Note: the membership of the standing committees, Bureau, task forces and working groups is presented in the chart of “Subsidiary bodies of the IUCN Council 2016-20”
### Monday, 21 October 2019 – Plenary sittings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Agenda Item</th>
<th>Documents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9:00-9:10</td>
<td>Agenda Item 1: President’s opening remarks and approval of the agenda</td>
<td>C97/1/2 Member comments - agenda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9:10-9:40</td>
<td>Agenda Item 2: Matters brought forward by the Bureau (unless included under other relevant items of the present agenda)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>09:40-11:00</td>
<td>Agenda Item 3: Report of the Acting Director General</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00-12:30</td>
<td>Agenda Item 4: Strategic discussion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.1 Strategic plan to ensure the long term financial sustainability of IUCN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Presentation of the concept for a strategic plan to ensure the long term financial sustainability of IUCN, prepared by the Task Force on Financial Planning Post-2020 established by the Finance and Audit Committee, followed by discussion. ³</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:30-14:00</td>
<td>Working lunch for Council members on conflict of interest</td>
<td>Red List A &amp; B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:00-14:45</td>
<td>Agenda Item 4: Draft IUCN Programme 2021-24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Presentation by the Programme and Policy Committee (PPC) of the comments received online and during the Regional Conservation Forums on the draft Programme issued on 7 May 2019 and PPC’s recommendations for the continued development of the draft IUCN Programme 2021-24 to be approved by Council in February 2020 for the purpose of submitting it to the 2020 Congress</td>
<td>Cf. item PPC50/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:45-15:30</td>
<td>Agenda Item 4: From IUCN’s Congress 2020 to CBD’s COP 15: optimizing the opportunity to influence the post-2020 biodiversity framework</td>
<td>Cf. item PPC50/2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:30-16:30</td>
<td>Agenda Item 4: Update from the Bureau and the DG Search Committee on the recruitment of a new IUCN Director General</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:30-17:00</td>
<td>Agenda Item 4: Management Response to the External Evaluation of IUCN’s governance</td>
<td>Cf. item GCC22/1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:00-18:30</td>
<td>Agenda Item 5: Annual Council session on the performance of the Commissions (Part 2)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.1 Presentation of the reports of SSC, WCEL and WCPA by the Chair of the respective Commission</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Presentation of the three remaining reports for 2019 (20’ per presentation) following presentations by CEM, CEESP and CEC in March 2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18:30-20:00</td>
<td>Council dinner [Cafeteria]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Tuesday, 22 October 2019 - Plenary sittings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Agenda Item</th>
<th>Documents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9:00-10:30</td>
<td>Agenda Item 4: <strong>Strategic discussion</strong> (Continued)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>Management Response to the External Evaluation of IUCN’s</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>governance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Discussion and decision on the proposals prepared by</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Council’s Working Group to prepare the management response</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:00-11:00</td>
<td>Agenda Item 6: **Report of the Congress Preparatory</td>
<td>[Agenda and documents of CPC]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Committee (CPC)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00-12:30</td>
<td>Agenda Item 7: **Reports of the standing committees of the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Council** (Continued)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*The agendas of the committees are attached hereafter as</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Annex 1.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.1 Report of the Finance and Audit Committee (FAC)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:30-13:30</td>
<td>Lunch</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:30-15:30</td>
<td>Agenda Item 7: **Reports of the standing committees of the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Council** (Continued)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.2 Report of the Governance and Constituency Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(GCC)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:30-16:30</td>
<td>7.3 Report of the Programme and Policy Committee (PPC)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:30-16:45</td>
<td>Agenda Item 4: <strong>Strategic discussion</strong> (Continued)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>Status of “Strategic Priorities for Council 2017-20”</td>
<td>[Regulation 44bis; decision C/95/6 Annex 7]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>(Regulation 44bis; decision C/95/6 Annex 7)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>At the end of its meeting, the Council reviews the status</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>of the Council’s strategic priorities in light of the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>results of the meeting and takes any measures necessary to</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ensure delivery by the time of the 2020 Congress.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:45-17:00</td>
<td>Agenda Item 8: <strong>Any other business</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Meetings of the standing committees of the IUCN Council

The agendas of the committees constitute an integral part of the Council agenda. The committees will suspend their meetings on Saturday afternoon 19 October 2019 enabling the task forces to hold face-to-face meetings and prepare their report for presentation in the relevant standing committee on 20 October 2019.

All Council members are invited to the working lunch on “R-approach, IUCN Programme and biodiversity post-2020” on Sunday 20 October 2019 from 12:30 to 14:00 in the cafeteria.

### Programme and Policy Committee (PPC) (50th meeting)

1. Draft IUCN Work Plan 2020, incl. the Commissions’ Work Plans 2020, for submission to Council for approval
2. Specific Programme and Policy issues
   - Progress report from the Post 2020 Global Biodiversity Framework Task Force (meeting on 19 October from 19:00 to 21:00)
   - Report from Council’s Global Oceans Focal Person
   - ToR and establishment of a Task Force on Human Rights and Environment – Follow-up from PPC47, March 2019
   - IUCN position/action regarding the fires in tropical forests around the world, especially considering the scenario of deforestation and forest degradation in South America
3. Draft IUCN Programme 2021-24
   - Interim synthesis of comments and feedback received on the Draft IUCN Programme 2021-24 issued on 7 May 2019 for the purpose of consultation online and during the RCF (deadline for comments: 30 September 2019).
   - Progress report on the development of the draft IUCN Programme 2021-24 to be approved by Council in February 2020 for the purpose of submitting it to the 2020 Congress.
4. Update on the development of the Project Portal (requested by PPC47, March 2019)
5. Annual Update on Evaluations
6. Follow-up on assignments (2016 Congress Resolutions requiring action from Council)
   - Update on the development of the IUCN Environmental Impact Classification for Alien Taxa (EICAT) (WCC-2016-Res-018) Postponed from PPC47, March 2019
   - Update on the development of a policy statement on the importance of the conservation of primary forests (WCC-2016-Res-045) Follow-up to PPC47, March 2019
   - Update on progress made with implementation of WCC-2016-Res-030 (ICCAs) and WCC-2016-Res-075 (Indigenous cultures) Follow-up to PPC47, March 2019
7. Update on the 2020 Congress motions process – including the role of Council members during the online discussion of motions, in particular the Council sponsored motions
8. Reports from task forces established by PPC:
   - Urban TF (meeting on 19 October from 17:00 to 19:00)
   - Private Sector TF (meeting on 19 October from 15:00 to 17:00)
   - Climate Change TF (meeting on 19 October from 13:00 to 15:00)
9. Other issues announced in advance
9.1 The discussion following the re-published 2017 opinion by the IUCN World Commission on Environmental Law (WCEL) Ethics Specialist Group and IUCN’s statement about it

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Finance and Audit Committee (FAC) (69th meeting)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Welcome and approval of the agenda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Review of minutes of the previous meeting and status of follow up points and decisions taken</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Report from the Head of Oversight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Report from the Legal Adviser</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Update on information systems projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Congress 2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19.10:09:00-12:30

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>8. Financial results to end September 2019 and forecast for 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9. Resource mobilisation update</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Investment update and portfolio performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Review of the Draft IUCN 2020 Budget for submission to Council for approval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Risk management update</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Financial Planning post-2020 (including report from the Task Force)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Financial plan 2021-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Reserves target</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Report of the Joint FAC/GCC task force on membership dues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Appointment of auditors for 2021-24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Carried forward funds of the 1st IUCN World Environmental Law Congress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Any other business</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Governance and Constituency Committee (GCC) (22nd meeting)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Governance issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Improving IUCN’s governance including proposed amendments to the Statutes, Rules of Procedure and Regulations:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.1 Review of comments from IUCN Members received during the Regional Conservation Forums and online, and possible revision of proposals, on:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 1.1.1.1 Including subnational governments in IUCN’s membership |
| 1.1.1.2 Election procedures and inclusiveness of dependent territories |
| 1.1.1.3 Establish an elected indigenous Councillor position |
| 1.1.1.4 Modification of the term “Regional Councillor” |
| 1.1.1.5 Improvements to the motions process |
| 1.1.1.6 Role of Commissions in National and Regional Committees. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1.1.2 Proposals on other topics due by October 2019:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.1.2.1 Comprehensive gender approach at IUCN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.2.2 Establishment / operating rules / oversight of National, Regional and Interregional Committees (IRC), incl. discussion of scope and purpose of IRC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.2.3 Clarification of membership admission and rights</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.2.4 Harmonized process for filling vacancies for Treasurer, Commission Chair and Regional Councillor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1.3 Review of the updated Table “Areas for improvement of IUCN’s governance” and identification of any governance reforms overlooked or</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| | See footnote |
| See also C97/1/2 |

<p>| | Agenda with timing |
| | C97/FAC69/5 |
| | C97/FAC69/6 |
| | C97/FAC69/9 |
| | C97/FAC69/10 |
| | C97/FAC69/11 |
| | C97/FAC69/12 |
| | C97/FAC69/13 |
| | C97/FAC69/14 |
| | C97/FAC69/15 |
| | C97/FAC69/16 |
| | C97/FAC69/17 |
| | C97/GCC22/1.1.1rev |
| | C97/GCC22/1.1.2.1 |
| | C97/GCC22/1.1.2.2 |
| | C97/GCC22/1.1.2.3 |
| | C97/GCC22/1.1.2.4 |
| | C97/GCC22/1.1.3 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1.2 Management Response to the External Review of IUCN’s Governance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.2.1 Consideration of the proposals from the Council Working Group established by the Bureau (decision B/XV, 28 June 2019, p.8) pursuant to Council decision C/96/6.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2.2 Review of, and possible amendments to the Statutes and Regulations concerning the role of the President, the Treasurer and the chairs of the standing committees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.3 Revision of the Performance Commitment for IUCN Councillors (Annex 5 of the Council Handbook) to include an express commitment to comply with the IUCN Data Protection Policy (Council decision C/96/26)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2 Constituency issues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.1 Members’ feedback on the Membership Strategy – presentation of version 4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.2 Update on IUCN membership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.3 Membership applications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.4 Changes of Members’ name or membership category</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.5 National, Regional and Interregional Committees Incl. the recognition of newly established committees and the revision of the by-laws of existing committees, if any applications are received</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6 Membership dues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6.1 Report of the Joint GCC/FAC task force on membership dues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.6.2 Update on Members whose rights were rescinded by e-vote of the IUCN membership in 2018 and update on Members whose rights are to be rescinded by the 2020 Congress</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3 World Conservation Congress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Consideration of the proposals from the jury established by the GCC at its 20th meeting (March 2019) for appointment as recipient(s) of the John C. Phillips Medal and IUCN Honorary Membership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2 Terms of Reference of the 2020 Congress Governance, Programme, Resolutions and Finance and Audit Committees and of the 2020 Congress Procedural Adviser</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 4 Any other business |

---

1 The difference between version 1.0 dated 25 September 2019 and the draft distributed to Council members for comments on 29 August 2019, is as follows:

- At the request of the President, a new item 4.3 has been included.
- Item 2.1 in PPC’s agenda “Consideration of a guidance note for implementing the WCC-2016-Rec-102” has been removed at the request of the Secretariat.
- Inclusion of a new item 2.4 in PPC’s agenda at the request of Angela Andrade, Carlos Durigan and Jenny Gruenberger.
- Addition of item 1.1.3 in GCC’s agenda at the request of the Chair of GCC with the purpose of addressing any governance reforms overlooked or not yet included in the list.

The difference between version 1.0 and 2.0 dated 10 October 2019 is as follows:

- A new item 1.2.2 “Review of, and possible amendments to the Statutes and Regulations concerning the role of the President, the Treasurer and the chairs of the standing committees” has been incorporated in the agenda of the GCC at the initiative of the Treasurer and in agreement with the Chair of GCC.
- A working lunch on conflict of interest open to all Council members has been added for Monday 21 October 2019 by the Secretary to Council.
- A working lunch on “R-approach, IUCN Programme and biodiversity post-2020” open to all Council members has been added for Sunday 20 October 2019 at the request of the Chair of PPC.
- A new item 9.1 about the discussion following the re-published 2017 WCEL opinion on trophy hunting was added under “Any other business” at the request of the Chair of PPC.
- A new item 3.2 has been added in the GCC agenda “Terms of Reference of the 2020 Congress Governance, Programme, Resolutions and Finance and Audit Committees and of the 2020 Congress Procedural Adviser”. Draft ToR are currently under review in GCC. The GCC will subsequently consult relevant other committees. This will not be ready in time to submit to the Bureau as initially intended and required by decision B/75/4. The
Chair of GCC has therefore added it to the GCC for consideration at its meeting during the 97th Council meeting.

The difference between version 2.0 and 3.0 dated 15 October 2019 is as follows:

- At the request of Antonio Benjamin, and with the agreement of the Chair of FAC, a new agenda item 18 “Carried forward funds of the 1st IUCN World Environmental Law Congress” has been added in the agenda of FAC.

2 A document code with hyperlink means that the Council document for this agenda item is available in the Union Portal. A document code without hyperlink means that the document is under preparation. Other agenda items will be introduced verbally or with a PowerPoint presentation.

3 With the support of the group established by Bureau decision B/78/4, August 2019, requesting the Treasurer, the Chair of FAC, the Acting Director General and the Chief Financial Officer to prepare, in cooperation, a proposal for a strategic plan to ensure the long term financial sustainability of IUCN, for discussion in the Bureau and subsequent presentation to Council.

4 Continuing a practice from the previous term, the order in which committees present their reports rotates at each meeting (C92: PPC, FAC, GCC; C93: GCC, PPC, FAC; C94: FAC, GCC, PPC; C95: PPC, FAC, GCC; C96: GCC, PPC, FAC; C97: FAC, GCC, PPC). The draft agendas of the standing committees follow hereafter on pp. 4-6.

5 Recognizing and respecting the territories and areas conserved by indigenous peoples and local communities (ICCAs) overlapped by protected areas

6 Affirmation of the role of indigenous cultures in global conservation efforts

7 All documents of the FAC are available to all Council members with the exception of the Report of the Head of Oversight, the Report of the Legal Adviser, the Risk Register and the 2020 Congress Budget which are only distributed to FAC members.

8 New applications which have received no objections from the membership will be considered by GCC by email correspondence prior to the Council meeting.

9 Will be considered by GCC by email correspondence prior to the Council meeting.
Comments from IUCN Members on the draft agenda of the 97th Council meeting

(v1.1 of the draft agenda dated 25 September 2019 issued to all IUCN Members on 26 September 2019)

1. 30 September 2019: from Arab Group for the Protection of Nature – NGO Member 24808, West Asia

From: Advocacy APNature <advocacy@apnature.org>
Sent: 30 September 2019 15:39
To: IUCN Membership <MEMBERSHIP@iucn.org>; AGUILAR ROJAS Grethel <Grethel.Aguilar@iucn.org>
Cc: razan.zuayter@gmail.com; Mariam Jaja <mariamjaajaa@gmail.com>; DAMHOUREYEH Said <saidd@ju.edu.jo>; EL SHAER Hany <Hany.ELSHAER@iucn.org>; RABI Ayman <ayman@phg.org>; AL DHAHERI Shaikha <saldhaheri@ead.ae>; MALLAH Ola <Ola.Mallah@iucn.org>
Subject: 97th Council Meeting - Draft Agenda with Comments

Dear Grethel,

I hope this email finds you well.

In reference to your request of adding comments to the 97th Council meeting agenda and our previous discussion with you and our Regional Councillor Dr. Said (cc'd in this email) in Kuwait, I have added my suggestions below:

APN has previously facilitated the development of two motions regarding conflict and the environment and would like to follow-up on their implementation during the 97th Council Meeting.

1- Motion 4.097: Liability and compensation mechanisms for environmental crimes during armed conflicts.
2- Motion 3.046: Conservation in regions in violent conflict of West Asia - Strengthening IUCN's presence to protect the natural and human development.

Also, APN would like to point out the necessity of addressing conflict and the environment during the 97th meeting. This topic could be potentially incorporated into the "Report of the Acting Director General (Agenda Item 3)" OR the "Draft IUCN Programme (2021-24) (4.2)" on Monday 21st.

APN has been extensively working towards the protection of the environment and the natural resources against all hazards including the destructive impacts of wars and foreign occupation around the World. Thus, APN would like to have an assigned slot to discuss the latest developments in terms of conflict along with the lessons learned for future recommendations.

Thank you and I look forward to meeting you soon.

Best regards,
2. 11 October 2019: from International Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies – International NGO Member 401, North America and the Caribbean

From: Deb Hahn <DHahn@fishwildlife.org>
Sent: 11 October 2019 22:00
To: IUCN Membership <MEMBERSHIP@iucn.org>
Subject: Comments on the Draft Council Agenda

Dear Acting Director General Aguilar:

The Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies (Association), as a member in good standing, recommends that an agenda item be added to the upcoming Council Agenda to discuss the recent posting on the IUCN website of an opinion piece from 2017.

We ask the Council to consider and share its deliberations on the following topics.

i. Providing clarity on how the opinion got posted.

ii. Providing clarification on IUCN’s policy regarding how a document becomes an IUCN position/policy and on how the Specialists Group operate.

iii. Request that if the opinion remains on the website, that the website make a statement about all the documents the Council considered in 2017 and provide the links to all of the so that one document is not highlighted above the rest.

3. 16 October 2019: from International Council for Game and Wildlife Conservation, International NGO Member - 1063 (See Annex 1 hereafter)

From: Mark Ryan <m.ryan@cic-wildlife.org>
Sent: 16 October 2019 10:53
To: Headquarters Cic <office@cic-wildlife.org>
Subject: URGENT letter to IUCN Council - publication of position as IUCN news

Dear Members of the IUCN Council,

Please find attached an urgent letter, on behalf of a consortium of eight IUCN members.

Should you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me.

With kind regards,

Mark Ryan
Deputy Director General

CIC - International Council for Game and Wildlife Conservation Headquarters, H-2092 Budakeszi, P.O. Box 82,
4. **17 October 2019: Letter Prof. R. Ottinger to Council on behalf of Center for Environmental Legal Studies (Pace University), NGO Member USA, regarding agenda item 1.1.1.5 (GCC agenda)**

See Annex 2 hereafter

5. **18 October 2019: Letter from German Hunting Association/Deutscher Jagdverband, NGO Member, Germany (attached as Annex 3)**

Dear Members of the IUCN Council,

The German Hunting Association (Deutscher Jagdverband), the umbrella-association of 15 hunting associations in Germany with 245,000 members, represented by the president Dr. Volker Böhning, wants to announce his support of the letter of CIC, FACE, DSC, SCI, JAGDSCHWEIZ, Nordic Hunters Alliance, Conservation Force and Jägareförbundet.

We fully agree with the proposals and demands of the aforementioned group of IUCN members.

With kind regards,

Dr. Volker Böhning

President

German Hunting Association/Deutscher Jagdverband

On behalf of the President,

Mit freundlichen Grüßen,

Stephan Wunderlich

Koordinator für Internationale Jagdangelegenheiten und Artenschutz - CIC/DJV
Coordinator for International Hunting Affairs and Wildlife Conservation - CIC/DJV

www.jagdverband.de • www.wild-auf-wild.de • www.jagd-fakten.de
USG-StNr. DE 12373987 • AG Charlottenburg VR 00145B
Anerkannte Naturschutzvereinigung nach § 63 Bundesnaturschutzgesetz
From: Florian Schöne <florian.schoene@dnr.de>
Sent: 18 October 2019 14:26
To: President - IUCN <president@iucn.org>; WELIKALA Nihal <Nihal.WELIKALA@iucn.org>; ANDRADE Angela <Angela.ANDRADA@iucn.org>; SOUTHEY Sean <Sean.SOUTHEY@iucn.org>; BENJAMIN Antonio <Antonio.BENJAMIN@iucn.org>; WALKER PAINEMILLA Kristen <Kristen.WALKERPAINEMILLA@iucn.org>; RODRIGUEZ JonPaul <JonPaul.RODRIGUEZ@ssc.iucn.org>; MACKINNON Kathy <Kathy.MACKINNON@iucn.org>; KAKA Ali <Ali.KAKA@iucn.org>; ROBINSON John <John.ROBINSON@iucn.org>; AMIN ASLAM Malik <Malik.AMINASLAM@iucn.org>; TIRAA Anna Elizabeth <AnnaElizabeth.TIRAA@iucn.org>
Cc: DIALLO Mamadou <Mamadou.DIALLO@iucn.org>; OSUNA Eriyo Jesca <EriyoJesca.OSUNA@iucn.org>; MOHAMED KATERERE Jennifer <Jennifer.MOHAMEDKATERERE@iucn.org>; GRUENBERGER Jenny <Jenny.GRUENBERGER@iucn.org>; CEREZO BLANDON Marco Vinicio <Marco.CEREZO@iucn.org>; DURIGAN Carlos Cesar <CarlosCesar.DURIGAN@iucn.org>; SUCRE Lider <Lider.SUCRE@iucn.org>; BATES Rick <Rick.BATES@iucn.org>; INCHAUSTEGUI Sixto J <Sixto.INCHAUSTEGUI@iucn.org>; HAMZAH Amran (IUCN) <Amran.HAMZAH@iucn.org>; HORIE Masahiko <Masahiko.HORIE@iucn.org>; SHAKYA Mangal Man (IUCN) <MangalMan.SHAKYA@iucn.org>; SUH Youngbae (IUCN) <Youngbabe.SUH@iucn.org>; AL DHAHERI Shaikha Salem <Shaikha.ALDHAHERI@iucn.org>; DAMHOUREYEH Said Ahmad <Said.DAMHOUREYEH@iucn.org>; RABI Ayman <Ayman.RABI@iucn.org>; BIGNELL Andrew <Andrew.BIGNELL@iucn.org>; COCHRANE Peter Michael <Peter.COCRHANE@iucn.org>; HOSEK Michael <Michael.HOSEK@iucn.org>; PATARIDZE Tamar <Tamar.PATARIDZE@iucn.org>; DANILINA Natalia <Natalia.DANILINA@iucn.org>; EGGERMONT Hilde <Hilde.EGGERMONT@iucn.org>; HUGHES Jonathan <Jonathan.HUGHES@iucn.org>; WESTERBERG Jan Olov <JanOlov.WESTERBERG@iucn.org>; BATZIN Ramiro <Ramiro.BATZIN@iucn.org>; BAERLOCHER Norbert <Norbert.BAERLOCHER@iucn.org>
Subject: To the IUCN Council on the occasion of its council meeting: Open letter regarding synthetic biology for biodiversity conservation

Dear Mr. Xinsheng,

Dear members of the IUCN Council,

on the occasion of your Council meeting this weekend, DNR would like to kindly draw your attention to the attached open letter, signed by 23 IUCN members worldwide, regarding the motion process based on the IUCN assessment report “Genetic frontiers for conservation: an assessment of synthetic biology and biodiversity conservation”.

On behalf of the undersigned organisations,

yours sincerely,

Florian Schöne
Political Director
7. 19 October 2019: Letter from the International Council of Environmental Law (ICEL) – International NGO Member (Annex 5)

From: Tafur, Prof. Victor M. <vtafur@law.pace.edu>
Sent: 18 October 2019 18:16
To: DE WEVER Luc <Luc.DEWEVER@iucn.org>
Cc: ROBINSON Nick <NRobinson@law.pace.edu>; Ottinger, Prof. Richard L. <rottinger@law.pace.edu>; Narula, Prof. Smita <snarula@law.pace.edu>; jrobinson@wcs.org
Subject: Council Proposal to Require a 2/3 Vote for Motion Passage

Dear Luc,

Attached please find a letter to the IUCN Council on the proposal to require a 2/3 Vote for motion passage to be discussed at the Council meeting on Monday.

While understand that this proposal was made public via the Union Portal and presented in the Regional Conservation Forums, proposed amendments to the Statutes must be approved by Council before being referred to the Congress in Marseille. Thus, we hope the Council takes into consideration our letter, which also supports the request by Prof. Richard L. Ottinger on behalf of the Center for Environmental Legal Studies.

Best regards,

Dr. Victor M. Tafur
Associate Executive Governor / UN Representative NY
International Council of Environmental Law
Pascual Madoz Institute for Land, Urbanism and the Environment, Universidad Carlos III – uc3m
28903 Getafe, Madrid Spain
Dear Members of the IUCN Council,

Please accept this letter on behalf of a group IUCN members who are deeply concerned by the recent publication on the IUCN website of an opinion entitled ‘Compatibility of Trophy Hunting as a Form of Sustainable Use with IUCN’s Objectives’ [accessed on 8 October 2019, here: https://www.iucn.org/news/secretariat/201909/compatibility-trophy-hunting-a-form-sustainable-use-iucns-objectives]. We shall hereinafter refer to it as the “opinion piece.” A copy of the page from the IUCN website from 8 October 2019 is included in Annex I. The “opinion piece” although it does not represent the opinion of IUCN as a body or its members as a whole, has generated a great deal of controversy and has already been used to tarnish the reputation of IUCN and several of its members. For the reasons described below, we make the following recommendations:

A. The continued placement of the opinion and matters in regard to its 2019 republication and use by certain IUCN members to the detriment of the IUCN and other members should be placed on the agenda of the next IUCN Council meeting, scheduled for 19-22 October 2019.

B. The opinion piece should be removed from the IUCN website in its entirety.

C. As an alternative to “B” (above)
1. the opinion piece should commence with the following language “this 2017 WCEL Ethics Special Group opinion does not reflect IUCN’s overall position on the subject of trophy hunting,” and

2. the placement of the piece on the IUCN website should be reconfigured so that it displays no more prominently than other documents submitted on the same topic, including but not limited to the document authored by Dr. Simon N. Stuart entitled: Comments on “Compatibility of Trophy Hunting as a Form of Sustainable Use with IUCN’s Objectives.”

D. The IUCN Council should conduct an inquiry to determine the following:

1. The identity of the "editor" who is responsible for the "Editor's note 4 October 2019" in the opinion piece.
2. Under what authority the editor and/or others re-posted and publicized the posting of the 2017 Opinion piece which appears to have been intended as an internal advisory opinion to the Council, not for public broadcast.
3. The identity of other IUCN members and/or staff who requested the reposting of the opinion piece.
4. The reasoning behind the IUCN’s decision to use the opinion piece as frontline news on its website.
5. The identity of the individual(s) who gave permission for the opinion piece to be placed in the news section of the IUCN’s website.
6. The reason why the opinion piece and not the other three papers, submitted on the same subject for the same membership inquiry, received such prominent attention two years following the drafting of these documents.
7. The extent to which the IUCN Secretariat and/or Council were consulted before the opinion piece was republished and given direct attention on the IUCN website.
8. The measures that the IUCN will take to reprimand/sanction those responsible for the reposting and website attention and the harm caused to the IUCN’s reputation and to the reputation of several IUCN members.

E. Should the IUCN Council not fully address this matter at its meeting scheduled 19-21 October, an inquiry should be convened for the purpose of considering potential sanctions/reprimands for any members or staff of the IUCN who requested, instigated or otherwise participated in the reposting of the opinion piece and its positioning as prominent news item on the IUCN website. The inquiry should also address potential sanctions/reprimands for IUCN members who utilized the reposting for social media campaigns targeted at the IUCN and particular IUCN members.

F. The IUCN Council should provide clarification to the membership about the IUCN’s policy regarding the process required for an opinion document drafted by members of a specialist group of an individual IUCN commission to become official IUCN position/policy.

G. The IUCN Council should provide a position on the propriety of IUCN members using traditional media and social media channels in efforts to force the removal of other members from the IUCN.
The undersigned IUCN members make these recommendations as a result of the disturbing actions resulting from the posting of the opinion piece, removal from the IUCN website and then reposting with a clarification, all taking place during the last several days. It is our understanding that the opinion piece was published on the IUCN’s main news page on 27 September 2019, without any explanation surrounding the background that led to its publication. It is also our understanding that the opinion piece was later removed from the IUCN website and then re-posted, together with the following introductory text at the top of the page on the IUCN’s website:

“Editor’s note 4 October 2019: This article reposts a recommendation by the IUCN WCEL Ethics Specialist Group. It was one of several positions presented to the IUCN Council in November 2017 for its deliberations on admission of new members. See all relevant documents here.”

In addition, the following links were posted on the right-hand side of the webpage, only one of which is an IUCN website link (link no. 1):

4. https://iwbond.org/2016/01/05/how-can-we-save-the-african-lion-panthera-leo/
6. https://capitalinstitute.org/braintrust/can-nature-monetized/
7. https://muse.jhu.edu/article/11197

The inclusion of all of these links is concerning, but in particular, Link no. 3 contains perhaps one of the most obvious and seriously mis-leading and factually incorrect statements, something which runs completely contrary to IUCN’s “[...] ability to convene diverse stakeholders and provide the latest science, objective recommendations and on-the-ground expertise [which] drives IUCN’s mission of informing and empowering conservation efforts worldwide.”

The mis-leading and factually incorrect statement in question in link no. 3 reads as follows:

1 Taken from: https://www.iucn.org/about [accessed 8 October 2019]
“The above figures appear to be extracted from the Economists at Large report\textsuperscript{2} which concluded: “Research published by the pro-hunting International Council for Game and Wildlife Conservation and the UN Food and Agriculture Organisation, supported by other authors, finds that hunting companies contribute only 3\% of their revenue to communities living in hunting areas. The vast majority of their expenditure does not accrue to local people and businesses, but to firms, government agencies and individuals located internationally or in national capitals. As the quote above demonstrates, expenditure accruing to government agencies rarely reaches local communities due to corruption and other spending requirements”.”

The investigation that we request above should not only focus on why those responsible for the publication of the opinion piece were allowed to prominently link these additional materials, but also should focus on the accuracy of the information the IUCN allowed to be placed on its website.\textsuperscript{3}

The presence of the links to these documents on the IUCN website makes it appear that the IUCN relies on these erroneous materials and undermines the IUCN’s position as a scientific authority. This alone supports the undersigned’s recommendation that the opinion piece and its links should be removed in their entirety.

Although complete removal of the opinion piece should be expeditiously carried out, there are several other issues that must be addressed to remedy the harm already caused by the posting of the opinion piece and to prevent similar future actions. We note that the opinion piece was only one of several documents prepared in 2017 as part of an investigation into the membership application of potential IUCN member. The linked ‘Factshhet (sic) produced by the IUCN Global Species Programme in consultation with the SSC Steering Committee, the Chair of the Joint SSC and CEESP Sustainable Use and Livelihoods Specialist Group’ (hereinafter the ‘factsheet’) documents several other positions presented to the IUCN Council

\textsuperscript{2} Economists at Large, 2013. The $200 million question: How much does trophy hunting really contribut to African communities?, a report for the African Lion Coalition, prepared by Economists at Large, Melbourne, Australia.

\textsuperscript{3} To aid the IUCN in its investigation, we provide clarifications on the 3\% figure in question, which relates only to Tanzania at a given point in time: http://www.cic-wildlife.org/2019/10/01/the-dangers-of-extrapolation-hunting-revenues-and-local-communities-1-october-2019/. Furthermore, the 3\% figure was an estimate of direct contributions from a hypothetical safari operator on a private concession to community development. For example, it did not include such obvious contributions as employment of local community members at hunting camps, game meat donated to communities, or trophy fees and other income to regional and national economies (all of which may benefit communities). Many hunting concessions in Africa are part of community-based natural resource management organizations (e.g., CAMPFIRE in Zimbabwe or NACSO in Namibia) in which 100\% of hunting revenues accrue to rural communities.
in November 2017 as part of that membership-related investigation. While the IUCN received several documents, only the one opinion piece received prominent reposting and media attention. For this reason, an investigation should be conducted to determine why the opinion was given special attention and was presented ahead of all others as well as why this piece, as opposed to all the others, appeared on the IUCN news on 27 September 2019.

The investigation must also determine how this entire situation was allowed to happen, including how IUCN processes allowed a piece to be initially construed as an IUCN report and published on IUCN’s website, only to have IUCN later find that it had to correct its action and remove the piece.

The undersigned are reminded of a similar process and back-tracking by the IUCN, whereby it was initially claimed that the following was an IUCN report: “Africa is Changing: Should its Protected Areas Evolve? Reconfiguring the Protected Areas in Africa” by Dr. Bertrand Chardonnet earlier this year. This was later followed with a statement from the IUCN Eastern and Southern Africa Regional Office on the report (Annex II) on 22nd of May 2019 in which it was stated that “IUCN ESARO would like to clarify that this report did not go through the official IUCN peer review process, and that the views expressed in this report cannot be in any way assumed to reflect the views of IUCN ESARO.”

For this to happen once within IUCN processes is already gravely concerning, but for this to happen a second time in less than a year is cause for serious inquiry. The issuance of a ‘IUCN Statement’ on the piece on 9 October 2019 entitled “IUCN sets the record straight on a 2017 trophy hunting opinion” was far from convincing and only reinforced some of the doubt and confusion surrounding the piece.

The undersigned therefore ask that the IUCN Council provide clarity on the situation by convening a public inquiry, leading to potential sanctions/reprimands for all those who requested/agreed to the republication of the opinion piece on IUCN news channels, as well as others responsible for the reposting/advertisement of the 2017 piece. The same process should apply to all IUCN members who instigated and/or cooperated in the effort. We are asking for a relentless investigation and transparent reporting on this embarrassing series of events. There is a strong need now, more than ever, to restore the credibility and leadership of IUCN in nature conservation.

Based upon the biased nature of the attention that the IUCN’s website gave the opinion piece, actions must be taken to correct the public’s understanding of the IUCN’s position on trophy hunting. We recognize the fact that the IUCN has posted a notice indicating that the opinion piece does not represent the IUCN’s position. The undersigned feel strongly that the IUCN must do more to rectify the situation. If the IUCN is unwilling to remove the piece in its entirety, we strongly recommend that the IUCN’s statement concerning the fact that the opinion piece does not represent its position be prominently displayed in the opinion piece itself. We also recommend that the website be reorganized so that all the relevant documents on the same issue receive the same level of prominence and that the website include a
statement about all the documents the Council considered in November 2017 so that there can be no confusion surrounding one document being highlighted above the rest.

Finally, attention must be given to the fact that several IUCN members have utilized this incident to shed the IUCN and individual members of the IUCN in an unfavourable light. In contrast, the undersigned have avoided giving this incident any sort of traction within the media, particularly as the facts, figures, logic, spelling, and the very ethics behind the opinion piece appear questionable, at best. We recognize the IUCN to be a scientific, not political entity and wish to ensure that it remains so. For this reason, we urge the IUCN Council to prevent its members from using the IUCN and their IUCN memberships as a weapon to harm other members, rather than to promote conservation. We ask the Council to take action to address the issue of its members using the membership-related documents such as the opinion piece and online petitions to try to force the removal of other members from the IUCN.

Nature conservation, more than ever, needs a strong IUCN which embraces differences in opinions rather than creating polarities. The opinion piece as currently presented on the IUCN’s website, and the IUCN’s silence concerning the use by some members of IUCN opinion materials to oust other IUCN members, strongly suggests that the IUCN is visibly taking one side over another. We strongly recommend that the Council take the necessary action to prevent this situation from becoming worse and/or being repeated in the future.

We stand ready to assist in answering any questions and helping as best we can in resolving this matter of serious concern.

Sincerely yours,

Tamás Marghescu  
Director General, International Council For Game and Wildlife Conservation (CIC)

John J. Jackson III  
President, Conservation Force

Corey Mason  
Executive Director, Dallas Safari Club

David Scallan  
Secretary General, European Federation for Hunting and Conservation
Knut Arne Gjems
President, Nordic Hunters’ Alliance

Warren Sackman III
President, Safari Club
International Foundation

David Clavadetscher
Director, Swiss Hunting Association

Bo Sköld
Secretary General, Swedish
Association for Hunting and
Wildlife Management /Svenska
Jägareförbundet
Compatibility of Trophy Hunting as a Form of Sustainable Use with IUCN’s Objectives

Fri, 27 Sep 2019

Editor’s note 4 October 2019: This article reposts a recommendation by the IUCN WCEL Ethics Specialist Group. It was one of several positions presented to the IUCN Council in November 2017 for its deliberations on admission of new members. See all relevant documents here.
The report aims for assisting IUCN to clarify the ethical acceptability of trophy hunting according to current IUCN statutes and policies and consistent with generally accepted methodologies of social and environmental ethics. There has been considerable debate around the morality of trophy hunting in the general public including the international conservation movement, and within the IUCN.

1. Introduction

For IUCN, the issue of trophy hunting recently arose in the context of whether organizations that are supportive of trophy hunting may be eligible for IUCN membership under the IUCN statutes. Of central importance to determining membership is whether, at least, one central purpose of an organization meets IUCN's objectives. The Council has to determine, in particular, whether:

"the objectives and track record of the applicant embody to a substantial extent (i) the conservation of the integrity and diversity of nature; and either or both: (ii) the aim to ensure that any use of natural resources is equitable and ecologically sustainable: (iii) dedication to influencing, encouraging and assisting societies to meet the objectives of IUCN."\(^1\)

In determining whether an applicant meets this test, the Council cannot rely on claims or representations made by the applicant, but has to consider whether the applicant's "objectives" and actual "track record" make it likely that the applicant is dedicated to advancing the objectives of IUCN. Hence, a mere intention or willingness of the applicant to advance IUCN's objectives would not be sufficient. The "dedication" to influencing, encouraging and assisting societies involves a credibility assessment. This may include a closer look at the membership of the applying organization, for example, the motives and actual conduct of its members and the overall impact that the organization has had, and would have as an IUCN member, on IUCN's dedication to meet its objectives.

The central question for the Council is - or should be - whether or not an applicant adds to the potential of the IUCN's overarching objective, i.e. "to influence, encourage and assist societies throughout the world to conserve the integrity and diversity of nature and to ensure that any use of natural resources is equitable and ecologically sustainable." (Art. 2). This objective cannot be interpreted in a way that emphasizes one aspect (e.g. "sustainable use") at the expense of other aspects. Nor would it be appropriate to liken the objective with "sustainable development" or any abstract idea of promoting conservation. Rather, Article 2 contains a certain hierarchy: the conservation of integrity and diversity of nature is the overall concern. The use of natural resources has to occur in a manner that it is equitable and ecologically sustainable so that the integrity and diversity of nature will be conserved (and restored where necessary). This clearly implies that sustainable use and sustainable development are both subservient considerations to the overarching aim of ensuring ecological integrity.

It would be wrong therefore to measure trophy hunting purely against "sustainable use" as it is commonly referred to in domestic environmental laws and international hard and soft law. Nor could it be measured against statements on sustainable use of wildlife as, for example, provided by WWF which contends: "WWF is not opposed to hunting programs that present no threat to survival of threatened species and, where such species are involved, are part of a demonstrated conservation
and management strategy that is scientifically based, properly managed, and strictly enforced, with revenues and benefits going back into conservation and local communities. Trophy hunting is not mentioned here, and even if it were, it would have to be measured against a “demonstrated” conservation strategy and against “revenues and benefits going back into conservation and local communities.” Furthermore, the overarching concern, for IUCN at least, is to conserve the integrity and diversity of nature (globally and locally) and to educate (“influence” etc.) societies (nationally) how this can be achieved. Is trophy hunting an acceptable means to achieve this end?

In answering this question, we need to consider not just sustainable use requirements and practices, but also the general debate around trophy hunting. There are pro-arguments in favor and arguments against. The former are largely based on economic benefits for local conservation efforts, while the latter is critical of such ‘trickle-down’ effects and emphasizes the ethical dimensions of trophy hunting.

For the Ethics Specialist Group, ethical grounding of conservation laws, policies and practices is critical and arguably consistent with IUCN’s overall objective to ensure integrity and diversity of nature. In the next section we outline some ethical considerations before addressing the actual question at hand.

2. General debate around trophy hunting

The debate about the justifiability of trophy hunting ranges from stressing economic benefits at one end of the spectrum to fundamental ethical objections at the other. Supporters base their argument largely on the perceived virtue of economic benefits and advantages for conservation. The claim is that local communities financially benefit from hunting and funds raised can be directed toward conservation efforts. These claims are based on financial, empirical evidence, but the benefits appear to be nowhere near as widespread as claimed. For example, in Zimbabwe as little as 3% of the income for trophy hunting actually reaches local communities.

Hunters as a group tend to privilege an abundance of the species they are interested in killing over the existence of biologically diverse ecosystems. Despite claims by trophy hunting organizations that hunting promotes wildlife conversation in Africa, there is evidence that trophy hunting causes populations of African lions to decline.

Apart from uncertainties around verifiable benefits generated by trophy hunting, there are basic concerns with cost-benefit analysis (CBA) used for the evaluation of wildlife conservation, particularly with respect to trophy hunting.

First, we can never identify all the direct and indirect benefits and costs of any action. This is especially true for wildlife conservation with its many unknowns. How to quantify the benefits of trophy hunting? Aside from possible benefits for local communities, the benefits of human-induced culling of wildlife are questionable given that trophy hunters often remove individuals with the highest breeding value from wildlife populations. Proof that hunting can have measurable conservation-related benefits for a species may be a possibility in principle, but is hard to come by given the complexities involved. Species development is not just affected by direct human action, for example, motivation of private landowners to increase the numbers of a certain species such as the
white rhino. There are important environmental factors to be considered including ecological interdependences, habitat stability and impacts of biodiversity loss and climate change. There are too many uncertainties to justify trophy hunting by pointing to benefits for wildlife conservations.

Secondly, in light of the debate about ‘valuing nature’ and ‘monetizing nature’ it can be questioned whether a monetary value can be placed on life. It is unethical to place a monetary value on human life. On what grounds then should this be different with respect to animals? Even if an ‘intrinsic value’ of animals (biocentrism) is denied, an assumed mere ‘instrumental value’ of animals (anthropocentrism) still requires justifiable reasons for killing animals. These may include essential human needs (food, clothing, cultural identity etc.), but certainly not killing for fun (‘experience’, sport, trophies). At the very least, the onus for justifying trophy hunting must lie with those who claim that the ‘benefits’ for wildlife conservation are greater than the ‘costs’ of loss of life. Again, it must be stressed that the assumption of justifiable trophy hunting could only be made on the grounds of ethical anthropocentrism - a position that arguably is not consistent with IUCN's overarching conservation ethics (see further below).

Thirdly, there are practical difficulties of compatibility. As economic benefits are easier to quantify than ecological benefits, there is a tendency to neglect ecological benefits and harms that are far more difficult to quantify, whether in economic/financial terms or in terms of conservation efficiency. Policy positions based on economic considerations often neglect critical ethical issues such as ecological justice, human rights and human responsibilities. The implication is that a preconceived level of economic benefit justifies (a degree of) ecological harm; especially if that benefit could be used to advance the human development project. If the economic benefit, as perceived by humans, is sufficient, then any ecological harm can be justified, whereas the “value” of maintaining ecological integrity is never stated or used as a counter-balance to economic value. This trade off approach raises the question of what the limits are – and that has to be determined or guided by ethical concepts.

Opponents of trophy hunting tend to argue from a moral and ethical perspective. Typically, they refer to social ethics (i.e. rich-poor disparities, trickle-down ideology, intra-generational justice, equality) and environmental ethics (inter-generational justice, inter-species justice, ecological sustainability). Both social and environmental ethics are relevant here as Articles 2 and 7 refer to them. It is important, however, to stress that environmental ethics offers the key to understanding the relationship between human needs and inspirations, on the one hand, and the sustainability of ecological systems on the other. The latter is a precondition to the former.

As far as the general debate around trophy hunting is concerned, there is a certain emphasis on assessing benefits against possible risks (e.g. economic benefits for communities vs endangering of species and/or ecosystems). Such emphasis looks at the consequences of human conduct – in our case trophy hunting - and is known as ‘consequentialism’. From a consequentialist perspective, the good outcome, or consequence, of a morally motivated conduct is crucial. If the outcome has more benefits than harm, then the conduct is justified. In the extreme, consequentialism amounts to “ends justifying the means”.

Contrasting with the consequentialist perspective is the deontological perspective. Here rules and moral duty are central. Deontology derives the rightness or wrongness of human conduct from the character of the behavior itself (at least since Immanuel Kant). Typical for deontological ethics is the idea of human rights or sustainability. Neither human rights nor sustainability can be entirely explained as protection measures against undesirable outcomes (typical for consequentialism), although they may be part of the reason why human rights or sustainability ought to be guiding rules for humanity. Essentially, if something is recognized as a (fundamental) rule, then any behavior not following the rule is unethical (and often, but not necessarily so, illegal).

For IUCN’s position on trophy hunting to be credible, it is important to reflect on both, economic (utilitarian) and ethical (consequentialist and deontological) considerations bearing in mind that IUCN typically derives its position from its own normative rules (e.g. statutes, resolutions, policies, guidelines etc.). Neither purely economic or utilitarian reasoning, nor purely ethical reasoning may satisfy all the stakeholders involved, although it has to be stressed that ANY human behavior is ultimately motivated by ethics, whether consciously or unconsciously. Arguably, IUCN is inherently motivated and shaped by ethical, not economic or utilitarian concerns for conservation, although it has to be said that the development of IUCN’s current policies and programmes has considerably lacked in this regard.

3. IUCN’s Current Position

As mentioned earlier, Article 2 of the Statutes charges IUCN with the commitment to “influence, encourage and assist societies throughout the world to conserve the integrity and diversity of nature and to ensure that any use of natural resources is equitable and ecologically sustainable.” Accordingly, the IUCN has an overarching commitment to ecological integrity assisted by a form of use of natural resources that is both socially equitable and ecologically sustainable. Neither socially unjust nor ecologically unsustainable practices could be tolerated, so the onus has to be on an applicant to demonstrate that their objectives and practices serve this commitment in order to justify IUCN membership. Again, the dedication to influence, encourage and assist societies and the ability and credibility to do so are crucial here.

In furtherance of its overarching commitment, the IUCN has passed over 100 resolutions that directly link conservation science (and practice) with justice and equity. Examples include: the World Conservation Strategy (1980), World Charter for Nature (also adopted by the UNGA in 1982); Caring for the Earth: A Strategy for Sustainable Living (1991); the Draft International Covenant on Environmental Development (1995/2015); Resolution 3.022 endorsing the Earth Charter as “an ethical guide for IUCN policy” (2004); Resolutions 4.098 Intergenerational Partnerships: Fostering Ethical Leadership for a Just, Sustainable and Peaceful World and 4.099 Recognition of the Diversity of Concepts and Values of Nature (2008); 3.020 Drafting a Code of Ethics for Biodiversity Conservation; and 004 Establishment of the Ethics Mechanism (2012).

The resolutions concerning the Earth Charter and the Ethics Mechanism are major recent landmarks. The first because the Earth Charter is the world’s most widely endorsed ethical guide for sustainability. It articulates the values of care, respect and responsibility for each other with ecological integrity at its core, and has been endorsed by civil society, governments and UNESCO. In addition to guiding policy, the IUCN has undertaken to “work to implement its principles” through its
programmes. The second resolution (calling for effective implementation of EthicsMechanisms) is crucial because it recognises the central importance of global ethics to the IUCN's mission, and delivery of its programmes and activities.

With respect to sustainable use of wildlife, Resolution 011 Closure of Domestic Markets for Elephant Ivory (2016) effectively bans trophy hunting of elephants as it "threatens the survival of many populations of savannah and forest elephants and undermines the ecological integrity of savannah and forest ecosystems".16

Against these overarching commitments and resolutions, other IUCN documents including guidelines and statements from specialists groups need to be assessed. With respect to trophy hunting, the Species Survival Commission has developed ‘Guiding Principles for Using Trophy Hunting as a Conservation Tool’, and IUCN has published a Briefing Paper (updated version prepared for CITES CoP17. These documents recognize that, when well managed, trophy hunting can deliver important benefits for species protection and recovery, habitat conservation, and reducing illegal hunting and illegal wildlife trade, as well as delivering important livelihood benefits to rural communities (e.g. in Namibia, Zimbabwe, Tanzania, Tajikistan, Canada, Pakistan and several European countries).

The documents do not explain, however, how "well managed" trophy hunting may be consistent with IUCN’s commitments to promoting ecological integrity and diversity, as expressed in IUCN’s objectives and many resolutions seeking to implement the objectives in policy and programme development. Given the hierarchy of norms that IUCN is guided by, it would fall upon the authors of subordinated documents such as the SCC’s ‘Guiding Principles’ or the IUCN’s ‘Briefing Principles’ to demonstrate their consistency with generally adopted objectives and resolutions or, if they aim for deviating from them, seek a status that binds IUCN at large, typically in the form of a resolution adopted at a WCC.

In the absence of such clarifications, the interpretation of trophy hunting as an acceptable form of "sustainable use" has to follow the guidance that Articles 7 and 2 provide. As shown above, Article 2 defines "sustainable use" with respect to IUCN's overarching concern to conserve the integrity and diversity of nature (not economic benefits for communities or conservation practices).

For the purposes of the question at hand here, the onus is clearly on an applicant for IUCN membership to demonstrate that its own objectives and track record would serve IUCN's overarching objective. In the light of the appropriate interpretation of Article 2 and the many resolutions (mentioned above) that further elaborate on the importance, meaning and implementation of Article 2, the 'Guiding Principles' and 'Briefing Paper' are insufficent to serve as a guide for a decision on the eligibility of organizations supporting trophy hunting. Instead, the objectives of such organizations are prima facie inconsistent with IUCN's objectives.

4. Conclusion

This report addressed the issue of "sustainable use“ as a possible criterion to determine the eligibility for IUCN membership of organizations supportive of trophy hunting. It also addressed the more general issue of IUCN’s position on trophy hunting. Both issues are intertwined and need to
be considered simultaneously.

Trophy hunting is not consistent with "sustainable use". And even if it were, "sustainable use" is not the sole criterion for the decision on eligibility of organizations seeking IUCN membership. The critical question is whether trophy hunting as it is practiced by individuals and promoted by certain hunting organizations may be consistent with IUCN's general objectives as expressed in Articles 2 and 7. This is clearly not the case. Any other view would threaten IUCN's credibility for providing moral and ethical leadership in conservation policies. It would certainly undermine the many efforts of IUCN members to promote a just and sustainable world.

This report has been provided by the following members of the WCEL Specialist Ethics Group (ESG), all professors of environmental law: Klaus Bosselmann (NZ/Germany), Peter Burdon (Australia), Prue Taylor (NZ), Ngozi Stewart (Nigeria), Louis Kotzé (South Africa) and Thiti Waikavee (Thailand).

1 Art. 7 (c) IUCN Statutes and Regulations (as last amended on 10 Sept. 2016); emphasis added.

2 https://www.worldwildlife.org/pages/sustainable-use-of-wildlife

3 Ibid.


10 It is worth noting that IUCN’s practices tend to favour CBA approaches over ethical approaches for the evaluation of biodiversity conservation measures. A report by the International Centre for Integrated Assessment and Sustainable Development at Maastricht University examined IUCN’s
perspectives, policies and practices with respect to biodiversity conservation for the period between 2007 and 2013 ("IUCN and Perspectives on Biodiversity and Conservation in a Changing World", Biodiversity and Conservation, December 2013, Vol. 22, Issue 13-14, pp 3105-3120) and found that anthropocentric, economic and market-based approaches far dominated genuine ethical approaches to evaluating biodiversity conservation measures.


This is also true in light of the needs of indigenous and local communities in poor (“developing”) regions of the world. Their livelihood was always dependent on a harmonious relationship with nature. This has not changed by the fact that the (over-)developed world has imposed existential threats to their livelihood with respect to both, social and environmental conditions.


See, for example, R. Engel (with K. Bosselmann), The Contribution of IUCN to the Ethics of World Conservation: Chronology from 1948-2008.

An example is the lack of implementing specific ethical resolutions such as the endorsement of the Earth Charter at the 2004 IUCN WCC or the adoption of Ethics Mechanisms at the 2012 IUCN WCC. See also P.E. Taylor, P. Burdon and D.A. Brown, ‘Moral leadership and Climate Change Policy: the role of the World Conservation Union’, Ethics, Policy and Environment (forthcoming 2017).

Notably, the International Council for Game & Wildlife Conservation expressed a disclaimer “for the record” stating that “legal elephant trophies are not subject of this Motion.” (WCC-2016-Res-011-EN; last paragraph).
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Environmental Ethics and Trophy Hunting
22\textsuperscript{nd} of May 2019

Statement by the IUCN Eastern and Southern Africa Regional Office on the report “Reconfiguring Africa’s Protected Areas” by Bertrand Chardonnet

The IUCN Eastern and Southern Africa Regional Office (ESARO) notes that the report “Africa is Changing: Should its Protected Areas Evolve? Reconfiguring the Protected Areas in Africa” by Bertrand Chardonnet is being widely cited as representing the official views of IUCN. IUCN ESARO would like to clarify that this report did not go through the official IUCN peer review process, and that the views expressed in this report cannot be in any way assumed to reflect the views of IUCN ESARO.

IUCN ESARO is currently in the process of reviewing the assertions and recommendations made in this report and consulting widely to assess their technical basis. Further details of the process will be shared in due course.

Luther Anukur  
Regional Director  
IUCN Eastern and Southern Africa Regional Office
October 17, 2019

To the IUCN Council Members:

I write to address Governance Issue 1.1.1.4, *Improvement to the motions process*, scheduled to be discussed by the Council Governance and Constituency Committee next Monday morning. I do so on behalf of IUCN Member, Center for Environmental Legal Studies, joined by Hawaii Justice Michael Wilson acting in a private capacity as a member of WCEL, to request that the Council drop consideration of its proposed requirement for a 2/3 vote to pass resolutions at the World Conservation Congress 2020 in Marseille.

We live in a fast-changing world that poses many threats to the outstanding work performed by our organization. The 2019 IPBES found that “Biodiversity – the diversity within species, between species and of ecosystems – is declining faster than at any time in human history,” and that “The rate of global change in nature during the past 50 years is unprecedented in human history.

IUCN must not be placed in an artificial 2/3 vote procedural bind that would prevent it from addressing these threats, particularly when addressing these threats may involve controversial actions. Threats existential to life on earth are being experienced, most prominently through climate change, and worse is anticipated unless action is taken. IUCN, as the world’s largest and most prestigious international environmental organization cannot afford to be precluded from taking action by a minority of its Members.

If the United Nations, with far greater diversity than IUCN, can take action by a majority of its members, then surely IUCN can do no less.

If the proposed procedural change is adopted, we shall be forced to engage all concerned members in a floor fight to defeat the proposal. It will be very divisive. We strongly urge you to abandon this proposal, avoiding the necessity for such a controversy.

Many thanks for your consideration. Best regards.

Richard Ottinger and Smita Narula
Co-Directors of the Center for Environmental Legal Studies ands
Member of the WCEL Climate Change Specialty Group
Compatibility of Trophy Hunting as a Form of Sustainable Use with IUCN’s Objectives’

Dear Members of the IUCN Council,

The German Hunting Association (Deutscher Jagdverband), the umbrella-association of 15 hunting associations in Germany with 245.000 members, represented by the president Dr. Volker Böhning, wants to announce his support of the letter of CIC, FACE, DSC, SCI, JAGDSCHWEIZ, Nordic Hunters Alliance, Conservation Force and Jägareförbundet.

We fully agree with the proposals and demands of the aforementioned group of IUCN members.

With kind regards,

[Signature]

President
German Hunting Association
Dear Members of the IUCN Council,

Please accept this letter on behalf of a group IUCN members who are deeply concerned by the recent publication on the IUCN website of an opinion entitled ‘Compatibility of Trophy Hunting as a Form of Sustainable Use with IUCN’s Objectives’ [accessed on 8 October 2019, here: https://www.iucn.org/news/secretariat/201909/compatibility-trophy-hunting-a-form-sustainable-use-iucns-objectives]. We shall hereinafter refer to it as the “opinion piece.” A copy of the page from the IUCN website from 8 October 2019 is included in Annex I. The “opinion piece” although it does not represent the opinion of IUCN as a body or its members as a whole, has generated a great deal of controversy and has already been used to tarnish the reputation of IUCN and several of its members. For the reasons described below, we make the following recommendations:

A. The continued placement of the opinion and matters in regard to its 2019 republication and use by certain IUCN members to the detriment of the IUCN and other members should be placed on the agenda of the next IUCN Council meeting, scheduled for 19-22 October 2019.

B. The opinion piece should be removed from the IUCN website in its entirety.

C. As an alternative to “B” (above)
1. the opinion piece should commence with the following language “this 2017 WCEL Ethics Special Group opinion does not reflect IUCN’s overall position on the subject of trophy hunting,” and
2. the placement of the piece on the IUCN website should be reconfigured so that it displays no more prominently than other documents submitted on the same topic, including but not limited to the document authored by Dr. Simon N. Stuart entitled: Comments on “Compatibility of Trophy Hunting as a Form of Sustainable Use with IUCN’s Objectives.”

D. The IUCN Council should conduct an inquiry to determine the following:

1. The identity of the “editor” who is responsible for the “Editor’s note 4 October 2019” in the opinion piece.
2. Under what authority the editor and/or others re-posted and publicized the posting of the 2017 Opinion piece which appears to have been intended as an internal advisory opinion to the Council, not for public broadcast.
3. The identity of other IUCN members and/or staff who requested the reposting of the opinion piece.
4. The reasoning behind the IUCN’s decision to use the opinion piece as frontline news on its website.
5. The identity of the individual(s) who gave permission for the opinion piece to be placed in the news section of the IUCN’s website.
6. The reason why the opinion piece and not the other three papers, submitted on the same subject for the same membership inquiry, received such prominent attention two years following the drafting of these documents.
7. The extent to which the IUCN Secretariat and/or Council were consulted before the opinion piece was republished and given direct attention on the IUCN website.
8. The measures that the IUCN will take to reprimand/sanction those responsible for the reposting and website attention and the harm caused to the IUCN’s reputation and to the reputation of several IUCN members.

E. Should the IUCN Council not fully address this matter at its meeting scheduled 19-21 October, an inquiry should be convened for the purpose of considering potential sanctions/reprimands for any members or staff of the IUCN who requested, instigated or otherwise participated in the reposting of the opinion piece and its positioning as prominent news item on the IUCN website. The inquiry should also address potential sanctions/reprimands for IUCN members who utilized the reposting for social media campaigns targeted at the IUCN and particular IUCN members.

F. The IUCN Council should provide clarification to the membership about the IUCN’s policy regarding the process required for an opinion document drafted by members of a specialist group of an individual IUCN commission to become official IUCN position/policy.

G. The IUCN Council should provide a position on the propriety of IUCN members using traditional media and social media channels in efforts to force the removal of other members from the IUCN.
The undersigned IUCN members make these recommendations as a result of the disturbing actions resulting from the posting of the opinion piece, removal from the IUCN website and then reposting with a clarification, all taking place during the last several days. It is our understanding that the opinion piece was published on the IUCN’s main news page on 27 September 2019, without any explanation surrounding the background that led to its publication. It is also our understanding that the opinion piece was later removed from the IUCN website and then re-posted, together with the following introductory text at the top of the page on the IUCN’s website:

“Editor’s note 4 October 2019: This article reposts a recommendation by the IUCN WCEL Ethics Specialist Group. It was one of several positions presented to the IUCN Council in November 2017 for its deliberations on admission of new members. See all relevant documents here.”

In addition, the following links were posted on the right-hand side of the webpage, only one of which is an IUCN website link (link no. 1):

4. https://iwbond.org/2016/01/05/how-can-we-save-the-african-lion-panthera-leo/
6. https://capitalinstitute.org/braintrust/can-nature-monetized/
7. https://muse.jhu.edu/article/11197

The inclusion of all of these links is concerning, but in particular, Link no. 3 contains perhaps one of the most obvious and seriously mis-leading and factually incorrect statements, something which runs completely contrary to IUCN’s “[...] ability to convene diverse stakeholders and provide the latest science, objective recommendations and on-the-ground expertise [which] drives IUCN’s mission of informing and empowering conservation efforts worldwide.”

The mis-leading and factually incorrect statement in question in link no. 3 reads as follows:

1 Taken from: https://www.iucn.org/about [accessed 8 October 2019]
“The above figures appear to be extracted from the Economists at Large report which concluded: “Research published by the pro-hunting International Council for Game and Wildlife Conservation and the UN Food and Agriculture Organisation, supported by other authors, finds that hunting companies contribute only 3% of their revenue to communities living in hunting areas. The vast majority of their expenditure does not accrue to local people and businesses, but to firms, government agencies and individuals located internationally or in national capitals. As the quote above demonstrates, expenditure accruing to government agencies rarely reaches local communities due to corruption and other spending requirements”.”

The investigation that we request above should not only focus on why those responsible for the publication of the opinion piece were allowed to prominently link these additional materials, but also should focus on the accuracy of the information the IUCN allowed to be placed on its website.

The presence of the links to these documents on the IUCN website makes it appear that the IUCN relies on these erroneous materials and undermines the IUCN’s position as a scientific authority. This alone supports the undersigned’s recommendation that the opinion piece and its links should be removed in their entirety.

Although complete removal of the opinion piece should be expeditiously carried out, there are several other issues that must be addressed to remedy the harm already caused by the posting of the opinion piece and to prevent similar future actions. We note that the opinion piece was only one of several documents prepared in 2017 as part of an investigation into the membership application of potential IUCN member. The linked ‘Factshhet (sic) produced by the IUCN Global Species Programme in consultation with the SSC Steering Committee, the Chair of the Joint SSC and CEESP Sustainable Use and Livelihoods Specialist Group’ (hereinafter the ‘factsheet’) documents several other positions presented to the IUCN Council.

2 Economists at Large, 2013. The $200 million question: How much does trophy hunting really contribut to African communities?, a report for the African Lion Coalition, prepared by Economists at Large, Melbourne, Australia.

3 To aid the IUCN in its investigation, we provide clarifications on the 3% figure in question, which relates only to Tanzania at a given point in time: http://www.cic-wildlife.org/2019/10/01/the-dangers-of-extrapolation-hunting-revenues-and-local-communities-1-october-2019/. Furthermore, the 3% figure was an estimate of direct contributions from a hypothetical safari operator on a private concession to community development. For example, it did not include such obvious contributions as employment of local community members at hunting camps, game meat donated to communities, or trophy fees and other income to regional and national economies (all of which may benefit communities). Many hunting concessions in Africa are part of community-based natural resource management organizations (e.g., CAMPFIRE in Zimbabwe or NACSO in Namibia) in which 100% of hunting revenues accrue to rural communities.
in November 2017 as part of that membership-related investigation. While the IUCN received several documents, only the one opinion piece received prominent reposting and media attention. For this reason, an investigation should be conducted to determine why the opinion was given special attention and was presented ahead of all others as well as why this piece, as opposed to all the others, appeared on the IUCN news on 27 September 2019.

The investigation must also determine how this entire situation was allowed to happen, including how IUCN processes allowed a piece to be initially construed as an IUCN report and published on IUCN’s website, only to have IUCN later find that it had to correct its action and remove the piece.

The undersigned are reminded of a similar process and back-tracking by the IUCN, whereby it was initially claimed that the following was an IUCN report: “Africa is Changing: Should its Protected Areas Evolve? Reconfiguring the Protected Areas in Africa” by Dr. Bertrand Chardonnet earlier this year. This was later followed with a statement from the IUCN Eastern and Southern Africa Regional Office on the report (Annex II) on 22nd of May 2019 in which it was stated that “IUCN ESARO would like to clarify that this report did not go through the official IUCN peer review process, and that the views expressed in this report cannot be in any way assumed to reflect the views of IUCN ESARO.”

For this to happen once within IUCN processes is already gravely concerning, but for this to happen a second time in less than a year is cause for serious inquiry. The issuance of a ‘IUCN Statement’ on the piece on 9 October 2019 entitled “IUCN sets the record straight on a 2017 trophy hunting opinion” was far from convincing and only reinforced some of the doubt and confusion surrounding the piece.

The undersigned therefore ask that the IUCN Council provide clarity on the situation by convening a public inquiry, leading to potential sanctions/reprimands for all those who requested/agreed to the republication of the opinion piece on IUCN news channels, as well as others responsible for the reposting/advertisement of the 2017 piece. The same process should apply to all IUCN members who instigated and/or cooperated in the effort. We are asking for a relentless investigation and transparent reporting on this embarrassing series of events. There is a strong need now, more than ever, to restore the credibility and leadership of IUCN in nature conservation.

Based upon the biased nature of the attention that the IUCN’s website gave the opinion piece, actions must be taken to correct the public’s understanding of the IUCN’s position on trophy hunting. We recognize the fact that the IUCN has posted a notice indicating that the opinion piece does not represent the IUCN’s position. The undersigned feel strongly that the IUCN must do more to rectify the situation. If the IUCN is unwilling to remove the piece in its entirety, we strongly recommend that the IUCN’s statement concerning the fact that the opinion piece does not represent its position be prominently displayed in the opinion piece itself. We also recommend that the website be reorganized so that all the relevant documents on the same issue receive the same level of prominence and that the website include a
statement about all the documents the Council considered in November 2017 so that there can be no confusion surrounding one document being highlighted above the rest.

Finally, attention must be given to the fact that several IUCN members have utilized this incident to shed the IUCN and individual members of the IUCN in an unfavourable light. In contrast, the undersigned have avoided giving this incident any sort of traction within the media, particularly as the facts, figures, logic, spelling, and the very ethics behind the opinion piece appear questionable, at best. We recognize the IUCN to be a scientific, not political entity and wish to ensure that it remains so. For this reason, we urge the IUCN Council to prevent its members from using the IUCN and their IUCN memberships as a weapon to harm other members, rather than to promote conservation. We ask the Council to take action to address the issue of its members using the membership-related documents such as the opinion piece and online petitions to try to force the removal of other members from the IUCN.

Nature conservation, more than ever, needs a strong IUCN which embraces differences in opinions rather than creating polarities. The opinion piece as currently presented on the IUCN’s website, and the IUCN’s silence concerning the use by some members of IUCN opinion materials to oust other IUCN members, strongly suggests that the IUCN is visibly taking one side over another. We strongly recommend that the Council take the necessary action to prevent this situation from becoming worse and/or being repeated in the future.

We stand ready to assist in answering any questions and helping as best we can in resolving this matter of serious concern.

Sincerely yours,

Tamás Marghescu
Director General, International Council For Game and Wildlife Conservation (CIC)

John J. Jackson III
President, Conservation Force

Corey Mason
Executive Director, Dallas Safari Club

David Scallan
Secretary General, European Federation for Hunting and Conservation
Knut Arne Gjems  
President, Nordic Hunters’ Alliance

Warren Sackman III  
President, Safari Club International Foundation

David Clavadetscher  
Director, Swiss Hunting Association

Bo Sköld  
Secretary General, Swedish Association for Hunting and Wildlife Management /Svenska Jägareförbundet
Compatibility of Trophy Hunting as a Form of Sustainable Use with IUCN’s Objectives

Fri, 27 Sep 2019

Editor’s note 4 October 2019: This article reposts a recommendation by the IUCN WCEL Ethics Specialist Group. It was one of several positions presented to the IUCN Council in November 2017 for its deliberations on admission of new members. See all relevant documents here.
The report aims for assisting IUCN to clarify the ethical acceptability of trophy hunting according to current IUCN statutes and policies and consistent with generally accepted methodologies of social and environmental ethics. There has been considerable debate around the morality of trophy hunting in the general public including the international conservation movement, and within the IUCN.

1. Introduction

For IUCN, the issue of trophy hunting recently arose in the context of whether organizations that are supportive of trophy hunting may be eligible for IUCN membership under the IUCN statutes. Of central importance to determining membership is whether, at least, one central purpose of an organization meets IUCN's objectives. The Council has to determine, in particular, whether:

"the objectives and track record of the applicant embody to a substantial extent (i) the conservation of the integrity and diversity of nature; and either or both: (ii) the aim to ensure that any use of natural resources is equitable and ecologically sustainable: (iii) dedication to influencing, encouraging and assisting societies to meet the objectives of IUCN."

In determining whether an applicant meets this test, the Council cannot rely on claims or representations made by the applicant, but has to consider whether the applicant’s “objectives” and actual “track record” make it likely that the applicant is dedicated to advancing the objectives of IUCN. Hence, a mere intention or willingness of the applicant to advance IUCN’s objectives would not be sufficient. The “dedication” to influencing, encouraging and assisting societies involves a credibility assessment. This may include a closer look at the membership of the applying organization, for example, the motives and actual conduct of its members and the overall impact that the organization has had, and would have as an IUCN member, on IUCN’s dedication to meet its objectives.

The central question for the Council is - or should be - whether or not an applicant adds to the potential of the IUCN’s overarching objective, i.e. “to influence, encourage and assist societies throughout the world to conserve the integrity and diversity of nature and to ensure that any use of natural resources is equitable and ecologically sustainable.” (Art. 2). This objective cannot be interpreted in a way that emphasizes one aspect (e.g. “sustainable use”) at the expense of other aspects. Nor would it be appropriate to liken the objective with “sustainable development” or any abstract idea of promoting conservation. Rather, Article 2 contains a certain hierarchy: the conservation of integrity and diversity of nature is the overall concern. The use of natural resources has to occur in a manner that it is equitable and ecologically sustainable so that the integrity and diversity of nature will be conserved (and restored where necessary). This clearly implies that sustainable use and sustainable development are both subservient considerations to the overarching aim of ensuring ecological integrity.

It would be wrong therefore to measure trophy hunting purely against “sustainable use” as it is commonly referred to in domestic environmental laws and international hard and soft law. Nor could it be measured against statements on sustainable use of wildlife as, for example, provided by WWF which contends: “WWF is not opposed to hunting programs that present no threat to survival of threatened species and, where such species are involved, are part of a demonstrated conservation
and management strategy that is scientifically based, properly managed, and strictly enforced, with revenues and benefits going back into conservation and local communities. Trophy hunting is not mentioned here, and even if it were, it would have to be measured against a “demonstrated” conservation strategy and against “revenues and benefits going back into conservation and local communities”. Furthermore, the overarching concern, for IUCN at least, is to conserve the integrity and diversity of nature (globally and locally) and to educate (“influence” etc.) societies (nationally) how this can be achieved. Is trophy hunting an acceptable means to achieve this end?

In answering this question, we need to consider not just sustainable use requirements and practices, but also the general debate around trophy hunting. There are pro-arguments in favour and arguments against. The former are largely based on economic benefits for local conservation efforts, while the latter is critical of such ‘trickle-down’ effects and emphasizes the ethical dimensions of trophy hunting.

For the Ethics Specialist Group, ethical grounding of conservation laws, policies and practices is critical and arguably consistent with IUCN’s overall objective to ensure integrity and diversity of nature. In the next section we outline some ethical considerations before addressing the actual question at hand.

2. General debate around trophy hunting

The debate about the justifiability of trophy hunting ranges from stressing economic benefits at one end of the spectrum to fundamental ethical objections at the other. Supporters base their argument largely on the perceived virtue of economic benefits and advantages for conservation. The claim is that local communities financially benefit from hunting and funds raised can be directed toward conservation efforts. These claims are based on financial, empirical evidence, but the benefits appear to be nowhere near as widespread as claimed. For example, in Zimbabwe as little as 3% of the income for trophy hunting actually reaches local communities.

Hunters as a group tend to privilege an abundance of the species they are interested in killing over the existence of biologically diverse ecosystems. Despite claims by trophy hunting organizations that hunting promotes wildlife conservation in Africa, there is evidence that trophy hunting causes populations of African lions to decline.

Apart from uncertainties around verifiable benefits generated by trophy hunting, there are basic concerns with cost-benefit analysis (CBA) used for the evaluation of wildlife conservation, particularly with respect to trophy hunting.

First, we can never identify all the direct and indirect benefits and costs of any action. This is especially true for wildlife conservation with its many unknowns. How to quantify the benefits of trophy hunting? Aside from possible benefits for local communities, the benefits of human-induced culling of wildlife are questionable given that trophy hunters often remove individuals with the highest breeding value from wildlife populations. Proof that hunting can have measurable conservation-related benefits for a species may be a possibility in principle, but is hard to come by given the complexities involved. Species development is not just affected by direct human action, for example, motivation of private landowners to increase the numbers of a certain species such as the
white rhino. There are important environmental factors to be considered including ecological interdependences, habitat stability and impacts of biodiversity loss and climate change. There are too many uncertainties to justify trophy hunting by pointing to benefits for wildlife conservations.

Secondly, in light of the debate about ‘valuing nature’ and ‘monetizing nature’ it can be questioned whether a monetary value can be placed on life. It is unethical to place a monetary value on human life. On what grounds then should this be different with respect to animals? Even if an ‘intrinsic value’ of animals (biocentrism) is denied, an assumed mere ‘instrumental value’ of animals (anthropocentrism) still requires justifiable reasons for killing animals. These may include essential human needs (food, clothing, cultural identity etc.), but certainly not killing for fun (‘experience’, sport, trophies). At the very least, the onus for justifying trophy hunting must lie with those who claim that the ‘benefits’ for wildlife conservation are greater than the ‘costs’ of loss of life. Again, it must be stressed that the assumption of justifiable trophy hunting could only be made on the grounds of ethical anthropocentrism - a position that arguably is not consistent with IUCN’s overarching conservation ethics (see further below).

Thirdly, there are practical difficulties of compatibility. As economic benefits are easier to quantify than ecological benefits, there is a tendency to neglect ecological benefits and harms that are far more difficult to quantify, whether in economic/financial terms or in terms of conservation efficiency. Policy positions based on economic considerations often neglect critical ethical issues such as ecological justice, human rights and human responsibilities. The implication is that a preconceived level of economic benefit justifies (a degree of) ecological harm; especially if that benefit could be used to advance the human development project. If the economic benefit, as perceived by humans, is sufficient, then any ecological harm can be justified, whereas the “value” of maintaining ecological integrity is never stated or used as a counter-balance to economic value. This trade off approach raises the question of what the limits are – and that has to be determined or guided by ethical concepts.

Opponents of trophy hunting tend to argue from a moral and ethical perspective. Typically, they refer to social ethics (i.e. rich-poor disparities, trickle-down ideology, intra-generational justice, equality) and environmental ethics (inter-generational justice, inter-species justice, ecological sustainability). Both social and environmental ethics are relevant here as Articles 2 and 7 refer to them. It is important, however, to stress that environmental ethics offers the key to understanding the relationship between human needs and inspirations, on the one hand, and the sustainability of ecological systems on the other. The latter is a precondition to the former.

As far as the general debate around trophy hunting is concerned, there is a certain emphasis on assessing benefits against possible risks (e.g. economic benefits for communities vs endangering of species and/or ecosystems). Such emphasis looks at the consequences of human conduct – in our case trophy hunting - and is known as ‘consequentialism’. From a consequentialist perspective, the good outcome, or consequence, of a morally motivated conduct is crucial. If the outcome has more benefits than harm, then the conduct is justified. In the extreme, consequentialism amounts to “ends justifying the means”.
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Contrasting with the consequentialist perspective is the deontological perspective. Here rules and moral duty are central. Deontology derives the rightness or wrongness of human conduct from the character of the behavior itself (at least since Immanuel Kant). Typical for deontological ethics is the idea of human rights or sustainability. Neither human rights nor sustainability can be entirely explained as protection measures against undesirable outcomes (typical for consequentialism), although they may be part of the reason why human rights or sustainability ought to be guiding rules for humanity. Essentially, if something is recognized as a (fundamental) rule, then any behavior not following the rule is unethical (and often, but not necessarily so, illegal).

For IUCN's position on trophy hunting to be credible, it is important to reflect on both, economic (utilitarian) and ethical (consequentialist and deontological) considerations bearing in mind that IUCN typically derives its position from its own normative rules (e.g., statutes, resolutions, policies, guidelines etc.). Neither purely economic or utilitarian reasoning, nor purely ethical reasoning may satisfy all the stakeholders involved, although it has to be stressed that ANY human behavior is ultimately motivated by ethics, whether consciously or unconsciously. Arguably, IUCN is inherently motivated and shaped by ethical, not economic or utilitarian concerns for conservation, although it has to be said that the development of IUCN's current policies and programmes has considerably lacked in this regard.

3. IUCN's Current Position

As mentioned earlier, Article 2 of the Statutes charges IUCN with the commitment to "influence, encourage and assist societies throughout the world to conserve the integrity and diversity of nature and to ensure that any use of natural resources is equitable and ecologically sustainable." Accordingly, the IUCN has an overarching commitment to ecological integrity assisted by a form of use of natural resources that is both socially equitable and ecologically sustainable. Neither socially unjust nor ecologically unsustainable practices could be tolerated, so the onus has to be on an applicant to demonstrate that their objectives and practices serve this commitment in order to justify IUCN membership. Again, the dedication to influence, encourage and assist societies and the ability and credibility to do so are crucial here.

In furtherance of its overarching commitment, the IUCN has passed over 100 resolutions that directly link conservation science (and practice) with justice and equity. Examples include: the World Conservation Strategy (1980), World Charter for Nature (also adopted by the UNGA in 1982); Caring for the Earth: A Strategy for Sustainable Living (1991); the Draft International Covenant on Environmental Development (1995/2015); Resolution 3.022 endorsing the Earth Charter as "an ethical guide for IUCN policy" (2004); Resolutions 4.098 Intergenerational Partnerships: Fostering Ethical Leadership for a Just, Sustainable and Peaceful World and 4.099 Recognition of the Diversity of Concepts and Values of Nature (2008); 3.020 Drafting a Code of Ethics for Biodiversity Conservation; and 004 Establishment of the Ethics Mechanism (2012).

The resolutions concerning the Earth Charter and the Ethics Mechanism are major recent landmarks. The first because the Earth Charter is the world’s most widely endorsed ethical guide for sustainability. It articulates the values of care, respect and responsibility for each other with ecological integrity at its core, and has been endorsed by civil society, governments and UNESCO. In addition to guiding policy, the IUCN has undertaken to “work to implement its principles” through its
programmes. The second resolution (calling for effective implementation of Ethics Mechanisms) is crucial because it recognises the central importance of global ethics to the IUCN's mission, and delivery of its programmes and activities.

With respect to sustainable use of wildlife, Resolution 011 Closure of Domestic Markets for Elephant Ivory (2016) effectively bans trophy hunting of elephants as it "threatens the survival of many populations of savannah and forest elephants and undermines the ecological integrity of savannah and forest ecosystems".\textsuperscript{16}

Against these overarching commitments and resolutions, other IUCN documents including guidelines and statements from specialists groups need to be assessed. With respect to trophy hunting, the Species Survival Commission has developed ‘Guiding Principles for Using Trophy Hunting as a Conservation Tool’, and IUCN has published a Briefing Paper (updated version prepared for CITES CoP17. These documents recognize that, when well managed, trophy hunting can deliver important benefits for species protection and recovery, habitat conservation, and reducing illegal hunting and illegal wildlife trade, as well as delivering important livelihood benefits to rural communities (e.g. in Namibia, Zimbabwe, Tanzania, Tajikistan, Canada, Pakistan and several European countries).

The documents do not explain, however, how "well managed" trophy hunting may be consistent with IUCN's commitments to promoting ecological integrity and diversity, as expressed in IUCN's objectives and many resolutions seeking to implement the objectives in policy and programme development. Given the hierarchy of norms that IUCN is guided by, it would fall upon the authors of subordinated documents such as the SCC's ‘Guiding Principles’ or the IUCN's ‘Briefing Principles’ to demonstrate their consistency with generally adopted objectives and resolutions or, if they aim for deviating from them, seek a status that binds IUCN at large, typically in the form of a resolution adopted at a WCC.

In the absence of such clarifications, the interpretation of trophy hunting as an acceptable form of "sustainable use" has to follow the guidance that Articles 7 and 2 provide. As shown above, Article 2 defines "sustainable use" with respect to IUCN's overarching concern to conserve the integrity and diversity of nature (not economic benefits for communities or conservation practices).

For the purposes of the question at hand here, the onus is clearly on an applicant for IUCN membership to demonstrate that its own objectives and track record would serve IUCN's overarching objective. In the light of the appropriate interpretation of Article 2 and the many resolutions (mentioned above) that further elaborate on the importance, meaning and implementation of Article 2, the ‘Guiding Principles’ and ‘Briefing Paper’ are insucient to serve as a guide for a decision on the eligibility of organizations supporting trophy hunting. Instead, the objectives of such organizations are prima facie inconsistent with IUCN's objectives.

\textbf{4. Conclusion}

This report addressed the issue of "sustainable use" as a possible criterion to determine the eligibility for IUCN membership of organizations supportive of trophy hunting. It also addressed the more general issue of IUCN's position on trophy hunting. Both issues are intertwined and need to
Trophy hunting is not consistent with “sustainable use”. And even if it were, “sustainable use” is not the sole criterion for the decision on eligibility of organizations seeking IUCN membership. The critical question is whether trophy hunting as it is practiced by individuals and promoted by certain hunting organizations may be consistent with IUCN’s general objectives as expressed in Articles 2 and 7. This is clearly not the case. Any other view would threaten IUCN’s credibility for providing moral and ethical leadership in conservation policies. It would certainly undermine the many efforts of IUCN members to promote a just and sustainable world.

1 Art. 7 (c) IUCN Statutes and Regulations (as last amended on 10 Sept. 2016); emphasis added.

2 https://www.worldwildlife.org/pages/sustainable-use-of-wildlife

3 Ibid.


10 It is worth noting that IUCN’s practices tend to favour CBA approaches over ethical approaches for the evaluation of biodiversity conservation measures. A report by the International Centre for Integrated Assessment and Sustainable Development at Maastricht University examined IUCN’s
perspectives, policies and practices with respect to biodiversity conservation for the period between 2007 and 2013 (“IUCN and Perspectives on Biodiversity and Conservation in a Changing World”, Biodiversity and Conservation, December 2013, Vol. 22, Issue 13-14, pp 3105-3120) and found that anthropocentric, economic and market-based approaches far dominated genuine ethical approaches to evaluating biodiversity conservation measures.


This is also true in light of the needs of indigenous and local communities in poor (“developing”) regions of the world. Their livelihood was always dependent on a harmonious relationship with nature. This has not changed by the fact that the (over-)developed world has imposed existential threats to their livelihood with respect to both, social and environmental conditions.


See, for example, R. Engel (with K. Bosselmann), The Contribution of IUCN to the Ethics of World Conservation: Chronology from 1948-2008.

An example is the lack of implementing specific ethical resolutions such as the endorsement of the Earth Charter at the 2004 IUCN WCC or the adoption of Ethics Mechanisms at the 2012 IUCN WCC. See also P.E. Taylor, P. Burdon and D.A. Brown, ‘Moral leadership and Climate Change Policy: the role of the World Conservation Union’, Ethics, Policy and Environment (forthcoming 2017).

Notably, the International Council for Game & Wildlife Conservation expressed a disclaimer “for the record” stating that “legal elephant trophies are not subject of this Motion.” (WCC-2016-Res-011-EN; last paragraph).

Languages

English

Links

WCEL Ethics Specialist Group
WWF Sustainable Use of Wildlife
The Economics of Poaching, Trophy and Canned Hunting
How can we save the African Lion?
Put a price on nature?

Can Nature Be Monetized?

Environmental Ethics and Trophy Hunting
22nd of May 2019

Statement by the IUCN Eastern and Southern Africa Regional Office on the report “Reconfiguring Africa’s Protected Areas” by Bertrand Chardonnet

The IUCN Eastern and Southern Africa Regional Office (ESARO) notes that the report “Africa is Changing: Should its Protected Areas Evolve? Reconfiguring the Protected Areas in Africa” by Bertrand Chardonnet is being widely cited as representing the official views of IUCN. IUCN ESARO would like to clarify that this report did not go through the official IUCN peer review process, and that the views expressed in this report cannot be in any way assumed to reflect the views of IUCN ESARO.

IUCN ESARO is currently in the process of reviewing the assertions and recommendations made in this report and consulting widely to assess their technical basis. Further details of the process will be shared in due course.

Luther Anukur
Regional Director
IUCN Eastern and Southern Africa Regional Office
Open Letter by the undersigned IUCN Members to the IUCN Council

AAO, AEnv, AGEREF/CL, ARCAS, BEES-ONG, BUND Naturschutz in Bayern, CEIDA, CENESTA, CRADIB-ONG, DNR, EuroNatur, Exploralis, FODER, FoN, INCA, Mweka, NACSSA, Pro Natura, REMBLAH, RSPN, SINCHI, Tour du Valat, ZoogDierVereniging

To the IUCN Council

18.10.2019

Dear Mr. Xinsheng,

Dear members of the IUCN Council,

we have taken note of the IUCN assessment report “Genetic frontiers for conservation: an assessment of synthetic biology and biodiversity conservation”. We are of the strong view that this report should not be regarded as a sufficient basis for the development of IUCN policy recommendations, nor should it be part of an IUCN motion process on synthetic biology in nature conservation to be voted on at the upcoming IUCN World Conservation Congress in June 2020 in Marseille.

Our first concern with the report and the related policy process is that it fails to raise the fundamental question of whether the tool of genetic engineering should be used for the purpose of nature conservation at all. In our understanding of nature conservation, interventions at the level of the genome of wild species contradict the aim of nature conservation and the protection of biodiversity. We believe nature should be protected as it emerged from evolutionary processes and not be replaced by genetically engineered organisms. The incorporation of genetic engineering as a tool of nature conservation would mean a redefinition of the term nature conservation and a fundamental paradigm shift for global efforts in nature conservation.

This very basic question needs to be addressed prior to the development of policy recommendations on synthetic biology in nature conservation and the adoption of an IUCN policy on this matter. The dialogue we propose should not merely involve a task force and authors who largely earn their living through (continued) research and development of the technology in question. In our opinion, this fundamental question needs a much broader, in depth and rigorous discussion among IUCN constituencies.

Given the lack of balanced debate about this topic at the current moment among the IUCN constituencies, we urge you not to move forward as planned with drafting policy recommendations for a motion process on synthetic biology in nature conservation aimed for adoption at the World Conservation Congress in Marseille in June 2020. We urge you instead to take the necessary time for a rigorous, more balanced, informed and critical discussion of this fundamental question.
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Other reasons why we would like to ask you to reconsider whether the report constitutes a sufficient basis for a subsequent motion process as required by Resolution 6.086 are:

- The report appears to promote the introduction of genetically engineered (GE) organisms and even gene drive organisms into wild populations without considering the ramifications of such an introduction in space and time.
- Several sections of the report seem to be biased towards the interests of those who intend to apply the respective technologies; some of whom were invited to be co-authors. Consequently, sufficient weight has not been given to requirements of the precautionary principle and protection goals such as conservation of the species that occur naturally within ecosystems.
- The report, and in particular the case studies, create a misleading impression as to both the limits of knowledge and the availability of methods for control of GE organisms after they have been released into natural systems - as required by the precautionary principle.
- Without this broader perspective most of the case studies in the report give the dangerous impression that interventions through GE in highly complex ecosystems might be feasible and controllable in the very near future.

Furthermore, we would like to raise the following concerns regarding the general use of synthetic biology for nature conservation –and the use of gene drive organisms in particular – which in our opinion the report fails to address sufficiently:

- If organisms derived from synthetic biology are introduced into natural populations as implied by the report, this would entail the genetic engineering of the ‘germ line’ of biodiversity with the risk of disrupting the functioning of existing ecosystems and their future evolutionary dynamics.
- In a similar way to how diseases vectored by non-native species or human activities spread, GE organisms introduced into natural populations may severely impact animal, plant and human health and also damage biodiversity and other values, particularly biodiversity of value to Indigenous peoples and other local communities.
- The biological characteristics of the original GE organisms produced in the lab and grown under controlled conditions cannot be considered reliable for predicting potential biohazards that may emerge in future generations; and after exposure to ongoing changes in the environment.
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- The release of GE organisms such as trees, corals, amphibians, insects, rodents and other wildlife into natural populations and their ecosystems implies a new level of uncertainty, leading to potential harms that cannot be assessed beforehand with sufficient accuracy to act in a precautionary manner. Complex and heterogeneous genomes, multitudinous networks of mutual interactions, highly diverse environments and changes of environmental conditions (e.g. caused by climate change), make it impossible to foresee the actual long-term consequences in most cases.

- The precautionary principle as established by the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) stipulates that effective measures are taken to intervene in the interest of biodiversity if something ‘goes wrong’. If no such mechanisms are available to prevent the uncontrolled spread of GE organisms after their release, the precautionary principle is completely undermined. However, this aspect is hardly mentioned in the report. To date there is no solution to the problem of retrieving the released genetically engineered organism in case something goes wrong. Effective control mechanisms (i.e. measures to control applications of GE organisms and their spread, which allow their retrieval from the environment and termination of their persistence if needed) are therefore crucial in the assessment of both potential hazards and benefits and have to be established before any decisions on the use of these organisms in the wild can be taken.

Yours sincerely

Association Les Amis des Oiseaux (AAO), Tunisia

Advocates for the Environment (AEnv), USA
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Association intervillageoise de Gestion des Ressources Naturelles et de la Faune de la Comoé-Léraba (AGEREF/CL), Burkina Faso

Asociación Rescate y Conservación de Vida Silvestre (ARCAS), Guatemala

Benin Environment and Education Society (BEES ONG), Benin

Bund Naturschutz in Bayern, Germany
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Centro de Extensión Universitaria e Divulgación Ambiental de Galicia (CEIDA), Spain

Centre for Sustainable Development (CENESTA), Iran

Centre de Recherches et d'Action pour le Développement des Initiatives à la Base (CRADIB-ONG), Benin

Deutscher Naturschutzring (DNR), Deutschland

Stiftung Europäisches Naturerbe – EuroNatur, Deutschland
Open Letter by the undersigned IUCN Members to the IUCN Council

Exploralis, Tunisia

Forêts et Développement Rural (FODER), Cameroon

Friends of the Nation (FoN), Ghana

Institute for Nature Conservation in Albania (INCA), Albania
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College of African Wildlife Management (Mweka), Tanzania

National Association of Conservancies of South Africa (NACSSA), South Africa

Pro Natura, Switzerland

Red de Manejo de Bosque Latifoliado de Honduras (REMBLAH), Honduras
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Royal Society for Protection of Nature (RSPN), Bhutan

Instituto Sinchi, Colombia

Tour du Valat, France

Vereniging voor Zoogdierkunde en Zoogdierbescherming, The Netherlands
October 18, 2019

Luc De Wever
Senior Governance Manager
Secretary to IUCN Council

On behalf of Prof. Nicholas A. Robinson, Executive Governor of the International Council of Environmental Law (ICEL), IUCN Member 352, I write to address Governance Issue 1.1.1.4, *Improvement to the motions process*, scheduled to be discussed by the Governance and Constituency Committee on 19 October 2019.

ICEL, is nearing its 50th anniversary, having been launched at the 10th IUCN General Assembly in New Delhi in November 1969, when it became the first non-governmental organization of jurists dedicated to establishing and advancing laws for environmental protection. Since its inception, ICEL has collaborated with the IUCN bodies and commissions, particularly with the Commission on Legislation, which has now evolved to the WCEL, making strides to strengthen environmental conservation by creating a strong network of environmental practitioners and lawyers including those from developing countries.

This letter is presented to request that the IUCN Council withdraw its proposed requirement for a 2/3 vote to pass resolutions at the World Conservation Congress 2020 in Marseille. In this respect, ICEL agrees and supports the letter by Prof. Richard L. Ottinger on behalf of IUCN Member Center for Environmental Legal Studies submitted October 16, 2019. To be sure, a procedurally binding 2/3 vote would limit IUCN from meeting its goal and mandates, it would allow a minority of its members to control decisions and it would preclude actions approved by a majority of its members.

We strongly urge you to abandon this proposal, avoiding the necessity for such a controversy at the World Conservation Congress 2020 in Marseille.

Many thanks for your consideration.

Victor M. Tafur

Prof. Victor M. Tafur
Associate Executive Governor
UN Representative (New York)
Acting Director General’s Report to Council
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1. Global Programme & Policy
## Regional Conservation Fora

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Guatemala</td>
<td>27-30 May</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>24-25 Jun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tunisia</td>
<td>24-26 Jun</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>1-3 July</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guinea Bissau</td>
<td>9-11 July</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>23-25 July</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiji</td>
<td>29 July - 2 Aug</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paraguay</td>
<td>12-14 Aug</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>5 Sep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuwait</td>
<td>9-11 Sep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>6-8 Nov</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Close to 1500 participants!
Regional Conservation Fora

**Washington D.C.**

*Key message:* “We need to focus on delivering solutions to the root causes of biodiversity loss including through explicit actions to secure species and protected areas.”

---

**Guatemala**

*Key message:* “There is a need for urgent and ambitious action to tackle the climate crisis and protect the rights of nature and people. The only way to do this is through strong alliances with the environmental sector, the private sector, governments, civil society, and communications and media.”
Regional Conservation Fora

The Netherlands

2020 SUPERYEAR
HOW CAN I PARTICIPATE?

Key message: “The Forum in Rotterdam called for transformational change to stop the current environment crisis and asked IUCN to step up its action and leave its own comfort zone to help secure the political will to achieve this change.”

Tunisia

Key message: “Collaboration between the IUCN Secretariat, Members and Commissions must be strengthened to implement the new IUCN Programme 2021-2024. As part of this, Members recommended the creation of a North African Regional Committee.”
Regional Conservation Fora

South Africa

Key message: “Experts from various sectors, specialists, community representatives and senior Government officials committed to strengthen their collaboration and work together as a Union through the IUCN ‘One Programme’ approach to address the challenges facing nature and people in the Eastern and Southern Africa Region.”

Guinea Bissau

Key message: “The IUCN Programme 2021-2024 must strengthen the effectiveness of the One Programme approach to achieve greater conservation impacts and benefits to all, especially in the context of climate change.”
Regional Conservation Fora

Paraguay

Key message: “The RCF concluded with a call to action for proposing and achieving realistic global goals, at the height of the biodiversity emergency, and compliance and monitoring mechanisms to hold States accountable so that the Post-2020 Global Framework for Biodiversity is ambitious, effective and achievable.”

Fiji

Key message: “Indigenous local knowledge and science, the empowerment and livelihoods of local communities, and best practice governance at all decision-making levels are key to tackling the climate change and biodiversity crisis.”
Regional Conservation Fora

Kuwait

Key message: “For nature, people and future generations IUCN ROWA aims to be active in all the region’s 13 countries in various conservation and sustainable development activities within the context of the IUCN Programme 2021-2024.”
Commissions

WCPA

SSC

CEC
Commissions

WCEL

CEESP
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Global Programme 2021-2024

WE ARE HERE
Global Programme: Work plan 2020

- Clear road to achieving Programme 2017-2020 targets
- Strong project pipeline in 2019 leading to active portfolio in 2020 (>CHF400M)
Post-2020 Framework

- **Mission**: Halt loss of biodiversity by 2030 - Towards restoration and recovery by 2050.

→ To ‘bend the curve’ of biodiversity loss

Mace *et al*. 2018
Post-2020 Framework
Global Policy: Science and Knowledge
UNGA: Climate Action Summit

IUCN’s engagement:

✓ Was highly active in **Nature-based Solutions (NBS) track** (one of nine tracks).
✓ Co-hosted, hosted or participated in **10 events** in the NBS Hub.
✓ Also organised a gathering of the **Patrons of Nature** (with Patrons participating in IUCN-led events)

“**Aquatic food production, biodiversity and climate change**” co-hosted by IUCN, FAO and University of West Indies
UNG A: Climate Action Summit

“Nature-Based Solutions for Climate Change – High level Knowledge Dialogue”
co-hosted by IUCN, WCS and France
UNGA: Climate Action Summit

“Nature-based Solutions Momentum - High-Level Event” convened by China and New Zealand, co-chairs of the NBS track
Nature-based Solutions

EXTENDING CONSERVATION’S REACH AND RELEVANCE

Priority to address drivers of loss of species and species habitat

Priority to resolve pressing societal problems and challenges

Safeguarding nature

Safeguarding society

Conservation norms and science
Nature-based Solutions

Driven by 10 years of IUCN leadership

• Strong uptake
  o Central pillar of European New Green Deal
  o 1,640 scientific articles published in 2019
  o >5,000 scientific articles with NbS in abstract

• Several large “wholesale” initiatives IUCN developed (including GCF) based on NbS

• CEM and Secretariat developing framework to assess NbS approaches
2. State Membership
State Members re/joining since last Council
Discussions with States about IUCN membership ongoing

- Kosovo
- Lebanon
- Mauritania
- Nigeria
- Central African Republic
- Kenya
- South Africa
- United Arab Emirates
- Kiribati
Membership – Dues payment

State Members – additional income 2019

602,349 CHF
3. Finance
Project Portfolio by Donor Category

CHF M

- Foundations
- Governments
- Multilaterals
- Other (NGO, conventions, etc)
- Private Sector
GEF/GCF Portfolio

Strategic approach is being taken

Total n° GEF projects approved for implementation – 14
  • USD 55,747,211

Total new GEF concepts approved – 10
  • USD 47,600,692

Total GCF projects approved – 2 + 1 “readiness”
  • USD 49,213,727

New GCF projects in the pipeline: 8 for approx. USD150 M
GEF/GCF Portfolio

Approvals since the last Council meeting

• **GEF:**
  • GEF-6 Project for implementation: USD8.25M grant
    CPIC Conservation Finance Initiative (#9914)
  • GEF-7 Concept (PIF): USD3.63M grant
    Sustainable Land Management (SLM) in South Africa (#10179)

• **GCF:**
  • Kenya (EbA for tackling drought): USD23.2M grant
2020 Budget

- Portfolio is healthy and growing
- Decreased reliance on projects in development
  - Decline in risk
- Increase in expenditure passing through Members and partners
2020 Budget

• Breakeven budget

• Core income: CHF 29M
  • 3% decline on 2019 forecast

• Project income: CHF 121M
  • 9% increase on 2019 forecast
Results to 30 September

• Deficit decreasing

• Membership dues above budget

• Framework income in line with budget

• Project expenditure below budget but expected to increase significantly in Q4 with reporting from implementing partners and grantees
Framework funding

• All framework funding secured up to 2020
  • Korea (+ 2 secondments + restricted funds)
  • France (+ 6 secondments + restricted funds)
  • Sweden (+ 30% increase)
  • Finland (signed in January 2018)
  • Switzerland (signed in December 2017)
  • Norway (2018-2020)
  • USA (annual basis – 2019 confirmed)
Patrons of Nature

Total income IUCN Patrons

[Bar charts showing total income for IUCN Patrons from 2015 to 2019, with data for Honorary and Paying Patrons.]
Patrons of Nature

- Two new Patrons since last Council
  - Ai Luming
  - Andrew Forrest

- Patrons met on the margins of UNGA

- Patrons participated in IUCN-led events

- Launched global initiatives

Various Patrons of Nature events were held in New York on the margins of the UN General Assembly.
4. IUCN Congress
We are on track

• 221 motions
  (highest ever figure, up ~60% from Hawaii)
  • Including 11 Council-sponsored

• 1,449 Forum proposals (up ~20% from Hawaii)

• 739 volunteer reviewers (up ~100% from Hawaii)

• ~80% medium & large stands for exhibit reserved, for e.g. by
  • State Members (Korea, USA, Canada)
  • Member organisations (Wetland International)
  • IUCN Partners (UNESCO)
  • Private sector (L’Occitane, LVMH)
Grand venue
Key dates

31 Oct
Congress registration opens

5 Sep – 26 Oct
Motions reviewed and decided on

11 Dec
Nominations for President, Treasurer, Commission chairs, Regional Councillors close

Nov
Forum official programme goes online

Mar ‘20
IUCN Programme 2021-2024 draft distributed

29 Apr ‘20 – 13 May ‘20
Electronic voting on Motions

11 – 19 June
Congress comms

• **Focus: Core IUCN audiences +**
  - Emphasise IUCN regions, youth and young professionals

• **Promotional videos**
  - 90 second version launched 5 Sep; 30 second version coming
  - Over 1 million views in first 3 weeks!

• **Newsletter and social media marketing campaign**
  - Launched in September for climate and SDGs summits
  - Other themes coming roughly 2x month

• **Partnerships**
  - National Geographic and IPS excited and coming on board

• **Support for RCFs**
  - Website pages, RCF logos, social media

• **Congress tool kit available for IUCN constituencies**
5. Operations
Operational Plan 2020-2024

1. Secretariat delivery of the IUCN Programme 2021-2024
2. Enhancing structural and operational capacity for growth and stability
3. Mobilising the Union and engaging members
4. Strengthening accountability and transparency on the use and allocation of resources
5. Investing in staff
6. Attracting investment: resource mobilisation and portfolio growth
Addressing risks: Strategic Risks Matrix

**Funding flexibility risk**
- Succeed in the external reviews
- Ensure Programme addresses framework partner priorities

**Change management risk**
- Executive Management Team in place

**Program and project M&E risk**
- Defining minimum expectations for M&E
- Adopting standard indicators

**Project portfolio coherence risk**
- Tier 1 → Tier 2
- Online Project Portal and workflow
Addressing risks

Are addressing the need to **prevent human rights violations** using the ESMS to apply risk management measures.

- **IUCN Risk Committee Task Force** assessed the risks of adverse human right impacts from IUCN Secretariat activities that support environmental law enforcement (July 2019) and made recommendations.

- An **Action Plan** was generated to respond to the Task Force’s recommendations. Its implementation has begun and will continue into 2020.
Addressing risks

Main points of the Action Plan:

• **New ESMS Guidance Note on security personnel /rangers**: to identify risks of potential of abusive enforcement practices by security personnel/rangers and to provide enforceable requirements to avoid or manage risks for communities.

• **Human rights screening in the Partner Risk Assessment Tool**: current tool to be amended to include screening of risks related to a partner’s non-commitment to human rights, and risk of potential abusive practices and behaviour of staff.

• **Project-level grievance mechanism**: to be applied by all ongoing IUCN projects that include law enforcement support. It is to set-up a project-level mechanisms that complements the overarching IUCN-institution-wide grievance mechanism.

• **Changes in ESMS Screening**: to apply to future IUCN projects above CHF1m; requirement for quality control of self-screening for smaller projects; rigorous ESMS application requirements for projects with grant-making mechanism.

• **Nomination of a lead owner** for grant-making processes to appropriately address risks.

• Incorporation of human rights risks into the **Enterprise and Project Risk Management systems, procedures and tools**, aligned with ESMS.

• Follow-through on human rights risks through **internal control** activities, information and monitoring.
Addressing risks

Defining & integrating IUCN’s accountability and oversight framework
Addressing risks

Moving from theory to practice using ‘outward facing’ assurance hubs

Yes, strong safeguards to prevent human rights abuse is critical for all IUCN projects. We are developing a hub to help monitor and communicate our processes and controls. Let’s review this together. First go to the link at ...

https://app.smartsheet.com/b/publish?EQBCT=87813095e153488d9e41d37a2e87ddf2
Gender Pay Gap Report

- Newly published

- **Gender pay gap**: Difference between average pay of male and female staff in an organisation

- Only four Secretariat locations were found to have pay gaps that could – potentially – be related to gender, but may also be influenced by age, position/grade and years with IUCN.

---

5 Sept 2019


Enterprise Vault

Dear Colleagues,

Thank you for attending the town halls today. As promised, I am pleased to share with you the IUCN Pay Gap Report.

By being transparent and aware of the factors that affect salary gaps, we can all contribute to developing a culture that embraces a diverse workforce with equitable compensation across our Union. This is just the first step, but together, and with the right mind-set, we can all make it happen.

If you have any questions, do not hesitate to reach out to HR.

Best regards,

Grethel
NAV Upgraded

• NAV 2017 and new NAV Web Client went live on 25 September 2019
6. Communications
Highlights Q1-Q3 2019 – General

**Media relations**
- 12 press releases
- 39,100 media hits, 688 target media hits

**IUCN.org**
2.9 million sessions, **up 52%** from 2018

**Social media**
- 9,916,644 total impressions across IUCN Facebook and Twitter channels
  - Twitter
    - 129,035 followers, **up 13%** from 2018
    - 6,767,008 impressions
  - Facebook
    - 169,207 followers, **up 3.4%** from 2018
    - 3,149,636 reach
Highlights Q3 2019 – Outputs

IUCN Red List update, July
- 641 media hits
- 191,682 k social media reach

DG Statement – International Day of the World’s Indigenous Peoples
- 31,815 k reach on social media

IUCN Statement on Amazon fires
- Published in five languages
- 39,009 k reach on social media

Aligning restoration report / UNCCD
- 12,110 k social media reach

Nature in climate commitments report / UN Climate Summit
- 742 downloads first 12 days
- 96,598 k reach on social media

European Red List update, trees
- 630 media hits
- 54,305 k reach on social media
Upcoming reports Q4 2019
Support of Titanic proportions

Clickable hyperlink to IUCN

Reach of more than 16 million

Direct mention of Acting DG

>4,300 reactions
264 comments
269 shares
(as of 20 Oct)
7. In summary...
On course for Congress and beyond

- Marseille is our biggest up-coming milestone
- The IUCN Programme 2021-2024 must aim to be transformative
- Ensuring the financial health of the organisation remains a top priority
- Steady and strategic growth in State membership is possible
- Efficiency and accountability is being mainstreamed into our operations
- IUCN’s visibility is growing
En Route to Marseille
Thank You

Merci

شكرا

Gracias
Strategic plan to ensure the long term financial sustainability of IUCN
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Strategic plan to ensure the long term financial sustainability of IUCN

• Task Force on post 2020 Finance formed by the FAC
  – Ayman Rabi
  – Nihal Welikala
  – Norbert Baerlocher
  – Rick Bates
  – Andrew Bignell
  – Marco Vinicio Cerezo

• Meetings held:
  – 1-2 April
  – 17 October
Purpose

- To support the IUCN mission and implementation of the IUCN Programme
- To provide the financial resources to sustain growth and impact
Challenges -1

• Income
  – Maintaining and growing unrestricted income
    ▪ Membership dues – risk of State Members leaving IUCN
    ▪ Framework income – risk of framework partners shifting to restricted funding
  – Reliance on bilateral and multilateral government funding
    ▪ Need to diversify income generation

• Expenditure
  – Large office footprint - 40+ offices, 10 regional offices
  – Infrastructure costs high in relation to programme volume

• Capacity
  – Under investment in oversight and assurance functions
    ▪ internal audit, planning, monitoring and evaluation, compliance
  – Need to build technical capacity – “fit for purpose” teams
Challenges - 2

• Budget
  – Budgeting for surpluses difficult
    ▪ Limited capacity to absorb financial shocks
    ▪ Limited capacity to develop and invest in new initiatives
    ▪ Pressure on reserves
Strategic directions

- Change from a Break-Even short-term budgeting model to a Surplus driven model so as to be able to invest for the long term
- Identify and correct delivery challenges
- Invest in strategic growth through further development of the programme/project portfolio
- Develop a cost rationalization plan
- Right size the office footprint
- Increase engagement with the Private Sector
- Build the IUCN brand
- Members engagement and support
Investment requirement

• Clear distinction between operational budget and investment budget

• Determine investment requirement:
  – Infrastructure investments: systems and process
  – Organisational and operational change to ensure efficient and effective programme delivery
  – Branding of IUCN and its knowledge products
  – Programme development
  – Technical staff capacity
  – Resource mobilisation capacity
Resource mobilisation

- Revenue diversification
- Programme funding in preference to project funding
- Pooled funding either at the project or programme level to enhance flexibility of use
- Target “catalyst funding” /development funding for large scale initiatives
- Target new State members
- Private sector engagement
- Blended finance (private/public)
- Provide Incentive to Commissions and Regions to generate revenue
- Utilize IUCN events and Products to generate more revenue
Questions for Council

1. How do we situate the finance strategy? What is the overarching strategy that the finance strategy needs to support?

2. Are we prepared to reorganize and find operational efficiencies to reduce costs and free up resources to invest in growth?

3. Are we prepared to use our reserves to invest in growth initiatives?

4. What Incentive Policies do we need to adopt to Maximize Revenue generation through regions and commissions?
Next Steps

- Draft Strategic Guideline Document to be Developed and shared with the Task Force by 15 December
- Third meeting of Task Force is Planned for Feb 2020 prior the Council Meeting to Finalize the Draft Guideline Strategy
Draft IUCN Programme 2021-24

Overview of comments received online and during the RCFs (Item 4.2)
4 Interconnected Programme Areas

Equitable Governance of Natural Resources

- Healthy Lands & Waters
- Healthy Oceans
- Climate Change Mitigation and Adaptation

... for Nature, People and Future Generations
Comments on the Draft Programme

- Large body of comments received: reports from 11 RCFs, 70 submissions online, 11 submissions sent in writing to the Secretariat
- Members, NCs, RCs, Commissions’ SC & SG
- Many comments of an editorial nature
- Identified some areas of convergence of feedback on strengths and shortcomings/gaps
1. Strengths

- Overall structure and broad direction
- Identification of key challenges
- Prioritized Programme Areas building on IUCN’s expertise and core linkages to SDGs
- Urban dimensions
- Youth component

2. Shortcomings/gaps

- Lacks ambition, inspiration, sense of urgency
- IUCN’s heartland missing (e.g. species and protected areas)
- Inland freshwater systems should be a separate programme area, not combined with lands
- Needs a compelling theory of change
- Importance of CEPA missing
- Not clear how it is a “One Programme” (e.g. involvement of the 3 pillars of the Union in delivery and reporting)
Approach to the Programme

- Use landmark assessments (e.g. IPBES, IPCC) to show key challenges to solve
- SDGs
- Integrate post 2020
- Transformation of economic models
- Nature based solutions as framework
Linkages to SDGs/Biodiversity framework post-2020

- Nature underpins sustainable development
- High level of ambition for nature conservation is necessary for SDGs
Programme 2021-2024 development: Timeline

- **23 November 2018**
  - PPC reviews Programme Construct

- **3 Dec 2018 to 31 Jan 2019**
  - Initial consultation of Members

- **7 Feb 2019**
  - Programme design workshop

- **Feb-Mar 2019**
  - Drafting of Programme

- **March 2019**
  - Council reviews draft Programme

- **May-Sept. 2019**
  - Regional Conservation Fora

- **May-Sept. 2019**
  - Consultation of Members

- **October 2019**
  - Council informed of feedback on Programme

- **October 2019**
  - Drafting of revised version of Programme

- **February 2020**
  - Council approves Programme

- **March 2020**
  - Programme posted online before WCC

---

97th Meeting of the IUCN Council – 19-22 October 2019
Next Steps

- Assess feedback (also feedback from MWG re. motions touching on the Programme)
- Prepare revised draft
- Consideration by next Council (8-11 February 2020)
- Finalize for release for WCC (deadline 11 March 2020)
- Debate at WCC-Members Assembly (11-19 June 2020)
- Approval of final version with agreed amendments
Accompanying activities:

- May-September 2019: collate feedback from RCFs and other comments submitted online
- First half of October 2019: prepare synthesis of comments to share with Council (October 2019 meeting)
- October-December 2019: develop a plan for preparation of the revised draft, including planning the Programme ‘Writing’ Workshop
- 13-16 January 2020: Programme ‘Writing’ Workshop (Secretariat, Commissions and PPC/Council representatives) to structure the results framework of the second draft, develop metrics/KPIs, assign teams to write up various sections
- Second half of January 2020: prepare revised draft for consideration by Council (February 2020 meeting)
- After February 2020 Council meeting: revise draft based on Council’s feedback if required; get Council endorsement
- Early March 2020 (no later than 11 March): final draft Programme published for WCC in the three languages
- 11-19 June 2020: Programme debated and approved
Issues to consider

- What do we want to see in the revised version
- How do we get there
- Who does what
### Basis for the present table are the recommendations of the final version of the Report of the External Review of Aspects of IUCN’s Governance dated 10 July 2019.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pillar</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Acceptance &amp; key responses and actions planned</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>Responsible</th>
<th>Current status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 6.1 People   | 6.1.1 Council composition / dedication of councillors                  | 6.1.1 Nominations process to stress expectations regarding time spent on Council work, including time spent engaging outside of meetings. | • Recommendation accepted and already partly implemented: the qualifications and requirements for elected positions were adjusted accordingly and approved by the Bureau before being attached to the Call for nominations (Bureau decision B/XVI of 1 July 2019), and Regional Councillor candidates’ responses to the online questionnaire about requirements for the position are being published via the Union Portal as part of the current nominations process.  
• Candidates should be requested to sign a commitment and be asked in Congress why they want to become Council members.  
• A mechanism should be established to provide information to prospective candidates before they are nominated (based on the example developed in Sur). | Before the next nominations process opens in 2023. (Rules can’t be changed during the on-going nominations process) | Next Council 2020-24 (and its GCC) | Qualifications and requirements for elected positions already adequately cover the “expectations”; Regional Councillor candidates’ responses to the online questionnaire about requirements for the position are being published as part of the current nominations process |
|              | 6.1.2 Lack of preparation by council members                         | 6.1.2.a Council (this could be a task force for example) could conduct a detailed skill and personal attribute mapping at the council level to assess what skills, competence and expertise are needed at council level, to help build alignment of skills with strategic direction, value added to the current board composition, as well as cultural fit with the board and training/improvement needs. | • Recommendation accepted.  
• At the beginning of the next term 2020-21, Council (or a Council committee or task force) should create a mechanism to map skill sets and provide training or define other mechanisms to complete missing skills.  
• The next Council should provide directions to the IUCN membership for the 2024 elections on the skill sets required for an effective Council. | Beginning of the next term 2020-21 | Next Council 2020-24 (or a TF of GCC open to other committee members and external support) |                                                                                                                                  |
<p>|              | 6.1.2.b Communicate expected preparation norms in councillor job description, including time |                                                                                 | • Recommendation accepted and partly implemented as the qualifications and requirements for elected positions were | Before the launch of the next nominations process in 2023 |                                                                                                                                  |                                                                                                                                  |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.1.2.c</td>
<td>Draft clear job descriptions of role of IUCN Councillor, aligned with the strategic and oversight goals of the Council, and the roles &amp; responsibilities, including performance indicators and independent evaluation, conducted externally.</td>
<td>Recommendation partly accepted as the evaluation mechanism should be independent but not necessarily carried out by an external party.</td>
<td>February 2020</td>
<td>Council's standing committees, followed by Council decision, before the 2020 Congress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.1.3.a</td>
<td>A council charter would help in clearly articulating the responsibilities of each Council member, the culture expected on the council and all governance bodies, inclusive of values of accountability and responsibility, and the process for a regular (annual or bi-annual) assessment against objectives (which should be specified in council members’ contracts.)</td>
<td>Recommendation accepted and already partly implemented as the Council Handbook, including performance tools, already cover what is recommended for a “council charter”.</td>
<td>Next Council 2020-24</td>
<td>Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.1.3.b</td>
<td>Write job descriptions of desired profiles, customized by type of Council member, role,</td>
<td>Recommendation accepted and implemented as the qualifications and requirements for elected positions were adjusted accordingly and approved by the Bureau before being attached to the Call for nominations.</td>
<td>Completed</td>
<td>Already implemented</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Adjusted accordingly and approved by the Bureau before being attached to the Call for nominations (Bureau decision B/XVI of 1 July 2019).
| 6.1.3.c Evaluation of individual members to be conducted by a third party, and any performance gaps addressed by the Governance & Constituency committee within the limitations of the structures. | • Recommendation *partly accepted* as the evaluation mechanism should be independent but not necessarily carried out by an external party.  
• Individual evaluation mechanism will be addressed by the response to 6.1.3.a.  
• Performance gaps in terms of missing skills will be addressed by the response to 6.1.2.a. | February 2020 Beginning of the next term 2020-21 | TF of GCC Next Council 2020-24 or a TF of GCC |
| 6.1.3.d The FAC ToR should explicitly articulate the role and responsibility of the committee with regard to its: its expectation of the external auditors; its relationship with the internal auditor function; its role in overseeing the full range of audits conducted within the organisation; disclosure of financial and related information; as well as any other matters that the FAC feels are important to its mandate or that the council chooses to delegate to it. | • Recommendation *accepted*.  
• The FAC should include this in its ToR. | Soon after Council 97 FAC prepares proposal for Bureau’s approval |
| 6.2 Information Architecture | 6.2.1 Meeting information / Council papers | 6.2.1.a Systematically ensure papers for council meeting are available at least 2 weeks before council meetings on the council portal. | • Recommendation *accepted*.  
• Council should take a decision requesting Secretariat and any Council committee, working group or task force, to provide the documents two weeks before the Council meeting, and that exceptions of documents made available later should be explained to Council. This rule should be included in the Council Handbook. | Decision by C97 in October 2019, for implementation at C98 in February 2020 | Council |
| 6.2.2 Insufficient involvement of Council in information design. | 6.2.2.a Bureau to determine what strategic questions and risks are vital and ensure that the information package contains the relevant data and sufficient analysis, allowing for recommendation acceptance;  
• Empower the Bureau to provide a leadership role for Council and the chairs of standing committees to obtain the information required to exercise strategic and oversight functions; | By December 2019, in time to be implemented at Council 98 | Bureau in cooperation with DG and Commission Chairs |
| 6.2.3 External information incomplete | 6.2.3.a Bureau should determine what external information should complement internal information in the Council papers, to better inform strategic thinking as well as its ability to assess strategic risk. | • Recommendation accepted. • The Bureau should take this up with the DG and Commission Chairs when discussing the level and format of information and analysis required for Council to exercise its strategic and oversight roles referred to in 6.2.2.a. | In February 2020 |
| 6.2.3.b It is also important for Council members to develop their own channels of external information, and a method to scan these regularly, to ensure they have an external perspective of their own on issues of potential strategic relevance to the union. | • Recommendation accepted. • Councillors should have regular contacts with the Regional Committees and, to the extent they are available, also the National Committees, and the Global Group for National and Regional Committee Development, in view of articulating their insights in changes in the external environment that affect IUCN. • Already covered by the qualifications and requirement for elected positions, this aspect of the role of Council members should also be reflected in the Council Handbook. • Membership Strategy should encourage National and Regional Committees to scan the external environment for developments affecting the IUCN and provide feedback to Council members. • Identify the categories of information Councillors need to fulfil their roles, in the respective committees including best practice, industry standards. | Henceforth (October 2019 Council), as part of their regular contacts. |
| 6.3 Structures and Processes | 6.3.1 Council agenda not sufficiently structured or focused on strategic priorities | • Recommendation partly accepted because already implemented in practice. • The practice of distributing to Council for comments a preliminary agenda 2 months before the meeting, and a draft agenda incorporating the comments from Council members should be approved by Council and codified in the Council Handbook with exceptions to be explained in the same way. | By December 2019, in time to be implemented at Council 98 in February 2020 |

| Bureau in cooperation with DG and Commission Chairs |

| Council members to raise with National and Regional Committees and the Global Group |

| Council to include in respective documents by February 2020 |

| 6.3.1.a Final meeting agenda circulated three to four weeks in advance of council meetings in order to allow adequate time for meaningful consultation, proposals of items by council members for final inclusion and approval. | • Recommendation partly accepted because already implemented in practice. | February 2020 |

| Council |

| Already implemented in practice |
### 6.3.1.b Maximum of 30% of meeting time allocated to management presentations, to allow sufficient time for discussion (hold maximum number of slides (e.g. 7) and time to each presentation (e.g. 7 minutes) with more materials potentially in appendix or in information package).

- **Recommendation accepted.**
- Such a rule, with appropriate time allocation and possibly exceptions, should be included in the Council Handbook as directions for Secretariat staff for Council plenary and standing committee meetings (typology of different types of presentations and timings to be considered e.g. limit presentations to 5 minutes if there is a paper, committee chair to accept more time depending on the topic, if there is no paper).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Council decision regarding the Council Handbook by December 2019, for implementation at C98 in February 2020</th>
<th>Council at GCC’s proposal</th>
<th>Already practised in Council’s PPC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### 6.3.2 Committee meeting structure allows too little time for proper reporting by standing committees to the council

6.3.2.a Hold Standing Committee and Bureau meetings 4 to 6 times per year, at least twice by electronic/web conference and twice in person before Council meetings.

- **Recommendation accepted.**
- Bureau and each standing committee should decide the frequency and modus of their meetings in function of the business to be carried out. But they should establish a schedule of meetings for the coming periods (October 2019 to February 2020 and February 2020 to Congress 2020) in order to allow everyone to organize their calendars.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>As soon as possible after C97 in October 2019</th>
<th>Bureau and standing committees (FAC, PPC and GCC)</th>
<th>In practice, Bureau and standing committees already meet at least once by conference call between Council meetings.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

6.3.2.b Prepare podcasts and/or reports of critical management issues, so that committee and bureau members can prepare beforehand.

- **Recommendation partially accepted.**
- All reporting and updates should be done in writing (document or PowerPoint, or other tools, and IT system updated accordingly) and distributed two weeks in advance of the meeting, with exceptions to be explained to Council, in the same way as for documents (cf. 6.2.1.a). This rule should be incorporated in the Council Handbook.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Council decision on Council Handbook by December 2019 and implemented at C98 in February 2020</th>
<th>Secretariat</th>
<th>Already practiced in Council’s FAC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### 6.3.3 Perceived lack of neutrality in the DG evaluation process

6.3.3.a Establish clear metrics upon which DG will be evaluated. Conduct the evaluation professionally and anonymously, via an evaluations committee.

- **Recommendation partly accepted** as only the part of the evaluation concerning the 360° feedback should be anonymous.
- Institutionalise and professionalise the process following the core areas of performance identified in §62 of the Council Handbook and determining SMART indicators at the time Council approves the objectives for the DG.
- Add HR Management as 6th area of performance in §62 of the Handbook. Council may add other core areas of performance as required.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Before 2020 Congress</th>
<th>Joint GCC/FAC task force</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 6.3.4 Perceived lack of transparency regarding DG succession / renewal | 6.3.4.a. Proactive and transparent process for DG succession and renewal process to be undertaken as a regular activity of the Bureau. Succession planning for critical leadership positions and identification of qualified pool on both an emergency basis and over the longer term, also by the bureau. | The 360° feedback should be carried out by an independent third party selected. Adequate precautions are taken to avoid conflict of interest in the selection of the third party. | Recommendation accepted
Establish a succession plan for the DG and establish a succession planning committee (or other mechanism) to ensure the plan is always up to date.
FAC to ensure that the DG establish a succession plan for key senior leadership positions in the Secretariat
Clarify whether the Succession Planning Committee established by Council decision C93/3 (March 2019) has been dissolved with the establishment of the DG Search Committee (Bureau decision B77/2, July 2019) | Before 2020 Congress | Bureau, with DG involvement |
| 6.3.5 Variance in performance of commissions | 6.3.5.a Consider introducing stronger accountability in commission performance requirements, including systematic reviews of individuals involved in leadership of Commissions. | Recommendation accepted
Strengthen the system of annual evaluations of the Chairs of the Commissions including by revising the performance requirements incl. internal governance aspects, leadership and ethics.
The system should include annual appraisal of the performance of individuals involved in the leadership of the Commissions, i.e. the members of the Steering Committees appointed by Council.
Strengthen the annual reporting obligation of the Commissions to Council on the basis of Regulation 78bis. | Post 2020 Congress | GCC, with input from FAC |
| 6.3.6 Monitoring & evaluation | 6.3.6.a Professionalize monitoring and evaluation of IUCN’s strategic process. | Recommendation accepted (based on 5.6 “Strategy” in External review of aspects of IUCN’s governance)
Members must be involved in the process through mechanisms such as Union Portal | Post 2020 Congress | GCC, PPC, FAC |
| 6.4 Group dynamics | 6.4.1 Low-energy council meetings | Chair to maintain greater discipline of Council discussion, to ensure its strategic focus, to surface areas of difficulty and concern, as well as to drive a professional, disciplined and | Recommendation accepted
Success is largely dependent on the person of the President. The qualifications and requirements for the position already contain this skill. So, prospective candidates should have this skill However, the next Council could consider the following actions to | Next term 2020-24 | Next Council to take up in 2020-24 |
| 6.4.1.b Feedback to the Chairman via an evaluation or other should be prepared by the council on a yearly basis, and provided by the chair of the Governance and Constituency Committee. | • Recommendation partially accepted.  
• Feedback to the President should be part of the individual evaluation mechanism referred to in 6.1.3.a. and presented by the Bureau. However, the evaluation mechanism should provide guidelines for this.  
• The evaluation mechanism should also foresee feedback to the standing committee chairs.  
• Depending on the proposed mechanism to follow-up on the “self-assessments” (cf. 6.1.3.a.), Regulation 48(c)(iii) may have to be amended by the next Council 2020-24. | February 2020  
Idem  
Next term 2020-24 | TF of GCC to reflect by February 2020 and make proposals, if considered realistic  
Next Council 2020-24 |
| 6.4.1.c Council meetings to be temporarily co-chaired with VPs taking it in turn (e.g. 1 VP per half-day) or by another facilitator to increase council meeting efficiency immediately. | • Recommendation rejected (Art. 52 of the Statutes assigns the role of chair exclusively to the President except when s/he is absent).  
• Council should promote an organisational culture that will include the practice in Council of sharing responsibility and preparing VPs for the eventuality that they might have to chair. | Approval of change in Council Handbook by December 2019, for immediate implementation at C98 in Feb 2020 | Council and President |
| 6.4.2 Lack of “one voice” | 6.4.2.a While Council members are encouraged to engage in constructive dissent during meetings, after the decision has been taken, Council members need to be aligned and to actively support this decision. | • Recommendation accepted but already implemented because included in §38 of the Council Handbook.  
• Where appropriate, the importance of this rule should be highlighted such as in the Council retreat when the newly elected Council holds its first meeting. | Completed | Council and President  
Already exists as part of Council members’ duties. |
| 6.4.3 Little impact by Council on IUCN | 6.4.3.a Council to make use of any site visits, presentations, or other Union events, to deepen their understanding of both the productive council culture, as well as to manage meetings with discipline. | • Recommendation partially accepted.  
• Refresh IUCN’s stated purpose and values and clearly set out the desired culture and behaviours. As appropriate develop systems. | Council |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk</th>
<th>Issue</th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
<th>Acceptance &amp; key actions planned</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>Responsible</th>
<th>Current status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>Technical</td>
<td>6.5.1 Lack of risk thinking at bureau and Council level</td>
<td>6.5.1.a. Professionalize risk thinking and building capabilities at the Council level, to mitigate technical risks. The Bureau could take an extended role in risk oversight preparation, developing a more considered view of risk appetite, for example.</td>
<td>Recommendation accepted provided the recommendation applies to strategic as well as technical/financial risk. Better define and extend in the Statutes the role of the Bureau, in particular in strategic risk oversight, leaving technical risk to FAC. Clarify reporting lines and periodicity, and modify FAC’s ToR accordingly. Increase oversight capacity for the overlapping relationships between the IUCN bodies, particularly with regard to the role of the Treasurer, to the role of chairs of standing committees and the President between Council sessions Establish clear and realistic roles and responsibilities for those who are in charge of oversight.</td>
<td>Preliminary guidelines to be established before 2020 Congress, to be constantly built upon</td>
<td>Bureau (possibly the FAC)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

organizational culture

culture and talent. The Bureau to prepare a systematic process thereof.

to support the integration of defined aspects of organization in IUCN. For e.g. in relation to information decision making chains

- Define organization culture indicators and data sources to operationalize agreed cultural values
- Include this in induction program for Council.

6.4.3.b Council members should seek input from the senior leadership team, including asking for information to better understand cultural dimensions of the organisation, such as employee survey results, internal audit reports, reward and performance management systems, and organisational measurement systems.

- Recommendation partially accepted
See 6.4.3.a

6.4.3.c The Council needs to determine, through a process of iterative conversations with management, the shared norms that IUCN aspires to have and identify the gaps within the existing culture.

- Recommendation partially accepted
See 6.4.3.a
| 6.5.1.b Modify reporting lines to strengthen independence of oversight: Head of Oversight to have a dual reporting to the head of the FAC and the DG. | **Recommendation accepted**  
- Include this in ToR for Head of Oversight | By 2020 Congress | Bureau |
|---|---|---|---|

| 6.6.1.a A facilitated process amongst governance bodies with a goal to build alignment around the IUCN strategy, and focused on allowing for sufficient attention to external developments as well as potential future opportunities and threats emerging from the external competitive landscape would be useful to conduct on an ongoing basis. This should be prepared by the bureau in interaction with management. | **Recommendation accepted**  
- Establish a process that focuses on strategic outlook, taking the next 20 years into consideration, leading to new strategy for Union which is tied to its financial strategy  
- Review the functions of the Treasurer as described in the Statutes and Regulations which should mainly be oversight  
- Propose a motion for Congress which tasks the next Council with developing a new global strategy for IUCN post-2030  
- Agree on the financial strategy till 2024 so that it may be presented to Congress | By 2020 Congress  
By 2020 Congress  
Feb 2020 | Bureau  
GCC/Council  
Review of Statutes and Regulations under review in GCC Under development for Council approval Feb2020 |
| 6.6.1.b Develop a more extensive continuing education program for councillors regarding the strategic process, including deepening understanding of the strategic role required of council members. These could be designed both as online and offline sessions (refer to Annex 6 for a proposed education program). | **Recommendation accepted**  
- Current Council to develop education program so that it may be executive by the next one  
- Study strengthening capacity in FAC and Council to accomplish the oversight and advisory roles regarding finance including e.g. making use of appointed Councillors | By 2020 Congress  
February 2020 | Joint GCC-PPC working group |
| 6.6.2.a Based on outcome of strategic planning process, the Bureau should conduct a comprehensive analysis of the membership models possible, and how these respectively meet strategic requirements. | **Recommendation accepted**  
- Membership models should be considered as part of the process that focuses on strategic outlook (cf. 6.6.1.a), taking the next 20 years into consideration, leading to new strategy for Union and tied to its financial strategy | Action to be taken at the 2020 Congress | This Council to develop motion Next Council 2020-24 |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6.6.2.b</th>
<th>Conduct an analysis of the membership model best adapted to IUCN’s strategy; consider adoption of a more agile process to adapt membership model to IUCN’s strategic changes in the future.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Council to bring the strategic plan to Congress for support and mandate to the next Council to develop the strategic plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Based on the above, see which membership models are most appropriate for fulfilling strategic plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation accepted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Action to be taken after 6.6.2.a is concluded</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At 2020 Congress 2020, and after 6.6.2.a is concluded</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Next Council 2020-24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6.6.3.a</th>
<th>Building the Council’s strategic muscle through facilitated strategy sessions, to build understanding and alignment around strategic priorities. Use of online tools could help alleviate cost impact. The Bureau should be deeply involved in the strategy process and the preparation for the Council.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Recommendation accepted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Council needs to build a strategic plan.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Adopt appropriate statutory and regulatory changes to empower the Bureau to carry out these functions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation accepted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6.6.3.b</th>
<th>Detailed description of strategic function in Councillor’s job descriptions should be developed and part of an education process.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Recommendation partially accepted as the strategic function is already adequately mentioned in the qualifications and requirements of the position.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• It should become part of Council members’ induction as well as of the governance training / assessment tool for candidate Council members referred to in 6.1.1.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation accepted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Before the next nominations process opens in 2023.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Next Council 2020-24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6.6.3.c</th>
<th>Further education strengthening the emphasis on Council’s strategic role and building strategic capabilities during the on-boarding process.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Recommendation accepted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• It should become part of Council members’ induction.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation accepted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newly elected Council’s induction in 2020</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Next Council 2020-24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6.7</th>
<th>Relationships between IUCN governance bodies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.7.1</td>
<td>Relationship between IUCN Council and Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.7.1.a</td>
<td>Process to ensure respectful interactions are maintained in the case of difficult relationships: following an established process will help to ensure that interactions remain professional and non-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Recommendation accepted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Clearly define responsibilities or Council and those of the Secretariat, enabling clarity of what is a technical decision, a management or a strategic decision</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Establish a calendar of governance and management decisions to be adopted and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommendation accepted</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By 2020 Congress</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>President, Council, DG</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Next Council 2020-24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
personal, and to adhere to highly professional standards. This may require facilitation in order to rebuild trust and re-establish the foundation for healthy relationships. Clarity, respect and professionalism of sensitive processes such as nomination and performance review is essential. See also recommendations A (1) and (2) of FAC’s “fact finding mission” dated 20 May 2019 attached hereafter as Annex 1.

### 6.7.1.b IUCN Secretariat

IUCN Secretariat to interview members with regard to their communication and information needs, with a view to enhancing formal and informal information flows between IUCN Secretariat HQ and regions.

- **Recommendation accepted**
- Clearly establish information flow processes between membership and Secretariat currently

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Feb 2020</td>
<td>Secretariat, with input from GCC</td>
<td>Already covered by draft membership strategy under consideration in Council for approval by Feb 2020</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 6.7.2 Members’ disengagement

#### 6.7.2.a Through interviews with select members, a concrete proposal of different membership models could be developed to better understand how these would contribute to enhanced member engagement.

- **Recommendation partially accepted**
- Must be carried out in tandem with and linked to wider discussions on IUCN’s Membership strategy (cf. 6.2)

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>For approval at 2020 Congress</td>
<td>Current Council 2016-2020</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 6.7.2.b Develop more proactive communication plan to improve transparency and coordination between regional and national offices with members in their regions or countries, for more proactive engagement.

- **Recommendation accepted**
- Consider investing in a platform (physical, digital and other opportunities) that allows for regular interaction between Members and Secretariat, Members and Council, Members and Commissions
- Proposal to be developed and presented for discussion at Congress

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Skeletal proposal to be developed in time for Feb 2020 Council</td>
<td>Secretariat</td>
<td>Already practised through Secretariat meeting with Members in several regions</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 6.7.3 Relationship between council and standing committees | 6.7.3.a Introduce committee-specific performance standards into Council member job descriptions, and ensure accountability to these standards is done regularly and transparently. | • Recommendation **partially accepted**  
• Introduce performance standards for Councillors in ToR of the standing committees that are specific to the committee they belong to.  
• Differentiate the expectations of performance of each Councillor based on the Council bodies they are part of. | Before 2020 Congress | Standing committees |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 6.7.4 Variable performance of commissions | 6.7.4.a Introduce stronger accountability in commission performance requirements – at both body and individual levels. | • Recommendation **partially accepted**  
• Strengthen the accountability of the Chair and members of the Steering Committee of the Commission and leave the individual Commission member performance to the leadership of the Commission concerned | As soon as possible |  |
| 6.7.5 Relationship between bureau, standing committees and secretariat lacks transparency | 6.7.5.a Accountability strengthened through clear performance indicators and evaluation procedure for standing committee members, as well as council members more broadly, conducted externally.  
See also recommendation D of FAC’s “fact finding mission” dated 20 May 2019 attached hereafter as Annex 1. | • Recommendation **partially accepted**  
• Existing accountability mechanisms should be implemented  
• Accountability mechanisms should be independent, but not necessarily external | Next Council | ToR of standing committees |
| | 6.7.5.b Greater transparency of bureau’s own processes and discussions and reporting back to council for decision-making. | • Recommendation **partially accepted**  
• Reaffirm that clear, transparent and respectful communication is key to a successful relationship between governance bodies  
• Commit to adopting a Council Communications Protocol to manage intra-Council communications, Council-employee communications and, external communications, facilitate communication exercise to build trust and establish the foundation for a healthy relationship at the start of a new Council. | Next Council |  |
| | 6.7.5.c Nominations process which systematically assesses subject matter expertise for the scope of work of the committee, as well as | • Recommendation **accepted**  
• Establish nominations process as follows in recommendation | Next Council | GCC, with Secretariat support |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>6.7.5.d Discipline regarding reporting lines and appropriate channels of communication between Secretariat and Bureau &amp; standing committee members.</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recommendation partially accepted</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reaffirm that clear, transparent and respectful communication is key to a successful relationship between governance bodies</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Commit to adopting a Council Communications Protocol to manage intra-Council communications, Council-employee communications and, external communications,</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Facilitate communication exercise to build trust and establish the foundation for a healthy relationship at the start of a new Council.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Next Council</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>6.7.6 Revolving door between Secretariat &amp; Council</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>6.7.6.a Require a minimum of a 2-year “cooling-off period” for secretariat employees who wish to become Councillors.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recommendation partially accepted</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>One year “cooling-off period” should be established in the Staff Rules to be approved by Council</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The same rule should also be incorporated in the profiles for the elected positions for the next nominations and elections in 2023-24 (For procedural fairness this was not introduced into the profiles for nominations process for the 2020 elections, as staff wishing to stand would not be able to comply).</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Post 2020 Congress</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>6.8 Integrity</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>6.8.1 Insufficient degree of independence in ethics oversight</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6.8.1.a An Ethics and Conduct body (committee for example) that is comprised of independent, non-voting members and which has processes that engages IUCN on an elevated awareness of potential conflicts of interest and ensures that incidents can be dealt with promptly and securely in a confidential and professional way. IUCN should have transparency on the work of this body.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recommendation partially accepted</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>The conduct and ethics system should be reviewed to ensure it is comprehensive and applies to all components of IUCN, allows independence to be improved, duty of care to all involved including appropriate confidentially and accessibility; and avoid reprisals.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Study whether a completely independent, non-voting member Ethics body is financially feasible. If not, propose instead to establish a body that includes key constituencies e.g. elected Councillors, nominees from IUCN</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Before WCC</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Develop TOR for Union-wide body</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Appoint independent hotline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Identify key principles for composite system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Council Ethics Committee, in consultation with the Council Finance and Audit Committee and support from Head of Oversight, Monitoring,</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Codes of conduct exist for the Council, the Commissions and the Secretariat. The Council’s Ethics Committee handles ethical issues involving Council members, the Secretariat’s Ethics Committee all ethical issues involving the staff.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>After WCC</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 6.8.1.b Education on conflicts of interest norms and standards, as well as more sophistication on processes to observe, including a complete interest registry made public (including links to individual disclosure of interest forms). See also recommendation B of FAC’s “fact finding mission” dated 20 May 2019 attached hereafter as Annex 1. | • Recommendation accepted  
• Comprehensive education on conflicts of interest norms and standards across IUCN, including Council, and with all partners should be developed and implemented through direct training and online training and resources, inclusion of appropriate standards and requirements in employment and consultancy contracts and in partnership agreements, and within communities where IUCN implements projects as part of our conservation and outreach activities.  
• Review and improve observation and monitoring systems including through an interest registry that is publically available. | Before WCC to ensure availability to new Councillors, with ongoing improvements | Head of Oversight, approved by Council’s Ethics Committee and Council |
| 6.8.1.c A third-party (or external or independent) Ethics Hotline that allows the safeguarding of anonymity, with data stored securely and access to data username/password protected. This should be included in the councillor code of conduct. | • Recommendation accepted  
• Establish external independent hotline that is available 24 hours, 7 days a week and that is accessible to all employees, Councillors; Commission members; partners including implementing organizations; consultants; volunteers, interns; members of communities where projects are implemented  
• Ensure that anonymity is guaranteed  
• Update the Council Code of Conduct to reflect this | Before WCC | Head of Oversight. System to be approved by Council |
| 6.8.1.d A Whistleblowing policy that protects the rights of individuals who report ethical misconduct of any kind. See also recommendation A (3) of FAC’s “fact finding mission” dated 20 May 2019 attached hereafter as Annex 1. | • Recommendation accepted  
• Establish a whistleblowing policy that promotes a culture of “speaking up” without fear of reprisals, that embodies duty of care to all involved parties respecting their rights and confidentiality, and ensuring that is accessible to all employees, Councillors; Commission members; partners including | Before WCC | Council Ethics Committee with Head of Oversight |
| implementing organizations; consultants; volunteers, interns; communities / members of communities where projects are implemented |  |  |  |
4 areas of governance failure:

- Failure to assess risk
- Strategic blind spots
- Executive selection and relationships
- Integrity
Strengthening people quality, focus and dedication

Nomination process to Council

- Guidance to members on skill set
- Candidacy responding to position requirements
- Candidates to sign commitment

Readiness during Council

- Skills mapping
- Standing committees TORs
- Individual evaluation mechanism
Creating an effective information architecture

The right information at the right time

- Document availability >2 weeks
- Bureau with DG and Chairs of standing committees to design information package

Access external information

- Councillors leveraging Regional and National Committees
- Regional and National Committees to be encouraged to scan external environment
Structures and processes for strategy and oversight excellence

Focused Council agenda
- Codify practice of advance sharing
- Shift from mgt presentations to discussions

Committee meetings
- Bureau and Committees online meetings
- All presentations shared in advance

DG evaluation & succession
- 360 evaluation against SMART indicators
- DG succession planning committee and succession plans for senior leadership positions

Commission accountability
- Performance requirements in annual Chair evaluations
- Annual appraisal of leadership positions in Commissions
Strengthening group dynamics

Energized Council meetings
- Meeting chairing skills
- Feedback to President and Committee chairs

One voice
- Reinforced in 1st meeting of new Councillors

Council impact on organizational culture
- Clearly set out the desired culture and behaviours
- Define organizational culture indicators to operationalize values
Building risk thinking

Roles and responsibilities

- Stronger role for the Bureau
- Clarify reporting lines and responsibilities, including FAC
- Expectations of oversight roles

Independence of the oversight function

- Head of Oversight to have dual reporting to DG and Council
Building strategic thinking

Alignment of the Union on strategy
- Develop long term Strategic outlook post 2030

Comprehensive membership model analysis
- Include analysis of membership models in strategic outlook

Ownership of strategic thinking
- Induction program on strategy for Councillors
- Enhanced role of the Bureau
Healthier relationship between governance bodies

Clear, transparent and respectful communications

- Clear definition of roles and responsibilities
- Calendar of management and governance decisions
- Principle of access to all information
- Council Communications Protocol
- Facilitated communication exercise during Council induction

Remedy member disengagement

- Consider investing in a platform to enable regular interaction between Members and Secretariat, Members and Council, Members and Commissions

2-year cooling off period for Secretariat employees

- 1 year cooling off period for staff to become Councillors
Leading with integrity

Independent Ethics and Conduct body
- Conduct a review of the ethics and conduct system
- Develop a comprehensive ethics and conduct system
- Study financial feasibility of independent ethics body

Awareness and application of norms
- Comprehensive education program
- Publicly available interest registry

Stronger integrity framework
- Whistleblowing policy
- Widely accessible ethics hotline
Council Decision:

The IUCN Council,

*Mindful of* Council decision C/97/6 and Bureau decision B/XV establishing the Council Working Group to prepare the management response to the external review of IUCN’s governance,

*Welcomes* the draft management response prepared by the Council Working Group and reviewed by the Governance and Constituency Committee,

*Invites* Council members to transmit their comments to the Council Working Group by 6 November 2019,

*Requests* the Council Working Group to submit a final draft to the Bureau for approval by 10 December 2019.
WCEL Council Report
2018-2019

Presented by WCEL Chair Antonio Benjamin
& WCEL Deputy Chair Denise Antolini
Monday, October 21, 2019
97th IUCN Council Meeting
Outline

• WCEL Leadership & Members
• IUCN Programme & SDG Connection
• WCEL Initiatives:
  • 8th World Water Forum
  • Global Judicial Institute on the Environment
  • Global Institute of Prosecutors for the Environment
  • Global Pact for the Environment
  • Model Forest Act
  • 2nd World Environmental Law Congress
• Global Outreach
WCEL Steering Committee

Steering Committee Members

Ex Officio Members

Chairs Emeriti
Connection to IUCN Programme 2017-2020 & SDGs
WCEL Specialist Groups

- Peace, Security, and Conflict
- Climate Change
- Compliance and Enforcement
- Early Career Group
- Ethics
- Forests
- Indigenous Peoples and Environmental Law (Joint with CEESP)
- Oceans, Coasts, and Coral Reefs
- Soil, Desertification, and Sustainable Agriculture
- Water and Wetlands
WCEL Membership

1077 Total Members (October 2019)
WCEL Signature Initiatives

- 8th World Water Forum
- Global Judicial Institute on the Environment
- Global Institute of Prosecutors for the Environment
- Global Pact for the Environment
- Model Forest Act
- 2nd World Environmental Law Congress
8th World Water Forum
Brasilia, Brazil
March 2018

• 140 Supreme Court & Senior Judges, Prosecutors, Attorneys, Experts and Young Professionals
• From more than 60 Countries
• Results:
  • OECD Water Governance Initiative
  • Brasilia Declaration of Judges on Water
  • Oposa Moot Court - Youth-Early Career
  • Dakar World Water Forum 2021
Brasília Declaration of Judges on Water Justice

• Guiding principles include:
  • Principle 1: Water as a Public Interest Good
  • Principle 6: In Dubio Pro Aqua
  • Principle 10: Procedural Water Justice
Global Judicial Institute on the Environment

1st Meeting of the Interim Governing Committee (17-18 March 2018, Brasília)
• Endorsed establishment of Secretariat with UN Environment
• Prepared 2-year strategic plan

2nd meeting of Founding Members of the GJIE (19-21 May 2017, Brasília)
• Formalized GJIE Statute and appointed three coordinators to Interim Governing Committee
• Approved Founding Members to the Interim Governing Committee

UN Environment – Support in Nairobi
• Maputo Conference July 2019
Global Institute of Prosecutors for the Environment

- Launched at 8th World Water Forum
- Led by Brazil’s former Attorney General Raquel Dodge
- Global meeting of Attorneys General
African Judicial Network on Environmental Law
Global Pact for the Environment

- Endorsed by UN General Assembly August 30, 2019
Model Flora Act

- Will incorporate legal principles of the main international forest instruments and promote good forest stewardship in different regions of the World
- MoU between WCEL and the United Nations Forum on Forests signed March 2018
- First face-to-face meeting of the drafting committee was held in Brasilia, Brazil, in December 2018
Global Outreach - 2
Staff, Budget & Partners

• Executive Officer – 1 staff paid from COF
• COF – Annual budget of 220CHF
• Strategic savings of appx 40% each year to rollover to 2d World Environmental Law Congress
• Substantial In-Kind Contributions from Partners: UN Environment, OAS, ADB, Environmental Law Institute, Brazilian Judges Associations
• Steering Committee Meetings – savings (venue, lodging, transportation)
• Every WCEL event “always in partnership”
2nd World Environmental Law Congress: 
*Environmental Law 2030 and Beyond*

- Welcome around 400 invited participants from around the world
- Assess the role of environmental law in light of the critical ecological crises that we face
- Focus on the future and connection with SDGs is an innovative look forward to the next decades of the legal discipline
- 1+ year of Preparation: 6 Global Consultations – by Region, Time Zone
- Received over 150 Abstracts for Papers
- Invitations for Keynotes speakers sent
- Partners actively engaged in Planning: UNE, OAS, Rio hosts
2nd World Environmental Law Congress:
Environmental Law 2030 and Beyond

Combination with:

• 1st Global Institute of Prosecutors for the Environment (GIPE) **Conference on Environmental Law**

• Organization of American States (OAS Inter-American Environmental Rule of Law and Justice Colloquium

• 1st Global Judicial Institute on the Environment (GJIE) **Conference on Environmental Law**

• Host for UNE Montevideo Process – (3 days)
2nd World Environmental Law Congress: Environmental Law 2030 and Beyond

Thematic Sessions

• Sustainable Urban Environment in Times of Climate Change and Biodiversity Crisis
• Ocean, Islands & Coastal Zone Crisis
• SDGs, Species & Ecosystem Extinction Crisis
• Convention of Biological Diversity Post-2020, Sustainable Use of Soil and Habitat Protection
• Enhancing the Practice of the Environmental Rule of Law
2nd World Environmental Law Congress: Environmental Law 2030 and Beyond

Critical Cross-Cutting Perspectives

- Climate Change
- Environmental Ethics
- Biodiversity
- Indigenous Peoples
- Vulnerable Groups, Displaced People & Equity
- Environmental Rule of Law
- Science, Complexity, Innovation, Technology, Environmental Problem Shifting
- Human Rights, Peace/Security/Conflict
- Sustainable Agriculture
- Energy
- Role of Private Sector
- Sustainable Development Goals

Rio de Janeiro, Brazil
March 23-29
Global Judicial Institute on the Environment

• Global Judicial Institute on the Environment/Conference of U.S. Chief Justices
  Honolulu, USA
  31 January 2020 – 2 February 2020
World Conservation Congress - Marseille: WCEL Forum Session Proposals

- Judges, Prosecutors & the Environmental Rule of Law
- Environmental Defenders
- Ocean & Coastal Zone: Biodiversity Beyond National Jurisdiction, Legal Protection of Mangroves

- Climate Crisis: Complexity, Ambition, and Litigation
- Biodiversity Crisis & Post-2020 Responses: Model Flora Act
- Environmental Law Education, Moot Court Plastic Pollution Crisis: Soil, Water & Circular Economy
- Global Pact for the Environment & Transformative Change
THANK YOU
WCPA Report to Council

Kathy MacKinnon, Chair
October 2019
World Commission on Protected Areas

- WCPA 2800+ members
- 10% YPs, 34% women
- 25 members SC (9 women)
- 21 SGs and 6 TFs
- Funding: COF 218k

- Joint Work Programme with GPAP,
- GMPP and World Heritage
- Other Commissions
WCPA Objectives 2017-2020

• Support global efforts to expand and effectively manage systems of PAs to achieve Aichi Targets, esp. Target 11.

• Recognise and mainstream PAs as natural solutions to global challenges, Climate Change, land degradation, food & water security, health and well-being;

• Make the case for investment in PA systems, supported by policy, capacity development & sustainable funding;

• Inspire all people, experience and value the wonder of nature through PA systems promote more support for conservation of natural ecosystems (#NatureforAll with CEC)

• Support efforts to raise the standards and practices of protected area governance and management globally.

• Joint Work Programme –Delivering Promise of Sydney
Achieving Targets – 2019

Global Target 1 Valuing and Conserving Nature
Protected Planet Report for COP 14, online updates of WDPA
Improving quality of PAs – Green List, MPA Global Standards
Applying Competence Standards – ZSL/NGS Training Courses

Global Target 2 Governance (WCPA VC for Governance)
BPG on Privately Protected Areas
Other Effective Area-based Conservation Measures COP guidance

Global Target 3 Nature-based Solutions
- Contribution of PAs to relevant SDGs and Aichi Targets (Rec.067)
- Case studies on PANORAMA.
- #Nature for All Programme – World Urban Parks.
By 2020, at least **17 per cent** of terrestrial and inland water areas and **10 per cent** of coastal and marine areas, especially areas of particular importance for biodiversity and ecosystem services, are conserved through effectively and equitably managed, ecologically representative and well-connected systems of protected areas and other effective area-based conservation measures, and integrated into the wider landscape and seascape.
Protected areas

Progress to date in coverage of protected areas

- 17 million km²
- 21 million km²
- 45 million km²
- 95 million km²

Aim by 2020

Percentage coverage:
- 11.3% in 2000
- 13.9% in 2017

Target 11: At least 17% of terrestrial and inland water areas are protected.

Target 12: At least 10% of coastal and marine areas are protected.

Progress in achieving the targets:
- Target 11: **3**
- Target 12: **3**

Areas of particular importance for biodiversity and ecosystem services protected.

Protected areas are ecologically representative.

Protected areas are effectively and equitably managed.

Protected areas are well connected and integrated into the wider landscape and seascape.
Achieving Aichi Target 11

• Terrestrial Coverage 14.9%, Marine 7.59%

• Other Effective Area-based Conservation Measures

  Conserving important Biodiversity – KBA Partnership

• Effective management – ME SG & Green List

• Equitable management – Governance SG

• Connectivity in land and seascape SG

• CBD Global Partnership for Target 11
Effective Management
IUCN GREEN LIST STANDARD

- Effective Management
- Good Governance
- Conservation Outcomes
- Sound Design and Planning
Recognising OECMs

Aichi Target 11 - well-connected systems of protected areas and other effective area-based conservation measures

Range of governance. Primary, 2ndary & ancillary conservation

Effective conservation regardless of management objective

CBD expert workshops Feb 2018, SBSTTA 22. COP14, Egypt Decision 14/8 OECM guidance

CBD Request to help operationalize decision – updated technical guidance

Relevance to Post 2020 Agenda
SDG16: Transboundary conservation in North Kenya: livelihoods, peace and security

• Lewa-Borana and Northern Rangelands Trust
• 33 community, 2 private conservancies
• Formerly area of conflict
• 5m ha conservation landscape
• Focus on conservation, esp. rhinos and large mammals
Protected Areas: nature-based solutions

PAs contributing to delivery of SDGs

WCPA ‘Natural Solutions’ work
Health and Wellbeing

- Health and Well-being SG, support Parks Victoria
- HPHP Australia, Colombia, USNPS, New Zealand
- Links to IUCN Urban Alliance
- World Urban Parks Conference 2018
- #NatureForAll, Urban Strategies
- PALF meeting, Victoria
- Publication—Health, Cities, Climate Change

Health not specific focus in IUCN programme
SDG14 The Open Ocean
Where is global warming going?

Ocean 93.4%

- Atmosphere 2.3%
- Continents 2.1%
- Glaciers & ice caps 0.9%
- Arctic sea ice 0.8%
- Greenland Ice Sheet 0.2%
- Antarctic Ice Sheet 0.2%
“Tampering can be dangerous. Nature can be vengeful. We should have a great deal of respect for the planet on which we live.”

Carl-Gustaf Rossby, 1956
Ocean risk: the challenges a warming, changing ocean presents to humanity and life on earth
IUCN

Ocean deoxygenation: Everyone’s problem
Causes, impacts, consequences and solutions
Edited by D. Laffoley and J. M. Baxter

Summary for Policy Makers

Full technical report  588pp
Summary for policy makers  28pp
Building Capacity

- BIOPAMA 2
- ZSL/NGS Training Course
- Updating WDPA
- Scaling up Green List
- Basic Management Effectiveness
- BPGs and Technical Reports
- Translations
Directrices para áreas bajo protección privada

¿Qué es un área bajo protección privada?

Buenas prácticas

Perspectivas futuras:
Oportunidades para conectar el potencial de las áreas bajo protección privada

Estudios de casos
CBD Post 2020 Agenda

- WCPA Task Force – successor to Target 11
- Global Biodiversity Framework
- **Thematic consultations: Marine (Nov) Area-based Conservation Dec 2019**
- At least 30% terrestrial/marine ABCMs,
- 3 conditions framework
- **IUCN World Conservation Congress June 2020**
- 3rd OEWG Colombia, July 2019
- COP 15 in Kunming, China
Challenges

- Commission Support
- Restructuring and One Programme Approach
- WCPA Succession
- Input to IUCN Work Programme 2021-2024
- Input to Post 2020 agenda for COP15
- World Conservation Congress space for inclusion
- Pavilions – Protected Planet, Post 2020
- Youth engagement – Youth Champions, IUCN Youth Programme for 2021-2024
WCPA in-kind and Cash Contributions 2018

• 7400 days contributed @ CHF500/day= CHF3.7m
• Full and part-time staff contributed by Parks Canada #NFA, Environment Canada (PAs and CC).
• Cash contributions: Workshops, activities, publications supported by donors e.g. BfN
• LAC Parks Congress (CAPLACIII) – WCPA and contribution from all Commissions
• CEC prep CAPLACIII 1400 days, Pavilion
• Highlights IUCN – good will, follow-up projects
#NatureforAll – Engaging Youth

• 24th World Scout Jamboree
• Wes Virginia, USA, August 2019
• 40,000 young scouts age 14-17
• #NatureforAll Pavilion and Scout Badge
Young Professionals and Communities
WCPA Awards CAPLACIII
La hoja de ruta de la Declaración de Lima
Looking Ahead

• WILD 11, India, March 2020
• Sydney+5 review 2019/2020
• WCPA 60th Anniversary 2020
• WCC/IUCN General Assembly 11-19 June 2020
• COP15 Kunming, China October 2020
• Africa Parks Congress postponed to 2021
• Asia Parks Congress May 2021
• IMPAC5 Vancouver, Canada, 2023
• World Parks Congress 2025
DARWIN 200

The voyage begins
WCPA Steering Committee, Amboseli, Kenya

2018 Reports on WCPA website
Items for Decision

Item 2: Update on preparations for the Members' Assembly
Item 5: Update on Members’ Assembly preparations
**Item 2: Update on Members’ Assembly preparations**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The motion submission process</td>
<td>7 May to 28 Aug (Closed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nominations process for the three IUCN Awards</td>
<td>15 May to 30 Sep (Closed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IUCN Member nominations for 3 individuals to be appointed for the Congress Preparatory Committee acting as the appeal body</td>
<td>17 June to 17 July (Closed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IUCN Member nominations for 3 individuals to be appointed in the Motions Working Group</td>
<td>17 June to 23 Aug (Closed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments on the draft IUCN Programme 2021-24</td>
<td>7 May to 30 Sep (Closed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposals and Nominations for President, Treasurer and Commission Chairs</td>
<td>25 July to 11 Dec 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposals and Nominations for Regional Councillors (Automated process)</td>
<td>20 Aug to 11 Dec 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IUCN Member proposals to amend the IUCN Statutes</td>
<td>15 May to 11 Dec 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IUCN Member proposals on Commission mandates</td>
<td>15 May to 11 Dec 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultations of the Provisional Agenda</td>
<td>10 Sep to 11 Dec 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council proposal for Governance changes to Members’ Assembly</td>
<td>11 March 2020</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Draft Council Decision
The IUCN Council,
On the recommendation of the Congress Preparatory Committee (CPC),
Requests the Bureau of the IUCN Council to consider and approve any urgent proposals which the CPC may submit in the period between the 97th and 98th Council meetings, subject to Council validation in accordance with Regulation 58.
1. As the ToR of the six 2020 Congress committees are approved by Council (The Nominations Committee in October 2019), the standing committees of the Council and members of Council will be invited to identify qualified individuals for nomination as members of the 2020 Congress committees. The CPC coordinates this process and forwards a proposal to Council in time for it to review the list at its 98th meeting in February 2020. Should it be necessary, this process will continue following the 98th Council meeting which may request the CPC to submit a complete proposal to the Bureau for approval in advance of the 2020 Congress.

2. The criteria for identifying candidates for 2020 Congress committees shall include, but not be limited to:

- Be associated with a Member organization/institution or member of Council (current or previous);
- A good mix between experience in past Congress(es) and new people;
- Be registered for the Congress and as a result, does not require financial support to attend the Congress for the specific purpose of discharging duties as a Congress Committee member;
3. Gender and regional balance in each committee; gender and regional balance across the chairs of all Congress Committees;

4. The Standing Committees may suggest additional criteria specifically related to the field of work of the respective Congress Committee.

5. Council members will be invited to identify candidates.

6. Nomination of individuals as chair of a Congress committee shall be done in close consultation with the IUCN President.

7. The IUCN President formally nominates to Congress the members of the 2020 Congress Committees.
Item 5: Process for identifying individuals for Congress Committees

Draft Council Decision
The IUCN Council, on the recommendation of the 2020 Congress Preparatory Committee, approves the process for identifying the members of the Committees of the 2020 Congress.
Items for Discussion

• Discussion on strategic discussions during Members’ Assembly

• Discussion on high-level events as part of Forum update

• Open discussion on Marseille commitments taking account of experience with the Hawaii commitments and how to improve process for setting and implementing commitments from 2020 Congress
Discussion on strategic discussions during Members’ Assembly
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UNDERSTANDING CURRENT CONDITIONS AND DYNAMICS</th>
<th>STRENGTHENING SOLUTIONS</th>
<th>FUTURE OPTIONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Inter-relationships between biodiversity &amp; people</strong></td>
<td><strong>Making conservation work</strong></td>
<td><strong>Cutting edge</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health</td>
<td>Oceans</td>
<td>Artificial Intelligence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecology of disease. Livestock</td>
<td>2020 Global biodiversity Framework</td>
<td>Civil society and conservation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human health</td>
<td>Urban Conservation</td>
<td>Transformative Change</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Climate change, immigration, biodiversity loss</strong></td>
<td>Ridge to Reef</td>
<td>Voices from diverse sectors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disparities in social and economic equity</td>
<td></td>
<td>Culture of conservation. Existing narratives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Consumption and production</strong></td>
<td>Industrial agriculture / sustainable farming/ agroecology</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harmful subsidies and incentives</td>
<td>Mining &amp; Biodiversity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>World Heritage Sites in Danger</td>
<td>Deforestation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ancient Forests</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Item 3: Decision on strategic discussions during Members’ Assembly

#### STRENGTHENING THE UNION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Financial sustainability</th>
<th>Membership</th>
<th>IUCN long term vision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New ways of working with members</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Women</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Youth in the Work of IUCN</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• Discussion on high-level events as part of Forum update
Item 6: Forum update
Four “High level dialogues”

- Faith, spirituality, religion
  - “The Spirituality and Nature Dialogue: a meditation on belief, religion and changed behaviours”

- Peace & conflict
  - “Restoring the fabric of nature and humanity - peace, conflict, and environment”

- Science, technology, knowledge
  - “Science and Story: Exploring frontiers of Science” (tentative)

- Mass mobilization, youth, climate
  - “A Movement for Planet Earth: Mobilizing the global community on nature and climate”
Item 6: Forum update
Two “Conversation with…”

- Environmental defenders
  - “tbd”

- Environmental Explorers and Adventurers
  - “Pushing the limits: How exploration inspires conservation policy and action”
Open discussion on Marseille commitments
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How we deliver...</th>
<th>Biodiversity Foundation</th>
<th>Land Stewardship</th>
<th>Water Security</th>
<th>Healthy Oceans</th>
<th>Climate Change</th>
<th>Voice, Inclusion and Justice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Technology, Data and Innovation</td>
<td>Innovation in data sensing, big data and AI in conservation knowledge and insights</td>
<td>Environmental footprint of the fourth industrial revolution</td>
<td>Innovation in data sensing and machine learning for freshwater species and ecosystems</td>
<td>Innovation in data sensing and machine learning for marine species and marine and coastal ecosystems</td>
<td>Innovation in data sensing, big data and AI in climate change knowledge and insights</td>
<td>Blockchain to protect right holders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth, Media and Communications</td>
<td>Youth engagement on biodiversity policy</td>
<td>Youth engagement on ecosystem management</td>
<td>Youth engagement on freshwater ecosystems</td>
<td>Awareness of threats to the oceans</td>
<td>Youth engagement on climate change</td>
<td>ICT for greater environmental transparency and accountability, and legal education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investments and Financial Sustainability</td>
<td>Ensuring the financial sustainability of conservation organizations</td>
<td>Shifting investments flows to sustainable production and de-risking investments the restorative economy</td>
<td>Shifting investments flows to sustainable river basins</td>
<td>Steering finance towards sustainable blue industries</td>
<td>Facilitating climate finance</td>
<td>Ensuring the financial sustainability of environmental governance and rule of law institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mobilizing conservation finance</td>
<td>Mobilizing financing for conservation outcomes</td>
<td>Mobilizing financing for integrated water resource management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Theme 3 – Conservation &amp; Sustainability Goals</strong></td>
<td><strong>A. Governance systems</strong></td>
<td><strong>B. Financial &amp; Economic systems</strong></td>
<td><strong>C. Technology systems</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A. Biodiversity Priorities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Aichi Targets</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Promise of Sydney</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Oceans</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B. Sustainable Development Goals</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Urbanisation</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Health</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C. Climate Change</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Mitigation</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Adaptation</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Theme 1 – Values Systems (Culture, Ethics, Religion & Spirituality)**

**Theme 2 – Critical Societal Systems**

**Theme 4 - Mainstreaming Gender Equality**

**Theme 5 - Inspiring a New Generation**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Value systems and cosmologies</td>
<td>Spirituality &amp; Conservation</td>
<td></td>
<td>(CEESP, CEC)</td>
<td>“Spirituality, religious forces and culture”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Societal Systems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Industrial and technical systems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Governance and regulatory systems</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GR2</td>
<td>“Financial systems and the Private Sector”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation Goals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Biodiversity</td>
<td>Oceans and Islands</td>
<td></td>
<td>GRI (also SSC, WCPA, CEM etc.)</td>
<td>“Oceans and islands” (fisheries)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. SDGs</td>
<td>Climate Change</td>
<td>“Climate Change: Nature based solutions”</td>
<td>GR3, 3.3.7</td>
<td>“Addressing Climate Change Action”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Climate Change</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender equality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.2.5</td>
<td>“Nature for all. Engage and empower Youth.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspiring the next generation</td>
<td>Youth</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.2.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“Development and conservation in a hot, flat, crowded and inquisitious world”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1. Culture of Conservation
2. Agriculture, land transformation and food
3. Private sector engagement (Agribusiness, mining)
4. Post 2020 CBD strategy
5. Nature-based solutions to climate change

Contributions to Marseille Mandate

1. IUCN Programme priorities
2. Themes identified by CPC
3. Motions
4. Host country interests and priorities
5. Outputs and discussions from Congress
Items for information

Item 4: Timeline and process for handling appeals against decisions by the Motions Working Group
Item 7: VIP engagement strategy
Item 9: Host Country update
Item 10: Communications update
Item 11: Fundraising update
THANK YOU
1. Approval of agenda of the CPC meeting

The agenda was unanimously approved. The apologies of Malik Amin, Kathy MacKinnon, and Nihal Welikala were noted.

2. Update on preparations for the Members’ Assembly

CPC took note of the progress for Assembly preparations as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Dates</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The motion submission process</td>
<td>7 May to 28 Aug</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nominations process for the three IUCN Awards</td>
<td>15 May to 30 Sep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IUCN Member nominations for 3 individuals to be</td>
<td>17 June to 17 July</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>appointed for the Congress Preparatory Committee acting as the appeal body</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IUCN Member nominations for 3 individuals to be</td>
<td>17 June to 23 Aug</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>appointed in the Motions Working Group</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments on the draft IUCN Programme 2021-24</td>
<td>7 May to 30 Sep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposals and Nominations for President, Treasurer and Commission Chairs</td>
<td>25 July to 11 Dec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposals and Nominations for Regional Councillors</td>
<td>20 Aug to 11 Dec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Automated process)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IUCN Member proposals to amend the IUCN Statutes</td>
<td>15 May to 11 Dec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IUCN Member proposals on Commission mandates</td>
<td>15 May to 11 Dec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultations of the Provisional Agenda</td>
<td>10 Sep to 11 Dec</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CPC noted the high number of motions received (221 compared to 135 in 2016). In addition, CPC requested the Secretariat to provide adequate support to Members concerning the nominations process as some Members had experienced glitches in the new system.

Given the proximity of Congress and that there is only one physical CPC meeting prior to it in February 2020 (linked to the 98th Council meeting), the CPC may wish to organize one or two conference calls prior to that meeting. In case any decisions coming out of these conference calls or any exchanges via email requiring Council approval, the CPC requests that the Bureau may give such approval.

The IUCN Council,

*On the recommendation of* the Congress Preparatory Committee (CPC), *Requests* the Bureau of the IUCN Council to consider and approve any urgent proposals which the CPC may submit in the period between the 97th and 98th Council meetings, subject to Council validation in accordance with Regulation 58.

3. Decision on strategic discussions during Members’ Assembly

The Senior Governance Manager explained that similar to 2016, three discussions on strategic issues would take place during the Members’ Assembly to comply with the requests made by Members after the 2012 Congress. As in 2016, these discussions are expected to last 2 hours each. CPC and the Secretariat agreed the strategic discussions at the 2020
Congress should be more participatory to address comments made by Members in the 2016 participant survey. The CPC Chair will work with the Senior Governance Officer and consult with the Vice-Presidents on the process for strategic discussions.

The overall purpose of the strategic discussions is to engage all constituent parts of IUCN in view of shaping a collective agenda. It is important that the IUCN Constituents (Members, Commissions and Secretariat) consider new or emerging future global challenges to accelerate achieving IUCN’s mission and to maintain a leadership role in the conservation community post 2020. The CPC’s decisions will provide the Congress team with a mandate to start making the necessary preparations.

Following a call by the CPC Chair in July 2019, suggestions were received from Council, CPC, National and Regional Committee Chairs and the Secretariat on potential topics for strategic discussion (see document here). The submissions received can be categorised as follows:

- **Conservation**
  - Understanding current conditions and dynamics
  - Strengthening solutions
  - Future options
- **Strengthening the Union**
  - Financial sustainability
  - Membership
  - IUCN long-term vision

In the discussion of this categorization of the Strategic Issues identified, Vice-President John Robinson offered some further reflections on a framework for identifying the Strategic Issues. The overall message would focus on broad concern at global level about planetary boundaries and survival. An analytical document to assist the CPC identify the Strategic Issues for the Members Assembly could have two levels of analysis: how to address conservation issues and how to strengthen the Union. This would help inform the commitments from the IUCN Congress 2020. Inputs from the IUCN Programme, the Congress themes, motions submitted by Members, Host Country interests could be used to frame the main conservation issues (as discussed in item 8).

CPC discussed the process for identifying the strategic outcomes of the Congress topics and agreed to set up a taskforce with led by Vice-President John Robinson and composed of, Andrew Bignell, Hilde Eggermont, Jennifer Mohamed-Katerere (CPC Chair), Ana Tiraa, a representative by the Host Country and Stewart Maginnis from the secretariat supported by the Senior Governance Manager, Luc De Wever to develop a strategic paper on key issues, identify the key concerns of members arising from the motions and any further steps to identify key topics. The TOR of the Committee will be to develop a framework for aligning the Marseille outputs/commitments with the desires of the Host Country, IUCN Programme, and the structure of the Congress, the IUCN Programme, and the desires of the Host Country. The objective is to define the conservation narrative coming out of Marseille and to use the Congress to deliver on that. TOR and timeline of the taskforce should be established in the coming weeks.

The Host Country expressed concerns that decision on high-level topics needs to be taken soon in order to ensure engagement at highest level in France and that the deliverable needs to be in line with France’s expectations of creating a stepping stone towards COP15 and the NY summit. France wishes to host a Heads of State summit linked to Congress engaging Heads of State, which are ready to make concrete commitments towards biodiversity and envisages a short document with concrete commitments. It was proposed that this be inclusive of State members of IUCN.
CPC agreed that there will be two different outcomes from Congress (Others may still be identified):

- A statement of commitments linked to the Heads of State (HoS) summit and possibly subscribed two by the other summits and stakeholders
- A larger outcome document that describes what the conservation community at large sees as next step in the conservation efforts, going beyond COP15 (“the Marseille Manifesto”).

The taskforce would work on the larger outcome document while the CPC will identify two individuals to work with France on the HoS statement. The Chair of the WCPA was asked to submit the CV of the person she was suggesting for the latter in order to be reviewed by CPC. The ADG will identify a member of the Secretariat.

### 4. Timeline and process for handling appeals against decisions by the Motions Working Group

The CPC noted its role and responsibilities as appeals body for the motions process (as per Rule 62ter) and that three additional members had been appointed by Council to the CPC to that effect (in line with Rule 62quarto). These are Ms. Iasmim Amiden, Mr. Babacar Salif Gueye, Ms. Gihan Soliman. The CPC noted that the three CPC members belonging to the Motions Working Group (Mamadou Diallo, Hilde Eggermont, Sixto Inchaustegui) would have to recuse themselves from the CPC acting as appeals body. The CPC agreed to appoint Kathy MacKinnon as Chair of the CPC acting as appeals body.

The timeline of the appeals process is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Publication of motions accepted by the MWG in original language</td>
<td>04 November 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The notification of IUCN Members will contain a description of the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>appeals process which opens on the same day</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communication to all proponents and co-sponsors whose motion</td>
<td>By 04 November 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>was either rejected or merged to inform them of the MWG’s decision,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>together with information on the appeals process which opens on</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 November 2019</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deadline for receiving appeals</td>
<td>18 November 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consideration by CPC of appeals through electronic means</td>
<td>19 November to 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>December 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notification of Proponent and Co-sponsors of the CPC’s decision</td>
<td>By 4 December 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publication of motions in all three official languages taking into</td>
<td>4 December 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>account the decisions resulting from the appeals process</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 5. Process for identifying individuals for Congress Committees

The Committee took note that in accordance with a decision of Bureau (October 2018) the Governance and Constituency Committee would prepare and submit the draft TOR of all Congress Committees for approval to Council.

The CPC reviewed the process and criteria used in 2016 for identifying Committee members and agreed to put the same criteria forward to Council for approval. CPC concurred that the chairs of the Committees could be decided closer to Congress but that it was very important that all designated chairs received adequate preparation on procedural issues.

**Draft Council Decision**

The IUCN Council, on the recommendation of the 2020 Congress Preparatory Committee, approves the process for identifying the members of the Committees of the 2020 Congress (Annex 1).
The CPC also reviewed the need for having a Procedural Advisor to support the chair of the Members’ Assembly and agreed that such support is essential to ensure proper running of the Assembly. The CPC agreed that the position of Procedural Advisor be maintained. It concurred that this role requires somebody with strong experience in IUCN statutes and culture, or appropriate skills, to adequately advise the chair of the Members’ Assembly and to be able to take prompt decisions. The Senior Governance Officer, Luc de Wever noted that the Secretariat could provide procedural advice if the GCC did not consider it necessary to appoint a Procedural Adviser or did not identify a proper individual for appointment in the position.

It was noted that the procedural advisor would need to be available to be on the podium with the chair at all times. The CPC agreed to recommend to GCC to submit TOR for a Procedural Advisor to Council for approval at the 97th meeting and to clearly distinguish the role of the Procedural Advisor from the role of the Legal Advisor. The identification of the person would subsequently happen between the 97th and 98th Council.

CPC welcomed the notice that the Secretariat would organise briefing sessions for the Members’ Assembly with the President and Vice-Presidents in connection with the 98th Council (tentatively scheduled for 12 February 2020).

1) **Update on Forum**

The Forum Manager gave an update on the Forum preparations including detailed statistics on the Call for proposals, which resulted in unprecedented success. It was noted that the high number of proposals received (1440) will require stringent selection to fill the 350+ slots as per the decision of the strategic review panel. The panel, which included two CPC members, two Commission representatives, a Host country representative and IUCN staff, reviewed proposals based on strategic value and overall balance. It made selections based on the merit assessment provided through the independent technical review process and the Forum team’s assessment and suggested modifications, rescaling and/or mergers where relevant.

The CPC discussed the proposed topics for the four high-level dialogues


3) Peace & conflict: “Restoring the fabric of nature and humanity - peace, conflict, and environment”

4) Science, technology, knowledge: “Science and Story: Co-Development of the Future of Nature”

5) Mass mobilization, youth, climate: “A Movement for Planet Earth: Mobilizing the global community on nature and climate”

And the two topics for the “Conversation with…” sessions: Environmental defenders and Environmental Explorers and Adventurers. These six events are aiming to put forward transversal topics going across the 7 themes and creating a wow-effect that engages a maximum number of different audiences.

The CPC approved the dialogue on mass mobilisation, peace & conflict and faith and made several comments about the focus of these sessions.

Dialogue number two and four are expected to get lots of traction and dialogue one is an important continuation of the dialogue in 2016 which needs to be maintained as values are the basic drivers of human behaviour and root causes of environmental problems.

Dialogue three is linked to the heartland of IUCN and important but the narrative requires further development. It should focus on the frontiers of science and wonders of nature.
CPC approved the “Conversation with environmental defenders” and agreed that this should be held during the Forum rather than the Members’ Assembly in order give maximum visibility and thus protection to this group.

The opinions on the second “Conversation with...” varied. While some CPC members thought this could attract new audiences as it can tell inspiring stories, others felt that this may be too close to the dialogue on science.

The Secretariat was asked to refine the narrative of all dialogues and “Conversation with...” sessions to take on board the comments made by the Committee.

CPC requested the Secretariat to provide regular updates on progress for Forum preparations by sending short written reports (information that is not time-intensive) combined with conference calls, as needed, before next physical meeting. The Chair indicated her interest in receiving regular updates from the Secretariat.

CPC discussed the progress on the four summits that had been planned for Congress:

6) CEOs’ Summit
7) Cities and Local authorities Summit
8) IPO Forum
9) Youth Summit

The Committee noted the funding challenges with regards to the summits (see item 11 below). The Youth summit is part of the Youth engagement at large, which would require a FTE youth coordinator. However, despite efforts to secure such a position via secondment with several organisations, this remains a challenge. Vice-President Ali Kaka promised to send names for a youth coordinator to the Secretariat and it was noted that UNESCO may also be able to provide support to that regard.

The Chair of the WCPA Commission raised the concern that a high number of potential participants may not be able to obtain funding to attend the Congress if their events are not accepted and enquired whether alternative solutions could be found to give space to these individuals i.e. in the exhibition hall. It was noted that previous Congresses had been struggling with the too many parallel events decreasing attendance in sessions and making navigating the programme for participants very difficult. The CPC Chair requested to review this request and to have a more broader discussion on this.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>C97/CPC2/7</th>
<th>6. VIP engagement strategy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>This item was not discussed but will be considered via email. It was agreed that CPC will propose VIPs to be invited to the Congress including a proposed role and information on how to access the individual.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Presentation</th>
<th>7. Open discussion on experience with the Hawaii commitments and how to improve process for setting and implementing commitments from 2020 Congress</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>For 2020, the CPC agreed that the results of the Congress need to be more formally integrated into IUCN’s work. To that effect, a framework is needed that captures the IUCN Programme, the objectives of the Membership (motions), the current status of the conservation community and where it would like to go as well as the objectives of the Host Country. Transformative change and setting a post-2020 biodiversity framework should be the overall umbrella for the commitments and strategic discussions, high-level dialogues should all contribute to them.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It was noted that the Hawai‘i Commitments had used an organizing framework around underlying value systems (culture, ethics, religion & spirituality), critical societal systems (governance, financial & economic, technology), conservation & sustainability goals and cross-cutting issues like gender equality and inspiring youth.

It was noted that the 2016 commitments were not implemented in a structured way, although they were included in the Programme.

**Presentation**

8. Update from Host Country representatives on preparations

The Host Country gave an overview on Congress preparations that have undertaken since the last CPC meeting.

They explained the governance structure in France at national and local level as well the progress on contracting key suppliers since the last meeting; 3 contracts have been awarded with a total value of €4.8m and one tender (value: €7m) is in the final stages. France plans to run 6 more tenders to deliver all services outlined in the Hosting Agreement.

The Host Country explained their plans for the “Nature Generations Areas”, a new feature integrated in the Congress that focuses on mobilising French civil society on biodiversity and inspired by the success of the COP21 Climate Generations Areas. The Host Country communications strategy focuses on mobilising the general public to the cause of biodiversity, to use the Congress as a vector of transformation, to enhance the visibility and impact of the national Biodiversity Plan and to drive participation to the Congress. The fundraising efforts of the Host Country are closely coordinated with IUCN and focus on corporate philanthropy contributions, mostly in kind.

In line with efforts made at other events organised by the French government, the Congress will be organised according to the ISO 20121 management scheme and France expects the event to be certified. Focus lies on carbon emission reduction and mitigation, food and beverage, hotel certification, waste minimisation and management, as well as actions on social issues (rehabilitation programs, equity, etc.).

France clarified that the security measures are coordinated by the Prefecture and include a close collaboration of all stakeholders (police, fire brigades, hospital, etc.).

CPC highlighted the need to inform participants wanting to travel to other countries in Europe to apply for a Schengen visa rather than a French visa in order to avoid any problems. The French Government also advised that would be working to ensure appropriate visa processes for the IUCN Congress.

France took note of CPC’s wish to increase the seating capacity for the opening ceremony and will study the options together with IUCN. Linked to this, the Secretariat will send actual participation numbers from previous Congresses including participation numbers in opening ceremonies were available. It was noted that the layouts for the Congress were largely defined and have been basis for tenders and contracts that have been issued.

The Acting Director General expressed her gratitude for the efforts, support and friendship that the government of France has shown to IUCN.

9. Update on Congress communications

The Communications Manager gave an update on Congress communications and marketing since last meeting with major website upgrades, a social media and communication toolkits. Supporting communications of the Regional Conservation Fora and the Host Country as well as promoting the call for proposals for the Forum were of key importance since May with the latter creating 26'000 page views. On 11 June, the one year to Congress campaign was
launched including a media advisory and linked to the UN and SDG summits a content marketing campaign was launched. The Congress video obtained more than 1’000’000 views and between June and September more than 6 million people were reached with the Congress hashtag #IUCNcongress. The following months will focus on registration launch, supporting communication on the upcoming RCFs and using other events (i.e. UNFCCC CoP25 in Chile) and a content marketing campaign to amplify outreach on Congress. A strong focus will lie on strengthening communication in the regions (including via a new partnership with Inter Press Service), and reaching youth and indigenous peoples. IUCN is developing a media partnership with the National Geographic society to amplify our reach.

It was clarified that the Congress strapline – One Nature, One Future – approved by the CPC was included in Congress materials such as bookmarks and that a tender will be run to select an agency for onsite reporting.

10. Update on fundraising
CPC noted the update on fundraising and commended the Secretariat for the progress with CHF 2.7m secured at this stage, mostly through exhibition sales. Current efforts are focusing on a broad pipeline to close the remaining gap. CPC noted that the targets and progress for sponsorships were fairly low, which is mostly due to the fact that the majority of budget lines attractive for sponsors were kindly provided by the Host Country.

CPC noted that the additional initiatives planned in relation to Congress such as the youth summit, IPO summit, CEO summit and Mayors’ summit were not included in the Congress budget and required an additional CHF 1.2m in total but fundraising for those was responsibility of the respective summit focal points. CPC requested Secretariat to increase investment in these summits and to share the concept notes as well as progress reports for these summits. CPC also asked to associate Council and Commission members to the organisation of these summits. CPC considered that all four summits were of high priority and should be pursued.

CPC and the President expressed their willingness to support the Secretariat’s fundraising and marketing efforts and requested receiving a sponsorship package for Congress as well as for the summits to that effect.

11. Update on logistics
This item was not discussed but will instead be considered via email.

12. Any other business
No other business was discussed but as the CPC meeting took place in Marseille, the following aspects were also covered during the meeting:

- Meeting with the Prefect’s office
- Meeting with the President of the “Conseil regional” Mr. Muselier
- Visit of the Congress venue “Parc Chanot”
- Boat excursion in the Parc des Calanques and old port of Marseille

In addition, the President and Chair of the CPC met with the Mayor of Marseille and the President of the Metropole and the President of the “Conseil départemental”.

Proposed process for identifying the members of the 2020 Congress committees

1. Once the ToR of all six 2020 Congress committees will have been approved by Council at its meeting in October 2019, the standing committees of the Council will be invited to identify qualified individuals for nomination as members of the 2020 Congress committees. The CPC coordinates this process and forwards a proposal to Council in time for it to review the list at its 98th meeting in February 2020. Should it be necessary, this process will continue following the 98th Council meeting which may request the CPC to submit a complete proposal to the Bureau for approval in advance of the 2020 Congress.

2. The criteria for identifying candidates for 2020 Congress committees shall include, but not be limited to:
   • Be associated with a Member organization/institution or member of Council (current or previous);
   • A good mix between experience in past Congress(es) and new people;
   • Be registered for the Congress and as a result, does not require financial support to attend the Congress for the specific purpose of discharging duties as a Congress Committee member;
   • Gender and regional balance in each committee; gender and regional balance across the chairs of all Congress Committees;

3. The Standing Committees may suggest additional criteria specifically related to the field of work of the respective Congress Committee.

4. Council members will be invited to identify candidates.

5. Nomination of individuals as chair of a Congress committee shall be done in close consultation with the IUCN President.

6. The IUCN President formally nominates to Congress the members of the 2020 Congress Committees.
IUCN 97TH COUNCIL MEETING
Report of the FAC
• The FAC noted progress being made on the implementation of the 2019 workplan, noting that implementation was on track.

• The FAC welcomed the holistic approach to oversight with an emphasis on prevention, and the adaptation of the GRC (Governance, Risk and Compliance) framework to meet IUCN needs.

• The FAC welcomed the work being done with the Regional Office for West Asia (ROWA) on the internal control hub and on the assurance that this provided to donors; and also the work being done on the safeguarding of human rights in conservation projects.
Report of the Legal Advisor

• FAC took note of the update on legal issues pertaining to legal actions by and against IUCN, and noted that risks were being appropriately managed.
Commission Financial Rules

The FAC reviewed the level of compliance with the Commission Financial Rules that were approved by Council in June 2017, noting that good progress had been made but that there were some compliance gaps that needed to be addressed.

The Finance and Audit Committee emphasised the importance of compliance and recommended as follows:

1. The Secretariat develops a reporting template which could then be used by Commissions for preparation and submission of 2019 financial reports to the Secretariat for consideration by the FAC in 2020.

2. The Secretariat explores the development of a self-assessment form with Commission Chairs.

3. Commission Chairs take action to improve the overall level of compliance where gaps have been identified.
Congress 2020 budget

• The FAC noted that good progress had been made on fundraising but that there was still a fundraising gap.

• CHF 6.6m had been secured out of a total budget of CHF 9.7m, leaving a gap of CHF 3.1m.

• CHF 2.0m of the gap would likely be covered by registration fees.

• The FAC was satisfied on the progress made on fundraising and that financial risks were being satisfactorily addressed.
Outlook for 2019

• The result at the end of September 2019 was an operating deficit of CHF 0.6m

• This was a significant improvement on earlier months but still represented a challenging situation.

• Some programme and regions were running significant deficits, primarily due to low rates of project expenditure.

• The Secretariat expects to end the year with a breakeven result and the Director General is working with the Leadership Team to ensure that this is realised.
Resource mobilisation update

- Growing portfolio
- ODA funding accounts for 80% of project portfolio
- Patrons of Nature core contributions growing
- Two external reviews planned for 2019, a critical element for securing Framework partners for 2020-2024
- FAC noted the heavy investment preceding and slow process for realising major projects (e.g. GCF)
- FAC highlighted the importance of having a strong and strategically staffed fundraising unit
The investment return for the 9 months to end of September 2019 was 3.1% which reversed the loss of 2.65% realised in 2018.

FAC noted that the investment decisions included an assessment of ESG (Environmental, Social and Governance) criteria and that exclusion criteria were applied, e.g. no direct investment in extractive industries. However, the portfolio included exposure to extractives through the investment in funds which held a broad range of assets.

FAC discussed the possibility of moving to a portfolio made up of 100% sustainable investments and asked the Secretariat to obtain preliminary proposals for such a portfolio.
Budget 2020

Headline numbers:
• Breakeven budget
• Core income: CHF 29m (2019: CHF 29m)
• Project income: CHF 121m (2019: CHF 125m)

FAC concerns:
• Tight budget
• Limited flexibility to absorb financial shocks
• Limited potential to invest in new initiatives
Budget 2020 – WCEL Congress

The FAC discussed the planned WCEL Congress to take place in 2020, and the expected cost.

The FAC noted that following the WCEL Congress in 2016 significant savings were made and CHF 445,000 was transferred to reserves in line with the IUCN reserves policy.

The unfunded cost of the 2020 WCEL Congress is estimated at CHF 350k.

The FAC noted that preparations for the Congress were at an advanced stage and that cancellation of the event could cause reputational damage to IUCN.

The FAC further noted that WCEL will make best efforts to fundraise for this amount.

Consequently, the FAC recommends that the 2020 budget be adjusted to reflect the additional cost, and that any shortfall in fundraising be covered from reserves.
Budget 2020

FAC recommends to:

Approve the 2020 Draft Budget as presented;

subject to the modification of CHF 350k to support the WCEL Congress;

and a commitment by the Secretariat that in the event that additional core income is raised, priority will be given to setting aside funds to invest in growth and rebuilding the reserve.

DRAFT COUNCIL DECISION

The IUCN Council, on the recommendation of the Finance and Audit Committee, approves the 2020 budget; subject to the addition CHF 350k in expenditure in respect of the 2020 WCEL Congress to be funded from reserves.
Risk Management

- 20 Unit-level risk registers (85% of target business units) had been developed
- 190 staff members had attended risk management workshops
- Risk register updated and shared with FAC
- Task force set up to look at human rights and safeguarding

The FAC recommended that financial risks, such as the collectability of debtors and advances with implementing partners are closely monitored.
The FAC noted progress being made on the development of a longer term financial strategy.

And requested that a draft be shared with the FAC for review and input by 15 December.
The FAC noted progress being made on the development of the Financial Plan 2021-24.

The FAC requested that:
1) the next iteration of the plan takes into consideration the work being done on the broader financial strategy;
2) investments are clearly identified;
3) a section on cost structure is added;
4) the plan provides scope to build reserves.
Reserves target

The FAC reviewed the reserves target, noting that this had been set at CHF 25m in 2011.

Following a review of risks and likely investment requirements the FAC agreed to maintain the reserves target at CHF 25m.

The FAC noted that the target should be kept under review, particularly in light of the increase in size in the project portfolio and the increase in risk that comes with grant making programmes and the increase in use of implementing partners as a delivery mechanism.
Update from the joint FAC/GCC task force on Membership Dues

• The FAC noted key recommendations made by the Task Force:
  
  • A move to using Total Expenditure in place of Operating Expenditure as a basis for assessment of Membership dues in categories B and C.
  
  • Introducing a separate categories for Zoos, Aquariums, Botanical Gardens.
  
  • Introducing a lower dues group for Members with low levels of resources.
  
• FAC broadly supported the recommendations made.
Appointment of auditors

The External Auditors are appointed by Congress on the recommendation of the Council. (Article 20 (j) of the IUCN Statutes).

PricewaterhouseCoopers (PwC) were appointed by the 2012 Congress and their mandate extended for a further 4 years at the 2016 Congress.

The FAC noted that the performance of PwC was satisfactory but that it was also good practice to change auditors after a period of time.

The FAC recommended that a proposal be made to Congress to reappoint PwC for a further 2 years and to give the mandate to Council to appoint a new audit firm for the following 2 years, following a competitive selection process.
Amendment to the FAC ToR

The FAC agreed with the Governance Review recommendation to amend the FAC ToR to articulate the role and responsibility of the committee with regard to its:

1. Expectation of the external auditors;
2. Relationship with the internal auditor function;
3. Role in overseeing the full range of audits conducted within the organisation; disclosure of financial and related information; as well as any other matters that the FAC feels are important to its mandate or that the council chooses to delegate to it.

And will propose a revised ToR to Council for approval.
### Report to Council

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FAC/1</th>
<th>Approval of the agenda</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Finance and Audit Committee approved the agenda as presented.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FAC/2</th>
<th>Review of minutes of previous meeting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Finance and Audit Committee took note that items carried forward from prior meetings of the FAC had been appropriately dealt with or would be covered in the current meeting. The Committee noted that the recommendation of the FAC to amend the Council Performance Commitment Form to include an express commitment to comply with the IUCN Data Protection Policy was included in the GCC agenda.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FAC/3</th>
<th>Report from the Head of Oversight</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Purpose and background</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Head of Oversight (HoO) presented her report which covered:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Status report on the implementation of the 2019 oversight workplan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- An overview of the GRC (Governance, Risk, Compliance) framework and how the different components fitted together</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- The assurance work being undertaken at ROWA which included the development of an internal control assessment which external stakeholders, e.g. donors, could have access to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- The outward facing hub on IUCN’s approach to safeguarding against human rights abuses in its work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- An update on investigations, noting that there were no new ones since the last meeting of the FAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Work on fraud prevention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Summary of the discussion</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The committee thanked the HoO for her presentation and the work undertaken, particularly that in relation to the safeguarding of human rights and the importance that this was being given.

The Treasurer welcomed the approach being adopted for oversight, noting that under the leadership of the current HoO a holistic approach was being adopted that focussed on prevention. The internal control portal developed for the Regional Office for West Asia (ROWA) was an excellent example. He noted that with the projected growth of the organisation and increasing regulatory demands, it was important to have a strong oversight function.

In terms of future work he suggested a risk based review of the balance sheet be undertaken and that debtors should be prioritised as collectability was a significant risk.

The Acting Director General (ADG) noted that good progress had been made on improving internal controls in ROWA and that this had been done by working closely with regional management.

The FAC noted the importance of control to guard against money laundering and asked that the Secretariat put in place the necessary controls.

**Conclusion**

The Finance and Audit Committee **TOOK NOTE** of the report from the Head of Oversight.

### FAC/4

#### Report of the Legal Adviser

1. **Legal actions against or by IUCN**

*Purpose and background*

The Legal Advisor presented an overview of the existing legal actions against or by IUCN, including statistics, a summary description of major cases, and developments since the last meeting of the FAC.

*Summary of the discussion*

The Legal Advisor responded to various questions posed by the committee.
The FAC requested what the process was for provisioning for losses and costs. The CFO replied that every case was reviewed at the year-end and provisions were made taking into consideration the likelihood of losing the case. A general provision was included in the budget to cover such losses.

**Conclusion**

The Finance and Audit Committee TOOK NOTE of the update on legal issues pertaining to legal actions by and against IUCN.

---

**Update on information systems projects**

**Purpose and background**

The report of the Director of Global Information Systems Group (GISG) was taken as read.

**Summary of the discussion**

The Chair asked for an update on the Time Management System. The Director of GISG noted that the system was to go live in January 2020 and that it would be fully integrated with other systems.

The Chair noted that a few offices scored low on the IS satisfaction survey. The Director of GISG said that they were doing further work to understand the underlying issues and that they would then take remedial action. For example, an external company had been contracted to support one office.

The Treasurer asked if there were any major investments that need to be made in the coming 4 years. Were there any major gaps? The Dir. of GISG replied that the ERP had just been upgraded and he did not see any major gaps though various requests for systems development had been received. One exception could be security as this was a fast moving area and additional investment could be required in the future.

A member of the Committee noted that the Union Portal does not allow bidirectional dialogue for Commission members and that something more practical was required. The Dir of GISG took note of the request.

**Conclusion**
The Finance and Audit Committee *TOOK NOTE* of the report of the Director of GISG and were satisfied with the attention being given to IT risks.

**FAC/6 Commission Financial Rules**

*Purpose and background*

The CFO presented a compliance report on the implementation of the Commission Financial Rules. The rules were approved by Bureau of Council in June 2017.

He noted that the level of compliance was high for Commission Operating Funds and for income and expenditure passing through the books of the Secretariat.

There were, however, compliance gaps for income and expenditure passing through the books of other organisations hosting commission activities and that these needed to be addressed. In addition, financial reporting needed to standardised, in line with the rules and the IUCN regulations.

The CFO proposed several recommendations to improve overall compliance going forward.

*Summary of the discussion*

The Chair proposed that the financial reports of Commissions should be reviewed by the FAC on behalf of Council.

Committee members noted that significant improvement had been made since the introduction of the rules but further improvements were required. It was also noted that all Commissions were different. For example, not all Commission received cash contributions.

It was noted that most Commissions do not have finance capacity and therefore processes and procedures had to be simple and straightforward to the extent possible, e.g. through the provision of templates for reporting, for receiving funds and for receiving in-kind contributions.

It was recognised that it would not be possible to capture all contributions, particularly in-kind contributions and that the objective should be to concentrate on significant items.

Implementation was important, mainly because of reputational risk.
A proposal was made to include a self-assessment and self-declaration of compliance and that this should be explored, noting that sub-groups would also need to complete a self-assessment.

Some flexibility was required around the type of supporting documents. For example, an MOU might result in a long bureaucratic approval process, whereas an exchange of letters would be more straightforward.

The ADG noted that processes had to be efficient so that they enabled the work of the Commission and did not result in an unmanageable workload. Transparency over commission activities and transactions was key for all components of the Union.

**Conclusion**

The Finance and Audit Committee emphasised the importance of compliance and recommended as follows:

1. The Secretariat develops a reporting template which could then be used by Commissions for preparation and submission of 2019 financial reports to the Secretariat for consideration by the FAC in 2020.
2. The Secretariat explores the development of a self-assessment form with Commission Chairs.
3. Commission Chairs take action to improve the overall level of compliance where gaps have been identified.

### Congress 2020 budget

**Purpose and background**

The report of the Director, Union Development Group, on Congress Budget was taken as read.

IUCN signed a hosting agreement with the Government of France. The host country will provide all on-site facilities. The projected cash budget for the 2020 Congress is estimated at CHF 9.7m including CHF 200k for contingencies. Out of this, CHF 6.6m had been secured.

IUCN will cover CHF 1.6m of the total Congress budget from annual budgetary allocations of CHF 250k as well as core allocations to the Congress Unit.
The host country will provide a cash contribution of CHF 2.3m of which CHF 1.7m will be for sponsored delegates.

Income from registration fees has been budgeted at 75% of the maximum expected amount and income from exhibitions budgeted at 70% of the maximum possible.

A full risk assessment was presented at the October 2018 FAC. The secretariat continues to monitor and mitigate these risks, including but not limited to:

- exchange rate fluctuations CHF/EUR
- labour law requirements – staff time, overtime, social security contributions - IUCN was looking at possible exemptions
- taxes – currently, only registration fees will be VAT exempt

Summary of the discussion

N/A

Conclusion

The Finance and Audit Committee TOOK NOTE of the budget update for the IUCN World Conservation Congress 2020 and the associated risks and was satisfied that these were being satisfactorily managed.

FAC/8

Financial results to end of September and forecast for 2019

Purpose and background

The CFO presented the 2019 financial results covering the period to September in order to update FAC on the latest financial situation.

The results show an operating deficit of CHF 0.6m, down from a deficit of CHF 1.2m at end of June. The deficit was largely related to low project expenditure. This will change in Q4 as expenditure incurred by implementing partners is booked into IUCN’s financial system. The Secretariat is forecasting a breakeven position by the end of the year.

Actual project expenditure was at 61% of budget for the period. It is likely that the project expenditure budget to year-end will be in the region of 90-95m, in line with 2018
expenditure but lower than the 2019 budget figure of 124.5m (reforecast to 110.4m in July).

**Summary of the discussion**

The Secretariat explained the measures taken between June and September to reduce the deficit and set a track to break-even by year-end;

i) 5% budget reduction across all global programmes and regional offices
ii) Improved project implementation rates
iii) Temporary freezing of recruitment for positions funded by core funds

The FAC welcomed progress made on reducing the deficit.

Members sought clarification from the Secretariat on issues such as;

i) Is it possible to have a more even presentation of spending by grantees across the year?
ii) How much of the deficit is structural and how much is due to timing of recording expenses.
iii) Deficits attributed to project development costs

The CFO responded noting;

i) Due to the number of grantees and amounts involved, the costs of getting reports from grantees on a regular basis could outweigh the benefits
ii) The deficit amounts are directly attributable to levels of project implementation
iii) Project development costs are heavy for large Programmes early on while returns on investments come much later. As IUCN is in early stages of GEF/GCF project implementation experience, programmes continue to spend resources on development of such projects without being able to recover such costs in the short term.

Members asked the CFO to provide a listing of all deficits and surpluses by unit for a global overview.

**Conclusion**

The Finance and Audit Committee TOOK NOTE of the results to end of September 2019.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FAC/9</th>
<th>Resource mobilisation update</th>
<th>INF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Purpose and background</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Director of the Strategic Partnerships Unit (SPU) presented a report on resource mobilisation, highlighting:

- Active project portfolio - CHF423m at the time of preparing the 2020 budget
- CHF92 of new projects signed since 1 January 2019
- Framework core funding secured until end 2020.
- Negotiations for 2021-2014 Framework commitments initiated.
- The European Commission remains IUCN’s largest donor
- Income from multilateral donors is now IUCN’s largest income source
- 2 new patrons recruited since June 2019, raising the number to 15 from 1 in 2015

The Director of SPU also informed FAC members that there are two external reviews commissioned, one by SDC and the other jointly by Framework donors and the Secretariat. The outcomes of these reviews will have an impact on the level of Framework funding for IUCN going forward.

The director also noted the need to invest in skills in the unit to take advantage of potential new sources for IUCN funding, such as US-based foundations, without overlooking the need to keep servicing the current donors.

**Summary of the discussion**

The FAC noted that commissions will be having high-level events in Marseilles and encouraged the SPU to reach out to them to see whether there could be possibilities of networking for future funding prospects.

Members commended the increase in Patrons of Nature and reiterated the need to give them a role in IUCN that will support resources mobilisation beyond their own individual monetary contributions.

The FAC underscored the importance of having a strong fundraising unit, capable of tapping into traditional and new opportunities, such as regional development banks, for-profit entities, and foundations.

**Conclusion**

The Finance and Audit Committee *TOOK NOTE* of the report and welcomed the progress made in various areas of resource mobilisation.
### FAC/10 Investment update and portfolio performance

**Purpose and background**

The CFO presented the performance of the investment portfolio from inception in 2013 to 30 September 2019.

For the first 9 months of 2019 the return has been +3.10% (about CHF 500k), reversing the loss realised in 2018.

The overall level of risk and volatility remain low.

**Summary of the discussion**

Members noted the potentially high risk of having investments, directly or otherwise, in non-sustainable investments. Noting that the monetary loss of divesting from such losses would be minimal, members asked the Secretariat, together with the Treasurer, to obtain proposals for a portfolio made up of 100% sustainable investments.

**Conclusion**

The Finance and Audit Committee **REQUESTED** that the Secretariat, together with the Treasurer, review investment options with a view to ensuring that 100% of IUCN investments are in Sustainable Investments, both directly and indirectly. The findings should be reported to FAC in its meeting of February 2020.

### FAC/11 Review of the draft IUCN 2020 Budget for Submission to Council for approval

**Purpose and background**

The CFO presented the 2020 draft budget. A breakeven budget was proposed. The 2020 budget reflects a stable level of core income at CHF 29m and a slightly lower level of restricted income (project income) at CHF 121m (CHF 125m in 2019).

Core income allocations were generally unchanged compared to 2019, with only minor modifications. Some additional funding had been allocated to the oversight function.

The main risks associated with the budget were project implementation levels not being achieved.
Summary of the discussion

The FAC noted that framework funds for 2020 had been secured with the exception of funds from the US. However, FAC noted that a breakeven budget left limited room for flexibility or the capacity to absorb financial shocks. The budgets also left limited room for IUCN to invest in new initiatives.

The FAC enquired about the overall decline in project expenditure compared to the 2019 budget. The Secretariat explained this was because of a more rigorous budgeting process and a reduction in the level of expenditure attributed to projects under development.

The FAC noted that delays in project implementation continues to be a risk with delivery levels normally reaching around 90% of budget. This could result in the budgeted levels of cost recovery not being realised and a potential deficit.

The Secretariat underscored the heavy burden in 2020 in terms of fundraising for events such as IUCN World Conservation Congress and the 4 Summits mandated by Council, alongside the need to fund the normal operations. As such, the Secretariat requested that FAC consider that 2020 budget be approved on a breakeven basis and that surpluses be built in future budgets.

The ADG agreed that, in the event that the Secretariat was successful in mobilising core funds over and above the budgeted level, it would prioritise the use of those funds for investment that would support growth and rebuilding the reserve.

In relation to FAC/18 (see below), the FAC supported to make available CHF 350k from reserves to fund the 2nd Law Congress to be held in 2020, noting that WCEL will make best efforts to fundraise for this amount. This amount, therefore, needs to be added to the 2020 budget.

Conclusion

The FAC recommends to approve the 2020 Draft Budget as presented; subject to the modification of CHF 350k to support the WCEL Congress; and a commitment by the Secretariat that, in the event that additional core income is raised, priority will be given to setting aside investment funds to support growth and rebuild reserves.
**DRAFT COUNCIL DECISION**

The IUCN Council, on the recommendation of the Finance and Audit Committee, approves the 2020 budget; subject to the addition of CHF 350k to support the WCEL Congress, to be funded from reserves.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FAC/12</th>
<th>Risk Management update</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Purpose and background</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Head of the Planning, Monitoring, Evaluation and Risk Unit (PMER) presented an update of the Enterprise Risk Management Framework and the Risk Register.

The Head of PMER informed FAC that 20 Unit-level risk registers (85% of target business units) had been developed. At least 190 staff members had attended risk management workshops led by the PMER unit.

The IUCN Risk Committee established a task force in March 2019 to undertake an initial self-assessment of law enforcement partnerships with security forces and judiciary authorities benefiting from direct or indirect support from IUCN. As a result of this assessment, an internal assurance hub is under development and a first high-level excerpt will be presented during the 70th FAC meeting.

**Summary of the discussion**

FAC members noted the progress made on Enterprise Risk Management Framework and the Corporate Risk Register.

Members expressed concern about the potential risks carried by working with partners, citing the ongoing accusation of Human Rights abuses made against WWF. The Head of PMER informed FAC that all partners are scrutinised through a due diligence process and that Human Rights issues will be added to those checks.

FAC noted that IUCN could seek the assistance of organisations competent in the Human Rights sphere to advise on how to go about designing projects and screening for human rights issues. The chair of WCEL offered to assist in linking the Secretariat to organisations such as Human Rights Watch and Amnesty International.

Members asked about the prioritisation of risks and whether they were being appropriately addressed. For example, were balance sheet risks such as collectability of debtors...
being addressed? The Head of PMER confirmed that these items were included in the risk register and that a risk owner had been assigned.

**Conclusion**

The Finance and Audit Committee *TOOK NOTE* of the update on the Enterprise Risk Management Framework, and the Corporate Risk Register.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FAC/13</th>
<th><strong>Financial Planning post 2020</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Purpose and background</strong></td>
<td>The CFO presented an outline document arising from the meeting of the Task Force on Financial Planning post-2020 held on 17 October. The outline identifies key steps towards the preparation of a strategy such as the reason why this is needed, the scope of the strategy, challenges and opportunities, strategic directions needed, investment requirements, and resource mobilisation. The Finance Strategy will support IUCN mission and implementation of the IUCN Programme and will define ways of providing the financial resources needed to sustain growth and impact.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Summary of the discussion</strong></td>
<td>FAC noted the timely need for a Financial Strategy bridging the gap between the mission of IUCN and the 4-year intersessional planning cycles. FAC observed that the strategy should look at a period not less than 10 years and be aligned to the IUCN corporate strategy. Members noted that IUCN needs an inspiring proposition that capitalises on its unique characteristics and that curves out a niche for IUCN as a global convenor of conservation and biodiversity movements. Both the Corporate Strategy and the Finance Strategy would draw from this inspiration. The Chair informed FAC that the Bureau has encouraged a coordinated approach to the work of the various Task Forces working on Strategy (Membership, Programme, and Finance) to ensure coherence. Members discussed various items that should be included in the strategy such as;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- Ensuring Financial sustainability
- Budgeting for and undertaking investments in both the infrastructure of IUCN as well as in project development
- Diversification of revenue sources including looking at untapped markets such as low income countries (state and non-state actors)
- Definition of what growth IUCN should be pursuing
- Investing in fit-for-purpose staff, Members and partners
- Tapping into niche markets, such as developing a mechanism similar to CO₂ pricing mechanism for biodiversity
- Recognising the value of in-kind support derived from commission members.

**Conclusion**

The Finance and Audit Committee TOOK NOTE of the outline presented by the Task Force on Financial Planning post 2020 and asked the Secretariat to provide a draft strategy by 15-Dec-2019. The FAC will review the strategy and comment on it electronically, and the Task Force will meet 2 days ahead of the 70th Meeting of FAC to work on the final draft to be presented to FAC and Council in their February 2020 meetings. The FAC member representing Switzerland generously offered to source funding for the 2-day meeting.

---

**FAC/14 Financial Plan 2021-2024**

**Purpose and background**

In accordance with Article 88e of the IUCN Statutes, the Director General shall submit to Congress for approval a draft financial plan for the period 2021-2024. The Financial Plan is required to be distributed to Congress 90 days ahead of the start of Congress.

The CFO presented a discussion document laying out the scope and preliminary data projections.

The summary income for the period is projected to be CHF 743m, of which 130m is Core and 613m is Project income.

The main changes from the 2017-2020 Plan are projected to be a 10% increase in membership fees, 6% increase in Framework Income and other unrestricted funds respectively, and a 47% increase in Project Income (10% p.a.).

**Summary of the discussion**
Members thanked the CFO for the draft Financial Plan and advised the Secretariat to enrich the plan by incorporating:

- A section on cost structure of IUCN (by Geography, Function, etc.)
- A section on investments

FAC noted the risks inherent in the financial plan highlighting the key ones as:

1. Maintaining framework income
2. Diversification into new income streams
3. Project portfolio risk related to increase in grant making and transfers to partners
4. Building reserves

**Conclusion**

The Finance and Audit Committee *TOOK NOTE* of the draft outline for the Financial Plan 2021-2024 and tasked the Secretariat with providing a draft document to FAC before 15-Dec-2019. This will be discussed by FAC electronically and final decision taken at the 70th meeting of the FAC and 98th meeting of Council.

---

**FAC/15 Reserves Target**

*Purpose and background*

In November 2011, The FAC approved a reserves target of CHF 25m, based on a consideration of 3 criteria made up as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>CHF m</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Working capital requirement</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risks</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future investments</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>25</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The CFO presented a review of the risks faced by IUCN and the possible drawdown in reserves, together with an estimate for investments. He recommended maintaining the target level of CHF 25m.

*Summary of the discussion*

Members considered the proposal by the CFO.

They recommended that the target should be maintained at CHF 25m, but kept under review, particularly in light of the increase in size in the project portfolio and the increase in
risk that comes with grant making programmes and the increase in use of implementing partners as a delivery mechanism.

**Conclusion**

The Finance and Audit Committee APPROVED to retain the reserves target at CHF 25m.

---

**FAC/16**

**Report of the Joint FAC/GCC Task Force on Membership Dues**

**Purpose and background**

At the 94th meeting of Council (April 2018) the FAC and GCC decided to form a Task Force to look at various issues around the membership fees structure.

The Task Force will present proposals to Council in its 97th Meeting. The CFO presented a verbal summary of the proposals for Members in groups B and C:

- Determination of membership dues will be based on total expenditure as opposed to total operating expenditure;
- The scale of dues will also be adjusted in line with inflation; and
- an additional dues group for small organisations will be added.

**Summary of the discussion**

Members expressed the need to base membership dues structure on a value proposition for Members. Members underscored the risk that changes in fees structure may result in reduced membership income for IUCN due to withdrawals in the event that Members found themselves in a higher category.

**Conclusion**

The Finance and Audit Committee TOOK NOTE the verbal report of the Joint FAC/GCC Task Force.

---

**FAC/17**

**Appointment of Auditors for 2021-2014**

**Purpose and background**

---
The External Auditors are appointed by Congress on the recommendation of the Council. (Article 20 (j) of the IUCN Statutes).

PricewaterhouseCoopers (PwC) were appointed by the 2012 Congress following a competitive process. PwC’s initial mandate was for 4 years, covering the years 2013-16. The mandate was extended by the 2016 Congress to cover the years 2017-20.

The CFO presented a proposal to FAC to extend the mandate of PwC for 2021 and 2022, and thereafter for the Council to appoint new External Auditors for 2023 to 2024 based on competitive selection process, with the approval of Congress.

For this, the Secretariat proposes that Council present a motion to Congress that reads:

The IUCN World Conservation Congress, At the recommendation of the IUCN Council, Appoints PricewaterhouseCoopers as IUCN External Auditors for the years 2021 to 2022, and requests that Council appoints the External Auditors for the years 2023 to 2024 following a competitive selection process.

Summary of the discussion

The FAC considered and accepted the proposal from the Secretariat.

Conclusion

The Finance and Audit Committee will present a Council decision in line with the above at the meeting to be held in February 2020.

| FAC/18 Residual Funds from 1st IUCN World Environmental Law Congress | DEC |
| Residual Funds from 1st IUCN World Environmental Law Congress |

Purpose and background

In the intersessional period 2013-2016, WCEL was exceptionally allowed to roll over unused funds from the Commission Operating Funds (COF) from one year to the next. These funds were held in a designated reserve earmarked for the 1st IUCN World Environmental Law Congress held in Rio de Janeiro, in March 2016. As a result of successful fundraising by the WCEL, CHF 445,000 was
not utilised. At the end of 2016, in line with the IUCN reserves policy, the funds were transferred to IUCN general reserves. The Chair of the WCEL requests that CHF 350k be made available from reserves to fund the 2nd Law Congress to be held in 2020, noting that WCEL will make best efforts to fundraise for this amount.

The chair of WCEL explained to FAC that planning for 2nd WCEL Congress on 2020 was largely based on the assumption that the funds earlier designated were still available to WCEL.

FAC noted that planning of the 2nd WCEL congress is well advanced and that not convening it could cause reputational damage to IUCN.

FAC asked to receive an estimate of the balance needed to convene the congress. The chair of WCEL estimated the balance needed to be around CHF 305K.

**Summary of the discussion**

Members noted that the Secretariat had acted within the laid down procedures in transferring the designated funds to the general reserves.

Noting that allocation from the 2020 budget would create an unfunded budget expense, the FAC considered 3 options:

i) Make an allocation in the 2019 budget

ii) Make an allocation in the 2020 budget and make compensatory reductions elsewhere

iii) Allow a deficit budget for 2020 with the deficit to be funded from reserves

**Conclusion**

To avoid any reputational risk that might occur should the 2nd WCEL congress not be organized as planned, the Finance and Audit Committee, on an exceptional basis, recommends to Council to allow the use of reserves to a maximum of CHF 350,000 for the 2nd WCEL Congress. These funds should only be used in case all other channels of raising funds for the congress bear no result.
The Governance Review includes several recommendation in respect of the role of the FAC. The review recommends that the FAC ToR should explicitly articulate the role and responsibility of the committee with regard to its:

- Expectation of the external auditors;
- Relationship with the internal auditor function;
- Role in overseeing the full range of audits conducted within the organisation; disclosure of financial and related information; as well as any other matters that the FAC feels are important to its mandate or that the council chooses to delegate to it.

**Summary of the discussion**

The FAC was in agreement with recommendations made.

**Conclusion**

The FAC agreed with the Governance Review recommendation to amend the FAC ToR to articulate the role and responsibility of the committee with regard to its:

1. Expectation of the external auditors;
2. Relationship with the internal auditor function;
3. Role in overseeing the full range of audits conducted within the organisation; disclosure of financial and related information; as well as any other matters that the FAC feels are important to its mandate or that the council chooses to delegate to it.

The FAC will propose a revised ToR to Council for approval at a future meeting.
Harmonized procedure for filling vacancies for Treasurer, Commission Chair and Regional Councillor

DRAFT COUNCIL DECISION

The IUCN Council,

On the recommendation of the Governance and Constituency Committee,

1. Approves the procedure for filling vacancies for Treasurer, Commission Chair and Regional Councillor in accordance with Regulation 47 (Annex);
2. Decides that it be integrated in the Council Handbook, replacing §19-21 of the Council Handbook and any previous decision of Council or its Bureau regarding the procedure for filling vacancies for Treasurer, Commission Chair and Regional Councillor.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Steps</strong></th>
<th><strong>Treasurer</strong></th>
<th><strong>Commission Chair</strong></th>
<th><strong>Regional Councillor</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Notice period</td>
<td>If circumstances permit, the incumbent should give at least three months’ notice before her/his resignation becomes effective.</td>
<td>If circumstances permit, the incumbent should give at least three months’ notice before her/his resignation becomes effective.</td>
<td>If circumstances permit, the incumbent should give at least three months’ notice before her/his resignation becomes effective.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interim appointment</td>
<td>If required, Council appoints a member of the Council as Acting Treasurer until Council fills the vacancy.</td>
<td>If required, the Deputy Chair of the Commission concerned acts as Chair until Council fills the vacancy.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacancy occurring less than a year before the Congress</td>
<td>If the vacancy occurs less than a year before the Congress, Council may appoint a member of Council as Treasurer if it considers it unnecessarily confusing and cumbersome to call for nominations to fill a vacancy in parallel with the Call for nominations of candidates for election as Treasurer.</td>
<td>If the vacancy occurs less than a year before the Congress and Council considers it unnecessarily confusing and cumbersome to call for nominations to fill a vacancy in parallel with the Call for nominations of candidates for election as Commission Chair, it may fill the vacancy based on a recommendation of one, or maximum two candidates by the Steering Committee of the Commission concerned, following the Steering Committee’s consultation of the Commission’s membership in the spirit of Regulation 30bis.</td>
<td>If the vacancy occurs less than a year before the Congress, Council may decide not to fill the vacancy if it considers it unnecessarily confusing and cumbersome to call for nominations to fill a vacancy in parallel with the Call for nominations of candidates for election as Regional Councillor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terms of Reference (ToR)</td>
<td>The ToR for the position, including the responsibilities as well as the qualifications and requirement for the position, are those approved by the Council and integrated in the Call for nomination of candidates for election as Treasurer referred to in Regulation 30 revised as required to take into account circumstances prevailing at the time of the vacancy.</td>
<td>The ToR for the position, including the responsibilities as well as the qualifications and requirement for the position, are those approved by the Council and integrated in the Call for nomination of candidates for election as Commission Chair referred to in Regulation 30 revised as required to take into account circumstances prevailing at the time of the vacancy.</td>
<td>The ToR for the position, including the responsibilities as well as the qualifications and requirement for the position, are those approved by the Council and integrated in the Call for nomination of candidates for election as Regional Councillor referred to in Regulation 30 revised as required to take into account circumstances prevailing at the time of the vacancy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identification of candidates</td>
<td>The Council establishes a Search Committee composed of the President, one or more Vice-Presidents proposed by the President based on relevant skills set, the outgoing Treasurer or the Acting Treasurer.</td>
<td>1. The outgoing Chair or the Deputy Chair of the Commission concerned is requested to establish an ad hoc committee under Regulation 30bis and to communicate to the Director</td>
<td>Council invites all IUCN Members of the statutory region concerned, which are up-to-date with payment of their dues, to submit nominations. The Vice-Presidents acting as Nominating Committee are requested to establish an ad hoc committee under Regulation 30bis and to communicate to the Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selection of candidates</td>
<td>Treasurer, if available, the Chair of the FAC and one other Concillor. In a first phase, all Council members are invited to encourage qualified candidates to put forward their candidacy to the Search Committee. Should this not produce qualified candidates, the Search Committee requests the Director General to issue a call to all IUCN Members worldwide, which are up-to-date with payment of their dues. The Search Committee presents to Council a single candidate for its endorsement.</td>
<td>General and the Vice-Presidents acting as Nominating Committee under Regulation 48, the names of the chair and the members of the Commission’s ad hoc committee. 2. The DG’s Call for nominations is sent to all IUCN Members and to the members of the Commission concerned. The Call for nominations states explicitly that, in the interest of time, it also constitutes the invitation to Commission members required by Regulation 30bis, inviting them to submit to the Commission’s ad hoc committee names to be considered for Commission Chair. 3. The Call for nominations specifies the deadline for submission of names by IUCN Members and CEC Commission members directly to the Council’s Nominating Committee (Regulation 30) and for the Commission’s ad hoc committee to transmit, with the prior endorsement of the Commission’s Steering Committee, a list of up to 2 prioritized candidates to the Nominating Committee (Regulation 30bis). 4. The Council’s Nominating Committee presents to Council a single candidate for its endorsement.</td>
<td>Committee under Regulation 48 (c) (ii) validate the nominations put forward by IUCN Members. The Nominating Committee presents to Council one single candidate for endorsement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council elects the individual to fill the vacancy for Treasurer for the balance of the term by a secret, electronic vote. If there is only one candidate, Council decides whether to endorse the candidate, during its meeting or by email ballot.</td>
<td>Council elects the individual to fill the vacancy for Commission Chair for the balance of the term by a secret, electronic vote. If there is only one candidate, Council decides whether to endorse the candidate, during its meeting or by email ballot.</td>
<td>Council elects the individual to fill the vacancy for Regional Councillor for the balance of the term by a secret, electronic vote. If there is only one candidate, Council decides whether to endorse the candidate, during its meeting or by email ballot.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Nominations Committee of Council

Draft Terms of Reference

The task of the Nominations Committee is to assist the Council in identifying suitable candidates for the positions of President, Treasurer and Chairs of Commissions for submission by Council to the World Conservation Congress for election in June 2020. The duties of the Nominations Committee will be as follows:

a) Establish a timetable for the work of the Nominations Committee during the nomination process based on a final deadline for receipt of nominations of 11 December 2019.

b) Designate individual members of the Nominations Committee to liaise with each Commission and ensure coordination with any internal search processes taking place within the IUCN Commissions.

c) Collect biographical information and reference material on candidates.

d) 1. Assess all the valid nominations which the Nominations Committee will receive from the Election Officer (Regulation 30) against the respective profiles for the elective positions after consultation, as the case may be, with the Ethics Committee of Council on any issues of ethics or conflict of interest, or with the Director General on any candidacies from members of staff. The methodology for assessing candidates will include:

   i. a rating system using a criteria based on the profiles for elective positions;
   ii. gender balance including one of two candidates for President, balance among Commission Chair nominees and nominees for Treasurer, depending on nominations received and qualifications;
   iii. review and assessment of candidates’ qualifications including but not be limited to, video or face-to-face interviews with the nominees for President, Treasurer, and for Commission Chairs in the case of more than one candidate nominated by the Commission Steering Committee and/or IUCN Members;

2. Receive a report detailing which applications were rejected and the reasons why.

e) Make short lists for each position.

f) Formulate recommendations for submission to Council at its 98th meeting in February 2020.

g) In the event that no candidate can be identified for a position, report to Council which may re-open the nomination process for that position.

h) Work as a collegial body and maintain strict confidentiality with regard to its deliberations.

i) Make recommendations to the next Council for improving the committee’s role and functioning based on its own evaluation to be made before the end of the 2020 Congress taking into account Council’s guidance for self-evaluation.
Task Force (CCTF) of the IUCN Council’s Governance and Constituency Committee (GCC) to develop a comprehensive gender approach at IUCN

Terms of Reference

(Approved by GCC22, 20 October 2019)

Background

1. Following a letter addressed by Jenny Gruenberger and other Council members to the IUCN President on 13 July 2018, the Bureau, at its 75th meeting of 5 October 2018, accepted to include in the Table of areas for improvement of IUCN’s governance a new section entitled “A.3 - Developing a comprehensive gender approach at IUCN”.

2. In the letter, Council members made the case for “incorporating gender equity in a comprehensive manner in the organization, governance and policy of the Union”.

3. Noting that the revised IUCN Policy on Gender Equality and Women’s Empowerment (approved by Council at its 95th meeting in October 2018) was about mainstreaming gender-responsiveness within the IUCN Programme of work, the Bureau suggested that Council considers an approach for the governance of IUCN in a broad sense, beyond the Programme.

Objective

4. Objective:
   a) Prepare a concept note including the definition of gender equality, gender equity and women’s empowerment, as well as a proposal for the overall goal, for the consideration of the GCC, at its 98th meeting (February 2020) with the view of presenting the concept to Council for discussion at the 98th Meeting.
   b) Prepare a plan to incorporate gender equality and equity as well as women’s empowerment in a comprehensive manner in the organization, governance, policy and practice of the Union, for consideration of the GCC and Council at its 98th meeting (February 2020) for approval, with the purpose of presenting it to the 2020 World Conservation Congress for discussion and adoption.

Functions

5. The plan to be submitted to GCC and Council at its 98th meeting (February 2019) should include an overall goal for the entire Union and its constituent parts individually to be achieved by a specific date, that can be quantified and tracked during the implementation, and a set of SMART objectives to support it.

6. Prepare a concept note including definitions of gender, gender equality, gender equity and women’s empowerment and a proposal for the overall goal, for the consideration of the GCC, by no later than its 98th meeting (February 2019) with the view of presenting the concept to Council for discussion at the 98th Meeting.

Modus Operandi

8. The members of the TF will implement their work principally via email and conference calls and coordinate any face-to-face meetings with the timing of Council meetings.
9. The TF will be assisted by a Secretariat focal point who will provide administrative and technical support.

10. The TF will periodically report to GCC on progress, but at least quarterly including at each face-to-face meeting of the GCC.

Duration

11. The TF is established by the GCC as a task force under Regulation 59 and will in principle terminate its mandate upon Council’s approval of the plan, at the latest in February 2020, unless decided otherwise by the GCC.

Composition of the Task Force

12. The GCC will establish a TF including other interested members of Council, the Secretariat and members of the Commissions. The principal members of the TF will be drawn from within the GCC and the wider Council. Proposed composition of the TF is:
   - 4 Council members (out of which 3 GCC members)
   - 2 members from Commissions
   - 2 External individuals (from within and outside IUCN) may also be invited to contribute from time to time as ad hoc experts in order to bring in necessary skills and knowledge on specific issues, as needed.
   - 1 expert member of the Secretariat appointed by the DG.
22nd meeting of the Governance and Constituency Committee
Room Red List B – IUCN Headquarters, Gland, Switzerland

Saturday, 19 October 2019 – 09:00-12:30
Sunday, 20 October 2019 – 09:00 – 18:00

(If links below don’t work, please click here to access all GCC documents)
https://portals.iucn.org/union/anglist/groupdocuments/13709/20008

Members of the Governance and Constituency Committee: Chair: Jennifer Mohamed-Katerere, Deputy Chair: Tamar Pataridze, Members: Shaikha Salem Al Dhaheri, Mamadou Diallo, Hilde Eggermont, Jenny Gruenberger, Masahiko Horie, Sixto J. Incháustegui, Líder Sucre, Ramiro Batzin.

- Secretariat Focal Points: Global Director Union Development Group: Enrique Lahmann; Senior Governance Manager: Luc De Wever; Membership Coordinator: Fleurange Gilmour; Communications Manager, Union Development Group: Sarah Over. Legal Adviser: Sandrine Friedli-Cela

Apologies: Ali Kaka, Youngbae Suh

Observers: Frank Hawkins

Opening of the meeting – Welcome to everyone

1 Governance issues

1.1 Improving IUCN’s governance including proposed amendments to the Statutes, Rules of Procedure and Regulations: DEC

1.1.1 Review of comments from IUCN Members received during the Regional Conservation Forums and online, and possible revision of proposals of the different reforms.

The GCC was invited to review the Council proposals in light of the comments received from IUCN Members during RCFs and through the Union Portal and, for each proposal, make a recommendation to Council either to:

a. maintain the proposal as it is; or
b. revise it; or
c. drop the proposal.

This should include establishing a process to ensure that the required amendments to the Statutes and/or, as the case may be, the Regulations are prepared in time to be submitted to Council for approval in February 2020.

The GCC should give clear directions to those who will be mandated to prepare the amendments.

The deadline for preparation of documents was set at 23 January 2020.

1.1.1.1 Including subnational governments in IUCN’s membership – DEC/DIS

Comments received during the RCFs only indicate that there was general support by the Members of this proposal. However, there was confusion regarding the proposed voting structure, the definition of “sub-national” and requests for the goal of the proposal to be clarified

Decision: A GCC working group (led by Shaikha Al Dhaheri) will work on a revision of the proposal taking into account the following:

- The need for clarification about voting powers, in particular regarding the State vote and balance of power between two houses
- Further work on the definition of “sub-national” is needed
- Clarification of the goal of the proposal.
- A proposal for dues for this category should the proposal be adopted (in collaboration with the Dues Task Force)
- Any amendments to the Statutes and Regulations that will be needed if the proposal is adopted.

Work will involve consultation with the Council WG on Subnational governments led by Amran Hamzah, the Legal Adviser and the Dues Task Force. The amended proposal will be presented to GCC by 23 January 2020.

**1.1.1.2 Election procedures and inclusiveness of dependent territories - DEC**

- Proposal of how to amend the Statutes does not need to be changed
- Goal needs to be clarified – how this will change the representation – but not over-representation
- Intention and power

There was broad support for this proposal, particularly in the Caribbean sub-region (who had initiated the amendment). In SUR there was a misunderstanding among some Members who thought that this proposal was a way for some states to gain more power. However, clarification of the fact that the proposal would allow for geographical location of a State to take precedence over its political status, allayed concerns.

The Legal Adviser explained that technically, it would be possible to have many representatives from one State (for example, France who has territories in many of the Regions and could have a representative in each of them). However, it was felt that this situation would be unlikely to happen and it was unnecessary to add wording to expressly limit the number of representatives from one State. Indeed, adding a limit could create more problems since this would require a decision process on selection of candidates where there are more than the maximum number, how to handle appeals and who should make the decisions, for example.

Feedback from RCFs included requests for clarification of the meaning of “part of a region”. Wording in the proposal was drafted with the Caribbean in mind, which is a sub-region that is formally recognized in IUCN but consideration should be given to whether or not this is a unique case.

**Decision**: A small group (Sixto Incháustegui, Luc De Wever and the Legal Adviser) would reflect on the issue of terminology and a revised proposal presented to GCC for email decision within a month. This would include:
- The purpose of the proposal
- Clarification of a part of a region

**1.1.1.3 Establish an elected indigenous Councillor position - DEC**

There was broad support for the proposal by Members. However, it was proposed that it would benefit from further formal consultation with Indigenous peoples’ organisations (IPOs).

At the RCF in Eastern and Southern Africa, there was concern about the definition of the IPO category, in particular the fact that the current definition excludes local communities. This might be an issue that needs to be reflected upon by the next Council. It was agreed that the process for the appointed Councillor would be better communicated to Members with clear criteria set out as previously discussed by the GCC.

In comments from Canada, it was pointed out that an IPO could be included as a sub-government under the new proposal. This could have an impact when choosing a representative for election.

However, since the mandate to create the IPO category came from the Indigenous NGO sector, it was felt that only associations within the NGO category could nominate a candidate for the position of an elected indigenous Councillor. It was agreed that a clear process for the appointment of an additional Councillor be established.

**Decision**: A small group (Jenny, Mamadou and Ramiro) was established to further develop the proposal, statute revisions required and to consider the issue of whether the proposal could result in more than one representative from the same State. This should be done in consultation with a spread of IPOs and with the support of the Legal Adviser for the required Statutory changes.
The group will seek a solution for the issue of same state limitation within one month and the paper on other amendments, including a change to Article 38 of the Statutes, will be submitted to GCC by 23 January 2020.

1.1.1.4  Modification of the term “Regional Councillor” - DEC

Feedback from the RCFs included the recognition of the fact that Regional Councillors have a dual role. One suggestion was to dispense with the term “Regional” and refer to “Councilors from the Regions” instead.

There was also a request that the duty of Councillors to communicate with Members in their Region be made more explicit.

There was support within the GCC for the proposed change from “Regional Councillors” to “Councillors from the Region”. The relevant section of the Councillors Handbook will also be reviewed to ensure that the regional and global responsibilities are properly reflected in there, as will the Performance Commitment and Code of Ethics.

Decision: A Working Group was established to look into making this change in the Statutes, and that to take care to ensure the wording of each section does not become cumbersome. The working group will compose of Masahiko, Mamadou (Chair), Legal Advisor. Proposals to GCC to be made by the group by January 23 2020.

1.1.1.5  Improvements to the motions process – DEC/DIS

A. Increase majority required to adopt motions

This proposal generated both strong support and strong opposition among the IUCN Members. In support of the motion was the fact that a moving to a 2/3 majority will avoid highly divisive situations and encourage people to work together. Concerns were raised that such a move will mean that IUCN becomes less able to adopt innovative motions that change the status quo and advance needed changes. Similarly, there was concern that if adopted, this requirement would prevent the adoption of proposals relevant at a regional, national and local level, for example, because people don’t understand the issues and abstain.

Two letters, one from Richard Ottinger and Smita Narula, Co-Directors of the Center for Environmental Legal Studies and one from International Council of Environmental Law received on 16 and 18 October respectively, were addressed to the Council with the request to withdraw its proposed requirement for a 2/3 vote to pass resolutions at the World Conservation Congress 2020 in Marseille on the basis of the same motives mentioned above (letters available here, as Annex 5).

It was argued in GCC that if there are good consultations for motions, there should be no reason not to achieve a 2/3 majority even by minority groups, for innovative ideas or issues of more local concern. More effort will have to be put in the process but it should be possible. Further data from the last Congress showed that had this rule been in place for the 2016 Congress, only 3 that were adopted would not have passed. However, it was unclear if those three were minority groups or innovative ideas.

B. Guarantee scientific independence of the work carried out.

There were no objections from Members on this issue. GCC also supported and it tabled the proposal unchanged.

C. Cap on abstentions Article 32 of the Statutes

Similar to 2/3 majority issue, some of the Members expressed concerns and raised questions in relation to one of the proposed statutory changes in relation to counting the abstentions as casted votes and putting a cap on the number of abstentions in order for a motion to be adopted. Because some of the Members wish to abstain, but may not necessarily want to prevent the motion from being adopted, these Members encouraged the Council to look for a solution that retains this option of IUCN membership.

GCC shared this concern and decided that some other options be considered and decide if a viable alternative could be found.
Decision: A sub-group, led by Tamar Pataridze, was established to address the issues for proposals A and C. Hilde Eggermont from GCC joined the group. Invitations would be extended to the members of the Task Force for this item and a revised proposal to be submitted by 23 January 2020. Secretariat will support the group in terms of providing the data and information, including for decisions for the last two Congresses to support the discussion process on proposal A.

1.1.1.6 **Role of Commissions in National and Regional Committees** - DEC

There was broad support by Members for recognizing role of Commissions within National and Regional Committees, with no voting rights.

The issue of whether Commissions should be aligned with the IUCN Regional programme was discussed as such alignment would promote working together. However, the Chair noted that Commissions bring a wealth of knowledge to discussions, even without extensive regulatory frameworks. To ensure this continues, the objective of including the Commissions in National and Regional Committees needs to be clarified, including both their action (work) and the knowledge they bring.

The next steps of the Working Group will be to propose the actual modifications to the operational, including the clarification that there be one representative from each of the Commissions.

**Decision:** Jenny Gruenberger will develop a proposal (with Secretariat support for translation) – to allow the consultation process by 23 January 2020, confirming with the Legal Adviser that no amendments to the Statutes are needed since the changes will be made to the National Committee operational guide.

1.1.2 **Proposals on other topics due by October 2019:**

1.1.2.1 **Comprehensive gender approach at IUCN** - DEC

GCC reviewed the proposed amendments to the functions of the Gender TF outlined in the draft ToR. The timeline was updated and it was agreed that the concept note will include a detailed plan for discussion at GCC/Council in February with the final proposal to be presented at the Members Assembly.

GCC also discussed the composition of the TF. Upon the request by the GCC Deputy Chair the day before GCC meeting, the Commission Chairs nominated two representatives for the TF - Meher Noshirwani, Chair of Gender specialist group (CEESP) and Shalini Dhyan, Regional Chair from East Asia (CEM), while the ADG nominated Jackie Siles, Senior Project Coordinator for the GGO as the expert representative from the Secretariat.

From GCC Jenny, Tamar and Shaikha volunteered to join the TF.

**Decision:** GCC approved the constitution of the group. It was agreed that the plan will be finalized by 23 January 2020 for discussion at GCC and Council at the next Council meeting before it is distributed to Members on 10 March 2020.

1.1.2.2 **Establishment / operating rules / oversight of National, Regional and Interregional Committees (IRC), incl. discussion of scope and purpose of IRC** - DEC

This relates to areas of improvement of IUCN’s governance B2 and B7. These two issues were put into the same paper because they link to each other. An initial discussion took place during GCC’s call on 23 September and some changes were made to the document based on proposals made during the meeting (section 3 b) and c).

Before the discussion there was a presentation by Secretariat on findings from the analysis on National and Regional Committees that was undertaken, and which links to paper B2/B7.

Following the presentation, Masahiko raised his concern that there was no linkage of the National Committee of Japan with the Secretariat. However, documents suggest otherwise since there is mention that the National Committee is responsible for translations and the actions that have been taken. There is no doubt that the relationship needs to be strengthened across the board and there is much interesting work to be done by the National Committees.
Hilde welcomed the recognition of opportunities that National Committees offer. The Statutes tend to focus and constraints and restrictions which sometimes confuse National and Regional Committees with regards to the work they can undertake under the One Programme Approach.

With particular reference to issues with the IUCN Netherlands Committee, she suggested that it would be interesting to study the current situation to establish how issues that had caused problems in the past have been mitigated. A lot has changed since 2017 and there is concern within the Committee that its past reputation is tarnishing the reputation of the Committee today.

Referring to the requirement of completing annual reviews, the Chair highlighted the reticence of people to complete annual reviews and wondered whether this has anything to do with the fact that work is carried out on a volunteer basis.

The Secretariat view is it is possible to support the Committees with the mandate and structure to enable this. By engaging with Committees, it becomes a positive cycle, justifying the funds for a unit and moving up through the engagement cycle. The difficulty is deciding where to start. Information gathering exercises by Secretariat will be conducted in the spirit of engagement and openness to avoid being viewed negatively.

**B2. Clarify, modify or develop the requirements for establishing National, Regional and Interregional Committees, acknowledging that the establishment of IRC may have political as well as ecological motives.**

The paper was prepared following:
- Initial discussions on the establishment of an Interregional Committee for the regions of West Europe, North and Central Asia in November 2017 ([Council document C/93/GCC/2.7.1.1](#)).
- Recommendation made in Council document ([Council document C/94/GCC13 2.4.4](#)) from April 2018 (94th Council) to extend the review to other Committees which was consistent with the approach taken by the Bureau WG at its meeting of 10 April 2018.

The Secretariat has undertaken an analysis of the current process and criteria for establishment of National/Regional and Interregional Committees, as stated in the Statutes and Regulations. Currently there is inconsistency with the establishment/constitution process of all Committees and their daily functioning and maintenance. It is advisable to have a similar establishment/constitution process for all Committees to ensure a proper democratic process and legitimacy.

**In order to define the common standards applicable to all types of Committees, and how the Statutes and Regulations may be amended, the GCC was asked to consider, as an initial process, the considerations/questions listed by the Secretariat in the document (section 3 (b) and c).**

The GCC focused on a number of issues regarding the establishment, composition, governance and scope of National, Regional and Inter-Regional Committees.

Whilst some of the questions listed were answered, the GCC felt that there was more discussion needed, particularly around the issues of composition, scope and governance. Secretariat was requested to produce a paper that evaluates the different iterations of the three types of Committee and the implications each of them has for the organization of IUCN with regards to decision-making and the rights of Members to engage and cooperate. The paper should set out the implications, opportunities and problems pertaining to each type of committee and will reflect the conversations that have been had to date.

The Chair wished it to be noted that she was concerned that she had not been made aware by the Secretariat, of a legal opinion relating to the rights of Affiliates to vote in National Committees. This is an important matter relating to the governance of National Committees and the rights of IUCN Members and is an issue that should have been brought to the GCCs attention for discussion, particular as Affiliates are none voting Members. She commented that this was a clear example of the lack of flow of information between the Secretariat and the Council.

The paper will be presented for discussion at the next Council meeting in February 2020. Should the GCC/Council not complete the work on this matter ahead of the Congress in 2020, the paper will serve as detailed handover notes for the 2020-2024 Council.

**B7. Guidance to IUCN’s National, Regional and Interregional Committees** to ensure their transparency, independence and integrity, including the respect of IUCN brand use guidelines and non-competition...
with the Secretariat when they operate outside their territory; effective implementation of the Operational Guidance for National/Regional Committees; and effective Council oversight.

This follows discussions from the 92nd Council meeting (February 2017), the 73rd meeting of the Bureau in November 201 and the 74th meeting of the Bureau in April 2018.

Concerns have been raised about: Committees acting as NGO with legal personality beyond the IUCN Council’s oversight; Operation outside their national state or region; risk for IUCN potentially affecting IUCN’s Programme, finance and governance.

Some options to strengthen Council’s oversight on the Committees include:

i. Effectively implement the obligation to submit an annual report to Council.
ii. Provide for the obligation of the Council to review the report.
iii. Have under the responsibility of the Council, through PPC and FAC, the oversight of the Committees as it already exists for the Commissions.
iv. Have a standardized website for each Committee.
v. Review the Operational Guide for National and Regional Committees, the license agreement and the logo rules for National and Regional Committees (according to the IUCN Brand Book) and ask each Committee to sign a revised copy.
vi. Consider amending Articles 65-66bis of the Statutes and/or Regulations 66(f) and 67(a).

The Secretariat proposes that Council takes the opportunity of the 2020 Congress to raise awareness of the lack of oversight and risks involved, by either including a section in the Council report to Congress or in the Congress document presenting Council’s proposals to amend the Statutes with regard to the Interregional Committees. The issue should be tabled for discussion in Congress after which the Congress Governance Committee may bring a summary or proposals for decision to the plenary. This could include e.g. a paragraph in the Congress Resolution amending the Statutes, requesting the next Council to take appropriate actions within its authority in order to address the risk and the gap in governance oversight, and to propose any actions beyond its authority, including proposals to amend the Statutes, for approval by electronic vote of the IUCN membership prior to the 2024 Congress. It was stressed in meeting that interaction with the Members committees should focus on facilitating engagement in the work of IUCN and the objectives of the Membership Strategy.

GCC discussion regarding the strengthening of the oversight of National, Regional and Inter-Regional committees focused on the requirement of annual reports by Committees. Different reporting structures were discussed and there was agreement that a structured format for the reports would be helpful. The process needs to be simplified. However, whilst it was broadly accepted within the GCC that there is merit in such reports to showcase the work undertaken by Committees, the Secretariat currently makes no use of the few that are submitted, thereby negating any incentive. The GCC urged the Secretariat to reflect on how these reports could be used to address concerns of members and implement the membership strategy.

There were also questions regarding what the results of non-compliance might be. It was agreed that it is good to have oversight, but thought must also be given to how to follow up on this. Should there be a clear definition on the role and mandate of Committees? Where should support for Committee work come from – the committees themselves or Secretariat?

The Legal Adviser suggested that the revision/update of the Operational Guide for National Committees be a good place to start. The Chair noted that in making any modifications it would be important to address the main concerns of the Members, who are currently disengaged and see little or no value in their IUCN membership. Highlighting the opportunities that the different tools available to them create, is one way of trying to improve this situation.

This matter is linked to the B2 paper referred to above and will be included in the paper that Secretariat will produce for the next Council meeting in February 2020.

1.1.2.3 Clarification of membership admission and rights - DEC

This relates to area of improvement of IUCN’s governance C3.

Some issues were identified by the Membership Unit, which is in charge or processing membership applications. A draft discussion paper was prepared by the Membership Unit for the 20th meeting of the GCC held during the 96th Council in March 2019. The matter was postponed to a later date for discussion to allow the Legal Adviser to make comments on the proposal.
The proposal was reviewed including the Legal Adviser’s opinion, especially on the question of the conditions for State Members to re-join IUCN and was discussed during the 21st meeting of the GCC on 23 September 2019.

GCC approved the amendments to Regulations 14 and 15 of the Regulations by email correspondence.

Changes to the Regulations shall be adopted by two consecutive meetings of Council (Art. 101(c) and would therefore need to be presented at this meeting and the following in February 2020.

**DRAFT COUNCIL DECISION**

The IUCN Council,

*On the recommendation of the Governance and Constituency Committee,*

*in conformity with Article 101-102 of the Statutes,*

Adopts in first reading the proposed amendments to Article 14 and 15 of the Regulations aiming to clarify the admission process for Members,

14. *The Director General shall mail notice of the applications together with the appropriate information on the applicants, to the Members of IUCN eligible to vote.*

15. *When a Member eligible to vote exercises its right to object to an application, such objection must reach the Director General within four weeks from the Director General’s notification referred to in Regulation 14.*

Decides to table the proposed amendment on the agenda of the next meeting of the IUCN Council (February 2020) for adoption in second reading, modified as the case may be following the consultation of IUCN Members required by Articles 101-102 of the Statutes.

**Clarification of the term “Members eligible to vote”**

The term creates confusion among Members and the Secretariat. A Member eligible to vote must, in addition to being a Member from Category A, B or C, have paid its membership dues up to and including the year preceding the invitation or call to exercise a right (e.g. vote or submission of motions, etc.).

The Legal Adviser advises not to change the Statutes or Regulations. Following its recommendation on 23 September, which was approved by e-mail correspondence, GCC agrees with the advice of the Legal Adviser and asks Council to take note.

The other two items of the paper “Application of Articles 14 of the Statutes and Regulation 26” and “Conditions for change of membership” will be discussed at the next meeting and/or by e-mail correspondence.

**1.1.2.4 Harmonized process for filling vacancies for Treasurer, Commission Chair and Regional Councillor - DEC**

Since there is little guidance in the Statutes and Regulations regarding the filling of a vacancy between Congresses, Secretariat made a proposal on how to proceed in each of the functions, based on decisions taken in such situations over the last ten years.

Since it may be considered too detailed to introduce the proposed procedure in the Regulations by way of an amendment. The proposal is therefore made to invite Council to approve the procedure and to integrate it in the Council Handbook, thereby replacing §19, 20 and 21 and any previous decision of Council or its Bureau regarding the procedure for filling vacancies for Treasurer, Commission Chair and Regional Councillor.
GCC decided that for all three positions, the Search Committee would present to Council a single candidate for its endorsement. The reasoning being that since the Search Committee will be formed of Council members who are entrusted by the rest of Council to do the job.

The GCC also established that the Search Committee for the position of Treasurer, would comprise the President, one or more Vice-Presidents proposed by the President based on their skillset, the outgoing Treasurer/acting Treasurer if available, the Chair of the FAC and one other Councillor.

It was also agreed that the Search Committee would be approved by Council in respect of the non-obligatory positions.

**DRAFT COUNCIL DECISION**

The IUCN Council, on the recommendation of the Governance and Constituency Committee,
1. Approves the procedure for filling vacancies for Treasurer, Commission Chair and Regional Councillor in accordance with Regulation 47 (Annex);
2. Decides that it be integrated in the Council Handbook, replacing §19-21 of the Council Handbook and any previous decision of Council or its Bureau regarding the procedure for filling vacancies for Treasurer, Commission Chair and Regional Councillor.

**1.1.3 Review of the updated table “Areas for improvement of IUCN’s governance and identification of any governance reforms overlooked or not yet included in the list**

Updated table was not reviewed during the meeting but is posted on the Portal for reference.

**1.2 Management Response to the External Review of IUCN’s Governance (DEC/DIS)**

1.2.1 Consideration of the proposals from the Council Working Group established by the Bureau (decision B/XV, 28 June 2019, p.8) pursuant to Council decision C/96/6.

The GCC reviewed and discussed the comments drafted by the Working Group. Input was added to the table that will be presented to Council on 21 October in preparation for discussion during the plenary session on 22 October.

1.2.2 Review of, and possible amendments to the Statutes and Regulations concerning the role of the President, the Treasurer and the chairs of the standing committees

As stated in the draft management response to the external governance review, the ToR of the President, the Treasurer and the chairs of the standing committees would need to be reviewed. The GCC received a discussion paper from the Treasurer and the Chief Financial Officer as input for the GCC’s work on this, showing how they see the role of the Treasurer. The GCC appreciated the Treasurer and CFO’s reflections and will transmit them to a subgroup of the GCC that will be set up to prepare proposals for the GCC on all the positions referred to above, in time for Council to consider them in February 2020.

1.3 Revision of the Performance Commitment for IUCN Councillors (Annex 5 of the Council Handbook) to include an express commitment to comply with the IUCN Data Protection Policy (Council decision C/96/26) – DEC

This agenda item will be discussed by GCC by e-mail correspondence.

**2. Constituency issues**

2.1 Members’ feedback on the Membership Strategy – presentation of version 4.0 (DEC/DIS)

Comments received during the RCFs and online afterwards suggest broad acceptance by Members of the draft Membership Strategy paper. The GCC decided that we should move to the implementation stage and that the Strategy should be considered as a “living document”.

It is expected that the final Strategy document will be ready for approval by the third week of November 2019. This will allow for the incorporation of all comments received from the RCFs,
including the one taking place in Islamabad from 6-8 November 2019. GCC is working with the Secretariat to ensure that comments are reflected in the document, including the ones that were received by the Latin American group of Members although most of the issues raised are already reflected in the document. Jenny Gruenberger will support Secretariat in this task as she is from that region.

The latest draft of the strategy (Draft 4.0) is available on the Union Portal and Council members are welcome to submit their comments by the third week of November.

Once the final document is ready, GCC’s is required to approve it. In order not to delay the process further, GCC requests the mandate of Council to approve to document. A draft action plan will be presented to GCC in February 2020.

The IUCN Council,

On the recommendation of the Governance and Constituency Committee,

Taking into account the multiple round of consultations with IUCN Members and the IUCN Members’ feedback through the Regional Conservation Forums and online,

Concerned to approve the Membership Strategy as soon as possible so that implementation may begin without delay,

Requests the Bureau to approve the Membership Strategy subject to the integration by the Governance and Constituency Committee (GCC) of any further comments received from IUCN Members during the Asia Regional Conservation Forum (RCF) to be held in Islamabad, 6-8 November 2019, as soon as possible after the RCF.

2.3 Membership applications (DEC) ¹

There were 56 membership applications submitted for consideration by GCC (refer to Annex). All the applications were reviewed by e-mail correspondence. Due to lack of time during the meeting, a number of applications were not discussed and are therefore deferred for discussion by e-mail correspondence and/or the next meeting of GCC (conference call).

DRAFT COUNCIL DECISION

The IUCN Council, on the recommendation of the Governance and Constituency Committee, Approves the admission of 45 organizations and/or institutions applying for membership. Defers the consideration of 11 organisations to its next conference call or meeting;

The Chair raised some concerns about the conservation record of some of the applicants and about the related expectations from IUCN on its membership. Reference to this extract from the 2008-2012 Constituency Committee Report and to Congress Decision 20, was provided by the Secretariat.

“Evaluating the suitability of an applicant with the requirements of Article 7 at present involves, to some extent, a subjective assessment. By proposing Congress to adopt the proposed amendments to Article 7 of the Statutes, Council intends to give more specific guidance to the IUCN Council as to what are the objectives and track record to be reviewed when considering an application for admission. Council is of the view that membership of IUCN can be broadened to those that are active in conservation of nature and/or in the sustainable use of natural resources or directly related activities which demonstrate that the organization shares and supports the objectives of IUCN. This is particularly relevant in the context of the draft new IUCN Programme 2013–2016 which aims to integrate new actors engaged in biodiversity conservation, nature-based solutions and nature’s benefits to peoples’ livelihoods. The amendments proposed therefore require Council to make sure that the government agency or NGO applying for membership meets at least two of the three criteria of paragraph (b) of Article 7 of the Statutes as revised. As a result, organizations that are not only traditional conservation organizations but organizations that focus on equitable and ecologically sustainable use – e.g. agriculture policy or
sustainable agriculture institutions – could join, as well as organizations focusing on communication and education of conservation or sustainable use.

The changes to the Statutes in relation with the admission of new Members proposed by Council to the Members’ Assembly are explained in Congress Paper WCC-2012-9.4.1/6.

Referral 9.4.1/6 that was submitted to the 2012 World Conservation Congress, was approved with minor edits. Refer to Decision 20 of the Members’ Assembly Proceedings to see the whole decision and amendments to Article 7 of the IUCN Statutes.”

2.5 National, Regional and Interregional Committees (DEC)

Incl. the recognition of newly established committees and the revision of the by-laws of existing committees, if any applications are received

The Governance and Constituency Committee considered the request for official recognition of the Cambodia National Committee and of the Chile National Committee. The six Members in Cambodia and the five Members in Chile have provided written agreement to the establishment of the National Committee.

To note that the National Committee of Chile was initially established on 23 June 1995 and recognized by Council on 29 April 1998. The Committee was dissolved in 2000. Members in Chile have agreed to the re-estabishment and recognition of the Committee.

As explained by the Legal adviser, the bylaws of both of these National Committees are in accordance with IUCN Statutes and Regulations, however some work will be needed to improve the text of these bylaws on specific points, for purpose of clarification which should not prevent GCC from approving the process of recognition by Council now, as the improvement of the documents will be more of a technical aspect.

DRAFT COUNCIL DECISION

On the recommendation from the GCC, Council

RECOGNIZES the Chile and Cambodia National Committees;

RECOMMENDS to these Committees to work with the Office of the Legal Adviser to improve the text of their respective bylaws on specific points for the purpose of clarification.

The Office of the Legal (OLA) has worked with the Chair of the Morocco Committee on the by-laws as indicated in the report of GCC to Council (paper C/96/7.1). The Committee has addressed some of the issues raised/recommendations made by OLA. However, some important points still require discussion. The difficulties in completing the revision of the by-laws arise from

(i) the complexity of the analysis (by-laws considerably different from those initially adopted by Council in 2014; not completely aligned with the template provided by Secretariat; need to comply also with relevant laws of Morocco where the Committee was formally registered as a legal entity, late 2018);
(ii) the advisability of requesting consistency with the Statutes and Regulations while not being more exigent with this Committee than with other Committees whose by-laws may not be so consistent (but still benefit from their recognition by Council).

For future, the Legal Adviser, recommended to improve the current IUCN bylaws template, especially considering the discussion held by GCC yesterday.

After some discussion, GCC’s guidance to the Legal Adviser was that she will resume exchanges with the Committee only on the most important issues to make sure that the Morocco Committee is treated on an equal basis with other existing Committees. Any other issues can be handled after the reviewing process of National/Regional Committee documents. In the meantime, it can continue to function as National Committee of IUCN Members.

2.2 / 2.6 Update on IUCN membership, dues and rescission of Members’ rights (INF)

As of 16 October 2019, IUCN has 1374 Members. Kenya, Mauritania, Central Africa Republic, and Nigeria re-joined the Union as State Members after having paid their outstanding dues from 2017. South Africa had verbally informed the former Director General of their withdrawal from IUCN in 2016, and decided to re-join IUCN effective 2018 and has paid its full membership dues for 2018 and 2019. Bahrain joined IUCN in March 2019 as a new State Member. Kosovo joined IUCN in April 2019.

GCC commended the Acting Director General and the UDG/Regional offices on the actions that have been taken to bring back these State Members.

GCC was informed that if the 56 Members being considered for admission are all admitted, IUCN will reach a record figure of 1430 Members. However, 61 Members might be withdrawn on 21 November 2019, following the decision by Members made by e-vote in November 2018.

Currently, there are 104 Members (incl. 16 States) whose remaining rights may be rescinded by the 2020 Congress. Members will be informed in due course and encouraged to pay their dues to prevent this happening. Councillors are requested to provide support in this process.

2.6.1 Report of the joint GCC/FAC Dues Task Force on membership dues

Following the presentation of the Dues Task Force recommendations, a Regional Councillor for North America and the Caribbean, Rick Bates, had a number of issues he wished to discuss with GCC. The first was relating to considerations made for organisations whose mandate is not solely conservation, for example the Assembly of First Nations of Canada. Many such organisations would like to join but the dues are prohibitive whether they are Total Expenditure (TE) or Operating Expenditure (opex) based, he suggested that the expenditure related to conservation should be considered. It would be helpful if this situation could be resolved because there are a number of organisations in that situation.

Another issue of concern was that there are a number of Members in Canada who should be in Categories A, B or C but they are applying for membership for the Affiliates category just to pay lower dues. This situation should be looked into with the aim of finding a way to prevent this from happening further.

On the topic of creating a separate dues group for Zoos and Aquaria, he advised that a number of organisations think that whilst it is good news that these venue-based organisations are beginning to expand their mandates into conservation, the net result is that they are another competitor in the field. If they are given a preferential rate, this could be seen as a subsidy and create an added level of competition. He proposed that the sum for the Dues should be reconsidered. This situation is of concern not only at the NGO level, but also at the GA level.

The Chair explained that the Dues Task Force is small group and it was hard to find what a reasonable fee would be. The SSC undertook a survey of zoos and the TF took the advice of the SSC regarding the fees level. The TF would not be opposed to having a further reflection on this issue. It is important they clarify that this is still at the proposal level and that the rationale is based on willingness to pay. This is also the rationale adopted for the new Group 1 proposal.
In response to a query related to small venue-based organizations, the Secretariat explained that for those venue-based organisations whose Total Expenditure falls below the level of that of the proposed fees, they would qualify for the dues group corresponding to the level of their Total Expenditure.

The GCC agreed to leave the recommendation from the Council as it is, on the understanding that there will be feedback from Council members and IUCN Members.

**DRAFT COUNCIL DECISION**

The IUCN Council, on the recommendation of the Governance and Constituency Committee and Finance and Audit Committee,

Approves the recommendations made by the Joint GCC/FAC Membership Dues Task Force, through GCC/FAC, in the review of the 2021-2024 membership dues, for the purpose of consultation with the IUCN Membership.

Requests the Dues TF to proceed with the preparations of the 2021-2024 Membership Dues Guide following these recommendations and consultation with IUCN Members and Council;

Requests the Dues Guide to be finalised for approval by the 98th Council in February 2020

3. World Conservation Congress

3.1 Consideration of the proposals from the Jury established by the GCC at its 20th meeting (March 2019) for appointment as recipient(s) of the John C. Philipps Medal and IUCN Honorary Membership

The Chair of the Awards Jury presented an update Awards process. He explained that the deadline had been extended to 30 September to ensure a more adequate balance in geography and gender of the candidate pool.

By 30 September, the following nominations had been received:
- **Phillips medal** – 21 nominations (4 female and 17 male)
- **Coolidge medal** – 24 nominations (4 female and 20 male)
- **Honorary Membership** – 18 nominations (1 female and 17 male)

Next steps: The Jury will appoint three additional external members of the Jury to assess the Coolidge medal nominations. The nominations will be scored according to the requirements of each of the Awards and final will be amalgamated. The Jury will discuss the results and select finalists, to be presented to Council for approval. Once approved, the Secretariat to contact winners and finalise arrangements for the Winners’ attendance at Congress.

3.2 Terms of Reference of the 2020 Congress Governance, Programme, Resolutions and Finance and Audit Committees and of the 2020 Congress Procedural Adviser” DEC

Pursuant to the Bureau decision B/75/1 (October 2018), GCC has been considering the ToR for the Nominations Committee only and decided to consider other ToRs for approval by e-mail correspondence and GCC online meeting if necessary later after receiving the feedback and comments on the ToRs from other standing Committees and Motions working group.

Jennifer Mohamed-Katerere suggested to split item d. of the TORs to have another layer of transparency and sharing of information, to be consistent with best governance practice, in the following way:

a. receive a report detailing which applications were rejected and the reasons why

b. Assess all the valid nominations which the Nominations Committee will receive from the Election Officer (Regulation 30) against the respective profiles for the elective positions after consultation, as the case may be, with the Ethics Committee of Council on any issues
of ethics or conflict of interest, or with the Director General on any candidacies from members of staff. The methodology for assessing candidates will include:

The Senior Governance Officer, Luc de Wever raised some questions for discussion of the GCC members, such as whether this change will add additional unnecessary workload on the Election Officer or undermine the level of trust the Election Officer is entrusted by the Council. Legal Advisor also raised the issues whether this change will also imply the change of the ToRs for the Election Officer. These issues were discussed and the GCC agreed that adding measures to ensure transparency and good governance was appropriate.

The GCC Chair explained further the intention of the proposed change and that the change was not intended to imply that the Nominations Committee has powers of appeal or review the decisions taken by the Elections Officer. GCC agreed to propose the change to the Council.

The Nominations Committee, will become operational and start reviewing the proposals submitted by the deadline of 11 December 2019, in time to make recommendations to Council in February 2020.

The process for constituting the Committee was agreed. As was the case in 2016, the Vice Presidents acting as Nominating Committee under Regulation 48 (c) will be requested to make a recommendation to the Bureau for the appointment of the members of the Nominations Committee of Council. They should do so on the basis of the expressions of interest received from Council members, taking into account gender and regional balance as well as a balance among first and second term Vice-Presidents/Council members.

**DRAFT COUNCIL DECISION**

The IUCN Council, on the recommendation of the Governance and Constituency Committee pursuant to Council decision C/95/2,

1. Approves the Terms of Reference of the Nominations Committee of Council (Annex 1) and the process for nominating candidates.
2. Invites members of Council to come forward with expressions of interest to become a member of the Nominations Committee which need to reach the President by 29 October 2019.
3. Requests the Vice Presidents acting as Nominating Committee under Regulation 48 (c) to make a recommendation to the Bureau for the appointment of the members of the Nominations Committee taking into account the expressions of interest received from Council members, gender and regional balance as well as a balance between first and second term Vice-Presidents/Council members.
4. Takes note that the GCC will prepare, in due time for the Bureau to approve before the end of 2019, the Terms of Reference of the:
   - 2020 Congress Finance and Audit Committee; (Annex 2)
   - 2020 Congress Governance Committee; (Annex 3)
   - 2020 Congress Programme Committee; (Annex 4)
   - 2020 Congress Resolutions Committee; (Annex 5)
   - 2020 Congress Procedural Adviser. (Annex 6)
1. Draft IUCN Work Plan 2020, incl. the Commissions’ Work Plans 2020

The IUCN Council,

On the recommendation of the Programme and Policy Committee, **approves** the IUCN 2020 Work Plan including the Commissions’ Work Plans.
Update on motions

221 Motions submitted for Marseille
Thematic clusters

- 11 thematic clusters used to facilitate internal processing and MWG decisions
- Majority of the submitted motions fall under two main thematic clusters:
  - Rights and governance
  - Conservation tools (including Protected Areas)
Geographic scope

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Number of motions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Europe, North and Central Asia</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meso and South America</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North America and the Caribbean</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oceania</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South and East Asia</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Asia</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Europe</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scope: Region the motion pertains to (as marked by Members)

- South and East Asia: 29%
- West Africa: 3%
- West Europe: 3%
- Oceania: 3%
- East Europe, North and Central Asia: 2%
- Meso and South America: 44%
Report to Council

PPC members in attendance: Jan Olov Westerberg (Chair), Amran Hamzah (Deputy Chair), Peter Cochrane, Jonathan Hughes, John Robinson, Ana Tiraa, Natalia Danilina, Michael Hosek, Angela Andrade, Sean Soutey, Kristen Walker.

Commission Deputy Chairs: Madhav Karki, CEM

IUCN Staff in attendance: Cyrie Sendashonga, Jane Smart, Stewart Maginnis, Charles Lor, Juha Siikamaki, Tom Brooks, Alvaro Vallejo, Sonia Peña Moreno

Report writers and support: David Goodman, Victoria Romero, Sandeep Sengupta, Michelle Frausing, Ella Diarra, Dao Nguyen, Raphaëlle Flint, Leonor Ridgway

Opening of the meeting, Saturday 19th October 2019

The PPC Chair, Jan Olov Westerberg, opened the meeting and welcomed members of PPC and staff. The Chair recalled the order of the agenda to follow.

The Chair then mentioned that under AOB an item regarding the “trophies hunting incident” over the last week will be added. When this item is discussed, the Chair and Deputy Chair of the WCEL will be invited to join PPC as well as the Chair of the GCC.

Peter Cochrane reminded PPC of the letter sent by a number of Members to all Councilors on 18 October expressing concerns about the IUCN synthetic biology process including the proposed Council sponsored-motion (which follows-up to Resolution 086 from Hawai‘i). The Chair suggested addressing this issue under AOB.

Cyrie Sendashonga, Global Director for Programme and Policy, recalled another item to be considered under AOB following a message received from a Member in West Asia who asked for an update on the implementation of Resolutions related to conservation and conflict (more specifically: RES 3.046 from 2004 and RES 4.097 from 2008).

Kristen Walker Painemilla, Chair of CEESP, asked for a short report on status of the flagship reports to be put in the agenda under AOB.

The PPC decided to accept the agenda with this addendums.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PPC/1</th>
<th>Draft IUCN Work Plan 2020, incl. the Commissions’ Work Plans 2020, for submission to Council for approval</th>
<th>DEC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Purpose of the agenda item</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The Programme and Policy Committee is invited to consider the IUCN 2020 Work Plan and Budget, including the Commissions’ Work Plans, and provide recommendations to the Council, for its adoption.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Brief summary of the discussion**

Charles Lor (Head, Planning, Monitoring & Evaluation Unit) presented the draft IUCN Work Plan for 2020, the fourth and final year of implementation of the IUCN Programme 2017-2020. He highlighted 3 main issues:

- There has been excellent progress in meeting the programme targets. By the end of the quadrennial programme, it is expected most targets will be achieved.
- Substantial increase in portfolio expected in 2020, to exceed CHF400 million. The B-list will shrink in favour of a larger number of C-list projects.
- The next year will be challenging in that we have to deliver a very successful IUCN Congress, and continue delivering high quality programme results.

Charles also welcomed feedback as to how would the Council like to see progress reported for the next Programme.

The Chair reminded members of the PPC that the focus will be principally on the work plan, as the FAC will address the budget, and the two elements will be brought together during the full Council meeting.

Members of the PPC appreciated the excellent work of the Secretariat to improve the reporting structure during the past few years. Angela Andrade, Chair of CEM, noted however, improvements are needed to better integrate the work of Commissions. She specifically highlighted recent developments in the Red List of Ecosystems.

Reflecting on the current Programme and aspects to improve in the future, Councillors commented that it lacked a system to integrate and connect all the activities in a “big picture” and a more unifying narrative about what IUCN as a Union is doing to change the world. A member suggested that this may have to do with a focus on performance rather than impact, and that future iterations of the work plan and reports should be careful to separate out outputs, outcomes, and impacts more consistently. The concept of “plausible attribution” as a way to think about linking performance to impact was introduced.

Cyrie Sendashonga clarified that a full report on achievements and impacts of the 4-year programme will be provided during Congress when a report is provided highlighting main achievements, including influencing and impact, on a quadrennial time frame. The exercise under consideration in this meeting is the annual workplan with a progress report on last year’s implementation status and what is planned for next year to complete the full cycle.

Some members suggested that consideration should be given to how the targets are connected to one another, whether some targets are unrealistic, and whether we scrutinize some targets more strictly than others. The discussion also touched on the need to better engage the Members in this process, since the work plan and achievements speak to the Union as a whole.

Addressing specific questions on the document under consideration, the Committee noted that much of the budgeted funds for 2020 will be allocated at the national or regional level, and also noted that the number of projects has reduced, while their volume and duration has increased, suggesting that the move from retail to wholesale. On the latter, the Secretariat confirmed that the trend is driven in part by IUCN’s role as an implementing agency for large multilateral funds, and as for the allocation of the budget, this highlights IUCN’s unique convening power and the development of knowledge projects, rather than local implementation. It was suggested this be reflected in the document.

**Conclusions**

The IUCN Council,
On the recommendation of the Programme and Policy Committee, **approves** the IUCN 2020 Work Plan including the Commissions’ Work Plans.
### PPC/2 Specific Programme and Policy issues

#### PPC/2.1 Progress report from the Post 2020 Global Biodiversity Framework Task Force (meeting on 19 October from 19:00)

This item was discussed together with item 3 on the Draft IUCN Programme 2021-24 and the 5Rs approach.

#### PPC/2.2 Report from Council’s Global Oceans Focal Person

**Purpose of the agenda item**

Peter Cochrane, Council’s Global Oceans Focal Person, provided an update on oceans since the last meeting in March 2019.

**Brief summary of the discussion**

Peter Cochrane made a presentation in which he highlighted key updates that have occurred, including the 6th World Ocean Summit in March 2019, BBNJ negotiations progressing, work on deep-sea mining regulations by the International Seabed Authority and work on Blue Bonds.

He highlighted the Special Report on the Ocean and Cryosphere by IPCC in September, which has added confidence levels to a lot of what was already suspected.

He also showed what has not changed since the previous meeting in March 2019, including the continued rise of greenhouse gas emissions and rising pollutants. He emphasized that if the prognosis for the ocean was previously poor, it is now bad if we do not do anything.

He highlighted key actions that need to happen:

- Reach zero net greenhouse gas emissions.
- Reduce plastic use and minimise waste – transformational change needed for production, use, consumer behaviour, recycling and reuse.
- More effectively regulate/manage impacts of extraction (fishing, mining).
- Better integrate ocean governance.
- Increase funding and capacity building.

He noted that we have now passed the point of return to some prior state. We are on a new trajectory no matter what we do.

Finally, he highlighted some steps in the right direction, including BBNJ, the growing number of Marine World Heritage Sites and an increased focus on plastic pollution. IUCN is also making multiple steps in the right direction, including the production of knowledge products and guidelines, and an increased engagement in oceans from Patrons of Nature. The challenge is now to harness this interest from Patrons. He also noted that more clarity is needed over next months on our exact ambitions for marine issues.

He highlighted that the Council now has an opportunity to keep a strong coherent focus on oceans issue and finally highlighted upcoming activities.

PPC felt that this was a very good report on oceans, but noted that it painted a true, but depressing picture. There were queries from the PPC on how blue bonds work and they agreed that it would be good to include a session on this in the future.

Angela Andrade, Chair of CEM, noted a few issues and events that were not mentioned in the presentation, including:

- The UN Decade for sustainable development.
- Work on the Red List of Corals.
- The Red List of Seagrasses presented in SSC meeting in Abu Dhabi.
- The development of the Red List of Mangroves.

Jane Smart, Global Director, Biodiversity Conservation Group, noted that the Post 2020 Global Biodiversity Framework must go beyond CBD. We need relevant content on the marine environment from across all Commissions and Programmes.
Ana Tiraa noted that research on deep sea ocean mining is coming from companies who do not necessarily view it from an environmental side. Peter reiterated that IUCN is deeply involved in the BBNJ process.

Jonathan Hughes queried whether IUCN could think about a vision for oceans, such as has been done for agriculture. What role does IUCN play in articulating such a vision and is it already done by others? Stewart Maginnis, Global Director, Nature-based Solutions, noted that IUCN is well placed to look at this and that we need to start seeing this in a more holistic way. It is no longer just the concern of the Global Marine Programme.

**Conclusions**

The Programme and Policy Committee *notes with appreciation* the update on oceans and *concurs* that the situation of our oceans is critical and that IUCN has an important role to play in this domain.

---

**PPC/2.3 ToR and establishment of a Task Force on Human Rights and Environment (Follow-up from PPC47, March 2019)**

*Purpose of the agenda item*
The PPC is invited to establish the Conservation and Human Rights Task Force and approve its Terms of Reference.

*Brief summary of the discussion*
Kristen Walker, Chair of CEESP, introduced this item. The proposal of establishing a Task Force stems from discussions held at the 47th meeting of the PPC, concerning IUCN’s response and engagement on the issues of Environmental Defenders, Human Rights and Conservation from now through the IUCN Congress. The PPC agreed on the establishment of the TF and recommended the TORs be developed for this session of the PPC.

*Conclusions*

The Programme and Policy Committee *establishes* a Conservation and Human Rights Task Force, *approves* the proposed Terms of Reference (TORs), and *invites* nominations from interested Council members to form part of the Task Force membership.

---

**PPC/2.4 IUCN position/action regarding the fires in tropical forests around the world, especially considering the scenario of deforestation and forest degradation in South America**
The Acting Director General, Grethel Aguilar, joined the PPC at the time of this agenda item on Saturday 19 October.

*Purpose of the agenda item*
Alvaro Vallejo, Regional Director, South America Regional Office, made a presentation to update PPC on the situation faced especially in South America with the recent forest fires in the Amazon.

*Brief summary of the discussion*
Alvaro pointed out to the following:
- Forest fires in the Amazon are not natural fires; almost all of them are caused by human activity; the Brazilian government is promoting the expansion of agricultural crops, so agricultural activity is increasing, causing these fires to spread out of control.
• In Bolivia, several important biomes are affected; 1 million ha of land is affected which is half of the affected area in Brazil. The Bolivian government is also pushing agricultural expansion.
• In Paraguay, the situation is similar, except that the biggest issue is related to soybean culture expansion.
• This issue should not be looked at necessarily through a climate change lens, but it is more about how humans use biomes in these regions.
• The IUCN South American Committee produced a statement and a motion on the importance of looking into forest fires, which has been submitted onto the motion system. Commission experts contributed, as well as the CEC that is defining an action plan about forest fires in these regions.

Angela Andrade agreed that this is an important issue that concerns all of South America and other regions as well. Brazilian researchers have stated that if we transform more than 20% of the Amazon region, the biome will go over its tipping point, and these recent events are a reminder of that. If this was to happen, rainfall patterns would be severely affected and the integrity of these ecosystems would be corrupted. She concurred that the biggest pressure is agricultural transformation and specifically soy plantations. We need to think about who the biggest buyers of products of the Amazons are. If we want to keep the integrity of the Amazon biome, immediate action is needed.

John Robinson commented that the Amazon is drying up because of three factors: anthropogenic causes, climate change which exacerbates fires, and the political push for agricultural transformation. He asked whether there is an opportunity for IUCN to strengthen action and discussion at the political level? Alvaro Vallejo agreed that there is an opportunity, but the problem remains the will of the Brazilian president. IUCN’s biggest opportunity is to work at the state level because they are willing to implement certain policies beyond the Brazilian federal policy. At the regional level, Colombia and Peru are more willing to act.

Jonathan Hughes referred to the UKRI GCRF Trade, Development, and the Environment Hub project which is looking into understanding the pathway of products from field to consumer, and how the transformation of commodities is driving biodiversity loss. It will good to relate this initiative to the issue of tipping points and the critical opportunity to act. It will help to shed light on how the Global North is contributing to driving biodiversity loss.

The Acting Director General addressed the PPC and recalled the challenges faced in the process of preparing and releasing the IUCN statement on the forest fires in the Amazon at the end of August. Even though IUCN works on climate change and ecosystems, we must not forget that we need to talk about the communities who live in these areas and who are suffering, and who are the ones who not only send us pictures, but also are doing the advocacy work. We need to look into the impact that these fires have on communities and indigenous people. This is not just a problem related to natural resources, but also to economic development, and the importance of people having a good standard of life. It is essentially a bigger discussion that has to do with the well-being of people and why they conserve the Amazon. If IUCN does not address this issue, it will become hard to actually act. The situation might be contained, but it has not ended, so IUCN still has much to do she concluded.

Tom Brooks, IUCN Chief Scientist, recommended that IUCN sends out a strong recognition that this is an issue that crosses forests worldwide and that it is equally relevant to the African tropical forests and Asia.

The discussion on this item was briefly continued on Sunday 20 October.

There was a reemphasis on the fact that wildfires are neither new nor geographically localized, and that while we tend to focus on the aftermath and response, the decisions and signals that lead to fires and land clearing are made much earlier. An IUCN response, or potential campaign, should acknowledge this, and note that forest fires relate directly to governance, regulatory, and legal issues, and that this issue will continue to come back in future cycles. A holistic approach is therefore needed, which could be developed in collaboration with the Environmental Law Centre.
Kristen Walker recommended looking at this issue with a long-term vision in view and with a global perspective. She asked PPC to reflect on the sort of mobilization is needed from IUCN.

Alvaro Vallejo alluded to the engagement of the National and Regional Committees of Members in the South America region as a good start. Stewart Maginnis suggested not only looking at this as a “campaigning issue” but as part of our work – Restore, Response and Readiness.

PPC likewise considered the role of the financial sector as an enabling factor in the proliferation of forest fires, as the actors responsible for clearing land are able to access the financial resources to do so. They discussed whether IUCN’s finance-related programmes, such as the Coalition for Private Investment in Conservation (CPIC), could play a role in directing financing toward actors engaged in responsible land stewardship, rather than destructive practices. It was noted that other international organizations, such as the UN Environment Programme Finance Initiative (UNEP-FI), are doing work in this area, but that there is far more that could be done.

Conclusions

The Programme and Policy Committee acknowledges the critical situation of forest fires in the Amazon region as well as other regions of the world and encourages the continuation of a wider discussion about IUCN’s role in contributing to reversing this situation and leading to positive and long-lasting change.

Draft IUCN Programme 2021-24

- Interim synthesis of comments and feedback received on the Draft IUCN Programme 2021-24 issued on 7 May 2019 for the purpose of consultation online and during the RCF (deadline for comments: 30 September 2019).
- Progress report on the development of the draft IUCN Programme 2021-24 to be approved by Council in February 2020 for the purpose of submitting it to the 2020 Congress.

This item includes the update on the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework and the report of the Task Force on that subject as well as the discussion on the “5Rs” approach.

Purpose of the agenda item

Provide an update on the feedback received on the draft IUCN Programme 2021-24 to date. In introducing the item, the Chair of PPC also shared with the group that a more substantive review of the Programme was scheduled in the writing workshop in January 2020 and that steps has to be taken before that to secure a smooth drafting process.

Brief summary of the discussion

In her presentation, Cyrie Sendashonga noted that a large body of comments had been received on the draft Programme to date. This included reports from 11 RCFs, 70 submissions online and 11 submissions sent in writing to the Secretariat from various Members, National and Regional Committees and Commissions groups. While many of the comments were of an editorial nature, it was noted that the feedback helped identify some ‘big picture’ strengths and shortcomings/gaps.

Among the strengths identified were:

(i) the overall structure and broad direction of the programme,
(ii) its identification of key challenges,
(iii) the prioritized programme areas and their linkages to SDGs, and
(iv) the inclusion of the urban and youth dimensions.

Among the shortcomings expressed were that the draft Programme:

(i) lacked ambition, inspiration and a sense of urgency,
(ii) did not sufficiently highlight IUCN’s heartland work (e.g. species and protected areas).
(iii) needed to include inland freshwater systems as a separate programme area, and not combined with lands,
(iv) needed a compelling theory of change,
(v) did not sufficiently recognise the importance of communications, education and public awareness (CEPA), and
(vi) did not fully clarify how the "One Programme" approach would be operationalised in terms of delivery and reporting.

It was also noted that, going forward, the draft Programme would need to take into account recent landmark assessments (e.g. from IPBES and IPCC) to identify the key global challenges that needed to be addressed, and that the Programme would need to connect directly to the SDGs (given that nature underpins the successful delivery of all the SDGs). It was also highlighted that ‘nature-based solutions’ could be offered as a common framework.

The remaining timeline and next steps for the finalization of the draft 2021-24 IUCN Programme were also detailed. It was noted that the Programme finalization process would need to consider key issues such as what should be included the revised version, how do we get to the revised draft to be ready for the Council meeting of February 2020, and roles and responsibilities in the remaining steps.

In the discussion that followed, it was clarified that a Programme ‘writing’ workshop would be held in Gland on 13-16 January 2020 to prepare a revised draft of the Programme, which would then be reviewed by the Council at its February 2020 session. On the question whether any IUCN members would be invited to participate in this Programme drafting/review process, it was clarified that this would normally not be the case, as it would be difficult to identify which members to invite and on what criteria and also because the Council itself was considered to be representative of IUCN’s wider membership’s views. The possibility of inviting representatives from the Global Group for National and Regional committees was mentioned.

It was further noted that the operational scope of the 2021-24 IUCN Programme — especially to what extent its implementation would have a greater involvement of all the three pillars of IUCN (Members, Commissions and Secretariat) — was yet to be fully determined. It was also stressed that the IUCN Programme would need to effectively speak to larger global debates, and demonstrate the contribution of the wider Union on them.

Cyrie Sendashonga concluded by informing the Committee that a note with a roadmap on how to proceed with the revision of the draft from now until the next Council meeting is under preparation for discussion in the Secretariat Leadership Team after which it could also be shared with the PPC and to guide the discussions during the Programme writing workshop planned for January 2020.

Conclusions

The Programme and Policy Committee, takes note of the compilation of comments on the draft IUCN Programme 2021-2024 presented by the Secretariat and equally takes note of the next steps for the revision of the current draft with a view to its presentation to Council in its February 2020 meeting, more clearly linking the new draft to the Post2020 and the 5R approach as a possible overarching communicative framework.

Progress report from the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework Task Force

*Purpose of the agenda item*

Hilde Eggermont, Chair of the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework Task Force joined PPC and briefly presented on the discussions the Task Force had the evening before.

*Brief summary of the discussion*

Hilde highlighted the following linkages between the IUCN Programme and the Post-2020
Global Biodiversity Framework process:

- Sense of urgency
- Programme to support the achievement of the Mission by 2030
- IUCN Programme Areas to be relevant and speak to the ‘nature emergency’
- Crosswalk draft targets (successors to Aichi Targets) to the key objectives of the draft IUCN Programme (how can the Union help deliver on these)?
- Build on input from our members: survey at RCFs collected Members’ views on Post-2020; digest and use this to re-orient the Programme?
- Programme will need a good narrative/framework (5Rs?)
- IUCN Programme Areas to demonstrably and clearly contribute to SDGs and the Post-2020 Framework through appropriate formulation of targets and indicators

Hilde also highlighted the need to broaden up to the linkages among the Rio conventions and other biodiversity related conventions. Specifically on synergies she emphasized the following points discussed by the Task Force:

- The framework should be the vehicle to deliver not only CBD but also the other two Rio Conventions, the biodiversity-related conventions and the SDGs;
- All MEAs are engaging with the development of the Post-2020 framework and this engagement must be capitalized; and
- Countries can identify progress with biodiversity targets when addressing climate change, desertification.

PPC members stressed that our ambition should be higher and beyond CBD, perhaps with a focus on the SDGs. John Robinson, referring to the discussions of the Task Force Saturday evening, commented that the Task Force had emphasized the need for more cohesion between the IUCN Programme and the Post-2020 work.

Antonio Benjamin, WCEL Chair, commented on the importance of including issues related to environment law, rights of nature, and rights and obligations in general into our Programme as well as into our evolving position on post-2020.

**Presentation and discussion on ‘5R’**

*Brief summary of the discussion*

Sean Southey, Chair of CEC, introduced the 5Rs. He indicated that this work was the result of informal discussions with some members of IUCN’s delegation to the meeting of the Open-ended Working Group on Post-2020 (OEWG-1) that took place in Nairobi last August and not from any formal mandate.

The 5Rs (or Re-Vision 2030) standing for Recognize, Retain, Restore, Resource, Reconnect is a multipurpose framework – a call to action, which aims to align IUCN advice to CBD, the IUCN 2021-2024 Programme and the outcomes of the IUCN Congress thus sending a coherent and connected overarching message. It could help frame the IUCN Programme in a useful and inspirational way that speaks to all of the Union; it could be the basis for its theory of change. Finally, it could fill the existing vacuum in the campaign towards 2020.

The discussions centred around views on the 5Rs framework, and how to integrate it into the Programme. Councillors welcomed the 5Rs and the ‘out-of-the-box’ thinking around it, indicating that it would improve the communication aspect of the Programme, provide much needed inspirational message. Some saw in the 5Rs the theory of change currently missing from the draft Programme. There was a suggestion to perhaps change ‘Recognize’ to ‘Respect’ as it conveys a much stronger action.

Peter Cochrane cautioned against restructuring the Programme elements to accommodate the 5Rs, but rather that these should emerge from the content of the draft Programme. Other Councillors echoed this remark, and considered the 5Rs as means to better communicate how the Programme achieves its impact, in other words, it could serve in shaping a powerful and more easily communicable theory of change. Sean Southey indicated that indeed, the next step concerning the links to the Programme would be to map the 5Rs to the current draft.
Kristen Walker noted that timing will be crucial – this IUCN call to action should be presented/tested at the upcoming CBD SBSTTA meeting, and a document (format to be determined) should be developed in the next few weeks, to this end.

Conclusions

The Programme and Policy Committee welcomes the update from the Post-2020 Global Biodiversity Framework Task Force and the work carried out together with the Secretariat; agrees on the unique opportunity presented by the IUCN World Conservation Congress to influence the process of finalization of the Global Biodiversity Framework to be adopted in Kunming, China in 2020; and encourages further thinking on how to integrate the “5Rs” approach in our communications in order to reach wider audiences.

PPC/4 Update on the development of the Project Portal (requested by PPC47, March 2019) INF

Purpose of the agenda item

PPC at its 47th meeting in March 2019 had requested an update on the development of the IUCN Project Portal. Charles Lor, Head of Planning, Monitoring, Evaluation and Risk, made a brief demonstration of the Project Portal and its main features. He emphasized progress made recently and plans for future developments.

Brief summary of the discussion

Charles Lor explained that this is the second iteration, Portal 2.0, which has an improved interface.

He highlighted the main functionality of the Portal and showed how it reveals new sections as items are completed – so the user only views the information required at that stage of the project. Functionality showed includes:

- Basic view of description, budget, what we will do with the project.
- Links to how we are contributing to different targets and how they link to Programme indicators.
- Overview of progress of the project and relevant documents.
- Overview of approval process, allowing teams to request approvals from relevant individuals. This also keeps track of approvals given.

Charles noted that, compared to when we were dealing with everything on paper, the portal has improved our ability to know the status of projects including by identifying where problems are being encountered. The Portal also builds a central repository of all documentation including the templates required.

Charles noted two impacts of the project portal:

1. It has provided a step change in allowing people an overview of projects. It is changing our risk profile in relation to our portfolio coherence.
2. It provides the basis for the annual report provided to Council.

Charles noted that the next step is to develop the Portal 3.0 by improving the Portal and creating an open portal:

1. How can the portal help project leaders and become more than just data collection? For example, by accessing tools and resources.
2. How to build a component in the open Portal that can give public access to search and find projects?
3. Eventually provide data as a Union to the International Transparency Initiative? This is already being done for some projects where it is a donor requirement for this.

The Chair of PPC noted that the Portal looks very elegant and well designed. He enquired about what kind of reports can be generated from the Portal. Charles indicated that the reporting viewing is still in the old viewing format but it is possible to access reports by
Unit, donors, SDGs etc. He informed the Committee that the reporting is being moved to
the new view within the next two months, which will improve the functionality.

Ana Tiraa enquired whether the portal is currently only available to the Secretariat or the
whole Union, and what guidelines are provided for use. Charles replied that the portal is
currently only accessible to the Secretariat as it takes a long time to train people. Users
can access guidelines and additional tools online.

Peter Cochrane noted that it would be helpful for Councilors to have access to view
projects in their region as they are often asked what IUCN is doing in a particular region.
The PPC Chair requested to look into providing Councilors with ‘Read only’ access in the
future.

Cyrie Sendashonga brought to the attention of PPC the huge effort that has gone into
creating the Portal and in preparing it for future public availability. She noted that Charles’
team are also providing regular webinars for staff to ensure correct use. Alvaro Vallejo,
Regional Director for South America, noted that the portal has been very helpful for his
region and is used every day.

**Conclusions**

The Programme and Policy Committee **takes note** of the update on the
Project Portal and **welcomes** the progress made in further developing
the portal and its functionalities.

---

**PPC/5 Annual Update on Evaluations**

**Purpose of the agenda item**

Charles Lor (Head of Planning, Monitoring, Evaluation and Risk
Management) presented an annual update on evaluations. He highlighted three key
evaluation reviews at different stages of development:

1. The Land Degradation Neutrality Project Terminal Evaluation (completed)
2. The Swiss Development Cooperation (SDC) review (ongoing)
3. The External Review (currently at the procurement phase and will happen next
   year)

**Brief summary of the discussion**

Regarding the Land Degradation Neutrality Project Terminal Evaluation, he highlighted
that this is one of the key successes of the year. It was externally evaluated by a consultant
and found cost-efficient and effective. The evaluators had recommendations on the
following:

1. Gender mainstreaming: even though there were some activities for gender
   inclusion, they appear to be more of an afterthought. In the future, they should be
   more integrated throughout the project, started on onset. IUCN now has a gender
   mainstreaming policy, which should help to that effect.
2. The team agreed with the consultant on the need for policy foundation and
   improved targets, which the organization is working on.

On the Swiss Development cooperation (SDC) review of IUCN’s relevancy, Charles
mentioned that the SDC did not want this to be a simple review, but rather look into how
IUCN translates its theory of change and uses it to generate knowledge, change policy,
apply solutions and deliver; and specifically, how does IUCN use its theory of change to
deliver actual systemic transformation.

The SDC review could be interesting for IUCN to understand how its theory of change
plays in practice, at the global, regional and country level. The review is looking into
countries such as Myanmar, Senegal, and Jordan to examine impact at the ground level.
To note that the consultants are traditional development generalists and experts on rural
development, and have almost no knowledge of IUCN. They studied the regions of South
East Asia, the Middle East, and Africa, which is where the Swiss have strategic interests.
At the country level, they scrutinized specific projects. An example of a regional project would be looking into water management in the Mekong region. At the global level, they focused on case studies and examined IUCN’s work with the CBD for example. They used the angle of Nature-based Solutions as a framework that triggers economic, social and environmental changes; teams have been heavily mobilized in that effort. This review should be interesting not only for Council, but also it is essential in ensuring wide donor support.

On the Quadrennial External Review, Charles mentioned that past reviews focused on specific themes, but framework partners have now demanded a more traditional OECD DAC review. Therefore, this review is a traditional and basic review with criteria. However, even though it is traditional, it is still key to ensure donor support. This review will focus on the programmatic aspect, and it will be delivered before Congress. Currently IUCN is still determining what country case studies will look like.

Cyrie Sendashonga highlighted the experience at the 14th meeting of the Conference of the Parties (COP14) of the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification held last month in New Delhi, India, when several governments delegations were thankful for IUCN’s work and assistance on the Land Degradation Neutrality Project, because it positively affects the implementation of SDG 15.3. IUCN helped on both the technical part, but also for obtaining funding from the global mechanism of the GEF dedicated for land degradation. This is an example of IUCN’s impact and influence. About the SDC review, she said it is an educational lesson if we can convince evaluators who are not from our core conservation community that biodiversity is relevant and important to the traditional development agenda. About the external review, she said that unfortunately its timing is not well synchronized with the timeline of the development of the 2021-2024 Programme to timely feed the lessons into the preparation of the next draft to be completed by February 2020.

After a question from the PPC Chair, Charles clarified that the SDC review is specifically asking about the relevance of IUCN’s work to the development sector, more specifically how the theory of change expressed in the 2017-2020 Programme plays out in practice and translates in development impacts. He said that there will at least be a draft with key elements of the findings, in time for WCC.

Conclusions

The Programme and Policy Committee takes note of the update on evaluations and encourages the Secretariat to continue to extract lessons learned from evaluations carried out so far to guide future evaluations.

PPC/6

Follow-up on assignments (2016 Congress Resolutions requiring action from Council)

PPC/6.1

Update on the development of the IUCN Environmental Impact Classification for Alien Taxa (EICAT) (WCC-2016-Res-018) Postponed from PPC47, March 2019

Purpose of the agenda item

The PPC is invited to take note of the progress made to date toward an IUCN standard classification of the impact of invasive alien species, as mandated under WCC-2016-Res-018.

Brief summary of the discussion

Jane Smart presented the update on IUCN Environmental Impact Classification of Alien Taxa (EICAT), an assessment process that classifies alien species into one of five ‘impact’ categories according to the magnitude of the detrimental impacts to the environment. Jane presented what has been done since the adoption of WCC-2016-Res-018 toward an IUCN standard classification of the impact of invasive alien species.

The process of developing EICAT has followed from the KBA Standard consultation process which had two rounds of public consultation. Currently Version 2 is under editing.
Followed by review by IUCN editorial board before being submitted to SSC Steering committee and finally IUCN Council for adoption as an IUCN Standard for the classification of the impact of invasive alien species, with a view to launch EICAT at IUCN World Conservation Congress 2020.

PPC briefly discussed that rationale behind this system, how EICAT will be used and linked with other regional legislation on alien and invasive species such as the European Union.

In response to a question from John Robinson, the Secretariat clarified that the knowledge created by EICAT will help governments and other stakeholders to take urgent action to intervene quickly to prevent AIS’ impacts on biodiversity and local communities. EICAT is a move from information into a system of quantification that is transparent and accountable, quantifiable.

Following a question from Michael Hosek, it was also mentioned that IUCN SSC Invasive Species Specialist Group and Global Species Programme have been working closely with the European Union and have been involved in the legislation process, providing technical support to the European Commission for the implementation of the European Union Regulation (No 1143/2014) on the prevention and management of the introduction and spread of invasive alien species (IAS).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PPC/6.2</th>
<th>Update on the development of a policy statement on the importance of the conservation of primary forests (WCC-2016-Res-045) Follow-up to PPC47, March 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Purpose of the agenda item</td>
<td>The PPC is provided with an update on the development of a policy statement on the importance of primary forests (Resolution 045 from Hawai‘i)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brief summary of the discussion</td>
<td>Stewart Maginnis reported on RES 045 (Primary Forests) and the work of the Task Force on Primary Forests. Since the last Council meeting, a first draft policy document was produced and a second draft will be under consultation until November 29. The final version of the document is expected by January 15, 2020. One of draft recommendations emerging from the document, was that IUCN work on post-2020 CBD targets, Nature Based Solutions and the SDG framework and goals should focus on integrated solutions that prioritise protection and restoration of ecosystem integrity and improve the long-term conservation outlook for primary forests. Answering a question from the Climate Change Task Force about what IUCN is doing for primary forests, Stewart highlighted a number actions such as a joint initiative with 3 African countries and the Protected Areas programme to use PA categories V and VI for land-use stabilization, and restoration assessments that have allowed to identify remnants of primary forests. He also indicated that this is a priority for the Forest Conservation Programme, working jointly with Protected Areas Programme.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PPC/6.3</th>
<th>Update on progress made with implementation of WCC-2016-Res-030 (ICCAs) and (WCC-2016-Res-075) Indigenous cultures)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Purpose of the agenda item</td>
<td>PPC provided an update on implementation of Resolution from 2016 030 (ICCAs) and 075 on indigenous cultures.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Brief summary of the discussion | Kristen Walker, Chair of CEESP, reported on progress implementing WCC-Hawaii-Res-030 (ICCAs) and (WCC-2016-Res-075) on Indigenous cultures. She highlighted the following activities:  
- Res 030: Recognising and respecting the territories and areas conserved by indigenous peoples and local communities (ICCAs) overlapped by protected |

INF
areas:

- There is a publication in progress on Best practice guidance to be ready for Congress. The ICCA Consortium has highlighted its concerns covered by the Resolution in work at the Latin America Parks Congress and in the context of the CBD.

- Res 075: Affirmation of the role of indigenous cultures in global conservation efforts:

- 19 member organisations held 2 meetings in Guatemala to exchange knowledge and IP members from the region attended at a high level at the regional Mesoamerican RCF.

- On the occasion of the World Indigenous Day 2019, the ADG issued a strong statement affirming the essential role of IPs.

- At the Latin American Parks Congress, IPs played an organising role and produced three declarations as an output. IPs are also engaged in the climate debate where CEESP held an event in August to support efforts to prepare IPs for the UNFCCC COP in Chile in December 2019.

- A publication on Indigenous traditional knowledge contributing to conservation and natural resources: legal opportunities and challenges is coming up and targeted for sharing at UNFCCC, UNPFII, 2020 IUCN Congress. Additionally, in preparation for the Marseille Congress, IP members will hold a summit with approx. 100 IP leaders provisionally just before the Congress. Financing is still being found — Councillor Ramiro Batzin is keeping an eye on this. The PPC Chair offered to act as a contact point to bring in a Sami representative member.

Kristen also mentioned that Anita Tzec from the Maya Indigenous community of Belize has been recently hired as IUCN IPO Officer and will work more closely with our IPO Members.

Finally, she mentioned that voluntary guidelines regarding the appropriate participation of indigenous peoples in the development, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of conservation projects, programmes and policies are under development.


Purpose of the agenda item

The CEM chair, Angela Andrade, provided an update to PPC on the development of the Global Standard on Nature-based Solutions.

Brief summary of the discussion

Angela introduced the discussion by providing a brief background of IUCN’s work on nature-based solutions, the NbS definition that had been formally adopted by Members at the Hawaii Congress, and the mandate that had been given for IUCN to develop a global standard on it. She drew attention to the growing influence of the NbS concept over the years, noting the heightened momentum and awareness that could now be seen on it across multiple fora.

She shared that in addition to the ‘wholesale’ NbS initiatives that IUCN was implementing on the ground (including through GCF projects), the Commission on Ecosystem Management together with the Secretariat were now developing a facilitative framework, in the form of a standard, that could serve as an authoritative, common reference point against which NbS approaches and policies could be assessed and improved. In this regard, she presented the 8 NbS principles that had been agreed to in IUCN Resolution
6.069 and how these linked with the 8 criteria that had been currently proposed for the NbS standard.

She also explained the process that had been followed for the development of the standard to date, highlighting the two rounds of open consultation that had been held, with 500+ people participating from across 100 countries. She also noted that the NbS standard was proposed to be compatible with the ISEAL Alliance Code of Good Practice, with the option of 1st party accreditation (self-assessment) and with possibility of 2nd or 3rd party accreditation in the future. In terms of next steps, she noted that the feedback gathered in the second consultation process would be integrated, and that a final version of the standard criteria and indicators would be presented at the 98th Council session, following which the approved criteria and indicators would be added to the Council-sponsored motion on this topic. She also shared that the aim was for CEM to conduct a periodic review of the NbS standard every 4 years.

In the discussion that followed, it was clarified – in response to a question on the syntax of NbS and its links to the framing used by the CBD – that the NbS approach of IUCN was a more comprehensive, integrated, and expansive one. In response to a question on how could IUCN maintain its leadership position given the rapidly growing wave and momentum on NbS, it was suggested that developing the NbS standard, and bringing in the latest science both from the social and ecological dimensions, would help it do just that. In response to the apparent divergence that was noted in the IUCN mandate, which had called for the development of NbS parameters, principles and guidelines (rather than a standard), it was clarified that given the growing, and unanticipated, demand for such a standard, it was now logical for IUCN to do so, also to demonstrate its intellectual leadership in this space. A practical example of NbS for disaster risk reduction in Japan was also shared.

**PPC/7**

**Update on the 2020 Congress motions process – including the role of Council members during the online discussion of motions, in particular the Council sponsored motions**

**Purpose of the agenda item**

The PPC is invited to take note of the update on the submission of motions for the IUCN World Conservation Congress 2020.

**Brief summary of the discussion**

Sonia Peña Moreno, Motions Coordinator, provided an overview of the motions process to the PPC. She emphasised that the process is unique, and reminded Councillors how the motions process connects to IUCN’s policy cycle, as motions are adopted as Resolutions and Recommendations at the Members’ Assembly. She highlighted that the motions process was revised before the Hawai’i Congress and that most elements now take place via an online portal. She then turned to the submission process for the Marseille Congress and highlighted some preliminary statistics on the number of motions (221 – the highest ever), the scope, and the topics of motions. Finally, she informed the PPC on next steps – the meeting of the Motions Working Group (MWG) next week, the publication date, the online discussion, the electronic voting and the debate of motions during the Members’ Assembly in Marseille.

Councillors who participated in the motion submission process for their Member organisations provided insights on how the revised process affected their decisions to propose or co-sponsor motions. In some cases, the additional information requested on the submission form caused them to be more careful about which kinds of motions they put forward for consideration.

The Committee noted that there were a large number of motions submitted pertaining to “Rights and Governance”. The Secretariat confirmed that this has been the case in past Congresses, and that the category encompasses several sub-categories. They also noted that there were fewer “Species”-related motion than in Hawai’i.

Councillors also discussed which motions are expected to be controversial, anticipating that those that address synthetic biology and trophy hunting are likely to be the sources
of heated debate. The Secretariat noted that almost 1/3 of the motion submissions were flagged as potentially controversial, but that this assessment is highly subjective.

The discussion also covered the online discussion, including the role of Councillors vis-à-vis Council-sponsored motions, noting that it would be useful for a Council focal point to keep an eye on those discussions, participate as needed, and keep themselves informed. It was also pointed out that the Secretariat Motions Team would facilitate participation for Members that lack consistent internet on a case-by-case basis, and that more time was allocated precisely to allow everyone to participate in the online discussion.

The Committee commended and congratulated the Secretariat Motions team for the great work done so far in supporting the motions submission process and planning for the work of the Motions Working Group.

Conclusions

The Programme and Policy Committee takes note of the update on the submission of motions for the IUCN World Conservation Congress 2020.

### PPC/8

**Reports from Task Forces established by PPC**

#### PPC/8.1 Urban TF (meeting on 19 October from 17:00 to 19:00)

**Purpose of the agenda item**

The Urban Task Force presented an update of its work since the last Council.

**Brief summary of the discussion**

Jonny Hughes presented the report, presenting the Theory of Change of the TF: ‘Why we are needed; What will we do; and “How will the world be better?”’. He briefly explained about the Urban Nature Index: (Science-Based) within cities, which has three dimensional index – urban, bioregional and global.

He updated PPC on the outputs and activities of this year including:

- Publication of the Living Cities Report
- Establishment of the bodies running the IUCN Urban Alliance including the Strategic Board, Project Board, Technical Expert Group and Members.
- Identification of c. 50 IUCN Members actively working on urban initiatives
- Identification of over 30 major urban projects across the Union
- Collation and/or writing of 12 blogs on urban nature
- Co-organisation of the Urban Biodiversity and Natural Capital Accounting workshop at the World Bank
- Contribution to advocacy efforts including chairing Salzburg Global Seminar, keynote at London National Park City launch, Regional Conservation Fora, Urban Nature Working Group, etc.
- Production of a first draft of pillar 1 of the IUCN Urban Nature Index
- Securing an urban pavilion at the IUCN World Conservation Congress
- Relocation of the Director (Russell Galt) across to the IUCN Secretariat

The Chair of the Task Force also reported that the urban agenda is linking its work to the UN Decade on Ecosystem Restoration, providing inputs into the post-2020 discussion in particular on Science-based Targets (SBTs) to cities. The Urban Task Force has also secured funding for a pavilion at the IUCN World Conservation Congress 2020, focusing on solutions, providing platforms for Members to share their views and see how to take the conversation forward.

PPC members asked on linkages and synergies between the work carried out in Europe on NBS. The Chair of the Task Force recommended contacting the team (Russell Galt, Director IUCN Urban Alliance and Chantal van Ham, EU Programme Manager Nature-based Solutions at IUCN EU Representative Office).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PPC/8.2</th>
<th><strong>Private Sector TF</strong> <em>(meeting on the 19 October from 15:00 to 17:00)</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Purpose of the agenda item**

PSTF to provide an update to PPC, including plans to engage businesses at the Congress 2020, and IUCN’s engagement with the extractives sector. Finally, to submit the following to the PPC: a request to “the PPC to support the consistent application of the Operational Framework on Engagement with the Extractives Sector in all aspects of the IUCN project portfolio that relates to and or is resourced by the extractive sector.”

**Brief summary of the discussion**

John Robinson, Chair of the Private Sector Task Force (PSTF), presented on the meeting of the PSTF. He highlighted IUCN’s ongoing business engagements to assess the nature of those relationships, as well as plans for the Congress, including a CEO Summit. The ambition would be to launch a far-reaching commitment to conservation.

More broadly, there are some relationships that are more philanthropic in nature, while in other cases IUCN works with businesses to help them more positively impact biodiversity. The PSTF also looked at renewable energy and pollution, with a focus on the circular economy. Peter Cochrane noted that we have a strong base to work from through the Global Marine and Polar Programme (GMPP), and their work on plastics.

The presentation then looked at how the Union engages businesses, and the potential to allow them to become Members. These could be businesses that rely on conservation for their business models, those that are trying to lead on conservation issues, or others. One option would be to allow businesses join as Affiliates, but the prevailing view is that it would be premature to do so at present.

Finally, John Robinson highlighted the Operational Framework on Engagement with the Extractives Sector developed in cooperation with the Business and Biodiversity Programme (BBP). The application has not always been consistent, and the PSTF proposed to that PPC takes a decision to support the application of that Framework across the Union’s engagement with the extractives sector, including throughout the regions.

The Chair of PPC, noted that it would be difficult to take such a decision, as the Framework had not been circulated to the Committee prior to the meeting. It was also questioned whether applying the Framework consistently across different units required a decision from the PPC and Council, or whether this was rather an operational issue to be addressed by management within the Secretariat.

Some Councillors noted that while in many cases that would be appropriate, given the nature of the Union’s engagement with the extractives sector, and the considerable reputational – and therefore strategic – risks involved, this should also be seen as a strategic issue, and therefore it was important to have Council oversight.

John Robinson noted that the goal is to acknowledge that the framework exists, and make a recommendation to seek ways to include considerations of engagement through that process. Projects that engage with the private sector should be reviewed through the operational framework. He further noted that the PSTF and the Business and Biodiversity Programme have worked on this issue for a long time, but have noticed that unfortunately, it is not applied systematically.

The Committee noted that this issue is not particularly time sensitive, and that a better approach would be to table the discussion at the next meeting of the PPC, with the Operational Framework circulated for consultation ahead of time. This approach was welcomed by John Robinson and Stewart Maginnis, who noted that this would also provide time for the Framework to be updated, including the addition of some Key Performance Indicators.

**Conclusions**

The PPC agreed that there is indeed a need for IUCN projects to use the framework more systematically when engaging with the private sector and especially the extractives sector as this poses a reputational risk to the organization. PPC agreed to put this item on the agenda for its next meeting in order to complete the discussion.
Climate Change TF (meeting on the 19 October from 13:00 to 15:00)

Purpose of the agenda item

The Chair of the Climate Change Task Force provided an update on the work of the TF.

Brief summary of the discussion

Angela Andrade as chair of the TF started with an update on the recent-climate related work done by IUCN’s secretariat including:

- Launch of IUCN-Oxford University report on Nature-based Solutions in Nationally Determined Contributions (NDCs)
- Launch of ECCA30 to bring 30 million ha of degraded/deforested land in Europe, the Caucasus & Central Asia into restoration by 2030 (IUCN, UNECE, FAO, WRI, World Bank)
- Various high-level events on NBS to climate change in New York, Geneva etc.
- Publication of an IUCN assessment on World Heritage Site glaciers,
- IUCN guidance on ‘Estimating the mitigation potential of forest landscape restoration’,
- Examples of regional/national work on climate change like, a) development of vulnerability assessments and climate change adaptation plans for wetlands in South East Asia b) Supporting NBS-NDC development and implementation in Morocco and Tunisia and c) Communicating EU Horizon 2020 ‘Grow Green’ project on NBS in cities.
- Lastly, plans for UNFCCC COP25 in Chile like the launch of Oceans deoxygenation report and continued engagement on NBS, forests, oceans, EbA, IPs, gender, etc.

It was noted that next year would be important, as the Paris Agreement would start to be implemented.

This was followed by presentation of main outcomes from the Commission specialist groups including:

- WCPA: active engagement in Latin America PA Congress, developing issues brief on ‘PAs and climate change’, PANORAMA case-studies, inputs for World Heritage Convention climate policy
- SSC: SSC Leaders Meeting in Abu Dhabi, inputs for CBD paper on ‘Invasives & climate change’, contributing to IPCC assessments in South Africa, incorporating climate change in Red Listing process
- WCEL: project to develop laws and regulations to ‘get to zero’, preparations for 2nd Environmental Law Congress in 2020, identifying synergies between CBD and UNFCCC/lessons that can be applied from experience of Paris Agreement
- CEESP: assessing environmental/climate impacts on IPs, support to IPs in Chile, launch of new SG on ‘people and oceans’, mainstreaming indigenous & tradition knowledge in UNFCCC (LCIP).
- CEM: strongly engaged on climate change, developing case-studies on EbA for climate-smart agriculture, FEBA events on EbA/Eco-DRR in Chile, development of NBS standard (not just in CC but also other societal challenges), contributions to standards on ecological restoration (SER)

The Chair of the Task Force also shared that out of 221 motions submitted that will be reviewed by the Motions Working Group, a rough analysis shows that there were 18 motions focusing mainly on climate change but approx.138 motions have some connection to the topic.

The last section of the presentation summarized a discussion the TF had, including:

- Call for IUCN to be more ambitious, impactful, and less siloed, on climate change – to better mobilise its global membership
- Suggestion to establish a new IUCN commission/standing committee on climate change in council to this end – & feedback from PPC & Commission Chairs – we need perhaps to wait for the next council.
- Need for IUCN to highlight forest protection vs restoration currently, especially of
primary forests (in addition to restoration), in its policy messaging.

- Importance of being mindful of newly published science on the possible limits/overestimates of NBS as carbon sinks, greenwashing etc.
- Urgency of providing inputs for climate-related targets in post-2020 biodiversity framework and red list assessments – recommendation from Wendy.
- Creating greater space in the Marseille Congress for discussing how to further strengthen IUCN’s climate efforts.
- Finally, Angela reported that she had invited the TF members to provide additional inputs.

PPC/9 Other issues announces in advance

The Chair had announced that under this item three issues would be discussed: 1) the matter of the incident when an report was on trophy hunting was re-published by the WCEL; 2) the letter from a group of Members addressed to Council regarding the IUCN process on synthetic biology and calling for the withdrawal of the Council-sponsored motion on the subject; and 3) the issue of the Resolutions on conflict and the environment which a Member of the West Asia and Middle East region had requested to be added to the agenda of PPC. The Chair also mentioned that PPC would receive a short update from Juha Siikamaki, IUCN Chief Economist, on the preparation of the first IUCN flagship report “The State of Nature in a Globalized World: Conflict, Migration and Nature”.

Regarding the issue of communication on trophy hunting, the Acting Director General addressed PPC and presented the facts. On 27 September 2019, the WCEL re-published a report critical on trophy hunting by the WCEL Ethics SG on the Commission’s section of the IUCN webpage. The report was originally published as part of the Council’s proceeding of 2017. Unfortunately, this report, which was not new nor an IUCN policy position, was taken by the media as being a new report and misinterpreted as conveying IUCN’s position on the subject. The article was removed from the website temporarily, at the direction of the ADG, and a disclaimer added clarifying the date of issue of this WCEL report and providing further context.

The ADG mentioned that an IUCN Member, the Born Free Foundation, which is seeking to ban trophy hunting and which also has submitted a motion to WCC on this issue, has been sending numerous letters and messages to Secretariat asking about IUCN’s position on this issue. Secretariat and councillors have also received letters from other organisations with the opposite opinion. The ADG decided to release a statement explaining IUCN’s policy on sustainable use adopted in Amman YEAR, and providing a link to the full set of reports from the Council’s deliberations in 2017.

She said that she had been having discussions with Commissions on the need for more training and guidelines on the use of the IUCN website, and the formation and sharing of policy positions within IUCN.

Antonio Benjamin, Chair of WCEL, addressed PPC and provided some background on the work of the WCEL Ethics Specialist Group.

Denise Antolini, Deputy Chair, WCEL, then complemented the information provided by Antonio. She regretted the unfortunate circumstances that had led to the incident and apologised for any inconvenience caused to IUCN, and she explained the need for Commissions to put more information out about their work but in a manner that does not lead to the sort of misunderstandings created by the re-posting of the Ethics SG report on trophy hunting. Denise also clarified the need for contextualization of information on issues which can be seen as controversial, and committed to work together with the secretariats communications team on a training for commissions.

Jennifer Katerere, Chair of GCC, recalled and clarified the context in which the initial report was produced back in 2017. She responded to Antonio Benjamin’s assertion that the document from the WCEL Ethics Specialist Group was a policy position clarifying that policies for IUCN can only come from Members at Congresses. She questioned whether the release of the statement by the ADG was enough for addressing any IUCN reputational risk or damage. She also mentioned the ongoing discussion about the roles and responsibilities of the different constituent bodies of IUCN in terms of conveying policy positions on behalf of the Union.
Antonio Benjamin then argued against the mentioning of reputational damage in this context.

The ADG reassured PPC that the management of the incident was appropriate and reminded everyone of the very hard work of the Communications Team in controlling the situation.

John Robinson recommended being clearer in our internal procedures with respect to conveying what IUCN policy is and what is not.

Cyrie Sendashonga recalled the Revised Policy System of IUCN approved by Council in 2010 that clearly identifies who defines policy in IUCN.

Jon Paul Rodriguez, Chair SSC, emphasized the need to hear all voices and opinions on every aspect in IUCN's work and recognized that for this particular issue, IUCN might need to be clearer and define its policy position.

Kristen Walker mentioned that because of the nature of our Union, we are bound to hear all voices. However, she stressed that clarity is needed in terms of what constitutes IUCN's policy, what constitutes an opinion, etc.

John Robinson mentioned the motion that Born Free Foundation had submitted for the Marseille Congress and said he anticipates the motion to be very controversial during the debate at WCC and that we should be prepare for this.

Finally, the Chair of PPC recalled the rich discussion and highlighted that IUCN is a Union of Members with very diverse opinions and that this spirit should be maintained. He agreed however, that more is needed in terms of reinforcing the internal procedures to avoid risk to the image of the Union, but also in clarifying the responsibilities and procedures for creating IUCN policy. He also acknowledged the explanation given by the WCEL and concluded that the discussion on the substance of the issue must follow the proper procedures starting with the discussions in the Motions Working group on the submitted motion and then in the ordinary process for handling of motions. The incident also must be used as an opportunity across the union to strengthen our handling of controversial issues.

The ADG then brought forward the issue of the Members in ROWA who alerted the ADG about the lack of follow-up from IUCN to Resolutions dealing with conflict, peace and the environment. Members had written to the Secretariat requesting this issue be added to the Council agenda.

Cyrie Sendashonga was given the floor. She mentioned that Resolution 3.046 (adopted in the 2004 WCC), Conservation in regions in violent conflict of West Asia – strengthening IUCN’s presence to protect the natural and human environment, is still an “ACTIVE” Resolution, but that there is little information in the activity reports database regarding the implementation especially given that the new way of reporting on progress in implementation of WCC Resolutions and Recommendations was systematized only after the 2012 WCC, with assignment of focal points (who can be drawn from Secretariat, Commissions and Members) who proved a report on a yearly basis that allows Global Policy Unit to prepare a consolidated report for the first meeting of Council each year starting with the year after Congress.

Likewise regarding Resolution 4.097 Liability and compensation mechanisms for environmental crimes during armed conflicts (adopted at the 2008 WCC), Cyrie said it is still “ACTIVE”, but there is no additional information in the status of implementation as there are no Activity Reports on the Resolutions platform.

The Programme and Policy Committee takes note of the sensitivity on the issue of trophy hunting and the risk associated with uncertainties on IUCN policy on the subject, and further takes note of the explanation given by the ADG and the WCEL on the origin and handling of the issue.
She also noted that one of the challenges we face with implementation of WCC Resolutions is the still prevailing perception that it is the sole responsibility of the Secretariat while it should be a responsibility of all parts of the Union.

The Programme and Policy Committee takes note of the critical importance of this issue, in particular for some regions of the world, and acknowledges the need for continued discussion on the wider subject of conservation, environment and peace in conflict-ridden areas, and on ways and means to make progress on the implementation of existing Resolutions.

Regarding the issue of the letter by Members on synthetic biology, the PPC Chair suggested answering the letter by recalling the task given to IUCN and Council through Resolution 086 from the 2016 WCC. PPC members agreed this was a good way forward.

Juha Siikamaki, Chief Economist, made a presentation on the status of development of the IUCN flagship report “State of Nature in a Globalized World: Conflict, Migration and Nature”.

After the presentation, Councilors welcomed the progress made and highlighted the importance of IUCN’s work on this issue. Some expressed surprise that climate change did not feature more prominently in the presentation as a major potential driver of conflict and migration, something which has been recognized by the international community. Extreme weather events are also closely linked to these issues, and will feature in the publication. Councilors suggested that more explicit linkages to IUCN’s work on land degradation neutrality could be made, and that the report should be sure to include both international migration and internal displacement.

Members of the PPC recognized that much of the literature on these topics is old and fragmented, and that the IUCN Flagship report could potentially draw a lot of interest, including traction in the media, and that a communications and dissemination strategy should be developed as soon as possible. Close collaboration with the Commissions and Members was recommended, and it was noted that Commission experts could review drafts that touch on their respective areas of expertise. In planning for dissemination, the first deliverable will be a report, but there are opportunities for complementary products, such as an online platform to present some of the data underlying the research.

The PPC Chair thanked everyone and adjourned the meeting at 5:55 pm on Sunday 20 October.