



**SSC STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING WCC 4.4
BUKIT TALITA MOUNTAIN RESORT, INDONESIA, 5-7 JULY 2011**

MINUTES

1. WELCOME, APOLOGIES, INTRODUCTIONS

1a. Chair's Welcome

SSC Chair Simon Stuart welcomed the Species Survival Commission (SSC) Steering Committee members to the fourth 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, Brahim Haddane, Hans de longh, Mirza Kusri, Danna Leaman, Jeff McNeely, Patricia Medici, Russell Mittermeier, Jon Paul Rodríguez, Anders Rhodin, Yvonne Sadovy, Michael Samways, Mark Stanley Price, Simon Stuart

Institutional Observers:

Elizabeth Bennett, Thomas Brooks, Carlos Drewes, Jon Hutton, Taej Mundkur, Andrew Rosenberg, Alison Stattersfield, Jane Smart, Jean-Christophe Vié

SSC Chair's Office:

Michael Hoffmann, Rachel Roberts

Guest attendees:

Onnie Byers, George Greene; Robert Mathers (IUCN Southeast Asia Regional Office)

Apologies were received from the following Steering Committee members and observers: Jonathan Baillie, Steve Broad, Claudio Campagna, Maj de Poorter, John Donaldson, Bob Lacy, Frédéric Launay, Stella Simiyu, Yan Xie

A special thank you was given by S Stuart to M Kusri for organising the pre-Steering Committee meeting symposium – “Issues in Global Species Conservation Effort” – at

Gedung Rektorat Institut Pertanian, Bogor Kampus, Darmaga, on July 4th, 2011. Twelve members of the Steering Committee gave presentations to 195 participants at the symposium and 30 people who joined via Internet live streaming. S Stuart noted that a number of hugely enthusiastic pupils attended which boded well for the future of conservation in Indonesia.

S Stuart welcomed a new International Observer for the SSC Steering Committee from Wetlands International, Taej Mundkur and also Onnie Byers who was standing in as the Conservation Breeding Specialist Group (CBSG) representative Bob Lacy. Bob Lacy has stepped down as Chair of the CBSG effective from 30 September 2011, so S Stuart gave special thanks for all of Bob's hard work and great success in leading the CBSG over the last eight years.

S Stuart asked the Steering Committee if they were happy with the current format of the minutes of their meetings. It was agreed that a summary of the main points are to be provided with action points, together with a voice recording which is to be archived as a CD and also put on-line with the minutes.

2. ADOPTION OF THE AGENDA

The Steering Committee adopted the agenda.

3. PREVIOUS MINUTES (WCC 4.3, 7–9 December 2010, Gland, Switzerland)

The minutes of WCC 4.3 were adopted by the Steering Committee following one amendment requested by JC Vié on the wording of section 5m, "there is a small amount" of money in SOS for Red Listing. This will be amended to read that SOS is not able to support National Red Listing.

4. MATTERS ARISING

Two items of matters arising were identified from the Steering Committee meeting WCC 4.3 that will now be moved to the next Steering Committee meeting.

	<u>Who</u>	<u>Action Item</u>	<u>SSC 4.2 Agenda Item</u>	<u>Update</u>
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	Ongoing – verbal report to be provided for SC Meeting 4.5
5	Y Sadovy, F Launay	To lead on moving the confiscation guidelines forward, starting with a consultation within the Reintroduction Specialist Group.	7i	Ongoing – verbal report to be provided for SC Meeting 4.5
	Y Xie,	In a review on the current guidelines on confiscated	6a	Ongoing –

	Y Sadovy, S Broad	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 reptilecentric. A proposal to be drafted to move this forward.		progress to be reviewed at SC Meeting 4.5
--	----------------------	--	--	---

5. REPORTS

5a. Report of the SSC Chair and Global Species Programme (GSP)

Full details to be found on pages 54-150, WCC 4.4 agenda pack.

i) General Report of the SSC Chair (Simon Stuart; p. 70, WCC 4.4 agenda pack)

S Stuart provided a detailed report of the work of the SSC Chair's office since the last Steering Committee meeting in December 2010. A huge thank you was given to the Environment Agency Abu Dhabi (EAD) which has agreed to provide generous support for the work of the SSC over the next three years – CHF 450,000 per year for three years. In particular, S Stuart offered a special thanks to both Ms Razan Khalifa Al Mubarak, Director General of the EAD, and Fred Launay for their commitment and support to bringing about this agreement. The new funding has been designed to be relatively flexible, but initially focus will be given to Red List training, sustainable use, species conservation planning, invasive species and biodiversity assessments in West Asia, plus several others. Investment is also proposed for a number of Red List Authorities (RLAs) to complete their Red List assessments, specifically the plant groups.

S Stuart reported on the extremely useful and stimulating CEESP Sharing Power Conference he attended in New Zealand in January, and added that some of the EAD funding agreement will contribute to core funding the Sustainable Use Specialist Group (SUSG) which will now be shared between SSC and CEESP. Core funding of \$300,000 USD / year for the next 5 years has also been received for this group from the Government of Newfoundland and Labrador. A call for nominations for the new Chair of the SUSG will be sent out shortly.

J Hutton noted that the timing of re-establishing the SUSG and finding the right Chairs is critical since sustainable use forms one of the three pillars of CBD. D Leaman acknowledged that better representation of plants is needed in the SUSG, and the Plant Conservation Sub-Committee is prepared to step up to this. S Stuart added that in the Terms of Reference of the SUSG, which are currently being developed with Aroha Mead, emphasis has been placed on all use, with specific focus on plants and fishes.

A summary of the Red List update was provided with emphasis accorded to the conservation success of Arabian Oryx which has now been downlisted. A total of 59,508 species are now on the Red List, and there is ongoing work to look at how to calculate percentages of Threatened species to achieve best estimates.

ACTION: Mike Hoffmann to provide a short summary for the Steering Committee explaining the issue of threatened species' percentages, and providing with key statistics of the percentages of threatened species in different taxonomic groups.

M Hoffmann noted that a set of guidelines for calculations and reporting of the percentages of threatened species has been developed and will sit with Red List Committee for future updates.

M Samways asked about the IUCN rules for when a species recorded in the Red List is thought to be extinct but is then rediscovered. M Hoffmann explained that 'Extinct' species which are rediscovered are immediately removed to the 'Critically Endangered' category but marked as a non-genuine change. Explicit criteria are being developed by the Standards and Petition Sub-Committee on how to distinguish extinction to avoid these situations.

J McNeely raised the issue of fundraising when there is a new update of the Red List. This would be taken under 5b - Red List Committee report.

S Stuart drew attention to a paper just published in *Science Express* called "High Value and Long-Lived: Double Jeopardy for Tuna and Billfishes". This was led by the SSC Tuna and Billfish SG and the GSP Marine Biodiversity Unit (MBU), and included fisheries scientists, ichthyologists, extinction risk experts and conservation biologists in its authorship. This high-impact paper showing links between generation length, market price and level of threat, across all the tuna and billfish species.

S Stuart also provided details of CITES work and his work as an IUCN Council member. He will be working with the new Deputy Director General of IUCN to help develop a new IUCN business plan for the next Council meeting, which is to include greater transparency in the allocation of core funds. It was noted that the percentage of flexible funding available to the Global Species Programme (GSP) has fallen below a critical level

There are to be enhanced links between the Global Invasive Species Database and the Red List / SIS. S Stuart also reported on the increasing misrepresentation of IUCN policies on invasive species (with papers being published with titles such as 'Embracing Invasives'). Conflicts on this issue are playing out in a number of high-impact academic journals, and the Chair of the SSC Invasive Species Specialist Group (ISSG), Piero Genovesi, has taken a strong lead on these.

S Stuart acknowledged that work to establish an SSC Archive Task Force had made slow progress; this initiative is being led by Elaine Shaughnessy. There are ongoing discussions centred on the possibility of housing the SSC archives at the Cambridge University Library, but this is far from certain. Work on a book on the history of SSC also needs to begin.

S Stuart congratulated NatureServe, with four university partners, for receiving a \$2m award from the US National Science Foundation for completion of the Western Hemisphere reptile assessments for the IUCN Red List, and subsequent biogeographic analyses of all tetrapods of the Americas.

S Stuart also reported good progress on the Amphibian Survival Alliance and the Action Asia campaign (joint with the European Association of Zoos and Aquariums – EAZA).

S Stuart noted the sad loss of two senior members from SSC this year – Peter van Bree (former Steering Committee member) and Jim Conroy (Chair of the Otter Specialist Group).

S Stuart gave thanks to the generous financial support for the SSC Chair's office, and also thanked the team in his office, the GSP and the Red List Partnership for their huge contributions.

In looking to the rest of the quadrennium, S Stuart noted that there are still some major matters that have to be addressed and topics which need constant attention, including on issues on which were previously thought to have been won by conservationists (the recent dispute over a road through the Serengeti being a good example). He questioned, "are we being effective in the conservation movement and having an impact, even with the very limited resources that we have?".

S Stuart stated that climate change remains largely unaddressed together with the impacts of economic development and how they affect key wildlife habitats. In general, low priority is given to conservation and wildlife worldwide and there is a widening gap between rhetoric and reality. There is a need to acknowledge that four countries are becoming major players and will change the world – China, India, Brazil and Russia. Organised crime and bycatch are still largely issues that require action, and there is a worrying rapid loss of megafauna in West and Central Africa.

S Stuart concluded that, in the next four years, the SSC must be instrumental in directing future work to possibly tackle some of these issues, but it must be effective and look towards building targeted actions into the next Species Strategic Plan (the SSC's and GSP's part within the Global IUCN Programme for 2013-2016).

J Smart agreed that it was timely to be having these discussions since the SSC and GSP are best placed as a community to achieve conservation action. Increasingly, however, there are limited resources, particularly in terms of staff, which will influence what can be realistically achieved. With this in mind, J Smart asked "what is the best use of our time jointly to achieve the greatest impact?" One obstacle that needs to be overcome is the slowness of getting data onto the Red List and getting the key information out to the right audiences.

R Mittermeier stated that there was a key issue of funding, with minute amounts of money going into these issues. The SSC must look to effectively package the things that it does to increase the success of its fundraising.

Y Sadovy suggested that a better understanding of biodiversity is needed in society and added that, although there has been some positive change, getting back to basics is still required. As awareness grows, people achieve greater understanding and want to do something, so knowing about an issue and caring about that issue is what changes behaviour.

ii) **General report on the Global Species Programme (GSP)** (Jane Smart; p. 70, WCC 4.4 agenda pack and p. 2 of WCC 4.4 addenda)

J Smart provided an overview of the work of the GSP which currently now totals 52 staff. The recent Red List update had gained fabulous media coverage. The next Red List update is scheduled for November of this year.

J Smart reported on both the Marine and Freshwater Biodiversity Units, saying that both were doing extremely well. J Smart gave special thanks and recognition to Will Darwall and his team for the production of "The Diversity of Life in African Freshwaters: underwater, under threat". This now provides the freshwater sector with detailed information for its work. It also provides the material needed to enhance media interest on the issue of freshwater biodiversity. The Freshwater Biodiversity Unit is now moving to projects in Asia.

J Smart noted that the European Red List work represented an effective partnership with EU which gives great results. However, although good assessment work is being carried out, it is not being processed fast enough and therefore does not always make it onto the Red List in a timely fashion. J Smart stated that, because of the decline in available core funding, there must be a protocol early in the development of new assessment projects to ensure that the costs of the Red List Unit are budgeted in.

J Smart provided an update on the Species Information Service (SIS), announcing that a technical version 2 is to be launched in July 2011. The Red List website has also undergone a major backend upgrade which was launched mid-June. J Smart reported on Red List training and the key challenge of getting more people trained.

J Smart turned to the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity which incorporates the Convention on Biological Diversity's (CBD) 20 Targets for 2010. Lead champions in IUCN have been established for each of the 20 targets, each of whom will facilitate the implementation of key IUCN work their allocated target. All six IUCN commissions are keen to follow up this work.

J Smart noted that the scientific bodies of all the biodiversity-related conventions have asked IUCN to map the CBD targets specifically to their own treaties and strategic frameworks (specifically on how their own conventions can contribute to the 2020 Targets). At the next CBD Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice (SBSTTA) meeting in Montreal in November 2011, the IUCN position papers have to be written early and be short, clear and easy to understand.

J Smart concluded by reminding everyone that the Species Programme is now called the Global Species Programme (GSP).

5b. Report of the Red List Committee (Jeff McNeely; p. 126, WCC 4.4 agenda pack)

J McNeely gave an overview of the activities of the Red List Committee (RLC) including reporting on the meeting held in May 2011, in Arlington, USA. The focus of the meeting was on the draft Strategic Plan for the Red List which has a new goal to be approved by the SSC Steering Committee. J McNeely reported that the Red List Technical Working

Group (RLTWG) is to look into approaches for making reassessments of speciose taxonomic groups both logistically and financially feasible.

Some of the other major issues of focus at the meeting were: the publishing of Red List Guidelines in other languages; seeking the support of the SSC Steering Committee to ensure that Red List assessments are published as freely available DOI-numbered publications (an important means of recognising the contributions of volunteers); and encouraging links between the Red List and Global Invasive Species Database (GISD).

J McNeely stated that it was important to be creative at the World Conservation Congress (WCC) in Jeju in terms of attracting attention to the Red List. There was a suggestion that each Red List update should be accompanied by 10 good project ideas which encompass the highest conservation priorities, identify the problems to be overcome and how to address them, and presenting donors with major new investment opportunities to combat extinctions. The WCC is an opportunity to grab the world's attention and as such needs to be fully exploited for showcasing the Red List.

M Samways suggested that funding coupled with the Red List should have a strong positive spin about helping those species on it. J McNeely agreed and added that projects that have benefits for people should, in particular, be a priority area for funding. JC Vié remarked that he was slightly cautious of M Samway's suggestion, since the SOS working Group is already tasked with identifying projects based on Red List findings.

S Stuart stated that with respect to the RLWTWG draft proposal on revising the documentation requirements for the Red List, Andrew Rodrigues (Network Support Officer, IUCN GSP) is to run a consultation process among the SSC Red List Authorities (RLAs), Red List Partners and the GSP, with a view to reaching agreement on the minimum supporting documentation requirements for the Red List in time for the beginning of the next IUCN quadrennium. Thanks were given to Stuart Butchart, RLWTWG Chair, for leading the process to prepare the new draft Red List document standards.

J McNeely proposed the new goal of the Red List Strategic Plan to be approved by the SSC Steering Committee. The proposed goal is: "To provide information and analyses on the status, trends and threats to species in order to [inform and] catalyse action for biodiversity conservation".

DECISION: The RLWTWG goal was agreed by the Steering Committee and granted final sign off, including the words "inform and".

J Smart recommended that the new goal should replace the existing two goals and should be implemented immediately e.g., with a presence on the website.

ACTION: The Red List Unit to replace the two former goals on the website with the new one.

The issue of DOI numbers on Red List publications was raised as to where it should sit in the queue of priorities since putting this in place is more of a budget constraint than a technical one.

S Stuart suggested that this will need to be addressed with the new SIS manager, once he / she is onboard, as the cost needs to be calculated.

ACTION: J Smart to devise a plan with the new Species Information Manager, together with a calculation on cost, on the implementation of DOI numbers for Red List publications, and report back to the Steering Committee meeting WCC 4.5.

S Stuart suggested that a feasibility study could investigate how the use of Red List launches could be used to raise funds for priority projects, and how this would relate to SOS. However, 10 projects would be too large a number and that two projects would be a good initial starting point.

JP Rodríguez added that, with some advance notice of what the Red List update will include and by linking in with the SSC network, the SGs could come up with suggestions for projects. JC Vié noted that this should be linked with SOS to avoid establishing a new system.

S Stuart confirmed that using Red List launches for raising money for priority species would be included on the agenda for the next SSC SC meeting.

T Contreras added that there needed to be a focus on specific areas, for example, freshwater species often get lost with the general marine updates.

ACTION: M Hoffmann, R Roberts, Dena Cator and Andrew Rodrigues to work with J McNeely on a paper for the next SSC SC meeting to investigate the use of Red List launches as a fundraising tool for specific high priority projects.

L Boitani confirmed that funding has been secured for two years to enable Federica Chiozza (with a likelihood of a further two years on top of that) to continue working with the mammal RLAs on updating the mammal assessments in the Red List. With the assistance of Mohamed bin Zayed Species Conservation Fund (MBZ) funding, relevant fieldwork on updating mammals on the Red list has been completed on Sulawesi. In another development, 15 papers using the mammal Red List data have been published in a species edition of the *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society*.

5c. Report of the Invertebrate Conservation Sub-Committee (ICSC) (M Samways; p. 165, WCC 4.4 agenda pack)

M Samways presented an update on the work of the Invertebrate Conservation Sub-Committee (ICSC). In March, the Global Conference of Entomology was held in Thailand with a promising contribution from many young people in Asia. M Samways gave a special thank you to Justin Gerlach for leading the Terrestrial Invertebrate Red List Authority (TIRLA) and continuing to coerce volunteers to stand as focal points for the various invertebrate taxonomic groups. M Samways also thanked the invertebrate SGs, namely the Bumblebee, Grasshopper, Dragonfly and South Asian Invertebrate SGs.

S Stuart noted that the longer established Sub-Committees would not be holding their annual meetings this year, but would use their allocated budget to push their individual priorities forward.

5d. Report of the Marine Conservation Sub-Committee (MCSC) (Y Sadovy; p. 172, WCC 4.4 agenda pack)

Y Sadovy reported on some of the highlights of the Marine Conservation Sub-Committee (MCSC) since the last meeting, including: 1) publication of a paper led by Claudia Campagna in *BioScience* on conservation in the Gulf of Mexico following the major oil spill, and making extensive use of Red List data; and 2) production of the third SSC marine newsletter (Y Sadovy expressed thanks to Andrew Rodrigues for his work on this) which included many contributions from the various Specialist Groups and other marine constituencies.

Y Sadovy mentioned that there had been some discussion on the inclusion of trade and use data in Red List assessments (the recently published *Science* paper “High Value and Long Life—Double Jeopardy for Tunas and Billfishes” shows the value of doing this). Following a discussion with Kent Carpenter of the MBU, it was agreed that perhaps the most productive way forward would be to fundraise in order to secure resources to collect the necessary data for selected groups on the back of, or following, Red List assessments.

Rather than having a fully fledged MCSC meeting, Y Sadovy noted that a smaller meeting has been proposed for later in the year (including the World Commission on Protected Areas (WCPA), the MBU and the IUCN Global Marine Programme (GMP)) to hone down on a subset of focused issues which need attention e.g., aligning species data with Marine Protected Area (MPA) designation; by-catch; Regional Fisheries Management Organisations (RFMOs) and their remits, as well as IUCN’s status in terms of representation on these RFMOs.

Y Sadovy noted that the MCSC was now starting to turn its attention to the issue of by-catch. With some of the Commission Operation Fund (COF) money available, a review of the by-catch work already in place (desk-top study) has been proposed to establish what the SSC can most usefully do in relation to this issue.

A Rosenberg added that it is difficult to get species data in some areas for by-catch. It would be useful to look to some of the SGs for this and to have the SSC Steering Committee consolidate the product of this, rather than trying to encompass all species to provide initial estimates for species groups.

The MCSC is also compiling stories on marine species to make these more available for education etc. The next main MCSC meeting will be prior to the SSC Chairs meeting in Abu Dhabi, February 2012.

5e. Report of the Plant Conservation Sub-Committee (PCSC) (D Leaman; p. 173), WCC 4.4 agenda pack)

D Leaman provided an overview of the main items of work of the Plant Conservation Sub-Committee (PCSC). A decision was made by the PCSC to focus on particular of the items on the work plan. There has been follow up on the Global Strategy on Plant Conservation and an updated summary on this has been written by Liz Radford of Plantlife. D Leaman commented that it would be useful for the SSC Steering Committee

to be familiar with this summary and encouraged members present to promote it to their communities.

D Leaman noted that the *Botanical Journal of the Linnean Society* has devoted a publication to the Global Strategy of Plant Conservation, with a very nice series of articles.

D Leaman mentioned that there is a proposal to establish a David Given Award for Excellence in Plant Conservation. This has been discussed within the PCSC at several rounds of meetings to honour David's contribution to plant conservation, with a focus on young scientists.

ACTION: S Stuart confirmed approval of the award and asked the PCSC to move forward with it.

J McNeely asked if there is an endowment for the award as it has to be given credibility with more than a certificate. At present, D Leaman explained that there is no funding available and that the PCSC would need to look for this. S Stuart agreed that this was worth pursuing.

R Mittermeier also agreed that the award was a great idea, but that it would need two sets of funding – one for an event to give the award and the other for the prize money (which should be \$5 – \$10,000).

T Brooks noted that the Global Strategy of Plant Conservation meeting in St Louis needs some rapid co-ordination with the relevant Red List Partners. It was confirmed that Andrew Rodrigues and Domitilla Raimondo (SSC Southern African Plant SG) will attend for IUCN (GSP and SSC respectively); co-ordination with the Red List Partners was not possible on this occasion, but must be a priority for future GSPC meetings.

5f. Report of the Species Conservation Planning Sub-Committee (SCPSC) (M Stanley Price; p. 175, WCC 4.4 agenda pack)

M Stanley Price presented some of the highlights of the Species Conservation Planning Sub-Committee (SCPSC) including a summary of its first meeting held in Oxford in March.

M Stanley Price reported that a vision for the SCPSC was revised and agreed at the SPCSC meeting: "Through the activities of the Sub-Committee, the IUCN SSC species conservation planning process will play a critical role in the conservation of species through products that are appropriately constructed and widely known, sensitively developed and successfully implemented with the assistance of SSC Specialist Groups". The four goals of the Sub-Committee were also outlined; in particular the SPCSC will be looking at the issue of threats which are hard to classify and standardise. Under goal 2 – enhancing SSC model – the SPCSC will look towards establishing a matrix of tools which can be used in different situations. Goal 3 – learning from experiences and confirming best practice - Caroline Lees carried out a virtual planning workshop using internet based tools, and she is working on a workshop to investigate developing this further. In general, the focus will be on maximising the attendance at meetings while cutting down on the number of face-to-face meetings required.

M Stanley Price noted that the development of an SPCSC website was underway and Phil McGowan is working on the content for this. The SPCSC are also looking into a “cook book” on how to plan for a Species Planning Workshop. John Donaldson (PCSC) and Justin Gerlach (ICSC) have been nominated to link in the work of the SPCSC with the other Sub-Committees.

M Stanley Price noted that the SPCSC is aiming to set up systems to enable lessons learnt to be captured from each planning effort as they take place. This will contribute to a summary of best practice to be readily accessed on the Internet.

M Stanley Price proposed that the second draft of the planning handbook should be completed for the WCC in 2012. The SSC Steering Committee was asked to provide any information on SGs that may be planning species conservation plans.

J McNeely commented that he had an issue with the wording on “products” in the vision.

A Stattersfield asked, with regards to the threat classification scheme, if the issue was concerned with the detail of the threats and added that it was important to liaise with RLTWG on this.

H de longh noted that regional conservation strategies and national action plans have no consistency which is a key issue, and asked if there were any plans to facilitate training workshops for those preparing national action plans? M Stanley Price agreed that these were needed.

M Samways asked about those species that may be very abundant but then may experience a catastrophic decline – where does this sit within the SCPSC? M Stanley Price agreed that he has been struck by the number of antelope species for which this is true, but the SCPSP is more focused on planning rather than population abundance.

T Mundkur suggested that a priority should be to keep common species common forever, e.g., avoiding catastrophes such as the vulture decline in South Asia. Are we doing a world a great disservice in calling a species ‘Least Concern’, as this sends out a very negative connotation which is supported by feedback from people out in the field? S Stuart clarified that Red List categories are about extinction risk, so a species is ‘Least Concern’ in relation to its extinction risk. However, S Stuart agreed that this has been an issue which commonly arises due to its misinterpretation, but to make any changes would require an approach to IUCN Council. S Stuart asked the SSC Steering Committee if the RLC should look at this.

A Rhodin suggested changing ‘Least’ to ‘Lower’. T Brooks preferred retaining the term ‘Least’.

J McNeely commented that the Red List is being increasingly applied beyond extinction risk, and that it has become more of a brand name without people looking at the detail. As this increases it is likely that the Red List will be incorrectly more frequently and, on this basis, it would be good to revisit the terminology.

E Bennett suggested the possibility of thinking ecologically and using a mirror image with a “Green List”. This would present what a fully conserved species looks like, with very clearly defined measurable steps from ‘Least Concern’ to being fully conserved.

ACTION: The proposals for an IUCN Green list, with which E Bennett has been particularly associated, will be discussed at the next meeting on the Steering Committee, and this will include a discussion on whether or not the term Least Concern should be altered.

5g. Report of the Freshwater Conservation Sub-Committee (FCSC) (T Contreras; *p. 178 WCC 4.4 agenda pack*)

T Contreras reported on the main activities of the recently formed Freshwater Conservation Sub-Committee. The first strategic planning meeting of this Sub-Committee was held at the University of Queretaro in Mexico in June. The FCSC has no allocated budget from the Commission Operations Fund (COF) so T Contreras had to seek out funding to hold the meeting and support the newly formed group. T Contreras raised \$50,000 for the meeting, and a symposium was held on the first day which was streamed live on the internet and linked to video conference facilities in the Mexican Universities of Queretaro, Morelos, Mexico State and Guerrero, and in at least three other countries (Costa Rica, Nicaragua and Panama).

T Contreras mentioned that he had hoped for a representative of the Ramsar Convention and the IUCN Water Programme to be present at the meeting but both were unable to attend. An additional requirement of the funding was also to set up a Mexican Working Group. A web page was developed for the meeting and will be the basis for the FCSC website. Also at the meeting, there was a presentation of 100 copies of the Cemex Freshwater book.

T Contreras outlined the main focus of the meeting – a Strategic Planning session which involved looking at different factors, a vision, barriers, strategies and projects. A Thinktank group posed questions which led to 17 main projects being identified and four main ones chosen.

S Stuart thanked T Contreras for his hard work and dedication on fundraising for the FCSC.

J McNeely noted that there is a lot of money in the private sector, including in Nestlé, soft drinks companies (which are all looking into using water more effectively), and beer companies. This Sub-Committee is one where the private sector is well worth approaching, together with agroindustry which needs to use less water. T Contreras agreed and added that he has already approached Corona which is showing an initial interest.

5h. SSC Specialist Group Update & 5i. SSC Red List Authority Update (Mike Hoffmann; *p. 180 & p. 207, WCC 4.4 agenda pack*)

These two agenda items were considered simultaneously. M Hoffmann provided an update on the SGs, including on membership, confirmation of Chair and Focal Point appointments and new proposals for SGs and RLAs. M Hoffmann confirmed that Nicole

Duplaix will be appointed as the new Chair of the Otter SG, replacing the late Jim Conroy. He also noted that Mike Knight had now taken over as Chair of the African Rhino SG (AfRSG), and that the Endangered Wildlife Trust (EWT) would be new host institution for the AfRSG.

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 announced the proposals for new SGs. The first of these was the Aquatic and Wetland Plant SG, which has largely developed as a result of the assessment work, following on from the freshwater biodiversity report for Africa, which included a number of aquatic plant species. Richard Lansdown has been proposed to serve as the Chair for this SG. M Hoffmann explained that since the exact number of species of this group is very difficult to quantify, it will have a particularly broad remit with some 5,000 species. There will also be a degree of overlap with some of the more regionally focused SGs e.g., the Arabian Plant and Mediterranean Island Plant SGs. The Aquatic Plant SG will not cover Red List assessments of the bryophytes, but will serve a support role to the Bryophyte SG on these. This SG will also not include the bladderworts due to a forthcoming proposal to establish a Carnivorous Plant SG. With regards to institutional support for the new Aquatic and Wetland Plant SG, M Hoffmann confirmed that a funding proposal has been developed for submission to the MAVA Foundation.

T Mundkur confirmed that on behalf of Wetlands International this SG was very much welcomed with a view to opening up some collaborative opportunities.

T Brooks also expressed approval with the establishment of this SG, noting that it meets the SSC criteria well having a unique life history of its species as well having a potential to link into existing funding sources.

DECISION: The SSC Steering Committee approved the establishment of the Aquatic and Wetland Plant SG with Richard Lansdown as Chair.

M Hoffmann outlined the second proposal for a Boa and Python SG. Currently there is no overarching Snake SG, though there is an umbrella Snakes and Lizards RLA for species not covered by SGs.

M Hoffmann explained that the initial membership list for this SG is very Americas-biased, but the proposed Chair has devised a list of 80 possible candidates which should help to remove this.

Y Sadovy asked if it was possible to encourage new groups to seek members from the more under-represented geographically areas.

JC Vié noted that the future responsibility of this group would need to include the luxury sector (skins), which is a much welcomed but also a difficult task since it will come under scrutiny with respect to CITES. S Stuart agreed that this SG is likely to require more than normal level support, including representation on CITES.

DECISION: The Steering Committee adopted the proposal for a Boa and Python SG with Tomas Waller as Chair.

M Hoffmann introduced the proposal for the Snapper, Seabream and Grunt SG which is an upgrade from the existing standalone RLA. The Red List assessments have not been completed for all the species of this group, but they are approaching about half. M Hoffmann noted that this was a reasonably manageable group with no overlap with existing structures in the SSC. The existing membership of the present RLA will become the *de facto* membership of the SG, but there will be a need to extend the membership to encompass the conservation issues. A RLA focal point will also need to be appointed.

Y Sadovy indicated favourable support for this proposal, adding that the group had a strong membership and had been very good at sourcing funding.

DECISION: The Steering Committee adopted the proposal for a Snapper, Seabream and Grunt SG with Barry Russell and Ken Lindeman as Co-chairs.

M Hoffmann detailed the other most recent proposals including the proposed Anoline Lizard SG. A Rhodin noted that this would cover about 400 species and has an established large community for some time, focusing on taxonomy and distribution, to support this group. Definite conservation needs are required for these species and the proposal focuses on assessments as well as action plans. M Hoffmann added that this SG would fill a vacant niche as well as lessening the load for the Snake and Lizard RLA.

ACTION: M Hoffmann is to work with the two proposed Co-Chairs, together with A Rhodin and R Mittermeier, on the proposal for an Anoline Lizard SG and report back to the Steering Committee on this by email.

T Brooks commented that looking at this group, at the very least the development of a RLA is really important. There are 100 species already assessed that need including in proposal. Regarding Red Listing, it would be essential that the new RLA co-ordinate closely with the new NatureServe-led NSF project for Red Listing Latin American reptile species (see Section 5a.i above).

A Rosenberg questioned if there was any concern with having new PhDs as Co-Chairs. R Mittermeier confirmed that personally he had no issue with this.

Other groups presented for consideration to the Steering Committee by M Hoffmann were: 1) the re-establishment of the Carnivorous Plant SG (proposal hopefully to be distributed prior to the next Steering Committee meeting); 2) the Brazilian Plant RLA; 3) the Goby SG; 4) and some additional bird SGs including on Penguins, Owls, and Eagles.

M Hoffmann noted that there has been a proposal for the establishment of a Task Force (or inter-commissional Task Force) on migratory connectivity as there are many threats currently facing migratory species. He was in discussion with the proponents, but there were some concerns as to whether or not they were receptive to SSC priorities.

ACTION: M Hoffmann, T Mundkur, and T Brooks to investigate further the possible formation of a migratory connectivity Task Force.

L Boitani suggested that all SGs should be asked to produce a report by the end of the year, which can be profiled on the internet and used for next year's SG Chairs meeting. R Mittermeier agreed and added that they have to be appealing to donors for handing out at Abu Dhabi.

ACTION: M Hoffmann, R Roberts, Dena Cator and Andrew Rodrigues to follow up with all SGs and RLAs for draft quadrennial reports by the end of December 2011.

5j. SSC-WCPA Joint Task Force on Biodiversity and Protected Areas (T Brooks; *p. 9, WCC 4.4 addenda*)

T Brooks reported on the activities of the SSC-WCPA Joint Task Force on Biodiversity and Protected Areas. Regarding Task Force Objective 1 (measuring PA benefits in terms of species populations), he reported on progress in the research of the two graduate students involved with the Task Force, and in engaging with ZSL and WWF regarding the Living Planet Index data. With regards to Task Force Objective 2 (consolidating the standards for the identification of sites of global biodiversity conservation significance), he said good progress has been made towards the establishment of the technical working groups.

T Brooks outlined three main products to target the WCC in Jeju, 2012: a slim booklet on similar lines to the Red list Criteria booklet; a proposal on recommendations regarding endorsement; a series of application studies. All of this work has a price tag so the task force will be working on fundraising which includes a Rio Tinto grant of \$75,000. Over recent months, a number of papers have appeared in journals relevant to the work of this Task Force's objectives over recent months with a further two papers planned.

T Brooks made a final point on policy linkage. A stated requirement of the decisions of CoP10 was the standardisation of criteria for identifying important sites for conservation. It is therefore particularly urgent to try and do something to address this for SBBSTA by the beginning of 2012.

J McNeely noted that there were a number of interesting papers listed in the SSC-WCPA Joint Task Force on Biodiversity and Protected Areas report, and asked if they could be made generally accessible. J McNeely also added that the MAVA Foundation has just founded Luke Hoffmann Institute, so the work of the task force could be interesting in terms of building on what they have already done. S Stuart stated that MAVA already supports a lot of SSC work so this needs to be taken into account to ensure complementarity.

A Rosenberg suggested linking the task force with the Marine World Heritage Sites.

ACTION: A. Rosenberg to provide T Brooks with appropriate contacts.

M Stanley Price asked if the Task Force was looking at the influence of climate change as threats to the sites. T Brooks replied that this would not be the case in first phase, but will be factored in when things move forward in terms of prioritisation and implementation.

5k. IUCN SSC Reintroduction and Invasive Species Task Force on Moving Plants and Animals for Conservation Purposes (M Stanley Price; *p. 213, WCC 4.4 agenda pack*)

M Stanley Price presented the highlights of the work of the Reintroduction and Invasive Species Task Force on Moving Plants and Animals for Conservation Purposes. M Stanley Price reported that there has been interest by a number of authorities on this work and that membership of the Task Force has expanded. The aim of the Task Force is to present the draft Re-introduction Guidelines to the next Steering Committee meeting in February, 2012, before the World Conservation Congress. M Stanley Price added that the Task Force faces some real dilemmas, which are likely to extend into areas far beyond reintroduction alone.

With regards to the revision of the Reintroduction Guidelines, M Stanley Price noted that the Task Force would like keep this title. However, since this title does not clearly encompass all the issues that the new guidelines will cover, the proposed new title is the 'IUCN Guidelines on Reintroductions and other Conservation Translocations'.

M Stanley Price reported that the Task Force will try to replicate existing guidelines as far as possible and they will remain generic (based on principles). There are also the legal aspects to consider, since so little of environmental law as it currently stands looks at moving species outside their ecological ranges. The Task Force has also identified various gaps in expertise, particularly welfare, the impacts of climate change and the precision and accuracy of models.

ACTION: M Stanley Price asked the Steering Committee to provide him with any contacts of people working in the area of restoration (ecological engineering).

With the influence of climate change, R Mathers asked if moving species to new areas where the future climate is more favourable is covered under the first point of the primary objectives.

J Smart suggested that it would be useful for the Task Force to link in with the WCPA as they have a group on restoration. M Stanley Price confirmed that all Commission Chairs have been invited to participate.

L Boitani commented that on the translocation diagram (appendix 1, *p. 218, WCC 4.4 agenda pack*) that "filling ecological niche" should be replaced with "fulfil available ecological function".

M Hoffmann noted that "assisted colonisation" has become the new phraseology to replace "benign introductions" and such changes will have to feed into the IUCN Red List guidelines.

DECISION: The SSC Steering Committee agreed the change in title of the Reintroduction Guidelines to the "IUCN guidelines for reintroductions and other conservation translocations".

5l. Update on Reintroduction Specialist Group (M Stanley Price; *p. 221, WCC 4.4 agenda pack*)

M Stanley Price reported back on the activities of the Reintroduction SG, including the process to develop the Amphibian Reintroduction Guidelines and the publication of the 2nd edition of Global Reintroduction Perspectives (the RSG reintroduction case-studies – a third edition is currently in preparation). S Stuart suggested that these case-studies could be put into a searchable online interface on the Reintroduction SG website (based on taxa, success/failure, region, etc.).

5m. Update on Conservation Breeding Specialist Group (Onnie Byers; *p. 222, WCC 4.4 agenda pack*)

Onnie Byers highlighted the major activities of the Conservation Breeding SG (CBSG) since the last report back in December 2010. S Stuart remarked on the huge opportunity for CBSG to help roll the species conservation planning work out to the SGs. On the CBSG virtual tools, which are expensive, M Stanley Price commented that IUCN could potentially take the licence and use them across their SGs or the Commissions.

ACTION: Dena Cator to explore possible options and costs around how IUCN could potentially take a license to deploy the CBSG virtual tools.

5n. Mohamed bin Zayed (MBZ) Species Conservation Fund (F Launay; *p. 230, WCC 4.4 agenda pack*)

Due to the unavoidable absence of F Launay from the meeting, it was agreed that this item would be postponed until the next Steering Committee meeting.

5o. Save Our Species (JC Vié; *p. 231, WCC 4.4 agenda pack*)

JC Vié gave a report on the current status of Save Our Species (SOS). The first official call for proposals was launched at the end of June and is accepting calls for both Threatened Species and Rapid Action grants. The deadline for proposals is August 12.

Since the call went out, JC Vié acknowledged that several questions and concerns have been raised including: selection of priorities; choice of recipients of first projects; funding for SGs (there is a perception that SGs are left out of the process); fundraising (including the perception of micro-management by the donors, and SOS competing with others for funding from the corporate sector); and politics.

In reference to the perception that SGs cannot apply for funding, S Stuart explained that since SGs are not legal entities they are not eligible to apply formally. However, they are certainly able to submit them through their host organizations or through close affiliate NGOs. In the latter case there is a need to ascertain that their interests are declared upfront, to ensure that SG members involved in writing proposals are not also reviewing them for the SOS Working Group. S Stuart added that this is not unique to SOS as SG's, for example, are often also involved in writing and reviewing CITES proposals.

J McNeely highlighted the recent press release of the Red List as an example of where it would be useful to tie the Red List updates with opportunities (in this case, SOS).

H de longh asked if there is any requirement to use the IUCN logo in publicity purposes. JC Vié confirmed that grant agreements are done with IUCN, but funded organisations are required to mention SOS (not IUCN, the World Bank or the Global Environment Fund (GEF)).

R Mittermeier suggested that with regard to additional fundraising for SOS, bilaterals should be an easier sell for SOS than corporates, unless there is someone opening the door to the CEOs.

Y Sadovy asked for further explanation of how the priorities were selected. JC Vié explained that during project preparation it was decided that the initial set of priority groups had to be completely assessed groups, with immediately available funding mechanisms in place. However, the expectation is to have more diversity in future calls (facilitated by the process L Boitani is leading) but there will probably always be a bias as long as it is donor-driven.

JC Vié concluded by noting that the SOS Donor Council has endorsed financial support to a large tiger project following on from the Tiger Summit in St Petersburg.

5p. IUCN's Strategic Approach to CITES (M Hoffmann; p. 233, WCC 4.4 agenda pack)

M Hoffmann gave an update on the progress of IUCN's Strategic Approach to CITES. A core team has been involved in developing a strategy for IUCN's future engagement in CITES, ensuring that the consultation supporting the strategy was more of a review of IUCN's past and current engagement in CITES and structured into three parts:

- 1) Part I: the introductory section;
- 2) Part II: a detailed review of IUCN's activities, both past and present, specific to the three individual components of IUCN (Secretariat; Commissions; and TRAFFIC), mapped onto the CITES Strategic Vision.
- 3) Part III: conclusions from the review, and a suggested way forward for Council to consider about how IUCN might go about developing a clear engagement strategy.

The Steering Committee's attention was called, in particular, to Part III (two pages).

Based on this report, a paper was drafted and submitted to the 76th meeting of Council. The paper was adopted without amendment.

M Hoffmann concluded that the SSC Chairs meeting will be used as an opportunity to discuss further IUCN's future engagement in CITES.

5q. SSC at National and Rational Levels (S Stuart; p. 405, WCC 4.4 agenda pack)

S Stuart introduced this agenda item, seeking first to adopt the ToRs for the Regional Vice Chairs (RVCs) of the SSC, emphasising the need to keep the ToRs light so as not to create an impossible demand on these voluntary positions (the Steering Committee members agreed with this). The intention would be for RVCs to make progress against these objectives, and not to achieve all of the activities from day one. S Stuart also

indicated the need to keep the size of the regions relatively small, in order to keep the burden of responsibility realistic (though these regional limits would not be defined in the ToRs themselves).

ACTION: To re-word point two to read: “Encourage IUCN National Committees and SSC regional structures to develop mechanisms for fostering improved communication between National Committees and SSC members.”

Add: “Seek opportunities to translate essential documents into regionally relevant languages”

Add: “Liaise with other organizations working on conservation within the region”

Add: “Promoting a focus on species conservation, and on the use of the Red List, national Red Lists using the IUCN system, and other SSC products”

[The revised text incorporating the above amendments and additions is presented in Annex 2]

There was some discussion as to whether Regional Vice-Chairs should also necessarily be the SSC representatives at IUCN regional meetings, but there was a general feeling that this responsibility would be too much for a single individual. Under the current scenario, the approach would necessitate, where possible the Regional Vice-Chair attending, but with the flexibility to delegate this representative function to other SSC members as required.

Vice-Chairs will not necessarily be members of the SSC Steering Committee (though ideally they should be, just as they are in other commissions, with the exception of CEM), as this would make the size of the Steering Committee too large.

A few Steering Committee members have already been asked if they would be interested in serving the capacity of Regional Vice-Chairs. S Stuart has already approached T Contreras for Mexico, P Medici for Brazil and Guianas and B Haddane for North Africa, all of whom have accepted to serve in the capacity of Regional Vice-Chairs. Others, including M Kusrini and C Campagna, are considering. X Yan has indicated that it would be difficult for her to take this on for East Asia. S Stuart will therefore seek other nominations from the Steering Committee for Regional Vice-Chairs according to the regions.

M Samways enquired whether there was any value in not just asking Steering Committee members, although JC Vié indicated that a key constraint was in ensuring that any RVC should be well plugged into the SSC and understand the background to its history.

P Medici asked whether regional offices and National Committees were aware of efforts to appoint regional vice-chairs, to which S Stuart responded that the current initiative was partly in response to their requests.

At the national level, S Stuart noted that Ariadne Angulo represented the SSC at the Latin America Regional Conservation Forum. A Angulo found someone in Uruguay interested in getting a national grouping of SSC members together, and mentioned that

there are similar expressions of interest from elsewhere. S Stuart has proposed forming a small group of individuals (chaired by JP Rodríguez, and including the SC members in the region, as well as some of the South and Central American SG Chairs and A Angulo) to try and move forward the process of stimulating national groupings.

JC Vié emphasised that when regional groups get in touch with regional offices it is essential that they also communicate with the GSP to ensure a closed loop on communications.

S Stuart explained that an important issue for the South and Central American working group to consider will be how to accommodate interested national experts into these national SSC structures, when they are not currently part of an existing SG structure (e.g., an SG or an RLA).

DECISION: The Steering Committee agreed to adopt the Terms of Reference for the Regional Vice-Chairs with modifications identified above and presented in Annex 4.

ACTION: Claire Santer to circulate the updated SSC national membership lists also to IUCN National Committees

ACTION: S Stuart to seek other nominations from the Steering Committee for Regional Vice-Chairs

ACTION: JP Rodríguez to chair a small working group to move the SSC at national-level forward. S Stuart to send an email to JP Rodríguez to initiate the process.

5r. Species Strategic Plan 2013–2016 (J Smart; *p. 407, WCC 4.4 agenda pack*)

J Smart introduced this item. She started by referring to the Species Strategic Plan 2009-2012, the Targets of which are set out under three headings: Status of Biodiversity; Pressures on Biodiversity; and Response to Biodiversity Loss. J Smart questioned if this current subdivision should remain for 2013–2016.

This Plan takes as its Vision and Mission the Strategic Plan adopted long ago for the 2000-2010 Strategic Plan. J Smart asked if the vision and goal needed refining:

SSC Vision

A world that values and conserves present levels of biodiversity

SSC Goal

The extinction crisis and massive loss in biodiversity are universally adopted as a shared responsibility, resulting in action to reduce this loss of diversity within species, among species and of ecosystems

J Smart noted that there are flaws in the vision, e.g. use of the word “present”. There should be more focus on what the SSC is doing rather than “adding”.

J Smart explained that there are three main areas under the current SSC mandate: 1) Observing and monitoring species; 2) Analysing the impacts of threats to biodiversity; 3) Facilitating and undertaking action. J Smart asked if the mandate needs to be updated.

In considering the work of the SGs, J Smart questioned if all of this should come under the Strategic Plan or just some of it. Action on the ground doesn't often get showcased so there could possibly be some targets added on this. In view of the One Programme approach, should there a focus on trying to achieve results with other commissions and programmes?

ACTION: A draft Species Strategic Plan 2013-2016 will be created by the assigned team (J Smart, D Cator, A Rodrigues, S Stuart, JP Rodríguez, M Hoffmann) and sent around to the Steering Committee, SG Chairs and RLA Focal Points for comment.

J McNeely noted that the Red List Committee Strategic Plan should be completed in Sep/Oct of this year and suggested that ideas from this could feed into the Species Strategic Plan. S Stuart agreed that all strategic work should be used that is already in existence. J McNeely further suggested having a Species Strategic Plan which is a sufficient umbrella for everything to fit under, and would therefore include all SG work. There must be a need to think about trying to influence a much broader constituency. S Stuart added that there will be a communication strategy to target the broader audience, and that this will be integrated into the Strategic Plan together with the Red List strategy.

R Mittermeier also agreed that the work of the SGs should be included in the Plan but cautioned that this would be a very large contribution. S Stuart suggested that the SGs would have to summarise the key things they do.

S Stuart asked if the plan should have the intention of encompassing the entire breadth of what the SGs do.

R Mittermeier agreed with the need to influence the private sector, etc, but to also ensure that the SSC does not spread itself too thinly since there are other sectors of IUCN that can do this.

JC Vié stated that with regard to SGs, they are already incorporated with the Red List assessments and so would different headings need to be created? J Smart confirmed that policy related and Red List work must be included, but action on the ground is the bit that is undersold and has to go in.

DECISION: There was a general agreement by the SSC Steering Committee to include SG conservation action work in the Strategic Plan but how this is done needs further thought.

B Haddane asked if the Red List for Ecosystems work will be included. JP Rodríguez noted that it sits with CEM presently, but because it has close links with the SSC he would like to see it become a bi-commissional structure.

Y Sadovy suggested that perhaps the SSC vision could capture the word "communication", and on the mandate to add "identifying" to analysing the impacts of threats to biodiversity.

T Mundkur commented that “facilitating and undertaking action” reads like fire fighting and that positive language is missing. M Samways suggested something more proactive. E Bennett said there was a similar issue with the goal which needs more positive and action orientated wording.

ACTION: S Stuart noted that by end of October the vision, goal and mandate will be circulated to the Steering Committee based on the comments above.

5s. World Species Congress (S Stuart; p. 418, WCC 4.4 agenda pack)

S Stuart provided an update of the World Species Congress (WSC). A paper was prepared for Council shared with colleagues from the World Association of Zoos and Aquariums (WAZA) and was adopted at the last Council meeting. The WSC is to be convened in 2015, and the Director General will be sending a letter to all IUCN State Members seeking expressions of interest in hosting the WSC.

J Smart stated that following a recent visit with Indian government ministers, they are keen to send in an expression of interest to host the WSC. S Stuart noted that contacts were also being made with the German government in this regard.

S Stuart said that there would be a session on the WSC at the SG Chairs meeting in Abu Dhabi to provide the broader SSC leadership with an opportunity to put forward their suggestions for the WSC’s focus and priorities.

S Stuart said that the SSC’s vision is needed to contribute to the content of the WSC. R Mittermeier noted that the big issue is to establish what the themes are and to get down to list which is short and manageable.

J McNeely added that it would be useful to have someone to lay out some options on how a meeting like this would look in terms of thematic, taxonomic, geographic areas.

S Stuart concluded that the Red List would have to be prevented from dominating the WCS. There needs to be a focus on implementing conservation action.

5t. Red List of Ecosystems (JP Rodríguez; p. 423, WCC 4.4 agenda pack)

JP Rodríguez summarised the main highlights of the Red List of Ecosystems work. The MAVA Foundation has approved a funding proposal to support this until October 2012. The main ongoing activities are conceptual and practitioner workshops, preaching, governance, communication/support and publications.

JP Rodríguez reported that this is a joint product of SSC and CEM, with a Steering Committee of 8 to 10 members with expertise from biological realms and geographical regions. One of the main aims is to draft and test categories and criteria for a Red List of Ecosystems by the WCC in Jeju, 2012, and to assess the conservation status of all of the world’s terrestrial, freshwater, marine and subterranean ecosystems by 2025.

J McNeely asked if this will this ever be completed because ecosystems are so dynamic making this a perpetual project.

R Mittermeier thought this to be a very powerful tool due to the focus on ecosystem services; however, he added that the timelines were concerning (2025) as this needs to be done more quickly particularly at the global level.

E Bennett asked what sort of scale it is at and JP Rodríguez confirmed that it was on several scales.

D Leaman also questioned if there is intent to link to KBAs. JP Rodríguez confirmed that this will be investigated.

A Stattersfield noted that previously a link had been shown between this and the Red List of Species. As the work moves forward and there is a better understanding of ecosystem status, this information should feed into species status assessments and link to the key sites and management units to show how to influence the work on the ground. In a sense, this becomes a reality check against species in those systems.

T Mundkur commented that this was a great initiative. Ecosystems are more difficult to manage as conservation units, so making a clear link would be very useful.

Y Sadovy asked if there were any links with FAO who are very advanced with ecosystem-based management.

M Stanley Price asked how species turnover and ecological function will be considered and at what point does it become a new ecosystem. JP Rodríguez confirmed that this was likely to be the exception rather than rule, and will need to be dealt with on an individual basis with guidelines developed to assist these issues.

S Stuart remarked that progress has been fantastic on this and that it is moving forward in integrated way with other major initiatives.

5u. SSC and Priority Setting (JP Rodríguez; *p. 426, WCC 4.4 agenda pack*)

JP Rodríguez gave an overview of the SSC and Priority Setting initiative and provided examples of some potential users including donors, zoos, aquaria and botanical gardens, national Red Lists and SSC SGs.

JP Rodríguez reported that a small working group had been established and is due to meet in Caracas on the week of 17-21 October, 2011. This working group will develop guidelines and a manuscript.

A Stattersfield noted that this was a species by species approach, but suggested if it would be possible to look at themes that affect species.

T Brooks asked if it is worth framing the whole exercise priority setting among conservation actions rather than species, given that in very many cases the relevant action will be “safeguard site X” which delivers benefits to multiple species simultaneously.

S Stuart stated that some actions have benefits for multiple species but which actions get the highest scores? Some site-based approaches could protect many high-priority species, so perhaps prioritising species and prioritising actions are two different, complementary approaches.

ACTION: T Brooks to connect Richard Maloney from the Department of Conservation, New Zealand, with JP Rodríguez on this work.

5v. SSC and Species Programme Finances (JC Vié; p. 427, WCC 4.4 agenda pack)

It was agreed that this item would be postponed until the next Steering Committee meeting.

6. ITEMS FOR DISCUSSION AND DECISIONS

6a. SSC Communications Strategy (J Smart; p. 434, WCC 4.4 agenda pack)

J Smart presented the SSC Communications Strategy (timescale is 2011-2016) which has to align with both the Species and Red List Strategic Plans.

H de longh highlighted the need to create more awareness of invasive species. S Stuart acknowledged this, especially with regards to the negative press it has been recently been attracting. The policies and guidelines need reviewing to see how they fit into this strategy, including invasive species. J Smart suggested that there maybe a need to communicate specific threats more clearly.

M Samways raised the issue of the re-development of the IUCN website and asked whether the Sub-Committees could each have two sites – one created individually and one as part of the main SSC pages on the IUCN website. S Stuart clarified that the Sub-Committee website template is currently being developed and that the MCSC and FCSC do both have their own websites.

ACTION: J Smart to ask Lynne Labanne whether the website Sub-Committee template can be fast-tracked.

M Kusrini noted that the RL process is often misinterpreted by local scientists. S Stuart said that this would be helped by initiating national Red Listing e.g., in Indonesia.

E Bennett stated that the Species magazine and E-Bulletin are both great communication tools but the use of other languages would enable us to reach an entirely different audience e.g., China. Defining what species conservation means, for example, would really help in China and Japan.

ACTION: R Roberts to construct a small summary on the definition of what species conservation means.

J McNeely suggested that to have a real impact there is a need to get down to the national level and make species culturally relevant and also relevant to the individual countries. There isn't any current capacity to react to emergencies, for example, when

species go extinct. In referring to the list of key messages of the Communications Strategy, J McNeely added that the third (“engendering a sense of wonder about wild species”) is most important and species must be projected as being wonderful. The audiences have to be considered too and the military is incredibly important. If species conservation were to be linked to national identity and patriotism, then this will help to influence a sector of society that is very often ignored.

R Mittermeier noted that with reference to the statement “there’s an extinction crisis” the associated question commonly asked is “so what”? A few different versions of responses are needed to capture people’s attention. J Smart agreed but added that this was hard to do, although members of the Steering Committee are best placed to assist with this. There should be huge outcry if a species goes extinct and high profile needs to be given to new and rediscovered species. The area of biomimicry is also much more common and the SSC should be taking the lead on this by linking with the military.

L Boitani stated that he didn’t see much change in the Communication Strategy from what was currently being done. There is a little bit of everything in it but the strategy needs us to focus on something specific. This is why we have objectives but they are actually intentions; objectives should be measurable which is not what it says in the strategy. L Boitani suggested setting some quantitative targets and added that internal communication is crucial. Some of the suggestions are too wide broad, for example, making reference to the private sector and universities. The questions should be where we can make the most difference and which of the audiences would we like to change first.

Y Sadovy agreed that it was important to target audiences. One way of addressing this is be more focused and select the type of promotional material required specific to the audience, e.g., religious communities, media, zoos, aquariums.

JC Vié commented that on the communications side we are still not making the most of the Red List. We know that species are being lost, but it is also groups of species that are being lost too. The European Rabbit is not very threatened but putting emphasis on less threatened species can make a much bigger difference, as it reaches out to wider audiences because they can relate these species better.

A Rosenberg felt that the Strategic Plan was a list of everything and that none of the items are strategic. The target audiences will always be the same but specific actions are needed, one of which has to relate to press work.

L Boitani suggested ranking the priority audiences.

ACTION: J Smart suggested sending the Communications Strategy PowerPoint presentation to the Steering Committee for comment, clarifying what the priorities should be at any scale and where communications can make the biggest impact. Comments to be sent to R Roberts and received by end of November. R Roberts will then follow up with L Labanne, J Smart and S Stuart to complete the strategy, in conjunction with completing the Species Strategic Plan.

6b. IUCN Guidelines on Scientific Collecting of Threatened Species (M Hoffmann; p. 435, WCC 4.4 agenda pack)

M Hoffmann presented an overview of the IUCN Guidelines on Scientific Collecting of Threatened Species. The document was re-circulated for a second round of input and comment to the SG Chairs, stand-alone RLAs and the CITES Secretariat. The revised guidelines reflect the comments that were received.

M Hoffmann reported that the guidelines on scientific collecting will be added as an annex to the Guidelines on the Appropriate Use of Red List Data, which in turn will come under the purview of the RLC to keep current and up-to-date. One of main changes has been to the introductory paragraph to include why the guidelines have been called for and what they are intended to promote, i.e., the responsible collecting of threatened species for scientific research. They are not intended to look at the broader issue of general collecting and do not address the issue of taking live individuals for maintenance in *ex-situ* situations. Recommendations are made on the different issues of collecting.

E Bennett asked in relation to the final paragraph if there been any discussion by various countries regarding the CBD. S Stuart wanted to make it clear from the beginning that this is not a comprehensive IUCN policy document incorporating Access and Benefits Sharing (ABS) but wording referring to the CBD ABS Protocol needs to be included.

J Smart noted that the guidelines should be in-keeping with the Nagoya ABS agreement, since this does include scientific collecting. The draft should be screened to make sure that there is accord between ABS Protocol and the guidelines.

Y Sadovy added that there are other cases with toe clipping and the removal of scales which are little bit more damaging but might be relevant.

H de longh explained that blood and tissue samples need export and import permits so there is sometimes a problem with this. With regards to non-lethal collecting, A Rhodin felt it was a mistake not to include genetic material.

ACTION: Following consultation with Sonia Peña Moreno to ensure that the ABS Protocol is properly reflected, M Hoffman to redistribute the guidelines to the Steering Committee for final sign-off.

6c. Nominations for SSC Chair (JP Rodríguez; p. 439, WCC 4.4 agenda pack)

The discussion regarding this agenda item was chaired by JP Rodríguez. S Stuart, J Smart, JC Vié, R Roberts and M Hoffmann left the room for the duration.

Two issues were considered:

1. Name a three person *ad hoc* committee to seek nominations for SSC Chair.

It was agreed that the committee would be composed of D Leaman, A Rosenberg and JP Rodríguez. They would write a letter inviting nominations, to be distributed electronically to all SSC members (in the three IUCN official languages), explaining in detail the expected qualifications and time-commitment of the position, and emphasizing that it is an unpaid, full-time job that requires external sources of financial support.

This letter would be emailed by 1 September, 2011, asking SSC members to submit their proposed candidates by 31 October, 2011. Nominations would be handled confidentially.

The *ad hoc* committee would evaluate proposals during the month of November and submit their recommendation to the SSC Steering Committee for endorsement by 1 December, 2011.

By 13 January, 2012, the recommendation of the Steering Committee would be sent to the Council Nominations Committee (due on 16 January, 2012).

2. Decide whether to pass on all proposals to Council Nominations Committee or make recommendations on who would (or would not) be considered appropriate candidates.

It was agreed that candidates would be ranked according to their qualifications, which would be clearly explained in the recommendation of the *ad hoc* committee.

6d. Motions for World Conservation Congress 5 (S Stuart; p. 440, WCC 4.4 agenda pack)

S Stuart introduced this agenda item asking for feedback on the possible motions to go forward for consideration by the IUCN members at the World Conservation Congress 5 (WCC5) in Jeju, Republic of Korea, September 2012.

The comments of the proposed motions are:

1. SSC-CEESP work on sustainable use - to go ahead. **ACTION: New SUSG Chair to lead on SUSG motion.**
2. Action Asia (Asian large animal initiative) – **ACTION: E Bennett to lead on Action Asia motion.**
3. The Barometer of Life - to be included on the General Resolution for the Red List. **ACTION: J McNeely to lead on general motion of the Red List Strategy.**
5. Important sites for biodiversity, and measuring PA benefits for species populations – **ACTION: T Brooks to lead on important sites motion assisted by Stephen Woodley and Annabelle Cuttelod.**
6. Re-introductions and assisted migration – it was agreed not to take this motion forward.
7. Species priority setting – **ACTION: JP Rodríguez to take the lead on species priority setting motion**
8. Species and climate change – not certain if need to do more beyond last resolution. **ACTION: M Hoffmann to check with Wendy Foden and new Climate Change TF to see if a motion is needed.**
10. Conservation of large animals in west and central Africa – agreed that it would be good to do something on this. **ACTION: M Hoffmann to lead, working with key people in SSC and partners.**
11. Conservation of wetlands in Korea – probably going to happen anyway. **ACTION: Taej Mundkur and S Stuart to be the lead people from the SC perspective.**

R Mittermeier suggested a resolution on Madagascar biodiversity focusing on funding agencies. **ACTION: R Mittermeier will lead on Madagascar motion.**

A Rhodin proposed a resolution on tortoises and freshwater turtles. **ACTION: A Rhodin will lead on tortoises and freshwater turtle motion.**

T Contreras suggested a resolution on freshwater biodiversity. **ACTION: T Contreras will lead on freshwater biodiversity motion.**

E Bennett proposed the Green List with an IUCN system focusing on categorizing action for all species somewhere on the red / green spectrum. S Stuart agreed that this would help investment in valuable species which are not necessarily threatened. **ACTION: E Bennett to lead on Green List motion.**

A Rosenberg proposed a role for IUCN in conserving biodiversity for food security.

JP Rodríguez proposed a resolution on National Red List use and funding. **ACTION: JP Rodríguez to lead on National Red List use and funding motion, working with the National Red List Working Group.**

On the proposed motion regarding conservation on wetlands in Korea, S Stuart explained that this is likely to be a major issue WCC5 because of the Congress location. The impetus for the motion will come from other institutions and partners, though a possible IUCN study to back up this motion should be considered.

A Rosenberg noted that a number of resolutions are going forward where the SSC needs to contribute to e.g., IPBES, etc.

The call for motions is open from 15th February to 8th May 2012.

ACTION: R Roberts to circulate the motion rules to the Steering Committee on the proposed motions.

With reference to the proposed motion #10, D Leaman commented that if this becomes a priority motion in the list then other threatened kingdoms should be considered e.g., cycads and corals. S Stuart agreed that this would be fine, but thought has to given to what we would want these to say.

B Haddane suggested that motion 5 should include important plant areas and important bird areas and S Stuart said that these would be included in the whole process of the SSC-WCPA Task Force and its agreed criteria.

J Smart reinforced that all motions should refer to the CBD targets in a consistent way as this is far more powerful.

ACTION: D Leaman to discuss with J Donaldson and the PCSC the possibility of submitting on or more WCC5 motions on plants.

J McNeely noted that it would be good to look at getting project proposals ready to implement as soon as the Resolution is passed, since donors will be attending the meeting.

6e. SSC Awards for World Conservation Congress 5 (S Stuart; p. 441, WCC 4.4 agenda pack)

S Stuart outlined the SSC awards and the process that will move them forward with the Awards Group. The SSC Awards will be given in 2012, the final year of the quadrennium.

M Stanley Price, P Medici, R Mittermeier, and A Rhodin will be reviewing and screening the nominations.

ACTIONS:

- 1. M Stanley Price, P Medici, R Mittermeier, and A Rhodin will form an Awards Group to receive nominations for the Peter Scott, George Rabb and Harry Messel Awards.**
- 2. S Stuart to send an announcement to all SSC members by 30 September 2011 describing the Peter Scott, George Rabb and Harry Messel Awards, and calling for nominations of candidates to be considered for these awards.**
- 3. A deadline for receipt of the nominations of 1 December 2011 will be announced.**
- 4. The Awards Group will consider all the nominations in a conference call to be held in December 2011 or January 2012.**
- 5. The Awards Group will make its recommendations to the Steering Committee at meeting 4.5 in Abu Dhabi in February 2012.**
- 6. The Steering Committee will make final decisions on recipients for each award.**
- 7. The awards will be announced by the SSC Chair at the SSC Specialist Group Chairs' Meeting in Abu Dhabi in February 2012, and again at the IUCN World Conservation Congress in Jeju in September 2012.**

6f. Revised Terms of Reference for the Climate Change Task Force (JC Vié; p. 448, WCC 4.4 agenda pack)

S Stuart introduced the background to the Terms of Reference (TOR) for the Climate Change Task Force (CCTF), seeking adoption of the revised TORs. A Stattersfield proposed some edits to the final bullet-point (under no. 3), specifically to capture important sites for biodiversity (see below).

DECISION: The Steering Committee agreed to adopt the Climate Change Task Force Terms of Reference as amended by A Stattersfield (revised Terms of Reference presented in Annex 3).

S Stuart reported that a call has been put out to the SSC for nominations for the CCTF Chair, and a large number of names have been received (23). A process is underway to refine this list to identify a suitable candidate, and Resit Akcakaya, Georgina Mace, Wendy Foden, JC Vié and S Stuart are currently narrowing down the shortlist. Once this

process is completed, and candidate will be proposed to the Steering Committee for appointment.

The Chair will appoint task force members through a predetermined process.

ACTION: Adopt the CCTF Terms of Reference with the addition of a bullet-point under item 3 of the ToRs as “Impacts on networks of key biodiversity areas, including predicted turnover of species at these sites (relevant to understanding management options to increase the resilience of the sites for their key species and/or facilitate adaption)”.

ACTION: S Stuart to propose a candidate for Chair of the Climate Change Task Force to the Steering Committee by 1 September 2011.

6g. Strategic Approach to Establishing New SSC Structures (S Stuart; p. 450, WCC 4.4 agenda pack)

S Stuart acknowledged that mixed feelings had been sometimes expressed on the establishment of new SGs. When there is disagreement as to whether or not ideas for new SGs should go forward to the full proposal stage, should the SSC Chair and Deputy Chair take an executive decision which of the possible new initiatives should be invited to make full proposals to the Steering Committee?

J McNeely suggested that those proposals that don't fulfil the criteria for a SG could be established as a Task Force which would act as an intermediary stage. They would have to prove that they are worthy of the recognition which would allow devoted and committed groups scope to be considered.

R Mittermeier confirmed that he would be happy for M Hoffmann and S Stuart to be responsible for the bulk of the judgement; it requires a common sense filter, based on the sufficient resources and capacity of the proposed group.

D Leaman suggested that where there is a Sub-Committee structure, there are a set of priorities and strategic plans that need to be considered which may make some of the decision making easier.

A Rhodin noted that the group that wants to form has to clearly understand what they are undertaking, i.e., a greater clarification on the difference between SGs and RLAs.

M Hoffmann remarked that people should not be discouraged from making proposals. Where there are Sub-committees in place, the proposals go through these before coming to the Steering Committee for approval.

A Rosenberg agreed that the SSC Chair and Deputy Chair should make the decisions, but suggested that there should be a clear framework for making decisions they get to the formal proposal stage.

M Hoffmann noted that the question is more concerned with the support that's required, and questioned if we would be better placed to establish structures for taxa where there is a clear need?

T Brooks said the opportunity cost has to be looked at in detail. The resources needed for new groups are being deflected away from the overstretched and underfunded work across the broad SSC spectrum.

R Mittermeier asked if groups have an expectation that new SGs will be funded by SSC. S Stuart confirmed that this used to be the case but now they tend to be keener to have an association with the name.

JP Rodríguez agreed with the empowerment process but having Chairs biased to Europe and the North Americas is also an issue that needs to be looked at.

DECISION: S Stuart proposed that two lists will be presented to the Steering Committee at each meeting: one list with the groups that have gone through a framework of initial screening by S Stuart, JP Rodríguez and Mike Hoffmann; and a second list of the ones that have been turned down at this stage together with the reasons behind the decision. Where there are relevant Sub-committees in place, the groups go through these before coming to S Stuart, JP Rodríguez and Mike Hoffmann for initial screening.

6h. IUCN Governance Proposals in Relation to Commissions (G Greene; p. 451, WCC 4.4 agenda pack)

IUCN Council agreed a number of proposed governance proposals for consultation with IUCN Members, Commissions and National Committees. G Greene provided an overview on commission-relevant IUCN Council governance proposals to open up discussion with the Steering Committee on three items:

- 1) One Programme Charter: Does the Charter properly address the relationship and commitments needed for Commissions to effectively play their role in the IUCN Programme?
- 2) Union Vision for Mobilizing and Influencing Society: What comments does the SSC Steering Committee have on the questions raised on future governance of IUCN and in particular on the future of IUCN Commissions?
- 3) Commission specific measures – term of chairs; steering committee resignations, nominations process.

1) Does the 'One Programme Charter' properly address the relationship and commitments needed for Commissions to effectively play their role in the IUCN Programme?

G Greene asked if the Charter makes sense among the components of the Union.

S Stuart noted that many members of the commissions would feel very far removed from the world this document comes from. They are aware the bigger conservation world exists, but how they fit it in to this is probably difficult for them to understand.

R Mittermeier noted that as you go down the SSC hierarchy there is an increasing sense of distance from IUCN concepts such as “One Programme”, but it is very positive for them to feel part of IUCN, gives them great credibility and is good for them psychologically.

T Mundkur suggested that how the charter is put into practice will check if it is effective or not, and also where it is not working. The effectiveness could be assessed in the next quadrennium.

O Byers acknowledged that a lot can be brought to the SGs which can be difficult to understand, but this is clear and meaningful and explains the philosophy of a community with the little pieces adding up to something significant. The SGs want to contribute and they need to know how to do this; the charter sets it out very clearly.

In terms of the language used, A Rosenberg suggested it should be rather more “we do” than “can”.

Under section 3. Roles, Responsibilities and Behaviours, item D (p. 453 *WCC 4.4 agenda pack*), T Brooks felt that the suggestion is that the commissions are constantly thrusting forward into new territory, but providing knowledge and science is the core bit and should come first. G Greene said that not all commissions have science as their core work so the wording has to reflect some of these.

M Stanley Price asked if IUCN can show investment by Commission members particularly as so many are volunteers.

S Stuart raised the issue of shadow accounting with regards to what the SGs are leveraging including finances raised, volunteer time and the mechanisms in place.

2) A Union fit for the future: advancing a Members’ vision for the future governance of IUCN

G Greene asked if these components can be better structured to have more influence, for example, ensuring it has the right membership. Should we have members beyond the conservation world, or do we want to look at new network models, i.e., do we have the right commissions? Can we up the game of national and regional committees? Do we have the right Council to govern IUCN? Do we need people with more influence (government leaders or big business men)? G Greene suggested that if Council is to be pushed to be more efficient and effective, then may be it needs to attract more high profile people and change the way we work.

In terms of the right members, S Stuart acknowledged that a lot of organisations that support SSC are not formal IUCN members, e.g., the International Rhino Foundation and a number of zoos. It might be worth encouraging these members to join so should we be proactive in bringing them in?

3) The IUCN Commissions

G Greene asked if IUCN has the right Commissions and are there ways of improving the network?

Y Sadovy said it is not clear how work across the current commissions is well integrated. Integration has come up in a number of ways over the years and how this would scale up to make us more effective.

G Greene agreed that it is possible to be more specific with that need in the Charter.

S Stuart noted that inter-commissional initiatives are quite hard to set up as they have different cultures and expectations.

J Smart explained that there are five network co-ordinators in the Secretariat whose job is to work with individual components (including Commissions) to try and break down the silos and achieve the harmony for optimum working.

J McNeely stated that it was not worth the effort to reduce the number of Commissions as it prevents discussions on important conservation issues. The key element is the mandate that will give flexibility and the people who are involved who matter. When Prince Philip was on Council it attracted higher profile members, but at present there is no capacity to co-opt the right people in an attempt to bring more money in.

S Stuart explained that there was a theoretical aspect to the IUCN Statutes and the existence of Commissions for just four years at a time. There are six commissions, each with a long continuity and with very distinctive cultures. If one is disbanded it will probably continue outside IUCN, and so the notion of standing one of them down is not really reality.

L Boitani suggested that the Commission Chairs should be established by Council as paid positions. This would probably help clarify the line of command and hierarchy.

R Mittermeier added that in reality there is a limit to how much can change. The budget allocation to Commissions is a very small fragment compared to their contribution to IUCN and the wider world.

S Stuart said that resourcing Commission Chairs is tricky because they are part of IUCN Council so they cannot be paid by IUCN. If Commission Chairs were paid by IUCN they would have to be removed from Council which would be disadvantageous to the Commissions (as they would then have to report to the Secretariat – which would be a significant demotion of Commissions in the IUCN structure). Perhaps an endowment fund for the SSC Chair and his/her office could be considered in the next quadrennium.

G Greene agreed with L Boitani that to be an effective Commission Chair they have to be properly funded, but without losing representation on Council. It is limiting to the capacity of some of the Commissions if they do not have full time Chairs.

4) The IUCN Secretariat

The final item for discussion was whether there is a need to change the role of the Secretariat. G Greene explained that Council would like to have more rigour from the nomination process from all the Commissions.

J McNeely noted that the Terms of Reference for the Chairs is probably more important than the actual nomination process.

7. MAJOR ITEMS OF WORK

7a. SSC Declaration of the Javan and Sumatran Rhinoceroses (S Stuart; p. 455, WCC 4.4 agenda pack)

S Stuart reported that at the African Rhino SG in March, the issue of the escalation of rhino poaching worldwide was discussed. The Javan and Sumatran Rhinos are both almost certainly now extinct on the Asian mainland and are by far the rarest rhinos in the world. It is clear that everything depends on Indonesia for their continued survival but that major conservation decisions are proving difficult to take as they are risky and involve improving habitats and carrying out reintroductions of the species.

S Stuart explained that, whilst their Steering Committee meeting was in Indonesia, that this would be a good opportunity to raise this issue with the Indonesian President. A declaration has been drafted (p. 445, WCC 4.4 agenda pack) and that a meeting is being sought with the President.

M Kusri stated that in the current political situation in Indonesia, species conservation is not really a high profile issue. There is a problem in that the rhino itself is not very flattering in Bahasa Indonesia, and there is a local saying of "muka badak" or "rhino face" which means people with no shame.

J McNeely remarked that the document made no mention of the World Heritage Convention. The remaining rhino sites in Indonesia are World Heritage Sites, which means that a strong commitment has been undertaken by Indonesia to protect these areas. This is a strong argument with a legal obligation and should be added to the draft declaration.

R Mittermeier said that raising these sorts of issues to a high level, while being present in a country at Steering Committee meetings, is exactly what the SSC should be doing.

DECISION: The Steering Committee confirmed their approval of the draft SSC Declaration of the Javan and Sumatran Rhinoceroses with the addition of wording emphasising Indonesia's commitments under the World Heritage Convention.

7b. SSC Endorsement of Species Conservation Plans and Projects (M Stanley Price; p. 459, WCC 4.4 agenda pack)

M Stanley Price outlined the progress to date on the principles and possible process for endorsement of species conservation action plans, on which discussion had taken place in a breakout group. The breakout group agreed several proposed modifications to the endorsement process which had been presented in the agenda pack.

[The revised endorsement process is presented in Annex 4]

M Samways asked for clarification on why someone would seek endorsement. J McNeely suggested that endorsement of a species plan may lead to a higher likelihood of success of a plan being funded or supported. Presumably, endorsement will be dramatically aided by plan developers following, and adhering, to the species conservation planning guidelines. J McNeely added that indeed it was agreed that species-based funding mechanisms should be encouraged (such as SOS or MBZ) which support action plans. It needs to be made explicit in the guidelines for proposals, that SSC-endorsed action plans will be given greater credence in consideration for funding.

J McNeely further suggested that it is worth emphasising that endorsement of a plan does not guarantee funding from IUCN or any other organizations.

H de longh asked how strictly the criteria would be applied. M Stanley Price emphasised that the endorsement process would need to be pragmatic but that all the criteria would have to be met. It was agreed that endorsement should not be accompanied by a time-bound statement as it simply implies that a process was followed at the time of developing the plan.

DECISION: The Steering Committee approved the principles and process for endorsement of species conservation plans (with the agreed modifications as presented in Annex 1).

ACTION: The SCPSC will formalise and advertise this opportunity (a letter will be drafted), widely to and within the IUCN membership (i.e., not just to SG members). This notice is to be accompanied by a summary of and reference to the SSC Handbook / Guidelines for species conservation action plans (as several SC members cautioned that many SG Chairs themselves are not aware of the existence of the Handbook, and that perhaps not enough people are aware of the manual).

7c. IUCN Global Programme 2013–2016 (J Smart; p. 462, WCC 4.4 agenda pack)

J Smart introduced this item by providing an overview of the draft IUCN Programme (2013-2016). It runs for four years and the final version has to be approved by IUCN members at the IUCN Congress in September 2012. The five results of the new programme are:

- Value and conserving biodiversity;
- Sharing nature’s benefits fairly and equitably;
- Nature-based solutions to climate change;
- Managing ecosystems for improved food and security;
- Greening the economy.

J Smart talked the Steering Committee through the draft IUCN Programme.

In terms of the proposed work on “sharing nature’s benefits fairly and equitably”, J Hutton noted that it was difficult to figure out what IUCN actually means by “fairly and equitably”, as these terms are widely used and “equitable” in particular needs clarifying. J Hutton suggested defining it through case studies and different experiences. S Stuart views it as the fairness and equitability of decision making, and suggested that it should

read “fair decisions for people and nature” instead of “sharing nature’s benefits fairly and equitably”. J McNeely added that there needs to be some wording to emphasise that a single magic bullet is not the answer, rather site specific/appropriate responses.

Y Sadovy thought that use of the word “sustainability” can cause problems, particularly with fisheries as it is the persistence of the latter rather than biodiversity. It has to be made clear that it refers to biological biodiversity.

M Samways felt that “avoiding overexploitation” was really needed.

JP Rodríguez commented on the “advocate for rights, indigenous peoples, women” and said that this need better qualification on what the group is.

J McNeely suggested that the proper role for IUCN is to look at the agricultural matrix – specifically the biological support systems which underpin agriculture. M Stanley Price thought that food security is not IUCN business but perhaps the concept of “biodiversity security” should be better promoted.

B Haddane added that despite mentioning food security, there isn’t any reference to access and benefits.

T Contreras noted that the draft is very terrestrially orientated.

In terms of “Greening the Economy” J Hutton suggested that there is a niche for IUCN and its regional and national offices to do some focused team work here.

A Rosenberg also suggested linking with TEEB as this is much clearer than the food security issue. There is a leadership role for IUCN here to push forward on TEEB. J Hutton added that the remnants of the Millennium Assessment should be brought together with TEEB; there is a sub global assessment network creating a learning sharing platform, and the same model could be used for TEEB – to try to bring the two things together. S Stuart voiced concern that there is no capacity in IUCN for this.

J McNeely suggested that an economic dimension to some of the SGs might be useful to give the kind of perspective that may be lacking e.g. invasive species and anything to do with wildlife trade. S Stuart said that the re-launch of Sustainable Use SG could be a good place to start on this and added that the utilisation data on the Red List could almost certainly be used more analytically.

S Stuart asked if it was important for the Strategic Plan to be more economically focused. The general response was that economic issues should be considered when drafting the Species Strategic Plan.

T Mundkur asked if the Red List of Ecosystems provided an element of economic evaluation. Ecosystems need to be better understood for their value to be better managed. JP Rodríguez said that the risk is assessed on the attributes of the ecosystem and priority setting will definitely need to be considered. Ecosystem services can be used as a measure of loss of function, or can be a metric of degradation.

L Boitani noted that the draft IUCN Programme was technocratic and lacked a component of looking forward - a critical assessment to look at what is being done and exploring the solutions of human-nature relationships.

S Stuart added that in the full Programme document there is a situation analysis which purports to provide the bigger picture. In IUCN the Programme tends to be a compromise because IUCN is such a multi-stakeholder organisation. S Stuart suggested that the Steering Committee should resist attempting to make this a perfect document, but to add what we feel to be important and remove anything damaging. J Smart agreed with L Boitani that it lacks vision.

J Hutton (relating to 5.1 of the draft programme) stated that it was controversial to engage with some companies, as it has the potential to be directly competitive with what some of the member organisations are doing. IUCN should be setting standards when working with members, so that everyone is singing from the same hymn sheet. This is a chance to change the way IUCN works, convening the members on issues to do with the corporate sector and move away from direct engagement with corporations.

J McNeely added that it is important to recognise that the Programme is a consensus document and that it's not going to be a ground-breaking and incredible innovation. However, this can be achieved with the Species Strategic Plan.

JC Vié felt that the draft Programme was too ambitious and that things do need to change – are we going to think of a way to really change/green the economy? On the issue of food security, perhaps a target should be proposed to green the FAO.

In relating to 5.1, T Brooks stated that IUCN does not realise the power it has with corporate engagements. It incorporates the conservation movement in a single go and has the clout to put engagements far upstream. R Mittermeier added that he was not sure that IUCN is experienced enough with dealing with the corporate sector, and wondered if it would be better to completely disengage from the private sector.

T Mundkur supported the idea for setting standards for the conservation community when dealing with corporates.

J Smart explained that there were three major IUCN engagements with the private sector, and it was very much down to expertise that influences the success. J Smart suggested adding an item at the next Steering Committee meeting to look at SSC's involvement with the corporate sector.

A Stattersfield proposed convening the expertise under the IUCN banner.

ACTION: The Steering Committee was requested to read the draft IUCN Programme 2013-2016 and to send any additional comments by the end of September to J Smart and S Stuart. The Steering Committee can also email programme@iucn.org if they wish to make any direct comments on the wording of the results.

7d. Internal SSC Species Communication Tools (P Medici; p. 508, WCC 4.4 agenda pack)

P Medici led the discussion group focusing on Optimizing Internal Communication Tools - Species Magazine and e-bulletin. The key items for discussion were:

- What do we want to achieve with our internal communications product/s?
- What audience are we trying to reach from the communications strategy which may affect what the broader audience might be?
- What should be different as a result of our communications?
- Do we need one or two products to do this?
- What is the best use of our limited resources?

From a summary of the group's discussions came three main options:

1. Change how the e-bulletin is distributed with a three-click option: a PDF; a link to the full version of the publication; embedded text and links in the email.
2. Include in the e-bulletin the content of the IUCN Science bulletin.
3. Add two pages of species content in the IUCN World Conservation Magazine.

Y Sadovy noted that it was good to get the SSC's information out to a much wider audience and for it to be made more widely relevant. A very brief questionnaire on readership could be sent out to establish who is reading what and investigate if there demographic differences on the membership side.

L Boitani remarked that the content of both publications is similar and should be joined into a single electronic e-bulletin. However, it would be bad to lose the 'Species' title so we need to think how we can keep the magazine but to rethink its role and content, e.g. well written articles by experts, possibly not scientific but covering more general themes like TEEB, forestry and climate change. This could then have a wider circulation (in electronic format only) and perhaps distributed at a small charge.

Y Sadovy suggested publishing species assessments in some way that could it be linked to Species, as the SG's update are important for their individual identity.

J Hutton noted that the SSC keep producing these sort things in the 21st Century; there are RSS feeds and new communication tools that need to be exploited. The IUCN's own magazine could have two pages in it on Species.

Y Sadovy asked the Steering Committee what they read and said her personal preference was for a hard copy publication. So many people are now inundated with information but perhaps there is there another form that can be used.

P Medici proposed listing out the different sections to find out which are the most popular sections.

J Hutton suggested an email that arrives and has three simple clicks to access the full range of choice in the newsletter / e-bulletin / magazine. The quickest possible options need to be made available to read the content. IUCN has an internal bulletin on science updates and these could be joined with the e-bulletin too.

P Medici thought that a questionnaire including other questions on communication, might also give some productive feedback on some other general communication issues. The size of the file of Species (3MB) can also be problematic to open in some countries too.

J Hutton recommended a state-of-the art bulletin, with science and other useful material. It could still be monthly but it would strip out some of the Species content and spread it out in the e-bulletin.

M Samways thought it was a pity not to have a run of printed hard copies as publications like the Species magazine are great to give out to potential donors; going solely electronic is a mistake.

L Boitani suggested doing something specific for that function over and above Species and proposed an annual report (similar to the one Zoological Society of London produces).

R Mittermeier agreed but highlighted the cost issue of printing.

M Hoffmann noted that if there was an issue of a publication once or twice a year it may free up resources for both printing and distribution.

M Stanley Price added that at a time when the Communications Strategy is being reviewed, should not there be clarity on this before decisions on these publications can be made?

Y Sadovy reiterated using a questionnaire could also capture some of the issues of importance for developing the Communication Strategy.

L Boitani commented that the e-bulletin will remain a communications tool, but that Species should not be part of a Communications Strategy. It should become a service providing articles with some substance rather than just focusing on internal interest only, but questioned if there is room for such a product in the market, either internally or externally. L Boitani concluded that he was not sure if a magazine called Species would appeal outside the IUCN.

T Mundkur added that if the desire is to reach out to a wider audience then 1000s of hard copies would need to be produced.

H de longh suggested choosing one product with a new name other than Species.

J Smart noted that any questionnaire should be initiated within the context of the Communications Strategy.

A Rhodin suggested that upgraded SSC website could feature updates and have something like SG of the month.

On the issue of printing, S Stuart acknowledged that it was no longer possible to print small numbers of the magazine and L Boitani agreed commenting that paper publications are dead generally. JP Rodríguez said that this was true except for commercial magazines which are increasing in number.

B Haddane suggested keeping Species but selling it, but J Smart said that this would be a huge effort for small revenue, but we could publish one publication per year, like an annual report (as suggested), which would be something for the donors. The action on

the ground needs to be highlighted and that sold and also including more of the expert articles.

ACTION: The general agreement of the Steering Committee was that the e-bulletin would remain a monthly and electronic publication (with a view to look at the 3-click options for its distribution), and that Species would be morphed into an annual report with a proposal to retain the title Species. This would mean that throughout a quadrennium, there would be three annual reports and one major report to sign off the quadrennium.

7e. World Conservation Congress Forum (J Smart: p. 509, WCC 4.4 agenda pack)

J Smart discussed the detail of the World Conservation Congress (WCC) which will take place on 6–15 September, 2012, in Jeju, Republic of Korea. Any workshop at the Forum will need to actively involve two or more different IUCN constituents in the preparation, development and execution of the proposal. The call for contributions is 16 May to 15 Oct 2011.

S Stuart asked if there are specific slots reserved for the SSC, but noted that 30 per cent of workshops are involved with conserving biodiversity providing good scope for SSC involvement. S Stuart added that thought needs to be given on how to hold additional workshops.

M Stanley Price suggested a reintroduction workshop; JP Rodríguez suggested a workshop on Ecosystem Red Lists.

Due to the popularity of Red List training at national levels, Jeff McNeely asked if a workshop or training exercise would fit in with the structure of the Forum. **ACTION: Jane Smart to check this.**

With regards to pavilions at the WCC, J Smart explained that these were causing some internal debate. It is difficult to commit to a pavilion due to the high costs, especially given the present budget cuts and financial climate; donors may not be keen to fund one either. The WCC Congress fundraisers will try to raise money for pavilions for the five areas, so there is a possibility of having one without needing to pay. However, J Smart insisted that absolute transparency is needed on who will be providing the funding.

ACTION: J Smart to investigate the cost of a pavilion at the WCC.

R Mittermeier said that the need for a pavilion is critical. S Stuart acknowledged that having our own space might lend its way to having the RL training session there and consultations. J Smart noted that noise is an issue, so mini Red List training sessions would need to be considered.

Y Sadovy asked if one slot be on communication. S Stuart said that the number of slots needs to be looked into together with a process for determining what will fill these (and also to think about who is going to be there).

ACTION: J Smart to circulate copies of the WCC PowerPoint to the Steering Committee.

S Stuart stated that, depending on funding, he hopes to get the Steering Committee to the WCC, but there will be a Steering Committee meeting in Jeju prior to it.

J Hutton felt that there was a need to create a legacy in the region as well as identifying more of a species focus in the region.

T Mundkur noted that many of SGs have weak membership in the region and this will help them to understand and look at ways to make things happen.

ACTION: S Stuart, the SSC Chairs office and the GSP will send out a structured call for workshop ideas to the Steering Committee, after information has been provided on number of workshop slots available to the SSC. The Steering Committee agreed that having a Species Pavilion was important.

7f. SSC Chairs Meeting (S Stuart; *p.523 WCC 4.4 agenda pack*)

S Stuart provided an update on plans for the SSC SG Chairs Meeting in Abu Dhabi. February 2012. Discussions included timing of the meeting and the importance of communicating this to participants as soon as possible to get the dates in their calendars.

S Stuart reported on the venue of the meeting and explained that all the costs of the Chairs meeting will be funded by the Environment Agency Abu Dhabi (EAD) (excluding some of the costs of the Steering Committee and Sub-Committees which would be covered by the SSC COF).

S Stuart asked the Steering Committee whether they were favourable of a 10-day meeting option for the SG Chairs' Meeting (including major sessions on training of Red List Authority Focal Points) or a shorter one (focusing mainly on the SG Chairs meeting itself).

JP Rodríguez preferred the 10-day option since it is a very valuable opportunity to get so many people together.

M Stanley Price asked if the meeting can be packaged into a strategic set of objectives to properly shape the context.

M Hoffmann discussed the possible content of the meeting with proposed timings. Currently, the Sub-Committee meetings will be held for two days prior to the Chairs meeting, after which the Steering Committee will be held and then will meet again the day after the Chairs meeting has finished. A day off has been scheduled in the middle of the Chairs meeting.

M Hoffmann explained that the content and number of days will rely on the final approved budget and will determine which other meetings will be held in addition the Chair's meeting. At present there is no funding for Red List training but there are plans for the SSC office to fundraise separately for this. The likely start date for the meeting is 22nd February and this will be communicated once confirmed by F Launay and Razan Khalifa Al-Mubarak.

DECISION: The Steering Committee agreed a preference for the longer meeting option for the SG Chairs meeting. However, it was also stated that if this would make the budget too large, the Steering Committee would be extremely grateful to the Environment Agency Abu Dhabi for supporting the shorter option.

8. ANY OTHER BUSINESS

8a. Large Carnivore Initiative for West and Central Africa (H de longh; p.524 WCC 4.4 agenda pack)

H de longh presented the large carnivore initiative for West and Central Africa. Genetic research has showed that lions in West and Central Africa are more related to Asian lions than they are to the East Africa species, which may add to their conservation priority.

H de longh reported that there are severe downward trends of large mammals in Africa, and that some national parks in West and Central Africa are now extinct of lions. It is suspected that lion parts are being used for trade which is adding to the existing threats to this species. Surveys show that there are no evidence of lions in Nigeria, the Congo, Ivory Coast and Ghana. There is still some trophy hunting being carried out and a study has found a significant difference in lion numbers the hunting zones (fewer animals) and national parks (more animals). Other carnivore research has also shown there is no longer any presence of Wild Dog and Cheetah in northern Cameroon.

H de longh added that these areas of Africa tend to be the forgotten regions, especially the French speaking countries.

S Stuart acknowledged that this was clearly a desperate situation, and that similar patterns can also be seen in large herbivores and most other large animals in the region. If this issue is to be championed then it has to be broadened, as it largely has to do with the breakdown of law and order in West and Central Africa.

T Mundkur noted that there is work being undertaken in Mali, where this is significant hunting of waterbirds and that may be a way of linking these issues working collaboratively with the Wetlands International office.

Also in West Africa, R Mittermeier added that there are two primate species that have either disappeared or about to so. In Central Africa there still a lot more habitat left and species-specific projects for primates are being implemented in these tiny areas.

L Boitani suggested a possible motion calling for a ban on trophy hunting completely in this region.

JC Vié drew attention to an IUCN publication on the benefits of trophy hunting in Africa, and added that these issues are not limited to land, e.g. the example of swordfish example, and also what has happened with vultures.

S Stuart questioned if was worth giving serious thought to more practical action – may be another workshop looking at the successes that might be produce replicable models.

M Stanley Price added that the situation in the area to north of Sahara is the same and probably even worse. Wildlife here is only hanging on in small pockets and there are weak governments covering huge areas with no law enforcement. Conservation solutions are going to require substantial resources.

R Mittermeier remarked that the West and Central African region often fall through the cracks of donor priorities, and the proved genetic difference in lions will help to draw attention to the problem.

J Hutton noted that it was a big mistake to assume that East and South Africa are exempt from these types of issues, and what is happening in West and Central Africa could be a foretaste of what could happen in these regions too. A practical step would be carry out a state-of-the-environment report for the region, using a joint IUCN-UNEP initiative to get to the UNEP Governing Council to push this issue up the ladder of priorities

ACTION: A post meeting discussion to take place between J Hutton, JC Vié, M Hoffmann and R Mittermeier to crystallise a clearer way of moving forward on this.

JC Vié concluded that with regards to SOS projects, the French are looking to sponsor projects in West Africa and this could go towards the suggested report.

8b. Madagascar and Papua Pig-nosed Turtles (R Mittermeier)

R Mittermeier reported that the World Bank's environment funding programme has extended funding for another three years in Madagascar. This has bought more time for this critically important place, and the political situation in the country might resolve itself over next few years.

R Mittermeier also reported that there are 600 Papua Pig-nosed Turtles from Indonesia which have been confiscated in Hong Kong which will not survive the winter. There are two choices available, either to euthanise them or send them back to Papua. R Mittermeier said that they should go back to Indonesia.

A Rhodin added that this species comprises a monotypic family, so this is a very unique species and it about to be upgraded to 'Endangered' on the Red List. It would be a symbolic gesture to return these animals to Papua.

M Kusrini noted that officials from the Ministry of Forestry were already aware of the situation and will help in any way to get the turtles back to their natural habitat. In 2006, the Ministry also repatriated the Pig-nosed Turtle back to its habitat through the help of Freeport.

ACTION: R Mittermeier to contact CI Indonesia for the possibility of Freeport assisting in this matter. M Kusrini, A Rhodin and R Mittermeier to stay in touch on the Pig-nosed Turtle issue.

8c. Korean Issue - Conserving the Yellow Sea – biodiversity, habitats and people (T Mundkur)

T Mundkur reported on the conservation issues of the Yellow Sea, which is a critical staging site for migratory shorebirds in their annual north-south-north migrations. The East Asian-Australasian Flyway is used by millions of migratory shorebirds moving from Siberia and Alaska through East and South East Asia to Australia, New Zealand and the Pacific. The area attracts some 250 populations of migratory waterbirds and over 30 populations of threatened waterbirds.

T Mundkur highlighted where most of the development is taking part in the Bo Hai Sea and said that there is concern that some of the extremely abundant species will start to become threatened. Saemangeum is an area that has been closed and is currently being reclaimed for industry and leisure. There was very strong international condemnation of the project but it was given the go ahead. There are plans for two tidal power plants to be developed, which means that over 75% of the coast of Korea will or has been reclaimed by the end of the year.

T Mundkur added that the entire coastline was crucial for many species but developments are wiping out the habitat. The extent of the development is unclear as there are problems in getting official figures out of Korea on coastal reclamation.

S Stuart acknowledged that this is an issue of global importance particularly since it is on the doorstep of the WCC in Jeju.

T Mundkur concluded that if IUCN or SSC has any direct contact with the Presidents of these countries, then that may help to initiate a much quicker response to addressing this issue.

It was decided to follow up by SSC providing technical support to a possible Congress motion on the subject (see minutes under agenda item 6d).

9. DATES FOR THE NEXT SSC SC MEETING

The next SSC Steering Committee meeting will be held in Abu Dhabi, February 2012.

ACTION: R Roberts to confirm dates.

10. CLOSURE OF THE MEETING

S Stuart closed by thanking M Kusrini, R Roberts, M Hoffmann, Jane Smart and JC Vié for their collective contribution to the meeting.

Thanks were also given by the Steering Committee to S Stuart for chairing the meeting.

[For a summary of all action points for WC4.4 please refer to Annex 1]

ANNEX 1

Summary of Action Points for SCC 4.4

	Who	Action Item	Agenda Item
1	M Hoffmann	To provide a short summary for the Steering Committee explaining the issue of threatened species' percentages, and providing with key statistics of the percentages of threatened species in different taxonomic groups.	5a (i)
2	C Hilton-Taylor C Pollock	The Red List Unit to replace the two former goals on the website with the new one.	5b
3	J Smart	To devise a plan with the new Species Information Manager, together with a calculation on cost, on the implementation of DOI numbers for Red List publications, and report back to the Steering Committee meeting WCC 4.5.	5b
4	M Hoffmann R Roberts D Cator A Rodrigues J McNeely	To work on a paper for the next SSC SC meeting to investigate the use of Red List launches as a fundraising tool for specific high priority projects.	5b
5	J Donaldson D Leaman	PCSC to move forward with the David Given award.	5e
6	M Hoffmann R Roberts	To ensure proposals for an IUCN Green list is included on the agenda of the next Steering Committee meeting (4.5) and also to include a discussion on whether or not the term Least Concern should be altered.	5f
7	M Hoffmann A Rhodin R Mittermeier	To work with the two proposed Co-Chairs of the Anoline Lizard SG on its proposal to report back to the Steering Committee by email.	5h/5i
8	M Hoffmann T Mundkur T Brooks	To investigate the possible formation of a migratory connectivity Task Force.	5h/5i
9	M Hoffmann R Roberts D Cator A Rodrigues	To follow up with all SGs and RLAs for draft quadrennial reports by the end of December 2011	5h/5i
10	A Rosenberg	To provide T Brooks with appropriate contacts for linking the SSC-WCPA Joint Task Force on Biodiversity and Protected Areas with the Marine World Heritage Sites.	5j
11	SSC Steering Committee	To provide M Stanley Price with any contacts of people working in the area of restoration (ecological engineering).	5k
12	D Cator	To explore possible options and costs around how IUCN could potentially take a license to deploy the CBSG virtual tools.	5m

13	R Roberts Claire Santer S Stuart JP Rodríguez S Stuart	Rewording of the ToRs for the SSC Regional Vice Chairs as stated in the minutes. To circulate the updated SSC national membership lists to IUCN National Committees To seek other nominations from the Steering Committee for Regional Vice-Chairs To chair a small working group to move the SSC at national-level forward. To send an email to JP Rodríguez to initiate the process.	5q
14	J Smart D Cator A Rodrigues S Stuart JP Rodríguez M Hoffmann	A draft Species Strategic Plan 2013-2016 to be created and sent around to the Steering Committee, SG Chairs and RLA Focal Points for comment. [S Stuart noted that by end of October the vision, goal and mandate will be circulated to the Steering Committee based on the comments above.]	5r
15	T Brooks	To connect Richard Maloney from the Department of Conservation, New Zealand, with JP Rodríguez on the SSC and Priority Setting work.	5u
16	J Smart	To ask Lynne Labanne whether the website Sub-Committee template can be fast-tracked.	6a
17	R Roberts	To construct a small summary on the definition of what species conservation means for use on communication products.	6a
18	R Roberts R Roberts L Labanne J Smart S Stuart	To send the Communications Strategy PowerPoint presentation to the Steering Committee for comment, clarifying what the priorities should be at any scale and where communications can make the biggest impact. Following the above to complete the strategy, in conjunction with completing the Species Strategic Plan.	6a
19	M Hoffmann	To consult with Sonia Peña Moreno to ensure that the ABS Protocol is properly reflected, and to redistribute the guidelines to the Steering Committee for final sign-off.	6b
20	JP Rodríguez D Leaman A Rosenberg	The <i>ad hoc</i> committee (for seeking nominations for SSC Chair) to write a letter inviting nominations, to be distributed electronically to all SSC members (in the three IUCN official languages), explaining in detail the expected qualifications and time-commitment of the position, and emphasizing that it is an unpaid, full-time job that requires external sources of financial support. This letter would be emailed by 1 September, 2011, asking SSC members to submit their proposed	6c

		<p>candidates by 31 October, 2011.</p> <p>To evaluate proposals during the month of November and submit their recommendation to the SSC Steering Committee for endorsement by 1 December, 2011.</p> <p>By 13 January, 2012, the recommendation of the Steering Committee would be sent to the Council Nominations Committee (due on 16 January, 2012).</p>	
21	<p>SUSG Chair</p> <p>E Bennett J McNeely T Brooks A Cuttleod</p> <p>JP Rodríguez M Hoffmann</p> <p>M Hoffmann</p> <p>T Mundkur S Stuart</p> <p>R Mittermeier</p> <p>A Rhodin</p> <p>T Contreras</p> <p>E Bennett</p> <p>JP Rodríguez</p> <p>R Roberts</p> <p>D Leaman J Donaldson</p>	<p>Proposed Motions for WCC 5</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To lead on motion for SSC-CEESP work on sustainable use. 2. To lead on Action Asia motion. 3. To lead on general motion of the Red List Strategy 4. To lead on important sites motion <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 7. To lead on the species priority setting motion 8. M Hoffmann to check with Wendy Foden and new Climate Change TF to see if a motion is needed on species and climate change 10. To lead, working with key people in SSC and partners, on motion for conservation of large animals in west and central Africa 11. To lead on motion for conservation of wetlands in Korea from the SC perspective. <p>To lead on a Madagascar motion.</p> <p>To lead on a tortoises and freshwater turtle motion.</p> <p>To lead on freshwater biodiversity motion.</p> <p>To lead on Green List motion.</p> <p>To lead on National Red List use and funding motion, working with the National Red List Working Group.</p> <p>To circulate the motion rules to the Steering Committee on the proposed motions.</p> <p>To discuss with the PCSC the possibility of submitting on or more WCC5 motions on plants.</p>	6d

22	S Stuart M Stanley Price P Medici R Mittermeier A Rhodin	S Stuart to send an announcement should be sent be sent to all SSC members by 30 September 2011 describing the Peter Scott, George Rabb and Harry Messel Awards, and calling for nominations of candidates to be considered for these awards. A deadline for receipt of the nominations of 1 December 2011 will be announced. The Awards Group will consider all the nominations in a conference call to be held in December 2011 or January 2012 and will make its recommendations to the Steering Committee at meeting 4.5 in Abu Dhabi in February 2012.	6e
23	R Roberts S Stuart	To amend CCTF Terms of Reference for general circulation. ACTION: Propose a candidate for Chair of the Climate Change Task Force to the Steering Committee by 1 September 2011.	6f
24	M Stanley Price	The SCPSC will formalise and advertise the principles and possible process for endorsement of species conservation action plans (a letter will be drafted), widely to and within the IUCN membership (i.e., not just to SG members). This notice is to be accompanied by a summary of and reference to the SSC Handbook / Guidelines for species conservation action plans.	7b
25	Steering Committee	To read the draft IUCN Programme 2013-2016 and send any additional comments by the end of September to J Smart and S Stuart. The Steering Committee can also email programme@iucn.org if they wish to make any direct comments on the wording of the results.	7c
25	J Smart J Smart J Smart	WCC Forum: To check if a Red List workshop or training exercise would fit in with the structure of the Forum To investigate the cost of a pavilion at the WCC. To circulate copies of the WCC PowerPoint to the Steering Committee.	7e
28	J Hutton JC Vié M Hoffmann R Mittermeier	To discuss a clearer way of moving forward on the large Carnivore Initiative for West and Central Africa.	8a
29	R Mittermeier	To contact CI Indonesia for the possibility of Freeport assisting in the relocation of Madagascar and Papua Pig-nosed Turtles.	8b
30	R Roberts	To confirm dates the dates of the next SSC Steering Committee meeting (Abu Dhabi, February 2012)	9

ANNEX 2

Terms of Reference: SSC Regional Vice-Chairs

SSC Regional Vice-Chairs are appointed by the SSC Chair, on the advice of the SSC Steering Committee, and serve in defined geographic regions. To the extent possible within available resources, SSC Regional Vice-

Chairs will:

1. Act as the first point-of-call for the SSC with the IUCN Regional and National Offices within their geographic region.
2. Encourage IUCN National Committees and SSC regional structures to develop mechanisms for fostering improved communication between National Committees and SSC members.
3. Represent SSC in key regional and national IUCN meetings, and other important meetings related to species conservation.
4. Keep contact with SSC members in the region and draw the attention of the SSC Chair, IUCN Regional Office, IUCN National Offices and IUCN Global Species Programme of any important, high profile issues that need attention.
5. Look for opportunities to enhance the effectiveness of the SSC within the region.
6. Identify potential new members of the SSC and recommend their appointment to SSC Specialist Groups, Red List Authorities, Sub-Committees and Task Forces.
7. Provide regular reports on progress to the SSC Chair and the SSC Steering Committee.
8. Seek opportunities to translate essential documents into regionally relevant languages.
9. Liaise with other organizations working on conservation within the region.
10. Promoting a focus on species conservation, and on the use of the Red List, national Red Lists using the IUCN system, and other SSC products.

ANNEX 3

Terms of Reference: Climate Change Task Force

Objective: To advise the IUCN on dealing with the impacts of climate change on species

Organizational structure: the Task Force will report for the SSC Steering Committee

Areas of Activity:

1. Design a strategy to help the SSC respond to climate change impacts, and outline future technical work in relation to this.
2. Develop the ongoing work on species' susceptibility to climate change into IUCN guidelines to inform conservation actions
3. Provide information and recommendations about enhancing species adaptation to climate change, including:
 - Integration of climate change into species action plans;
 - The incorporation of species into REDD+ projects;
 - Impacts of changes in human behaviour in response to climate change (e.g. biofuels, geo-engineering, displacement of agriculture), and how these relate to species;
 - Potential impact on existing priority areas of SSC's work, such as invasives, wildlife health, reintroductions, assisted colonization and sustainable use;
 - Impacts on species in highly impacted ecosystems, such as islands, mountains, coral reefs, oases, and others;
 - Impacts on networks of key biodiversity areas, including predicted turnover of species at these sites (relevant to understanding management options to increase the resilience of the sites for their key species and/or facilitate adaptation).
4. Keep under constant review the overall IUCN Programme of Work on climate change, with a view to ensuring that biodiversity concerns remain central
5. Promote coordination of climate change responses between:
 - SSC Specialist Groups
 - SSC partner organizations
 - Other IUCN Programmes areas
6. Conduct new research as needed, for example, an assessment of the relationship between species, climate change and human wellbeing
7. Disseminate relevant information on climate change and species.

Next steps:

To appoint the Climate Change Task Force members.

ANNEX 4

SSC Endorsement of Species Conservation Plans and Projects (revised text with agreed modifications of the SSC Steering Committee)

The SSC has published “Strategic Planning for Species Conservation: A Handbook” (http://cmsdata.iucn.org/downloads/scshandbook_2_12_08_compressed.pdf). At the SSC Steering Committee meeting WCC 4.3 of December 2010, a working group considered the topic, resulting in the Steering Committee’s 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.*”

This proposal follows up on that Action, based on discussions at the Species Conservation Planning Sub-Committee meeting in March 2011, and subsequent work by a small group of sub-committee members, comprising, Mark Stanley Price, Richard Jenkins, David Mallon and Urs Breitenmoser.

The main driver for endorsement is the desire to encourage development of a new generation of species conservation plans which result in realistic plans and more effective conservation of species.

Benefits from endorsement

Deriving from this driver, we hope that endorsement by IUCN SSC will be an assurance of good practice which will help those developing the plan by, for example:

- 1/ obtaining the necessary support of governments, and/or
- 2/ raising resources for implementation, and/or
- 3/ promoting effective implementation of plans and successful species conservation.

We also anticipate that an endorsement system that is genuinely supportive of planning efforts by many bodies will promote the development of species planning approaches and tools for general use, in the interests of more effective species conservation.

Scope around endorsement

There is considerable complexity around the fundamental issue of endorsing high-quality species conservation plans. This is mostly due to:

- 1/ SSC, through its Specialist Groups, is not the only body planning species conservation; while there is much commonality in objective, there is great diversity in process, terminology, and approach etc. We cannot expect such bodies to drop their own tested methods to adopt the relatively untested SSC approach. Therefore, endorsement, must be based on common best principle and process, rather than rigid adherence to the SSC or any other method,
- 2/ The SSC planning handbook contents are based on a relatively narrow set of case histories: there is no consideration of aquatic species, or plants; this further argues

against rigorous adherence for all taxa under all situations being the basis for endorsement,

3/ Species planning experience by members of the sub-committee has required flexibility in application of the handbook process; this has related to the relative emphasis of different elements in the planning process depending on circumstance, and the need for giving more attention than in the handbook to implementation and subsequent monitoring; this flexibility and extension of cover must be reflected in the endorsement criteria,

4/ Scope: we are concerned with the endorsement of species conservation plans; often, plans are developed for several co-occurring species, usually of the same or closely-related genera; alternatively, plans may be developed for species that are closely linked ecologically; we see all these as species conservation plans, irrespective of geographical scale; but we would not be seeking to endorse plans that clearly relate to site-based conservation and/or for multiple species that are not closely connected ecologically.

Key elements of the endorsement process

Based on the above and the practicality of endorsement, we see the key elements of endorsement as:

1/ Any species conservation plan that is seeking endorsement must be based on clear, simple criteria of good practice, applicable to all situations and circumstances found in species planning,

2/ Endorsement cannot require great inputs of IUCN resources: therefore, endorsement will be by the SSC Species Conservation Planning Sub-Committee, based on criteria and process approved by the SSC Steering Committee,

3/ To combine the objective that endorsement will significantly promote a plan and that it is the result of a simple, swift and fair process, we must welcome plans from diverse sources and ensure the review process handles diversity of approach combined with rigour of thinking,

4/ Those responsible for species planning will have undertaken large amounts of work in designing and planning, usually over a considerable period of time, involving many parties and at considerable cost; consequently, as part of the endorsement process, the Species Conservation Planning Sub-Committee should not be able to require major change to a plan for endorsement; this means that endorsement is more likely where the plan organisers have worked with the SCPSC from the start on the design and process of the planning; if this is followed, the sub-committee should be expected to endorse any plan arising.

PRINCIPLES OF SPECIES CONSERVATION PLANNING

A species conservation plan must offer best prospects for effective implementation to meet the stated objectives for the species being planned. Therefore, any plan must be:

- Explicit in its objectives that will lead to conservation benefit for the target species,

- Comprehensive in covering all aspects material to the target species and its conservation,
- Logical in its analysis of the species' situation(s) and the means to improve it/them,
- Appropriate to the situation, (whether it is a range-wide or national plan, emergency situation, single/multiple species)
- Realistic, in terms of the assumptions behind the recommended actions, the capabilities available, resources needed, and the plan is not impossibly ambitious,
- Inclusive in its preparation,
- Designed around a cyclical approach to implementation, learning and adjustment.

CRITERIA FOR ENDORSEMENT

SSC believes that the species conservation plan process described in its Handbook version 1 contains the essential elements for sound planning. Endorsement will require inclusion of the following elements (or their evident equivalents, where terminology may vary depending on organisation, circumstances etc.)

- A logical and hierarchical set of steps from the visionary/long-term to the detailed short-term actions
- Objectives, that are specific and time-bound, preferably SMART,
- Actions that are SMART, with responsibility and accountability for implementation by those present/involved in the planning, and with necessary resources defined, and with time-lines,
- A comprehensive and current status review of the planned species,
- A thorough analysis of threats to the species, assessing direct and indirect stressors, and their relative importance and interactions,
- A process that has demonstrably included representatives of all relevant stakeholder groups (varying whether single/multi species, range-wide or national planning etc.),
- A robust logic thread between Threats-Objectives-Actions,
- Demonstrable accountabilities for implementing Actions,
- Preferably, a mechanism for formal review of progress at suitable intervals with consequent adaptive management in pursuit of objectives, but as a minimum, a commitment to review progress and success at the end of life of the plan.

Under some circumstances, a note explaining any radical departure or omissions from the above may facilitate the endorsement assessment.

THE ENDORSEMENT PROCESS

Given the Purpose (above) of endorsement, scrutiny of any plan for endorsement by the SCPSC should:

- 1/ Occur when a species plan is in draft, before presentation to governments or other authorities for their approval,

- 2/ Be speedy to avoid holding up completion and approval,
- 3/ Not require to-and-fro between planner and sub-committee, and the sub-committee will not request changes that are fundamentally impossible after the planning process and events.

We suggest the following process:

- 1/ Anybody intending to seek SCPSC endorsement of a plan is encouraged to engage with the sub-committee at the plan design stage, in order to maximise the prospect of straight forward endorsement subsequently.
- 2/ The plan to be scrutinised is sent to the Chair of the SCPSC; it may be accompanied by any explanation as to why a particular approach or emphasis was taken because of the situation if that will assist evaluation against the criteria,
- 3/ Two members of the SCPSC (who were not involved in in the planning process) will review the plan against the criteria, and formulate their opinion about endorsement on a yes/no basis,
- 4/ The SCPSC sends the opinion of the two sub-committee members to an independent person of appropriate expertise in taxonomy and/or the planning process (e.g. Chair of a Specialist Group, Red List Authority, CBSG or other planning process specialist) for confirmation of their conclusion,
- 5/ If a 'yes to endorse' decision is confirmed, this is communicated to the plan proponent,
- 6/ If a 'no to endorse' decision is made, this and the reasons are communicated to the plan proponent with an invitation to resubmit for reconsideration for endorsement,
- 7/ If there is a disagreement between the sub-committee reviewers and the independent external advisor over whether to endorse, the materials will be reviewed by the Chair of the sub-committee and one further, different member of the SCPSC, whose opinion on endorsement will be final.
- 8/ If the species plan proponent disagrees with the Sub-Committee declining to endorse, it may petition the SSC Chair to review the plan against the criteria; under these circumstances, the SSC Chair will appoint two persons to review the matter and advise the SCPSC whose decision will ultimately be final.

Evidence of endorsement

Endorsement of a species conservation plan would comprise:

- 1/ Use of the IUCN and SSC logos on the plan,
- 2/ An explanatory statement inside the plan; this might be, "The IUCN SSC Species Conservation Planning Sub-Committee endorsed this plan (version x.y dated rr//ss//tttt) on x.x20xx. The plan contains the elements of a species conservation plan that are appropriate to and necessary for the situation described, and effective implementation should lead to conservation benefit for the planned species."