



**SSC STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING WCC 4.3
GLAND, SWITZERLAND, 7–9 DECEMBER 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 third meeting of the 2009-2012 IUCN Quadrennium.

1b. Attendees and Apologies

The following people attended the meeting:

SSC Steering Committee:

Luigi Boitani, Topiltzin Contreras MacBeath, Maj de Poorter, John Donaldson, Brahim Haddane, Mirza Kusriani, Bob Lacy (by phone for item 5n only), Frédéric Launay, Danna Leaman, Jeff McNeely, Patricia Medici, Russell Mittermeier, John Robinson, Jon Paul Rodríguez, Yvonne Sadovy, Michael Samways, Mark Stanley Price, Simon Stuart, Yan Xie

Institutional Observers:

Jonathan Baillie, Thomas Brooks, Carlos Drewes, Jon Hutton, Andrew Rosenberg, Alison Stattersfield, Jane Smart, Jean-Christophe Vié

SSC Chair's Office:

Michael Hoffmann, Rachel Roberts

IUCN Secretariat:

Dena Cator, Josephine Langley, Andrew Rodrigues, Trevor Sandwith, C Santer

Guest attendees:

Jonathan Barzdo (CITES Secretariat – part-time), Urs Breitenmoser (Cat Specialist Group – item 6e only), Robert Brownell (Cetacean Specialist Group – part-time), Gerald Dick (World Association of Zoos and Aquariums – item 6a only), Ed Gillespie (FUTERRA – item 6b only), Jörg Junhold (Leipzig Zoo – item 6a only), Kristin Leus (CBSG – item 5n

by phone only)), Phil McGowan (World Pheasant Association – item 5n by phone only), Cathy Taylor Houlser (CBSG – item 5n by phone only)

Apologies were received from the following Steering Committee members and observers: Steve Broad, Hans de longh, Bob Lacy, Anders Rhodin, Stella Simiyu

Trevor Sandwith, the new Head of the IUCN Programme on Protected Areas, was introduced to the SC. T Sandwith stated that he would like to see more collaboration between SSC and WCPA, and noted the new joint Task Force on Biodiversity and Protected Areas. In view of this, he drew attention to the next World's Parks Congress which will be taking place in 2014, most likely in Australia.

2. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

The Steering Committee adopted the agenda.

3. PREVIOUS MINUTES (WCC 4.2, 27–29 January 2010, Venezuela)

The minutes of WCC 4.2 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 4.2 Agenda Item</u>	<u>Update</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	See item 6b
5	M Samways	All Red List coordinators in TIRLA to be posted on the IUCN website as part of the site update.	5d	Ongoing
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	Done
9	D Cator, A Rodrigues , R Roberts	Minutes of all Sub-committees to be posted on the IUCN website following each Sub-committee meeting.	5e	Ongoing
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. To be tracked	5e	Ongoing

		within the MCSC.		
11	PCSC (J Donaldson & D Leaman)	It was agreed that a few additional SSC SGs might be needed to cover economically valuable species such as legumes, bamboos and rattans. The PCSC are currently seeking suitable Chairs for these groups, and also the groups are being identified for National and Regional RL. This is an important strategic decision for SSC based on the 2010 targets. The 'Useful Wild Plants proposal' will also consider functionally important groups. A report to be provided from the PCSC at each meeting on how to move this forward.	5f	Ongoing
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	Postponed until 2011
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	See item 6a
19	A Stattersfield, M Stanley Price	To initiate a proactive programme to integrate experts from BirdLife's network into cross-sectoral parts of the SSC. Appeal to Chairs to approach BirdLife, e.g., Invasive Species and Species Conservation Planning Sub-committees).	5h(ii)	Ongoing
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)	See item 5i. Andrew Rodrigues to follow up.
30	J Langley, F Launay, M Stanley Price	The re-introduction guidelines now to be reviewed within the CBD targets. Since CBD COP10, these targets are to become more formally enshrined in IUCN policy.	6a	See item 5j
	Y Xie, Y Sadovy, S Broad	In a review on the current guidelines on confiscated animals (adopted in 2000), it was proposed that more detail was required for euthanasia, and to clarify what is meant by humane use and animal welfare. Guidelines in Hong Kong to be reviewed to assist in this process. Other taxa also need to be considered since the guidelines are currently marine and reptile-centric. A proposal to be drafted to move this forward.	6a	Ongoing
	S Stuart	Human-wildlife interactions to be reviewed once the SUSC is up and running again.	6b	Deferred until 2011
	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	See item 6b
	D Leaman, PCSC	Plants are being added to SIS taxon by taxon on a request basis. Any SGs wanting to do SIS-based assessments still need to go through a complicated process of building in the correct taxonomic structure. This has not been helped by the lack of a global list for plants, but this should be solved shortly by Kew, which will assist reporting into SIS. The PCSC is to continue	6i	Ongoing

		working with the RL unit on this.		
	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	See item 6j
	S Stuart	The issue of financial compensation of SSC awards to be considered further at the next meeting of the Steering Committee.	6l	See item 5a
	R Roberts	A list of all members of the SSC Roll of Honour, and Distinguished Service Members would be added to the website.	6l	See item 5a
	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	See item 6b
	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	See item 6b
	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	See item 5p
	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	See item 5a
	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	See item 5m
	S Stuart, J Smart, D Cator, S Broad, Thomasina Oldfield	Following the CITES COP, to develop a new strategic approach to CITES	7k	See item 6d
	JC Vié, Wendy Foden, S Stuart	To identify a chair and members for the SSC Task Force on Climate Change.	8a	Ongoing
	T Contreras MacBeath	To engage Zeb Hogan in Crisis Asia, in view of his focus on large freshwater fishes.	8c	Done
	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	See item 5f
	T Contreras MacBeath	To follow up with the Mexican Government on the possibility of holding the World Species Congress in Mexico.	8g	Currently postponed
	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	See item 6a
	S Stuart	To bring a report and recommendations on Korean issues to the next SC meeting.	9	Report below*
	J Smart/J Hutton	J Hutton to pass over old plant database at UNEP-	9	Ongoing

		WCMC to the PCSC.		
	JC Vié, Wildlife Health SG	IUCN's will contribute to the World Health Organisation on emerging zoonotic diseases through the Wildlife Health SG, which has established a small secretariat to deal with this. In Feb 2011, JC will give a talk at a One Health conference in Paris and continue to follow this up.	9	Ongoing

* Report on Korean issues

The next IUCN World Conservation Congress is to be held in Jeju Island, Korea in September 2012; however, the Government has embarked on a number of controversial projects, of which two are of interest to the SSC due to their apparent lack of consideration to the area's biodiversity. 1) The river diversion '4 rivers' project is being cast in terms of green development but, from the evidence of SSC members, does not factor in biodiversity conservation adequately. IUCN has proposed to the Korean Government to carry out an independent review of this project, with a view to proposing suitable mitigation and conservation measures. However, it is far from clear that this independent review will happen. 2) The reclamation of tidal wetlands (including Song Do and several others) is ongoing in Korea, and is in contravention of an undertaking made by the Government to the last Ramsar Conference to halt the reclamation of tidal wetlands. The loss of tidal wetlands in Korea is implicated in global declines of migratory wetland birds, especially waders. In view of this, the IUCN Director General, Julia Marton-Lefèvre, reminded the Minister of the Environment in Korea of this commitment in a letter in September 2010. S Stuart is discussing these issues with the Ramsar Secretariat.

T Brooks remarked that Song Do and other developments are being communicated as "green economy", but could be otherwise construed as "green washing". A Stattersfield stated that BirdLife International is also engaged in these issues, and needs to liaise with S Stuart so ensure a complementary approach in the way they are tackled. J McNeely suggested that a briefing note should be prepared for individuals attending meetings in Korea prior to Congress, to ensure consistency in the relevant issues and to clarify IUCN's position.

ACTION – S Stuart will prepare an SSC briefing paper on the conservation of Korean wetlands prior to IUCN Congress, and will provide an update to the next Steering Committee meeting.

5. REPORTS

5a. Report of the SSC Chair and Species Programme

Full details to be found on pages 54-150, WCC 4.3 agenda pack.

General Report of the SSC Chair (Simon Stuart; pp. 55-61, WCC 4.3 agenda pack)

S Stuart began by recognising the financial support of all the organisations to the SSC office: Conservation International; Al Ain Wildlife Park and Resort; the MAVA

Foundation; the UNEP World Conservation Monitoring Centre; the World Association of Zoos and Aquariums; Chester Zoo; and Bristol Zoo. He acknowledged all those involved in the Species of the Day initiative and thanked all the staff in the Bath office, as well as the entire Species Programme team. S Stuart also acknowledged the huge accolades received by J Smart from Council, in view of her solid and efficient running of the IUCN delegation at the 10th Meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), in Nagoya, October 2010. S Stuart thanked Jane and her team, highlighting the strong influence of IUCN in getting many of the CBD Targets accepted at the Convention. Many of these Targets will now become key parts of the SSC's agenda until 2020.

S Stuart stated that *CITES*, the 14th Conference of the Parties to the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora, took place in Doha in March with many controversial issues on the agenda including Polar Bears, African Elephants, Bluefin Tuna, Sharks, Tigers, Humphead Wrasse and Corals. There was a deadlock on marine fisheries with none of various listing proposals being adopted, and African Elephants dominated media reports. S Stuart remarked that there is a perception that there has been a reduced attention to science in listing proposal recommendations. However, positive outcomes were achieved with the Rhino, Tigers and Humphead Wrasse (the latter is being followed up by the Indonesian government as a major exporter of this species). D Leaman noted that the Medicinal Plant SG will be preparing a short note on the use of euphorbia species in lipsticks for their new on-line newsletter, Medicinal Plant Conservation. S Stuart gave thanks to D Cator and T Oldfield for their contributions to this meeting.

J Barzdo noted that there were very high expectations of this meeting built up by the media, but the overall results showed that a number of good things had been achieved. J Barzdo added that listings on *CITES* is only one element of the conservation of a species; for example. *CITES* listing is not necessarily designed for the long-term management of commercial fisheries. The value of *CITES* is to put pressure on regional fisheries management organisations, such as the International Convention on the Conservation of Atlantic Tuna (ICCAT), to help ensure sustainable fisheries management.

A Rosenberg noted that the Bluefin Tuna result was not a good one, with only a nominal change in ICCAT resulting from the increased pressure from *CITES*. J Donaldson stated that he believed the role of science (excluding that for the marine species) was far more positive, and that improved scientific information did raise pressure and make a difference for a number of species.

D Leaman announced the launch of the revised FairWild Standard for the sustainable collection of medicinal plants, and noted that certified products were now on the market. The Medicinal Plant SG (MPSG) has also made important contributions to some of the outcomes at *CITES* CoP15 particularly: 1) facilitating a process through which Aveda, Estee Lauder and other cosmetic companies were able to make a case to the *CITES* Plant Committee to recommend exempting finished products of *Eurphorbia antisiphilitica* (including high-quality lipsticks) from documentation requirements, because these do not contribute to conservation measures and may actually undermine range country (Mexico) efforts to promote a sustainable wild harvest; and 2) promoting the use of the International Standard for Sustainable Wild Collection of Medicinal and Aromatic Plants (ISSC-MAP), now incorporated in the FairWild Standard, as a basis for

non-detriment findings for perennial plant species. A summary of these issues is included in an article by Uwe Schippmann in the recent volume of “Medicinal Plant Conservation”, the MPSG newsletter, now available online at: http://cmsdata.iucn.org/downloads/mpc_14_1.pdf.

S Stuart presented an overview of the IUCN Red List updates. There were four in 2010 but, due to the increased workload and lack of processes to support this number, this will be reduced to two updates in 2011. Many plants went on to the Red List this year: 1,203 global species assessments were published, approximately 763 of which were new to the Red List and 440 were reassessments. S Stuart thanked J Donaldson for his work on the Cycad assessments. In total, 9,370 global animal assessments were published. There were regular updates for the amphibians, birds, mammals, quite a few reptiles (from the Sampled Red List Index (SRLI)), and many fish (2,500 each freshwater and marine – 5,000 in total). Results of the assessments showed very high threat levels, for example, in sturgeons, cycads, amphibians, sharks and rays, and reef-building corals. The African Freshwater Assessment which has been carried out over five years was also completed – 6 regions assessed and 5,038 species, and a truly outstanding piece of work.

S Stuart brought attention to the Steering Committee the work that had been carried out during the year on conservation impacts – a synthesis of vertebrate conservation to determine how much worse species would have done without applied biodiversity conservation. Results showed that species decline would have been about 20% worse without conservation measures, which is still likely to be a pretty significant underestimate. S Stuart thanked Mike Hoffmann who led on this work, and the many other contributors to the resulting paper “The Impact of Conservation on the Status of the World’s Vertebrates” published in *Science*, which received excellent publicity. This is a first step within the SSC to give a strong, scientifically rigorous message that conservation can work.

S Stuart discussed national Red Listing and noted that the website for this is set up through ZSL. ZSL has been leading on this and there are plans to expand further. P Medici mentioned that the Brazil Federal Environment Agency has just formalized a partnership with IUCN Brazil, and have set a goal for national Red Listing in Brazil to be completed and published by 2014. J P Rodríguez remarked on the numerous calls for help with National Red Lists, so he is looking into a way that IUCN can support this with a system that can engage people better. J McNeely noted that Finland has just completed national Red Listing for roughly half of the country’s species (21,000 species of 45,000 in total). FINIDA has expressed a keen interest to assist other countries with national Red Listing, by providing expertise and any necessary help. J McNeely added that may be other EU countries could be approached to engage in a similar way.

ACTION – D Cator to communicate FINIDA’s expression of interest in assisting other countries on National Red Listing to R Miller and C Pollock of the Red List Unit.

J Donaldson asked whether or not there is a plan in place to bring data from national Red Lists onto the IUCN Red List. J P Rodríguez answered that the largest obstacle to achieving this relates to taxonomy, as different countries do not always follow the same standards. This could be addressed by making countries aware that if they wish for their national data to be put on the IUCN Red List, they would need to use their follow IUCN’s

taxonomy. S Stuart made the point that many countries have a long history of Red Listing in their country, but that they were not using the data as indicators. The island nations in the Pacific, and sub-Saharan Africa, are the regions with the least capacity in Red Listing.

S Stuart discussed the uses of the IUCN Red List beyond threatened species conservation. It is being used to help determine the Global Environment Facility (GEF) STAR allocations (i.e., the amount of money that each country is eligible for from the biodiversity envelope of GEF). It is also being used for the Biodiversity Indicators Partnership (BIP) in the form of the IUCN Red List Index and several other indicators, and for decision support for the private sector (in the form of the species layers within the online Integrated Biodiversity Assessment Tool (IBAT)). S Stuart also added that the “Barometer of Life” paper, published in *Science* in April 2010, set out an agenda for broadening the profile of the Red List. Together with the co-writer of the paper, E O Wilson, S Stuart and Julia Marton-Lefèvre are to embark on identifying possible investors to fundraise for the 60 million US dollar budget, calculated for the Red List to fulfil its potential as the Barometer of Life.

S Stuart wished to acknowledge and give thanks to the Red List team, in particular C Hilton-Taylor and C Pollock; Resit Akcakaya, Chair of the SSC Standards and Petitions Sub-Committee; and S Butchart, Chair of the RL Technical Working Group. More than anyone else, these people are responsible to taking responsibility for maintaining and enhancing the high standards of the Red List, on which IUCN’s reputation depends more than anything else.

S Stuart noted that the IUCN core support of the Species Programme is still declining, and is now lower than it’s ever been in more than a decade; the Commission Operations Fund (COF) allocation, however, remains level. The total core allocation to IUCN Species is therefore falling, but fundraising for projects is increasingly successful. S Stuart added that the percentage of flexible funding available to the Species Programme has fallen below a critical level (below 20% of the overall budget in 2010), and this message needs to be conveyed to Council. A Rosenberg confirmed that the same patterns are happening in many organisations, with much more project than core funding. T Brooks asked if there was anything that the RL partnership could do to voice concern. S Stuart suggested a careful approach was needed with ongoing direct discussions. JC Vié added that network support, beyond the RL, is the aspect of the work most seriously affected through the reduction in core funding, e.g., support of the SSC network and its ability to engage with processes such as CITES and post-Nagoya follow-up. A Rosenberg suggested the need to emphasise what project funding cannot do. D Leaman also suggested presenting information to show how much of the project-related funding is supporting the network, rather than the programme.

S Stuart mentioned that the Species Conservation Planning Sub-Committee was now up and running, as is the SSC-WCPA Task-Force on Biodiversity and Protected Areas. Ten new Climate Change Flagship Species have been identified, and a manuscript is to be sent to a high impact journal early in 2011 which assesses species’ vulnerability to global climate change. S Stuart noted that W Foden is now an IPCC lead author (Chapter 19), but that this was an unfunded mandate.

S Stuart stated that he is currently raising funds for the Sustainable Use SG (SUSG), and it will be re-launched with jointly with CEESP. Y Xie asked about whether this could

include an element focusing on trophy hunting, because this is a big focus within China. S Stuart confirmed that re-launching the SUSG was one of his highest priorities for major action in 2011 together with supporting the Invasive Species SG. The Amphibian Survival Alliance (ASA) has already received contributions from donors and the Executive Director position is currently undergoing short-listing. The Action Asia initiative has a new collaboration with EAZA, with a joint campaign starting in September 2011. Will Duckworth has been hired to lead a fundraising campaign for this work.

Recently, S Stuart and JC Vié had attended the International Tiger Forum in St Petersburg. The Global Tiger Recovery Plan was adopted and funding committed that amounted to approximately 50 million US dollars. Commitment was also made to double tigers in the wild, in range states, by 2022. S Stuart noted that positive discussions have been held with WWF, WCS and TRAFFIC about following up collaboratively post-St. Petersburg on how to move forward with the Global Tiger Forum and the Global Tiger Initiative (GTI).

S Stuart announced that Save Our Species (SOS) is now operational and was launched at CBD in Nagoya. S Stuart noted that a report was written with the IUCN Crane SG for the Poyang Lake, China, intervention. The plan is to raise the level of the lake, causing serious concern for the damage to biodiversity. This is a good example where IUCN expertise can be used to reach out to governments to effect conservation change.

S Stuart confirmed that George Rabb had agreed to the establishment of the Award for Conservation Innovation in his honour. G Rabb has generously pledged initial funding for the award.

S Stuart ended his update giving special thanks to J Smart and JC Vié.

General Report on the Species Programme (Jane Smart; pp. 62-69, WCC 4.3 agenda pack)

J Smart opened her presentation with an overview of the Species Programme team, showing its growth in numbers to now over 40 people.

ACTION – C Santer to add photographs to Species Programme organogram

J Smart also discussed: the Biodiversity Conservation Group, the Red List support of the SSC, the Marine Biodiversity Unit, the Freshwater Biodiversity Unit (African assessments are now completed so work is now moving into Asia), Red List training, communications and marketing and the Red List scale, fundraising and the process of forming a new charity in the UK), and the work on climate change and invasive species (and the need to update IUCN Guidelines on the latter).

J Smart provided a brief overview of the CBD meetings that took place in 2010 including the UN General Assembly, with a reminder that IUCN helped draft the CBD from the outset. J Smart noted that the 'triple deal' outcome of the CBD in Nagoya focused on the Protocol on Access and Benefit Sharing (ABS), the Resource Mobilization Strategy and the 2011-2020 CBD Strategic Plan. J Smart added that ABS is now legally binding but that the hard negotiating on Resource Mobilization will be postponed until 2011. ABS and Resource Mobilization are covered within the CBD Strategic Plan, which has

adopted a vision for 2050 and a mission for 2020 with 20 targets. The IUCN was very influential with its inputs into CBD Strategic Plan, particularly on target 12 and species extinctions. J Smart talked about whether the new CBD Strategic Plan can really work towards halting biodiversity loss. She emphasised that there was now a challenge on how best to integrate the new CBD Strategic Plan into the IUCN programme of work, and this will be discussed at Council.

J Baillie asked about national green accounting and which countries were not keen to enter into this. J Smart answered that it was the Latin American countries, in particular those in the ALBA Group such as Bolivia and Venezuela, who were not enthusiastic about it. There was a misunderstanding that green accounting was seen as a means of “selling nature off”, specifically the “commodification” of nature. J Smart added that there needs to be a way of incorporating the findings of the TEEB report into national policy.

5b. Report of the Red List Committee (Jeff McNeely; *pp. 62-69, WCC 4.3 agenda pack*)

The first meeting of the new Red List Committee was held on 1–2 November, 2010. J McNeely discussed the Red List in terms of what the different members can do. The Red List is IUCN’s flagship and over the last few years has increased in importance. J McNeely stressed the need to exploit the new targets of the CBD strategic plan, as there are at least 13 of the 20 where the Red List is able to make a contribution. The Red List meeting discussed a strategic plan for the Red List, built upon the current four-year IUCN programme, the SSC/Species Programme strategic plan and 1998 Red List strategy.

J McNeely outlined what the strategic plan would do and the Red List Committee discussed the following: 1) to develop ways to provide better support to our data providers; 2) to publish all final Red List species sheets with DOI numbers to allow them to be treated as a publication. This would benefit those having their data published, as it would be treated as a journal article and therefore citeable, which would act as an incentive for those contributing to the Red List; 3) enhance the relevance and number of applications (e.g. IPBES, GEF, CBD, FAO) and private sector work. There needs to be more effort spent in getting institutions to better understand the relevance of the RL; 4) identify more opportunities to promote the Red List, and increase its exposure through holding workshops as part of larger events (e.g. Society for Conservation Biology); 5) promote more applications at the national level; 6) identify ways of linking the Red List to all relevant conventions, for example, the World Trade Organization needs to be persuaded to take onboard the responsibility of invasive species, since species are spread by trade; 7) increase the linkages between the Red List and GIS databases through SIS; 8) enhance the relevance of the Red List to other major issues like climate change; 9) develop ways to enhance the quality of data; 10) recommend who does what to convert the Red List strategy into species conservation action; 11) ensure that there are at least 5–10 good project concepts to accompany every launch of a new edition of the Red List. Every time the Red List is launched, there are some new challenges which are answered or responded to.

J McNeely asked what the focus of the Red List should be. Should it be on expanding the number of species assessed, or reducing the number of data deficient entries? Or

should time series be built in to allow trends to be investigated? J McNeely believed that all of these should be considered.

J McNeely outlined the four elements which are key to the way forward: 1) species are relevant to all sectors of society (e.g., agriculture, trade, energy, economics, health, biomimicry, national security (best lands for biodiversity) etc.) and pollinators which provide services worth billions of dollars. If species are lost it affects overall ecosystem resilience; 2) build stronger scientific support (e.g., linkages with the Barcode of Life), and recognizing that losing species negatively affects ecosystem resilience; conversely, restoration enhances ecosystem productivity; 3) building stronger public support and getting more people involved with conservation (including children); 4) identifying the values of species and ecosystems (e.g., through TEEB); 4) communicating this to the public.

The next RLC meeting will be in Washington DC, May 2011. The proposal is to have open attendance at the National Zoo, bringing in people from government and other members of IUCN and to show them how they can both benefit from the Red List and contribute to it.

J Donaldson asked how to engage with other organizations that might have different species priorities than Red List. J McNeely stated that it was important to communicate how other organizations can use the Red List for their own needs. There is a portfolio of project concepts that are considered to be the highest priority. There needs to be diversity in the approach to conservation, using the Red List in a way that is most appropriate to the need and to be creative in its use.

Y Xie wanted clarification on using the Red List for environmental/biodiversity impact assessments. It would be helpful if the Red List Committee could discuss processes for regular updating of national Red Lists, for China and many other countries, as they don't have a mechanism for updating their Red Lists. The use of national Red List data also needs to be promoted better. J McNeely confirmed that the Committee has a National Red List Working Group and that they can consider these kinds of questions. There is already a clear linkage with the private sector that uses the Red List to make decisions about where to develop.

ACTION: Y Xie to discuss with J Baillie and JP Rodríguez on national Red Lists, and how the National Red List Working Group can engage with China.

R Brownell noted that, relating to the updated Cetacean Action Plan, if species are going to be conserved in the marine environment, it has to be at the population or sub-population level. J McNeely confirmed that a meeting report had just been published dealing with this issue. S Stuart added that a paper is due to be published in BioScience that also deals with this issue. P Medici mentioned that assessments are being done per biome in Brazil and T Contreras added that the Salmon SG is also working at the population level.

Y Sadovy asked about the Red List Committee membership in terms of covering all the regions. S Stuart replied that membership is defined in the Red List Partnership Agreement and is reasonably balanced across the regions. T Brooks, however, felt that a broader geographic representation was needed and S Stuart agreed this may need to be reviewed.

J P Rodríguez noted that he supported the idea of DOIs to be able to have citation, with the Red List data counting as a publication. The plan is to get to stage where new assessments will have a DOI, but this will not happen retrospectively to existing assessments. More discussion on DOIs will need to take place, not least because the Steering Committee member who was most involved in promoting this issue, Anders Rhodin, was unable to attend this meeting.

ACTION: Red List Committee and Red List Technical Working Group to formulate a clear plan for publishing new RL accounts with DOIs.

5c. Report of the Invertebrate Conservation Sub-Committee (ICSC) (M Samways; pp. 174-196, WCC 4.3 agenda pack)

M Samways provided the report of the ICSC, providing an overview of the composition of the sub-committee and outlining the formation of new Specialist Groups since the last Steering Committee meeting: the Grasshopper SG, the South Asian Invertebrate SG and the Butterfly SG. The Bumblebee SG needed to be ratified at this meeting.

M Samways noted that The Terrestrial Invertebrate Red List Authority (TIRLA) has undertaken an exercise for prioritising the selection of future groups, mainly by using their value as service providers, cultural significance and role in monitoring systems. There has been lots of activity in the various groups; for example, the Dragonfly SG has been very active with freshwater assessments.

J Robinson asked how the taxonomic priorities for network expansion were dealt with by the ICSC. M Samways replied that the new SGs tend to arise and grow organically (e.g., the Bumblebee SG). In general, the ICSC is prioritizing groups for which there is enough knowledge and capacity for them to function well within the SSC structure.

Y Xie noted that a significant number of invertebrate species in have been evaluated and included on the Chinese national Red List. M Samways noted that if there are good regional assessments for endemic invertebrates from China, these could be put on the IUCN Red List. These regional assessments need to pass through TIRLA in the first instance, before going to the Red List Unit.

ACTION: Y Xie to contact J Gerlach (TIRLA) to discuss how the endemic Chinese invertebrates can be brought on to the IUCN Red List.

5d. Report of the Marine Conservation Sub-Committee (MCSC) (Y Sadovy; pp. 197-202, WCC 4.3 agenda pack)

Y Sadovy reported that the MCSC e-bulletin is going well, and there has been another call for contributions from all SSC marine people. The last meeting was held at the IUCN HQ in Gland, in June 2010. The Committee is currently working on gathering suitable marine stories to be used by the IUCN Director General, and to give greater profile to marine issues for presentations, etc. Y Sadovy also brought attention to the '20 seconds of truth' YouTube video.

Y Sadovy noted that a focus of the MCSC would be on trade and use data, as this information does not currently exist for many species on the Red List. There has been an attempt to try and capture this kind of data in assessment workshops but it has not been too successful so far. A separate project might be developed to get better results. The MCSC is working with TRAFFIC to develop terms of reference for a trade mapping project. This will initially begin with a couple of species to examine where there are enforcement bottlenecks (e.g., Humphead Wrasse is one example). Another focus of the MCSC is to promote conservation issues more effectively in the policy arena, e.g., in regional fishery management organisations (RFMOs). A matrix is being developed, with the support of J Langley and the IUCN Global Marine Programme, to identify where the IUCN already has representation with RFMOs, and to reveal the highest-priority gaps for further engagement with RFMOs.

Y Sadovy highlighted a policy paper had been drawn up by members of the MCSC responding to the Gulf of Mexico oil spill. This paper, which highlights the value of Red List data in informing the long-term response to the oil spill, is pending a revision with a view to being published in BioScience. There has also been discussion on the outcome of CITES COP15, and how marine species are being dealt regarding CITES implementation. By-catch has been prioritized by the MCSC as needing much greater attention within the SSC and IUCN, including the impacts of fisheries on habitats, non-target invertebrates, etc. Y Sadovy stressed that the sticking point in moving ahead with a by-catch initiative was identifying someone who is available and willing to lead it. S Stuart asked the SSC if anyone would be willing to develop a by-catch approach with the MCSC to progress this issue. A Rosenberg offered his support, together with M Samways. J Baillie noted that Selfridges in London, UK, will promote the issue of ocean biodiversity for six weeks early in 2011 and that by-catch will be one of the issues profiled. J Baillie asked if anyone had any creative ideas for this to please let him know.

Y Sadovy added that there is little documentation of relative volumes of species in by-catch, and that here might be way to encourage the collection of this kind of information on boats. M Samways asked if there had been any extinctions of invertebrates from by-catch. Y Sadovy thought that this was very likely in Asian coastal waters. T Brooks mentioned that there is evidence of coastal mollusc extinction from Australia.

ACTION: Y Sadovy to liaise with A Rosenberg and M Samways on the by-catch issue.

J McNeely commented on the Census of Marine Life, where 5,000 new species were discovered and asked if there was a way that the Red List could take advantage of this data. A Rosenberg suggested that the obvious connection would be through the Ocean Biogeographic Information System (OBIS), and added that the Red List would need to drill down to the species accounts in OBIS to retrieve the relevant data, but that this should be feasible. There should be deep links from the Red List species accounts to the OBIS accounts. T Brooks noted Daniel Pauly's comments on the Census of Marine Life published in Nature Geoscience with regards to the lack of top-down coordination, and suggested that this could be a chance to engage the IUCN Global Marine Species Assessment. T Brooks also added that there was an important linkage between the SSC-WCPA Biodiversity and Protected Areas Task Force and the Global Ocean Biodiversity Initiative (GOBI) on the identification of ecologically and biologically significant marine areas.

ACTION: J McNeely to liaise with K Carpenter on the linkage between the Red List and the Census of Marine Life and OBIS.

5e. Report of the Plant Conservation Sub-Committee (PCSC) (J Donaldson; *pp. 203-218, WCC 4.3 agenda pack*)

J Donaldson reported that the last PCSC meeting was held in November 2010 at the IUCN HQ in Gland. Among the highlights, the South African Red List had recently been launched, and the Global Strategy for Plant Conservation was adopted at CBD COP10 in Nagoya, and now provides 16 targets for plant conservation for the next ten years.

J Donaldson noted that the PCSC has identified Red List priorities for plants which include cycads, conifers, cacti, legumes, orchids and palms, which are systematic assessments, together with thematic priorities e.g., crop wild relatives, medicinal plants, trees, and CITES taxa.

Progress on plant assessments is good. Cycads and conifers are completed; there has been good progress with cacti; palms are now underway; the SRLI is largely completed, and economically important plants and range-restricted plant data (South Africa, Brazil) are both gaining momentum.

J Donaldson reported that the 'Useful Wild Plants' proposal is being worked on, mainly for medicinal plants, trees, and crop wild relatives. The aim of this to try to parcel the proposal into appropriate units for funding. The PCSC has also been looking at what Plant SGs exist and what other ones should be created. Legumes have been selected as a priority, and a Pacific Island Plant SG (Alan Tye is to submit a proposal for this). The grasses and carnivorous plants have also been looked at, but these are likely to come later. The PCSC is working on raising the profile of plants in global initiatives, for example through the SRLI, national Red Lists, South African data, and analysis of assessed data (e.g., cycads, conifers, mangroves, cacti and seagrasses).

J Donaldson reported that the PCSC has discussed completing more plant assessments. There have been problems in getting plants on to the IUCN Red List. One of perceived barriers was the level of documentation required for each assessment, some of which has been identified by the PCSC as excessive for the plant assessments. There are five issues which could significantly hold up plant assessments: 1) common names in other languages; 2) GIS range map of species' distribution; 3) conservation actions classification scheme; 4) research classification scheme; 5) utilization classification scheme.

S Stuart noted that the documentation standards are included in the Terms of Reference of the Red List Authorities. The next opportunity to revise these will occur at the beginning of next IUCN Quadrennium at the end of 2012. In view of this, S Stuart proposed asking the Red List Technical Working Group (RLTWG) to start reviewing the documentation requirements now, with a view to proposing any changes to the Red List Committee and Steering Committee well before the end of this Quadrennium. J Smart agreed that the outcome of these results from the RLTWG should be fed back to the SSC Steering Committee for review. M Hoffmann mentioned the good progress with the cactus assessments. He stated that Barbara Goettsch has estimated that only

US\$50,000 is required to complete these assessments. The SC was asked if they knew of any suitable sources of funds for this.

ACTION: Red List Technical Working Group to review the Red List documentation requirements, and to make a proposal for any modifications. This proposal should be presented to the Red List Committee for approval and then to the Steering Committee for final adoption, for implementation in the next IUCN Quadrennium.

5f. Report of the Species Conservation Planning Sub-Committee (SCPSC) (M Stanley Price; pp. 219-221, WCC 4.3 agenda pack)

M Stanley Price reported that the SCPSC had a useful event in May during the Conservation Breeding SG (CBSG) meeting, looking at species conservation planning tools. M Stanley Price confirmed that membership of the SCPSC is now established. The SCPSC has asked the CBSG to take the lead on a Tool Development Working Group and Caroline Lees will lead on this.

Mark Stanley-Price met with Species Programme and SSC staff in June at IUCN Headquarters to discuss SSC Specialist Groups that would benefit from more planning support. The SCPSC will facilitate its work by attending meetings of Specialist Groups that are creating new plans or revising existing ones. Priority species for support will be identified through a 3-strand approach of post-hoc, opportunistic and strategic approaches.

The former Species Conservation Planning Task Force produced a species conservation planning handbook, though its coverage of all the aspects of species planning was not uniform. Gaps have been identified in the process and an SCPSC working group will help fill those gaps. M Stanley Price stated that species conservation planning has to be looked at in terms of the different regional/national contexts, and approaches may need to be less prescriptive than the guidelines in the current species conservation planning handbook.

ACTION – D Cator to assist the SCPSC with finding resources for the next meeting in late March 2011.

M Stanley Price also mentioned the need for a wider array of taxonomic and geographical expertise on the SCPSC, and the Steering Committee was asked to suggest possible suitable candidates. There are also other organisations involved on this work, such as BirdLife and the Cat SG, so it would be useful to harmonise the approach with these groups.

ACTION: M Stanley Price to liaise with A Stattersfield on BirdLife participation in the SCPSC.

M Stanley Price confirmed that a figure has been discussed for developing a species conservation plan, and this is approximately 50,000 USD. But, ideas of how to cut costs, maximize impact, and get countries to pay for such plans, need to be identified. M Stanley Price would welcome any ideas and offers of engagement on this.

M Samways asked how the new generation of SSC plans would relate to the old SSC action plans. Will they be living documents, and how was the 50,000 USD figure derived? M Stanley Price suggested that one possible way of economising was to not pay participants in-country. Also costs could be minimised cost by using electronic documents on the internet. M Stanley Price noted that conservation rarely works in a linear way; adaptive management needs to be built in to create a flexible process. T Brooks suggested that there needs to be tighter connections between the SCPSC's work and the Red List process, for example making greater use of the Threats and Conservation Actions classification schemes. J Baillie added that a number of action plans have been posted on the National Red List website. J Robinson asked what core elements needing further work were identified from the handbook review process. M Stanley Price replied that a more comprehensive version two of the handbook would be envisaged in a couple of years. One of the problems with the handbook is that there are six levels of thinking (objectives, goals, strategies, etc.) which is very difficult to distinguish with different languages.

5g. Report of the Freshwater Conservation Sub-Committee (FCSC) (T Contreras; pp. 222-224, WCC 4.3 agenda pack)

T Contreras reported on this recently created Sub-Committee, which was approved by the SSC Sub-Committee in January 2010. Financial support of £7,000 was received from North of England Zoological Society, which enabled the first preparatory meeting to get underway at Chester Zoo in November 2010. The functions of the FCSC were discussed, in particular how to raise the profile of freshwater issues, how to address freshwater priorities, how to widen the scope of freshwater internally within IUCN, fundraising, and how to better stimulate field conservation. There are about 25 SGs related to freshwater and the FCSC wants to strengthen the relationships between them. T Contreras noted that the FCSC's main focus would be to support the Global Freshwater Biodiversity Assessment to completion. A core group has been proposed which will be finalised before the next Strategic Planning Meeting in June/July 2011.

M de Poorter suggested linking the FCSC with the Invasive Species SG (ISSG) and J McNeely suggested another good link would be with the soon-to-be-formed SSC Climate Change Task Force (CCTF).

ACTION: T Contreras to build links with the ISSG (through M de Poorter), the CCTF (though W Foden); J Langley to assist with making suitable links between the FCSC and the IUCN Water Programme.

M Samways noted that the formation of this group was very timely in respect to feeding into the 2020 CBD targets and ecosystem services issues. M Samways asked if other systems should be looked into that could also be connected, e.g., arctic and tropical forest systems. S Stuart confirmed that forest systems are already an area of strength which many SGs are covering, but freshwater and marine have not received sufficient attention from SSC over the years. Generally the SSC has established sub-committees to address areas of work that need building up (such as invertebrates, plants, marine, freshwater, species conservation planning, etc). J Smart was happy that the formation of the FCSC will move the freshwater work on and help to raise its profile.

5h. SSC Specialist Group Update (Mike Hoffmann; pp. 225-246, WCC 4.3 agenda pack) and **5i. SSC Red List Authority Update** (Mike Hoffmann; pp. 247-253, WCC 4.3 agenda pack)

These two agenda items were considered simultaneously.

M Hoffmann reported that, at the last update, the SSC now had 7,400 members. By the time registration is completed, this is likely to increase to over 8,000. There are 122 SGs with Chairs currently appointed and who have accepted, and there are 76 SGs that have appointed an RLA within the SG. There is still a need to appoint some other RLA Focal Points (FPs). M Hoffmann noted that SG Chairs are being encouraged to carefully consider the capacity of RLA FP, if they are standing in this position too. The Stand-Alone RLAs all have FPs except the newly approved Snakes and Lizards RLA, for which a Focal Point is currently being sought. M Hoffmann also stated that the new MOU with Wetlands International (WI) has just been signed, and this governs how SSC and WI work together on the SGs that they share.

C Santer asked for feedback on published monthly SSC E-Bulletins and also content for future issues. Through IUCN's new content management (CMS) system, the team is now able to see who views the bulletin and what they click on for interest.

M Hoffmann reported on the new set of guidelines for proponents interested in establishing new SGs. The guidelines outline that new SGs need a clear conservation need, a core group of people available to service the expertise of the group, a clear taxonomic remit, and an enthusiastic Chair to drive the SG forward. These guidelines are now in use, and have already been used for two proposals that are now for consideration. The *Bombus* (Bumblebee) SG has been proposed (Annex 4, WCC 4.3 agenda pack). M Samways suggested that the SG should be called the Bumblebee SG. The SSC SC confirmed that the new SG should be called Bumblebee SG, not the *Bombus* SG, and, on that basis, the formation of this group was approved.

The second proposal was for establishment of a Vulture SG (Annex 5, WCC 4.3 agenda pack). The conservation issue of vultures are: the severe declines due to poisoning by Diclofenic (and other drugs); direct poisoning in Africa; trade in vulture parts for medicinal purposes (South Africa); and habitat loss. The group will have a global focus, and there is already a list of members able to provide suitable expertise.

A Stattersfield noted caution on the formation of SGs which need to add value and not repeat effort. However, A Stattersfield felt that the process of forming this SG had been handled very well using the guidelines, and that the dual approach between the Old and New World vultures would be beneficial. T Brooks suggested that the membership should ensure that the range states were well covered, and included experts from the Peregrine Fund and National Aviary (Philadelphia). S Stuart added that other organisations in India would also need to be linked in. M Stanley Price suggested that since recovery of vulture populations will require re-introduction, it would be useful to link with the Re-introduction SG. S Stuart stressed that a regionally-balanced membership would be required to bring together individuals from key institutions. The SSC SC agreed to the establishment of a Vulture SG, but with the condition of seeing the membership list prior to establishment in order to ensure that it is balanced across the regions in which vultures occur.

M Hoffmann outlined other expressions of interest for forming SSC SGs. These included: a Pangolin SG (which would be the re-establishment of a former SG), a Penguin SG (not supported by BirdLife as formation of the group was related to project funding); an Owl SG; a Python and Boa SG; an Aquatic Plant SG (the formation of which is contingent upon funding); a Pacific Island Plant SG; and a Caribbean Island Plant SG.

A Stattersfield noted that in relation to the establishment of new bird SGs, it is important to remember that a separate Red List Authority for all birds is already in place. The update of bird Red Listing is via an internet discussion forum. There will be an annual invitation for contributors to this forum as future Red List updates are carried out.

M Hoffmann concluded by noting that there are a number of SGs that have not yet submitted their membership lists. These will be reported on at the next meeting.

ACTION: C Santer to prepare a report on SSC SG and Stand-Alone RLA membership for the next Steering Committee meeting.

5j. Revisions to Re-introduction Guidelines and Policy Statement on Translocation of Living Organisms (F Launay; pp. 254-257, WCC 4.3 agenda pack)

F Launay reported that a new task force under both the Re-introduction SG (RSG) and Invasive Species SG (ISSG) had been created to lead the revision of the Re-introduction Guidelines and the Policy Statement on Translocation of Living Organisms. F Launay is working closely with M Stanley Price to identify a network of people to consult both within and outside the IUCN network; the consultation needs to be a broad and well managed process. F Launay noted that the existing guidelines focus a lot on reactive situations, but not proactive “conservation introduction” where possible common traits could link to a number of taxa. It is important to have a structured decision-making process before embarking on a proactive conservation solution. The proposal is to revise the guidelines in order to develop a structured decision-making process which will address all the issues and questions necessary when a re-introduction takes place.

M Stanley Price added that there will be another RSG/ISSG Task Force meeting early in 2011. There is a need to examine the issues surrounding re-introduction. For example, is it a species that merits moving? Have all the ethical, technical, and social issues that are linked with the process been addressed? What is the ability to predict the effects of habitat loss and fragmentation, as well as climate change?

S Stuart suggested linking the group with JP Rodríguez regarding his work on priority setting. M de Poorter asked if the group had considered seeking advice from lawyers. For example, if a species is moved and it subsequently becomes invasive, what are legal implications of this? M Stanley Price confirmed that they were looking into this, but the right questions needed to be thought out. D Leaman mentioned the enrichment planting of medicinal plants. M Stanley Price acknowledged that this had not yet been considered.

S Stuart concluded with thanks to the Al Ain Wildlife Park and Resort for generously funding this work.

5k. SSC-WCPA Joint Task Force on Biodiversity and Protected Areas (T Brooks; pp. 258-269, WCC 4.3 agenda pack)

T Brooks presented an update on the SSC-WCPA joint Task Force on Biodiversity and Protected Areas (PAs). T Brooks stated that most species are threatened by habitat loss, and the linkage between safeguarding species through protecting areas has been pervasive over the last few years. However, there has been some difficulty in bringing Species and PAs together internally within IUCN, so the task force is a mechanism to establish that linkage. The task force has two main objectives for this quadrennium: to evaluate which factors increase the likelihood that PAs are successful for safeguarding biodiversity; and secondly to convene a technical and consultative process to establish criteria for defining the biodiversity conservation significance of sites.

T Brooks reported that the first Task Force committee meeting was held in August 2010, and two other informal meetings have also been held on the fringes of other meetings during the year. Some initial progress has been made on communications for the task force, e.g., the TF details are now available on the IUCN website, and Google groups have also been established. With regard to the evaluation of the conditions that increase the chances of PAs delivering biodiversity benefits, T Brooks noted that this was being addressed through collaboration with academia, and that two graduate students will be allocated to working full-time on this. The data used will include PA data at UNEP-WCMC, the new Protected Planet data, species population time-series data, and the ZSL/WWF Living Planet Index work. The Task Force will also start outreach through the IUCN Commissions to seek further data sets to feed into this process.

T Brooks talked of progress on consolidating standards for finding sites of conservation significance. The main progress on this was the success at CBD COP10 in Nagoya, e.g., Target 11 of the Strategic Plan which contains important language on the strategic and targeted expansion of PAs. T Brooks also noted that there would be revisions to the PA programme of work, with an emphasis on national gap analyses and safeguarding the most important sites for biodiversity. The Global Strategy on Plant Conservation (GSPC) and safeguarding important areas for plant conservation will also be included in the work programme, as well as seeking opportunities for coordinating with organisations such as Ramsar and UNESCO. T Brooks also reported that over the last few months, links were being made with the Alliance for Zero Extinction (AZE), and a process is being put in place to establish a dedicated funding mechanism for AZE.

T Brooks outlined the next steps for this second objective of the task force: 1) to establish a set of technical task groups to develop papers on key issues; 2) to hold a series of regional consultations; 3) to convene a global workshop to create a document for the next IUCN Congress; 4) to hire a staff coordinator – applications have been received and a shortlist is now being selected for interviews. The task force will also be sending out targeted invitations to other stakeholders.

D Leaman asked if the task force been in contact with Liz Radford from Plantlife. T Brooks confirmed this. J Hutton noted that selling the importance of protected areas and AZEs to corporate business has been easy, but they do not understand KBAs more generically. We have to inoculate the concept into processes such as the IFC's performance standards so that it rises in importance over time. T Sandwith mentioned

that many regions will plan meetings in the lead up to the World Parks Congress, and so suggested that this could be a good opportunity to test out signature products.

5I. Mohamed bin Zayed (MBZ) Species Conservation Fund (F Launay; pp. 270-274, WCC 4.3 agenda pack)

F Launay announced that Abu Dhabi is willing to host the second SSC SG Chair's meeting. There was much positive feedback from the SG Chairs regarding the previous meeting, so the SSC is keen to try and host these more regularly. S Stuart said they would be happy to accept the invitation and suggested that the proposed meeting should take place early in 2012.

F Launay provided an overview of the MBZ Fund which has been working very successfully. It has received almost 800 applications so far, and is likely to reach 1,000 by the year end. There are 334 projects worldwide currently receiving money to date. There is no real formal strategic approach to grant approval; it is done on a case-by-case basis with the emphasis on supporting grass root projects. In terms of the fund allocation to species groups, the proportion of projects from mammals far exceeds that of any other taxa. If this is further broken down into the allocation to RL categories, there is a great deal of potential for the Data Deficient and Not Evaluated species as, typically, these often do not receive much funding from other sources. The fund will actively seek proposals such as these, and also for under-represented species.

F Launay confirmed the next round of funding will be agreed in March 2011. The focus will continue to be on expanding the diversity and reach of the funds, both taxonomically and geographically. Some longer-term projects will also be identified and recognition will be provided for conservation leaders.

T Contreras noted that money from the fund had been used to encourage governments to provide further financing for a conservation initiative. By taking a \$15k MBZ grant to his local government, their response was to provide a further \$100k for habitat restoration.

A Rosenberg asked if the MBZ funding can be used to support RL workshops. F Launay confirmed this.

M Hoffmann added that an exercise had been carried out to look at the projects that MBZ has funded in association with the relevant SGs. There needs to be an increased awareness of the existence of the fund, and to encourage more SGs to submit proposals. M Hoffmann suggested that certain groups are very good at this, but it would help to take a more proactive approach with groups that are not currently exploiting this opportunity. The Chairs meeting may benefit by having a session on helping and training people to write proposals.

J Smart emphasised the need to better promote the MBZ fund amongst the plant and invertebrates SGs. The communities working on birds and mammals are often very different from those that work on other groups of species. Those working on plants and invertebrates are often more academic and are not necessarily "conservation people" in the first instance. They may not be aware of the available funding mechanisms, and

often have little fundraising experience, with limited connection into the right networks. There is a need to reach out to these communities in particular.

J Hutton asked if data are going to be shared on applicants. F Launay confirmed that, for example with SOS, it was necessary to avoid duplication and there may have to be representatives on review panels and respective working groups.

5m. Save our Species (JC Vié; pp. 275-276, WCC 4.3 agenda pack)

JC Vié presented an overview of Save our Species (SOS). Two million US dollars will be spent in the first year. Steering Committee members are encouraged to identify companies that might want to contribute to SOS, or species that may need funding individually. JC Vié noted that maximum complementarity needs to be ensured between SOS and the Mohamed bin Zayed Species Conservation Fund (MBZ). A working group of 11 people has been formed and will meet around June 2011. The review process for funding allocation will rely heavily on the support of the SSC network, and the process must be transparent and objective.

T Brooks suggested pushing to maximize the value of the relationships with the contributing companies, so that they are not donating relatively small amounts for a big gain on their part (and possibly green washing). Incentives could be offered to double the amounts they contribute, e.g., bring them onboard to IBAT. JC Vié confirmed that this is happening with Nokia, who are assisting with communications by developing a 'green application'. JC Vié added that there is a small amount of money in SOS for Red Listing. J Baillie asked whether SOS could be a vehicle for getting money from the Global Environment Fund (GEF) through to national Red List assessments. JC Vié confirmed this.

D Leaman asked about how SOS would deal with broader taxonomic priorities. JC Vié answered that the technical working group will propose two to four major funding blocks, e.g., on taxonomy, geography, threat, that will run for that year.

A Stattersfield questioned how the SSC will input into the process. JC Vié stated that for 2011 the priorities were established, but that the working group will need to work on the priorities for the following year. S Stuart added that four or five people from the SSC network would be represented on the working group anyway, and that L Boitani was chairing it.

J Robinson questioned who will be approaching the companies. JC Vié confirmed that this would be himself, S Stuart, J Marton-Lefèvre and Monique Barbut (CEO and Chairperson of GEF).

T Contreras proposed that freshwater fishes need consideration for SOS support.

P Medici asked if individuals could identify donors for certain animal groups. JC Vié suggested using the SOS package to approach donors with earmarking of funds for specific species or animal groups. JC Vié stressed that the IUCN Secretariat is not eligible to have its own field projects funded through SOS, and that if the SSC SGs want to apply to the fund, they will need to follow this up through another organisation, not through IUCN.

S Stuart thanked JC Vié for all his hard work and dedication in getting SOS up and running and also thanks were also given to L Boitani for his involvement.

5n. Proposal to revise the current IUCN Technical Guidelines on the Management of *ex-situ* Populations for Conservation (B Lacy; pp. 277-278, WCC 4.3 agenda pack)

A Skype call was set up in the meeting and was attended externally by Bob Lacy, Kristin Leus, Bob Lacy, Phil McGowan, and Cathy Taylor Houlser.

B Lacy provided the background on the revision of the Technical Guidelines of the Management of *ex-situ* Populations for Conservation. The need for their revision has been stimulated by the widely varied interpretations of the existing guidelines.

ACTION: The Steering Committee agreed that the Technical Guidelines of the Management of ex-situ Populations for Conservation should be revised through a consultation process, and requested that CBSG lead this process.

M Stanley Price noted that the important question was when should a species be taken in and managed in captivity. B Lacy agreed that there needs to be clarity on when it is appropriate to bring a species into a captive programme.

S Stuart asked what the timeline is on the revision of the document. K Leus explained that a first draft will be worked on over the next couple of months, so that something can be produced relatively quickly. The CBSG would like the revision to be completed to coincide with the next SSC SC meeting.

S Stuart suggested collaborating with M Stanley Price who is currently working on the Reintroduction Guidelines. C Taylor Housler asked whether people working on different taxonomic groups could give their input into the guidelines. M Hoffmann suggested taking the guidelines to the different Sub-Committees, and also suggested that members of SC should propose names of individuals who could provide useful input to the revision of the guidelines. T Contreras suggested Gordon Reid to do this from the perspective of the FCSC.

K Leus is the focal point within CBSG for the revision of these guidelines.

ACTION: Chairs of the Sub-Committees and SC members to nominate suitable individuals with whom the CBSG could liaise on the revision of the guidelines. M Hoffmann to coordinate.

5o. The SSC and Priority Setting (J P Rodríguez; p. 279, WCC 4.3 agenda pack)

JP Rodríguez identified three situations for the SSC and priority setting: 1) the CBSG and how to plan for re-introductions; 2) the development of National Red Lists; 3) how to decide on which species should be selected for species conservation planning.

However, the work on priority setting was still in its infancy, and the next step was to hold a workshop to get the work started.

JP Rodríguez noted that expressions of interest have been received with a view to raising funds for a workshop in October 2011.

6. REPORTING FROM MAJOR ITEMS OF WORK

6a. World Species Congress (S Stuart; pp. 297-305, WCC 4.3 agenda pack)

S Stuart introduced this topic and reminded the Steering Committee members that the World Species Congress (WSC) was called for in an IUCN Congress resolution in 2008, and that this resolution was subsequently prioritised by Council. This showed that there was significant support for the idea of a WSC. S Stuart noted that IUCN does not usually like to organize major Congresses closer together than two-year interval. The problem with this policy, however, is that the WSC could not be held until 2018 (World Conservation Congresses in 2012 and 2016, and the World Parks Congress in 2014). Most people in SSC that S Stuart had spoken to felt that 2018 would be much too late for the WSC.

J Smart noted that there is a formal process that must be followed in organizing any IUCN Congress. First, IUCN will have to contact its State Members to invite expressions of interest in hosting the Congress. The State Members are given a list of standard requirements for any such Congress (e.g., guarantees that visas will be provided, adequate and sufficient accommodation, good and cheap local transportation, good meeting facilities, etc.). IUCN would evaluate all offers to host the Congress, and through a careful process select the best offer. IUCN would establish a Congress Advisory Committee to oversee and guide the WSC process.

S Stuart told the meeting that he had just been informed of a preliminary offer from the World Association of Zoos and Aquariums (WAZA), working together with Leipzig Zoo in Germany, to host and secure funding for the WSC. He introduced the president-elect of WAZA and director of Leipzig Zoo, Jörg Junghold, to the meeting.

J Junghold presented WAZA's proposal for the WSC (see Annex 1). The proposal suggests the possibility of WAZA and Leipzig taking over the responsibility for the logistical organisation of the Congress, with IUCN being responsible for the substantive agenda. The first possible date that could be offered for it to take place at the zoo would be in May 2013, at a current estimated cost of 6.5 million Euros.

J Smart agreed that it would be very good for IUCN to work with WAZA on the WSC, whether or not the generous offer from Leipzig is eventually accepted. She emphasised that neither she, nor the SSC Chair, nor the Steering Committee meeting was empowered to accept or reject the Leipzig offer. IUCN would have to go through its official process for congresses, as outlined above, and she very much hoped that as part of that process, the German IUCN State Member would make a formal offer to host the Congress in Leipzig. The overriding question is whether or not IUCN can organize a WSC by 2013. If this was to be successfully achieved by 2013, it would need to be initiated in a much less onerous way than other IUCN congresses, and this could perhaps be achieved through close collaboration with a partner organisation. J Smart

asked if IUCN can realistically organize three conferences in the three years of 2012 to 2014. R Mittermeier felt that this was unrealistic. However, he pointed out that a major rationale for holding the WSC in 2015 would be to have it mid-way through the CBD 2020 process. J Hutton suggested considering the possibility of adding something on to the World Parks Congress to deal with Species.

M Stanley Price proposed the idea of a WAZA conference co-branded with IUCN. J McNeely suggested that getting the other Commissions talking about species was an important objective. He added that there was a big difference between a technical Congress (such as on Parks and Species) and a World Conservation Congress. For example, with the Parks Congress the resolutions process and the overall programme can be managed more strategically. J McNeely stressed the importance of having a clear reason for the Congress with concrete outcomes.

A Rosenberg supported WAZA's impressive offer but was unclear about who would be taking care of all the tasks involved. A Rosenberg noted that it is important to consider sponsors and to ensure that all the tasks were outlined determining who would do what. A Rosenberg asked if Leipzig Zoo would be taking care of the logistics and added that Conservation International could offer assistance.

G Dick stated that the IUCN Congress resolution for the WSC was not about having regular Congresses, but rather about holding a specific Congress. G Dick added that the congress was timely in relation to Target 12 of CBD COP10, as this would be enough to put Species at the top of the political agenda. G Dick also made the point that WAZA and IUCN have an MoU and a partnership agreement. Using partnerships could be a new way of doing Congresses, as this would allow IUCN to focus more on the content rather than the logistics.

S Stuart clarified the issue of branding and stressed that this will be an IUCN Congress, but held in collaboration with a number of partners, including WAZA. S Stuart said that it was important to find out what is required in order to satisfy the needs of an IUCN Congress, without IUCN killing itself in the process. J Smart stated that a professional conference organisation was appointed for last Congress, and a tendering process was in place for selecting the venue. J Junghold confirmed that Leipzig Zoo has access to a professional congress organizer.

J Smart stated that, in order to start the process of inviting IUCN State Members to express interest in hosting the WSC, a decision from IUCN Council would be needed at its May 2011 meeting, instructing the Director General to move ahead. The bidding process would then take place after May. The State Members would need to be given several months in which to respond and prepare proposals, and this would have an impact on the proposed WAZA timelines (see Annex 1). S Stuart agreed with J Smart that the process would need to be started formally at the May 2011 Council meeting. He felt that holding the Congress in 2013 would be too tight a timeline, and suggested that it might need to be pushed back to 2015. J McNeely proposed that the importance of the event needs to be emphasised to Council, and that it should be held soon since the longer we wait, the more species are lost. J Junghold noted that by September 2011, Leipzig Zoo would need to know whether the Congress is to be held 2013 or whether it will need to be pushed back to 2015.

ACTION: S Stuart and J Smart, working with G Dick and J Junghold (with B Haddane and R Mittermeier representing members of Council), will prepare a short paper for the May 2011 IUCN Council meeting outlining the need for the WSC, and asking for authorization for the bidding process by IUCN State Members to start. This paper will need to make a final recommendation on the WSC date (2013 or 2015). The paper will need to be completed by the end of March 2011.

Turning to the subject of the substantive content of the WSC, S Stuart asked if the Targets from CBD COP10, Nagoya, provide a framework to set an agenda for the World Species Congress. S Stuart felt that the WSC needs to be a culmination of some serious conservation work by the SSC and its partners and not another case of holding an event for the sake of it. G Dick commented that the Conservation Breeding SG (CBSG) at its recent meeting had already discussed the WSC and made recommendations as to its substantive focus. These recommendations are on pages 283-289 of the meeting pack. S Stuart stated that the CBSG's deliberations were very helpful, but felt that at the end of their discussions there had been too much of a push to narrow the agenda of the WSC. If the WSC is to be a large Congress, rallying the species conservation world, then the agenda will need to be relevant to all sections of the SSC's diverse constituency, and the agenda will need to be broad.

The floor was opened to the SC to put forward a list of issues that should be discussed at the Species Congress. The list is recorded below, in no particular order, and should be considered as an initial brainstorm. This will be taken further at the next SC meeting.

Possible Substance and themes for Congress – for ALL species

- Delivering on species components of CBD strategic plan – how are we going to deliver on it?
- Human wildlife conflict
- Bushmeat issue – over-exploited species (legal and illegal)
- Managing invasives
- A new era of species discovery
- Conservation success stories
- Link between species diversity & ecosystem services
- Species and habitat fragmentation
- Sustainable use
- Conservation strategies and tools
- Current state of extinctions
- TEEB for species
- Role of species in relation to climate change adaptation and mitigation
- Ex-situ conservation
- Protected areas and species
- Ecotourism
- Session for media interested in species
- Species and tipping points – e.g. crises in systems
- New monitoring techniques and new technology
- Communicating species conservation to the general public and policy makers
- Drivers of biodiversity loss e.g. agricultural expansion / land conversion
- Species and medicine and health
- Education of children and youth
- IUCN Red List and its influence on policy

- Cultural / religion / philosophical approaches
- Link between in-situ and ex-situ conservation
- Success stories of turning scientific info / data into policy
- Community-friendly development
- Law enforcement
- Trans-boundary conservation
- Nature conservation career development
- Re-engineering species conservation for the next 50 years
- Mobilising development sectors for conservation
- Defining species – what is a species?
- Strategic role of zoos, aquariums, botanical gardens, butterfly houses etc in species conservation
- Biomimicry
- Conserving underground biodiversity
- Scenarios to aid future predictions
- Conservation case studies focused on individual species – whales, tigers, turtles,
- Alliance for Zero Extinction
- Citizen science
- Funding species conservation
- Certification programmes
- Replacement of species' products – ivory / bear bile, etc
- Evidence-based conservation
- REDD and the role of species in FSC
- Global strategy for conservation in zoos
- Wildlife disease / emerging diseases
- New mechanisms for mobilising the conservation community
- Migratory species
- Climate change and species
- Getting species on to the political agenda / increased public awareness
- Test some of the policy interventions – to what extent do species benefit? Do other interventions deliver at species level?
- Tease out the difference between how some interventions work for some species and not others
- Taxonomic capacity
- Species concepts
- Conservation of species in secondary / disturbed habitats
- Testing the effectiveness of landscape planning
- Create space for species-related conventions, what are the future prospects e.g., CITES, CMS, etc
- What is being spent destroying biodiversity (e.g., perverse subsidies, etc) compared to how much we spend on conservation
- Creative use of incentives
- The SSC – rationales for Red Listing / Conservation planning
- Animal – plant relationships
- Fungi, protists
- Data management
- Species and fashion
- Building of a conservation culture into society
- Sustainable management of small populations
- Barometer of Life

J Langley took all of these ideas and cross-referenced with the CBD Strategic Plan 2011-2020 (Annex 2).

J Robinson noted that a powerful message needed to come out of the Congress on how the extinction crisis is to be addressed. J Baillie listed a number of things that should come out of the WCS, such as fundraising successes, a clear understanding of what works in species conservation and what are the limits to scale, clear guidance on the implementation of CBD and the role that species conservation should play within this, and how conservation success will be monitored.

J P Rodríguez suggested setting a target for the SOS fund at the Congress opening. S Stuart added that the global community should also commit to set of aspirations and a means of how they can be achieved. He concluded this item by stating that a more in-depth discussion on the WSC technical agenda would take place at the next SC meeting.

6b. SSC Communications Strategy and Tools (L Labanne and E Gillespie; *pp. 290-296, WCC 4.3 agenda pack*)

L Labanne and E Gillespie reported on the break-out session that discussed the SSC Communications Strategy and Tools (see Annex 3).

The workshop on communications was carried out as a response to the issues that were raised at the Communications breakout session at the SSC Steering Committee Meeting in January 2010. This workshop had the objective of discussing the following issues in order to use outcomes from the discussions in building the 2011 Communications Strategy for the SSC and the Species Programme:

- Review of the problem statement developed at the January 2010 SC meeting
- Identifying IUCN and SSC positioning
- Identification of target audiences
- Branding Biodiversity presentation
- Audience / objectives / channels
- Key messages
- Communication tools review
- Working with partners and intermediaries

During the session the communications problem statement was revisited. There was some disagreement with regard to the statement, as not everyone in the room had been involved in the development of the statement during a breakout session at the previous Steering Committee meeting.

IUCN's value position was presented and a mapping exercise was carried out to identify the position of the SSC in relation to IUCN and the conservation community. It was found that the SSC sat in the same position as IUCN, being seen as a science provider and neither too passive or too active in its approach.

Ed Gillespie presented on the topic of “Branding Biodiversity” and suggested various ideas on how to package communication messages to deliver change. The Futerra theory works around the four elements of: Less Loss, More Love, Balance Need and Add Action. They propose that messages that communicate Love plus Action = public change. And messages that communicate Need plus Action = Policy Change.

Next a discussion was held on target audiences, resulting in identification of the following as the key target audiences for SSC and Species Programme communications activities:

- External
 - Conservation Communities /other NGO's
 - Governments / parliamentarians*
 - Media*
 - Potential donors*
 - Private sector *
 - Conventions and intergovernmental organizations
 - Youth – select group
 - Zoos, Aquariums, Botanical Gardens
- Internal
 - SSC / Species programme*
 - Other IUCN programmes and commissions*
 - IUCN members*

Four breakout groups were created and each group discussed one of the target audiences as highlighted with an asterisk in the list above. Ideas were generated on what each group should be doing as a result of communication activities. For example, for IUCN members it may be to get them to use the Red List more in their work. The discussion therefore focused on how we could reach these audiences, and which communications tools should be used to achieve this. The ideas generated in these groups will be used to develop audience communications strategies and also a “message megaphone” as part of the 2011 Communications Strategy for the SSC and the Species Programme.

An overview of current communications tools was given. This included a media activity overview, an update on the changes that are being made to the Species website, Species Magazine, and the Species E-bulletin.

Due to a lack of time, two planned topics were not able to be discussed:

- how we can increase our reach and awareness by working with partners and intermediaries e.g., zoos
- key messages to include in communications such as Species matter, Stop extinctions, Species and biodiversity are at risk , Conservation works , The IUCN Red List is part of the solution

The next steps are to develop the communications strategy including creation of the “message megaphone”, key messages, communications tools, and measurements for success.

J Robinson noted that the Pew Charitable Trusts were running a similar process, and it would be useful to link in with this. The audiences are virtually identical and there could be some interesting synergies.

ACTION: J Robinson to provide link to Pew Charitable Trusts to L Labanne.

S Stuart suggested that it would be very helpful to have a small number of committed and responsive SC members to help with the communications strategy. [Subsequently, P Medici and M Stanley Price agreed to make themselves available to help with this.]

J Hutton stated that he was curious as to what the message actually is that needs to be conveyed. M Stanley Price added that what needs to be said is still a major issue that has to be tackled.

J McNeely stated that the objective is to stop extinction, but the question is who needs to be engaged to make that happen. It is not a single message, but one that has to be adapted for different audiences.

ACTION: L Labanne to work on completing the draft of the 2011 Communications Strategy for the SSC and the Species Programme, working with P Medici, M Stanley Price and R Roberts. The draft will be reviewed at the next Steering Committee meeting.

6c. IUCN's Strategic Approach to CITES (M Hoffmann; pp. 297-305, WCC 4.3 agenda pack)

M Hoffmann stated that it has been agreed that an internal review is needed within IUCN to consider what it would like to achieve with CITES. The primary purpose is to conduct a fairly extensive consultation process with an identified set of consultees, to canvass opinion and options as to the role that IUCN should play in future with regard to CITES. Thirty questions were identified for the basis of consultation in order to determine to what degree should IUCN be providing independent scientific advice within the CITES context, or having an influencing role, or both of these.

The breakout deliberated on these questions, and proposed that instead of circulating a questionnaire or conducting phone interviews, it would be more effective to prepare a draft document outlining a proposed IUCN strategic approach to CITES and seeking in-depth feedback on it. The discussions of the breakout group can be found in Annex 4.

S Stuart noted that there is currently no internal policy for IUCN on how to engage with CITES. There needs to be an internal consensus regarding a more strategic approach. The original questions proposed were intended to determine whether or not IUCN should use its scientific information as a basis for making specific recommendations with regard to CITES decisions.

D Cator suggested that the approach really need to sets the context of what IUCN is trying to achieve. At recent CITES meetings, despite the ready availability of scientific information, the obvious conclusions of the science have not necessarily been picked

up. A policy protocol is needed on how the science can be best used, and who will assist when the IUCN decides to make recommendations.

J Smart asked how much it costs to support IUCN's input into CITES. S Stuart replied that over the years there was now much less money available to contribute to CITES. Appropriate roles need to be clarified and this will have resourcing implications. Raising funds for the analysis for the 2010 COP 15 proved to be more difficult than ever before.

J Donaldson suggested looking into the impact of what would happen if the scientific input was withdrawn, since many developing countries rely heavily on this. S Stuart agreed that this would be good to consider.

The breakout session proposed the drafting of a short paper (two to five pages in length) to approach the consultation process. The paper needs to scope out what IUCN has been doing with CITES and as well as what it should be doing. This includes: providing information and analysis; pushing for particular conservation outcomes; facilitating and convening; communication; capacity development; and future vision (e.g., on new issues such as economic incentives). Details of how the IUCN could provide information to CITES needs to be articulated and could include: Analyses of the Proposals to Amend the Appendices; preparatory documents for meetings; providing information for drafting proposals; collecting data and doing analyses to help inform a particular CITES process (Red List data could be used for this in many instances).

The paper should also clarify the relevant components of IUCN that should take part in each CITES-related activity: Members; IUCN Secretariat (the Species Programme but also including regional offices, the Environmental Law Centre, and the Economic Unit); Commission leadership (primarily SSC); SSC SGs; and TRAFFIC.

The paper also needs to outline how IUCN should engage with CITES, profiling previous engagements. Examples of SSC SG engagement include the work on the Humphead Wrasse, Elephants, Rhinos, Crocodiles, Cycads and Sharks.

Finally, the paper should outline possible ways that IUCN can engage with CITES. Examples to be considered are the SGs providing information, working with country delegations, advising the Secretariat and working on listing proposals (before CoP15); actively lobbying for certain resolutions within the CoP or other meetings; a review of Significant Trade; non-detriment findings; data collection; and IUCN representatives in working groups.

ACTION: It was agreed to develop this document based on the following deadlines:

- 1) December - develop list of people to circulate document to including core group***
- 2) January 21 – first draft of document sent to core team (M Hoffmann)***
- 3) February 28 – revision of document and send out for first external review – broad consultation (M Hoffmann)***
- 4) March 30 – revision of document and completion of version 2 (M Hoffmann)***
- 5) April 15 – final review / sign off (J Smart, S Stuart)***
- 6) April 25 – submission of document to Council (S Stuart)***
- 7) May 23 – presentation of document at Council (S Stuart)***

The core team supporting this work was defined as: J Hutton (crocodiles); S Stuart; M Hoffmann; Thomasina Oldfield; Sarah Fowler; D Cator; Amie Brautigam; Y Sadovy; J Donaldson; Holly Dublin; S Broad; Y Xie; A Rosenberg; Alison Rosser; Dietrich Jelden; Sue Mainka; A Stattersfield. The CITES Secretariat must be informed of progress.

6d. SSC at National and Regional Levels (S Stuart; pp. 306-313, WCC 4.3 agenda pack)

S Stuart stated that there has been growing demand in recent years for the SSC to organise itself on a regional and/or national basis. This would represent a departure from the SSC's traditional way of doing business, as most of its internal structures are based either on taxonomy or on a disciplinary/thematic approach.

S Stuart noted that a variety of factors give rise to the desire to have SSC structures on a geographic basis. Part of it is as simple as SSC members in different SGs and RLAs not knowing who each other is. But most of the pressure comes from the fact that most impetus for conservation action comes at the national level and below, and much SSC activity seems rather remote from this. There is a widespread concern that simply making nationally relevant data available on the internet, through the IUCN Red List, Global Invasive Species Database and other sources, is not enough to support national-level action. Indeed, many of the larger and more active SSC SGs and RLAs already have their own national and regional groupings. Another consideration is that the empowerment of national groupings would provide a mechanism to develop a more culturally and ethnically diverse new generation for the SSC's global leadership.

There is already an SSC national grouping in Bolivia, formed as a local initiative. Pressure for such national groupings has come from many countries, including Malawi, South Africa, India and China. Support for such groupings is particularly strong in the IUCN Eastern and Southern African Regional Office (ESARO) and Asia Regional Office (ARO). On 13 September 2010, a meeting was held in Beijing to discuss the formation of an SSC sub-group in China. The meeting was convened by the IUCN China Office, and it was attended by SSC Steering Committee member Y Xie.

Y Xie described the process to date in China. The IUCN Councillor from China, Prof Ma Keping, worked with the IUCN office to arrange the meeting in September. There was good representation of IUCN institutional members and government agencies at the meeting, the focus of which was to establish an IUCN working group in China. The establishment of this working group would strengthen communication among IUCN constituents in the country, both individual Commission members and among institutions, and help to strengthen communication with the secretariat. It would also try to work closer with the government to increase the voice for conservation. The working group's primary goal is to promote conservation in China. Regulations and objectives of the working group have been established, and a work plan has been developed. The activities are to include:

- Promotion of communication among members via annual meetings and fora.

- Facilitation of communication between committees and institutional members and the secretariat.
- Initiation of conservation programmes.
- Status and threat assessments including Red List evaluations, species data evaluations and also ecosystem threat evaluation.

Y Xie also detailed a second priority area, which is to increase capacity in conservation in China especially for protected areas and best-use practices. Specifically, support would be given to world heritage planning, application and management. Three different sub-groups of the working group have been established: 1) species conservation – SSC; 2) ecosystem protection and management – CEM, WCPA; 3) law and education training CEC, CEL. Each group has a chair, some vice chairs and members.

J Smart and M Kusri presented examples from Sri Lanka and Indonesia. In the former, a national Red Listing initiative has not progressed due to a lack of capacity and training in the region. It was noted that by putting in place regional Red List focal points or go-to people, this problem could be minimised. In Indonesia, where only two NGOs are IUCN members, the Red List criteria have not been used and the nation has developed its own system.

M Kusri noted that stronger regional presence is needed to increase IUCN's work with Indonesia, and the next Steering Committee meeting in the country could be an opportunity to reach out to the region with an invite to all Indonesian SSC members to join the meeting. An increase in membership in Indonesia is a priority, since there is a lot of activity in particular SSC SGs, but little inter-connectivity between SGs. The Red List Partnership could be a way to reach out to other groups, for example, via marine initiatives working on the coral triangle.

S Stuart stated that if there is a national interest to develop a regional or national SSC group, it will generate naturally but there need to be some standards and criteria for it to qualify as an SSC grouping. Such groupings could help information flow to regions as well as facilitating regional input into the SSC, for example on the revision of policies or guidelines. The Mediterranean is an example where a regional SSC structure would be useful to facilitate freshwater and mammal work. There was also a call for an SSC regional presence in Southeast Asia. A regional focal point should be aware of regional issues and should also be familiar with the structure.

J McNeely noted that the need for increased communication is important, particularly electronic communication. IUCN's Knowledge Network provides a tool for finding people's contact details, although it was noted that some members were still not on the list and access needs to be facilitated to members.

JP Rodríguez commented that the setting up of national groups is less of a technical exercise than a political one. IUCN National Committees are strongly cultural so it is important to address this issue. It was suggested that a different logo could be used by volunteers and commission members to differentiate those who are volunteers and those who pay membership dues. Under IUCN statutes, S Stuart stated that IUCN members can form IUCN National Committees, but these National Committees have to be approved by Council. National Committees must include all the IUCN Members in that country, but they do not necessarily have to include Commission members. In short,

there has to be flexibility and a variety of approaches have been used for different countries.

J P Rodríguez stated that with regard to a particular structure for these groups, a first decision needed to be made on what the exact role of the regional groups would be (working on national Red Lists or Key Biodiversity Areas are examples). Regional focal points could be formed to consider what the functions of any SSC groupings would be in each region. There should be SSC initiatives that would function on a country-by-country basis, focused on pushing forward conservation through governments and NGOs.

A Stattersfield suggested engaging with structures that already existed; Birdlife, for example, already works at a national level. This kind of engagement would change on a country-by-country basis. M de Poorter offered her services as a regional focal point for the Oceania region.

S Stuart thanked M de Poorter for her offer, and stated that regional vice-chairs of the SSC could be inaugurated and these would act as the regional focal points. These would be volunteer positions for active SSC members who know the IUCN structure and who are familiar with SSC processes, including the Red List. These people would also have to be close to or on the SSC SC. For most regions of the world there are members within the present SC who could serve as regional vice-chairs (with the exception of West and Central Africa and Russia, for which there is no current representation on the SSC SC). For a more thorough engagement at regional and national levels, it would be necessary to have more full-time staff in the IUCN regional and country offices. The regional offices vary in their capacity to support the SSC, and all of them need more resources for this work than they currently have. The South American (SUR), Asian (ARO) and Eastern and Southern African (ESARO) regional offices have shown the most active interest in working with the SSC in recent months, and all are high priorities for species conservation.

S Stuart also noted that the SSC bylaws need to be amended to provide overarching guidance. The established groups would not necessarily have to be SSC working groups, but could in some cases also be IUCN working groups with crossover with, for instance, the WCPA. These groups could find their own sources of funding to support themselves. However, the key issue is that the right local person is chosen to dedicate his/her time and resources to the group.

The discussion concluded with the following decisions:

1. Should the SSC start an initiative to develop regional and national groupings?

ACTION: An increase in communication between SSC members and IUCN National Committees has to be encouraged by all Steering Committee members. The structure of any regional and national groupings will be the subject of further discussion in the Steering Committee.

2. If so, should this be started initially on experimental basis, or according to a deliberate strategy to cover the globe?

ACTION: It was agreed that initially there should be passive encouragement of regional and national groupings, but when Species staff are in place in Regional Offices, this needs to move to active encouragement. It was agreed that

communication needed to be promoted but a model on how to do this was not required.

3. Should the focus of national and regional groupings be more related to assessments, or conservation planning, or promoting conservation action?

ACTION: It was agreed that there was no need to have a focus that applies to all such groupings. The focus would be decided at regional / national level.

4. How would regional and national groupings best be supported, and where could resources be found for their operation?

ACTION: It was agreed that the groups would need to capitalise on existing resources whilst keeping an eye on opportunities for securing new funding, especially with regard to strengthening Species capacity in regional offices.

5. How would their memberships and leaderships be appointed?

ACTION: It was decided that the SSC should not make recommendations about national structures. The will be decided on a case-by-case basis.

6. Should the SSC establish regional vice-chairs?

ACTION: It was agreed to appoint SSC Regional Vice-Chairs.

6e. SSC Endorsement of Species Conservation Plans and Projects (M Stanley Price; pp. 314-321, WCC 4.3 agenda pack)

M Stanley Price reported on the break-out session that discussed the SSC endorsement of species conservation plans and projects (see Annex 5).

The purpose of this group discussion was to further clarify IUCN's role in supporting species conservation planning, the degree to which IUCN should be involved in reviewing them and the conditions for "endorsing" them (particularly when not IUCN-led) for example through branding them with the IUCN and SSC logos.

The discussion focused on whether and how IUCN would endorse species plans. IUCN is looking at the process by which 1) a written statement of endorsement would go on a plan, and 2) when the IUCN / SSC logos are put on it. This is in the light of a general assumption by Specialist Groups that they can use IUCN / SSC and Specialist Group logos freely.

It was agreed that endorsement of species action plans is a role that IUCN can take on and would depend on a certain suite of criteria that the plan would need to adhere to, following the Species Conservation Planning Handbook, including generally SSC / IUCN involvement in developing the plan through the Specialist Groups and / or the Species Conservation Planning Sub-Committee.

There was debate over whether to have a one or two level of endorsement approach: 1) Specialist Group Chair reviews the action plan, determines whether the above criteria have been met and recommends endorsement with or without further review, 2) SG Chair communicates whether the plan has met the criteria of the Species Programme.

The second level of endorsement would refer to plans of greater scope – whether multi-species or across multiple countries and / or where IUCN might want to monitor implementation. In this case, the IUCN role and right to draw attention to the relevant authorities would be part of the planning process, and that role and responsibility would need to be accepted by the authorities in question. Such a plan would need higher level endorsement than under the single scheme.

Use of logos must be accompanied by internal text stating the precise interpretation and limitations around use of IUCN / SSC and Specialist Group logos.

Mindful of IUCN Secretariat capacity, any endorsement and monitoring role must be as resource-light as possible. The breakout group seriously recommended the engagement of IUCN regional offices as the mechanism for interacting with governments on implementation, or on issues arising from higher level endorsed plans.

Further, the group recommended that the SSC explores the possibility of offering its species planning capability to the CBD's enhanced programme for National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans for GEF funded countries.

ACTION: The Species Conservation Planning Sub-Committee will develop and fine-tune a practical, resource-light process by which IUCN and SSC can endorse species conservation plans, and will recommend this to the next Steering Committee meeting

6f. SSC in relation to the new CBD Strategic Plan (J Smart; pp. 322-352, WCC 4.3 agenda pack

J Smart presented an overview of the new CBD Strategic Plan and its components. It was noted that the Strategic Plan goes way beyond CBD defined narrowly and in fact is a strategic plan for the world. In a few examples of the Targets, J Smart suggested that Target 4 was a big one to focus on, and noted that some of the SGs are already working on Target 13, and that a "TEEB for species" would fit well in Target 2. J Langley had completed the exercise of matching the brainstorming (carried out by the Steering Committee on the previous day) on possible topics for the World Species Congress with the CBD Strategic Plan (see Annex 1).

R Mittermeier added that Target 12 is essentially the zero extinction Target and is therefore very significant. Target 11 is an increase of 4% in the extent of terrestrial protected areas, and this increase in area needs to be targeted on the critical gap areas – those of highest priority for biodiversity.

J Hutton noted that the Strategic Plan was a big agenda which IUCN needed to keep an overview of. The SSC needs to decide on priority areas and how they can deliver on these.

S Stuart added that the IUCN had a Core Programme Area, which essentially covers species and protected areas. Targets 6, 9, 11 and 12 fall under the Core Programme Area in particular. The SSC needs to concentrate on the areas where it has recognised authority.

D Leaman suggested that Target 4 is useful to strengthen the links between the species people and the business and biodiversity people within IUCN.

Y Xie noted that most of the Chinese haven't heard about the 2020 targets. Information needs to be shared with Chinese officials, including the Ministry of Environment, to make them aware of the new targets, particularly in the different sectors such as agriculture and forestry. Y Xie suggested that maybe IUCN should talk to Ma Keping, the IUCN Councillor from China, about how to strengthen this.

S Stuart agreed that most countries lack knowledge of the targets and that this is a massive communication issue. All opportunities where there are interactions with Governments need to be seized to get the message across.

J Baillie noted that the text in the CBD gave governments flexibility in terms of implementing the CBD targets, so there needs to be a clear strategy on accountability and engaging youth groups and legislators to give it more teeth. J Baillie asked what can be done with the national governments to increase accountability. S Stuart suggested that this was partly the role of civil society and NGOs who need to wake up to their responsibilities.

D Cator suggested using the SSC e-Bulletin to get the CBD target messages out to a wider audience and the IUCN Members.

J Langley suggested other platforms to raise the profile of the Strategic Plan to the wider world could include the 2012 World Conservation Congress, the regional offices, and the National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans (NBSAPs) which will need to be done relatively quickly (within a couple of years). The SSC and IUCN Members need to encourage governments to start the interactive process on NBSAPs, engaging the regional offices.

J McNeely noted that we should liaise more with the regional offices as they have stronger links to governments. This should be done particularly through the species focal points in the regional offices.

J Hutton recommended close working relationships with the organisations that are already working on this, such as the CBD Secretariat, UNEP and GEF, and using the IUCN's influence with these organizations.

J Baillie noted that IUCN has a strong background in action planning and proposed working with legal bodies to implement the CBD targets. The IUCN regional offices are a perfect support for governments, and partners of SSC could also be involved. The IUCN could issue guidelines or a legal framework.

R Mittermeier thought there was a role of the SSC in working with the CBD Secretariat to make sure that species are represented highly within the work going forward.

J Hutton asked J Smart how the SSC would be best able to work with IUCN Members on influencing the NBSAPs on the grounds that coordinating the Members is the key to moving the work forward.

J Langley noticed that there was a draft NBSAP training module on the IUCN web site, so it would be good for the Steering Committee to keep her updated on any new information about this.

ACTION: J Smart asked for Steering Committee members to volunteer their time to push this forward IUCN's engagement in the implementation of the CBD Strategic Plan. T Brooks, R Mittermeier, J Hutton and J Baillie volunteered their support.

6g. Red List of Ecosystems (J P Rodríguez ; pp. 353-363, WCC 4.3 agenda pack)

JP Rodríguez provided an overview of the Red List of Ecosystems. A number of test cases are currently being run on how to apply the categories and criteria. A workshop is to be held in April 2011, in Washington DC, with a view to producing a paper to get more science behind the criteria. There will also be the linking and integration of Red List data and data from different schemes, but the landscape classification needs to be clarified first.

J Donaldson asked about an ecosystem services component. JP Rodríguez responded that this was being considered, though the service aspect in many cases might have to be approached through proxies.

D Leaman suggested Plantlife might be interested in engaging in the process, linking in human use values as part of ecosystem functional value and degradation.

6h. Draft Guidelines for Scientific Collecting of Species on the IUCN Red List (M Hoffmann; pp. 364-365, WCC 4.3 agenda pack)

M Hoffmann provided the background behind the guidelines. In Bangkok 2004, there was a resolution passed on the uses of the RL. Incorporated within this was a call for the SSC to develop guidelines on the scientific collecting of species listed as threatened on the IUCN Red List. Progress was made on these guidelines in the previous quadrennium, but for various reasons they could not be signed off. At the most recent World Conservation Congress in Barcelona in 2008, another resolution was passed calling for the guidelines to be completed, and appending the draft guidelines in the form that they were in October 2008. The call for these guidelines came about due to blanket restrictions on the scientific collecting of species listed as 'Endangered' or 'Critically Endangered', by countries such as Tanzania, Australia, Brazil and the USA.

M Hoffmann stated that the guidelines have been taken to several subcommittee meetings – including the ICSC and PCSC – from which there has been feedback. The PCSC felt that it was important to distribute them to SGs and let them comment on the draft. This needs to be done for all SGs. The guidelines need to be explicit in what they are for, with a clear plan for communicating their use to government bodies that make the decisions on this in-country. The guidelines will become an annex to the Guidelines on the Use of Red List Data.

S Stuart stated that it was important to emphasise that these guidelines are simply on scientific collecting of species listed as threatened on the IUCN Red List. They do not

aim to be a general IUCN policy on scientific collecting, nor an IUCN policy on access and benefit-sharing. The next RL Committee meeting will need to look at the draft and provide advice.

M Hoffmann also mentioned the issues regarding the use of DNA collection; the guidelines encourage non-lethal collecting, which will become easier as technology develops. M Stanley Price asked that given this covers lethal and non-lethal collecting, what distinguishes the latter from collecting from the wild for captive breeding. JP Rodríguez added that in many countries it is often more difficult to collect DNA than to kill the species. The guidelines need to be sensitive to this.

M Hoffmann acknowledged that the favouring of the collection of DNA samples via non-lethal collecting should be made explicit. However, the definition of non-lethal collecting has to be made clearer, as to what differentiates non-lethal collecting and collection for captive breeding.

ACTION: M Hoffmann to oversee the consultation process with the Specialist Groups, Red List Authorities and Sub-Committees, and to present the draft to the next meeting of the Red List Committee. The final draft should be brought to the Steering Committee for adoption before the end of the current quadrennium.

7. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

S Stuart requested T Brooks to start the discussion on Any Other Business. T Brooks requested a statement on the tragic death of Leonardo L. Co to be recorded in the SC minutes.

On 15 November 2010, Leonardo L. Co, of the University of the Philippines Institute of Biology, and two other members of his field team, were killed in the forests of Leyte. While it was initially reported that they were caught in crossfire between the Philippine Army and a rebel group, an independent probe has subsequently suggested that the Philippine Army was the only armed group present.

Leonard was a world-class field botanist who passionately studied plants (with a particular interest in medicinal uses), worked for their conservation, and generously shared his knowledge with others.

He will be sorely missed.

[See “Leonardo L. Co: In Memoriam” on facebook at <http://www.facebook.com/home.php?#!/pages/Leonardo-L-Co-In-Memoriam/162637747108520?v=info>]

ACTION: D Cator and A Rodrigues to ensure that this is published in the next SSC E-Bulletin.

7a. Sahelo-Saharan species and CMS Programme (J Baillie; pp. 367, WCC 4.3 agenda pack)

J Baillie noted that a meeting was held in London before CBD COP10 to highlight the status of deserts, in particular in North Africa. A scientific paper is planned on this. The Sahara is one sixth of the entire global land surface and the large mammal fauna is rapidly disappearing. A case for support is needed based on technical work, changing lifestyles, insecurity, and the geo-politics of the area. J Baillie explained that this was a complex issue and the solution may only be to protect large representative areas. The Red List accounts should be updated, and it should be relatively easy to undertake a study comparing range retractions in the Sahelo-Saharan region with other regions of the world.

T Contreras added that the fishes also needed considering in the area.

J Baillie stated that this issue was not being addressed on the political agenda in a big way, so a case needs to be made to begin funding for it. Three steps are required to get there: a scientific paper; a regional RL; and a response strategy. The relevant documentation also needs to be centralised so the case can be strongly emphasised. Specifically a RL for the Sahelo-Saharan region is needed and funds have to be generated for this.

ACTION: J Baillie and B Haddane will work on this issue and report back to the next meeting of the Steering Committee.

7b. SSC and WCPA Work on Urban Parks (B Haddane; pp. 367, WCC 4.3 agenda pack)

B Haddane noted that a WCPA task force is working on parks and gardens in cities to assess biodiversity and asked whether the SSC could support this.

S Stuart added a former chair of CEESP, Ted Trzyna, is heading this task force and had requested SSC support. S Stuart had asked for SSC members to volunteer to help, but no-one had so far put their names forward. J Smart added that the WCPA is keen to work on urban parks, but biodiversity has to remain the focus. B Haddane announced that he was on the task force and could represent the SSC on it.

T Brooks suggested an analysis of AZE sites within cities.

J McNeely stated that human-animal conflict is becoming a big problem in cities, and that this is a problem that the SSC can probably assist with. M de Poorter said that she would follow up on this with the Invasive Species SG.

T Contreras said that urban parks had an important educational component, and that it was very important to have contact with nature in cities.

Y Xie noted that urban parks in China are there only to provide green areas, and not to enhance biodiversity conservation. However, in Beijing parks are now being encouraged to include biodiversity in their management plans, and to use biodiversity indicators to

guide the funding of urban park management. They are also being encouraged to plant specific plants that attract different animals.

ACTION: B Haddane to represent the SSC on the work on urban parks with input from M de Poorter.

7c. Important Plant Areas in the Mediterranean (B Haddane; pp. 367, WCC 4.3 agenda)

B Haddane asked if the Malaga office was dealing with promoting Important Plant Areas (IPAs) in the Mediterranean region. T Brooks offered to provide technical support from the SSC/WCPA Task Force on Biodiversity and Protected Areas. J Smart suggested creating a web story on Mediterranean IPAs.

ACTION: D Cator and A Rodrigues, working with B Haddane, to follow up on a web story of IPAs in the Mediterranean, liaising with Plantlife International.

7d. SSC Archives (S Stuart; pp. 368-383, WCC 4.3 agenda pack)

S Stuart provided an update on what the current situation was with the SSC archives. The main issues are to investigate what archives the SSC has, where they are, how safely they are stored, and whether or not a policy is needed on them. All of Peter Scott's SSC archives are in the basement of the IUCN building in Gland and these need looking after due their high value (it covers most of the history of the SSC prior to 1980). Hal Coolidge's SSC archives are at CI in the US.

S Stuart suggested forming an SSC Archiving Working Group with Elaine Shaughnessy, Claire Santer and R Mittermeier. Someone has to be available to scan and catalogue the documents, with the library keeping one or two copies of every publication. E Shaughnessy has also been looking at funding sources for archiving. The SSC newsletters also need tracking especially since most are now in electronic format only.

ACTION: The SSC agreed to the establishment of an SSC Archiving Task Force. E Shaughnessy to be asked to lead and form this task force and to develop and coordinate a long-term archiving strategy.

7e. Large Carnivore Initiative for West and Central Africa (H de longh; p. 384, WCC 4.3 agenda pack)

H de longh had to cancel his attendance at the Steering Committee meeting at the last minute because of ill health. It was decided to request H de longh to address this item at the next SC meeting.

7f. Species of the Day (S Stuart)

S Stuart provided an overview of Species of the Day (SPOD) which was launched as a web initiative to celebrate the International Year of Biodiversity. Its impact as a communication tool, raising the profile of a tremendous variety of species, was generally applauded with thanks given to Rachel Roberts and Kathryn Pintus for their work on the project. S Stuart noted that SPOD has proven to be a huge success with over 600 websites now linking to it, and approximately 4,000 followers on Twitter. However, funding from the United Nations Environment Programme is unlikely to be continued and whether SPOD should continue beyond 2010 was raised as a matter for discussion.

Three potential possibilities were put forward:

1. Discontinue SPOD;
2. Produce a 'Species of the Week' although there would have to be some adaptation to the existing webpage;
3. Continue with SPOD, recycling old material where necessary.

M Hoffmann proposed a fourth option with a new name like 'species portfolios' or 'species portraits' but done on an ad-hoc basis.

J Smart highlighted the importance of the Red List website calling for an increased investment in the website and not SPOD (or Species of the Week) which has placed a huge pressure on staff. S Stuart assured the SC that the information on SPOD would not be lost and would still remain accessible on an archived webpage.

M Samways added that many people have been extremely appreciative of this fantastic initiative, it's user-friendly, it reaches out to the youth, and it works.

A Stattersfield noted that duplicating efforts should be avoided and perhaps information could be automatically drawn from the RL.

M Hoffmann added that there are now 365 profiles on the RL which can be repackaged into something more marketable.

B Haddane thought that it would be a pity to stop the SPOD programme because it is educative and increases public awareness. He would be very keen to see a 'species of the week' with a possible focus on specific programmes like forests for example. R Mittermeier also added that SPOD has been great and that it should continue once a week, to increase the visibility and awareness of species. J McNeely also supported the weekly option.

SPOD was also seen as a potential way of making funds. Two potential options were proposed:

1. A donate button/link on each species where donors could pledge funds for conservation projects for that species. R Roberts stated that this would create more work and that project concepts and decent budgets would have to be developed.
2. The repackaging of the information into a book/calendars/collecting cards etc.

S Stuart noted that one of the problems with regard to these options, and more generally, was the use of photos. Photographers copyright has to be an important consideration that could hamper the use of SPOD profiles. JC Vié agreed that when sourcing photos, the full rights need to be secured initially to ensure that use is not too restrictive.

R Mittermeier expressed an interest in partnering the continuation of SPOD with Conservation International and would follow up with S Stuart.

M Samways noted that the first Red Book was full of pictures, but that there has been failure since then to get images out there.

T Brooks agreed with J Smart that a high priority should be to source visual material for the RL (photos and video), and may be this could do be done with a view to setting up an automated process like A Stattersfield suggested.

J Baillie suggested a focus should be on obtaining the images, as this will become more valuable in the long-term.

Y Sadovy said that communication needed to be mindful of different audiences, with a focus on appealing to younger audiences. It was noted that this raised other questions about linking with suitable educational material.

J McNeely noted that Cristina Mittermeier runs the International League of Conservation Photographers, and that they should be provided with a list of images as a challenge to obtain.

S Stuart added that SGs also need to go out and get the photos of their species.

The general consensus was that more photos are needed and that these should go on the Red List website.

ACTION: Discussion paper on photos for the next SSC SC meeting to be prepared by L Labanne and R Roberts.

ACTION: S Stuart and J Smart to consider the views of SC members and come to a rapid decision on the future of SPOD in 2011.

7g. Establishing an Official Scientific Research Journal of the SSC (M Hoffmann)

M Hoffmann discussed Endangered Species Research, an open access journal established in 2006, which has evolved into a more inter-disciplinary publication on field research. The journal has themed issues, e.g., one covered the RL, but it does not yet have an impact factor because it is a new journal.

M Hoffmann suggested establishing a much closer relationship with the journal. The SSC does not have its own journal, so there would be much to gain for Endangered Species Research to plug into the SSC network. An alternative option could be that Endangered Species Research becomes the official publication of the SSC.

From 1 January 2011, Endangered Species Research can no longer be a free open access journal. M Hoffmann noted that if this were to become the official scientific journal of the SSC, the content has to be made available to all the members of the SSC. Endangered Species Research is amenable to exploring options around this model. They could significantly reduce the subscription rate for those in developing countries, but the SSC would have to find a way to cover the costs for those from developing countries. The editorial board would still maintain their independence, but there would be the opportunity for SSC members to sit on the board.

M Hoffmann asked the SC if the idea of an academic peer-review journal for the SSC's scientific work interested them. M Hoffmann added that the subscription rates model could not be avoided; does the SSC want to be subsidising members in developing and developed countries as a means of giving something back to them.

S Stuart noted that the SSC gets a great deal from its members, so this could be a way of giving something back to them.

Y Sadovy questioned if an SSC journal would fill a niche that is not filled elsewhere. Should the members be canvassed to seek their opinion on this? M Hoffmann stated that letters of support had already been received, as Endangered Species Research publishes research that many journals are no longer publishing.

JP Rodríguez was very supportive of the proposal, as it would get individuals acknowledged for their work on RL assessments. He noted added that interactions with this journal have always been very good, but charging could become a serious problem because of transfers, currency conversions, etc.

M de Poorter asked how strictly the research on endangered species is to be defined and would it be inclusive enough. M Hoffmann confirmed that Endangered Species Research is amenable to the scope of the journal being open to some discussion. However, cost is an important issue; if it does involve a cost for members, will that be a 'red light' or should SSC find the resources to give something back.

JC Vié asked if feedback from FFI could be obtained on how to manage a journal like Oryx, and asked if the use of 'threatened' rather than 'endangered' could be considered.

M Hoffmann noted the general issues that SGs have with journals, for example, how to get a DOI number, how to get indexed, how to get an impact factor? Only one SSC SG journal currently has an impact factor: Chelonian Conservation Biology. The Cat SG does not want Cat News to go down a more formal route. M Hoffmann added that the plan is not to set up the journal as an independent entity, but rather to integrate it into an already existing structure.

D Leaman sees this as having many benefits as an outlet for the SSC network.

J Baillie was not entirely supportive of the idea as, in the experience of ZSL, journals create a lot of work. He added that he sees value in it as a RL model, but it should be free, there should be a focus on Data Deficient species, and funds need to be raised to do it.

T Brooks felt that this was not a high priority.

M Stanley Price questioned how it would work. Would the SSC have to find resources to cover the journal so it can be made free to the members? And, if it becomes the official journal of the SSC, would members feel obligated to publish in it? M Hoffmann confirmed that the journal would have to be free to the SSC members and there would be no requirement for someone to publish in it.

J P Rodríguez reminded the SC of the discussion to improve RL assessments to the extent that they can become publications with DOI numbers. If this was the case, there would be no need for a journal.

S Stuart noted that the Conservation Breeding SG had previously recommended the Journal of Threatened Taxa for RL publications. S Stuart felt that there was likely to be a huge upset if linking in with Endangered Species Research takes place, and if a potential link with the Journal of Threatened Taxa was not considered. There are also budget implications which the SC did not fully support.

ACTION: It was decided not to proceed with a collaboration between SSC and Endangered Species Research.

7h. Agreement between UNEP-WCMC and IUCN (J Hutton)

J Hutton provided an update on the agreement between UNEP-WCMC and IUCN. WCMC used to be an IUCN institution, but when they separated some things became joint entities, and some separated (some going with UNEP-WCMC, others with IUCN). In 2003, there was an MOU between IUCN and UNEP-WCMC but this was never fully implemented and expired in 2008. A new MOU between IUCN and UNEP has now been concluded which allows for supplemental agreements, for example the relationship between UNEP-WCMC and IUCN in the governance of the World Database on Protected Areas (WDPA), the global biodiversity indicator processes (including on how the IUCN will incorporate the RL into the Millennium Development Goals), and also the legal status of species (e.g., linking IUCN data with the UNEP-WCMC species database). J Hutton provided this update for information, and stated that SSC should consider any particular issues that it might want to be covered in the supplemental agreement.

7i. Confiscation Guidelines (Y Sadovy, F Launay, Y Xie, B Haddane)

Y Sadovy reported back from a small side-group discussion that had taken place earlier in the meeting on the confiscation guidelines. It was agreed that the guidelines would be circulated to specifically selected SGs with experience with confiscations. A short set of questions have been drafted which need to be circulated to people across all regions of the world. The process will start in January 2011 by having the current guidelines reviewed by the members of the Re-introduction SG. On the basis of this response, a much wider survey should be considered with the ultimate goal being the production of annexes to the current framework. It was also suggested that some specialists in animal welfare should be approached to assist with the creation of those annexes.

M de Poorter noted that if the release of animals into placement areas contained a risk they could escape into the wild, then it would be useful to include the Invasive SG. F Launay agreed that the confiscation and re-introduction guidelines should feed into one another.

ACTION: Y Sadvy and F Launay to lead on moving the confiscation guidelines forward, starting with a consultation within the Re-introduction Specialist Group.

7j. IUCN Situation analysis

S Stuart reported that preparations were underway to develop the IUCN Programme for the next quadrennium. The process starts with the preparation of a situation analysis, and the SSC made a large contribution to this the last time round. S Stuart asked the SC what input should the SSC put into this, bearing in mind that the draft programme must go out in March for review by the Programme and Policy Committee of Council.

S Stuart noted that the current framework of the Programme will largely be retained in the next Quadrennium, but the SSC will still need to provide input into the programme consultation process.

J McNeely suggested using the Red List Index, and the paper that M Hoffmann produced on conservation success, as important influences to the process. Many of the regional offices do not prioritize in work on species and this could be opportunity to increase their focus on such work.

ACTION: J McNeely to assist S Stuart and J Smart in providing input to the situation analysis and 2013-2016 IUCN Programme.

8. DATES FOR THE NEXT SSC SC MEETING

It was proposed that the 2011 SSC SC meeting should be held in second half of June or early July in Indonesia.

ACTION: R Roberts will circulate a Doodle poll on dates for the next SC meeting.

ACTION: The SSC SG Chairs Meeting will be held in February or March 2012 in Abu Dhabi with a SC meeting linked to it.

9. CLOSURE OF THE MEETING

S Stuart closed by thanking R Roberts, D Cator, A Rodrigues, D Zivkovic, E Jueni, L Labanne, J Langley, C Santer, M Hoffmann, J Smart and JC Vié for their collective contribution to the meeting.

[For a summary of all action points for WC4.3 please refer to Annex 6]

ANNEX 1

WAZA's's proposal for the World Species Congress

WAZA provided the following arguments for why a WSC, hosted by Leipzig Zoo, would be a success:

- Leipzig Zoo is a leading zoo in Europe;
- There has been a process of transformation of the zoo into a “Zoo of the Future” since 2000;
- A huge tropical hall, “Gondwanaland”, will be opened in 2011 with unique education and conservation features;
- The zoo is an ambassador for threatened tropical rainforests as hotspots of biodiversity
- The director serves as WAZA President from 2011–2013;
- Excellent infrastructure in Leipzig is available.

Leipzig is offering the following for the Congress:

- WAZA and Leipzig Zoo take over responsibility for logistical organisation of congress;
- Leipzig fair offers complete support;
- Two job positions can start working in Autumn 2011 in Leipzig;
- WAZA and Leipzig Zoo guarantee funding of the missing part budget (i.e., that which cannot be covered by participants' fees);
- Support by City of Leipzig, State of Saxony and German Government will be arranged;
- IUCN takes responsibility for the substantive agenda of the congress.

The following budget was presented for the Congress (5,000 participants, 5 days):

Income		
		€
1	Registration Fee (5,000 participants @ 500.00 €	2,500,000.00
2	Sponsoring/Exhibitors	500,000.00
3	Public Support	3,500,000.00
4	Others	50,000.00
	TOTAL	6,550,000.00
Cost		
1	Congress Facilities	1,250,000.00
2	Internet	150,000.00
3	Brochures/Programme	250,000.00
4	Abstract Management System	50,000.00
5	Mailing Costs	100,000.00
6	Organisation	250,000.00
7	Communication/PR	450,000.00
8	Hotesses, Drivers, Registration	350,000.00
9	Catering	1,500,000.00
10	Social Programme/Reception/Dinners	250,000.00
11	Transport	150,000.00
12	Speakers	750,000.00
13	Others	1,050,000.00
	TOTAL	6,550,000.00

WAZA and Leipzig Zoo outlined their proposed timing of the next steps:

Task	Timing	Who to initiate task
General agreement on congress date	Q I/II 2011	IUCN / WAZA
Agreement on financial support	Q III 2011	WAZA (Leipzig)
Conference office start work	Q III/IV 2011	WAZA (Leipzig)
First announcement	Q IV 2011	IUCN
Final agreement on contents/outcome	Q II 2012	IUCN
Call for papers	Q II 2012	IUCN / WAZA
Congress date	May 2013	

ANNEX 2

Cross-reference between SSC Steering Committee ideas for the World Species Congress and the Targets of the CBD Strategic Plan

Issues that did not fit into the targets (but would be related to implementing the Strategic Plan and or positioning those working on species to accelerate progress towards halting biodiversity loss.)

- aims of Species Congress - how will it be aimed at conservation practitioners (given different audiences- diff policy audience, public awareness audience v practitioner audience)
- what about relevance right now for grassroots- in the short term
- space for major species – related conventions to do work on what the future might look like, not internal management issues but where can they go/ what could they do?
- space for major species – related conventions to do work on what the future might look like, not internal management issues but where can they go/ what could they do?
- species and fashion/ species and art/music / recipes

CBD Strategic Plan	Short version	Comments from SSC
Strategic goal A. Address the underlying causes of biodiversity loss by mainstreaming biodiversity across government and society	Driver/ underlying cause	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conservation career development • Drivers of biodiversity loss e.g. land conversion
Target 1: By 2020, at the latest, people are aware of the values of biodiversity and the steps they can take to conserve and use it sustainably.	Awareness	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • communication, education and media particularly for youth/ cultural/ religious outreach • Strategic role of zoos/botanic gardens/ butterfly houses/aquariums in conservation • Bio mimicry • Citizen Science (and conservation and monitoring) • For more funding- funders need to be more aware • Get species on public awareness, why it is important to do species conservation? • New technologies that feed into citizen science (e.g. frog atlas, butterfly atlas in South Africa, virtual atlas) • Rationales for conservation planning
Target 2: By 2020, at the latest, biodiversity values have been integrated into national and local development and poverty reduction strategies and planning processes and are being incorporated into national accounting, as appropriate, and reporting systems.	Public policy, strategies, planning and national accounting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conservation strategies • TEEB for species • Species data into policy • legislation and law enforcement for species conservation • Transboundary conservation • Mobilising development sectors for conservation • Replacement of species in the market(e.g. ivory, bear bile, tiger parts) • Get species on the political agenda- why we need to do this: high level political agenda- practitioners (grassroots), how cater for both types of participation

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conservation of economically valuable species through options other than enforcement • Need to build species conservation culture into economic development and cultural celebrations
<p>Target 3: By 2020, at the latest, incentives, including subsidies, harmful to biodiversity are eliminated, phased out or reformed in order to minimize or avoid negative impacts, and positive incentives for the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity are developed and applied, consistent and in harmony with the Convention and other relevant international obligations, taking into account national socio-economic conditions.</p>	<p>Incentives (positive and negative)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mobilising development sectors for conservation • Innovative funding for species funding • Aims of Species Congress to get species on the political agenda- why we need to do this: high level political agenda- practitioners (grassroots), how cater for both types of participation • Perverse subsidies, trying to destroy species from governments that is causing trouble • Creative use of incentives (e.g. positive incentives) • Conservation of economically valuable species through options other than enforcement
<p>Target 4: By 2020, at the latest, Governments, business and stakeholders at all levels have taken steps to achieve or have implemented plans for sustainable production and consumption and have kept the impacts of use of natural resources well within safe ecological limits.</p>	<p>Business and other stakeholders Sustainable production and consumption within safe ecological limits</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Human/wildlife conflict • Exploited species • Link between species diversity and ecosystem services • Eco-tourism • Bio mimicry • certification programmes (evaluation, effectiveness) • role of species in FSC • replacement of species in the market(e.g. ivory, bear bile, tiger parts) • aims of Species Congress to get species on the political agenda- why we need to do this: high level political agenda- practitioners (grassroots), how cater for both types of participation • aims get species on public awareness, why it is important to do species conservation • conservation of economically valuable species through options other than enforcement
<p>Strategic goal B. Reduce the direct pressures on biodiversity and promote sustainable use</p>	<p>Pressures and sustainable use</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Drivers of biodiversity loss e.g. land conversion • Emerging diseases/Wildlife disease and systems • Zootic and epizootic disease humans- domestic animal- wildlife animal transference
<p>Target 5: By 2020, the rate of loss of all natural habitats, including forests, is at least halved and where feasible brought close to zero, and degradation and fragmentation is significantly reduced.</p>	<p>Habitat loss, degradation and fragmentation</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Human/wildlife conflict • Exploited species • Species and habitat fragmentation • Species and climate change mitigation and adaptation 4.5 migratory species • Species outside national jurisdiction • Testing effectiveness of landscape planning for species conservation (do corridors work)
<p>Target 6: By 2020 all fish and invertebrate stocks and aquatic plants are managed and harvested sustainably, legally and applying ecosystem based approaches, so that</p>	<p>Sustainable harvest</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Delivering on the species component of the CBD Strategic Plan. How will this be done? For all the taxonomic groups • Exploited species Strategic role of zoos/botanic

overfishing is avoided, recovery plans and measures are in place for all depleted species, fisheries have no significant adverse impacts on threatened species and vulnerable ecosystems and the impacts of fisheries on stocks, species and ecosystems are within safe ecological limits.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> gardens/ butterfly houses/aquariums in conservation migratory species Species outside national jurisdiction Conservation in disturbed habitat e.g. selective logging habitat contains endangered species, disturbed habitat can help some species
Target 7: By 2020 areas under agriculture, aquaculture and forestry are managed sustainably, ensuring conservation of biodiversity.	Sustainable agriculture, aquaculture and forestry	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Human/wildlife conflict Conservation in disturbed habitat e.g. selective logging habitat contains endangered species, disturbed habitat can help some species
Target 8: By 2020, pollution, including from excess nutrients, has been brought to levels that are not detrimental to ecosystem function and biodiversity.	Pollution	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Eco-tourism Species and tipping points
Target 9: By 2020, invasive alien species and pathways are identified and prioritized, priority species are controlled or eradicated, and measures are in place to manage pathways to prevent their introduction and establishment.	Invasive alien species	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Species and tipping points Invasive species
Target 10: By 2015, the multiple anthropogenic pressures on coral reefs, and other vulnerable ecosystems impacted by climate change or ocean acidification are minimized, so as to maintain their integrity and functioning.	Reduce pressure on Coral reefs, other ecosystems vulnerable	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Eco-tourism Species and tipping points Species and climate change mitigation and adaptation
Strategic goal C: To improve the status of biodiversity by safeguarding ecosystems, species and genetic diversity	Status	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Delivering on the species component of the CBD Strategic Plan. How will this be done? For all the taxonomic groups
Target 11: By 2020, at least 17 per cent of terrestrial and inland water, and 10 per cent of coastal and marine areas, especially areas of particular importance for biodiversity and ecosystem services, are conserved through effectively and equitably managed, ecologically representative and well connected systems of protected areas and other effective area-based conservation measures, and integrated into the wider landscape and seascapes.	Protected areas, areas important for biodiversity and ecosystem services	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Delivering on the species component of the CBD Strategic Plan. How will this be done for all the taxonomic groups? Human/wildlife conflict Exploited species Transboundary conservation Migratory species Conserving below ground biodiversity AZE Testing policy options: to what extent does species benefit from interventions or contribute to policy option Testing effectiveness of landscape planning for species conservation (do corridors work) Species and protected areas/1.8 species and habitat fragmentation Conservation in disturbed habitat e.g. selective logging habitat contains endangered species, disturbed habitat can help some species In-situ / ex-situ linkages, re-introduction Community-friendly conservation
Target 12: By 2020 the extinction of known	Extinction	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Delivering on the species component of the CBD

threatened species has been prevented and their conservation status, particularly of those most in decline, has been improved and sustained.	and conservation status	Strategic Plan. How will this be done? For all the taxonomic groups <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Current state of extinction • AZE • Migratory species • Testing some of the policy options: to what extent does species benefit from interventions or contribute to policy options • Sustainable of small animal population • Ex-situ conservation • Fungi and protists
Target 13: By 2020, the genetic diversity of cultivated plants and farmed and domesticated animals and of wild relatives, including other socio-economically as well as culturally valuable species, is maintained, and strategies have been developed and implemented for minimizing genetic erosion and safeguarding their genetic diversity.	Genetic diversity Cultivated, domesticated , socio-economically / culturally valuable species	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Delivering on the species component of the CBD Strategic Plan. How will this be done? For all the taxonomic groups • Exploited species Testing some of the policy options: to what extent does species benefit from interventions or contribute to policy options • Medicinal species and health
Strategic goal D: Enhance the benefits to all from biodiversity and ecosystem services.	Benefits	
Target 14: By 2020, ecosystems that provide essential services, including services related to water, and contribute to health, livelihoods and well-being, are restored and safeguarded, taking into account the needs of women, indigenous and local communities, and the poor and vulnerable.	Ecosystem services (especially water) and human well-being	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • link between species diversity and ecosystem services 2.3 eco-tourism • species and tipping points • medicinal species and health • Conserving below ground biodiversity • role of species in REDD • conservation in disturbed habitat e.g. selective logging habitat contains endangered species, disturbed habitat can help some species
Target 15: By 2020, ecosystem resilience and the contribution of biodiversity to carbon stocks has been enhanced, through conservation and restoration, including restoration of at least 15 per cent of degraded ecosystems, thereby contributing to climate change mitigation and adaptation and to combating desertification.	Resilience and restoration and climate change mitigation and adaptation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • link between species diversity and ecosystem services • Species and climate change mitigation and adaptation 2.4 species and tipping points • in-situ / ex-situ linkages, re-introduction • Conserving below ground biodiversity • role of species in REDD
Target 16: By 2015, the Nagoya Protocol on Access to Genetic Resources and the Fair and Equitable Sharing of Benefits Arising from their Utilization is in force and operational, consistent with national legislation.	Fair and equitable sharing of benefits	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • exploited species • community-friendly conservation
Strategic goal E. Enhance implementation through participatory planning, knowledge management and capacity building	Response/implementation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Re-engineering species conservation for the next 50 years • evaluation conservation (success and failures) • mechanisms for mobilizing the conservation community • testing effectiveness of landscape planning for

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> species conservation (do corridors work) animal and plant relationship data management and sharing
<p>Target 17: By 2015 each Party has developed, adopted as a policy instrument, and has commenced implementing an effective, participatory and updated national biodiversity strategy and action plan.</p>	<p>National planning of national biodiversity strategy and action plan</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Success stories in conservation Conservation strategies Cultural/ religious outreach Data into policy Legislation and law enforcement Community-friendly conservation Strategic role of zoos/botanic gardens/ butterfly houses/aquariums in conservation Testing some of the policy options: to what extent does species benefit from interventions or contribute to policy options Planning to compare across taxa and get learning, CITES worked for elephants but does it work for marine Taxa, policy options and intervention effectiveness across taxa (maybe works for one but not another)
<p>Target 18: By 2020, the traditional knowledge, innovations and practices of indigenous and local communities relevant for the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity, and their customary use of biological resources, are respected, subject to national legislation and relevant international obligations, and fully integrated and reflected in the implementation of the Convention with the full and effective participation of indigenous and local communities, at all relevant levels.</p>	<p>Indigenous and local communities for conservation including traditional knowledge</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> human/wildlife conflict exploited species success stories in conservation/1.9 Conservation strategies/ 2.12 community-friendly conservation cultural/ religious outreach new approaches to monitoring e.g. smart satellite approaches replacement of species in the market(e.g. ivory, bear bile, tiger parts) conservation of economically valuable species through options other than enforcement

<p>Target 19: By 2020, knowledge, the science base and technologies relating to biodiversity, its values, functioning, status and trends, and the consequences of its loss, are improved, widely shared and transferred,¹ and applied.</p>	<p>Information, science, and data sharing</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • species discoveries • communication, education and media particularly for youth • cultural/ religious outreach • data into policy • Conservation career development • What is a species? (re-defining species) 4.16 what is a species- what about taxonomy? Need to know what they are, we sometimes forget about – taxonomic needs, expertise • Strategic role of zoos/botanic gardens/ butterfly houses/aquariums in conservation • Biomimicry • Species concepts • Taxonomic capacity • future projection scenarios for species • Citizen Science (and conservation and monitoring) • new technologies that feed into citizen science (e.g. frog atlas, butterfly atlas in South Africa, virtual atlas) • new approaches to monitoring e.g. smart satellite approaches • replacement of species in the market(e.g. ivory, bear bile, tiger parts) • planning to compare across taxa and get learning, CITES worked for elephants but does it work for marine Taxa, policy options and intervention effectiveness across taxa (maybe works for one but not another) • Conservation strategies • do interventions for reasons other than species do they deliver at the species? • conservation of economically valuable species through options other than enforcement • rationales for conservation planning • Barometer of life,
<p>Target 20: By 2020, at the latest, the mobilization of financial resources for effectively implementing the Strategic Plan 2011-2020 from all sources and in accordance with the consolidated and agreed process in the Strategy for Resource Mobilization should increase substantially from the current levels. This target will be subject to changes contingent to resources needs assessments to be developed and reported by Parties.</p>	<p>Money, sufficient funding</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mobilising development sectors for conservation • innovative funding for species funding • aims of Species Congress to get species on the political agenda- why we need to do this: high level political agenda- practitioners (grassroots), how cater for both types of participation • how much \$ is being spent trying to protect species?

¹ A reference to Article 16 of the Convention will be added to the technical rationale.

ANNEX 3

Species Communications – Breakout Group Discussion

Breakout Groups:

- Four breakout groups were created
- Each group discussed a target audience (audience group)
- Ideas generated in these groups will be used to develop audience communications strategies as per the exercise example table on p. 21. For each audience
 - what do we want them to do
 - how can we reach them

Audience – Media

- Print
 - Everything has multiplier effect
 - Get specialists – don't do others work
- Film, Video, Radio, DVD
 - Local cultural knowledge and language materials via IUCN members
 - Low cost video, open access, local soundtrack on SSC issues
- Digital
 - Social networking
 - Awareness
 - Action response
 - Beyond control
 - Species images as mandatory corporate screen savers
- Activity
 - Media training
 - Relationship building
 - Establishing partnerships
- Identify and access key environmental journalists
- Media pack incl. SSC Stories
- Access to rich imagery and partnerships e.g. Arkive

Governments / Parliamentarians

- Who
 - All ministries (also finance)
 - IUCN Members
 - Lower info status on environment / conservation (non-specialist audience)
- What
 - Inspire and educate
 - Step process / structure
 - Comms objective – make species conservation sexy, simple and engaging. Red List = THE place for species conservation
- How

- Website
- Pictures, attractive content, Social media links, google, CEC, Wikipedia, media, Nokia?

IUCN world and the conservation community

- Why species matter
- Photos, stories, films, biological highlights
- More complete stories
- Added value of species approach
- How to use species for their own benefit
- Apply our tools to the needs of our constituency – different cultures
- All species are unique but are mutually inter-dependent
- Stories linking consumer choice to species conservation
- More people with appropriate background, advocating for species conservation
- Build species issues into all projects
- Stories linking to ecosystem health/services and livelihoods
- For IUCN management decisions to mainstream species
- Good species ambassadors
- Text for each value dimension (ethics, economics..)
- Women's magazines (women influence men)
- Military
- Conservation community who don't understand species conservation issues well enough
- Private sector

Private Sector and Donors

- Different donors – those we approach as the SSC rather than individual organizations
- Tools that are useful for conservation planning
- Private sector not good as donors get them to use our data = make them pay for it at commercial rates
 - Show them this is good for their bottom line
 - The win-wins – IBAT
- Use SSC as the respectable brand
- Industry association (useful niche providing way to get to these industries in a single go)
 - Mining and minerals
 - WBCSD
 - Davos
- Providing guidelines and standards to reduce impact on biodiversity e.g. logging companies and reduction of impact on great apes
- Tapping into agricultural organizations
- Donors
 - Influencing donor spending (climate change)
 - Getting money from the donors (climate change)
 - Relative to GEF and bilateral agreements, SSC members in-country can receive money for national conservation planning
 - Pushing for framework agreements

- Advisory committee??
- SSC members on the ground in developing countries – different tract than high level targeting

ANNEX 4

IUCN's Strategic Approach to CITES – Breakout Group Discussion

The goal of this session was to refine the questions proposed to answer: What the particular role is of IUCN in CITES? What is the process by which information from IUCN can be used in CITES? Should IUCN make recommendations for CITES meetings (e.g., advocacy)?

A list of proposed questions for consideration in this review had been prepared in advance and is given below. The breakout group made revisions to these questions.

List of proposed questions (proposed addition in italicised bold type):

Previous engagement with CITES and IUCN

1. What previous involvement have you had with CITES?
2. Have you contributed directly to IUCN's participation in the CITES process? If yes, how – i.e., on IUCN delegation to COP, or Standing Committee (SC); Animals Committee (AC); Plants Committee (PC), or some other CITES process (e.g., inter-sessional processes, such as projects arising from resolutions or decisions; assisting range States in the preparation of or review of CITES listing proposals or making of non-detriment findings)?
3. What form of financial support (if any) from IUCN have you received in the past to aid your participation in IUCN preparations for CITES?
4. Have you taken part in the CITES Analyses? If so, was it useful and an objective process? Did it contribute to desired conservation outcomes?
5. What is your overall impression of IUCN's organization and preparedness for CITES (relative to other groups like WWF, TRAFFIC and so on)?
6. Do you think there is a lack of clarity re what you can say as a formal intervention in plenary and also outside of the formal meetings?

IUCN's future engagement in CITES

7. Is IUCN a conservation advocate or a neutral scientific advisor in CITES? Is it possible for IUCN to be both (or different parts of IUCN to have differentiated roles)? If IUCN should do both, how would the scientific advice be seen as authoritative, independent and objective?

J Hutton rewording: How can IUCN most productively engage as a neutral scientific advisor and how can IUCN engage as an advocate. Can both be done?

S Stuart commented that there is an issue concerning what is advocacy and what the definition is. Should advocacy be left to the IUCN Members? It is unclear where Specialist Groups fit in this (can they be advocates for certain things and also fully neutral on other things?).

8. Should IUCN take positions on CITES listing proposals (always, sometimes, never)? If sometimes, what criteria should be used for deciding whether or not to take a position? Should IUCN have supported, for example, Appendix I listing of Bluefin tuna?

9. Is it true that CITES is paying less attention to science and more attention to economic / political issues when making decisions within the Convention? If so, what can IUCN help do about this?

10. Should Red List releases be timed to influence CITES policies?

11. What do you see as the greatest challenges facing CITES? How could IUCN help in overcoming these challenges?

12. Should IUCN continue to engage with CITES? Why – what is IUCN's comparative advantage?

13. How could IUCN better support the Convention intersessionally? (e.g., More work along the lines of the support to rhino issues)

14. Should IUCN continue to form part of the TRAFFIC/WWF/IUCN trio that engages with CITES? Is it clear to you how the three groups relate to one another?

15. How can IUCN better support Commission engagement in CITES?

16. Does CITES have sufficient linkages with other MEAs? If not, how can IUCN help facilitate this?

17. Has CITES effectively integrated the MDGs and the broader international development and economic agenda into its work? What role can IUCN have in this?

18. How should/could IUCN be engaging on the issues of ABS within the CITES forum?

19. How can IUCN contribute to in-country, science-based, capacity building to help make CITES more effective at the national level?

Others:

20. Have you been associated directly with any CITES projects (e.g., Significant Trade; Listing Criteria; MIKE, ETIS, Livelihoods, etc)? If yes, have these projects produced desired conservation outcomes? Was IUCN's participation in these optimal? If not, how could it be improved?

21. [For non-secretariat] In previous engagement with IUCN secretariat on CITES, whom have you primarily engaged with?

22. [For non-secretariat] What is your view of the role that IUCN staff play in CITES?

23. Should IUCN take positions on other agenda items on the COP agenda (always, sometimes, never)?

24. Should IUCN take positions on agenda items on the SC agenda (always, sometimes, never)? If sometimes, what criteria should be used for deciding whether or not to take a position?

25. Should IUCN take positions on other agenda items on the AC/PC agenda (always, sometimes, never)? If sometimes, what criteria should be used for deciding whether or not to take a position?

26. What are countries' (Parties to CITES) opinion of IUCN and its approach to CITES? E.g. are governments interested in IUCN giving advice and recommendations in addition to contributing its scientific data to CITES meetings? Do Parties want IUCN and TRAFFIC to continue producing the Analyses document and would they be interested in IUCN recommendations based on the Analyses?

27. Should IUCN encourage Parties to address international trade of commercially = exploited species through CITES (in addition to or instead of RFMOs)?

28. Is there a role for a larger focus on using economic incentives in CITES? If so, how could IUCN help with this?

29. Are CITES structures, processes, rules and procedures fit for purpose? What role can IUCN play in making these more effective?

30. Does CITES science make the proper links with CITES policy? Do we have the right mix in IUCN of scientific analyses and policy analyses in CITES?

31. Should other parts of IUCN be more engaged with CITES – e.g. Policy, Law, Economics, Marine, Forests?

32. Is CITES equipped with the tools need for assessing sustainability? Can IUCN provide these tools?

Y Sadovy asked if it might be easier IUCN could have a specific advocacy role regarding species issues outside the CITES process, e.g., Shatter the Myth campaign that focused on the issue of marine extinctions. IUCN needs to identify where there are some key perception problems, which is something that also could be considered outside of and beyond CITES.

A Rosenberg suggested the need to determine what other things IUCN needs to do to have more of an impact on CITES outcomes and issues dealt with in CITES (e.g. more consultation with RFMOs and FAO regarding marine commercial species). IUCN is currently not very active in RFMOs such as ICCAT.

J Robinson asked that given that science is not necessarily being considered in any great depth by CITES during its meetings when coming to key decisions, how does IUCN deal with that situation?

A Stattersfield noted that Birdlife is engaged in RFMOs, this being a major component of its seabird work. Their advocacy efforts have been to monitor by-catch and mitigate issues. It may be useful to talk to the seabird team with regards to whether it would make a difference for IUCN to play more of a role in RFMOs.

A Rosenberg added that this comes back to the question about whether IUCN is an advocate in RFMO meetings too or only a scientific advisor?

J Donaldson stated that there is a science role in CITES but an extended role is also needed – recognising where science plays a role and how to improve that.

S Stuart confirmed that IUCN's main role regarding CITES has been as a scientific advisor, but there have been a number of situations where IUCN has made clear recommendations, albeit based on science, e.g., with crocodilians.

A Stattersfield added that there is a big gap in what IUCN is doing; the IUCN Red List should be used to communicate species that could benefit from proposals (outside of the proposals that the Parties submit each year). For example, every two years a shadow list of species could be produced that may be considered for listing. This would change engagement from being reactive to proactive. Where use has been identified as a threat and related to international trade, making that information more proactively available would be helpful.

S Stuart noted that there is a first step in that direction with regards to the US Fish and Wildlife Service funding of the Asian snake assessment work. This work will highlight the Red List status of these species, and indicate which species are most impacted by trade.

J Hutton said that this is a difficult process and proposed that, instead of circulating these questions, or conducting phone interviews, a better way might be to circulate a draft paper on IUCN's role in CITES for comment. The starting point for this paper would be to emphasise IUCN's value proposition, as a scientific advisor (through the SSC) and as a facilitator and convener.

A Stattersfield agreed that J Hutton's idea of drafting a paper first off would be a good way to approach this consultation.

S Stuart agreed that doing a very short paper might be a way forward. There are three main ways in which IUCN engages with CITES: 1) providing information alone; 2) pushing for particular conservation outcomes; and 3) facilitating and convening. The paper could describe these three functions to elicit feedback.

J Robinson suggested considering all the various IUCN elements (including SSC Specialist Groups) and defining what role each element has, or potentially could have, within the CITES process. Identifying a specific niche for each unit would help to clarify things.

A Rosenberg proposed that IUCN could set up a meeting with the key delegations six months ahead of meetings to convey information for use in meetings.

S Stuart noted that if a short paper is decided upon it should be clear that it is not just about the COP, but also about the full range of interactions with CITES. The draft paper would need to be put forward proposed answers to questions about what IUCN's role should be. Such an approach might help flesh out the issue of the definition of advocacy, and how this might usefully be addressed in the IUCN/CITES context. The paper also needs to deal with the IUCN Members and their role, not just the Secretariat and the Commissions.

A Rosenberg suggested encouraging SSC members to participate on government delegations in order to communicate information.

It was agreed that the short paper (2 to 5 pages) was a better way to approach this consultation.

A Rosenberg proposed that IUCN could make recommendations but they would have to be based on science. There should be a clear IUCN protocol for this and SSC SGs need to know when Red List updates are going to happen in order to allow them prepare for input and information on certain issues. The 'Analyses' could have information about "things that need to be considered" rather than advocating for an outcome per se.

J Hutton noted that IUCN generates recommendations on proposals to amend the Appendices. The CITES Secretariat is also asked to make recommendations on proposals at COP meetings. The IUCN could feed into this and support the process. It would be useful to know what the uptake of the Secretariat recommendations are for the proposals and how this differs from TRAFFIC's recommendations. The advisory role of IUCN to the CITES Secretariat could be formalised through an MOU.

ANNEX 5

SSC Endorsement of Species Conservation Plans and Projects – Breakout Group Discussion

Attendees

Mark Stanley Price (MP)
John Donaldson (JD)
John Robinson (JR)
Russell Mittermeier (RM)
Danna Leaman (DL)
Jon Hutton (JH)
Urs Breitenmoser
Mike Hoffmann
Jean-Christophe Vié
Jonathan Baillie
Dena Cator

J Robinson asked whether there were any specific recommendations that this group would work with for this discussion.

M Stanley Price thought that the only feasible way forward regarding options for IUCN endorsement of species conservation plans would be the open standards system. There are a number of principles needed for this: 1) a good status review, 2) inclusiveness, and 3) rigour in the thinking, so that testable hypotheses are produced about problems and solutions are defined with strong monitoring, feedback and adaptive management systems.

J Robinson noted that it makes sense for the IUCN to endorse Species Plans, because it is good to have a standard. He had two questions: 1) what are the minimums that we want to think about (e.g. the need to monitor, adaptive management, to have a measurable plan)?; 2) how does the SSC and IUCN respond to all plans out there and do reviews of them without getting bogged down? A suggestion was not to do extensive reviews but to touch on certain standards, for example, if a species plan meets a set of minimum standards, then IUCN can publish it rather than endorsing it per se.

R Mittermeier agreed that a flexible, common-sense approach was required. It could be the responsibility of the SSC Chair to determine if a species plan is up to standard, but the approval process should not be too rigid or onerous.

D Leaman noted that at the beginning of the FairWild process, consideration was given to whether or not a best-practice document would be better than an actual standard. For a standard you need to have stakeholders agree on a set of principles and criteria that indicate that the standard has been met. Then you need indicators to monitor it against. If the SSC wants a monitoring and verification system attached to guidance, it becomes a huge effort to maintain a standard. D Leaman added that currently there are guidelines for best practice in the IUCN planning handbook and this might be a more effective means in which to proceed.

M Stanley Price suggested that species conservation planning being dealt differently from the FairWild standard. What was needed was a simpler process so that species plans could be labelled as “SSC good practice plans”.

U Breitenmoser noted that there should be a distinction between publishing a species plan and endorsing that plan. For example, many plans are published on the Cat SG website, but no responsibility is taken by the SG for content. Endorsement however, implies that the IUCN would have some kind of control and responsibility (e.g., in terms of follow-up, revision, renewal, timing); if that is not the desired mandate, then the plans should not be “endorsed”. Also the endorsing process should look at who the owners are of a strategy (e.g., for a Pan-African lion conservation strategy endorsed by all governments, should be involved in endorsing the strategy and be involved in its implementation?). This would mean that IUCN would need to have both the mandate and the capacity for this.

JC Vié recognised that the current discussion was similar to the endorsement of national Red Lists, with similar issues regarding checking if people have used the right standards. In the past, one person in the Species Programme has reviewed draft SSC SG action plans prior to their publication by IUCN. Many of these plans have been done seriously, but different SGs have not always followed the same standards in their action planning. When IUCN is involved from the start (e.g., in Djibouti) the work can be intensive. Also, what if IUCN endorses a plan but then there are last minute changes from the governments, how should that be dealt with?

M Stanley Price added that in Madagascar, there is a good Golden Mantella plan produced following the SSC guidelines. The producers of the plan would like to put the IUCN and SSC logos on it before going to the government for final approval, as this would provide them with a better chance of securing that approval. However, if the IUCN logo is put on a publication too soon and the plan changes, where does that leave us?

JC Vié noted that IUCN is not now publishing or funding old-style action plans to any significant extent, partly because there are few donors for this, and partly because SSC SGs now tend to have other priorities. But the IUCN and SSC logos have been allowed to go on publications. It is important that whoever produces species conservation plans, should drive the process.

U Breitenmoser suggested that if IUCN endorses a plan, then it must go out and train SSC SGs on best-practice standards. Even as SSC SG Chairs, it is not possible to be responsible for all the follow-ups. IUCN is in a good position to address governments and work with them in a different way than other organisations. For example, IUCN could ask questions about the implementation of plans (whether the plan is being implemented in a proper way), although thought would need to be given about the most suitable response to a violation of the plan.

M Stanley Price clarified that very few requests for endorsing species plans were actually received but that S Stuart was looking for a proactive approach.

JC Vié added that care should be taken not to overload IUCN by having a detailed approval process for plans.

J Donaldson asked if IUCN should endorse the approach or the outcome. IUCN would need a lot of information, and to be involved in the planning process, to determine whether all relevant information is included in a plan.

M Hoffmann noted that the Iguana SG has a lot of experience in developing species action plans in regions. There will be plans that will be done in the SSC according to the IUCN conservation planning guidelines and those could perhaps get a certain type of branding. But, then IUCN will receive a whole suite of other types of plans that it will need to make a decision on whether or not it will “endorse” or “publish” them.

M Stanley Price added that the handbook on species conservation planning is being sent proactively to the SSC Specialist Groups in order to encourage them actually to plan for the conservation of their species, and to use the handbook to guide such processes.

R Mittermeier suggested that when a SG is known to be effective, the IUCN logo should be put on any relevant plans from them. The same for where there is strong government involvement; common-sense needs to be used when approving plans.

M Stanley Price stated that the Species Conservation Planning Sub-Committee can get in contact with Specialist Groups and help manage the species planning process where relevant. However, plans completed out of the blue could still be sent to IUCN for endorsement.

J Robinson noted that the general agreement was that the role of IUCN is to endorse plans. If the plans are not related to an SSC SG, the body producing the action plan can approach an SG for interaction and approval. Regarding implementation, there needs to be thought about how to drive forward plans and monitor them over time. For example, with the African Wild Dog plan, if it was endorsed it would give it more clout and more profile at national and regional levels. IUCN should be able to comment on whether a plan has been implemented and link it to something bigger if we are concerned about the implementation.

J Robinson added that the initial response of the SSC Strategic Conservation Planning Task Force was the need to improve the original action plans. Plans should: 1) have objectives / goals; 2) be measurable and related to species populations; 3) have a monitoring process resulting in adaptive management; and 4) have a reality check including adequate funding, stakeholder involvement and government buy-in. These could be the primary principles to be considered for discussion. If the key principles can be confirmed, then the process that SSC will follow for endorsing / accepting species conservation plans can be also be agreed upon. For example, does just the SG sign off on a plan or is it someone in the Species Programme? Issues that need to be thought about: 1) are these new species conservation plans different from the old action plans? 2) Is there a set of standards and practices associated with them? 3) How does IUCN deal with this? Stakeholders could be a separate criterion.

R Mittermeier stated that many of the original IUCN species action plans were effective but the failure was caused by expectation that if an action plan was produced, IUCN would fund it. There was a lot of disappointment about this, because there was no follow-up from IUCN. The idea of some kind of Red List certification process for species action plans is too onerous. Many action plans are funded and coordinated by donors so

the approval process can be less onerous. Consideration needs to be given to the fact that GEF-eligible countries (developing nations) have 500,000 dollars each to produce or refine National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans. These processes could be linked with SSC's species conservation planning.

M Stanley Price proposed that IUCN needs to be flexible in terms of content for conservation plans as government and donor-led plans can be very different from IUCN's in format. IUCN could state its endorsement of species conservation plans by supporting the process, but not specifically the content of the plan in question. But care is needed to ensure that IUCN has the time to check publications before they go out with the IUCN logo on it. If IUCN endorses a species conservation plan, that could include use of the IUCN and logos plus a written endorsement statement. There could be endorsement statements on different levels, for example, if there was a difficult political situation, you could seek out higher endorsement (e.g., from IUCN rather than just a SG). Also, some early species action plans were very successful because action planning was used as a tool rather than a starting point; plans were successful because people wanted to do the actions. IUCN and the SCPSC should encourage countries to prepare species action plans, and should make sure that these countries know about the SSC plans that have been developed or which are underway. This could affect the success of the implementation of the plans, and could have an influence on how IUCN endorses and implements the plans. If there is a plan involving several countries, IUCN endorsement could be set at a higher level than a SG.

M Hoffmann added that the responsibility of IUCN must be stated specifically in any given plan. U Breitenmoser agreed that if IUCN gives endorsement to a species action plan, there must be certain quality criteria in place. M Hoffmann further noted that the review of species conservation plans is too onerous for the IUCN Secretariat; this would have to be done by the SGs. To ensure a rigorous procedure was in place, third party verification would be required, with IUCN being the final sign-off after the SGs. J Robinson agreed that a third, external level of verification of conservation plans could be used beyond SG endorsement.

JC Vié noted that with IUCN's old action plans, there was text in the publications stating that the "views in the document are not necessarily endorsed by IUCN". This is a standard statement in all IUCN publications now.

M Hoffmann stated that this type of statement frequently comes across as being negative, so a more positive and proactive was needed with any new species action plans. The SCPSC might be the level at which to decide to put the SSC logo on a publication. IUCN would need to think about whether it would be involved in that way before government input or after.

J Robinson proposed that the sign-off of plans needs to be simultaneous – both IUCN and government at the same time.

M Hoffmann said that people want the IUCN / SSC logo to help with government endorsement of plans.

J Baillie noted that the SG Chairs could facilitate communication with the Species Programme regarding the endorsement of plans, through something like five key points.

This could be a standardised approach, so that the Secretariat can approve the use of the logo as well as overall endorsement, so there would be a joint approval process.

JC Vié also suggested considering species conservation plans in the context of the Convention on Migratory Species and other conventions which are important for planning.

J Baillie stated that the IUCN has a special role in action planning, and development of action plans should be done with the policy people in the regions. This is about using the entire IUCN network and membership for conservation planning rather than just the IUCN offices to do this.

U Breitenmoser suggested that if there was a clear endorsement statement about a conservation plan, it will speed up the process of endorsement and it will be helpful for SGs in facilitating these plans. SG Chairs can communicate that if certain criteria are met, then it will be possible for IUCN to endorse a species conservation plan and consequently include the IUCN logo. Endorsements by IUCN should be in writing and must be based on satisfying a certain number of quality criteria in addition to the logo.

M Hoffmann asked how endorsement would play out for higher-level multi-national species plans. There should not be more than a two-stage approval process.

JC Vié suggested the need for some general guidelines with regards to maps, definition of countries (e.g., Taiwan) for plans, and that is something IUCN can assist with.

M Hoffmann asked about a non-SSC group wanting IUCN's endorsement on a plan? U Breitenmoser noted that in the past, the Cat SG has been asked to review other plans not related to the SSC and it has reviewed them but has not specifically endorsed them.

JC Vié said that there was a need to reiterate and clarify use of logos. When can the IUCN and SSC logos be used? This requires general clarification.

M Hoffmann felt that if the SSC logo can be used on its own, then this could be helpful for a more expedient sign off. If external requests are received for IUCN to endorse action plans that it has not been involved in at all, then it would be very hard for IUCN to endorse them. D Cator proposed communicating external plans through existing IUCN plans or through the IUCN website, even if IUCN does not specifically endorse them. J Baillie added that this was already happening through the national Red List website – communicating various countries' Red Lists and related information.

JC Vié noted that with regards to SOS, species-specific issues are supposed to be addressed and this is something that the SCPSC should get involved in. It would not be endorsement but would be deciding what kind of action plans to develop for species under the SOS. SOS will have project calls in 2011 that focus on SSC action plans, there might be a way to develop some standards for projects too.

ANNEX 6

Summary of Action Points for SCC 4.3

	Who	Action Item	Agenda Item
1	S Stuart	To prepare an SSC briefing paper on the conservation of Korean wetlands prior to IUCN Congress, and will provide an update to the next Steering Committee meeting.	4
2	D Cator	To communicate FINIDA's expression of interest in assisting other countries on National Red Listing to R Miller and C Pollock of the Red List Unit.	5a
3	C Santer	To add photographs to Species Programme organogram	5a
4	Y Xie, J Baillie, JP Rodríguez	To discuss national Red Lists, and how the National Red List Working Group can engage with China.	5b
5	Y Xie	To contact J Gerlach (TIRLA) to discuss how the endemic Chinese invertebrates can be brought on to the IUCN Red List.	5c
6	Y Sadovy , A Rosenberg, M Samways	To liaise with each other on the by-catch issue.	5d
7	RLTWG	Red List Technical Working Group to review the Red List documentation requirements, and to make a proposal for any modifications. This proposal should be presented to the Red List Committee for approval and then to the Steering Committee for final adoption, for implementation in the next IUCN Quadrennium.	5e
8	D Cator	To assist the SCPSC with finding resources for the next meeting in late March 2011.	5f
9	M Stanley Price	To liaise with A Stattersfield on BirdLife participation in the SCPSC.	5f
10	T Contreras J Langley	To build links with the ISSG (through M de Poorter), the CCTF (though W Foden); To assist with making suitable links between the FCSC and the IUCN Water Programme.	5g
11	C Santer	To prepare a report on SSC SG and Stand-Alone RLA membership for the next Steering Committee meeting.	5h/5i
12	CBSG	The Steering Committee agreed that the Technical Guidelines of the Management of ex-situ Populations for Conservation should be revised through a consultation process, and requested that CBSG lead this process.	5n
13	M Hoffmann	Chairs of the Sub-Committees and SC members to nominate suitable individuals with whom the CBSG could liaise on the revision of the guidelines. M Hoffmann to coordinate.	5n
14	S Stuart, J Smart	To work with G Dick and J Junghold (with B Haddane and R Mittermeier representing members of Council) to prepare a short paper for the May 2011 IUCN Council	6a

		meeting outlining the need for the WSC, and asking for authorization for the bidding process by IUCN State Members to start. This paper will need to make a final recommendation on the WSC date (2013 or 2015). The paper will need to be completed by the end of March 2011.	
15	J Robinson	To provide link to Pew Charitable Trusts to L Labanne.	6b
16	L Labanne, R Roberts, P Medici, M Stanley Price	L Labanne to work on completing the draft of the 2011 Communications Strategy for the SSC and the Species Programme, working with P Medici, M Stanley Price and R Roberts. The draft will be reviewed at the next Steering Committee meeting.	6b
17	M Hoffmann M Hoffmann M Hoffmann S Stuart, J Smart S Stuart, J Smart S Stuart	<p>IUCN's Strategic Approach to CITES Paper:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) December - develop list of people to circulate document to including core group 2) January 21 – first draft of document sent to core team 3) February 28 – revision of document and send out for first external review – broad consultation 4) March 30 – revision of document and completion of version 2 5) April 15 – final review / sign off 6) April 25 – submission of document to Council 7) May 23 – presentation of document at Council <p>The core team supporting this work was defined as: J Hutton (crocodiles); S Stuart; M Hoffmann; Thomasina Oldfield; Sarah Fowler; D Cator; Amie Brautigam; Y Sadovy; J Donaldson; Holly Dublin; S Broad; Y Xie; A Rosenberg; Alison Rosser; Dietrich Jelden; Sue Mainka; A Stattersfield. The CITES Secretariat must be informed of progress.</p>	6c
18	SCPSC	The Species Conservation Planning Sub-Committee will develop and fine-tune a practical, resource-light process by which IUCN and SSC can endorse species conservation plans, and will recommend this to the next Steering Committee meeting	6e
19	J Smart, T Brooks, R Mittermeier, J Baillie, J Hutton	To push this forward IUCN's engagement in the implementation of the CBD Strategic Plan.	6f
20	M Hoffmann	To oversee the consultation process with the Specialist Groups, Red List Authorities and Sub-Committees, and to present the draft to the next meeting of the Red List Committee. The final draft should be brought to the Steering Committee for adoption before the end of the current quadrennium.	6h

21	J Baillie, B Haddane	To work on the Sahelo-Saharan species and CMS Programme and report back to the next meeting of the Steering Committee.	7a
22	B Haddane, M de Poorter	B Haddane to represent the SSC on the work on urban parks with input from M de Poorter.	7b
23	D Cator, A Rodrigues, B Haddane	To follow up on a web story of IPAs in the Mediterranean, liaising with Plantlife International.	7c
24	E Shaughnessy	To form and lead an SSC Archiving Task Force and to develop and coordinate a long-term archiving strategy.	7d
25	L Labanne, R Roberts	To prepare a discussion paper on photos for the next SSC SC meeting.	7f
26	S Stuart, J Smart	To consider the views of SC members and come to a rapid decision on the future of SPOD in 2011.	
27	Y Sadovy, F Launay	To lead on moving the confiscation guidelines forward, starting with a consultation within the Re-introduction Specialist Group.	7i
28	J McNeely, S Stuart, J Smart	To provide input to the situation analysis and 2013-2016 IUCN Programme.	7j
29	R Roberts	To circulate a Doodle poll on dates for the next SC meeting.	8