SSC Roll of Honour

The Steering Committee may appoint to the SSC Roll of Honour small number of highly distinguished people who have played critical roles in the history of the Commission. This honour may be awarded posthumously, and the names of members of the Roll are retained after they have deceased. The current membership is:

- HRH Prince Bernhard, Netherlands (deceased)
- Lieut. Col. C.L. Boyle, UK (deceased)
- Mr Richard S.R. Fitter, UK (deceased)
- Mrs Maisie Fitter, UK (deceased)
- Dr Kai Curry-Lindahl, Sweden (deceased)
- Dr Boonsong Lekagul, Thailand (deceased)
- Major Ian R. Grimwood, Kenya (deceased)
- Prof. Grenville Lucas, UK
- Prof. Alexey Yablokov, Russian Federation

Proposed new members of the Roll of Honour are:

- Sir Peter Scott (deceased)
- George Rabb
- Ralph Daly (deceased)
- Lee Talbot
- Hal Coolidge (deceased)

ANNEX 2

SSC Freshwater Sub-Committee Proposal

Report from the Breakout Group:

T Brooks, B Haddane, T Contreras MacBeath, J McNeely, M Kusrini, M Samways, X Yan, A Rhodin.

The focus of the Sub-Committee would be to address the freshwater crisis drawing on the experience of the marine and plant sub-committees.

The niche for a Freshwater Sub-Committee:

- 1) Beyond single species; indicators
- 2) Climate change link – water scarcity
- 3) Most threatened/degraded ecosystem
- 4) Popular opinion: just water source
- 5) Restoration – new paper in Conservation Biology
- 6) Define boundaries: estuaries, watertables, soaks, oases, streams, peat swamps, frozen
- 7) Promote freshwater protected areas
- 8) Policy guidelines: canals, invasives, impacts, management of dams – problems, also positives; fisheries; aquaculture
- 9) Freshwater scarcity; IUCN global perspective, unitary approach, link to species
- 10) Examples of potential niche in China
- 11) Awareness raising; youth

The links with a Freshwater Sub-Committee:

- 1) MCSC, ICSC (TIRLA), ISSG
- 2) Link to CEM, Water Program, CEC?
 - Encourage CEM to work more on water
 - Encourage freshwater program to move beyond projects (Middle East, Mekong)
- 3) Wetlands International, Biofresh project, Belgians
- 4) Relationship with Ramsar, UNFCCC, CBD
- 5) World Water Forum, UNEP

The Practicalities of a Freshwater Sub-Committee:

- 1) How big will the Sub-committee be? Core team – who should it comprise of (cost) – half a dozen; then network
- 2) Synergies, e.g., Ramsar meetings
- 3) Support from university etc for chair; involve graduate student(s)
- 4) Establish priorities; first meeting – strategic planning, watching brief or active engagement
- 5) World Species Congress as a target?

The potential composition of a Freshwater Sub-Committee:

- 1) SSC: freshwater fish, amphibians, turtles, crocs, otters, hippos, waterbirds, odonata, molluscs, cetaceans, crayfish/crabs, aquatic plants, etc.,
- 2) MCSC, ICSC, ISSG, SUSG, others?
- 3) IUCN Species Program freshwater; IUCN Water Program; CEM
- 4) Wetlands International, other NGOs?
- 5) Ramsar; UNFCCC? World Water Forum? FAO?

The potential donors of a Freshwater Sub-Committee:

- 1) Water companies; Nestle, Evian, Volvic; talk to IUCN Business & Biodiversity group who already engaging already with relevant businesses like Nestle, etc., and other corporate foundations. Approach as the SSC rather than IUCN program.
- 2) Which companies benefit from biodiversity e.g., forestry, drinks manufacturing, recreational fishing, the aquarium trade.

Two levels of fundraising for a Freshwater Sub-Committee:

- 1) Small, short-term – for operations of FCSC
- 2) Large, building a programme – but not for FCSC itself, but rather for facilitating and coordinating partnerships around Red List assessments and implementing freshwater species conservation.

Possible arguments against a Freshwater Sub-Committee:

- 1) Any danger of duplication of effort, competition? No, there appears to be a strong rationale and a clear niche.
- 2) Funding/fundraising? No, this should be possible.

The Freshwater Sub-committee could be organised to take information from the SGs to address the bigger issues.

ANNEX 3

Communications

Report from the Breakout Group:

Communication creates the ability to be influential, and to build respectability.

How do we bridge the disjunction between the two levels of interest: species appeal to the public but ecosystem processes appeal to governments?

There are groups to be considered:

- The general constituent;
- Key players damaging species in some way;
- Key decision makers;
- Religious communities (each religion must be treated differently and not as an entirety)

From the SSC perspective, how do we link with all the other organisations with similar concerns, as well as getting traction for a species agenda? The SSC basically has two personas: the assessments which give a detailed status of each species (without spin); and making practical conservation happen (often at SG level, by species, and by site). Should the SSC become an advocacy organisation?

There needs to be a focus on positive stories with a call for action (no-one listens to bad news). SSC needs to send out the message that species are important for the future of the world.

IUCN and SSC members are sometimes becoming frustrated by IUCN not taking positions on certain issues (such as on bluefin tuna at CITES). This is a dilemma as the SSC might lose scientific credibility and impartiality by taking a stand on controversial issues. But does sticking to impartial science marginalise the SSC?

The SSC needs external expertise in order to decide how to move ahead (for example social marketing skills directed towards specific objectives). The SSC needs to bridge the current disconnect between knowledge and concern. But what is the SSC's role beyond the provision of information? It is the big issues which need focusing on.

Problem statement

Species are going down the tubes but the public and policy makers aren't responding (and we need to understand why this is)

AND

We do not have the expertise to understand how to communicate and influence effectively.

We need to understand the 3 levels of engagement:

- Attitude
- intention to act
- actual behaviour

The SSC has a lot of experience in influencing attitudes, though regular high-profile media launches, often related to the RL. However, it has next to no experience in influencing “intention to act” or “actual behaviour”.

Action

The breakout group recommended a brainstorming session (one-day meeting) with external experts to reach a clear starting point for develop a new communications approach in IUCN Species (SSC and SP). The session should be kept small and be facilitated. SSC should also engage with the IUCN Commission on Education and Communication (CEC) on this. The output would be a clear guidance upon which to build a strategy.

ANNEX 4

Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES)

The breakout group proposed the following text to be incorporated into the IUCN position paper on IPBES:

IUCN is in a position to play an important role in coordinating biodiversity science for IPBES. IUCN is in a major position to contribute cutting-edge policy-relevant science to IPBES for three reasons:

1. IUCN has the world's largest **global network** of conservation specialists and biodiversity scientists

IUCN has the largest global scientific and expert networks focussing on biodiversity (especially on species and ecosystems), ecosystem services and protected areas.

2. IUCN has an unrivalled **knowledge** base on biodiversity and ecosystem services

IUCN collates, manages and disseminates many of the largest global datasets on biodiversity, specifically:

- Information on species status, trends and drivers of changes through the IUCN Red List of Threatened Species
- The National Red List Database (shared with the Zoological Society of London)
- The World Database of Protected Areas (shared with the UNEP World Conservation Monitoring Centre)
- Global Invasive Species Database

3. **Biodiversity analyses**

IUCN has significant expertise on, and a long history in, analysing data on biodiversity status and trends and providing decision makers with the most robust, impartial science.

ANNEX 5

SSC and Save Our Species (SOS)

Report from the Breakout Group:

SOS will engage the private sector financially and also to build interest in species conservation work. The institutional part (from the GEF and WB) already has 10 million USD committed. A website and brochure have been developed and Jeremy Harris (SSC Chair's Office) is leading on corporate fundraising. 'Corporate species', reflecting the interests of particular corporations, can be supported, the priorities of which can be based on SSC recommendations. An SOS Donor Council exists comprising IUCN, GEF, and the World Bank. There will be a need to establish how the SSC network is to be mobilised for the engagement and monitoring of projects. How will priorities be established? The IUCN has committed to setting up SSC structures for agreeing funding priorities, evaluating and monitoring, and prioritising

L Boitani stated that SOS was about optimising grant allocations. A Rhodin added that a unified strategy should be employed for approaching corporate organisations. H de longh asked if there were strict criteria for applicants? T Contreras MacBeath also asked if there are any criteria for the donating companies?

J C Vié stated that SOS would be looking for large donations in the first instance, but that they would be keen to approach companies with the SGs. The main application criterion is that IUCN cannot apply for grants, but other organisations can in collaboration with the SGs. The grants will only go to civil society organisations, not to governments. There are no real criteria for companies wishing to donate to SOS.

R Mittermeier stated that from an NGO perspective, this initiative was disadvantageous because they have to go through 'x' number of steps before the funds can be released. However, the attractive selling point from the big donors is that the money is already there. He suggested that government, as well as corporate, donors should be sought.

A recommendation was made by the breakout group to convene an SSC SOS working group (regionally representative, with taxonomic spread of expertise) with the following terms of reference.

To:

- Identify species action plans already existing, and identify new ones to be developed
- Develop the mechanism by which prioritization can take place, and then establish priorities
- Refine the criteria for proposals and for selection of projects
- Develop and define the higher-level review mechanism, and the format that it will take
- Develop a rationale for approaching broader range of funders
- Help select SSC members to be involved in the implementation, monitoring and evaluation of proposals

ANNEX 6

Climate Change

Report from the Breakout Group:

The breakout group proposed the following terms of reference for the SSC Task Force on Climate Change:

- To provide input and advice to IUCN's overall work on climate change, with a specific task of helping to ensure that biodiversity concerns remain central to IUCN's climate change programme and to other IUCN sub-programmes (Water, Protected Areas, Marine, Forest).
- To develop the overall approach and priorities for the work on climate change being conducted by the SSC and the Species Programme. Issues to consider include the impact on species and their response to climate change, and the impact on species of the changes in human behaviour as a response to climate change.
- To identify emerging issues in relation to biodiversity and climate change, and to help ensure that the SSC and the Species Programme remain on the cutting edge of these issues.
- To be available to the Species Programme and to the SSC to provide scientific and technical advice, especially on prioritised projects relating species and climate change.
- To establish links between the different groups working on biodiversity and climate change (e.g. WAZA and CBSG have already formed Task Forces on climate change).
- To provide expertise to those Specialist Groups with particular concerns associated with climate change issues.
- To communicate the responses of species to climate change (within the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) and beyond) and to ensure that species are incorporated into all relevant climate change projects such as REDD+.
- To establish a network of scientists (including both the climate change modelling community and the species specialist community) with expertise in this area of work.

Other areas of discussion

- Doing things that IPCC does not do but is happy for us to do as a contribution to their work;
- A Task Force is an initial start but this will be a long-term issue that will evolve;
- Climate change is going to be a continuing challenge;
- Need to consider assessment, look at adaptation, and address mitigation;
- Designing and leading an assessment of the relationship between species, cc, and human wellbeing (building on Albertine Rift project) (focus on islands, mountain, coral reefs, oases, and other highly affected ecosystems).

Possible members for the SSC Climate Change Task Force were discussed. It was felt that members needed to link across all the major groups, e.g. water, forest, etc., and that a Chair should be nominated who already has a high profile within the climate change arena.

	<u>Who</u>	<u>Action Item</u>	<u>Agenda Item</u>
1	A Rhodin, Y Sadovy, E Bennett, B Lacy, P Medici	To constitute a group from the Steering Committee to work with J Smart on rolling out the RL branding.	5b
2	M Hoffman	To follow up with Texas A&M University for a resolution of the legal issues raised by their lawyers, and for completion of their MOU with IUCN.	5c/6g
3	RL Committee / Species programme	To draft a proposal on how the RL can become more of a stimulus for conservation action, and also used to raise money for those species identified in the assessments.	5c/6g
4	S Stuart/M Hoffmann/ Rebecca Miller/ Caroline Pollock	The development of a RL training strategy to be referred to the RL Committee.	5c/6g
5	M Samways	Circulate a list of all red list coordinators in TIRLA to SC members for their information, and to arrange for it to be available on the website.	5d
6	M Hoffmann	To provide the contact details of Leeanne Alonso in CI to M Samways.	5d
7	Y Sadovy	Josephine Langley from the IUCN Biodiversity Conservation Group, who liaises with the Global Marine Programme, to be invited to the next MCSC meeting.	5e
8	J Smart	Clarify what the Global Marine Programme is planning to do on the coral crises leading up to Ngoya, and to provide feedback to J Baillie and Y Sadovy. It was also suggested that links should be made with Helen Pippard in IUCN Oceania as part of the Pacific 2020 initiative.	5e
9	Y Sadovy	It would be useful if the minutes of the MCSC were distributed to all of the marine-related SGs and RLAs. Y Sadovy agreed to do this.	5e
10	JC Vié	To liaise with K Carpenter, Y Sadovy, S Broad and Mike Hoffmann on ensuring better collection of data on the use of marine species in the RL.	5e
11	M Hoffmann/J Griffin	It was agreed that a few additional SSC SGs might be needed to cover economically valuable species such as legumes, bamboos and rattans. Follow up with the PCSC to identify leaders for such SGs.	5f
12	B Lacy	To report back at the next SC meeting on the results of the April workshop (dealing with a number of conservation breeding initiatives in the ex-situ world).	5g
13	S Stuart	The next SG Chairs' meeting to be considered as a perfect venue to showcase the work on species conservation planning, and other suggestions for the next Chairs meeting to be included on the next SC meeting agenda.	5g
14	J Smart	The Species Programme to report back on at the next SSC meeting on the possibilities of outsourcing staff to support SGs.	5h(ii)
17	SSC Office	Newly designed SG questionnaire to be used in all future proposals for new SGs (not just bird SGs).	5h(ii)
18	A Stattersfield, Claire Santer, M Hoffmann, S Stuart	To design a practical means of enabling those experts contributing to bird RL assessments to be given the opportunity to join the bird RLA.	5h(ii)

19	T Brooks, A Stattersfield, Claire Santer	To initiate a proactive programme to integrate experts from BirdLife's network into cross-sectoral parts of the SSC, including the: Species Conservation Planning Sub-Committee; SSC-WCPA Task Force on Biodiversity and Protected Areas; Conservation Breeding Specialist Group; Invasive Species Specialist Group; Wildlife Health Specialist Group; Re-introduction Specialist Group; and Sustainable Use Specialist Group.	5h(ii)
20	S Stuart	To identify potential chairs/co-chairs for a new Small Mammal SG, covering rodents, shrews, hedgehogs, and tree shrews.	5h(iii)
21	R Mittermeier	The SC agreed the colugos would come under the purview of the Primate SG	5h(iii)
22	R Roberts	To send appointment letters to Richard Jenkins as chair, and Krystal Tolley as RLA FP of the newly formed Chameleon SG.	5h(iv)
23	R Roberts/ M Hoffman	To send an appointment letter to Chris Jenkins, Chair of the new Viper SG. RLA FP still to be appointed.	5h(iv)
24	R Roberts/ M Samways	To send an appointment letter to Axel Hochkirch, Chair of the new Grasshopper SG. RLA FP still to be appointed.	5h(iv)
25	M Samways	M Samways to identify the appropriate chair or co-chairs for the South Asian Invertebrate SG.	5h(v)
26	S Stuart	Following consultation with the PCSC, to report back on the identification of a new chair for the Arabian Plant SG to the SC.	5h(v)
27	S Stuart	Following consultation with the PCSC, a recommendation is to be brought back to the SC on the future of the South Atlantic Island Plants SG.	5h(v)
28	M Samways	To identify a chair/co-chairs for the re-established Butterfly SG, and submit a formal proposal to the SC.	5h(v)
29	SSC Chair Office	The SC noted the new RLA FPs are needed for: Madagascar Plants New World Marsupials Australasian Marsupials and Monotremes Snakes and Lizards (for the species for which RLAs do not already exist) Vipers Sharks Grasshoppers	5i
30	J Smart	To discuss the re-introduction guidelines with Sonia Pena Moreno in IUCN headquarters, to seek advice on how best to handle this in the CBD context.	6a
	X Yan, Y Sadovy, S Broad	To review the current guidelines on confiscated animals (adopted in 2000), with a view to making possible recommendations for changes.	6a
	S Stuart	The topic of human-wildlife interactions to be reviewed at the next SSC SC meeting.	6b
	Dena Cator, Julie Griffin, M Hoffmann, K Pintus, Lynne Labanne, R Roberts, Leigh Ann Hurt.	To develop a coherent proposal for the future of Species and the e-bulletin for the next SC meeting, involving key SC members in the process.	6e
	D Leaman	To refer the issue of there being no taxonomic list on SIS for the	6i

		plant groups, to Craig Hilton-Taylor and Caroline Pollock in the RL Unit.	
	M Hoffmann, J McNeely	To follow up resolution 4.015 on scientific collecting of threatened species, by using the draft guidelines which had been reviewed by SSC SGs in the previous quadrennium.	6k
	S Stuart	The issue of financial compensation of SSC awards to be considered further at the next meeting of the Steering Committee.	6l
	S Stuart	To check with George Rabb that he agrees to the establishment of a new George Rabb Award.	6l
	R Roberts	To invite SC members, SG Chairs and others to propose candidates to become Distinguished Service Members (DSMs).	6l
	R Roberts	Sir Peter Scott, George Rabb, Ralph Daly, Lee Talbot and Hal Coolidge were added to the SSC Roll of Honour.	6l
	R Roberts	A list of all members of the SSC Roll of Honour, and Distinguished Service Members would be added to the website.	6l
	T Contreras MacBeath	To draw up terms of reference for the FCSC, based on the discussions held in the breakout group.	6m
	S Stuart	To continue his discussion with IUCN Global Communications with a view to improving the navigation from the IUCN homepage to the IUCN Species page.	7b
	M Stanley Price	To provide the contact details of the specialised environmental communicator with whom he had worked.	7b
	S Stuart/R Roberts	To initiate a one-day brainstorming session with external experts to reach a clear starting point for develop a new communications approach in IUCN Species (SSC and SP). SSC also to engage with the IUCN Commission on Education and Communication (CEC) on this.	7b
	J Smart	To include the SC-approved changes to the “A New Vision for Biodiversity Conservation” (the draft IUCN position paper on the CBD strategic plan) in the preparation of the final draft.	7c
	S Stuart	To pass the SC-adopted amendments to Annex 4 of the IUCN position paper on IPBES to Neville Ash, IUCN headquarters.	7d
	J Baillie, J Smart, S Stuart, J McNeely, A Stattersfield	To liaise on how best to obtain a closer interaction with TEEB, and any successor to TEEB.	7f
	M Hoffmann	To follow up with J Baillie and D Leaman to see how their points on RL data and integration with IBAT, and medicinal plant information for companies, can be linked to IBAT.	7g
	M Hoffmann	To follow up with Nicholas Heard on obtaining information on how effective each SG has been on passing on information about the MBZSCF to its members.	7h
	JC Vié	The SC agreed to form the SOS working group with the terms of reference as given in Annex 5.	7i
	S Stuart	S Stuart requested that SC members send him their nominations for membership of the SOS working group by 10 February. J Smart suggested that it would be helpful if each SSC Sub-Committee could nominate someone to participate in this.	7i
	S Stuart, J Smart,	Following the CITES COP, to develop a new strategic approach to	7k

	Dena Cator, S Broad, Thomasina Oldfield	CITES	
	JC Vié, Wendy Foden, S Stuart	To identify a chair and members for the SSC Task Force on Climate Change.	8a
	S Broad, S Stuart	To follow up on engaging WWF in Crisis Asia, working with Carlos Cruz after he has taken over a Director of Species Conservation at WWF International.	8c
	T Contreras MacBeath	To engage Zeb Hogan in Crisis Asia, in view of his focus on large freshwater fishes.	8c
	R Mittermeier, E Bennett, JP Rodríguez	To work on developing the connection between the RL and the next necessary steps for species conservation planning.	8e
	T Contreras MacBeath	To follow up with the Mexican Government on the possibility of holding the World Species Congress in Mexico.	8g
	S Stuart, J Smart, JP Rodríguez, M Hoffmann, R Mittermeier	To discuss the World Species Congress further, with a view to coming back to the SC with more concrete proposals.	8g
	S Stuart	To bring a report and recommendations on Korean issues to the next SC meeting.	9
	J Smart/J Hutton	To refer the matter of what to do with the old plant database at UNEP-WCMC to the PCSC.	9
	B Haddane, J Baillie, Richard Kock (WHSG), JC Vié	To discuss the issue of IUCN's possible involvement in offering expertise to the World Health Organisation on emerging zoonotic diseases and agree a way forward.	9