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A Personal Summary

By
Simon Stuart

Chair, IUCN Species Survival Commission
The Background

In the 1960s and 1970s, when the IUCN Species Survival Commission (SSC) – and indeed the entire conservation movement – was much smaller than it is today, meetings of the SSC were a regular occurrence. The charismatic SSC Chair of the time, Sir Peter Scott, essentially travelled the world and held meetings of the Commission at least twice a year, and often more frequently. There was essentially no budget, and so the SSC members for the most part dug into their own pockets in order to attend. Of course, many members did not have the means to attend SSC meetings in some far-flung part of the world, but most of them were able to attend when the meetings were in their own regions. During the course of Sir Peter’s long tenure as SSC Chair, probably most SSC members were able to attend a Commission meeting at least once, and often much more. Although these meetings had a regional flavour, it is amazing how many members from other parts of the world attended, so there was always an added global flavour. These SSC-wide meetings were essentially the social glue that held the SSC together in an age when communications were by letter, and could take weeks or even months, international phone calls being prohibitively expensive for most SSC members.

During the 1980s, when I started my association with the SSC, the regular meetings were still travelling the world, but I think it is fair to say that by this time they had lost some of their original dynamism, and they were certainly becoming less frequent. A much larger and increasingly busy SSC membership was asking awkward questions, such as “what is the purpose of the meetings?” People were finding it harder to attend, or to justify their attendance. Soon, the idea of SSC-wide meetings became restricted to a single day meeting held just before each IUCN World Conservation Congress – in other words once every four years. The last SSC-wide meeting not linked to an IUCN Congress was held in Rome in August 1989, hosted by Luigi Boitani (and incidentally one of the best meetings held!).

Probably three factors gave rise to the demise of the SSC-wide meetings. First, as the number of Specialist Groups (SGs) grew (and hence the number of SSC members expanded from hundreds to thousands worldwide), the SSC membership increasingly became dominated by true specialists, many of whom were not interested in hearing what was going on in the SSC beyond their own SG. Second, as the membership and leadership of the SSC expanded greatly beyond the richer countries, it became increasingly difficult to hold regionally balanced meetings, especially if SSC members were expected to travel at their own cost, as was the case. And third, the advent of the fax, and email soon after, meant that communications within the SSC suddenly became much quicker, cheaper and easier; no longer did people feel that they needed to attend a meeting in order to have a sense of belonging.

At the same time, we have seen a huge proliferation of focused, targeted SSC meetings dealing with particular issues. These include a wide range of SG meetings, and workshops on Red Listing and Population and Habitat Viability Assessments among many others. Meetings under the SSC umbrella probably take place somewhere in the world in almost every week of the year. But these meetings serve a very different purpose from the old SSC-wide meetings.

Despite the much faster and easier electronic communications that have brought about a level of information sharing within the SSC that our forebears could never have dreamed of, there has been a growing sense of unease within the SSC leadership, and especially on the Steering Committee, that we have lost something. As Russ Mittermeier, the long-serving Chair of the SSC Primate SG, says:
“we are all still social primates”. Ultimately, we need to spend time together and to get to know each other if the SSC is to function to its potential. Electronic communications are great, but they don’t generate that sense of belonging and commitment that is essential to a well-functioning and effective network. David Brackett, SSC Chair from 1996 to 2004, first floated the idea of a meeting of SSC SG Chairs. The problem was finding a means of paying for it. David’s successor, Holly Dublin, continued to pursue the idea, and this is when the Environment Agency Abu Dhabi (EAD) stepped forward and, with extraordinary generosity, paid for the first ever SSC SG Chairs’ Meeting, held in Al Ain in February 2008. This was attended by the Steering Committee and the great majority of SG Chairs, and was universally considered to have been a huge success by all those who participated.

And so, when EAD approached me early in my term as SSC Chair to offer once again to host a meeting of the broad SSC leadership, I seized on this generous offer. The 23-27 February 2012 SSC Chairs’ Meeting was held in Abu Dhabi and was on an even more ambitious scale than the one held four years earlier. In addition to the Steering Committee and SG Chairs, the meeting included members of all of the SSC Sub-Committees, many Red List Authority Focal Points, all the Red List Partner organizations and other close SSC collaborators, representatives from the other IUCN Commissions, over 20 staff from the Global Species Programme (GSP) in the IUCN Secretariat, all of the IUCN regional offices (including every SSC focal point in these offices), senior managers from IUCN headquarters, the President of IUCN, and many friends and colleagues from Abu Dhabi. In total we had over 300 participants, and none of this would have been possible without the extraordinary generosity of the EAD, and especially of its Secretary General, HE Razan Khalifa Al Mubarak. We are also most grateful to the Mohamed bin Zayed Species Conservation Fund (MBZ) for its support.

The most remarkable thing about the contribution from EAD and MBZ is their willingness to support a large, expensive, international meeting that is not primarily focused on taking decisions or producing results. Although there are plenty of outputs and decisions recorded in the 140-page report of the meeting, its primary focus was actually to forge new partnerships and relationships within and around the SSC – in other words to be the social glue of the SSC, much as the old SSC-wide meetings were in the 1960s and 1970s. Ironically, I suspect that a meeting that is not tied to producing a narrow set of pre-defined results can actually achieve much more in terms of tangible conservation benefits. In this respect, the February 2012 SSC Chairs’ Meeting was one of the most dynamic, stimulating and useful ones that I have ever attended – and I go to a lot of meetings!

The overall feeling of the participants was that the meeting was a huge success, and built a new sense of teamwork and vision within the SSC leadership. The meeting also laid the foundation for the upcoming Quadrennium, helping SGs to consider their strategy and devise new ways on engaging their membership and the wider community. The Chairs’ meeting was immediately preceded by meetings of the GSP staff (18-19 February), SSC sub-committees (20-21 February), and the SSC Steering Committee (22 February). These meetings provided extensive inputs to the draft 2013-2016 IUCN Species Strategic Plan, and completed the preparations for the Chairs’ meeting itself. On 28 February the Steering Committee met again for a wrapping-up session, and also focused on preparations for the IUCN World Conservation Congress being held in Korea in September 2012.
The Meeting

So much was discussed and achieved during the five-day meeting that it is impossible to cover it all, even in the detailed content of the report that follows. At best, we can give highlights that hopefully provide a useful flavour of this remarkable event. Although, as stated above, the meeting was deliberately not tied to producing specific deliverables, it did have clear objectives as follows:

- To allow the SSC leaders to get to know each other better and to develop new collaborations
- To develop partnerships with IUCN Commissions, Programmes, Regional Offices, Members and Partners
- To learn about new products and tools
- To complete plans for SSC’s work in 2013-2016
- To develop major new global and regional initiatives
- To plan for the 2015 World Species Congress
- To consult on developing policies, guidelines and standards
- To thank the SSC Chairs for all their hard work

We achieved these objectives by holding a variety of different sessions, including:

- Plenary sessions dealing with major topics of broad interest
- Workshops (for example, on global and regional initiatives, international conventions, new tools and training, etc)
- A Working Group to plan for the World Species Congress in 2015
- Networking (market-place sessions with IUCN regions, SSC sub-committees, SSC disciplinary Specialist Groups and other Commissions)
- Consultations (to develop new IUCN and SSC policies and guidelines)
- Informal networking and mixers

The event began with a powerful talk from Dr Ashok Khosla, President of IUCN, addressing the multiple global crises of uncontrolled economic growth, poverty, population, pollution, climate change and biodiversity loss. He emphasized the need for credible science to support solutions to save the global environment and biodiversity, and underlined that human livelihoods and wellbeing depend or conserving the world’s species. Dr Khosla, who is also the founder of Development Alternatives, an NGO with an aim of eradicating poverty, emphasized how ecology is the basis of society and economies, something that is often ignored. He spoke of consumption patterns and production systems and the need to change these urgently to create a sustainable future. Dr Khosla’s talk gave a firm foundation to the conference, challenging SSC members to identify realistic and positive strategies to take into the next IUCN Quadrennium.

As Chair of the SSC, I then outlined the structure and working relationships of SSC within the broader IUCN family, reported on the highlights of the SSC’s achievements in the 2009-2012 IUCN Quadrennium, and introduced and explained the agenda of the meeting. Russell Mittermeier, SSC Steering Committee member and Chair of the Primate Specialist Group, presented a detailed history of 50 years of SSC. This was followed by a moving tribute to 41 SSC members who had passed away since the 2008 Chairs’ Meeting, photos of each of these greatly-missed people being shown, with Samuel Barber’s Adagio for Strings as accompaniment.
HE Razan Khalifa Al Mubarak, Secretary General of EAD, then officially welcomed the gathering to Abu Dhabi and reiterated that EAD was proud to support this meeting which would set the global species conservation agenda for the next four years. A team of biodiversity scientists in the EAD and other Abu Dhabi-based institutions then presented an excellent series of talks on field research and conservation activities in the UAE, outlining some of UAE’s key flora and fauna and the efforts to protect them. Later, the new draft IUCN Programme and the Species Strategic Plan for the IUCN Quadrennium 2013-2016 were introduced by Jane Smart, Head of the GSP.

On the afternoon of the first day, the meeting broke into parallel sessions to discuss new regional and global conservation initiatives, such as: Action Asia; Conservation of Island Biodiversity; A Regional Recovery Effort for the Gulf of Mexico; Inter-tidal Wetlands in East Asia; Amphibian Survival Alliance; Arctic Conservation; the IUCN Red List vis-à-vis the Forestry Sector; and Organizing SSC at Regional and National Levels: A Latin America Focus. There was also a Working Group on the World Species Congress, chaired by myself, to develop plans for the World Species Congress proposed for 2015.

The second day started with my report back to the plenary on the initial deliberations of the Working Group on the World Species Congress. Extensive feedback was received from the plenary that was then built into later discussions of the Working Group. The Working Group met again on the second day and incorporated comments received. Further discussions took place in the margins of the main meeting and it had been intended to report back to the plenary on the final afternoon. However, we ran out of time for this and the report was therefore circulated later. This report, which is essentially the SSC’s proposal for what the World Species Congress should be, is attached as Annex 1 to the report that follows.

Jane Smart and Dena Cator from the GSP gave a presentation on the IUCN Species Communications Strategy, including a branding overview, communicating the work of the SSC, and making the most of social media in the SSC. Several SSC SGs shared their experiences of using social media. Later the delegates worked in parallel sessions on a variety of themes, including on promoting engagement in international species-related conventions: Convention on International in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES); World Heritage Convention; Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals (CMS); and the Ramsar Convention on Wetlands. There were also parallel sessions on: Virtual Planning Environments; Capturing, Managing and Disseminating Species Population and Range Data; Red List Tools; Writing Successful Funding Proposals; and Wildlife Disease Risk Analysis and Surveillance. All SSC Sub-Committee Chairs (covering invertebrates, plants, freshwater, marine and species conservation planning) and all IUCN Regional Offices gave brief reports with examples of their work, and this was followed by a “market place” session in which delegates visited the individual “stalls” set up by the Sub-Committees and regional offices. This provided an opportunity for extensive detailed discussions to build new collaborations.

A series of excursions were arranged on the third day for the delegates, which gave the opportunity to visit a number of interesting and important sites in the UAE. The sites visited all demonstrated the UAE’s incredible dedication to conservation with perhaps the star attraction being the Arabian Oryx, a species that was once Extinct in the Wild but with an exceptional conservation effort it has been
successfully down listed to Vulnerable. Other delegates were lucky enough to see wild Dugongs, turtles and sharks on the Arabian Gulf.

Day four began by featuring existing funding mechanisms available for species conservation efforts, with emphasis on Save Our Species (SOS) and the MBZ. The Red List assessment process was then reviewed including some of the tools and resources available. The latest developments in Species Information Service (SIS – the database that underpins the Red List) and Geographic Information Systems (GIS) were presented. In the afternoon, another “market place” session was held, this time featuring the other IUCN Commissions (Education and Communication; Environmental, Economic and Social Policy; Environmental Law; Ecosystem Management; Protected Areas), and the SSC disciplinary SGs (Conservation Breeding; Invasive Species; Re-introduction; Sustainable Use; Wildlife Health; and Climate Change). As with the previous “market place” session on day two, this proved to be an excellent opportunity to lay the ground for exciting new conservation initiatives in future years.

On both day four and the last day, special lunchtime sessions were held during which the SG Chairs and Co-Chairs could pose any of their questions to me. These sessions were not originally scheduled in the agenda, but there was a valid concern among many of the SG Chairs, especially those who had served for a number of years, that the agenda did not allow time for them to raise some of their collective concerns. These additional lunchtime sessions were therefore held to accommodate this need, and some most useful discussions took place, covering some interesting topics such as: mentoring of new SG Chairs; planning for succession in SG leadership; models for SG structure and function; and establishing an SG Chairs email list. It was widely agreed that in any future Chairs’ Meetings, such sessions should be scheduled at the outset.

The last day featured a report from the SSC Red List Committee on the evolving strategies to guide priorities and activities around the IUCN Red List over the next IUCN Quadrennium, followed by a session on opportunities for building relationships between the ex situ and in situ organizations. This was followed by a series of parallel sessions involving consultations to develop major new IUCN and SSC policies, guidelines and standards as follows: developing new Taxonomic Standards for the IUCN Red List; revising and updating the IUCN guidelines on Reintroductions and other Conservation Translocations; consolidating new Global Standards for the Identification of Sites of Biodiversity Conservation Significance; a new approach to Priority-setting and Species; developing new Guidelines on Conservation Trophy Hunting; defining Protected Area Outcomes in terms of Biodiversity; developing the new IUCN Red List of Ecosystems; revising the Red List Minimum Documentation Standards; and the revision of the IUCN Technical Guidelines on the Management of Ex Situ Populations for Conservation.

Before the closing ceremony, an important session was held on “what every SSC group should know”. This covered a range of topics, including: constituting and managing SSC group members and their details; SSC SGs and advocacy; the legal status of SGs and managing finances; distinguishing SGs from host institutions; network support - who to call on when; and communications (managing websites on the IUCN server, logos, and media).

The main focus of the closing ceremony was the announcement of the names of the winners of the various SSC conservation awards. For me personally, announcing and giving these awards was the
most moving part of the entire meeting. The SSC’s highest honour, the Peter Scott Award for Conservation Merit, was given to five people during the quadrennium: Raoul du Toit for this pioneering work on the conservation of both rhinos in Zimbabwe; the late Sue Mainka for her work on conserving the Giant Panda, leading the IUCN Species Programme, and encouraging conservationists in Asia; Martin Brooks for his long and effective service as Chair of the SSC African Rhino Specialist Group; Anders Rhodin for his leadership of the SSC Tortoise and Freshwater Turtle Specialist Group; and Luigi Boitani for his dedicated service of SSC in numerous roles over a forty-year period. The new George Rabb Award for Conservation Innovation has been generously funded by former SSC Chair George Rabb himself. The first two recipients are Bob Lacy and Resit Akçakaya for their ground-breaking work on population viability assessment, and the handling of uncertainty in making consistent Red List assessments. The Harry Messel Award for Conservation Leadership, generously funded by Harry Messel, was given to six people: Viola Clausnitzer; Richard Emslie; Sonja Fordham; Dave Garshelis; Barbara Goettsch; and Alexine Keuroghlian. The SSC Chairs Citation of Excellence was given to 14 people/groups: the Freshwater Biodiversity Unit in the GSP; Frédéric Launay; Gabriela Lichtenstein; Patricia Moehlman; Sanjay Molur; Caroline Pollock; Randy Reeves; the Sampled Red List Index for Plants Project at the Royal Botanic Gardens, Kew; Jane Smart; Andrew Smith; Pritpal Singh Soorae; Jean-Christophe Vié; Grahame Webb; and Doreen Zivkovic.

The meeting concluded with special thanks and loud applause to the meeting’s hosts from the EAD and MBZ, especially HE Razan Khalifa Al Mubarak, Frédéric Launay, Nicolas Heard, Kirk Duthler and Nabil Zakhour. From the closing ceremony, we were all taken by buses to the Shangri La Hotel for an amazing gala dinner, with spectacular views across the water of the Sheikh Zayed Grand Mosque lit up against the Abu Dhabi skyline, and the moon hanging just above the mosque – a display that seemed to have been put on just for us.

Conclusion

As mentioned above, one of the objectives of the meeting was to allow the SSC leaders to get to know each other better and to develop new collaborations. We were therefore careful to allow plenty of time for informal networking and deal-making. Clearly a huge amount of business was transacted, and we’ll never be able to pull all of this together into a single report. However, here are some great examples that have come to my attention:

- The Asian Wild Cattle and Deer SGs have started planning a joint workshop with the Asia Regional Office, provisionally scheduled for 2013.
- Details have been agreed for the Central India Wild Water Buffalo Workshop, scheduled for November 2012.
- The possibility to use the African and Asian Elephant Database for Asian wild cattle was discussed.
- Collaboration between the Canid and Asian Wild Cattle SGs on a Banteng / Dhole study in Baluran National Park in Indonesia has been planned.
- The Galliforme SG and the European Association of Zoos and Aquariums agreed a number of points of collaboration, including trying to secure funds for a part-time GSG Programme Officer, and producing a Global Strategy for Galliformes Conservation.
• Priority species groups to be assessed in the future at the European level were considered (for example marine fish, pollinators and medicinal plants), and this information will be used to develop a Red List Strategy for Europe.

• Two meetings of an ad hoc Steering Group of the Sustainable Use and Livelihoods SG (SULi) were held, enabling discussion of the organization and structure of the group, programme of work, and initial planning for the World Conservation Congress.

• The SULi Chair, Rosie Cooney, was able to meet with people from other SGs with strong areas of activity in use/trade, including the Medicinal Plant SG, Shark SG, African Elephant SG, African Rhino SG, South American Camelid SG, etc. This allowed her to form working relationships for the future, and to gain a better understanding of what the key priorities for work on sustainable use are across the SSC network, and of where the gaps in knowledge/management tools might be.

• The regional Chair for Europe of SULi, who is working on a Charter for Fungi and Biodiversity under the Bern Convention, met with representatives of various SSC Fungi SGs to gain expert input and form a working group to take the Charter forward.

• Two special meetings were held of SG Chairs from Central and South America, convened by SSC Deputy Chair Jon Paul Rodríguez. This has built a much improved basis for future information sharing and collaboration.

• The SSC leaders from Argentina met, and decided to arrange a future meeting with the Argentinean IUCN Committee in order to inform them of the SSC’s work and explore opportunities for collaboration.

• The South American Camelid SG held useful meetings with the CITES Secretariat, TRAFFIC and the GSP to plan for future work.

• The South American Camelid SG also obtained legal advice from IUCN Commission on Environmental Law, and agreed to establish an early alert system on plans to promote new “production legislation” with regard to wild camelids.

• Plans were developed to prepare population-level Red List assessments of the Guanaco.

• Very useful discussions were held among members of the Freshwater Fish SG (FFSG), including on developing a new FFSG communication strategy.

• The FFSG also started discussions with the IUCN West and Central African Office, and this has subsequently led to exciting new opportunities to collaborate in the Democratic Republic of Congo.

• As a result of interactions between the Marine Turtle SG and the Seagrass RLAs, a large joint proposal has been developed that links turtle foraging grounds with seagrasses.

• Many side discussions were held regarding the current status of a dam proposed for the outlet to Poyang Lake in China, the wintering area for 98% of the world population of Critically Endangered Siberian Crane and 400,000 other waterbirds. Next steps for SSC’s response on this issue were agreed.

• Discussions were held between the Crane SG and the IUCN West and Central African Office regarding possible work in Cameroon on the Black Crowned Crane.

• The Crane and Wildlife Health SGs discussed how to approach the issue of contaminants and their impact on cranes in China, opening possibilities for potential new collaborations and laboratory testing.

• The Crane SG, GSP and TRAFFIC spoke about the CITES significant trade review process now underway for Grey and Black Crowned Cranes.

• The Climate Change Task Force provided valuable advice and information for a three-year Climate Change Vulnerability Assessments project that the Crane SG is initiating at key crane stopover locations in northeastern China.

• The Crane Specialist Group also sought advice from the Species Conservation Planning Sub-Committee regarding the conservation plan for the 15 species of crane. The outline of the
plan was reviewed, and guidance was given on stakeholder involvement that would satisfy requirements for endorsement of the plan by SSC.

- The Amphibian SG was able to build connections across a number of other SGs and IUCN regional offices that have led to ongoing communications regarding potential habitat protection initiatives across Africa.
- Also, as a result of a number of side discussions, the Amphibian SG is now working on a number of potential research projects to better understand the relationships between threatened amphibians and watershed management.
- Improved communications across SGs, particularly with SG Programme Officers, is helping to develop the Amphibian SG’s strategy for the next four years.
- The Small Mammal, Afrotheria, New World Marsupials, and Australasian Marsupial and Monotreme SGs negotiated a collaboration to conduct an analysis of the global distribution of small mammal diversity, threats and conservation requirements – hopefully a paper will emerge towards the end of 2012 if all goes smoothly.
- A detailed discussion was held between the Small Mammal SG and the University of Rome “Sapienza” on a preliminary plan for Red Listing a priority subset of the small mammals by 2015.
- A conversation was held between the Small Mammal SG and Wildscreen on a possible initiative to motivate wildlife photographers to collect photos of ‘un-photographed’ small mammal species.
- The IUCN West Asia Regional Office and the GSP Red List Unit agreed on the substantive steps needed for establishing the Red Data Book of the Flora of Jordan.
- Arrangements were agreed for the IUCN West Asia Regional Office to participate in the Arabian Peninsula Freshwater Biodiversity Assessment Review Workshop in May, 2012.
- The IUCN West Asia Regional Office also held useful discussions with Al Ain Zoo, including on the latter’s possible application for IUCN membership.
- The Marine Turtle SG and the IUCN West Asia Regional Office discussed options for arranging for the inclusion of Saudi Arabia in the regional marine turtle project.
- The IUCN Asia Regional Office worked with the Seagrass RLA on developing field guides for Asian seagrasses.
- The Shark SG and the IUCN Asia Regional Office held a meeting on assisting India and Indonesia with their National Shark Action Plans.
- The Aquatic Plant SG and the IUCN Asia Regional Office discussed plans for fostering commercial propagation of the endemic water onion in Thailand.
- The IUCN Asia Regional Office held meetings with the Invasive Species and Crop Wild Relatives SGs to discuss future plans for collaboration.

This long list, although obviously very partial, gives a flavour of how productive this meeting was, and of the positive and constructive spirit that seemed to permeate the entire proceedings. The two quotes below sum up for me the atmosphere of the meeting:

“One thing that was really strong from the meeting was a sense of an SSC community and purpose, and an emerging vision of what can be achieved. I hope to exploit the experience of some of the more senior SG Chairs that I met to help me develop the Small Mammal SG. And although I don’t fully understand the level of effort that must have gone into organizing the meeting, it really is much appreciated”. Richard Young, Co-Chair, Small Mammal SG

“I feel very privileged and honored to be a part of this incredible organization. I am more energized than ever to do even more work on behalf of the Bear Specialist Group. I was
incredibly surprised to be chosen for the Harry Messel Award. I feel that I still have much to learn about how to improve bear conservation worldwide, but I believe our Specialist Group has some very good people who can help to advance the bear conservation agenda”. Dave Garshelis, Co-Chair, Bear SG

Finally, I must give my own thanks. I cannot name everyone here because the 2\textsuperscript{nd} SSC Chairs’ Meeting was the product of a massive effort by everyone who participated, and even some who did not. Many people commented to me on how well-organized the meeting was. I can take none of the credit for this. The people responsible for doing this are: the super-efficient staff in the MBZ who held the fort as the local organizers; the staff of the Yas Island Rotana Hotel who handled every change of plan with amazing patience and good humour; the team from the IUCN GSP who back-stopped every single session of the meeting, took all the notes, kept us to schedule and were present whenever help was needed; and of course the wonderful staff in my own office who ran the logistics, the agenda, the budget and pretty much everything else. Naming people in such instances is always dangerous because of who is left out. However, I must mention: HE Razan Khalifa Al Mubarak and Frédéric Launay from EAD; Nicolas Heard, Kirk Duthler and Nabil Zakhour from MBZ; Amy Burden, Dena Cator, Ian Harrison, Claire Santer, Andrew Rodrigues, Jane Smart and Jean-Christophe Vié from GSP; and last, but by no means least, Mike Hoffmann, Rachel Roberts, Jeremy Harris and Jennifer Luedtke from my office. The most effective teamwork I have ever seen!
### Acronyms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AAZ</td>
<td>Al Ain Zoo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACAP</td>
<td>Amphibian Conservation Action Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AED</td>
<td>African Elephant Database</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AESR</td>
<td>African Elephant Status Reports</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AEWA</td>
<td>Agreement on the Conservation of African-Eurasian Migratory Waterbirds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFESG</td>
<td>African Elephant Specialist Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AOO</td>
<td>Area of Occupancy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASEAN</td>
<td>Association of Southeast Asian Nations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASW</td>
<td>Amphibian Species of the World</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AZE</td>
<td>Alliance for Zero Extinction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BGCI</td>
<td>Botanic Gardens Conservation International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIOPAMA</td>
<td>Biodiversity and Protected Areas Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAFF</td>
<td>Conservation of Arctic Flora and Fauna</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBD</td>
<td>Convention on Biological Diversity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBMP</td>
<td>Circumpolar Biodiversity Monitoring Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBSG</td>
<td>Conservation Breeding Specialist Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEESP</td>
<td>IUCN Commission on Environmental, Economic and Social Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEM</td>
<td>IUCN Commission on Ecosystem Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CITES</td>
<td>Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMS</td>
<td>Convention on Migratory Species</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CoL</td>
<td>Catalogue of Life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR</td>
<td>Critically Endangered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAPTF</td>
<td>Declining Amphibian Populations Task Force</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRA</td>
<td>Disease Risk Analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAAF</td>
<td>East Asian-Australasian Flyway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EAZA</td>
<td>European Association of Zoos and Aquariums</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDGE</td>
<td>Evolutionarily Distinct and Globally Endangered</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EEZ</td>
<td>Economic Exclusion Zone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EID</td>
<td>Emerging Infectious Diseases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EOO</td>
<td>Extent of Occurrence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESBA</td>
<td>Eastside Sustainable Business Alliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAO</td>
<td>Food and Agriculture Organisation of the United Nations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FCSC</td>
<td>Freshwater Conservation Sub-Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GBIF</td>
<td>Global Biodiversity Information Facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEF</td>
<td>Global Environment Facility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GFBA</td>
<td>Global Freshwater Biodiversity Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GIS</td>
<td>Geographic Information System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GISD</td>
<td>Global Invasive Species Database</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GMSA</td>
<td>Global Marine Species Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GSP</td>
<td>Global Species Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GSPC</td>
<td>Global Strategy for Plant Conservation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIV</td>
<td>Human Immunodeficiency Virus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HQ</td>
<td>Headquarters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IBA</td>
<td>Important Bird Areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IBAT</td>
<td>Integrated Biodiversity Assessment Tool</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IBZN</td>
<td>International Code for Botanical Nomenclature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acronym</td>
<td>Full Form</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICF</td>
<td>International Crane Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICZN</td>
<td>International Code for Zoological Nomenclature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILCP</td>
<td>International League of Conservation Photographers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMLS</td>
<td>Institute for Museums and Library Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPBES</td>
<td>Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISSG</td>
<td>Invasive Species Specialist Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IUCN</td>
<td>International Union for the Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IWC</td>
<td>International Waterbird Census</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KBA</td>
<td>Key Biodiversity Areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LPI</td>
<td>Living Planet Index</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MBZ</td>
<td>Mohammed Bin Zayed Species Conservation Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIKE</td>
<td>Monitoring the Illegal Killing of Elephants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NGO</td>
<td>Non-Governmental Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ODA</td>
<td>Official Development Assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OIE</td>
<td>World Organisation for Animal Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ORMA</td>
<td>IUCN Regional Office for Mesoamerica and the Caribbean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA</td>
<td>Protected Areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PACO</td>
<td>IUCN Regional Office for Central and West Africa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCP</td>
<td>Regional Collection Planning (EAZA)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REDD+</td>
<td>UN Collaborative initiative on Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and forest Degradation in developing countries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RGB Kew</td>
<td>Royal Botanic Gardens, Kew</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RL</td>
<td>IUCN Red List of Threatened Species</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RLA</td>
<td>Red List Authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROWA</td>
<td>IUCN Regional Office for West Asia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SARS</td>
<td>Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBSTTA</td>
<td>Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SG</td>
<td>Specialist Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIS</td>
<td>IUCN Species Information Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOS</td>
<td>Save Our Species</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPAW</td>
<td>Specially Protected Areas and Wildlife</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SRLI</td>
<td>Sampled Red List Index</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSC</td>
<td>Species Survival Commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUR</td>
<td>IUCN Regional Office for South America</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWOT</td>
<td>State of the World’s Sea Turtles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAG</td>
<td>Taxonomic Advisory Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UAE</td>
<td>United Arab Emirates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNEP</td>
<td>United Nations Environment Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USAID</td>
<td>United States Agency for International Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WAZA</td>
<td>World Association of Zoos and Aquariums</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WCC</td>
<td>World Conservation Congress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNEP-WCMC</td>
<td>UNEP World Conservation Monitoring Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WCPA</td>
<td>World Commission on Protected Areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WDPA</td>
<td>World Database on Protected Areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHC</td>
<td>World Heritage Convention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHO</td>
<td>World Health Organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WI</td>
<td>Wetlands International</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WSC</td>
<td>World Species Congress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WWF</td>
<td>World Wide Fund for Nature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acronym</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WWT</td>
<td>Wildfowl and Wetlands Trust</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ZSL</td>
<td>Zoological Society of London</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Introduction

Thanks to the generous sponsorship of the Environment Agency - Abu Dhabi (EAD), and the support of the Mohamed bin Zayed Species Conservation Fund (MBZ), the second IUCN Species Survival Commission (SSC) Chairs’ Meeting took place on 23–27 February 2012 in Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates (UAE).

The main purpose of the meeting was to develop a work plan for the SSC for the next IUCN quadrennium (2013 – 2016), with the objective of advancing global species conservation efforts to create a positive impact and achieve our vision: “A world that values and conserves present levels of biodiversity.”

The meeting aimed to provide an open platform for all Specialist Group (SG), stand-alone Red List Authority (RLA) and Task Force Chairs in the SSC and the IUCN Global Species Programme (GSP) to meet, share their experiences, and discuss ways forward on key conservation issues. In addition, networking sessions were held to strengthen existing and establish future collaborations with other IUCN Commissions, Programmes and international conventions.

At maximum attendance, over 300 participants convened in Abu Dhabi for the week. The meeting was opened with greetings from the SSC Chair, Simon Stuart, the Environment Agency of Abu Dhabi, Frédéric Launay, and from Jane Smart, Global Director of the Biodiversity Conservation Group. The IUCN President, Ashok Khosla, gave a keynote speech with an impassioned plea to consider the fundamental value of biodiversity and the need to change our destructive impacts on the environment through the use of good knowledge, good science and good data to influence decisions and ultimately change human behaviour.

The participants of the meeting were also privileged to be welcomed to Abu Dhabi by Her Excellency Razan Khalifa Al Mubarak, Secretary-General of the Environment Agency. HE Al Mubarak explained that the hosting of the conference was “out of a deep and historical commitment to protecting biodiversity on a national, regional, and global scale”. She concluded by emphasizing that the meeting would set the global species conservation agenda for the next four years and that EAD was proud to support it.

The agenda of the meeting was divided between plenary, parallel and marketplace sessions. The plenary sessions included a diversity of talks from fundraising and communication, to international policy and Red Listing. The parallel sessions, however, were more specific with some having a practical application (e.g. tools available on the Red List, conservation planning tools and how to write fundraising proposals), while others prompted active participation and consultation (e.g. IUCN guidelines on trophy hunting and consolidating the global standards for the identification of sites of biodiversity conservation significance). The marketplace sessions provided a forum for networking, making connections across the IUCN SSC network, establishing collaborations and building relationships.

Concluding the event was an award ceremony presided over by the Chair of the SSC. This event provided the senior leadership of IUCN and the SSC with an opportunity to express their gratitude and recognition to the volunteer experts of the SSC network who generously dedicate their time and
expertise to species conservation and the preservation of biodiversity. The recipients of these awards are listed prior to the conclusion of this report.

The Report

The primary purpose of this report is to provide a detailed overview of those sessions where minutes were recorded. Each session also summarises the main action points that require designated follow-up.

The report is organised in chronological order following the sequence of the meeting agenda. The length of the report reflects the collective productivity of all the sessions. A decision was made to provide a high level of detail so delegates not only have a report of the sessions that they were able to attend, but also of those sessions in which they were interested, but could not participate.

Furthermore, the report from the sessions of the World Species Congress working group is included in Annex 1.

Finally, please refer to the meeting website for the meeting agenda and PowerPoint presentations of the plenary sessions

(http://www.iucn.org/aboutworkprogrammesspecieswho_we_areabout_the_species_survival_commission_ssc_members_area_iucn_ssc_chairs_meeting_2012).
Thursday, 23 February

Plenary: Opening Ceremony

Welcome from the SSC Chair— Simon Stuart

Simon Stuart introduced himself and gave a huge thanks to the hosts of the meeting: EAD, for their generosity and support for the meeting, and to the staff from the MBZ. He also thanked the SSC members for coming and the SSC office staff and the GSP secretariat.

Welcome from the Environment Agency of Abu Dhabi— Frédéric Launay

Frédéric Launay gave a warm welcome from EAD and MBZ fund. He pointed out that the first SSC Chairs’ meeting four years ago was not as large as this year’s. He believed that the size of the meeting emphasises the strength and commitment of the SSC to conservation. Finally, he encouraged participants to share their experiences.

Welcome from IUCN President—Ashok Khosla

Ashok Khosla has been involved with IUCN since 1975. His paid job is working to help people cope with poverty within India. He stated his belief that this work highlights the strong links between people and nature. He understands the issues that impinge on the work of the SSC, both in the field and laboratory. Finally, Ashok Khosla encouraged the meeting, affirming that scientists do in fact affect the world.

A summary of Ashok Khosla’s presentation is as follows:

- The downward trends in biodiversity that have been appearing in relatively recent years are alarming. For example, tigers in India have shown a huge decline since 1900 and it seems likely that future generations may never see a tiger in the wild again. Another example is the vulture populations in India which have suffered a 99% decline in recent years. However, in this case, the sharp declines sparked conservation action that has resulted in recovery of populations being seen since 2008.
- Where does IUCN fit in this global picture? IUCN has great assets through its membership, commissions and secretariat; as all three areas interact. The members are a massive force for action, influence and advocacy. On their own, the Commissions mobilise 10,000 experts around the world, which is a remarkable achievement. The secretariat coordinates the members and commissions.
- SSC is one of six IUCN Commissions and is the largest, mobilising around 8,000 people. The commissions are designed to bring in data and to provide this knowledge to the public and decision makers. This is a huge amount of work.
- IUCN, as a whole, places the information in a central position to encourage action.
• Ecology is the basis of human society—not economy. Humans have developed large areas of the world, which may have improved the lives of people, but has degraded massive parts of our environment.

• The world’s consumption patterns vary around the world; e.g. weekly consumption of food for a family in a developed country involves a lot of waste (uneaten food, packaging, etc.). There is huge inequality for people around the world (see photos in slideshow).

• Desertification is increasing, flood events are increasing, and we are losing biodiversity that is potentially extremely useful to people (e.g. for medicinal use).

• It is clear that we need to change behaviours and the degrading impacts on the environment. To do this we need good knowledge, good science and good data – only these will influence decisions.

• If we do not change now, our children will pay a heavy cost.

• Ecological footprints differ widely. The footprint of the UAE is even greater than that of the USA. Around the world, we are using 50% more resources than we actually have (demand is far greater than the earth’s biological capacity).

• Before 2000, people laughed when we suggested there will be a problem and that resources would start running out. By 2000, people began to take the message more seriously and stopped laughing.

• Biodiversity loss and other issues that are squeezing the world and humanity were not highlighted twenty years ago – today they are taken seriously and are publicised.

• Along with physical boundaries affecting nature, we must also consider societal boundaries (poverty, hunger, unemployment, violence, etc.).

• Biodiversity is fundamentally valuable in its own right, but few societies will accept this as an important point. So what we can do is tell people how much they get from biodiversity and how much more they can get if they invest more in biodiversity. For example, pollinators, crop plants, medicinal plants, etc: pollination in the USA accounts for $2 billion; 40% of pharmaceuticals are derived from natural products; coral reefs, wetlands, etc. all contribute huge amounts to the functioning of societies.

• Using natural environments intelligently can save huge amounts of money in developing artificial systems.

• Nature is inspirational and often leads to innovative constructions and developments just through copying what happens in nature (e.g. building design based on natural cooling systems used in termite nests).

• As with climate change targets, we need to work on bringing species loss down to the background rate.

**Welcome from Global Director, Biodiversity Conservation Group— Jane Smart**

Jane Smart welcomed everyone, thanking them for coming, including the regional directors and non-SSC members. She pointed out that GSP staff work with SSC in more ways than SGs may realise. The GSP is constantly trying to optimise support for the SGs, but also works with you for communication, policy, red listing, etc. The GSP is hugely grateful to the SG Chairs and is privileged to work alongside some of the world’s top scientists.
Plenary: An introduction to the SSC—Simon Stuart

Simon Stuart opened with thanks to EAD for their generous support to the SSC, showing a photograph of the signing of the agreements both for the EAD support to the SSC agreement, and the Chairs Meeting agreement. He remarked that Her Excellency Razan Al Mubarak, noted that EAD was supporting this meeting because they believe in it.

Simon Stuart reminded the audience of the structure of IUCN: members, commissions, and secretariat. The union includes more than 1000 members (1147 from 160 countries), dominated by Non-governmental Organisations (NGOs). These members have voting rights within the IUCN. The secretariat is global: the headquarters (HQ) are in Gland with support from the regional programmes. There were representatives from all the regions at the meeting. Of the six commissions, the largest is the SSC with 8000 members. All the commissions were represented at the meeting as well, in three cases by the Chairs.

He then provided an idea of the operational structure of the SSC, ranging from the Chair and Deputy Chair through the Steering Committee (appointed by Council), sub-Committees, and SGs (disciplinary, taxonomic), RLAs etc. The sub-Committees are primarily focused on areas where we believe there is need for long-term focus on building up under-valued areas. One highlight was a slide showing the logos of all the SGs, noting that the logos of RLAs, sub-Committees and some SGs are to be added.

Simon Stuart then introduced his office, noting that the Chair sits on the Council and is not paid by IUCN. Rather, the Chair is supported by other organizations: Al Ain Zoo (AAZ), Chester Zoo, Bristol Zoo, MAVA Foundation, UNEP-World Conservation Monitoring Centre (UNEP-WCMC), Conservation International, EAD, World Association of Zoos and Aquaria (WAZA), and the Zoological Society of London (ZSL) to whom Simon Stuart extended many words of thanks. WCMC hosts the office, providing the secretariat.

In his introduction to the GSP, Simon Stuart noted it is a large staff in support of the SSC. He emphasized that the staff are primarily paid on project funds, not on core IUCN funds. Those funds are raised jointly for the work of the SSC and GSP.

Regarding the book of SSC profiles produced for the meeting, Simon Stuart specifically highlighted the report of the Chair and GSP Head which provides further details that he might miss out in his talk. Simon Stuart remarked that the book really provides the details of what the SSC and GSP does.

Simon Stuart then moved onto some highlights from the quadrennium:

- **Species of the Day**: this ran during 2010 – The International Year of Biodiversity. It is now done on a weekly basis.
- **CBD (Convention on Biological Diversity) Target 12 and the Strategic Plan**: one of the twenty Aichi targets is Target 12, which SSC was heavily involved in the wording for. Simon Stuart emphasized that we should not be apologetic about asking governments to change their direction, because they have committed to it. He also highlighted other targets, such as Target 9 on invasive species.
• Global Strategy for Plant Conservation: a revised GSPC was adopted in Nagoya; included SSC and GSP involvement.

• Red List (RL): the flagship product. Big improvements going on the website and mapping interface. He highlighted that the RL also gives us some success stories, such as the downlisting of the Arabian Oryx (noting that it is first time a species formerly EW has been downlisted a full three categories); acknowledged the Red List Partners who provide the significant support to the RL, mainly in kind; noted that the RL partnership has grown in the quadrennium from four to nine; remarked on the taxonomic expansion across the RL, both through comprehensive and sampled approaches; noted completion of the African Freshwater Biodiversity assessment, funded by EU, which will allow important progress in conservation planning. There was much effort on marine assessments, notably a paper led by Bruce Collette on tunas and billfishes. Simon Stuart also highlighted the Red List Index, and that this was one of the major inputs used to determine whether or not the 2010 target was met. Increasingly involved in supporting National RLs, showing up a slide of the National RL website managed by ZSL.

• IUCN-TRAFFIC analyses: IUCN has continued its work on Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species (CITES) of Wild Fauna and Flora, including the flagship analysis project for every CITES CoP, but also many other projects such as Monitoring the Illegal Killing of Elephants (MIKE).

• Species conservation planning: following the development of the guidelines, a Sub-committee has been established to roll out implementation among SGs (including a process for endorsement).

• Task Force on Biodiversity and Protected Areas (PAs): a joint task force between the World Commission on Protected Areas (WCPA) and SSC, focused on biodiversity outcomes in PAs and consolidating standards for identifying key sites for biodiversity.

• Climate change: GSP unit headed by Wendy Foden, but also a new Climate Change Task Force established. Simon Stuart highlighted a project to identify ten new climate change flagships used in the Copenhagen CoP.

• Re-introduction guidelines: an initiative underway to revisit these and update them. A Task Force between the Invasive Species SG (ISSG) and Re-introduction SG been established to lead this, supporting by AAZ and EAD.

• Disciplinary groups: Sustainable Use SG re-established in 2012. It has taken a long while to find the resources to get this moving. The SG is shared with the Commission on Environmental, Economic and Social Policy (CEESP) and Rosie Cooney has been appointed as the new Chair.

• Bob Lacy stepped down as Conservation Breeding SG Chair, and Onnie Byers has stepped in; group is key liaison with the zoo community.

• Re-introduction SG: re-introduction case studies, and re-introduction guidelines.

• ISSG has a new Chair since the last quadrennium and has been focussing on linking the Global Invasive Species Database (GISD) and the RL.

• The Wildlife Health SG has built up capacity with two new Programme Officers now on board.
• Amphibian Survival Alliance: launched in this quadrennium, supported by many donors. Noted thanks to George Rabb. An Executive Director has been appointed: Jaime Garcia Moreno.
• Action Asia: a campaign focused on the large animal crisis in Asia. The European Association of Zoos and Aquaria (EAZA) collaboration to highlight the issue and raise funds from the zoo-going public.
• Save Our Species (SOS): SSC has a major role in disbursing grants through SOS, the first grants of which have been disbursed. SOS is jointly funded by World Bank, GEF, Nokia, and the French GEF. Thanks to Luigi Boitani for chairing the SOS Working Group. A new website has also just been launched.
• Poyang Hu Lake: an example of a case where an SG has come to us seeking high-level engagement. SGs are not sufficiently aware that they can use IUCN’s intergovernmental status to get to the top levels of government on high-level issues. The SSC wrote twice to the Chinese government (working with the Crane SG) about the establishment of a dam on Poyang Hu Lake. Simon Stuart emphasized that you can use the SSC to raise issues up the political agenda.

Simon Stuart shifted focus to why we are here:

• To allow SSC leaders to network and develop better collaborations;
• To facilitate partnerships outside of the SSC, with regions, Commissions, Members and partners;
• To learn about new tools and products;
• To plan for 2013-2016;
• To develop major new global and regional initiatives;
• To plan for the 2015 World Species Congress (WSC);
• To consult on developing policies and guidelines (not to be finally adopted here);
• And, finally, to thank the Chairs.

The audience included hosts from EAD and other colleagues from the UAE; the president of IUCN; the SSC Steering Committee; SSC Sub-Committees; SSC SG Chairs; Task Force Chairs; RLA Focal Points; IUCN Commissions; IUCN GSP; IUCN regional office staff; other HQ staff; IUCN member organisations; Red List Partners; IUCN partners.

Simon Stuart summarized briefly what will happen, noting the meeting will have a mix of plenary and parallel sessions, the latter comprising workshops, networking sessions, and consultations.

**Plenary: A History of the SSC—Russell Mittermeier**

Russ Mittermeier (Chair, Primate SG) provided a perspective of the history of the SSC. He gave special thanks to Her Excellency Razan Al Mubarak and EAD for their support for the second Chairs meeting. The presentation focused on the previous Chairs.

Russ Mittermeier started with a personal history of his exposure to IUCN and SSC, noting that in 1976 he was invited to become a commission member and then in 1977 to become a Chair.
culminating eventually in 2008, where he was chosen by the IUCN Council to be the Vice President for the quadrennium.

Some of the first advice he received from Wayne King was to not have more than fifteen members in a group. The Primate SG proceeded to invite fifty members, and now they are at 400!

At the request of Sir Peter Scott, a call came out for Action Plans. The Crocodile SG was first to respond, but the Primate SG produced the first action plan in the mid 1980s.

The SSC was created in 1950 as the Species Survival Service, and then it became a full commission in 1956. The third assembly of SSC referred its bird interests to what was then the ICBP, now Birdlife. Hal Coolidge was the first influential Chair (and one of the founders of IUCN, helping bankroll IUCN), and for whom one of the IUCN medals is named. The next person to take over as Chair was Lieutenant Colonel Leofric Boyle (because Coolidge stepped down to become Chair of WCPA) for a few years. However, the most famous of all Chairs was Sir Peter Scott, who was Chair for the better part of seventeen years. He was instrumental in the creation of the World Wildlife Fund (WWF) and designed the panda logo. Sir Scott was also good at finding talent, scouting Ullie Seal, who became Chair of the Conservation Breeding SG.

In 1980, the name changed to the Species Survival Commission. Russ Mittermeier wondered why we are not called the World Species Survival Commission. In 1981, Gren Lucas took over as Chair and introduced plant conservation into the SSC. He essentially shared these responsibilities with Wayne King. It was a conflict period in the life of the SSC, and there was even discussion about splitting off from IUCN as a separate entity! In the mid-1980s, Simon Stuart appeared on the scene as a Programme Officer. In 1989, George Rabb took over as Chair until 1996. George Rabb did many things, but he especially established the Declining Amphibian Populations Task Force (DAPTF), which led to the amphibian assessment, and subsequent action plan. Around this time, the idea of a WSC was first floated, feeling that it would help elevate species to the same level as parks.

In 1996, David Brackett was elected as Chair until 2004. He is the only person who was not candidate of choice from the commission and won by a land-slide. He chose excellent folks as his deputies. He also picked Christian Samper as deputy, who is now the new CEO of the Wildlife Conservation Society. The first major SSC planning meeting was held in Djerba, Tunisia in 1999, with a huge impact on IUCN’s planning. Under David Brackett the Sustainable Use SG was created, as was the Red List Committee.

Holly Dublin was elected in 2004, and led the strategic planning process, the joint Task Force on biodiversity and PAs, and the first Chairs Meeting in Al Ain in Feb 2008.

Finally, in 2008, Simon Stuart was elected as Chair and is running unopposed for the next quadrennium. Under Simon Stuart, a Freshwater Conservation Sub-Committee was established, SOS was established (with Jean-Christophe-Vié’s leadership), and new donors have been sought out. And, of course, Simon Stuart has worked with EAD to secure support for the second SSC Chairs’ meeting. Russ Mittermeier highlighted the strong support of the GSP in supporting the work of the SSC.

Russ Mittermeier concluded by highlighting the greatest products of SSC:
The Red List: completed both at global levels and at regional levels, and which garner the largest profile of any product.

Action Plans: taking information in the RL and translating it into action on the ground. These action plans led to the formation of funding mechanisms to implement these actions (such as the Primate Action Fund managed by the Primate SG – US$ 8 million). There was an expectation, though, that once produced, the plans were turned over to IUCN for a check.

Influencing conventions and even IUCN itself: the SSC has always been a driving force in the Union, think of the work on CITES and the CBD 2020 Aichi targets.

SSC is a truly unique global network and has immense convening power. Russ Mittermeier re-emphasized Ashok Khosla’s points of capturing new directions and ensuring that we make ourselves relevant in the context of current interests (human well-being, ecosystem services).

He concluded with the need to ensure that we document our history (i.e. of SSC) much more effectively to demonstrate where we have been and help us better understand where we are going.

**Action Points**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agenda Item</th>
<th>Action Point</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A history of the SSC</td>
<td>Although not an agreed Action Item per se, RAM made an impassioned plea for immediately better documenting SSC’s history, before the knowledge is lost and to demonstrate where we have been and help us better understand where we are going.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Russ Mittermeier, Simon Stuart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Craig Hilton-Taylor, Mike Hoffman</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Plenary: Address to the meeting from the Secretary-General of the Environment Agency of Abu Dhabi—HE Razan Al Mubarak**

Her Excellency Razan Al Mubarak of EAD warmly welcomed delegates to the IUCN SSC Chairs’ meeting, stating that it was an honour to have so many of the world’s experts present in Abu Dhabi for the meeting.

Her Excellency continued that the EAD was proud to support the endeavour and that the delegates provided inspiration for conservation activities.

She stated that the people of Abu Dhabi shared a concern for the environment, at the local, national and regional scale; and that all Emiratis had a deep respect for wildlife.

Her Excellency reminded participants of Sheik Zayed bin Sultan al-Nahyan’s interest in wildlife, and for the need to continue to protect biodiversity from decline.

She stated that to achieve the protection of biodiversity there is a need to draw on the depth of IUCN expertise and, in recognition of this, Abu Dhabi is now a framework donor to IUCN, as well as hosting the IUCN SSC Re-introduction SG.
Her Excellency concluded that hosting the IUCN SSC meeting for a second time was a natural extension of Sheik Zayed bin Sultan al-Nahyan’s vision.

**Plenary: Panel discussion: The UAE in national and international biodiversity conservation**

**Himansu Das (EAD)—Dugongs in Abu Dhabi Emirate**

- Himansu Das stated that dugongs are a slow-breeding, long-lived species which are both a flagship and umbrella species for conservation.
- Abu Dhabi holds the second largest population of dugongs in the world after Australia, with estimates from aerial surveys of between 2,000 and 3,000 animals.
- Dugongs are only found in Abu Dhabi within the Emirates because of the seagrass beds with which they are associated. In Abu Dhabi, 70% of the dugong population is found within PAs. There are two marine PAs covering almost 6,500 km².
- Threats to the species include illegal nets, boat strikes and the general destruction of habitat through development. Dugong mortality has been increasing with more females killed than males.
- Satellite mapping indicates that dugongs do not move far, and there is an initiative to map seagrass beds, and to raise awareness of dugongs through education programmes.
- There is considerable regional and international cooperation on dugong conservation, and the UAE is a signatory to important international conventions (e.g. Convention on Migratory Species).

**Salim Javed (EAD)—Satellite tracking of birds in Abu Dhabi**

- Salim Javed stated that the UAE had a good diversity of bird species including many important migratory species.
- Key areas for bird conservation included the need to document migration routes; identify stopover sites; and identify local habitat use.
- Salim Javed provided an example of tracking the migration route of the Sooty Falcon, where birds passing through the UAE had been recorded migrating as far south as Madagascar. Stop over sites for the falcons have been identified, and they use cultivated fields for feeding. There was concern about the use of pesticides in Madagascar.
- Ospreys have been tracked in UAE, with the indications that adults have limited ranges and movement, while the young disperse to other Gulf Countries making the UAE a source country for this raptor.
- Steppe Eagles have also been tracked and show a looped migration pattern.
- Salim Javed gave extensive details about tracking flamingos travelling through the UAE, including the identification of key stopover sites and flyways. In 2009, the largest breeding colony had been identified through monitoring movement patterns.
- Satellite tracking was recommended as a means by which key bird areas and potential new protected areas could be identified.
- There are future plans to track the migration of Egyptian Vultures and to work on the implementation of a raptor action plan.

**Ashraf Al Cibahy (EAD)—Abu Dhabi corals relative to warming global seas**

- Ashraf Al Cibahy noted that coral reefs are among the most biologically diverse ecosystems on Earth, but had recently experienced a 20% decline.
- Ashraf Al Cibahy mentioned that the corals of the Arabian Gulf were exceptional because they lived in the hottest sea on Earth, and were distinct biologically. There are also high
temperature anomalies between seasons in the Gulf. Gulf corals are adapted to the most extreme coral-bearing environment on earth.

- There had been a number of coral bleaching events in the Gulf between 1996 and 2011. The Gulf is an open laboratory to understand biological system resilience and impact of climate change.
- Reef areas have been mapped and are monitored in Abu Dhabi.
- Ashraf Al Cibahy noted that hard coral diversity was recorded at 34 species (Arabian Gulf) and 103 species (Arabian Sea); while there were 32 species in ten families of soft corals.
- He indicated that there was a direct value of Arabian Gulf coral reef ecosystems with 55-60% of fish biomass associated with the reef systems.
- Ashraf Al Cibahy stated that coral reefs of the Gulf are moving towards a critically endangered state. Effective conservation actions, long term monitoring, and regional partnerships are needed.
- 41 sites were under protection in the Arabian Gulf, and a conservation plan for Abu Dhabi has been produced.

**Rima Jabado (UAE University)—Sharks in UAE waters**

- The UAE is a signatory to the 1999: UN Code of Responsible Fisheries but lacks data on its shark fishery.
- Concerns exist over the lack of information and increasing pressures on sharks in the Gulf – no definite species list or biological data available. Research was needed to establish baseline.
- Data were gathered through interviews with fishermen; landing surveys; fisheries independent survey (tagging); market surveys and DNA barcoding; feeding ecology study.
- There are now known to be approximately 30 species in the Gulf, although the status of many species is unknown largely through the lack of information on life history data etc.
- Current management initiatives include gear restrictions – long lining, trawling ban; vessel and license restrictions – Emiratis on board; Ministerial decree 542 for year 2008 and 216 for year 2011 on shark fishing - seasonal ban, vessel and hook restrictions, fishing grounds, catch and effort data; shark finning is illegal; there are two protected species – whale sharks and sawfish. Marine protected areas and offshore oil rigs provide habitat.
- From landing site and market surveys since October 2010, 11,452 sharks originating from the Gulf were sampled; with six species representing over 91% of the total catch in the UAE.
- However, UAE is the fifth largest exporter of shark fins in the world. Trucks arrive daily from Oman full of sharks and fins. Bags of dried fins brought from other Emirates, Gulf countries, Iran and Africa (West and East).
- There are still many management challenges for the Gulf and fisherman knowledge shows declines in shark numbers in the past five to ten years.
- Rima Jabado stated that there is still little information available on the shark fishery and sharks in the Gulf.
- Priorities for conservation include, rigorous scientific information (biological data) to enable stock assessments; effective monitoring and enforcement – independent observers; building research capacity and increasing awareness – workshops, symposia, stakeholder involvement; species identification guides; support for research and management – central coordination; cross-jurisdictional management (highly migratory species); and funding for this work.
Plenary: The IUCN Programme 2013-2016 new Business Model: Species Strategic Plan—Jane Smart

Apologies were given for the absence of IUCN Deputy Director General, Poul Engberg-Pederson.

An introduction to IUCN’s new Programme and Business Model was given. The programme had been revised and was now divided into three areas:

1. Valuing and Conserving Nature
2. Effective and Equitable Governance
3. Deploying Nature-Based Solutions

This new framework was decided upon after a broad consultation with commissions, members and regions. This new programme is underpinned by the Aichi targets, for which there are champions within IUCN.

IUCN has also developed a set of priorities against which the Business Plan has been aligned. These new priorities should increase IUCN’s leveraging power with funders:

1. Providing Knowledge Products
2. Delivering Results on the Ground
3. Strengthening Policy and Governance
4. Engaging and Leveraging the Union

IUCN knowledge products include the IUCN Red List of Threatened Species, the Red List of Ecosystems, Key Biodiversity Areas and the World Database of Protected Areas (WDPA). Two new knowledge products were also envisioned – one on human dependency on nature and a natural resource governance framework that would encompass all of the knowledge products.

The SSC strategic plan is aligned to the programme and divided into global results, key species results, rationale for priorities and SSC and GSP targets.

Comments on this strategic plan should be sent in by early March.

Plenary: Species at the World Conservation Congress 2012—Simon Stuart

The last congress was held in Barcelona in 2008 with an attendance of 8000 people. The World Conservation Congress (WCC) will be held this year on Jeju Island, South Korea from 6-15 September. It is the opportunity for the governments, NGOs, Commissions and Partners to come together. It is the governing body of IUCN.

The congress is divided into two main parts: the Forum and the Member’s Assembly with World Leader Dialogues proposed for the evening. The forum is divided into workshops, posters, knowledge café, conservation campus, pavilions and exhibition, social events and media events.
80% of proposals received found a way of being presented in Jeju (unfortunately 20% of them will not be able to take place).

Every Commission, including SSC, has a few reserved slots. SSC has four:

1. The Strategic Plan for Biodiversity
2. Establishing the RL as the Foundation of Species Conservation
3. Re-developing the work of the Sustainable Use SG
4. Funding Species Conservation (with the involvement of SOS and MBZ)

The Members’ Assembly approves IUCN’s four-year programme and its financial plan and there is the election of the president, treasurer, regional councillors and Chairs of the commissions. It is also when there is the vote on motions.

**Action Points**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agenda Item</th>
<th>Action Point</th>
<th>Lead</th>
<th>Others</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Possibility of carrying proxy votes to the WCC</td>
<td>If the member organization cannot participate – should this be encouraged in order to better represent the species view in every motion?</td>
<td>Any member of IUCN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>There may actually be a physical limit to the number of votes that can be put in the ballot per person (2 or 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submission of motions for WCC</td>
<td>Deadline for submitting motions</td>
<td>Simon Stuart</td>
<td></td>
<td>9\textsuperscript{th} May 2012</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Plenary: IUCN and SSC in the international policy context— Jane Smart**

Jane Smart introduced IUCN and SSC’s Global Policy work. Their role in Gland is to take the knowledge of networks and bring about best policy result. However, policy is not the only answer.

Jane Smart gave an overview of policy work and briefly discussed biodiversity-related conventions. A more detailed session was planned for the next day. She introduced the different fora, introduced the lead people, and explained how the data of the present SG Chairs feed into policy. Challenges and resources were also discussed.

Challenges: big excitement on adoption of the targets but will this momentum be maintained? It is important to support target setting at the national level.

**Q&A**

Jonathan Baillie (Pangolin SG): what are the major messages that IUCN will be bringing to Rio +20?

Jane Smart: IUCN will be linked to the Aichi targets – what we have to do looking at action and underlying causes; particularly focusing on nature as the basis of the green economy.
Sue Lieberman (Deputy Director, Pew Environment Group): agrees that IUCN has been timid. They have been very involved in Rio negotiations on the zero draft. There is still time to make a difference. IUCN has special status at the meeting. Members would be keen to discuss how they can feed into IUCN’s input at Rio +20.

Jane Smart: will try to have a meeting this week to discuss this.

Piet de Wit (Chair, Commission on Ecosystem Management): species information is not really what IPBES (Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services) is expecting, as ecosystem services are not included (in Jane Smart’s presentation). The Sustainable Use SG information needs to feed in. Not answering the questions that the government are asking with species information.

Jane Smart: also mentioned RL of Ecosystems which is under development and will look at ecosystem services; did not mean that this is only knowledge going in, but what were presented here are the flagship IUCN products.

Simon Stuart mentioned Jonathan Baillie’s EDGE (Evolutionarily Distinct and Globally Endangered) of Existence work.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agenda Item</th>
<th>Action Point</th>
<th>Lead</th>
<th>Others</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>Discussion on input to Rio +20 through IUCN Members and SGs</td>
<td>Sue Lieberman</td>
<td>Any interested</td>
<td>Meeting to be convened during the Chairs’ meeting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Plenary: Organizing the SSC at Regional and National Levels: an Introduction—Jon Paul Rodriguez

The SSC currently has 8050 SSC members in 173 countries. It is organized thematically by SGs, Task Forces and Working Groups. While it is global in scope, implementation occurs nationally and regionally. An example of the dimension of national-level implementation is comprised of National Red Lists, which may not necessarily be spearheaded by IUCN.

The development of SSC regional networks is carried out with the appointment of regional vice-Chairs. Additional possibilities for strengthening regional networks may involve the establishment of new groups and National SSC Committees, whose role is to foster interaction among SSC members, experience-sharing with more seasoned SSC members, forum for national species conservation, etc. A Latin American experiment is currently being discussed.

Question: Purpose – how do we use data to influence good stewardship?
Parallel: Global conservation initiatives: Action Asia—Will Duckworth

Introduction on Action Asia

Introduction Q&A

Steven Broad (Director, TRAFFIC): what will Action Asia’s role be?
Will Duckworth: this is a discussion point – catalyst rather than implementer.

Andrew Smith (Chair, Lagomorph SG): in China, legislation may be in place but often does not get implemented on the ground. How to effect change is the key issue in Asia.
Will Duckworth: agree laws in place but not implemented. Need high level in government to see this as important.

Jeff McNeely (Chair, Red List Committee): we need a Greenpeace for species – not us, not SSC. Someone needs to embarrass the countries, but someone needs to do this because this will be the only thing that will work.
Will Duckworth: not part of Action Asia.

William Oliver (Wild Pig SG): Action Asia is for one year. Is the objective to raise funds?
Will Duckworth: so far it has acted as a body influencing the funding mechanisms already in place – e.g. SOS, and the Partnership with EAZA – their two-year campaign (had been intended as one).
Action Asia will continue after this short term “programme”, with one of its objectives being to tackle the reliance on short term funding that is a problem for interventions for the most critically threatened species.

Amanda Vincent (Chair, Seahorse, Pipefish and Stickleback RLA): How are you going to engage the commercial sector? We have had good relationships with private sector.
Will Duckworth: Action Asia is not going to be doing this per se. It is directed at the site level except for dialogue with governments. It will prioritise species, sites and work for that site, and may well involve the private sector where relevant to these highly threatened species.

Nicole Duplaix (Chair, Otter SG): write letter of responsibility of extinction to Presidents and Leaders. This is an opportunity to bring together SGs working on a common purpose.

Unknown: IUCN has so many committees – wouldn’t want to make yet another structure.

Billy Karesh (Co-Chair, Wildlife Health SG): if the focus is at site level then, you need to change the demand for these. WildAid has been successful with shark fins. Action Asia could engage the health sector—governments do listen. The Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) has lots of partner options that would bring a lot of strength.
Will: Action Asia is about urgency for these species and addressing the deficits (often seen as financial, but also often technical) in making site conservation effective. There are positive examples to follow. But Action Asia must not spread itself too thinly. Also, it is not restricted to SGs.
Steven Broad: Action Asia must connect to other initiatives that are already going on. Tigers: a lot of emphasis on site based work already. Need to include intelligence (e.g. trade intel) and have to be connected to other work on trade in order to effect long-term demand and behavioural change.

Will Duckworth: Action Asia is likely to be a catalyst rather than an implementer. It will be up to the sites to figure out what is needed to make it more effective, and where there is a role for Action Asia to help in meeting this need.

Richard Kock (Co-Chair, Wildlife Health SG): supports Jeff McNeely. What will the governance of this process be?
Will Duckworth: suggestions welcome.

Richard Emslie (Programme Officer, African Rhino SG): from Africa – good site-based examples. We need short term but also long term commitment in order to secure futures. How will you address the political will? Influencing Presidents?
Will Duckworth: in a case-by-case way – very often this will include dialogue with very high-level politicians

Phil Bowles (Co-Chair, Snake and Lizard RLA): there is a lack of conservation awareness or culture in many of these countries.
Will Duckworth: yes this is another major source of 'deficit' as well as financial and technical

Scott Perkin (Head, Biodiversity Conservation Programme, IUCN Asia Regional Office): Would like to hear more on mechanics – a list of species to start with and then begin to identify sites, catalysing activities.

Simon Hedges (Chair, Asian Elephant SG): it would be useful to have a timeframe for decisions on how this is going to run (e.g. list of species).
Will Duckworth: the list of species is expected the next few months – twenty-four possible – but will not include the Tiger. This is not the same as the One hundred species most at risk of extinction list – but this is a PR process and communication tool.

Phil McGowan (Programme Officer, Galliformes SG): what about Alliance for Zero Extinction (AZE) species. Are there any active sites for this?
Will Duckworth: there is some overlap here but by no means complete because many species at very high risk of extinction do not meet AZE's single-site criterion.

Prof Andrew Smith: the more you use this name you might get closed down by the magazine “Action Asia”.
Will Duckworth: were thinking of using Crisis Asia – which was not very popular.

Grahame Webb (Chair, Crocodile SG): suggested that Action Asia tailor solutions one at a time – drawing on SG experience. You need to be looking at those that are getting benefits from the trade. Embarrassing countries might not filter down to the harvester level, so you need pragmatic solutions.
Will Duckworth: agrees with Graham Webb too, particularly the need for looking at each species and site as an individual and determining exactly what the priority needs are.

Richard Kock: If environment is not right you won’t succeed.
Phil Bowles: viability of populations.

Will Duckworth: we are not using a sharp dichotomy of viable or not viable as species close to extinct are often not well known.

William Oliver: most conservation efforts do not work; address trade at community level; should not only be looking at the species level; if too prescriptive not looking at the underlying conservation problems.

Will Duckworth: originally Action Asia focused on large animals (>1kg), but there are also many Critically Endangered species <1kg threatened by trade. He would like to remove this threshold to minimise extinction of all animals threatened by trade.

General Q&A:

- Should it look at look at all CR?
- Only species >1 kg? No-one agreed
- Only species threatened because hunted for trade? A few agreed
- All CR species not just traded not just > 1 kg? More people agreed. Some suggested it should be all vertebrates (including marine).

Steven Broad: who decided on what we do? Originally came from big NGOs and IUCN, stimulated by the results of the Global Mammal Assessment – where the 1 kg lower size cut-off came from.

Will Duckworth: using ASEAN as the region.

Andrew Smith: could have example species for habitat loss or trade. Only dealing with a few but the scale of problem is huge.

Will Duckworth: we cannot deliver resources for everything. Some populations of highly threatened species show site-based projects can work, so we are using this model for those species where this is an apt response.

Cetacean SG: Appreciate focus but concerned about aquatic – still are issues in this realm.

Will Duckworth: Encouraged SSC to do something for marine fauna, but Action Asia should not spread itself too thin, and also it would be difficult to deal with sites.

Nick Dulvy: concerned about branding of Action Asia. Currently, the focus is very narrow—mainly on mammals. False branding may cause damage, and runs the risk of leaving out these taxa.
Will Duckworth: clearly need to rethink the name if it is leading a person to expect something that looks at all the important conservation issues in Asia.

Grahame Webb: should establish a species list by not just looking at the RL. How do we establish priorities for species that really need action now?

Will Duckworth: Critically Endangered species is a start; use feedback from other processes, e.g. the 100 species initiative and ask SGs to review the list to identify which are the most endangered and if things are not on the list.

Grahame Webb: this opportunity will be seen in different ways.

William Oliver: Marine issues are huge and important – populations may be threatened.

Amanda Vincent: did not understand genesis of Action Asia. Understood that the decisions are based on the level of threat, but you should look at level of potential to resolve that threat. Be careful about excluding any group or realm; she was not sure why Action Asia was restricted to sites.

Will Duckworth: we need a gate. The Global Mammal Assessment showed the concentration of threat in Southeast Asia; due to proximity to markets. Several major bodies agreed this was a crisis and needed a different way of dealing with it. Action Asia is not restricted to sites as a matter of principle but since the species it deals with are all on the edge of extinction, site-based activity is likely to be a prime component for nearly all, or even all, species.

Nicole Duplaix: what about a motion for WCC?

Will Duckworth: good idea.

What are the other steps for site selection?

Will Duckworth: Some species are only in one or two places, so the sites will be automatic (provided the apparent restriction is not simply a function of under-survey of other potential sites). Some are already being conserved in a number of areas and here site selection is more complicated.

Richard Kock: Who will pay for this? Need business case for the species that are in peril rather than selecting a few species and then raising the money for this or selecting the species on the basis of amount of funds available.

Will Duckworth: would like further discussion on funds but also on technical gaps?

Dave Garshelis: Action Asia was started because so many large species were threatened in SE Asia, and the main reason for this is the trade demand, but now it has widened out. We should go back to the trade focus and select sites that cover many species with a trade issue.
Will Duckworth: the focus is on minimising the extinction of species.

Donors are likely to go for the site-based multi-species approach.

**Parallel: Global conservation initiatives: Conservation of Island Biodiversity— Alan Tye and Helen Pippard**

After a word of welcome by Alan Tye (Chair, Galapagos Plant SG) and Helen Pippard (Regional Species Focal Point, IUCN Oceania Regional Office), there was a round of introductions and then Alan Tye reminded everyone that the aim of the session was to have a discussion about the tools and mechanisms available to encourage the promotion and sharing of knowledge amongst conservation scientists and managers working in islands states, the main purpose of the discussion being to address the question of how we can work together more effectively to apply lessons learned and to share knowledge to conserve island biodiversity.

The session very much emphasized the uniqueness of island biodiversity and the high levels of endemism on islands, but that conservationists working on these islands faced many difficulties such as isolation, lack of capacity, lack of funding, etc.

The session was built around a series of presentations.

**Introduction to the Pacific Islands Species Forum— Helen Pippard**

This meeting is to take place in Honiara, Solomon Islands from 25-27 April 2012. Full details about the Forum are available from: [http://www.iucn.org/about/unionsecretariat/offices/oceania/ro_getinvolved/speciesforum](http://www.iucn.org/about/unionsecretariat/offices/oceania/ro_getinvolved/speciesforum), but in essence the meeting is about promoting the gathering of data on the status of biodiversity across the Pacific and to determine how to harness that for conservation action to halt biodiversity loss. The Forum will focus in particular on the CBD Aichi Targets, with a particular focus on Target 12. The Forum will be used to raise the profile of species within the Pacific region and although aimed primarily at the Pacific, there will be issues of broader relevance to islands elsewhere. Proceedings of the Forum—which may be useful more widely—will be published with specific actions and lessons learned. The Forum will not just focus on negative aspects, but also on the positive with a specific session on celebrating successes.

**Overview of the CBD Island Programme of Work— Bernard O’Callaghan**

This is to be discussed at the next Subsidiary Body on Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice (SBSTTA) meeting and it was stressed that it was important to get good input from island practitioners. A review document has been prepared by the Global Island Partnership (see [http://www.cbd.int/islandglispa.shtml](http://www.cbd.int/islandglispa.shtml); hosted by IUCN USA) this is open for comment and review (see [http://www.cbd.int/islandreview.shtml](http://www.cbd.int/islandreview.shtml)).
An issue highlighted in the discussions was that small island states do not have the resources to do the work to meet the Aitchi targets, let alone Target 12. It was requested that someone needs to point this out at the SBSTTA meeting.

Alan Tye asked if anyone was aware of support mechanisms in regions outside the Pacific which help countries to contribute to such processes (i.e. what are the equivalents to the Secretariat of the Pacific Regional Environment Programme (SPREP), which assists its member countries to prepare for CBD meetings including joint positions, by organising regional pre-COP and pre-SBSTTA consultations?). Justin Gerlach (Chair, Terrestrial and Aquatic Invertebrate RLA) said that, for the Indian Ocean marine environment, there are discussion fora and coordination mechanisms at governmental levels via the Indian Ocean Commission and the Nairobi Convention, but that conservation practitioners were excluded from these. There was also mention of the UK Overseas Territories Forum (http://www.ukotcf.org) and a similar equivalent for French Territories.

It was agreed by all present, that there was a lot to be learned from each other, especially within similar zones (e.g. tropical, Antarctic, etc.), but there was no mechanism to allow this exchange.

**Hawaii Plant Extinction Prevention Program—Marie Bruegmann**

Marie presented the terrible statistics for Hawaii – 756 out of 1,500 plants are threatened (50%), 10% are already Extinct, 37% of all USA Endangered species are in Hawaii, and Hawaii has more invasive species than native species!

The main focus of their programme is on the 200 species with less than fifty plants left in the wild. The goal is to try to stabilize the populations. The team comprises one state-wide coordinator, five island coordinators and five technicians; they have an annual budget of US$ 1 million (about US$ 4,500 per species). The SSC Hawaiian Plant SG (sixty members) is very involved in supporting the process and developed the criteria for selecting which species to work on and decide on what needs to be done for each species.

The programme faces many challenges: many species are on a privately owned island or grow on cliffs – so there are issues of accessibility and safety: collecting propagules; subsequent re-introductions are tricky if impact is to be minimized; limited resources – staff, volunteers, funds. Funding had been received from US Fish and Wildlife Service, US Forest Service, MBZ and Sir Peter Scott Fund (from the sale of Brighamia plants – see action point). These funds were mostly used to buy helicopter time to get to inaccessible areas.

Questions arose around how to deal with the extinction of pollinators (e.g. Honeycreepers that pollinated Cyanea species) and how to deal with invasive species as the Hawaii situation is extremely complex (as one clears one invasive often a more invasive one comes in; and dealing with ungulates is very problematic). There were also questions about genetic representation in the re-introduction programme – there is little choice, stocks have to be mixed, but outbreeding depression does not appear to be a problem – the main issue is finding suitable areas for re-introduction.

**Possible Creation of Island Listserv or Network— Alan Tye**

Although everyone felt the need for these, there were no offers by anyone to lead anything. It was suggested that the Global Island Plant Conservation Network hosted by Botanic Gardens
Conservation International (BGCI) might be expanded to cover all taxa (see http://www.bgci.org/ourwork/islandsnetwork and see action point). It was pointed out that the focus should not just be on species but on island ecosystems. Another suggestion was to make use of the Aliens listserv (http://listserv.utk.edu/archives/aliens-l.html), although it was suggested that the GIPCN model (mainly for information sharing) might be more appropriate than the aliens-l model (much discussion). It was noted that guidelines may be required to prevent the listserv being used for political purposes.

**Invasives on Islands—Olivier Langrand**

Island Conservation focuses on conservation of Critically Endangered and Endangered vertebrate species threatened by invasive vertebrates on small islands (<50,000 ha) – see www.islandconservation.org. This initiative is developing a database of island biodiversity and invasives, in order to inform conservation planning, particularly island eradications. The database is linked to a number of other datasets, but more work on this is required. The data used so far are being filtered to direct conservation investments, some of which have been effective in getting species downlisted following successful eradication programs. The database has great value, but is too vertebrate-focused and so many key priorities for interventions are being missed. It also needs to include other data sets (e.g. conservation introductions, climate change mitigation).

**European Commission-funded project on island invasives—Geoffrey Howard**

This has only just started and Geoffrey Howard will be needing help with this. He also reminded everyone of the Islands Initiative within IUCN, but that there was only one person in Mauritius running this.

**Advances in ant management—Michael Samways**

Michael Samways (Chair, Invertebrate SG) described a case-study from the island of Cousin in Mauritius where invasives had been successfully cleared, but then there was a major outbreak of invasive alien ants. These could be controlled using hydromethylnone, but this could not be broadcast as it would kill many non-target species, but the use of special bait stations solved the issue, and brought the ants down to sufficiently low numbers for natural predation to keep them under control.

The case-study emphasized the need for close monitoring and adaptive management, and also the need for a mechanism to inform others about the lessons learned.

**Action Points**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agenda Item</th>
<th>Action Point</th>
<th>Lead</th>
<th>Others</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Send participants list to Alan Tye to circulate to everyone</td>
<td>Craig Hilton-Taylor</td>
<td>Alan Tye</td>
<td>ASAP after meeting</td>
<td>Done</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What has happened to funds received from the sale of Brighamia plants from European nurseries? The Hawaii Plants SG received some funds from this, but nothing for a long while</td>
<td>Craig H-T</td>
<td>Andrew Rodrigues, Chair’s office</td>
<td>ASAP after Chairs Meeting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Approach the Global Island Plants Conservation</td>
<td>Alan Tye</td>
<td>Christoph</td>
<td>ASAP after Chins</td>
<td>In</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Parallel: Global conservation initiatives: A Regional Recovery Effort for the Gulf of Mexico—Thomas Lacher and Roger McManus

The group reviewed circumstances surrounding SSC engagement in the Gulf BP blowout and the needs for more effective responses to the chronic environmental degradation in the region, particularly as it regarded species recoveries. Observations concerning species needs and recovery efforts, recommendations, and options were discussed and reviewed. Key considerations included:

- We need to ensure that the IUCN RL provides the broader basis for species conservation planning and implementation in the public and private sectors regionally, nationally and globally.
- We need to carefully consider how we can reverse current trends in species declines, with an emphasis on identifying needs that are not normally being satisfied by the SSC and our partners.
- A major emphasis in our 23 February plenary sessions was the need to ensure information on species is most effectively incorporated into species conservation policy and regulatory frameworks for implementing recovery plans in the public and private sectors.
- We need to organize to efficiently tap into SGs for ongoing and emergency regional stewardship needs.
- Regionally, we need collaborative recovery efforts including both the public and private sectors enjoying as many positive synergies as possible, but also ensuring critical stewardship needs are being met by the responsible public and private sector institutions. There needs to be transparency regarding the science, stewardship efforts and levels of accomplishment.

The following suggestions are developed from several sources including the discussions in the 23 February meeting (specific emphases from that meeting are underlined).

Complete the first Global Marine Species Assessment (GMSA) for the Gulf of Mexico, including for selected invertebrate species.

Several workshops are probably needed. [Kent Carpenter, give us a dollar figure: I can guess that we need, at a minimum, one invertebrate workshop at US$ 80,000 and two workshops to complete regional assessments for the global marine vertebrate assessments that are (or will be completed soon), including a synthesis of all of the above at US$ 160,000]. The foundation for a regional recovery plan is a comprehensive Red List for the region along with the associated data and information.

Fund and complete the GMSA globally.

Establish an expert data base, grounded in regional SSC membership with other experts in biology, management and stewardship, related law and policy, etc. This data base would probably be included in gulfbase.org administered by the Harte Institute.

Establish regional or national data bases for species. In the case of the Gulf of Mexico, we are looking at using gulfbase.org administered by the Harte Institute augmented with RL data. In previous discussions it was agreed to expand the scope of species addressed to include coastal ecosystem species as well as marine species. Texas A&M has opened the possibility of a Master of Science program focused on species of concern.
• **Identify sentinel species of concern, including those species in IUCN Red List threatened categories and others protected by national law in the participating countries.** In the United States species identified would include, for example, species protected by the U.S. Endangered Species Act, the Marine Mammal Protection Act, and the Migratory Bird Treaty Act, or managed by the Magnuson Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act. It could also include, CITES Appendix I species. This database will be the standard reference point for species that need to be included in policy analyses and consideration of legal obligations for regional initiatives such as for Environmental Impact Statement analyses.

• **Develop Regional Recovery Plans based on currently available Red List Assessments.** Traditionally recovery plans have been initiated and implemented by SGs, although Federal and State agencies with authorities to conserve species of concern are often leading such efforts as well. However, past recovery efforts have not always included the policy, legal or other expertise necessary to implement effective recovery efforts. The experience and needed expertise for such aspects should be included as appropriate for the collaboration. Recovery plans should focus on key recovery needs, such as implementation and compliance with existing law providing species protection, identification of critical habitat needs, protection of spawning aggregation areas, and establishment of spatial and temporal management regimes, including new protected areas as needed. Regional recovery plans should enjoy the synergies and accommodate legally mandated and institutional driven recovery efforts. The collaboration as a whole should be greater than the parts.

• **Establish an SSC-driven regional recovery plan development initiative.** In the case of the Gulf of Mexico there should be a focus on BP and associated funds. However this project can be the basis for the development of a template or model for other regional recovery plans. The development of this model would include several components listed below.

• **Identify environmentally sensitive areas based on analysis of biodiversity and threatened species to inform placement of Marine PAs.**

• **Identify linkages and synergies with regional IUCN offices in Gulf of Mexico area.**

• **Formally establish regional collaborations for species recoveries.** Such a group is being proposed to include biological, policy and legal expertise needed for all aspects of species stewardship and recovery. We are looking at the Partners in Flight organization as a possible model.

• **Explore and establish communications linkages between regional plan partners and the Commission on Environmental Law and other IUCN commissions.**

• **Monitoring and Reporting on Recovery Progress.** Monitoring and Recovery Progress could be reported on by SSC communication vehicles and other means. In the Gulf of Mexico, for example, the proposed Report Card may include some elements of the recovery efforts.

• **Develop and distribute educational materials, perhaps a manual, to the Specialist Groups on strategies regarding policies and regulatory frameworks for species recovery efforts.**

Proposal

• GMSA
• Red List Data Base
• Expert Data Base
• Establish Sentinel Species
• Initiate identification of Recovery Team Members and conduct a preliminary strategic analyses to identify sentinel species.
• Conduct a Regional Recovery Plan Workshop
• Publication
• Establish Full Recovery Team and convene a meeting to initiate monitoring and Reporting - Gulf Report Card

Parallel: Global conservation initiatives: Inter-tidal wetlands in East Asia— Taej Mundkur

Taej Mundkur provided an overview on the conservation issues of the Yellow Sea, which is a critical staging site for migratory shorebirds in their annual north-south-north migrations. The Yellow Sea fits into the East Asian-Australasian Flyway (EAAF) and, in terms of biodiversity it connects waterbirds and seabirds of Alaska and Siberia, with East, South East, South Asia and Australasia. Land claim is a main driver for taking habitats over and not reclaiming it for another purpose. The changes are not just on the coast but also inland and upstream, including the rivers feeding into the Yellow Sea.

EAAF Network Site - under this partnership there is an international network of sites designated as important migratory sites; this area is crucial for many birds.

Saemungeum has been claimed for industry and leisure locally labelled “Green Growth”.

The area is also important for the harvest of clams. The income of villages is dropping due to the reduction in yields. There are plans for two new tidal plants which are expected to impact on the reaming wetlands in Northwest Korea. It is very difficult to get good information on the coastline, since different agencies give different types of information which are not necessarily comparable.

The Partnership for the EAAF was launched in 2006 and covers twenty-two countries. It has twenty-six flyway partners and is a Ramsar Convention Regional Initiative. A Task Force for the Yellow Sea was established in 2010. There are nine network sites in the Yellow Sea.

Opportunities for IUCN SSC and others include:

• Multipronged approach needed
• Identify mechanisms for direct engagement to raise issues with national, provincial, state, city and governments in China and the Republic of Korea
• Independent IUCN assessment of the environment and biodiversity status of the intertidal wetlands and the development of conservation plans
• Preparation of a strategy for the Yellow Sea
• Development of an NGO strategy
• More information is needed, tracking of status of wetlands and species
• Finding models and solutions for sustainable development
• SGs have a big role to play to review the independent assessment
Conference Call with Nicola Crockford (RSPB)

The reclamation of intertidal habitats and land claim of mud and sand flats is a particular problem in the Yellow Sea. Research has shown that the rate of intertidal loss in China and the Yellow Sea is massively higher than anywhere else around the planet.

What can we do? A number of organisations wrote to the IUCN Director General to inform IUCN that they would be planning to submit a motion for the WCC in Korea, September 2012. SSC advised that the best way forward to address the issues was to commission a desk study, to get an assessment of the facts to accompany the motion. The deadline for this is the end April (motion deadline end of May).

Two consultants have already been hired (Yvonne Verkuil and John MacKinnon) to carry out an IUCN situation analysis desk study on East and Southeast Asian intertidal habitats, particular reference to the Yellow Sea. The first draft is to be ready in March for discussion at East Asian- Australasian Flyway partnership MOP6.

Information is being collected for the following key areas:
- Land claim information
- Protection status
- Trend data on waterbird populations

The vast majority of top priority sites are in the Yellow Sea in China and South Korea. In China there are huge clusters of sites around Bohai Bay, South Yellow Sea and Northeast Yellow Sea.

For each important site the following are being collected:

Historical data of intertidal wetlands on:
- The area of remaining intertidal wetlands
- The area of intertidal wetlands affected by land claim

For important sites and the total flyway the following is being analysed:
- Trend data on bird populations
- The area of intertidal wetlands affected by land claim

Comments

Malcolm Coulter (Co-Chair, Stork, Ibis and Spoonbill SG) explained that another issue, in addition to that of land claim, is also that this is a very shallow sea. Malcolm Coulter has worked on Black-faced Spoonbill conservation in Taiwan with landscape architects to develop alternative land planning. A very effective group called SAVE were involved.

Xie Yan (SSC Steering Committee member) noted that WWF China has a large programme in Bohai Bay and the Yellow Sea and asked Nicole Crockford if a link had already been made with them? Nicole Crockford suspected that Yvonne Verkuil has already been in touch with WWF China.
Michael Lau (WWF Hong Kong) noted that there was a December workshop looking at the conservation strategy in the Yellow Sea region, which is a prioritisation for the WWF China network. He emphasised the importance of collaboration on this.

Jim Harris (Crane SG) mentioned the threat of invasives on the coast, particularly *Spartina* (a perennial deciduous grass which is found in intertidal wetlands). Significant measures can be put in place to reduce the disturbance to birds and that worryingly the number of Red-crowned cranes has halved.

Baz Hughes (Chair, Threatened Waterfowl SG) asked if the current studies being carried out by Queensland University in this region encompasses the other threats (e.g. land claim with disturbance and the presence of *Spartina*) that increase the impact.

Nicole Crockford clarified that they are keen to look at everything but that the first stage will focus on land claim since this is the ultimate threat because there is no going back. The WCC motion will probably be calling for a proper ecosystem services study focusing on the Yellow Sea, looking at the accumulative threat to birds and human livelihood issues. Waterbirds are indicators of the health of water systems, so they bring together a compelling case.

Jim Harris suggested that using a case study to bring the other issues in and offered to make the information available and provide contacts to Yvonne Verkuil.

Will Darwall (Manager, Freshwater Biodiversity Unit, GSP) also suggested that the WCC motion could incorporate the threats to other taxonomic groups to highlight the wider negative impacts.

*Action Points*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Action Point</th>
<th>Lead</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| IUCN situation analysis desk study on East and Southeast Asian intertidal habitats | To provide information on:  
• Land claim information  
• Protection status  
• Trend data on waterbird populations  
Details on land claim and conservation status of interest:  
(1) The historical area of intertidal wetlands (pre-1950)  
(2) The area of remaining intertidal wetlands (in 2011)  
(3) The area of intertidal wetlands affected by land claim or conversion to land and artificial wetland in the periods pre-1980; between 1980 and 2010; and as predicted, between 2010 and 2020  
(4) The conservation status of the intertidal wetlands  
(5) Examples of conservation initiatives taken in order to maintain or restore intertidal wetlands and | Yvonne Verkuil: yvonne_verkuil@hotmail.com | Before 19th March | |
Parallel: Global conservation initiatives: Amphibian Survival Alliance—Jaime Garcia-Moreno

This session was a discussion regarding how to increase the institutional base resources to the Amphibian Survival Alliance (ASA) in order for it to continue its work on amphibian conservation, particularly through implementation of the Amphibian Conservation Action Plan (ACAP) – ideas that were suggested ranged from fundraising through online methods or with celebrities to developing a fundraising strategy that focuses on foundations and consortiums.

Jaime Garcia-Moreno gave a presentation introducing the ASA – focusing on threat status and evolution of the Alliance.

- Alliance set up in June 2011;
- Need: to increase institutional base, resources to maintain ASA, resources to maintain ACAP implementation;
- Core ASA operations currently US$ 250,000 per year; maintaining the current staff for ASG, Red List Authority, and Amphibian Ark costs an additional US$ 500,000;
- Red List update would cost US$ 1 million, ex-situ rescues – US$ 50,000 to $100,000 per species;
- Want advice on how to increase the institutional base – e.g. more institutional contributions and how do we sell the concept of the alliance and leverage?

Discussion

Chris Jenkins (Chair, Viper SG): current model is not a good one as many zoos will be suffering financially soon.

Jaime Garcia-Moreno: explained that this is the way the model started, but wants to build beyond this.

Jonathan Baillie (Co-Chair, Pangolin SG): how about a funding development board?

Jaime Garcia-Moreno: have not thought about a separate board but populating the board with money people.

Claude Gascon (Co-Chair, Amphibian SG): we need to think about the corporate sector – ZSL is a good example of how to do this. Using social networking tools for donations.

Jonathan Baillie: only getting about US$ 20,000 from donation button for ZSL [Jonathan Baillie works for ZSL].
Chris Jenkins: you pay a lot of money to get to that point. Website and online materials are critical to big asks – would go for big ask and then upgrade website and materials even more, which can help further with fundraising. Made links to presentations – have set up donors.

Jaime Garcia-Moreno: was thinking about doing a TED talk but does not have the contacts for this.

Jonathan Baillie: need to have a clear funding strategy, for next two years, should focus on key foundations and consortiums – so need to identify a number of key foundations. Also, key celebrities – frogs are easy to sell to individuals.

Claude Gascon: need to think about freshwater links regarding foundations.

Jaime Garcia-Moreno: the ASA is trying to mobilize institutions that can link amphibians to freshwater, since freshwater is more attractive to many donors.

Chris Jenkins: need to capitalize on being an umbrella organization. Also, Turtle Survival Alliance has maintained their network really well and continues to serve as an umbrella organization. Hold a turtle meeting every year, scientists and zoo people are there – people recognize the turtle survival alliance as the umbrella. It’s a meeting that people pay to come to.

Katalin Csatadi: who is the executive committee?

Jaime Garcia-Moreno explained him and Phil Bishop.

Jaime Garcia-Moreno: will present the ASA at the European parliament, to deal with chytrid fungus.

Brahim Haddane (Regional Chair, Sustainable Use SG - North Africa): sites and species protected by ASG actions?

Jaime Garcia-Moreno: 22,000 hectares and fifty-five species.

Tom Brookes (?): Should check AZE Developing world fund to see if there would be any funds available.

Jaime Garcia-Moreno: is already having a discussion with AZE regarding a more formal alliance. GEF and World Bank put in a core of resources to support AZE and then other institutions putting in other money (e.g. Brazil)—the money would go from Brazil from GEF funds.

Richard Jenkins (?): if get all the cash you need, what will you do with it?

Jaime Garcia-Moreno: secure network of sites and simultaneously figure out how to get species from captivity back into nature. The plan is to give people within ASA grants to do this work. Implementation is local, but coordination is international.

Claude Gascon: Ran “Lost Frogs” campaign last year and got huge pick up, part of the reason is because it was good news – it gets a lot of press, and if people donated online, could be great pickup. You could get donors to pay not to buy land but to reintroduce frogs.

Charity Water has about a third of their staff dedicated to website and media fundraising work. Viper Specialist Group is doing a lot of work on website and making donations very visible.
Parallel: Global conservation initiatives: Arctic Conservation—
Richard Hearn

Issue

Many Arctic species are currently facing severe threats, the majority of which are linked directly or indirectly to climate change. Whilst there are several excellent monitoring plans in existence for circumpolar programmes (i.e. Circumpolar Biodiversity Monitoring Programme, CBMP), the reality is that limited monitoring activities are actually taking place and even these modest national efforts suffer from a lack of international co-ordination; CAFF’s (Conservation of Arctic Flora and Fauna) seabird group being a notable exception. There is also a lack of communication on generic conservation issues, between SGs, and no formal Arctic presence within IUCN. There is much to be gained by the development of both of these from both practical and operational, strategic and policy perspectives.

Richard Hearn (Chair, Duck SG)

Focus was given to two main species – the Long-tailed Duck and the Velvet Scoter, whose populations have been declining, resulting in them both being up-listed on the RL in 2012. Other European Sea Duck populations also appear to be in decline.

A number of possible threats were listed, including climate change-related effects on breeding success, pollution, unsustainable harvests, and a decrease in levels of eutrophication (negatively affecting prey abundance). However, overall the cause of decline is unknown, and it was postulated that distribution shifts may at least partly explain observed trends (though this is considered relatively unlikely).

It was noted by an audience member that a decrease in eutrophication is unlikely to be the cause, as rainfall is likely to provide sufficient nutrients.

The response to these declines is to hold a workshop (in April 2012) to start the process of developing action plan(s). With this in mind, Richard Hearn is looking for collaboration in order to ensure that all relevant data are incorporated into this process.

Dag Vongraven (Chair, Polar Bear SG)

Dag Vongraven gave a brief speech on the topic of Polar Bears and their status, and noted the differences between this situation and that of the species described in the previous talk.

It was noted that the situation is highly political and economic, and differs greatly between hunting and non-hunting nations.

Dag Vongraven stated that he would like to learn from other specialist groups.

It was asked whether Red List assessments are conducted at the population or global level. The response was that assessments are global.

Reference was also made to the Programme ‘Snow, Water, Ice, Permafrost in the Arctic’ (SWIPA).
An audience member encouraged Dag Vongraven to make contact with the Conservation of Arctic Flora and Fauna (CAFF) Working Group.

Kit Kovacs (Chair, Pinniped SG)

Kit Kovacs began by describing the impacts of climate change in the Arctic, with special focus on sea ice changes as these directly reflect “habitat” for sea ice-associated marine mammal species and are some of the best studied environmental changes to date. Sea ice has decreased throughout the Arctic in extent, volume (thickness) and seasonal duration. The greatest changes have occurred in the amount of multiyear ice in the Arctic (much reduced) and the timing of ‘fall freeze-up’ (delayed markedly).

It was noted that levels of sea ice in Svalbard have been notably abnormal since 2005, and that in 2012 there is no sea ice at all so far in this region.

A number of case studies were described, illustrating some of the documented impacts of changing ice conditions on Arctic marine mammals:

**Ringed seals** – have shown poor breeding success since 2005 in Svalbard; reductions in ovulation rates and pregnancy rates have also been documented in the Canadian Arctic. Ringed seals breed on sea ice, in snow caves over breathing holes. This specificity and the small size of neonates and their long period of dependence make them extremely vulnerable to changing ice conditions. They do not use land for hauling out or breeding. Other related threats include changes to the food web, increased levels of disease and parasites, and increased human traffic. Although monitoring is limited, negative impacts of reduced Arctic ice are clear for this species.

**Gray whales** – have shifted their distribution northward into the Beaufort Sea and they migrate south later than normal in recent years, if they migrate at all. Their traditional benthic food in prime locations of a decade ago off the coast of Alaska has decreased markedly in abundance. Gray whales appear to have responded by shifting their feeding to target euphausiids, which may put them in competition with bowhead whales.

**Bearded seals** – exhibit reduced pup growth rates when spring sea ice extent is reduced. They also show signs of shifting their foraging habitat (less off shore prey), and trophic feeding level (eating less fish) in low ice years compared to heavier (normal) ice years.

**Walruses** – the loss of sea ice has affected walruses at all life history stages. Mothers and calves are increasingly observed on land (as opposed to ice), often in extraordinarily high densities with males on shore. This results in increased mortality, often due to increased predation and crushing of infants by adults during stampedes.

**Hooded Seals** – in the West, ice populations have suffered an 85 – 90% decline, due to the combined effects of hunting and decreased ice on which to breed. It is also possible that there has been a breakdown in the social system – the increased densities means that females are unable to defend their pups against the large numbers of males that can access them on small ice floes.

**Harp seals** – have shown a 50% decrease in pup productivity in the White Sea population, and the frequency of ice-breeding failure is increasing in the other populations as well.

**Killer whales** – are showing and increased presence at high latitudes, with significant impacts on other marine mammal species.
RL assessments have been conducted to subspecies level and are due to be published soon.

Overall, Kit Kovacs stressed that the key take home message was that there is no need to look into the future to see impacts of climate change in the Arctic, as the problems are already evident and manifesting themselves now.

Discussion

Following Kit Kovacs’ talk, discussion took place regarding how climate change impacts are often not captured on the RL. It was noted that climate change had been used to determine the status of Polar Bears, but not in pinnipeds, despite the similar threats. The comment was made that the Polar Bear SG may have been somewhat ‘maverick’ in their approach and are going through the assessment process a second time currently.

The question was posed to Kit Kovacs ‘What would you do to lessen the threat of climate change?’, to which the response was that ‘mitigation remains a key approach, that it is not too late, and that IUCN should be visible and opposing governments when climate change is not being addressed, for example, when the Kyoto protocol is not signed’.

It was then asked ‘are there actually any adaptation options?’ The response was that areas that are expected to remain intact should be urgently identified and given high protection.

A brief comparison was made between impacts upon terrestrial and marine environments, and it was noted that in the latter it is much harder to monitor species’ population declines.

The topic then returned to the subject of the RL, and particularly on whether assessments can or should be based on predictive models. It was noted that climate change is different to most other threats. It was state that while, for example, deforestation could theoretically be stopped tomorrow, climate change will be with us for some time, even if we alter emission rates now. Therefore it was suggested that a means to provide a more precautionary approach should be adopted. The discussion moved on to cover whether a new element to the RL should and could be created, and the intricacies of such an amendment.

Stephen Talbot (Chair, Arctic Plants SG)

Stephen Talbot presented his past, current and future work on data collection and synthesis relating to his field. This included:

- Circum-Arctic and Circum-Boreal vegetation maps, which were divided by region and by sector (?).
- An international Arctic vegetation database.

Stephen Talbot described how he aimed to pool all of this data in the formation of the online ‘Arctic Plant Portal’.

Stephen Talbot also mentioned that he is now working on Red List assessments for many Arctic plant species.
Stephen Talbot’s talk went on to describe the key issues that he is facing in his work. These included a notable requirement for better coordination of resource gathering, and a need for an improved framework through which to pool voices and data.

Stephen Talbot noted that in order to achieve this it will be important to define clear relationships with IUCN, and to establish key contacts both inside and outside of IUCN for future collaboration.

Stephen Talbot has provided a number of links to his ongoing work.

**Action Points**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agenda Item</th>
<th>Action Point</th>
<th>Lead</th>
<th>Others</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Circulate notes to all that attended the session and those not present that represent relevant SGs</td>
<td>Jamie Carr, Richard Hearn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A stronger position for Arctic conservation issues within SSC was identified as desirable.</td>
<td>Speak to Simon Stuart about the best way to take this forward, e.g. Arctic Sub-Committee.</td>
<td>Richard Hearn, Jamie Carr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A stronger link to CAFFs CBMP was also identified as desirable for most SGs (some already have this).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contact Mike Gill (CBMP) to inform him of the desire for closer collaboration and to discuss the preferred way forward for this</td>
<td>Dag Vongraven</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Parallel: Global conservation initiatives: The IUCN Red List and the Forestry Sector—Andrew Rodrigues and Gretchen Walters**

**Context**

An overview of current forest management plans being implemented in Gabon was given as an example of current practice in Central Africa. However, precise species names for all species exported from Gabon are difficult to find. Currently, 59.8% of Gabon’s forest cover is under concession and the Gabonese forestry code demands that each of these concessions produces a detailed forest management plan before exploitation can occur. An overview of one of these forest management plans, the Haut-Abanga concession, was given. There were 4 stages in this process: 1) Data collection and forest inventories; 2) Delimitation of the forest into series; 3) Definition of management plan goals; 4) Development of management plans for each series and the definition of management parameters for each of these series. Though the precise details of each plan vary between different countries and concessionaires, the four stages of the forest management plan process, as outlined above, remain true across the region.
In accordance with the Gabonese forestry code, the logging concessions owners must also contribute directly to the financing of local development projects and create community forest. However, this element had not yet been developed for the Haut-Abanga concession.

The example was put into a broader Central African context to demonstrate that these were processes that were ongoing throughout the region and that there are potential collaborators within the forestry sector, notably the Association Technique Internationale des Bois Tropicaux (ATIBT) who provide technical and scientific advice to the forestry sector. The increasing presence of REDD+ initiatives in the region was also shown.

The example of Central Africa was then put in a broader global context where flows of timber across the globe were shown in order to initiate a brainstorming session on how the Red List could inform the forest management planning process.

**Points raised:**

The discussion could be divided into three main areas: the sustainability of the forestry sector, the delimitation of the forest into series and the development of management plans for these series.

**Sustainability of the forest sector**

The sustainability of the forest sector was called into question with what seemed to be little information available on the species that were being exploited and how exploitation was affecting those species. The production of Red List of those species was considered a first step and consideration should be given as to how this should be carried out at national and global levels. The FairWild Standard—developed by the Medicinal Plant SG—was put forward as an example where a matrix had been developed to determine those species that would be most at risk from exploitation. Given the large amount of data held by the forestry sector, their engagement would be essential.

**Delimitation of the forest into series**

The delimitation of areas into those of relative high and low biodiversity drew comparison to certification schemes’ high conservation value (HCV). Though there is a process in place for the demarcation of HCV the implementation of that process could be improved. The issue of how guilds could be recognised in this process also arose, with guilds being defined as groups of species that exploit the same resource.

**Development of management plans**

There is a current lack of understanding of the process of restoration of degraded forests with little knowledge on how to track ecosystem functionality. Are there assemblages indicative of ecosystem functionality? This would feed directly into the REDD+ process.

With regard to community forest issues, examples of community management systems exist already and south-south exchanges could be encouraged to develop models for the Central African region.

**General points**

Some more general comments that were made:
- How can the conservation community (NGOs, organisations etc.) provide the forestry sector with good data/tools?
- There should be increased collaboration with less well-known taxonomic groups;
- Partnerships should be promoted with other conservation organisations;
- The roles of national versus global assessments should be considered;
- A task force should be formed to work on these issues.

### Action points

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agenda Item</th>
<th>Action Point</th>
<th>Lead</th>
<th>Others</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Development of a task force was proposed to take forward the thinking on how IUCN SSC could engage in the forest management planning process.</td>
<td>Andrew Rodrigues, Gretchen Walters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agenda Item</th>
<th>Action Point</th>
<th>Lead</th>
<th>Others</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A working group was formed that will take forward the thinking on how IUCN SSC could engage in the forest management planning process.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Parallel: Global conservation initiatives: Organizing the SSC at Regional and National Levels: a Latin American Focus— Jon Paul Rodriguez

**Main Questions:**

- What do you expect for the Regional Support?
- How to increase the participation of the SSC a national and regional level?

**Rodrigo Medellin (Co-chair, Bat SG)**

- Threats affecting bat species (including habitat and roost destruction)
- “South” Vision of Global Conservation: conservation planned from USA and Europe; No South-South communication and collaboration; missed opportunities.
- Creation of National Bat Conservation Initiatives (creation of a Regional Network: RELCOM from 2007, including a strategy defined by consensus; an e-bulletin; definition of AICOMS – KBA for Bats).
- Difficulties to create a similar Network for the North American region.
- Next Steps: learn about similar efforts in the world and extend collaborative arms.
- Comments:
Interest in knowing more about funding sources and governance of the Network.
Experiences in other regions (India and Southeast Asia)

Mayra Camino (Chair, Chytrids, Zygomycetes, Downy Mildews, Slime Moulds SG)

- Explained that in the Latin American context, the Fungi Specialist Group has included a Latin American Congress for these taxonomic Group (last one in July 2011 was in Costa Rica)
- In this congress the need for a Network of Fungi Experts (integrated by several experts from the Region)
- The experts have an Organization (infrastructure) but this is a new independent Group of IUCN (from 2009)
- Experts are working in conservation at national and regional level (but through the Society) – including the International Society. It is possible that another infrastructure inside the IUCN structure is needed.

Discussion

- How to improve the work in the Latin American region:
  - Work with other Networks (considering that SSC members in the region play different roles in other Networks).
  - Increase the link with the National IUCN Committees (including the possibility of mapping experts).
  - Increase knowledge of the IUCN Network and the support that every component could provide in order to improve a synergistic work (SSC and Secretariat).
  - Include SSC objectives inside IUCN Regional Programs (2013-2016) in order to insert SSC-specific priorities in the IUCN program.
  - How to influence a Latin American Species Conservation Agenda: common ground for regional initiatives? Latin American strategic initiatives? – For instance considering the food security issue.
  - Consider also avoiding redundancies of working at geographical and taxonomic Groups.
  - Need to identify local “potential” members for the SSC in every region and understand also the “dynamic” of the SG.
  - Role of the SG Chair as promoter of the SSC work.
  - Promote Regional Work in order to increase IUCN visibility (considering different aspects like language).

Action Points

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agenda item</th>
<th>Action Point</th>
<th>Lead</th>
<th>Others</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mapping of Latin American active members of the SSC (including the expertise of these members) and support coming from the Species Programme (this support needs to be coordinated with the information sent by the Chairs of the SG).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Create TORs for National Focal Points for the SSC in the IUCN National Committees.

Send proposal and experiences on how national committees are organized in different regions and countries.

Mixer: Programme Officers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agenda item</th>
<th>Action Point</th>
<th>Lead</th>
<th>Others</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Setting up PO list</td>
<td>Need to better define what a PO is and typically does</td>
<td>Mike Hoffman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>serve</td>
<td>Get a better handle on who the full-time POs are</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mixer: Stand-alone Red List Authority Chairs

This session was attended by fourteen SG and Stand-alone RLA representatives and two staff members. After a round of introductions, the meeting broke into a set of smaller discussion groups who were given some suggested topics to discuss, but the discussions were also open to raise any issues of particular interest to those present.

Topics for discussion

- Establishing an RLA
- How best to structure it
- How to keep members engaged
- Assessment process
- Review process
- Communications – unexpected assessments from other projects with no prior communication
- Quality of assessments
- Mapping – production and management of maps
- Training of RLA members
- Keeping up with new species
- Issues with citations
- How to handle reassessments

The groups were then requested to report back on some of the issues discussed. The matters raised were grouped as follows:

Financial support

- Funding was a big issue: the RL is the most important product produced by IUCN, but there is no serious investment from IUCN - lack of funding prevents progress
• Stand-alone RLAs need support and help from Secretariat, but IUCN facilitators need staff to be covered if not core funded
• Many groups were keen to meet, but there is no funding available for such meetings (some RLAS had made good use of remote learning tools and Skype, others were able to piggy-back their meetings on the back of other meetings, some had been able to raise funds to run workshops)

Language Issues

• Not all RL Documents are available in other languages (must be in French and Spanish at least)
• Want to submit assessments in other languages
• Call for multi-lingual volunteers to help RLAs with translations

SIS

• Can SIS receive a large number of assessments?
• Need to be able to use SIS offline
• Cumbersome adding in data for LC and DD species – takes a long time

Capacity

• Loss of members is a problem as then have to recruit new ones and train them from the start

Communication

• Need to inform relevant RLAs about species being assessed by other assessment teams (onus is on those teams to do this, but this needs to be written down in the process document)
• Need for a User Group to discuss issues, or an FAQ?

Action Points

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agenda Item</th>
<th>Action Point</th>
<th>Lead</th>
<th>Others</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Include something in RLA ToRs and Assessment Process document about the need to keep all relevant RLAs informed about any planned assessments so that these can be factored into their planning when they are sent out for review</td>
<td>Craig Hilton-Taylor</td>
<td>RL Technical Working Group, Chair’s office</td>
<td>For start of next quadrennium</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigate establishment of an RLA listserv</td>
<td>Craig Hilton-Taylor, Caroline Pollock</td>
<td>RL Technical Working Group, Chair’s office</td>
<td>For start of next quadrennium or sooner if IUCN can get a new server set-up for this</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red List Technical Working Group to discuss further issues raised during this session</td>
<td>Stu Butchart</td>
<td>RLTWG</td>
<td>May or June meeting 2012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mixer: Regional Species Focal Points

The intention of this informal session was to provide the opportunity for regional species focal points and IUCN Regional Offices without specific species focal points to discuss opportunities for enhanced collaboration with the SSC and the Global Species Programme. To begin the session, everyone present in the room introduced themselves. Present in the room were:

- Arturo Mora, IUCN Regional Office for South America (SUR)
- Victor Inchausti, IUCN Regional Office for South America (SUR)
- Ana Nieto, IUCN European Union Representative Office, Brussels
- Gretchen Walters, IUCN Regional Office for West and Central Africa (PACO)
- Grethel Aguilar, IUCN Regional Office for Mesoamerica (ORMA)
- José-Arturo Santos, IUCN Regional Office for Mesoamerica (ORMA)
- Fabien Barthelat, IUCN Regional Office for Mesoamerica (ORMA) (Caribbean Initiative)
- Khaldoun Alomari, IUCN Regional Office for West Asia (ROWA)
- Catherine Numa, IUCN Centre for Mediterranean Cooperation
- Bernard O’Calaghan, IUCN Oceania Regional Office (ORO)
- Helen Pippard, IUCN Oceania Regional Office (ORO)
- Leo Niskanen, East and Southern Africa Regional Office (ESARO)
- Raquibul Amin, IUCN Asia Regional Office (ARO)
- Will Darwall, IUCN Global Species Programme (Freshwater Biodiversity Unit)
- Kent Carpenter, IUCN Global Species Programme (Marine Biodiversity Unit)
- Caroline Pollock, IUCN Global Species Programme (Red List Unit)
- Andrew Rodrigues, IUCN Global Species Programme (SSC Network Support)
- Geoffrey Howard, IUCN Global Species Programme (Invasive Species Initiative)
- Giuseppe Notarbartolo Di Sciara, Cetacean Specialist Group
- Patricia Medici, Tapir Specialist Group
- Yong-Shik Kim, Korean Plant Specialist Group
- Wanda Olech-Piasecka, Bison Specialist Group (Europe)
- Mayra Camino Vilaro; Chytrids, Zygomycetes, Downy Mildews, Slime moulds SG (based in Cuba)

The discussion was centred on the needs of the regional offices, SGs in the regions, and the GSP, and how we can better collaborate together to address these needs. Some main issues that came up during the discussion were:

**Funding**

This is an age-old problem that affects not just the SSC network or the Regional Offices, but also the GSP which is mostly supported through project funds rather than core funds. The GSP can advise on where to target for funding, and can also collaborate on funding proposals (especially where project proposals coincide with areas the GSP is already working on, or opening up new projects that result in Red List assessments and capacity building within the region). But there is never any guarantee that a proposal will succeed.
One suggestion put forward was that, although different regions have different capacities, if regional offices collaborate on funding proposals (or at least share their experiences and offer advice to each other), perhaps together they can achieve real improvements in regional capacity, helping themselves, SSC and the GSP.

Communication between offices and SSC

Some offices feel there is a lack of guidance on how regional offices can help advise governments on how to use Red List data effectively; it is not clear how this information at the global level can be used for their national-level work.

Some examples of practical application of RL information may help. Some examples were given from the European regional assessment project. Note that the European Regional Assessment has an ongoing commitment from a major donor (EU) because they have a vested interest in having a high-quality and reliable knowledge base to inform major international legislation (e.g. the Habitats Directive). The European Red List is driving policy change within the region. It should also be noted that the European Regional Assessment project includes global assessments (for endemic species) and REGIONAL assessments (for non-endemics); it is therefore specifically tailored to be applicable to the European region.

Advice on how to get the RL information to the desks of the appropriate people within countries would be helpful. A Species Focal Point would need to know (or at least foster good relations with) the right organisations and government departments to facilitate a means of getting the information to the right place. RL information also needs to be packaged in a way that makes it relevant and useable in the context of country level policy and actions.

In the European Regional Assessment project, there is a certain amount of reliance on the published information being picked up by governments and organisations without actively targeting specific departments or people directly. Although the message does seem to be picked up in Europe, perhaps an overarching strategy for communicating the information would help to increase the uptake of these messages and help to actively promote action.

It was suggested that a summary of the main threats always be placed in a prominent position when communicating Red List results, with the emphasis that implementing actions to alleviate these threats will help countries to achieve biodiversity targets set by CBD.

Clarification of the target audience for communication was highlighted. Part of this audience is within IUCN. IUCN staff and members must be encouraged to understand what the information on the Red List means and how to translate this into local action and how to translate the information appropriately into other languages.

There is also a lack of regional expertise (or knowledge of species experts within the region). For example, in West and Central Africa there seem to be insufficient people working on species at a level to allow the regional office to really engage with SSC. If the local media or a government department contacts the office for statements on a specific species related issue (e.g. shark finning in the region), they do not always know who to put them in touch with or who to contact to find out who is the most appropriate person to comment.

The SSC members within each region could be supplied from the SSC members database (although note that there are some technical problems with that database and developments are required to ensure the expertise of each member is recorded appropriately). This would give the regional office
a list of existing members, but would not help them to identify regional experts that are not members of any SG.

For the SGs, the role of the regional office is not always clear. For example, can they advise SG Chairs on locating suitable experts to become new SG members? Judging from the comments above, probably not. Better communication on the role of the Regional Offices is needed.

There was a general feeling in the room that having a Species Focal Point in each regional office would be a helpful move forward. Of course, this does relate to the issue of funding (see the previous discussion).

**Capacity Building**

Red Listing is increasingly becoming a priority within regions, but those regions that do not have a Species Focal Point find it difficult to handle this. For example, the staff does not know how to interpret information from the RL in a way that is useful for informing work at a country level. Sometimes there are very keen, young scientists that do not speak English within the region but materials are only available in English.

The RL Unit is keen to share with the Regional Offices the RL training materials they have been developing over the last couple of years. Currently work is also underway to develop an online training course for red listing, which is planned for release towards the end of 2012. This course, and most of the associated materials, will also be translated into French and Spanish, but probably not until 2013 (after the online course is developed). There are also some materials (e.g. User Guidelines) that are updated too frequently for these to be translated and kept up-to-date.

The lack of staff (as well as the lack of appropriately experienced and trained staff) is a big problem in some offices. For example, in ROWA, there is no Species Focal Point, but they are trying to encourage more species work within the region and trying to work out ways to provide technical support within the region without a point person in place. This is extremely difficult with high workloads in other priority areas.

For those Regional Offices that do have a species focal point in place, it was noted that there are also demands for support from national Red List projects in the region. For example, in South America the Brazil Red List work that is underway demands a lot of regional office staff support, and there are other national Red List initiatives underway in the region.

Clear terms of reference for a Species Focal Point are needed (for general guidance – not to replace existing work ToRs) and a strategy for how Regional Offices should use RL information to target the right audience and encourage appropriate actions within the regions.

**Action Points**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agenda Item</th>
<th>Action Point</th>
<th>Lead</th>
<th>Others</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regional Species Focal Points</td>
<td>Develop and circulate a questionnaire around all of the regional offices to gather all of the regional offices need to improve their support for species issues within the regions.</td>
<td>Caroline Pollock</td>
<td>Jean Christophe Vié</td>
<td>June 2012</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Species Focal Points</td>
<td>Respond to the above questionnaire to help move this issue forward.</td>
<td>Recipients of the</td>
<td>Caroline Pollock</td>
<td>Aug. 2012</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Points</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Species Focal Points</td>
<td>Write a draft ToR for regional species focal points and strategy for using Red List information within the regions and circulate this around regional offices for comment and input (possibly meet to discuss this during WCC in Jeju for those who will be there).</td>
<td>questionnaire in all regional offices (chase up on replies if necessary)</td>
<td>Caroline Pollock, Jean Christophe Vié</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Species Focal Points</td>
<td>Finalise ToR and strategy.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Caroline Pollock, Jean Christophe Vié</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sept. 2012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Dec. 2012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Plenary: Improving Communication— Jane Smart

Following an introduction by Jane Smart, Dena Cator launched the new IUCN video produced by the Communication Unit, which presents the Union to a general audience. The video can be seen at http://www.iucn.org/about.

The rest of the presentation focused on the different communication media offered by IUCN SSC to the SGs:

- **SG websites:** can be based on the IUCN template, which is free and has the potential to make their branding stronger. The sites could be hosted on IUCN website free of charge.
- **Species e-bulletin** – distributed to more than 8000 people and tracks readership through the “Mailchimp” software.
- **Amazing Species:** Rachel Roberts presented the Species of the Day and Amazing Species web project. She explained that the initiative is running out of species to highlight and requested that SGs provide two nominations for Amazing Species in the near future.
- **Social Media:** SGs presented their positive experiences with the Social Media surge. Mariella Superina (Chair, Anteater, Sloth and Armadillo SG) provided feedback on how her SG uses a combination of their website and Facebook to promote the SG’s work. Thanks to the Twitter account Lucy Harrison (Programme Officer, Shark SG) created for the Chairs’ meeting, by the second day of the meeting, 36,000 Twitter users were aware that the meeting is happening.
- **YouTube channels:** these are easy to link to SG websites. DC explained how amateur videos posted on YouTube go viral, thus presenting a high potential for communicating the work of the SGs and the plight of threatened species.
- **Television shows:** Patricia Medici (Chair, Tapir SG) participated in an 18-minute interview on a national talk show in Brazil hosted by a very famous Brazilian comedian. Tapirs were profiled in the Brazilian media eighty times in the last year. Patricia Medici’s talk show appearance was the event with the highest profile and generated the most media coverage. (An interesting angle for this success was offered by the fact that calling somebody a “tapir” in Brazil is equivalent to call him “jackass” in English).
- **Press Releases linked to specific events in the calendar:** the Lagomorph SG was featured in a press release issued by IUCN on the eve of the Chinese Year of the Rabbit. This offered a communication opportunity for the SG and generated 31,000 visits to the website on the day of the release (compared to the usual average of 12-16,000 hits).
- **IUCN Red List logo:** this can be used to systematically communicate species’ status to the public through various media.
- **Wildlife imagery:** Richard Edwards (Chief Executive, Wildscreen) showed ARKive’s introductory video and stressed the power of wildlife imagery when related to a good story. Richard also presented the ARKive collection of photos and videos.
Q&A
The Q&A session at the end of the presentation was very animated and suggested further ideas for improving communication on species conservation. Some of the topics raised included:

- How to measure the impact of communication on conservation efforts.
- New media are good, but conservationists should not forget the important impact of “old” media (radio, newspaper, TV), especially in regions where Internet connections are slow or non-existent.
- There is evidence of young generations teaching their parents about issues through Facebook, thus highlighting the potential of SGs spreading information to target audiences through “intermediaries”.
- Conservationists need to generate the high quality content communicated by new media. We should also monitor this content (example given of an orchid being mistaken as an animal on Wikipedia and Facebook).
- SGs could gather stories on how social media are impacting conservation.
- Songs are also a powerful medium to communicate issues and of reaching a broad audience.
- The power of celebrities. Securing the support of celebrities whose voices are widely recognized to narrate stories in videos is a compelling communication tool. This idea offers the added value of being replicable in any language.
- The power of mobile phones in communication (both normal and Smartphones). Web traffic on them is increasing and can potentially reach unexpected audiences. Building Smartphone apps is one avenue to explore: (see Species on the Edge app at http://www.iucn.org?uNewsID=8603).
- Western social media are not popular in all countries, especially those that use a different alphabet like China. Conservationist should keep this in mind when developing messages for their target audiences.

Action Points

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agenda Item</th>
<th>Action Point</th>
<th>Lead</th>
<th>Others</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SG websites</td>
<td>Can be based on the IUCN template in order to make their branding stronger</td>
<td>SG Chairs</td>
<td>Dena Cator, IUCN Com. Unit</td>
<td>Any</td>
<td>SGs to further investigate this option if interested</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Could be hosted on IUCN website for free</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SG newsletter and bulletins</td>
<td>Introduce “Mailchimp” software to monitor reach of SG newsletters</td>
<td>SGs</td>
<td>Dena Cator, Claire Santer</td>
<td>Any</td>
<td>SGs to further investigate this option if interested</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Species of the Day and Amazing Species</td>
<td>Each SG to provide 2 species nominations for Amazing Species in order to avoid the initiative running out of species</td>
<td>SG Chairs</td>
<td>Rachel Roberts</td>
<td>by June 2012</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Social Media Impact on Conservation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>SGs</th>
<th>SSC Chairs Office</th>
<th>Long-term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gather stories on how social media are impacting conservation</td>
<td></td>
<td>SGs</td>
<td>SSC Chairs office</td>
<td>Long-term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IUCN Regional Office in Latin America offered help to SG based in Latin America to feature their contents on the online radio</td>
<td>Victor Inchausti (IUCN SUR)</td>
<td>SGs interested</td>
<td>Any</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Update of guidelines for SG on communication issues to be undertaken after the meeting and to be shared with all SGs</td>
<td>Dena Cator, Andrew Rodrigues</td>
<td>SGs</td>
<td>SSC Chairs office</td>
<td>Long-term</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Parallel: Promoting engagement in the international species-related conventions: CITES and SSC Engagement—Steven Broad

The session was intended to briefly introduce CITES to the SGs, explain some of the key processes that they could be involved in, and to let them know that Thomasina Oldfield and Dena Cator are a resource to help them with engagement and understanding of the Convention.

**David Morgan – Head of Scientific Support Team, CITES Secretariat**

David Morgan gave an overview of CITES, key meetings of the Convention and the role of the Secretariat including information on the CITES Virtual College which can be used by SGs to learn more about CITES and how it works. He noted that, although some have said the Convention could not function without IUCN, it was perfectly capable of functioning. However, IUCN certainly does help the Convention function better.

- History of CITES: it came out from an IUCN meeting
- CITES 40th meeting in Bangkok (COPs take place every three years)
- International WT worth around 300 Billion, from Sue Lieberman, WWF. CITES is a tool for regulation of trade in wildlife. CITES decisions put into practice inform their sustainable use and demonstrate how species are important to people
- Input from all SSC SGs would be very welcome
- The role of the CITES secretariat is to implement the convention
  - Role of parties and how they participate in implementation
  - Overview on how species are selected by CITES to be under control or part of appendices
  - The Red List criteria is one way species are selected
  - Periodic review takes place to keep the process up-to-date
  - Non-detriment finding equivalence to sustainability of species
Dena Cator and Thomasina Oldfield, IUCN Species Programme

- Outline of IUCN work within CITES and how this relates to SGs
- IUCN present at all the CITES meetings, as well as inter-sessional working groups within CITES, and tries to collaborate with SGs on this
- Link between IUCN Species and Traffic work was outlined
- IUCN works with Traffic to look at information available on species in relation to the criteria and appendices
- TRAFFIC makes recommendations on proposals to amend CITES appendices and examples were given of work done at CoP15
- Invitation to SSC members on how they want help and ways they can be helped were presented

Presentations by Specialist Groups

Holly Dublin (Chair, African Elephant SG)

- Overview on when the African elephant was listed in CITES, some history and role of IUCN in engagement with CITES;
- Panel of experts process explained;
- Role of the SG with regards to CITES process and partnerships;
- Relationships with the two elephant monitoring systems;
- MIKE and ETIS;
- Explained how the relationship is on a day-to-day life basis, rather than just at meetings;
- Overview of what was under MIKE Phase 2;
- Future engagement with CITES looking as exciting and busy - e.g. Mike Phase 3;
- Raised issue of sensitivity of data, and political nature of the species.

Yvonne Sadovy (Chair, Grouper and Wrasse SG)

Yvonne Sadovy shared lessons learnt and non-detriment findings issues relating to Humphead Wrasse:

- Low volume traded fish, listed in Appendix 2;
- History of the reef fish; attractiveness to trade; focus on juvenile fishery;
- Explained process of capturing information about the species and modelling process with the help of FAO.

Danna Leaman (Chair, Medicinal Plant SG)

Danna Leaman’s presentation described the involvement of the Medicinal Plant SG in advising on procedures for making CITES Non-Detriment Findings for plants, and the new FairWild standard which assesses the harvest and trade of wild plants against various ecological, social and economic requirements.

Phil McGowan – (Galliformes SG)

This presentation focused on the work that Dr McGowan, on behalf of the Galliformes SG, is doing to encourage completion of the CITES Periodic Review process, where species on the CITES Appendices are reviewed for their appropriate placement there. An approach to complete the Periodic Review for Galliformes is currently being trialled.

Rodrigo Medellin (Co-chair, Bat SG)
Rodrigo Medellin highlighted the ways IUCN can engage with CITES Parties themselves in the Convention. An example is by contributing species conservation status data to the Periodic Review process.

Q&A

Nick Dulvy (Chair, Shark SG): Question to Danna Leaman: how do you deal with uncertainty?
Danna Leaman: this is discussed in the IUCN guidelines on CITES but what's on the ground with respect to the management systems is more important to consider.

Robert Cantley (Chair, Carnivorous Plants SG): Can CITES help provide data on prosecutions?
David Morgan: no, but countries concerned or TRAFFIC can help.

Mike Fay (Chair, Orchid SG): What happens when scientists come unstuck or members are made to feel like international criminals even though they are legitimately moving orchids?
No real answer to this one - just be prepared!

Action Points

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agenda Item</th>
<th>Action Point</th>
<th>Lead</th>
<th>Others</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CITES and IUCN</td>
<td>Discuss import of Scientific samples</td>
<td>Dena Cator and Thomasina Oldfield</td>
<td>CITES Secretariat, TRAFFIC, Dr Mike Fay</td>
<td>End April</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Parallel: Promoting engagement in the international species-related conventions: World Heritage—Tim Badman

Introduction: the aim was to open up further discussion between the World Heritage (WH) Convention and SSC, especially developing connections with SSC members.

Tim Badman gave an overview of the WH Convention, an outline of how it works, where it sits in the IUCN structure, and the need for additional recognition for natural conservation within it. Currently, 188 states are currently signatories to the WH.

The question was then posed as to whether WH is connecting with SSC on threats to biodiversity within WH sites. An open question session was convened.

From the floor an outline of the SSC-WCPA Joint Task Force was provided. This is intended to identify standards and criteria to identify sites for potential WH sites, often through the use of pre-existing identified biologically important sites (e.g. KBA’s, IBA’s etc.). This would allow better documentation of the biological value of the importance of WH sites, identify potential new WH sites, enable monitoring within and outside of WH sites, and combine data systems (e.g. Red List and WDPA).

The question of whether WH sites could be identified on agricultural biodiversity grounds was raised. This was considered possible either through the biological or cultural criteria of the WH Convention.
The submission of sites for inclusion on the WH list where the situation is portrayed as being ‘rosy’, although this may not be the on the ground truth, was questioned. In response, participants were ensured that a confidential process was used to review the true quality of sites.

A question was raised as to whether biogenetic resources in agricultural land, such as from small-scale, traditional farms could qualify as WH sites.

A point was raised as to how SGs could assist with the monitoring of WH site quality. The response indicated that this was a two-way street in which WH site managers could let the countries know of any concerns. People identified as knowledge holders for the site (such as SSC members) should then be engaged. This is important especially for sites qualifying under Criterion 10.

It was noted that nominations of new sites are difficult as the state in which they are found must nominate the site and they are only allowed to nominate two per year.

There was some discussion on the spatial scale with which SSC could help monitoring of sites. The answer was that, for management of large marine sites, the SSC-WCPA committee should be involved.

There was some concern that monitoring of marine sites may be difficult to determine if they are healthy – and that there is a challenge to establish indicators.

Funding for monitoring was raised – who pays for this? In response, small grants of up to $30,000 can be offered by the WH Convention, but these can only go to state agencies. Other small grants may be available for non-state agencies.

**Action Points**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agenda Item</th>
<th>Action Point</th>
<th>Lead</th>
<th>Others</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q&amp;A</td>
<td>Find out whether biogenetic resources in agricultural land, such as from small-scale, traditional farms could qualify as WH sites.</td>
<td>Tim Badman</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lead to consult with FAO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Parallel: Promoting engagement in the international species-related conventions: CMS & Ramsar— Taej Mundkur and Borja Heredia**

**Convention on Migratory Species (CMS)**

The purpose of the session was an explanation of how the SSC can better interact with CMS. A PowerPoint presentation was given as an overview of it. Following are the key points:

- CMS was finalised in 1979
- CMS is, like CITES, species-focused unlike the other conventions, such as CBD
- CMS is mainly in place to promote international co-operation for species migrating across boundaries; the focus is on trans-boundary migrations.
- Currently, 116 countries are Parties to CMS – a priority is to get more countries involved
- The primary tools of the convention are
  - Species listings (Appendix I, II)
  - And regional agreements (Countries prefer the more flexible Memorandums of Understanding (MoUs) than signing up to the full legally binding convention. MoUs
incorporate an Action Plan and are said to be quite effective. An overview of the main threats was given.

- Bycatch is a priority issue for CMS; in particular the impact of gill nets on marine species, and SSC input might be used to assess this impact.
- Obstructions to migration, such as roads, dams, trains, wind-farms are another priority and guidelines are being developed looking at the impact of power lines on birds. For mammals in Mongolia and Russia construction blocking migration routes is a priority.
- Wildlife diseases—the need to work with SSC was stressed
- Invasive species – CMS is planning a review
- Communication campaigns are mainly based on the “Years of the.....” which have been successful
- Resolution 10.3 Ecological Networks from the last COP was approved, stressing the need to focus on habitat conservation. So the CMS focus is no longer solely on species, but also their habitats.
- The “Living Planet: Connected Planet” publication was mentioned as a useful communications tool.
- Resolution 10.12 Fresh Water Fish was adopted in the last COP. SSC has a key role in identifying candidate fish to be taken forward with a party to the next COP.
- A clear agenda for cetaceans at the global level now exists.
- Climate change: would like IUCN to identify the most affected species (IUCN input was stressed as being most important)
- Impacts of poison on birds was emphasised and has led to the creation of a working group on this issue
- New proposal for African Eurasian land birds to address the decline
- Proposed that a closer link with IUCN would help in access to policy makers
- The small grant programme is to reopen later this year thanks to the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) and SSC should consider applying (Max grants of EURO 15,000); synergies with Save Our Species might be useful

The Ramsar Convention

- The Ramsar Convention has been adopted by 151 countries.
- It was started to protect waterfowl, but has since broadened to include other wetland species and ecosystem services.
- It is outside the United Nations (UN) system, but has a group of IoPs including IUCN.
- One pillar of the Convention is the identification of sites using 9 criteria that link directly to information on species. IUCN SGs have been involved in the development of the criteria and the IUCN Red List is important for Criterion 2, but all nine criteria can use the support of the data generated by the SSC.
- A lot of time was spent on developing Criterion 7 (for fish) with a focus on species of biodiversity—rather than commercial—value.

Q&A

- Tom Dacey (Programme Officer, Crocodile SG): expressed concern for a couple of Critically Endangered crocodiles impacted by palm oil plantations in Lake Mesangat, East Kilimanatan, Indonesia. He would like to see if it might be designated as a Ramsar site.
- Paul Racey (Co-Chair, Bat SG): has there been any progress on an Africa agreement for migratory bats?
  - Not much progress yet, but CMS is looking into ways to move things forward in a more methodological manner in order to ensure any new MoUs are effective.
- Viola Clausnitzer (Chair, Dragonfly SG): It would be nice to have a greater focus on inverts (for example, crabs, molluscs and odonata) in Ramsar and CMS.
• We need a map of who is doing what related to what Convention. Many related regional activities and organisations involved in the actions for the various conventions are not well connected – or at least the connections are not clear.

• Amanda Vincent (Seahorse, Pipefish and Stickleback RLA): To what extent have the Ramsar criteria been applied to the marine environment?
  o There is some activity in some countries but the marine habitat is still poorly represented. Raising the coverage of the marine habitat is a priority for Ramsar, such as through resolutions for better management on intertidal wetlands. So the roots are there for site proposals. Is there an analysis on the current marine cover by Ramsar sites and the potential sites for marine cover?

• Richard Lansdown (Chair, Aquatic Plant SG): proposed a quantitative criterion in Ramsar for selection of sites based on wetland plants and for a better definition of “wetland” to include wetland dependant plants.

• Gordon Reed (Chair, Freshwater Fish SG): CMS needs to consider movements of larvae, eggs, seeds, etc which require clear routes for passive migration – it would be good to address this in the conventions.

• Richard Foster: There is a need for cross-sectoral communications to avoid duplication or inappropriate actions. For example, in Sudan there is a need to take care in developing grand ideas for conservation action in the absence of on-the-ground knowledge. In reality, there may not be much scope for practical action given the many constraints in the region of interest.

• Jean-Christophe Vié (SSC GSP): regarding CMSGSP MoU, many SG’s deal directly with CMS. We would rather the SG’s go through GSP in providing information that might then be used to develop position papers to influence the convention. We need a more structured approach such as we have for CITES where we have a big influence. Many parties complain about the lack of an IUCN representative in the CMS council.

• Monika Bohm (ZSL): Patterns of impacts to vertebrates do not necessarily reflect those for invertebrates. Why is there therefore no focus on invertebrates in CMS?

**Action Points**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agenda Item</th>
<th>Action Point</th>
<th>Lead</th>
<th>Others</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Resolution 10.12 Fresh Water Fish</td>
<td>SSC to identify candidate fish to be taken forward with a party to the next COP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Climate change</td>
<td>IUCN to help CMS identify most affected species</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crocodiles in palm oil plantations of Lake Mesangat, East Kilimanatan, Indonesia</td>
<td>Contact the WI office in the Region of Indonesia to see if efforts can be made to designate the site under Ramsar</td>
<td>Taej Mundkur</td>
<td>Tom Dacey</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A greater focus on invertebrates in Ramsar and CMS</td>
<td>Take a request to the Ramsar secretariat to include more sites based on invertebrates</td>
<td>Taej Mundkur</td>
<td>Viola Clausnitzer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applying Ramsar criteria to marine sites</td>
<td>Investigate options to draw up a motion to Ramsar for better inclusion of marine sites</td>
<td>Amanda Vincent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Selecting Ramsar sites based on plants</td>
<td>Take proposal for a criterion on plants and wider definition of “wetland” to the Scientific and Technical Review Panel</td>
<td>Taej Mundkur</td>
<td>Richard Lansdown</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Parallel: Workshops: Virtual Planning Environments—Caroline Lees and Onnie Byers

The session took the form of a brief presentation followed by a hands-on demonstration of the tools. Caroline Lees presented her experience of using the AdobeConnect tool to run a virtual workshop to produce a report involving a series of meetings online in a group of around 8 people. Overall the result was very positive providing a good way for a group of people who already know and trust each other to work together avoiding the stress, cost and carbon of international travel.

Caroline Lees also demonstrated Google Sites as a tool to create personalised web pages as a means of sharing documents and content on a specific project or topic. This is a good way to create a web space for free, then use the space and delete it when the project is finished.

Action Points

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agenda Item</th>
<th>Action Point</th>
<th>Lead</th>
<th>Others</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hold a virtual meeting session using the CBSG hosted tool</td>
<td>James Burton</td>
<td>other attendees</td>
<td>01 May</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Share meeting facilitator check list</td>
<td>Caroline Lees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Play in the CBSG AdobeConnect sandbox</td>
<td>All</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Enthuse colleagues to consider virtual meetings</td>
<td>All</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Parallel: Workshops: Capturing, managing and disseminating species population and range data using online tools—Diane Skinner

Diane Skinner from the African Elephant SG (AfESG) provided an introduction to the African Elephant Database (AED), a tabular and spatial database on elephant distribution and abundance. It provides the only information on elephant status in Africa. An African Elephant Status Report (AESR) is produced every three to five years.

The AED will consume any and all info that data providers will provide. It is then categorized: for African Elephants, range is categorized as known, possible, doubtful, and non-range (but coded differently for Asian Elephants) and population estimates are coded as definite, probable, possible, and speculative (based on survey type: sample counts, dung counts, total counts, guesses etc). This allows the production of numbers at the national, regional and continental level. The AED also has
an information quality index – an index of overall quality on population estimates. The last time an IQI was calculated was 2007 (time of the last AESR).

The data contained within the AED permit calculation of trend analysis, where areas have been surveyed over multiple years with the same methodology. The database tracks reasons why populations are changing (i.e., in order to determine genuine changes). The database also allows one to identify areas to prioritize for future surveys, which is useful for countries and for donors.

The new system online is conceived of as a multi-species system and is built using open source software. The code is available for other projects and for improvement. The online tool has many new features, including: online public submission process; the inclusion of iNat observations; the ability to publish survey reports if the data provider has licensed them into the public domain; the ability to undertake more frequent updates of pooled estimates; and a nimble new structure to allow alternative ways of calculating pooled estimates.

Why the change? The old process had a database manager based in Nairobi, pulling survey reports out of the field, and then required manpower to process each survey, and then subsequently produce a status report. Now the process is simpler in that people submit data directly (although, of course, they will still have to chase down reports).

AED is based on a relational data model, with a data table for every type of survey. It can accommodate historical datasets besides the current dataset (necessary for calculating trends).

The online submission process includes the critical aspect of data licensing: one where the data provider retains the license and another where it is licensed under a creative commons license (CC-BY-NA). Not all fields in the database are compulsory, although some fields are critical for a successful submission of data. The submission process concludes with a file upload, including the option to add links, upload geometry, attachments, etc. The data are then checked by the AED data officer, who releases the data to the public (depending on the licensing).

Now that a database officer is in place, the next step is entering data. Analysis will then start as soon as possible, with publication of a set of 2011 pooled estimates. The intention is to utilize the new web interface to communicate these data effectively. Eventually, additional functionality will be added to the website.

Diane Skinner offered meeting participants several options to engage:

1) The system is open source, so interested parties can take the entire code and use it for their own purposes.
2) There is the option to jointly manage the system for multiple species. Especially useful for species that share range (e.g. buffalo and giraffe). Would require collaboration to determine how best to use the tool for data entry. Also require decisions on the analytical structure required for each species and how to display the data for each species.

Dianne Skinner expressed a final word of thanks to donors and partners: Asian Elephant SG; CITES; MIKE; European Union; United States Fish and Wildlife Service; Solertium; Save the Elephants; and Tusk trust.
The African Elephant SG also maintains the AED library (5,500 references). The library system is out of date, and Diane Skinner was keen to know if there is any interest in engaging in an enhanced reference management system.

Discussion

Stephen Woodley (Co-Chair, Joint SSCWCPA Protected Areas and Biodiversity Task Force) noted that NatureServe has developed a similar system called Kestrel. It is based on a system of bins. The question AED has to answer is whether you want to go from being a database concerned only with African Elephants to multi-species. There is also Protected Planet, which has a wiki function allowing you to upload data and attach it to a PA. Stephen Woodley offered that it would be nice to see better linkages between WDPA, Protected Plant and AED.

Souleymane Konaté (IUCN Deputy Coordinator, Protected Areas Programme, Programme pour l’Afrique Centrale et Occidentale) asked whether there is a need for capacity building to help people in West Africa use the tool, or if there will be online training. Diane Skinner replied that the tool is very intuitive and should be very straightforward to use and require no training. Souleymane Konaté also made reference to the AfroBioDrivers project and offered to make the needed connections as it may be relevant and would probably deliver data of relevance.

Rebecca Lewison (Chair, Hippo SG) remarked that her group was desperate for this sort of database and welcomed the opportunity to collaborate.

Mike Knight (Chair, African Rhino SG) indicated that they are developing something similar for Black and White Rhino populations in southern Africa. They have huge confidentiality issues though.

Simon Hedges (Chair, Asian Elephant SG) mentioned that the Asian Wild Cattle SG has already mapped the range of all the Asian wild cattle species in south-east Asia, and it would be easy to add those data (given that the database already includes the Asian Elephant). He proposed chatting with James Burton (Chair, Asian Wild Cattle SG).

Amanda Vincent (Chair, Seahorse, Pipefish and Stickleback RLA) noted that they are trying to do similar things for the marine environment. She also made reference to the London Citizen Science Summit, held earlier in the year.

Philippe Chardonnet (Co-Chair, Antelope SG) noted that there will be a need to include other categories for other species. Diane Skinner replied that this should not be a problem, but would require; a) developing the logic for those data fields and categories and b) funding to support developer time to further develop the database. Philippe Chardonnet also asked how one ensures the categories are defined on a consistent basis. Dianne Skinner replied that, for species for which it makes sense, one could use the AED categories. Alternatively, if you have a different category framework, the tool is there and one can just adapt it. Obviously, if you don’t have a cat framework, then you need to develop one.

Dianne Skinner asked if there are other categorization systems that other groups have. Mike Knight replied that they have information down to individual animals, but would need to have other categories.
Jon Hutton (Director, UNEP-WCMC) expressed interest from the crocodile group. They did a “half-way house” system built around Google (www.crocsurveys.net). Their main problem is the historical data. It took them about a year to pull information from the recent 50 years’ worth of surveys. Each survey is geo-referenced and then linked to the original document. However, it doesn’t include any analysis. Jon Hutton noted that out of 600 surveys that showed presence or absence, none could be used to show trends.

At this point, Dianne Skinner gave a live demonstration of the tool. She also demonstrated a data request system that relates to the use of AFGSG data, and highlighted the function of having the system password protected and secure to limit membership, and keep data secure and private.

Stephen Woodley asked if there is recognition for data providers and contributors, and Dianne Skinner confirmed that there is (all data is cited to source, usually a paper, or report, or personal communication).

Mike Knight emphasized that the critical aspect is the security of the information. It is okay to give people access to the summary of the information, but not to the individual populations.

Jon Hutton noted that there may be an issue on licensing of the AED because it is different to the licensing being adopted by the World Database on Protected Areas (WDPA) and RL. A real issue (which the terms and conditions of both the RL and WDPA have dealt with) is that the Creative Commons does not define commercial use, which provides a loop-hole for corporates, or those working on behalf of corporates, to use the data.

**Action Points**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agenda item</th>
<th>Action Point</th>
<th>Lead</th>
<th>Others</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>Notes (if necessary)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Capturing, managing and disseminating species population</td>
<td>SGs interested in utilizing the AED open source software, or in partnering with the Africa and Asian Elephant SGs on the development of the database, to indicate their interest directly to Diane Skinner, who will then work with Mike Hoffman to determine the best way to move forward.</td>
<td>Diane Skinner</td>
<td>Other SGs as appropriate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


This session focused on demonstrating the main Red List (RL) tools available for assessors. Online resources were used for most of the session. Caroline Pollock introduced the session, listing the four main topics that would be covered: SIS (presented by Craig Hilton-Taylor), the RL web site (presented by Caroline Pollock), RL assessment tools (presented by Resit Akçakaya), and mapping tools (presented by Vineet Katariya).

Before going into the SIS part, Caroline Pollock spoke about RL Training (see presentation).
Please note that information in the Microsoft PowerPoint presentation is restricted to the introduction.

**Species Information Service (SIS)**

Craig Hilton-Taylor gave an overview of the new version of SIS and demonstrated some of the new features and functionalities that have been added to the new version. It appeared that only half of those attending the meeting had used SIS.

There were questions about when the offline version would be available for use by the SGs, seeing as some SGs have poor access to the Internet.

There were a few questions about getting large number of assessments into SIS in a batch process as well submitting assessments in Microsoft Word documents.

**Red List Website**

Caroline Pollock presented the search functionality on the RL website and explained some of the resources and features. Many of the attendees could not carry out complex searches on the RL website, so Caroline Pollock went through a few examples.

**Red List Assessment Tools**

Resit Akçakaya presented RAMAS tools for RL. He demonstrated the use of fuzzy numbers for calculating Extent of Occurrence (EOO), Area of Occupancy (AOO) and population decline.

**Mapping Tools**

Vineet Katariya demonstrated web-based mapping prototypes that facilitate species mapping for the RL—both for freshwater as well as terrestrial species. She also presented the current resources and tools for GIS and mapping available at:


**Action Points**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agenda Item</th>
<th>Action Point</th>
<th>Lead</th>
<th>Others</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RL Training</td>
<td>Send a questionnaire around the SG and RLA Chairs, Focal Points (including the SSC Bolivia country focal point), and IUCN Regional Offices asking for their Red List training needs.</td>
<td>Caroline Pollock, Rebecca Miller</td>
<td></td>
<td>April 2012</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RL Training</td>
<td>Respond to the above survey.</td>
<td>SSC &amp; RLA network, Regional Offices</td>
<td></td>
<td>By end July 2012</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RL web site</td>
<td>Add the appropriate SG logos to assessment accounts on the RL web site with hyperlinks embedded to the SG web site.</td>
<td>Ackbar Joolia, Craig Hilton-Taylor, Web Site developers</td>
<td></td>
<td>TBC ( ideally for WCC in Sept.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIS</td>
<td>Send a questionnaire around the SG and RLA Chairs, Focal Points (including the SSC</td>
<td>Caroline Pollock</td>
<td></td>
<td>April 2012</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Bolivia country focal point), and IUCN Regional Offices asking for which members and staff need access to SIS.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SIS</th>
<th>Respond to the above survey.</th>
<th>SSC &amp; RLA network, Regional Offices</th>
<th>By end July 2012</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Action Point</td>
<td>Contact the RL Unit if you have any questions or comments on RL Training, SIS, the RL web site, the assessment tool for handling uncertainty, or mapping tools.</td>
<td>SSC &amp; RLA network, Regional Offices</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Parallel: Workshops: Writing successful funding proposals—Nicolas Heard, Alessandro Badalotti and Jeremy Harris**

Speakers for the session were Nicolas Heard from the Mohammed bin Zayed Species Conservation Fund and Alessandro Badalotti of IUCN's Save Our Species Fund (SOS) supported by Jeremy Harris, Development Director of the SSC.

An overview was given of each of the funds represented but it was made clear that this session was about applications to funding beyond the scope of those represented and not intended to provide specific insight into applying for funding from the Mohamed bin Zayed Species Conservation Fund or SOS. Questions were invited following the presentation during a period of discussion scheduled for the end of the allotted time.

A distinction was made between proposals seeking funds for species-specific conservation projects as opposed to other conservation proposals. The primary consideration in this instance is the scope of the project with direct impact considered to be harder to demonstrate where the geographical scope is broad.

The high level of competition for species conservation funding was highlighted with the recommendation that in light of this any specific requirements of the funding body be carefully considered and adhered to. It was recommended that reporting on the use of funds be considered from the outset and thanking funders is essential.

Some general tips were provided alongside pitfalls that may be easily avoided (see presentation from session).

Discussion following the session centred on management of donors and tips for the effective engagement of different kinds of funders. An emphasis was placed on storytelling and being mindful of the reviewer when completing a proposal for funding. Given the high levels of competition it is also essential to follow guidelines to the letter and build credibility in the project by referencing the broader conservation context within which the proposed project falls.
Parallel: Workshops: Wildlife Disease Risk Analysis and surveillance—Richard Kock, Billy Karesh and Catherine Machalaba

Wildlife Disease Risk Analysis—Richard Kock

Development of guidelines and manuals for analysis of wildlife disease risk:

- **Aim**
  - To help address disease threats to biodiversity
  - Open access
  - Endorsed by IUCN and OIE (World Organization for Animal Health)

- **Background**
  - In 1992 the Conservation Breeding SG (CBSG) established its Disease Risk Assessment Initiative
  - There were training workshops in Costa Rica, South Africa and Mexico
  - Since then, however, ecological health concerns have increased as have scientific and technological advances in risk analysis
  - In 2011 a new initiative is being led by CBSG with the involvement of several SGs

Disease as an indicator of biological change across the planet:

- The historical approach to disease has been very narrow – there are very few diseases that don’t have co-factors.
- Some examples of disease as indicators:
  - Distribution of Bighorn sheep: many populations in the 1800s, a few, dwindling populations in the 1960s, and some recovery in 2001.
  - Population crashes are not straightforward – there are more factors involved.
  - An example would be the Saiga outbreaks, when disease mortality was at its highest the population was still growing.
  - What is driving chytrid fungus in amphibian declines?
  - A Disease Risk Analysis (DRA) approach makes us take a much broader perspective, where disease-mortality causality may not necessarily be linear as there may be other factors involved

Primary project components:

- IUCN guidelines and manual
- Process description
- Tools library
- Training programme

Advertising and promoting are key in getting these taken up:

- DRA provides both quantitative and qualitative results using simple and if necessary, complex modelling
- DRA reduces uncertainty in decision-making and increases confidence
- Its use can complement Environmental Impact Assessments, conservation planning and wildlife management, and facilitate animal translocation and re-introduction
  - Floor input: DRA can identify where the risks and threats are and what can be done about them, in this way facilitating conservation
  - There are several tools (software) freely available on the Internet or at low cost
  - These involve modelling methods, but not necessarily much mathematics
  - Training Programme
- Train the trainers
- Face-to-face virtual training
Progress: June 2012: publication of stand-alone documents and guidelines for policy makers

Q&A

Q: What countries don’t have regulations for importing animals? What about translocations and re-introductions? Even if countries don’t have guidelines in place, this is an important issue.
A: It is important to consider the parasitic load of the animals being introduced.

Q: How about Red Listing of parasites? The person who enquired about this was laughed at at a previous meeting where it was brought up.
Floor: We don’t know the consequences of trans-locating parasite communities.
Floor: We don’t know how many generations it takes for changes in immune resistance.

Q: What % of human travellers are carrying parasites each year?
A: Probably much more than we realize. Travel has changed, and it is highly likely that people are transporting parasites.
Floor: Millions of dollars are being lost in the hotel industry because of transportation of bed bugs.

Q: In development of the manual has there been consideration of wildlife management approach?
A: What is known about animal susceptibility to disease? There are methods that can be used in species that are vulnerable to the same disease. However, there is a lack of data on a huge number of animal diseases.

Q: Any experience with organisms not so linked with domestic animals?
A: We don’t understand the relationship (e.g. between the organism and the bat; bats that get white nose disease).
A: Think about the chemical industry which affects bats – there are linkages and much complexity.
A: We don’t have to know everything in order to take some action. It is important to convince managers that this is worth doing.
A: DRA is a transparent process because you know what was involved in the decision-making process.
   - DRA is looking at the context of disease emergence
   - Agencies decide whether to conduct a DRA
   - DRA can bring in non-disease components into the picture

Q: What are the disease hazards in the international trade of bushmeat?
A: No DRA undertaken. The UK & French governments have banned testing of bushmeat because of the implications on trade if something is found.

Q: What role should vaccination programmes have?
A: Ultimately you don’t want to vaccinate a wild population, unless there are unique circumstances where it is valid (e.g. highly threatened species). (The vaccination approach is very complex.)

Q: CITES will be looking at a wildlife disease document shortly. What advice would you give to CITES?
A: Probably quite a lot, the SG has not been approached yet.
   - There is a need to move diagnostic samples, CITES should allow for that
   - It is important to consider a DRA of threatened species because they will they also move disease
   - There are lots of resources available and we need to be connected to disseminate this
One Health—Billy Karesh

“One Health” is a big topic in the global health community.

Background:
- Hunters caught Ebola virus from great apes (bushmeat). The World Health Organisation (WHO) picked up on this, and asked park guards to increase the surveillance for mortality events as well as collecting samples, to help prevent outbreaks among humans.
- Most Emerging Infectious Diseases (EIDs) are zoonotic and most have a link to wildlife.
- More money is becoming available for disease monitoring.
- The wildlife management perspective is not interested in eradicating disease, just managing it. This is in direct contrast to the public health perspective, which focuses on the eradication of disease.
- A number of diseases are common to humans and apes. Humans could be vaccinated to protect not just themselves but also the apes.
- Cattle bring foot and mouth disease in and pass it along to gazelles, so the source of disease here is domestic stock.
- There is no wildlife reservoir for foot and mouth disease in Asia.

Avian influenza:
- One Health concept—complements different sets of expertise; brings the wildlife community together to address disease.
- The disease was generated by domestic animal industries that spilled out into wildlife.
- 35 countries collecting industry, early example of One Health.
- The One World, One Health approach was born out of the conservation community. It involves WHO, governments, etc. The concept has been hijacked from the conservation community, public health took over the concept and left the conservation community behind.
- It would be more appropriate to call it “two thirds health” instead of One Health if the environment is left out of the equation.
- USAID has allocated US$ 450 million towards a program to fund emerging zoonotic diseases.
- The origin of diseases is not necessarily from wildlife—most come from domestic stock and then transfers over to wildlife.
- Unfortunately the Human Immunodeficiency Virus (HIV) washed out statistics on other EIDs.
- The One Health approach includes the environment: a reason to work together and not against each other.
- Disease risks and wildlife trade: affecting native wildlife, domestic animals, humans, legal trade, etc.
- What disease brings us together?

Surveillance:
- It is probably used incorrectly
  1) Baseline data are really important to build upon
     a. Testing – monitoring program
2) Mortality monitoring – opportunity to collect data
   a. Or you can do infectious diseases over time
3) Surveillance is aimed at first detection
   a. Surveillance isn’t true surveillance unless it is used for action – early response and intervention

- Consider what you want to accomplish with surveillance—this is where DRA comes in
- Market interaction between wildlife species – Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome (SARS) and civets?
- Surveillance for new diseases of humans: sources could be rodents, apes, and bats
- Story: how to leverage concerns for EIDs and how to support the conservation and wildlife management communities
- Some diseases opened the doors for collaborations
- SG portal to give way forward and help think around this whole health issue

Q: Are you following the conservation medicine group? This is along the same lines. Key issue: ecology of disease. Young generations do not get the message of integrality.
A: The biggest challenge here is getting through to the medical community.
At the last Davos World Economic Forum meeting there was some talk about the environment Lancet journal – would be a good source for building bridges between the medical and wildlife health communities.

Plenary: Networking I: IUCN regions and SSC Sub-Committees

Asia—Scott Perkin and Raquibul Amin

Context:

- Asia contains >50% of the world’s population
- Rapid economic growth
- Wildlife trade on a great scale
- Extreme vulnerability to climate change
- Over 40% of the Critically Endangered mammals on the IUCN Red List come from Asia, as do more that 60% of CR turtles

Examples of current projects:

- Red List for India
- Olive Ridley turtle conservation in collaboration with Turtle SG
- Gibbon conservation in Laos
- Saola Working Group created with collaboration for Laos & Vietnam
- Conservation of endemic water onion in Thailand

Some future project possibilities:

- Ensuring a strong species focus in National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans
- Invasive alien species
- Conservation of wild crop relatives
- Building capacity for national Red Listing
- Assisting with SOS and Action Asia
• Developing national species action plans

Collaboration with SSC would be welcomed!

Central America & the Caribbean—Grethel Aguilar, Fabien Barthelat and José-Arturo Santos

• Regional RL for the Caribbean most advanced project for this new sub-Committee
  o Aimed to include all vertebrates, odonates and echinoderms
  o Only marine species so far

• Specially Protected Areas and Wildlife (SPAW) protocol to be updated; Caribbean office initiative to add species to the protocol annexes using RL data; group looking for experts to advise on additional species to include

• Central America group trying to develop an integrative agenda combining development needs with conservation of plants and animals.

• Current work conserving and restoring key ecosystems, including collaboration with Ramsar, WHC and PA
  o E.g. Lachua Ramsar site: using monitoring systems’ information and with communities
  o Working with different sector to examine sustainability and impacts
  o Work with markets to control trade supply and demand
    ▪ E.g. developing sustainable markets in palms and timber, and working with hunters
  o Engaging local communities in biodiversity conservation while ensuring IUCN plays a key role

East & Southern Africa—Leo Niskanen

• New (1 year old) conservation area & species diversity programme
  o Combines site and landscape-level approaches
  o Incorporates WHC sites, trans-boundary areas and Biodiversity and Protected Areas Management (BIOPAMA) sites

• Collaborations:
  o Needing new species assessments and ways to ensure these are incorporated into conservation and development planning
  o Particularly keen to link to SGs

Europe—Ana Nieto

• The work on species focuses on the development of the European Red List. This initiative started in 2007. So far we have assessed the conservation status of all mammals, amphibians, reptiles, butterflies, dragonflies, freshwater fishes, freshwater molluscs and a selection of saproxylic beetles, terrestrial molluscs and vascular plants. All species have been assessed at two geographical levels: EU and pan-European with the collaboration of the SSC.

• As part of the European Red List, new assessments include a European Red List for pollinators, medicinal plants, marine fishes and birds. These assessments will be done with the collaboration of the SSC Specialist Groups (e.g. Bumblebees SG, Medicinal plants etc.) The bird assessment is led by Birdlife.
• We are in the process of developing a European Red List Strategy to identify what species groups should be next assessed at the European level. Inputs from the SSC Specialist Groups will be key. Future plans may include:
  o Remaining saproxylic beetles
  o Other plant groups
  o Water beetles
  o Diptera
  o Grasshoppers
  o Remaining terrestrial molluscs
  o Marine molluscs

Oceania—Bernard O’Callaghan and Helen Pippard
• Very high terrestrial endemism and high diversity; very low human populations
• Threats: high levels of exploitation, risks from climate change, habitat destruction, invasive species particularly problematic.
• Poorly-known region taxonomically and with very little technical capability
• Working on both RL assessments and with CITES implementation
• Collaborates with NZ office of Invasive Species Specialist Group
• Established a Threatened Species Working Group for the region
• Need to liaise with other RL groups for greater taxonomic coverage
• Need to work on sustainable use
• Continuation of work controlling invasives

South America—Victor Hugo Inchausty and Arturo Mora
• Support from the Regional Office in these areas:
  o Regional Red Listing and Regional/Sub-Regional Initiatives (e.g. Tree SG);
  o Policy actions (GECS – Vicuna Convention; CITES);
  o Initiatives on the field (Tapir Action Plan for Ecuador; La Plata basin);
  o Engagement with IUCN National Committees.
• Other actions needed:
  o Effective link with the New Quadrennial IUCN-Sur Program 2013-2016;
  o Increase the link with other IUCN components (including National Committees) and thematic programs (water, climate change, etc);
  o Better understanding of common targets for conservation of species in the national/local context;
  o Increase resources for conservation of species in the region.

West & Central Africa—Gretchen Walters and Souleymane Konaté
• Offers technical capacity on sustainable management, species conservation, protected areas, poverty reduction, and invasives
• Can make use of SG and RLA species data to support this programmes
• RL projects underway on marine fish
• Collaboration with Elephant SG requested: to limit prospects of conflict between people and these animals
• Want to use RL data to guide policy, e.g. EIAs
• Collaboration with Cameroon Endemic Plants RLA, Central Africa RLA, and Orchid SG
• Interested in joint development of large projects
• Can assist with workshop organization and communication of results to the general public and policy makers

**West Asia—Khaledoun Alomari**

• Covers 13 countries
• 47 members and 7 state members
• No species programme
• Continue supporting Bald ibis conservation programme in Syria; established a protected area at the breeding site, and local capacity building
• Regional training of RL trainers workshop in Jordan in 2011, developing a pool of 16 experts from 9 countries
• Working on a book on the flora of Jordan
• Assist Saudi Wildlife Agency with species planning
• Involved with annual Sharjah assessments
• Funding and resource shortages, despite occurring in a wealthy part of the world
• Need to improve communication with SSC and encourage a larger SSC presence in the region
• Keen to learn about species conservation issues that different groups can raise

**Freshwater—Topis MacBeath**

In the past, issues of freshwater conservation have often been overlooked, or have been dealt with in relatively little detail. The Freshwater Conservation Sub-Committee (FCSC) was developed to fill this gap and specifically address freshwater issues, and to coordinate these freshwater needs with other IUCN sub-Committees.

Topis MacBeath outlined the history of the sub-Committee thus far and gave the following points:

• A Mesoamerica regional group of the Sub-Committee has already been established.
• The FCSC members are particularly interested in linking with different SGs. They also want to engage with the IUCN Water Programme (to link biodiversity to water management and livelihoods), and with water developers and other stakeholders in the private sector.
• The FCSC vision (draft): STEMMING THE LOSS OF FRESHWATER BIODIVERSITY AT A GLOBAL LEVEL (making the case for freshwater biodiversity conservation worldwide).

Some possible projects on which the Sub-Committee should focus:

1) Analyses of conservation evidence – looking at impacts of dams, invasive species, studies of protective areas; results may be distributed using ‘Commons based peer production’ methods (e.g. online review and distribution).

2) Census of Freshwater Life project – expedition, exploration, and use of new technology to find and document the extent of the world’s freshwater biodiversity; focusing on unique and poorly known regions; based on the same design as the Census of Marine Life. It is hoped that such an initiative might help to raise the issues and reach a wide audience.

The Freshwater Sub-Committee will also develop a freshwater communications strategy.
• Proposed links with the IUCN Water Program (no response), freshwater SGs, water-related conventions, SSC Steering Committee, private sector groups that can influence biodiversity conservation.
• Need to develop a group of flagship species.

Invertebrate—Michael Samways
• Major assessments of invertebrates: African freshwater - freshwater crabs and crayfish, freshwater molluscs; dragonflies completed along with sampled RL assessments.
• Insects and many other invertebrates may be at particular risk.
• Sub-Committee includes the grasshopper SG, bumblebee SG, mollusc SG, freshwater crab and crayfish SG, dragonfly SG, South Asian Invertebrate SG, butterfly SG, and the terrestrial invertebrate RLA, as well as many individual scientists/conservationists representing single groups.
• This Sub-committee is the only one representing invertebrate conservation at the species level in a global context.

Marine—Yvonne Sadovy and Claudio Campagna
• Originally focused on marine mammals; later convened to prioritise on five marine priorities to focus on.
• Advises Steering Committee on marine issues.
• Develops links between SSC and other IUCN and external groups.
• Marine species remain underrepresented in the RL.
• Global Marine Species Assessment (GMSA) heavily associated with this sub-Committee.
• So far assessed 50% of focal GMSA species – over 10,500.

Plant—John Donaldson
• Focus on four priority areas
  • useful plants: timber, crop wild relatives, medicinal plants.
  • Sampled RL of several plant groups being conducted.
  • Flagship plant groups, e.g. carnivorous plants, cycads.
  • Support for regional and national RLs.

Species Conservation Planning—Mark Stanley Price
• Seeks better representation across taxa and geographic regions.
• So far limited representation of major taxa in species action plans.
• SGs need to identify the key species in their groups that require specific attention.
Plenary: Options for securing funding for species conservation—Jean-Christophe Vié and Dr Frédéric Launay

The session started with a random selection of five SGs that were asked to explain the challenges they face in fundraising and what they are currently doing about it.

- Bear SG – Explained that they work in collaboration with professional organizations for bears and a lot of fundraising is done through these organizations. They have a small grants system in place that receives thirty to forty applications for six grants per year. The SG is trying to obtain funding for bear monitoring programmes.
- Diver/Loons SG – Explained that they base their activities on two layers of support: professional biologists and amateurs. The organizations of amateurs are active in every state and engaged in the fundraising themselves. For this reason it is difficult for this SG to have one umbrella organization for fundraising.
- Iguana SG – Explained that experts from the twenty-three countries represented in the SG try to hold a meeting every year and fundraise. The SG holds a small grant program and sent a student assistant to their meeting. Their main challenge is finding money for a full-time Programme Officer.
- Asian Rhino SG – Explained that their funding priorities are the Sumatran and Javan Rhino. They are finding it quite a challenge to fundraise for these species as the countries in which they occur are not really funding this conservation.
- Re-introduction SG – Explained that different organizations hosting members of the group do fundraising on their own. The challenge is to find money for the SG as a whole.

Fundraising and the GSP

Frédéric Launay in his capacity as the Re-introduction SG Chair asked Jean-Christophe Vié a series of questions on fundraising.

What does the GSP actually do in terms of fundraising in support of the SGs?

- GSP works with the SSC Chair office to raise around US$ 4 million to sustain the Red List and US$ 3 million for operations every year.
- Very good at raising funds for RL assessments – about US$ 3 million every year go into this.
- Support SGs in writing proposals.
- Not successful in securing core funding for SGs.
- GSP survives and grows because some funds to cover core costs are taken from each of the many projects that it has.
- Trying to develop a “donate” button on the IUCN website.
- Securing in-kind donations such GIS software through ESRI – available to all SGs and equivalent to US$ 1 million in value.

Where is the money coming from?
The GSP is fundraising from all the possible sectors: governments (bilateral), foundations, multilateral (EU & GEF) and the private sector.

Are attempts being made to secure core funding or project funding?

- SGs should attempt to secure core funding for themselves—at least for a Programme Officer to keep the SG alive. However, core funding is more difficult to secure for the Chair. In many cases this funding can be obtained from a host institution that covers the salary of the Programme Officer.
- SGs should try to get more credit for what SSC is doing as this could help to promote the SSC profile among potential donors. It is difficult to imagine a donor coming to support SSC as such (apart from the UAE).
- Work is being done by the GSPSSC Network Officers to support SGs (Dena Cator and Andrew Rodrigues).

How can you justify to a donor giving money to a group of people that are not assembled under a legal entity (legally established organization) but rather under many organisations?

- One way of doing it is by using host institutions, the other is to manage the funds for SGs directly at the GSP – some are already doing so such as the Invasive Species SG and AFESG. This could be extended to more SGs as long as they do not exceed the management capacity of the GSP.

What can you do in the future?

- Online donation needs to be developed;
- Private sector opportunities – two choices: go for US$ 10-20,000 for one small activity or go for a big donation that is programmatic and strategic;
- Frustrating but unfortunately cannot satisfy everybody.

Species conservation funds: a mechanism for SGs

- Mohammed Bin Zayed Fund (MBZ)
  - Created in 2008 as a consequence of the first SSC SG Chairs meeting;
  - 99% of the time they are receiving better results from the projects than they are expecting;
  - Created an endowment fund based on US$ 29 million of the original fund and regular sums of money are taken from it for grants (managed by Credit Suisse);
  - No financial manager younger than 25 years old is accepted;
  - 28% increase since the start of the fund – now standing at US$ 30.5 million allowing MBZ to give another US$ 6 million in grants;
  - Donor is interested in the human face of conservation – wants to know the stories of the conservationists who receive the grants;
  - To date granted US$ 7.2 million to over 600 projects from well over 2,000 applicants;
  - In 2012, there will be 3 funding rounds with US$ 500,000 available for each round for a total of US$ 1.5 million;
  - Trying to reach higher amount in the endowment fund to be more stable in this difficult financial situation;
  - Projects are based on the RL categories and MBZ is not afraid to spend on Not Evaluated, Data Deficient or Least Concern species.
• Save Our Species (SOS) – back to back with MBZ but very different and a lot less flexible than MBZ
  o These funds are not specific for SGs but for the larger conservation community;
  o Unfortunately we know a lot of the people whose projects are rejected but we are a friendly fund and try to communicate clearly with all applicants;
  o Small Secretariat with rather fixed objectives, strategic directions and types of grant;
  o Jean-Christophe Vié stressed the importance of charismatic stories for SOS.

The final part of the session was devoted to a presentation by Olivier Langrand (Director of Global Affairs, Island Conservation) on Official Development Assistance (ODA). He explained that:
  o ODA amounts to a total of US$ 143 Billion annually for which 23 countries are responsible;
  o 0.7% of Gross National Income should be going to ODA by 2015 as this was earmarked for ODA in the Monterrey Consensus adopted at the International Conference on Financing for Development Monterrey, Mexico in 2002;
  o All multilateral funding is earmarked for governments and not NGOs (the GEF V for instance);
  o We should ask ourselves if we are pushing governments enough in getting this funding and in making sure that it goes to the right priorities – we need to work more closely with these governments;
  o Money from public sector comes at a high cost – highly restricted, complicated reporting, cannot cover certain expenses; could be rather cumbersome for small organizations.

Q&A

A participant suggested SGs who are not yet using it consult www.COS.org as it provides good updates for funding and weekly alerts and is free to most academic institutions and comes at small fee for others.

Baz Hughes (Chair, Threatened Waterfowl SG): Money for Programme Officers is a big limitation; Wildfowl and Wetlands Trust (WWT) is an organisation that can help with money for Programme Officers and secure matching funds from WAZA or EAZA etc.

Are there ways in which there could be a better return on investment for MBZ?

Frédéric Launay: MBZ fund was doing well at 40%

Conifer SG: our experience in fundraising raises the question of what to do if competition is very strong?

There are two potential sources of fundraising: 1) existing funding mechanisms and 2) private donors. Relationships with private donors require time to be cultivated, but over time can provide a higher return on investment. In most cases it is difficult to get private donors to donate in cash (and not in kind) to a non-legalised entity, but it is rather simple and not too expensive, to set up a charity in many of the countries in which we are based.

Gretchen Walters (Regional Species Focal Point, PACO): From the perspective of an IUCN region, developing a synergy between Regional Offices and SGs could help in writing better proposals.

Lucy Harrison (Programme Officer, Shark SG): World Species Congress (WSC) could earmark 10% of its funds for SGs.
Urs Breitenmoser (Co-Chair, Cat SG): SGs do a lot of boring background work that can be difficult to translate into the exciting stories for which donors and species conservation funds are looking.

**Action Points**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agenda Item</th>
<th>Action Point</th>
<th>Lead</th>
<th>Others</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Managing funds for SGs</td>
<td>The IUCN GSP can manage SGs project funds through its financial administration system as long as the number of SG projects requesting this does not exceed the management capacity available in Gland.</td>
<td>SGs</td>
<td>Jean-Christophe Vié</td>
<td>Any</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Plenary: Private sector and corporate engagement—Jon Hutton and Jean-Christophe Vié**

This session began with an open microphone aimed at collecting examples of SG engagement with the private and corporate sectors.

- Elephant SG: working with Kenya Airways on ivory trade awareness campaign.
- Seahorse SG: receiving funding (and seahorse shaped chocolates) from Guerlain Chocolates.
- Crane SG: working with mining companies.
- Medicinal Plant SG: receive a fee for service; payment for work from companies seeking to certify collection of plants; advice from companies on things and developing sponsorship fee for Friends of FairWild.
- Salmon SG: working with OG Paper in Japan; providing cash and helping with creation of freshwater areas.
- Asian Elephant SG: provides advice to hydroelectric companies.
- Taej Mundkur (SSC Steering Committee): his time and salary is covered by Shell.
- Invertebrate SG: funding from Mondi (paper and packaging company), Sappi (paper company), and Morenso.
- Sustainable Use SG: Taro Limited and Karo Track in the UK.
- IUCN PACO: engaging with the forestry sector to do joint assessments.
- Marine Turtle SG: working with companies in India; provide technical advice on developments.
- Orchid SG: relationship with clothing company with orchid themes.
- Butterfly SG: working with small companies in the USA – local coffee and printing company.
- Wildlife Health SG: working with pharmaceutical companies on issue of vulture poisoning.
- IUCN ORMA – working with Nespresso.
- Canid SG – receives vaccinations on rabies from companies.
- Flamingo SG – receives funds from bird food company in UK to sponsor website and company to support action plans as well.
- Primate SG: Disney wildlife conservation fund.
**Feedback from session participants**

- Michael Samways (Invertebrate SG): the corporate world wants to know what we (IUCN) can do for them, so just asking is not going to cut it. You have to build a relationship over time, take people out to lunch, meet with them and do things the corporate way.
- Bat SG: there can be disparity between what companies say and what they do – be cautious that IUCN is not being deceived by companies
- Tom Brooks: how does Integrated Biodiversity Assessment Tool (IBAT) impact this space?
- Katie (from FW?): Are there any ‘no go’ companies? Is there a risk in approaching retail? Are companies really responding to consumer demand or driving it?
  - Guidance on which companies to avoid working with is coming as a part of IUCN’s business strategy.

**Action Points**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agenda Item</th>
<th>Action Point</th>
<th>Lead</th>
<th>Others</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Private sector policy</td>
<td>Ensure RL is injected into policy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge products</td>
<td>Process to engage IUCN in the delivery of ‘good data’ and develop knowledge products with IUCN and the private sector</td>
<td>Sara Oldfield</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharing experience</td>
<td>Include more time for this dialogue at next meeting – SGs have significant experience in this and much is to be learned.</td>
<td>Jon Hutton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Plenary: The IUCN Red List: IUCN’s Flagship Knowledge Product—Craig Hilton-Taylor, Vineet Katariya and Ackbar Joolia**

**Timing of the Red List process**

- Concerns raised:
  - Media issues – optimal time for releasing certain data etc.
  - Policy issues – deadlines, donor requirements etc.
- Media issues addressed by RL launches are tied to specific events, meetings and SG timelines for completing key projects.
- ‘Rolling’ submissions and four releases per year proved unworkable due to volume of assessments.

**Internal and external review**

External submissions (e.g. national RLs) are released to relevant SGs and RLAs for review on receipt.

**Publishing**
• Anders Rhodin (Chair, Tortoise and Freshwater Turtle SG): Absence of hard copy publications presents a problem when historical accounts cannot be accessed; we need to be able to account for and trace synonyms etc.
• Online publishing process needed, but no resources available – needs resolution.
• Requires assessments to be top quality prior to submission (often a problem – e.g. Sampled Red List Index).
• Suggestion made for supplementary electronic material.

Mapping

Russ Mittermeier (Chair, Primate SG):
• How long does it take or cost to enter one species into this system?
  o Automated once map assessment completed
• Is it possible to select a subset of species?
  o Difficult to work on as layers cannot be distinguished, i.e. you can’t tell which layer reflects which species
• Can this data be used in handheld data storage units (phones etc.)?
  o Most data from third parties

James Lewis (Programme Officer, Amphibian SG):
• System already used via iNat photos to identify and conduct a targeted survey for a potentially non-described species.

Tom Brooks (Co-Chair, Joint SSCWCPA Protected Areas and Biodiversity Task Force):
• Problems with low resolution data (e.g. RL maps) and high resolution map data (e.g. WDPA), which may overestimate species’ occurrence in protected areas.
  o Work on confirmed presence lists underway for Pas.
• Process for replacing and updating maps: prepare and submit new maps through RLA.

Q: Can data be downloaded in a GIS format?
A: Currently in preparation

GBIF problems raised by multiple speakers

Nigel Maxted (Co-Chair, Crop Wild Relative SG):
• Is predicted distribution possible to include?
  o Certain predictive data systems may be included in the system.

Parallel: Lunchtime Discussion for Chairs

Specialist Group Chair mentoring and exchange
• At this meeting, there are many new SG Chairs which begs the question of how to encourage mentoring, from more experienced Chairs to newer ones.
• A couple of suggestions were made including: long-term Chairs partnering with newer Chairs, partnering newer Chairs with SSC Sub-Committees.
• There was good support for mentoring in the room (e.g. from long-time Chairs Russ Mittermeier and Andrew Smith).
• Rob Cantley (Chair, Carnivorous Plants SG) would like more information on setting up SG membership.
• Nicolas Pilcher (Marine Turtle SG) suggested using a Listserve or portal for exchanging information between SG Chairs.

**SSC Steering Committee notes**

• The SSC Chair’s office will send out a summary of action points and decisions from the SSC Steering Committee meeting in an email to all SG Chairs.

**SSC Specialist Group succession planning**

• The Otter SG set up a decision-making process to find a new Chair – a similar process was followed for the Conservation Breeding SG and Tortoise and Freshwater Turtle SG.
• Appointing specific people to carry out functions in the SG – e.g. Deputy Chairs, regional coordinators, and management team can be helpful for succession management.
• Anders Rhodin (Chair, Tortoise and Freshwater Turtle SG) recommended designating a Deputy Chair who would be mentored by the existing Chair.

**Internal SG structure and operation**

• This discussion focused on whether the SGs want a standardized structure.
• Nick Dulvy (Co-Chair, Shark SG) asked about the management structure of different SGs. Simon Stuart answered that there is a big difference.
• SGs decided that prescribing a certain structure for groups is not a good idea because they are all so different.
• Lagomorph SG has a system that directs all people generally interested in lagomorphs but without a conservation portfolio to a different subsection of the SG.
• The Marine Turtle SG developed ToRs for group members to manage engagement.
• The Cat SG also has simple ToRs and an evaluation that they ask all members to fill out at the end of the quadrennium outlining what members have accomplished – based on this information they decide who stays in the SG and who does not.
• The Butterfly SG needs new ToRs. It has regional representation. There are non-biology oriented people that want to join the SG, try to encourage them to join IUCN in general.
• The Mollusc SG finds that new projects bring in new members, so it is possible to cherry-pick people to a certain degree.
• The Goose SG has 600 members who meet every two years; 100 to 200 people attend.
• The African Elephant SG has the same model as the Cat SG in terms of members filling out a report at the end of the quadrennium – this helps with producing a final report of the group’s activities as well. It also sets up a separate list for people who will probably not continue working on elephants (only serious people on official membership).
• The Freshwater Fish SG weeds out potential members that just want IUCN on their Curriculum Vitae.

**Action Points**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agenda Item</th>
<th>Action Point</th>
<th>Lead</th>
<th>Others</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Listserve or portal to be created for SGs to exchange information on best</td>
<td>SSC Chair’s office, GSP</td>
<td></td>
<td>ASAP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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practices to running a Specialist Group. Also, send an email out to ask who is interested in mentoring.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The SSC Chair’s office will send out a summary of action points and decisions from the SSC Steering Committee meeting in an email to all SG Chairs.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SSC Chair’s office</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Parallel: Promoting synergies among taxon-based groups: Mammals—
Carlo Rondinini, Luigi Boitani and Dena Cator

Comments on agenda

- Richard Kock – wanted to discuss how SSC disciplinary groups will relate to the mammal groups.

Carlo Rondinini (University of Rome, Sapienza)

- Carlo Rondinini gave a presentation outlining the staff of University of Rome, Sapienza and explained its involvement in being the conduit to receive new mammal RL assessments and its partnership with the IUCN Red List Unit in Cambridge in doing this.
- Discussed the fact that all reassessments need to be done by 2018 but perhaps by 2015 to link to the 2015 Millennium Development Goals.
- Regarding re-assessment, a strong approach would be prioritizing genuine changes (e.g. sensitive species under high risk, Near-Threatened species, fluctuating assessments, trends) and non-genuine changes (Data Deficient – 15% of mammals, and inconsistent information).
- Also could consider species described after 2008 – haven’t kept track of all new species since 2008 so there would need to be a focus on this.
- Want to know the SGs’ input on all this.
- Also, need to determine which taxonomic groups need to be a priority – there are 35 mammal SGs. For all SGs with a large numbers of species, could do rapid assessments and for others, full assessments.
- Sensitive species under high risk – need to evaluate genuine changes. Carlo Rondinini showed a graph illustrating outliers in this.

Comments

- Giuseppe Notarbartolo di Sciara (Deputy Chair, Cetacean SG): sub-population level is an issue, particularly for populations that are isolated from each others. Is there a policy for this?
  - Carlo Rondinini: can accommodate for any level of population in RL; for cetaceans, we have traditionally had population and sub-population data. For some species, we do not have upper population assessments but only sub-population so that can make it difficult if some species have this and some not. So when you do population level assessments, make sure to do the upper taxonomic level.
- Will Duckworth (Action Asia): wants to know about taxonomic side of things. Have each RLA run its own Red List authority group (but could also deal with for all mammals). If each RLA has its own taxonomic working group, that could be confusing – so should they work together?
  - Carlo Rondinini: it would be nice to have one taxonomic working group but maybe not realistic as no one can force a SG to use a particular taxonomy. However, SGs
argued that having one taxonomic group could be useful. Cats have many different taxonomy issues. Bats change taxonomy often too and this relates to CITES as well. In the case of mammals in CITES, we have adopted the Wilson and Reeder direction. Everyone can use Wilson and Reeder as a base, so he suggested taking this approach: start with Wilson and Reeder and then, if someone has a problem with it, have a further discussion about this. Carlo Rondinini agreed that this could be a good approach – there could be a designated person within the group to deal with this.

- Claudio Sillero (Chair, Canid SG): we need to consider the timing of RL assessments and guidelines regarding when to stop at species level (e.g. wild dogs).
- Federica Chiozza (University of Rome, Sapienza): everything that was processed before March will be in next RL update.
  - Carlo Rondinini: it’s too long of a discussion in the session regarding when to stop at species level. Simon Hedges mentioned that there are existing guidelines on this.
- Russ Mittermeier (Primate SG): regarding taxonomy, held a workshop on primate taxonomy, and believes that it is the responsibility of the SG to determine what the taxonomy is.
- Will Duckworth: regarding taxonomy, SGs want taxonomy to follow evolving studies, so Global Mammal Assessment could help in the following ways:
  - SGs need clear guidelines from Red List Committee about how we can use taxonomy in the best way and,
  - SGs need help on how to deal with taxonomy; it would be a lot of work to set up and run a taxonomic working group, so could have one group.
- Helene Marsh (Co-Chair, Sirenia SG): comment on criteria for regional assessments. Canadians have done quite a bit of work on this and in Australia are dealing with this as well – she feels that the bottom line is the conservation gain.
- David Mallon (Co-Chair, Antelope SG): Craig Hilton-Taylor has stated that the taxonomy is the responsibility of the SG, but if necessary can take to the next RL Committee.
  - Carlo Rondinini: agreed that can bring to the RL Committee.
- Urs Breitenmoser (Co-Chair, Cat SG): if a taxonomic working group is created, suggest that they consult.

Luigi Boitani (University of Rome, Sapienza)

- Luigi Boitani gave a presentation on the “Mammal Conservation Strategy”.
- Could be good to assess all species by 2015 for the anticipated WSC.
- The SGs said that this depends on the prioritization process but generally agreed to try to go for 2015 re-assessments if possible. Russ Mittermeier asked whether that was realistic – Luigi Boitani answered yes.
- Luigi Boitani explained that the strategy is a general strategic approach and not prescriptive. Do we want to do something similar for mammals or not? Need to identify a strategy for whom (e.g. IUCN, SSC), for what (e.g. to get political attention, inform priority setting, influence policy). If do strategy, it would be good to do it now. Some people are familiar with the plant conservation strategy which could be a model. Structure of the document? Deadline of 9th May for resolution if want to go that direction.

Comments

- David Mallon (Co-Chair, Antelope SG): what is the added value of having an overall strategy? Isn’t it too general? And how does it fit into existing species conservation action plans?
  - Luigi Boitani: agreed that we can’t make this a general strategy, as it would need to be framed at a CBD level.
- Rodrigo Medellin (Co-Chair, Bat SG): the plant conservation strategy took a long time to create, so that could be problematic.
• Richard Emslie (Programme Officer, African Rhino SG): we need to think about how the document would be used.
• Giuseppe Notarbartolo di Sciara (Deputy Chair, Cetacean SG): we would need to understand the policy implications of a general strategy (e.g. related to industrially harvested cetaceans).
• Russ Mittermeier (Chair, Primate SG): the primary audience for something like this would need to be the CBD.
  o Luigi Boitani – it could be just strategic principles.
• Claudio Sillero (Chair, Canid SG): with the plant conservation strategy, there is a functional role which can be emphasized in the plan, but stronger.
• Luigi Boitani: suggested creating a one page outline on the concept of the “Mammal Conservation Strategy” which can be circulated to all mammal SGs.

Richard Kock (Co-chair, Wildlife Health SG): relationship of mammals with disciplinary groups

• The Wildlife Health SG (WHSG) is trying to make linkages with mammal SGs, so he wanted to know which groups are interested in making linkages.
• Claudio Sillero (Chair, Canid SG): the Canid SG does a lot of work with the WHSG. Would you like to have focal points in each SG on this?
  o Richard Kock answered yes.
  o Susana Gonzalez (Co-Chair, Deer SG) also said that she was interested in collaborating.

Claudio Sillero (Chair, Canid SG): Wildlife Conflict

A few years back, there was discussion of creating a SG on wildlife conflict. The feedback was that groups are already dealing with conflict. Claudio Sillero would like to know if creating a Wildlife Conflict SG is still a good idea and, if so, how to integrate.

• Rebecca Lewison (Chair, Hippo SG): For the Hippo SG, creating a Wildlife Conflict SG would be a great way of interacting with other SGs.
• Simon Stuart: there was a resolution passed in Barcelona which directed IUCN Commissions to work more closely with each other (e.g. SSC & CEESP), but we were unable to advance the full agenda this past quadrennium. So how we address this agenda item (e.g. interdisciplinary SGs) remains to be seen. Simon Stuart welcomed input on this.
• Xie Yan (SSC Steering Committee): the wildlife conflict issue also relates to compensation for local people. According to a review, most compensation programs do not achieve the goal of conservation. So this should be considered in this discussion.
• Claudio Sillero: would like to know if there will be a consultation process on this.
• Bruce McLellan (Co-Chair, Bear SG): the Bear SG has a consultation process on this.
• Russ Mittermeier (Chair, Primate SG): a wildlife conflict group would be important because it will help put focus on the issue. In the Primate SG, we are always dealing with most threatened species rather than baboons and other species like this.
• Diane Skinner (Programme Officer, African Elephant SG): the African Elephant SG shares this issue with the Asian Elephant SG – and ESARO wants to work on this, across species. So a group on this would help.
• Rodrigo Medellin (Co-Chair, Bat SG): suggested that the SSC Chair office contacts each mammal SG and collates case studies and examples. This would be a good start rather than just starting a group on this.
  o Claudio Sillero: that approach may be too complicated.
• Simon Stuart: we cannot just launch into a new initiative. Instead, we need to investigate how it would work first.
Claudio Sillero and others agreed but want SGs to exchange information on this.

### Action points

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agenda Item</th>
<th>Action Point</th>
<th>Lead</th>
<th>Others</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Approach to mammal taxonomy</td>
<td>SGs decided on a general rule to use Wilson and Reeder as a first point of reference for taxonomy, but ultimately it is the SG Chair and RLA that have responsibility. If there are issues, can engage in a dialogue with U of Rome, Sapienza staff or bring to the RL Committee. Each mammal SG should try and designate someone in their group to be a taxonomy lead.</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>ASAP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RL re-assessments</td>
<td>RL re-assessments of mammal species to be targeted for 2015 to correspond with WSC, if possible.</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft of strategy</td>
<td>A one page outline on the concept of the “Mammal Conservation Strategy” will be drafted by Dr Luigi Boitani and circulated to all mammal SGs.</td>
<td>Luigi Boitani</td>
<td></td>
<td>ASAP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter-SG work</td>
<td>Mammal SGs encouraged to have a contact point for work on cross-cutting issues (e.g. Wildlife Health, Re-introduction, etc.). So establishing a connection to disciplinary SGs.</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>ASAP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildlife Conflict SG</td>
<td>Investigation to take place into creation of a Wildlife Conflict SG. Dr Stuart to lead discussion on how it would work and SGs to exchange information on this.</td>
<td>Simon Stuart?</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>ASAP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Parallel: Promoting synergies among taxon-based groups: Birds—Rachel Roberts and Taej Mundkur

**Stuart Butchart (Chair, Bird RLA): Red Listing the World’s Birds**

- Approaching end of current assessment period.
- Reassessment every four years.
- Data was managed in Birdlife world bird database – now migrated to IUCN database (SIS).
  - Used when a species is suggested for re-categorisation.
  - Anyone can propose re-categorisations with justification.
- Updated factsheets are reviewed by one to five experts.
- Opportunities for SGs to contribute:
  - Provide data ad hoc.
  - Propose re-categorization.
  - Input via forum.
  - Independent review.
  - Sign-off assessments.
- The RL data is important for many reasons, including contributing to conventions, millennium development goals, setting priorities, etc.

**Comments:**

- The Birdlife assessment gives the bird groups a different relationship with IUCN. There is a need to tighten the SG role in contributing to the RL as Chairs are contacted, but sometimes not early enough in the process.
• Consensus is important and SG comments should be a key contribution in the process. But, for the RL assessments, the contextual information can be equally or sometimes more important, hence other contributors also need to be considered. If there is any disagreement between SG members, SG Chairs and Birdlife, there needs to be consultation between all three.
  o Heron SG: SG Chairs should always review the final product. Communication does happen but it should be a requirement.
• The forum has proved very useful; to automatically get update notifications you must subscribe to the forum and request the notifications you want.
• SGs have much expertise that is not necessarily known to Birdlife.
• We need to consider the PR around the up-listing of common species – the Vulture SG may be able to help with this as they have past experience dealing with such issues.

Taej Mundkur (Wetlands International): Promoting Conservation and Sustainable Management of Waterbirds and Wetlands
• Wetlands International (WI) has a new strategic intent for 2011-2020.
• Species conservation is a key part of this strategy under the goal “Conserving Biodiversity”.
• Three of twelve targets directly relate to waterbirds.
• All WI products are available freely through WI website.
• Critical Site Network tool available online.
• Waterbird Population Estimates – currently being developed into online tool.
  o All waterbird SG Chairs should be on mailing list for International Waterbird Census (IWC) issues.
  o Taej Mundkur is the coordinator of IWC.
  o Communication – WI website has been upgraded including the IWC pages, forum has been developed for discussions on waterbirds.
• What outputs do we need at global and flyway level?
  o AEWA Conservation Status Report (for MOPs).
  o Critical Site Network tool.
  o Both underpinned by IWC (Neotropical WC, African-Eurasian WC, Asian WC, Caribbean WC).
• Global Steering Committee and Coordination Council for IWC is being formed.
  o WI want it to include representation from SSC SGs.
  o Three regional subgroups: African-Eurasian, Asia-Pacific and Americas.

Q&A
- Are there any bird species that should be brought to the attention of the Species Conservation Planning Sub-Committee (SPCSC)? The Co-Chair of the Galliformes SG is on this committee, so there is already cross-over between the SPCSC and the Bird SGs.

Action Points

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Action Point</th>
<th>Lead</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Red Listing process for birds</td>
<td>Ensure Chairs are notified early in process</td>
<td>Birdlife</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Listing process for Birds</td>
<td>All SG Chairs should send Birdlife a list of species experts</td>
<td>Bird SG Chairs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ensure Birdlife’s SG contact details are correct</td>
<td>Stuart Butchart, Rachel Roberts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Parallel: Promoting synergies among taxon-based groups: Plants—Andrew Rodrigues and Jane Smart

This session was an informal discussion between Chairs of the plant conservation network to address current activities within their groups and potential future directions of their work.

Parallel: Promoting synergies among taxon-based groups: Fungi—David Minter and Craig Hilton-Taylor

This was a very small, ‘in-house’ meeting, comprising only the Chairs of each of the fungal groups plus Olga Nadyeina from the Lichen SG. Simon Stuart and Mike Hoffmann also dropped in briefly to check on proceedings. The discussion was wide-ranging and covered various topics.

Mainstreaming fungi within IUCN

Some members argued for the creation of a Fungal Conservation Sub-Committee with representation on the SSC Steering Committee, etc. It was indicated that IUCN could not support this financially given the limitations of its budget. It was also indicated that because the Fungal Chairs are a close-knit group and in regular contact, they were effectively fulfilling part of this role informally.

It was recommended that, as a first step, the Chairs find appropriate champions on the other Sub-Committees to put forward and raise fungal issues and to forward relevant issues to the Chairs of the respective Sub-Committees.

It was agreed that all would keep on lobbying people within IUCN and outside on fungal conservation issues.

It was agreed there was a need to ensure that any policies on agents of disease should involve fungal SSCs in their development and should recognize the value of rusts, smuts and other disease-causing fungi and the need for them to be conserved.

A joint proposal for a session at the IUCN Congress was submitted by the Fungal SGs in association with ZSL and Plantlife. This bid appears to have been unsuccessful, but there may be other sessions at Congress where fungal conservation issues can be raised.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SG Comments on RL assessments</th>
<th>Need to ensure three-way communication if there is any disagreement (Birdlife, SG Chair, relevant SG members)</th>
<th>Birdlife</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Liaison with SPCSC</td>
<td>Consider planning needs and contact Planning Sub-committee if needed</td>
<td>Bird SG Chairs</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SG Matters

It was agreed that the Myxomycetes should now be recognized as a discrete SG. David Minter should submit a proposal to establish this group to the SSC Chair.

It was confirmed, after a bit of back and forth discussion, that Andrew Rodrigues is the Secretariat Focal Point for the Fungal Groups.

The Fungal SG Chairs should liaise with Andrew Rodrigues about creating their respective SG websites.

Assessing the status of fungi

Various meetings had been held around the world to discuss the assessment of fungi and fungal conservation issues, but it was agreed there was a need for an assessment workshop that would examine the issues around applying the Red List Criteria to fungi. This would then result in an agreed methodology that could be followed by all the groups world-wide.

The possibility was discussed of holding this workshop in or around Nov 2013 in Marmaris (or another venue) in Turkey in association with the meeting of the International Society for Fungal Conservation. All the Chairs would work together to make this happen.

A number of datasets were already in place to help speed up the process, e.g. thirty basidiomycete case-studies are available for Europe and a Sri Lankan data set (for lichens?) is also ready.

A random sample of 1500 ascomycetes has been assessed for the Sampled Red List Index (SRLI) project (the ZSL team are aware of this).

The Chairs were pushed to think more about setting priorities for which groups were more tractable to be assessed: taxonomy, geography and thematic areas (e.g. useful fungi) were all discussed as possible criteria. There was also still an interest in using fungi to look at the impacts of nitrogen deposition. Dr Christoph Scheidegger (Chair, Lichen SG) said he has an outline of a draft proposal on this and it was agreed that this should be expanded and an appropriate target donor identified and the proposal submitted.

The Darwin Initiative was identified as a potential donor for one of these projects.

SIS

David Minter (Chair, Cup-fungi, Truffles and their Allies SG) will supply Craig Hilton-Taylor (Manager, Red List Unit) with a taxonomic list, at least down to generic level that can added to SIS to create the fungal ‘back-bone’ for future assessment work. Species will then be added as and when appropriate.

Key Biodiversity Areas (KBA) Project

It was agreed there should be some fungal input into the KBA project and they nominated Martin Ainsworth, of Natural England but based at Royal Botanic Gardens, Kew, as the best person to attend the June workshop.
### Action Points

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agenda Item</th>
<th>Action Point</th>
<th>Lead</th>
<th>Others</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Myxomycetes be proposed as a separate SG</td>
<td></td>
<td>David Minter</td>
<td>Mayra Camino Vilaro</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chairs to liaise with Andrew Rodrigues about creating fungal SG web sites</td>
<td></td>
<td>All Chairs</td>
<td></td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrange fungal RL workshop</td>
<td></td>
<td>David Minter</td>
<td>Mustafa Isiloglu</td>
<td>For Nov 2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree on criteria for selecting fungal groups to assess, set up process to identify the tractable groups, and initiate process to fund-raise to do the assessments</td>
<td></td>
<td>David Minter</td>
<td>Other Chairs</td>
<td>ASAP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete proposal to look at impacts of nitrogen deposition on fungi</td>
<td></td>
<td>Christoph Scheidegger</td>
<td>Other Chairs</td>
<td>?</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supply fungal taxonomy for import unto SIS</td>
<td></td>
<td>David Minter</td>
<td>Craig Hilton-Taylor</td>
<td>ASAP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Give Martin Ainsworth’s name to Annabelle Cuttelod as a potential participant in the KBA workshops</td>
<td></td>
<td>Craig Hilton-Taylor</td>
<td></td>
<td>ASAP</td>
<td>Done</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Parallel: Promoting synergies among taxon-based groups: Herps—Richard Jenkins and Neil Cox

Richard Jenkins (Chair, Chameleon SG) introduced the session and provided a brief description of the different reptile and amphibian SGs (e.g. age, number of species, number of members) which highlighted the existence of both well-established and very new SGs. The idea of the session was to learn from each other, explore opportunities for collaboration and boost coordination between groups.

This was followed by an overview of the Global Reptile Assessment by Neil Cox, highlighting the value of doing comprehensive assessments, the methods involved, and the outputs resulting from this process. This was followed by a presentation on the forthcoming assessment of reptiles of the New World, funded by a five-year National Science Foundation grant.

Next, Phil Bowles explained the role of the new (February 2011) Snake and Lizard Red List Authority, and how its work complemented, and differed from, those of the reptile SGs.

Back-to-back presentations by the more established SGs provided insights into the ‘tricks of the trade’. Anders Rhodin (Chair, Tortoise and Freshwater Turtle SG—TFTSG) emphasized key elements of the group’s work:

**Guiding Principles**
- Facilitating research.
- Supporting assessments.
- Catalysing conservation action.

**Structure & Scope**
- Number of species (323 species, plus 125 subspecies).
- Membership (133).
Achievements and Modus operandi

- TFTSG was involved in the establishment of a small NGO (Chelonian Research Foundation) to facilitate fundraising, and produces a journal which is ISI rated;
- It has also been involved in a diversity of activities, such as the Asian turtle trade, taxon breeding, the creation of a Turtle Conservation Fund (a partnership coalition), a Global Action Plan, and raising 617,000 US dollars that were distributed among threatened species;
- The TFTSG has a presence in CI and WCS, IUCN Council, Red List Committee and Steering Committee, and provides advice to USFWS Wildlife Without Borders and MBZ;
- Catalysis of action is carried out via an annual SG meeting, the Turtle Conservation Coalition, producing the Turtles in Trouble book and a poster. Conservation goals have been achieved by combining assessments and annual checklists, the establishment of a conservation award, and enlisting a celebrity endorsement i.e. Harrison Ford.

Marine Turtles were covered next, by the Chair of the SG, Rod Mast, who introduced the SG by providing foundation date (1966), the process for selecting regions (marine basins) for the SG and for selecting membership (members are expected to sign terms of reference which are time-bound to each quadrennium, members are vetted by regional vice Chairs). The MTSG mission and goals are embedded in its activities, and are re-visited on a regular basis. Activities are based not only on assessments but also achieving conservation goals. Rod highlighted some of the difficulties with assessment when it comes to marine turtles, as it tends to become polemic when 750 members are involved with seven wide-ranging migratory species. The MTSG holds “burning issues” workshops with fifty-eight regional management units, and envisions doing subpopulation level assessments for sea turtles, for which creating and fostering alliances is key. There is an annual general meeting, providing an opportunity to get together and further marine turtle conservation. The initiative for State of the World’s Sea Turtles (SWOT), led by CI, WCS and Duke University, has published a report annually since 2004. Data from this initiative are updated annually and are held in a database within Duke University. Alliances with other non-profits have proven very valuable to the MTSG.

Glenn Gerber, chair of the Iguana SG provided information that led to the creation of the group in 1997 (as West Indian Iguana SG) and an update of its current status (inclusion of all iguana species, with eighty-five members in twenty-three different countries).

The ISG is conservation action oriented with a diverse membership: twenty-three of the members are academically based with diverse discipline interests, the rest of members are zoo-based, vets, enthusiastic hobbyists, governments, NGOs. Each year there is an annual meeting, which is held in a different country, and these meetings are opportunities to revise, or create, action plans (currently seventeen species have action plans, in the process of exploring to officialise these as IUCN publications). Membership is reassessed using the quadrennium system. Spinoff NGO foundations can produce US$ 60,000 year; a small amount of those funds goes to support student travel to attend meetings. The ISG is still growing, but the main limitation is lack of core funding.

Grahame Webb spoke about the Crocodile SG, of which he is the Chair, initially providing a historical background to knowledge on crocodile populations (declines after World War II), highlighting the difficulty of fostering conservation concern for an apex predator. The Crocodile SG (CSG) started in 1971 as a closed group, and crocodiles began to recover at the end of that decade. Of twenty-three species maybe ten have some value in the pelt industry, and in the 1980s they were included on
Appendix III of CITES. A key concern for the CSG was how to create incentives for people to live with crocodiles. Ranching programmes were trialled and proved successful given density dependent mechanisms, and the CSG revised proposal for CITES listing. CSG changed from being anti-trade to pro-trade, but with the focus that production from farms did not become disconnected from habitat. However, it’s harder to attract resources and interest for species of no commercial value e.g. *Paleosuchus*. Every two years there is a week-long meeting with the attendance of ca. 300 people, arranged by thematic working groups.

In the case of amphibians, the Declining Amphibian Population Task Force (DAPTF) was created in the 1990s and operated a successful seed grant programme, which has continued with the amalgamation of the Global Amphibian SG into the creation of the Amphibian SG in 2006. The seed grant programme has now been funded for over twenty years. Habitat protection is one of the main foci of the ASG in an initiative coordinated by Robin Moore with the collaboration of large and small NGOs. More recently, James Lewis, ASG Programme Officer, joined the ASG to work on optimizing networking, coordination and communications within the over 600 members of the ASG. The Amphibian RLA manages the IUCN amphibian database, with over 6300 amphibian species already in the IUCN Red List. However, the RLA is under-resourced to keep up with an average of 185 species described on a yearly basis, not to mention a significant number of updates to the existing amphibian assessments.

Jim Collins highlighted that we are fortunate to have AmphibiaWeb, which began under the DAPTF, but did not have resources and IT back then. It has grown significantly from there, and is a great model for other groups.

Q&A

Q [during GRA presentation]: A lot of new SGs are different from amphibians, much more taxon-focused. How to plug into larger umbrella groups?
A: Assessments themselves are carried out by Global Reptile Assessments (e.g. for Central American workshops), contact Bruce and coordinate assessment update, assessments for specific taxonomic groups get handed to specific SGs to ID any discrepancies before getting submitted to the Red List Unit.

Philip Bowles: by attending workshops he is in a position to identify potentially good members of smaller SGs and recommend them to the respective groups.

Marine turtle discussion:
- Strategies to filter out those people who request membership to SGs – ask “what would you bring to the table?” Very few people get back. Anders Rhodin: uses a different approach, asks for CV that may indicate whether there is genuine interest. Often only 50% of people get back.
- Marine Turtles: Liberal about having people from a whole bunch of backgrounds. Group uses closed listserv that actually seems to work well. Anders Rhodin (TFTSG): watch out for people that can dominate and intimidate. What is hard to do is identifying which hobbyist captive breeding group is worth including in the SG.
• Sea Turtle Flagship Program at CI – frequent press releases and campaigns, which helps brings awareness to sea turtle conservation. Last year there were important scientific papers published, SG worked with the communications department of CI and IUCN and came up with a Sea Turtle September Campaign to raise awareness. Companies sponsored sea turtle tracking and there was a fundraising campaign with e.g. Red Hot Chilli Peppers done together with National Geographic, great for using sea turtles for marine conservation. Each turtle had an Olympic swimmer coach!

• Q: Is there a Terms of Reference (TOR) that Marine Turtle SG sends to members (James Lewis), and are there guidelines?
  o A: Yes, will send copy of TOR ACTION, but no guidelines are sent to members. TOR outlines the terms in a more general way to give a frame of reference.
  o Suggestions (Marine Turtle): It is a big plus if Chairs are inviting and welcoming. Advice: hang out with folks and adopt models that work.
  o CSG suggests that the approach towards membership is important: “It is not what the CSG can do for you but what you can do for the CSG”.
  o TFTSG (Anders Rhodin): Step into the role of leadership and grow, brand yourself in some way, publish, create an in-house publishing mechanism, build a team around yourself, and little by little the alliances grow and your group becomes respected.

Q: Seems that most groups have an in-person meeting. How valuable is the in-person meeting?
A [TFTSG (Anders Rhodin)]: It is huge. Would always go to sea turtle symposium, we need a symposium focused on freshwater turtles and tortoises, and when the Turtle Survival Alliance was created we realized that we wanted to use the Sea turtle Society as a model for us. It creates a great opportunity.

• Another group: Always competing for space and overlapping side events. Often thought of doing a stand-alone meeting. Struggle to bring together a cohesive meeting that meets people’s expectations.
• Sea turtle SG: Have created “Burning issues” workshop for sea turtle conservation.

Graham Webb: NGOs are big players in marine turtle conservation, but we do not want a marine turtle SG that gets out of hand. It’s different for the CSG because none of the NGOs wanted to work with crocodiles.

Anders Rhodin: SGs need to maintain an identity as it helps collaborations. Also highlights the Importance of new groups to engage with CITES.

Peter Paul van Dijk (Programme Officer, Turtle and Freshwater Tortoise SG): Will be happy to help out with CITES-related discussions, IUCN team has helped out as part of IUCN delegation. It is always better to stick with the facts for CITES’ purposes.
Parallel: Promoting synergies among taxon-based groups: Fishes—Will Darwall and Kent Carpenter

The purpose of the meeting was to look for issues of possible joint effort for the marine and freshwater fishes groups.

What is the biggest problem we face in getting conservation of fishes?

Fish species are not viewed as beautiful or charismatic by the public, and they are viewed mainly as a commodity or agricultural product.

Areas of possible collaboration

- Collaborate on sessions at IUCN WCC
- Gordon McGregor Reid (Chair, Freshwater Fish SG) and Ken Lindeman (Snapper, Seabream and Grunt SG): Estuarine studies—the Marine and Freshwater fish groups need to work together for a ridge-to-reef approach for the study of fishes, and estuaries represent the obvious area of overlap for our studies. The impact of increasing numbers of large cities near coasts and estuaries, and their impact on fisheries
- Terry Donaldson (Chair, Hawkfish and Sandperch RLA): attention usually focuses on the large systems and it is important to look at the small systems as well; they require different approaches and solutions.
- Gordon McGregor Reid: Fish taxonomy—new species are being described constantly. How do we integrate that information into our knowledge base?
- Victor Inchausty (Regional Director, IUCN SUR): there is a need to integrate species data into water management issues.
- Peter Rand (Chair, Salmon SG): increasing importance of third party certification for sustainable fisheries; the need to apply this methodology to freshwater fishes.
- Amanda Vincent (Chair, Seahorse, Pipefish and Stickleback RLA): greater integration of social dynamics with biological information in analyses
- Localized human activities can impact environment and socio-economics more broadly
- Roger McManus (IUCN Marine Assessments): the importance of freshwater flows to commercial marine fisheries

Topical discussion

Bycatch
The group could conduct analyses of science behind by-catch issues; analyses at the type of gear used; the issue of ‘directed by-catch’ (using gear that is designed to increase the chance of also catching by-catch when the primary target species is rare) (Sue Liebermann).

Raising the status of fish

1. Influencing fisheries sectors and polices: there are several problems in the way that fisheries sectors, policy-makers etc view the world’s fishes. The Freshwater and Marine groups can address this in the following ways:

- Identify key people in relevant agencies (e.g. FAO) who might be willing to collaborate with us.
• Look for regional foci to develop work; West Africa is a good option. All the freshwater fish species have been assessed by the Global Freshwater Biodiversity Assessment (GFBA) and the marine fishes are about to be assessed by the Global Marine Species Assessment (GMSA).

• Start a series of activities to reach out to relevant sectors to influence their opinion. The focus of the outreach highlight that if the goal is to manage food stocks then it is necessary to look more closely at biodiversity (i.e. species), otherwise the management decisions are incompletely informed and there is a risk of ‘crashing the resource’ (using it unsustainably).
  ○ Step 1: write up a letter addressed to FAO stating that proper assessment of fisheries is an important issue and that our groups have this as a priority. We represent a source of expertise that can help FAO address these issues, and we want to help.
  ○ Step 2: send a similar letter to IUCN regional offices; because we are dealing with complex issues and they will know the right people to approach
  ○ Step 3 (linked to step 2): contact national committees and people in key government, to bring the issue up with people in charge of policy and who are working with FAO. Send letters to fisheries departments in governments around the world; inform them that IUCN groups offer expertise and help for them to develop the policies they need to attain their CBD targets.
  ○ Step 4: write to FAO fisheries and aquaculture departments and highlight specific agenda items (certification codes etc) that are directly relevant to species.
    ▪ Include alien invasive species in the discussion with FAO.
  ○ Additional step: perhaps draft a motion for IUCN WCC.

• Another possible action (suggested by Peter Rand): propose a similar intervention through the certification process; the people doing the certification need expertise to help with this. Marine and Freshwater Conservation Sub-Committees send them a letter to let them know we are here as an expert resource to help them do this.

• Coordinate a broad level meeting of ministries of fisheries, environment and forestry from different regions. This would be an opportunity for different decision-makers to sit together and collaboratively think through thematically and geographically cross-cutting issues. This would be a high level workshop bringing together different reps from different countries, to discuss cross-cutting issues. We could possibly do this at Rio+20 (though we will probably not have the right people there).

2. Public outreach

• We could select a specific professional photographer who could be associated with IUCN and provide top quality photographs. International League of Conservation Photographers (ILCP) provides some of these types of roles.

• Talk to natural history museums and zoos about how they display fishes; this should be done more dynamically and more engagingly than previously.

• We might develop a website where the public can upload stories related to fish conservation of interest to the wider public – to get people more engaged and aware of their fishes. We might then extract some of the best stories to use in our own awareness raising activities.

**Action items**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agenda Item</th>
<th>Action Point</th>
<th>Lead</th>
<th>Others</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marine and freshwater fish groups should collaborate on sessions at WCC</td>
<td>Anyone contributing a session should share this information</td>
<td>Anyone contributing a session</td>
<td>Anyone contributing a session</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bycatch analysis</td>
<td>Topis MacBeath will circulate</td>
<td>Topis MacBeath</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Raising the status of fishes (influencing fisheries sector and policies) | copies of the freshwater by-catch paper he is working on with others. | 1) Identify key people in relevant agencies (e.g. FAO) who might be willing to collaborate with the fish SGs  
2) Looking for regional foci to develop work (e.g. West Africa) | Suggested by Victor Inchausty |
|---|---|---|---|
| Start a series of activities to reach out to relevant sectors to influence their opinion. | 1) Write a letter to FAO stating that proper assessment of fisheries is an important issue and that our groups have this as a priority. We represent a source of expertise that can help FAO address these issues, and we want to help.  
2) Send a similar letter to IUCN regional offices because we are dealing with complex issues and they will know the right people to approach.  
3) Contact national committees, and people in key governments, to bring the issue up with people in charge of policy and who are working with FAO.  
4) Write to FAO fisheries and aquaculture departments and highlight specific agenda items (certification codes etc) that are directly relevant to species.  
5) Draft a motion for IUCN congress  
6) Coordinate a broad level meeting of ministries of fisheries, environment and forestry from different regions; for different decision-makers to sit together and collaboratively think through thematically and geographically cross-cutting issues. | Sue Liebermann, Amanda Vincent, Nick Dulvy, Ken Lindeman  
9 May | Suggested by Will Darwall  
Suggested by Amanda Vincent |
| Raising the status of fishes (public outreach) | 1) Select a specific professional photographer who could be associated with IUCN and provide top quality photographs  
2) Talk to natural history museums and zoos about how | | Suggested by Lucy Harrison |
they display fishes; this should be done more dynamically and more engagingly than previously.

3) Develop a website where the public can upload stories related to fish conservation of interest to the wider public – to get people more engaged and aware of their fishes.  

Suggested by Amanda Vincent

Parallel: Promoting synergies among taxon-based groups: Invertebrates—Claire Santer and Michael Samways

ZSL led product for launch at IUCN Congress, Jeju, 6-15 September 2012

This was a discussion about a potential publication on the status of the world’s invertebrates along the lines of the “Evolution Lost” book on vertebrates. The SG is working with ARKive to obtain beautiful images for print and possibly an exhibition at ZSL.

Structure to comprise three main sections:
- Why invertebrates matter – illustrating the importance of invertebrates for ecosystem services, ecological base, pollination, etc.
- Population status and trends drawing on the latest assessment work
- How to improve the situation through conservation action

Include success stories and uncharted realms such as the deep ocean.


Jonathan Baillie, Monika Bohm and Scott Black will coordinate. Timeline is short. Group should respond to Jonathan Baillie.

Red List popular site – using invertebrates as a pilot for stories linking to people’s searches

Akbar Joolia (Biodiversity Systems Manager, GSP) spoke briefly about the plan to develop a popular RL website. The group agreed that they are keen to provide material to pilot. Akbar could create the space and template, and leave the group to populate it, load stories etc. They should start providing news story material for the existing Species website as this has just been redesigned and needs new content regularly to maintain interest.

Invertebrate Red Book

The discussion came to the conclusion that a hardcopy publication is not a good idea. It is expensive, requires a lot of work, the target audience is not defined, and distribution would be difficult. Instead the focus should be on getting more Amazing Species profiles prepared for Rachel Roberts in the SSC Chair’s office. We should source stunning images and build up an online resource.
Species Conservation Plans
The following species identified as priority for Conservation Planning:

1. The Usambaras Forest (REDD) molluscs and grasshoppers
2. West Indian Ocean corals – regional endemics
3. Crau Grasshopper
4. Turkish bush cricket
5. Tennessee crayfish (3 species)
6. Singapore crab
7. Bird’s nest soup cave crab
8. West Cape dragonflies
9. Freshwater Vietnam bivalves

Action Points

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agenda Item</th>
<th>Action Point</th>
<th>Lead</th>
<th>Others</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Status and Trends publication to go ahead as quickly as possible.</td>
<td>Jonathan Baillie</td>
<td>All to input as required</td>
<td>mid July</td>
<td>Launch at Congress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inform GSP Communications Officer of plans to allow adequate support on press release etc</td>
<td>Jonathan Baillie</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>05 March</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Provide news stories to SSC Invert Focal point (Rachel Roberts)</td>
<td>Michael Samways</td>
<td>All</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Source stunning images</td>
<td>Scott Black</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|                      | 1) Provide more Amazing Species profiles | Michael Samways | All | 05 March |       |
|                      | 2) Send list of species to Mark Stanley Price, Chair of the Conservation Planning sub-committee | | | |       |

Plenary: Networking II: Commissions and disciplinary Specialist Groups
Please see the related PowerPoint presentations posted on the meeting website (hyperlink in report introduction).

Protected Areas—Ernesto Enkerlin
Environment, Economic and Social Policy—Aroha Mead
Ecosystem Management—Piet Wit
Environmental Law—Sheila Abed
Education and Communication— Juliane Zeidler
Sustainable Use—Rosie Cooney
Invasive Species—Piero Genovesi
Wildlife Health—Billy Karesh, Richard Kock and Catherine Machalaba
Conservation Breeding—Onnie Byers
Monday, 27 February


Jeff McNeely (Chair, Red List Committee) explained the purpose of the RL Committee.

Jeff McNeely presented on the ten points for the RL Committee, which are aimed to be the main priorities and area of work over the next IUCN quadrennium and until 2020. He suggested we focus on the following: how smart apps could help with conservation, integration of work between RL and WDPA and IBAT, how invasive species are being introduced in lots of parks and affecting other species.

Piero Genovesi (Chair, Invasive Species SG) demonstrated the work of the SG, and the kind of reports and analyses that could be coming out of the Invasive Database. He talked about potential integration with the RL data, which would help improve the quality of the data. Plant data should be coming soon in the Global Invasive Species Database (GISD).

Parallel: Building Partnerships between the ex situ and in situ communities—Sara Oldfield, Lesley Dickie and Gerald Dick

The objective of this session was to allow the SSC network to discuss the benefits and challenges of, and opportunities for, closer collaboration between the in-situ work being done by the SG network and the ex-situ work being done by zoos, aquaria, herbaria, etc.

Mike Hoffmann (Senior Scientific Officer, SSC) introduced the session. Participants were asked to raise their hands if they currently work with ex-situ organisations, if they produce newsletters sponsored by the ex-situ community, or if they have produced conservation action plans involving ex-situ conservation. A few people raised their hands to each point.

Sara Oldfield, Botanic Gardens Conservation International (BGCI)

The aim of BGCI is to mobilise botanic gardens and their partners to secure plant diversity for the wellbeing of people and the planet. We value the IUCN Red List and are also part of the SG network. BGCI works closely with RBG Kew—our headquarters are there—and we also work with a wide range of botanic gardens whether they are members of BGCI or not.

Conservation work has been recognised by botanic gardens for many years: the RBG Kew conferences happened in 1975 and 1979, and the Botanic Garden Conservation Coordinating Body was launched in 1979 (BGCI continues with the roles of that coordinating body). At the time of the coordinating body’s formation, there was a Red Data Book of plants produced by IUCN. Despite these early beginnings, we still do not know how many threatened plants there are. There is a clear need to increase the pace of red listing plants. Sara Oldfield gave a few examples of plants that have changed status since 1978.
BGCI (through the Global Tree SG) has started fundraising for a complete reassessment of all tree species by 2020. Botanic gardens need this information for the basis of their conservation activities, whether ex-situ or in-situ.

One particular project is “Trees at the Top of the World”, assessing the impact of climate change on tree species in montane areas.

BGCI also produces a series of reports to help guide restoration and re-introduction type activities.

There is an MOU between BGCI and CBD to contribute to the implementation of the Strategic Plan for Biodiversity.

The botanic garden community is already closely linked to the work of IUCN, but there is more that we can do together. There is a real sense of excitement over the red listing work going on for plants (demonstrated at this meeting) and we can use this enthusiasm to work more closely together in future.

Finally, there are also other SGs that work closely with the botanic garden community (e.g. Cycad SG).

**Lesley Dickey, European Association of Zoos and Aquaria (EAZA)**

EAZA is a pan-European association of zoos and aquaria. Collectively, members spend €80-100 million on in-situ conservation. Collectively, they maintain managed breeding programmes for Extinct in the Wild and threatened species, and play a central role in formally educating the global community.

EAZA coordinates various campaigns, highlighting important issues and threatened species around the world.

There is already a good relationship between EAZA and SSC.

Taxonomic Advisory Groups (TAGs) oversee more than 300 breeding programmes. These TAGs often match the areas covered by existing SGs—they include one plant TAG.

Regional Collection Planning (RCP) is EAZA’s programme of work. EAZA would like the SSC network to help them to identify species that would benefit most from captive breeding programmes. For the SGs, there are benefits of:

- Financial resources and beyond.
- Possibility of EAZA members ‘hosting’ SGs (or staff working on SG projects), or contributing a percentage of staff time for SG Programme Officers.
- Financial and in-kind support for day-to-day operations.
- Active role for helping EAZA to guide captive breeding programmes, etc.

EAZA would like to see real partnerships between EAZA TAGs and institutions and SGs.

See the EAZA website for more information on the organisation and the topics they publicise.

To contact EAZA, contact their executive office. They can then put you in touch with the appropriate contacts within the TAG network.

**Gerald Dick, World Association of Zoos and Aquariums (WAZA)**

[See Gerald’s Power Point presentation]

David Minter: Do not forget the fungi! There is ex-situ work going on around fungi, too.
Discussion in working groups

Thirteen working groups were set up around the room, each with a facilitator from the ex-situ community. Participants were invited to join a station to discuss benefits, challenges and opportunities for closer collaboration with the ex-situ network.

What do SGs consider to be the main areas of support that zoos, aquaria and botanical gardens can provide?

1) Collaborations
   - Codes of Conduct.
   - Conservation and ethical recommendations.

2) Outreach and Education
   - Raise the awareness of species and key messages and issues that the public may not be aware of; Zoos provide a mechanism for bringing the wild, outside world into the grasp of urban populations and children who might not otherwise have access to it. By showing them the wildlife ex-situ, they might be more likely to take an interested in in-situ conservation.
   - Broaden the focus beyond just the charismatic species.
   - Raise awareness of IUCN and SSC.
   - Zoos should develop a clear ‘code of conduct’ that outlines their purpose and how they contribute to conservation.
   - Zoos educate people about conservation. They play an important role for developing a ‘culture for conservation’, especially in developed countries where many important zoos are based. But zoos also need to ensure that the same conservation culture is progressed in other countries where most of the zoos’ biodiversity originates. This will help educate people in the countries, and develop local capacity to implement conservation action.
   - Red List labeling on exhibits is a very helpful way of educating people about conservation.
   - Potential use of branding.

3) Captive breeding, Re-introduction Programmes, Genetic rescue (supplementation)
   - E.g. Black rhinos for specific parks where they have important genetic lineages.
   - Consider a global strategic plan for introductions could be considered.
   - Zoos can provide opportunities for research using captive populations.

4) Funding and In-kind support
   - Zoos need to extend their support beyond those species that are kept in their establishments.
   - If each zoo committed a small amount annually, some core and valuable support for a SG could be built up.
   - If there were no money available, provide dedicated time of a staff member to serve as a Programme Officer for the group to assist with communications, networking, project management, etc. This has the potential to create a very beneficial mutual relationship.
   - Donation of office space, computer support, and logistical support.
   - Hosting of conferences, meetings or providing an institutional base for SG members.
   - Zoos may have access to potential species-focused funding sources that may not be available to SGs (or that they know about). Work in partnership to have one common message and statement for joint fundraising activities, using the infrastructure and support of SGs to impress donors.
   - Make the right approach to zoo directors (a business case) since many are often now business people rather than zoologists (and use case studies and testimonials to assist this process).
• Tapping into funding through the Institute for Museums and Library Services (IMLS). Provision of a respected postal address for the SG and being a legal entity that facilitates fundraising and management of funds. Funding for key personnel such as SSC Chair, Conservation Breeding SG director, ASA Director etc.
• Zoos can provide financial support to in-situ field conservation programs. They should put at least 1-2% of their total annual budget into conservation (aim for 5% of their total yearly budget; maybe aim for 10%). Zoos should sign the Monterrey Accord so that they contribute a value equivalent to 1% of their host GDP to conservation.
• Zoos could provide money for training people but with a focus on training and capacity building in the areas where the animals are found, rather than where they are displayed.
• Zoos could provide travel programs to areas that are important for conservation; they could focus their effort on eco-tourism areas that are higher priority for conservation and in need of donor support.

5) Seek out cross-cutting issues and joint projects
• Provide expertise and avoid duplication. Increase and expand the conservation impact by joining forces on related issues (rather than operating as separate entities).
• The use of Citizen Science projects to get the public more involved and feed, for example, their observations into scientific research.
• The creation of boundary organizations could be considered e.g. Amphibian Ark, that work between the zoo community and experts.
• Zoos could employ a RL Focal Point to link directly and be partner in Red List assessments.

6) Provision of information
• Exposure of conservation issues to a wider constituency.
• Increase the information available on species and situation in the wild.
• Make use of social media and tools such as smartphone apps.
• Include Red List assessments in zoo publications.
• Use zoos as venues to speak about those species that cannot be easily represented in them.
• Zoos can also provide biological information on species that would otherwise not easily be received from experts in the field.
• Knowledge on how to overcome or address welfare issues.

7) Meetings
• Invite members of SGs and individuals from zoos etc. to appropriate meetings to foster relationships and to stimulate cross-fertilization of ideas.

8) Geographic and taxonomic pairing
• Identify SGs and zoos where this pairing is suitable. SG Chair to make the initial introductions with zoo or institutions using a formal SSC letter to outline what the SG is able to offer.

9) Genetic Research
• Access to materials – sample collections

What knowledge, expertise or support can SSC groups provide to the ex-situ community?
• Priority setting on identifying what needs conservation and what zoos can maintain. Zoo populations now are essentially the result of what happened forty to fifty years ago. There are opportunities to do more planning and to consider if these are the best species to be keeping. SGs could also provide early alarm systems.
• Specialists can also provide knowledge on the conservation status of species. They can provide lists of species suitable for re-introduction and also advice on what species not to include in collections (e.g. invasives).
• Help identify re-introduction sites and with re-introduction expertise.
• Lots of husbandry and breeding expertise sits in SGs (indeed, even from people who are not based in ex situ institutions).
• Advising on collection protocols.
• Good and scientifically vetted information for their exhibits.
• Use of experts in the field to provide stories to capture people’s imaginations.
• Provision of data on species’ life history and natural history.
• Checking facts that are disseminated through displays and campaigns at zoos, aquariums etc.
• Provision of fundamental research in support of captive management.
• Collaboration on the development of research methods’.
• Advice on genetics education materials, Red List and mapping information, interpretation of technical information, etc. Use of the Red List to maximize captive maintenance success.
• Connection with field workers and their experience; provide ex-situ workers with field experience.
• To help promote the work of good ex-situ institutions to reduce prejudices against zoos among the wider public and in-situ community.
• Form networks of collaborating field and zoo organisations.
• SSC should provide the business case outlining the leverage zoos will get from being connected with an SG.
• In some countries (such as China) aquariums and zoos are private and as such it is more difficult to find areas of common interest. WAZA needs to help promote synergies.
• Resolution passed at CITES COP 13 in Thailand (Res. Conf 13.9): “Ex-situ and In-situ collaboration”.
• SGs are often excellent repositories for literature on the species in question (several groups maintain outstanding reference collection, while individuals within groups may have comprehensive libraries and can help serve as a source for essential references.
• SGs can also provide a form of “certification” or accreditation of ex-situ programmes (not in the formal sense, but certainly in helping to ensure that ex-situ managed breeding programmes maximize on their potential to deliver conservation benefit).

What are the perceived challenges and obstacles of forging these relationships?
• Zoos do not have a clear ‘code of conduct’ that outlines their purpose and how they contribute to conservation). As part of this, zoos must be involved in in-situ as well as ex-situ efforts.
• Limited capacity and resources on both sides.
• More involvement in zoos, aquaria and botanical gardens with the key conservation issues e.g. climate change (draw on the science).
• A view that ex situ and in-situ communities compete for the same funds.
• Provocative themes.
• A perception of zoo ex-situ conservation among conservationists.
• Acronyms – IUCN acronyms are a big barrier and the SG names are a real turnoff (suggestion to drop the IUCN SSC prefix).
• Lack of communication because the parts of a botanical garden or zoo that is linked to an SG may not be related to other relevant parts of the same organization (and vice versa).
• Data shortages for species of interest that limits taking animals into captivity, and institutional inertia among zoos etc. unwilling to take risks with unknown taxa or those of little perceived interest to the public.
• Selling less “charismatic” species to the public – i.e., marketing versus conservation (how to strike a balance between the two).
• The aim of upper management of a zoo or aquarium may not be conservation (some are more like theme parks rather than focused on conservation). Institutions need to see the activities as part of their strategic plan.
• No continuity at the helm of private aquariums (in China for instance) to guarantee long term engagements.
• Some zoos still work with hybrids (African wild dog, lions) – this provides an obstacle for some joint work on species.
• Proof of legal origin of founding stock (in some cases not available by zoos) prevents collaboration with in-situ experts (Germany, South Korea, Philippines for instance). In some cases this is due to confiscations at airports or borders.
• Reputational risks stemming from the relationship – no control over management decisions of the other institution – risk of seeing own reputation tarnished.
• Risk of commercialization of excess animals or plant specimens that get reintroduced in the wild without control of the experts (if sold to privates).
• Issues with taxonomy (e.g. splitting and lumping which causes problems relating to captive breeding programmes and also law enforcement).
• Escapes of potentially invasive species and also disease issues relating to re-introductions.
• Many zoos currently do not give enough money to conservation. Much of the zoo budget goes to high tech research within zoos with less available for in-situ conservation, and most state funded zoos do not have the flexibility in use of funds to decide on the allocation of funds to in-situ projects.
• CITES has no control over animal or plant trade within countries – it was proposed WAZA might be able to play a part here.
• Zoos may not want to send CR, high profile animals that draw in the public, back to the wild – but this can of course be used to generate positive publicity.
• Zoos do not do a good enough job of developing a ‘culture for conservation’ in the countries where their biodiversity originates – most of the education and capacity building is focused on the region where the zoo is placed, not the region where the species come from.
• Zoos do not do a good enough job with their travel programs; they could focus their effort on eco-tourism areas that are higher priority for conservation and in need of donor support.
• Zoos need to have a better idea about the financial return on their conservation investment (they should also be properly acknowledged for the positive contributions that they make to conservation).
• Aquariums need to improve their conservation focus as they tend to be more commercially focused and less focused on achieving conservation compared to zoos.
• Zoos can give a biased vision of the seriousness of threats to species; zoos can imply that species can always be saved simply if populations are held in zoos, even if the species’ habitat is totally lost.
• It is a responsibility of zoos to highlight the need for habitat conservation in-situ as well as the ex-situ conservation breeding program of the individuals. Zoos must highlight the importance of field-based conservation as a component of species conservation.
• It is important not to over-sell re-introduction projects as a universal solution. For a lot of animals, ex-situ breeding with re-introductions might not always be practical or there is no chance of successful re-introduction in the near future. It might not be possible to make the re-introductions, for financial reasons or politics.
• A lack of knowledge on potential linkages and how to go about developing them (this works both ways – apparent lack of awareness on both parts). “Are zoos aware of the SSC?”
• Zoos may be geographically aligned or have a focus on multi-species conservation, but SGs tend to be taxon specialists.
• Perceived inappropriate behaviour by some ex-situ institutions and in-situ groups causing conflict; getting a better understanding of both communities’ agenda (e.g. overcoming the perception that ex-situ management is purely commercially driven).
• Time issue involved in setting up partnerships and the framework for those partnerships.
• Need cooperation and respect between the two communities. For example, recognise that having the funds to do something doesn’t necessarily mean they have the expertise. Need to allocate responsibilities to the appropriate people from either side and responsibility from either side need to be implemented, for example for:
  a. Reporting
  b. Decision making
  c. Communication.

Consider the groups represented around your table: within your working group, can you identify any such partnerships that we can establish (i.e. where can we play match-maker)?

• Seagrass SG (Fred Short offered to provide Gerald Dick with advice on the use of Seagrasses in aquariums).
• By the end of the year at least one SG is linked to a zoo, aquarium or botanical garden.
• Links to explore:
  ○ BCGI with Galliformes SG
  ○ Hawkfish & Sandperch with aquaria
• Solution to persuade each zoo to ‘sponsor’ a single species of interest as a species champion.
• Linking zoos to hobbyists who have a body of existing expertise on captive breeding certain animals, often including rare species not found in collection.
• Bringing groups together through the WSC.
• Try to address EAZA and WAZA accreditation, so that in-situ conservation projects are required to accredit a zoo.
• SGs to provide interesting species stories for zoos to use.
• SGs to advise on improvements to zoo and aquaria signage.
• SGs to advise on priority and suitable species for ex-situ conservation.
• Bring WAZA, EAZA and SSC groups together in meetings for cross-fertilization of ideas.
• The Galliformes SG would be happy for an ex-situ organisation, such as a zoo, to donate funds or staff time to provide the SG the services of a suitably qualified and experienced Programme Officer, primarily to initiate and supervise urgent conservation projects.
• Sharjah Breeding Centre has a large rodent display and it may be worth making a connection between the Small Mammal SG and Sharjah.
• Are butterfly parks part of the ex-situ community? Can be a good place for other smaller groups.
• Ex-situ network should actively raise awareness of taxonomic groups (TAGs).
• SSC network needs to be proactive in making direct links with zoos (i.e. attend zoo meetings) get to know the appropriate contacts within the ex-situ network, etc.
• Zoo associations need to fix the divide between ex-situ and free-ranging management for local species, by encouraging a ‘one-plan’ implementation.
• Vaquita: are there any zoos or aquaria hosting Vaquitas? Are there linkages to be made with the Cetacean SG?
• Vancouver Aquarium – orca research trips with scientists.
• Plants: information on invasive species of fungi and conservation impacts: this present an education opportunity.
• Develop linkages with Pasadena and South African (SANBI).
• More displays on natural species assemblages.
• Thailand South-eastern Botanical Gardens and palms present opportunities for education.
• Animals – Asian Wild Cattle SG and Conservation Breeding SG – facilitating more partnerships like this (specific work with TAGs).
• Assisting with Red Listing at national levels.
• Remember to include non-living collections.

Parallel: Consultations I: Developing Taxonomic Standards—Craig Hilton-Taylor

Craig Hilton-Taylor wanted to discuss how to develop taxonomic standards for the IUCN Red List. For the RL, taxa should be validly published. We currently have two nomenclature codes: International Code for Zoological Nomenclature (ICZN) and International Code for Botanical Nomenclature (IBZN).

In July 2008, the RL Committee suggested three broad operating principles:
• Standards should be broadly consistent between different groups
• A mechanism through the RLC is needed to respond to taxonomic issues
• A group of people needs to be available to help think about these issues

High-level issues:
1. What is an appropriate high-level species concept compromise?
2. How to decide on what master checklist sources to follow?
3. In absence of a master checklist, what do we do? What principles are followed in the compilation of a taxonomy?
4. How do we use the answers to the above three questions to resolve disputes? (applies to both global and regional scale).

Issues of current situation:
• We cannot always tell external organisations what taxonomy we are using.
• There are often cases where we deviate from existing taxonomy checklists we are using.
• It does not capture the FULL synonymy for the RL.
• Tracking taxonomic changes over time is time-consuming and it is not always clear when and what changes are necessary.
• Making taxonomic changes in SIS can be complex.
• How to handle uncertain taxonomy (NE, DD, and NR).
• How to match up taxonomy between the different Multi-lateral Environmental Agreements.
• What common names should be used on the RL.
• Must be careful not to accidentally publish any undescribed species name on the RL.
• Need the names of experts in the nomenclature codes so we can approach them with issues we cannot resolve ourselves.
• Comparing patterns of threat to phylogeny – we need to be sure that the phylogenies match.

Comments made during a general discussion of the issues:

• CITES – may be slow to respond to taxonomic changes, but that is often deliberate. We should define the purposes for which the RL is to be used.
• There tend to be two different approaches: 1) is consistency more important (telling the world that these are the species that we want to save), or getting the taxonomy absolutely right? 2) concern over where taxonomy is going (e.g. splitting species).
• Because the spectrum of RL users is wide, we need to be clear first and foremost on the purpose of taxonomy. We should be quite conservative and ensure proper validation of taxonomic changes because, in the end, conservation is the purpose of the RL.
• Primate SG: we always put high importance on taxonomy. Twelve years ago, we held a taxonomy workshop in which we decided to adopt the phylogenetic species concept. Since then, we are constantly updating our taxonomy list as new species are described. It will be very hard to come up with an across the board list for everyone. The Turtle SG has a Taxonomic Working Group.
• Birds: using a liberal approach on the RL is potentially dangerous. We want to avoid misallocating resources. Also, as scientists, we want to establish as best we can what the units we call ‘species’ actually represent.
• Turtles: we work with a wide network to try and keep turtle taxonomy updated. Even the Catalogue of Life (CoL) is not complete, but we are working to help expand this.
• Mammals: we have 35 SGs—some groups keen to keep their own taxonomy while others not so keen and want to use a standard source. We need to try to keep taxonomy relatively stable over time and update at specific time-steps.
• The taxonomy used by SSC would benefit from using large checklists like CoL which feeds into GBIF, etc. The general public accesses these data sources if they want to understand a name. The CoL is fairly comprehensive, so having a direct link between searching the RL and the CoL would be useful.
  o Craig Hilton-Taylor: one problem is that the name may match but the taxonomic concept used in CoL may not actually be the same as what has been assessed
• Agreement that we will not get a one size fits all for this. The African Rhino SG, would tend to favour the more traditional biological species concept to accommodate management. We are waiting for genetic information to be available before we convene a meeting to discuss the possibility of officially splitting into Northern and Southern species (rather than subspecies).
• If there are inconsistencies between knowledge products linking to the RL, this can lead to problems.
• Most leading taxonomists studying primates are members of the Primate SG. We are trying hard to work WITH these taxonomists.
• How often does the RL get confused as a taxonomic authority and how do we handle this?
• The RL may not be a taxonomic reference, but it does have a huge importance as a reference source for conservation status, so getting it right is extremely important.
• Plants: the elephant in the room is that there is a right solution to get a global master reference source. We know that, as taxonomists, we are always going to disagree. Alternatives to an agreed taxonomic concept could be a way forward (although we should handle this with care).
• Freshwater crabs and crayfish SG: another aspect to listing on the RL is external challenges to taxonomy. For example, a mining company could challenge the taxonomy because a listed ‘species’ occurs where they want to work. This potentially undermines the assessment.
• Mammals: Example given above – lots of people who have no interest in taxonomy need to be able to use the RL as an effective communications tool. Rapid taxonomic changes are unhelpful for communication: the RL is primarily a tool for conservation. For example, genus level changes do not mean anything in terms of the status of that species (still the same thing).
• Fungi: With taxonomic change, does the RL database have the facility of recording different name changes?
  o Answer: yes.

High-level issues to address (general discussion):

1. **What is an appropriate high-level species concept compromise?**
   • It is important to be transparent on what taxonomy SGs are using (e.g. the Antelope SG clearly states the taxonomy employed on its website).
   • We need to identify what the species concept should achieve. The key thing we want is for it to be conservation-relevant. Managers need to be able to clearly know what is species x and what is species y – they are not taxonomists.
   • Algae – often find species that need very, very careful examination to determine which species are which.
   • Sometimes it is not even clear what taxonomic concept the original author actually used.
   • Russ Mittermeier (Chair, Primate SG): is it too novel to say that the taxonomy chosen should depend on the SG? Seems that is what we should do.
   • Bill Baker (Chair, Palm SG): it is key that the taxonomic concept is be based on consensus; appropriate taxonomic experts should be brought into your SGs to ensure that concept is kept intact.
   • David Morgan (Chief of Scientific Support Unit, CITES): taxonomy also has practical ramifications: it is fine if SGs are the drivers but what is their rationale for deciding on a specific taxonomy and is it going to remain practical in the wider world?
   • The issue of having SG members (e.g. from different regions and countries) who want to split species into many different species, and others who want to keep the species intact.

2. **How to decide on what master checklist sources to follow?**
   • Ask the SG.
• Reptiles: the reptile database is used as a starting point (updated irregularly); tries to be comprehensive and fails; the proper level of expertise is within the SG.
• Need a list from somewhere; in the reptile world, there is no equivalent to the Amphibian Species of the World (ASW); it is down to the individual SGs to define their taxonomy.
  o Craig Hilton-Taylor: taxonomy invariably comes up in assessment workshops and we try to minimize these discussions, but sometimes deviate based on what is said during the workshop.
• Reptiles: that has always worked for us as long as we record clearly what taxonomic reference source we are using.
• Turtles: sometimes we explain in the taxonomy notes what taxonomy is used AND in the rationale notes fields explaining the effects of a different taxonomy being used.
• Plants: Caucasus Plants RLA and the Conifers RLA may disagree on taxonomy, but we then refer both to the Global Plants Checklist.

3. In absence of a master checklist, what do we do? What principles are followed in the compilation of a taxonomy?
• If no SG in place, we need to look around for global checklists (e.g. CoL).

Ad-hoc Advisory Group for Taxonomy
Are there people in the room who would be happy to participate in an ad-hoc group to help guide us on taxonomic disputes, etc?
• Someone from RBG Kew could be found.
• Tom Brooks (Co-Chair, Joint SSCWCPA Protected Areas and Biodiversity Task Force) was also put forward as a member.
• David Mallon (Chair, Antelope SG): we sometimes get people pressurizing the SG to avoid a taxonomic change because this will affect their funding for a particular project—clearly, this can be a serious issue.
• David Minter (Chair, Cup-fungi, Truffles and their Allies SG): it is straightforward for the fungi because we have the Index Fungorum (more or less internationally accepted); the person who runs the Index is sympathetic to conservation and would be a good person to include in a Taxonomic Working Group.
• (DD species get more funding attention than NT species).

Action Points

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agenda Item</th>
<th>Action Point</th>
<th>Lead</th>
<th>Others</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Developing Taxonomic Standards</td>
<td>SGs need to clearly define the taxonomy they are following (e.g. explain this on their web site) and on RL web site.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing Taxonomic Standards</td>
<td>SGs should appoint appropriate taxonomic experts to their groups as members to help develop and maintain consistency in the taxonomic approach they are using</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Parallel: Consultations I: IUCN Draft Guidelines on Re-introductions and Conservation Translocations—Mark Stanley Price and Piero Genovesi

The presentation began by noting that these guidelines are similar to the document produced in 1998. However, the more recent document has a widened scope, which has several implications.

The document produced in 1998 was published in seven languages. It was short, concise and based on solid principles.

Why do we need to update these guidelines?

- Numerous movements of organisms are currently being made by a diverse range of practitioners.
- Much experience has been gained since the last publication—some good, some bad.
- Further research has been conducted, including on welfare.
- There is now believed to be a greater urgency for such practices, coupled with a more complex conservation situation.
- ‘Interventionist’ conservation is becoming more common.
- Climate change is now an emerging and highly relevant threat.
- Re-introductions are increasing in number and diversity of taxa (including vertebrate, invertebrate and plant examples).

Among the objectives of the current document are the following:

- To be well recognised.
- To be short and principle-based.
- To be applicable to all taxa.
- To be multilingual.
- To contain user-friendly terminology.
A flow chart was shown depicting various objectives and the recommended terminology. Then the question was also raised whether the term ‘historic range’ was suitable. It was suggested that the term ‘indigenous range’ may be better—the definition is provided in the draft guidelines.

It was noted that there needs to be continuity and harmony of terminology between this document and the IUCN WCPA draft document “Ecological restoration for protected areas: principles, guidelines and best practice”.

In justifying conservation translocations, it is important to consider the associated risks, alternatives, and priorities (i.e. how important is this action? Is it just in the interest of certain people?), as well as the nature of the threats which have resulted in a need for conservation action in the first place (e.g. are they widespread or at a more local scale? Which stage of the species’ life cycle does the threat affect?). In considering alternatives, a more ‘area-based’ approach, such as creating corridors or restoring habitat may be more effective and appropriate.

When planning conservation translocations, the minimum requirements include one or more clear goals, objectives and targets. These should take into account the three main phases of the process: the establishment (or release) phase, the growth phase, and the regulation phase (wherein population growth should level off due to the impact of natural control factors).

Important considerations at the planning phase include:

**Biological feasibility**
- Species’ ecology such as interspecific relationships, habitat requirements and climatic requirements, among others.
- It is also good, where possible, to devise simple models of the species in question to judge and assess outcomes.
- Impacts at the species’ source(s) and destination(s).

**Founder populations**
- Where they will come from and level of availability.
- Genetic aspects.
- Welfare of individuals.

**Social acceptability**
- Have there been adequate consultations?
- What are the economic impacts?
- Are there any ethical concerns? (e.g. will this harm other species)
- Compliance to regulations (e.g. are there licensing requirements) particularly across international borders.

Piero Genovesi explained the associated risk of biological invasions. Although translocations are usually done with good intentions, outcomes can be disastrous – the example of the Cane Toad in Australia was given, which is known to be affecting eighteen Critically Endangered species.

The following points were made: we can learn from the past, risk assessment is essential, and some believe the whole concept is not a viable strategy at all, as it is too complex to assess and, therefore, too risky (an example was given that ‘weeds’ can undergo local adaptations and can form complex relationships).
A key factor in risk assessment is considering a species’ history of invasiveness. However, this can differ even between very similar species and warrants high caution.

Examples of assisted colonization projects included:

1. The movement of some UK butterfly species a short distance (requiring no legal steps) in order to forecast the effects of climate change.
2. The movement of certain gorgonian species to deeper levels within an Italian marine reserve, in order to assess the potential effects of sea level rise.
3. The proposed movement of coral species in the Arabian Gulf – currently causing fears that certain species may become dominant.
4. The creation of entire Aspen forests in Canada.

The decision making process should include ‘risk screening’ (which is often limited by available info), assessment of the ‘risk landscape’ (i.e. assessment of all impacts – including to ecosystem structure, function and services), and consideration of future climate scenarios. It was noted that the guidelines do not include approaches to multispecies movements. It was also noted that negative effects (both at source and destination) may take years to manifest, particularly genetic and socioeconomic impacts.

A chart was shown plotting risk factors against uncertainty or risk. A wide band showing possible outcomes demonstrates that risk types are varied and difficult to identify. The band of suggested risk and uncertainty increased rapidly where different factors were relevant and in conjunction with each other.

At the implementation stage, strong focus should be given to monitoring, including all factors (demographic, genetic, ecological impacts, and so on). This will allow assessment of targets, and changes in management direction to be made if required. The question was also raised on whether one should consider the simultaneous movement of parasites along with the focal species. A figure was presented demonstrating ‘cyclic monitoring’ – this showed a variety of outcomes and responses (i.e. adaptive management) including possible removal of the focal species if required. It was stressed that it is better to think of what MIGHT happen prior to implementation, and then to proceed slowly – almost on an ‘experimental’ basis.

A brief mention was given to disseminating results, although this was kept intentionally short.

A number of outstanding issues were presented, and audience members were asked to consider:

- Are the tone and language right for all possible users?
- Is the length conducive to good uptake?
- Could the document be shorter (perhaps with details placed into annexes)?
- Does the document cover all situations?
- Does it balance encouragement with awareness of complexity and risk?
- Will they remain relevant for at least 20 years?

The following schedule was given:

- Feedback from SG Chairs was welcomed—to be submitted within the next month.
- Draft version to be completed by the end of March 2012.
- Version 2 to be reviewed by a wider audience.
- Deadline for wider feedback to be the end of May 2012.
- Develop final guidelines.
• Submit to the SSC Steering Committee.
• Knowledge Café on the Guidelines has been accepted for the WCC in September.

Q&A

Q: Is there any indication of what the minimum goals are?
A: Yes; viable self-supporting populations. This fact perhaps needs reinforcing.

Q: Mention was given to uptake of the guidelines by other groups. Who exactly was this referring to?
A: Various SGs (e.g. Primates, Galliformes, Rhinos).

Q: Will there be an official endorsement by IUCN?
A: Yes. This will be treated as an update on the previous document.

Comment: In veterinary and medical sciences the term ‘risk-based approach’ has a different definition. This is complex and could cause confusion. Perhaps the terminology requires reconsideration.
Response: This will be looked into.

Comment: There is a need to assess the risk of action vs. inaction. There is rarely a case where there is no risk, and there can be possible risks of waiting too long.
Response: The authors tried to cover this aspect. It is described in the section describing alternatives. Perhaps this is too brief.

Comment: In taxa such as (for example) cichlids, there can be important interdependencies between species. This is a very complex situation which may result in a need to move several species at once.

Comment: This document may be a little too permissive, and could lead people to be more inclined to be in favour of assisted colonization.

Q: Will it be possible to bring this document together with the conservation breeding guidelines?
A: Yes, this is planned, along with other IUCN policy documents. This still requires thought.

Comment: Feel that communities will not be able to follow these guidelines as they are too complex. It is possible that on the ground guidance will be required. Also, explicit, simple guideline and rules right at the beginning of the document may prove useful.

Comment: Worried about uptake as the document may be too long and technical. Judging by the previous document, which has had great uptake, it might be better to aim to be shorter.

Comment: Simon Stuart requested that the Guidelines should be a very short summary of key points, to ensure the same degree of uptake and impact as the 1998 version, with as much relevant information as necessary in annexes etc.

Comment: Simon Stuart also suggested that the draft guidelines be circulated among the wider IUCN (i.e. the wider SSC and Species Programme, and, where relevant, other commissions) for feedback and comments.
Parallel: Consultations I: Consolidating the global standards for the identification of sites of biodiversity conservation significance— Tom Brooks and Stephen Woodley

Tom Brooks (Co-Chair, Joint SSCWCPA Protected Areas and Biodiversity Task Force)

The largest threats to PAs come from habitat loss. We have a large tool-box for protecting areas – through government, national, and regional techniques.

There is an important need for systematic conservation planning; focusing on vulnerability and irreplaceability. The RL gives us a powerful mechanism for measuring vulnerability of species. RL of Ecosystems is another resource. There are two major strands of precedence for this work. One is from science; the other from agencies identifying sites of significance. The last couple of decades have generated different mechanisms for measuring sites for different taxonomic coverage etc. Important Bird Areas (IBAs) were an initial and important technique; this approach was extended to other groups; e.g. plants, butterflies. It was extended across biomes (e.g. mechanisms for analyzing freshwater and marine environments).

Mechanisms exist for identifying sites of urgency that are not specific to a single taxon group, but can be defined by any taxon group – Alliance for Zero Extinction (AZE) sites. There are consistent mechanisms for developing criteria for defining irreplaceability and vulnerability. For irreplaceability, three of these criteria are as follows:

- Centres of endemism
- Sites that are important for species’ life-cycle and ecology
- Sites of biogeographic importance above the species level

All approaches are balanced between relying on global standards, and the application of those standards at the national or site levels.

What do these approaches not seek to do? They are not everything that is necessary for conservation; but they are an essential contribution to biodiversity conservation overall. Broad-scale landscape and regional studies are not part of this approach (e.g. marine turtles with migrations across ocean basins require ocean policy actions as well as these site level actions). Site level characteristics (vulnerability to climate change, landcover change etc.) are fundamental for conservation planning and action but have not been incorporated into the identification of sites.

There is a need to harmonize approaches. IUCN is called to lead this process.

The strongest link is through collaboration between SSC and the WCPA, with associated publications (e.g. Langhammer et al. (2007) publication on KBA identification).

This collaboration led to the joint task force of WCPASSC. The Task Force has an objective of consolidating global standards to categorize sites. This requires a well-defined methodology and transparency (see slides). IUCN has published Guidelines for Applying Protected Areas Categories (global standards applied at local level).

There are 192 members in the Task Force.

The Task Force process has been developed under four sets of initiatives:
1) Implementation of an International framing and review workshop – initially set as a final step but then recognized as being necessary to have this early in the process (summer 2012). This workshop will set the boundaries of the Task Force process and start the higher level framing of the process.

2) Formation of technical working groups and the development of ‘options papers’ to lay out current experience and best practices for: criteria; delineation; documentation (process and workflow); application.

3) Implementation of regional consultation workshops, probably starting with the Australasian region. It may be possible to hold these workshop by adding extra sessions to existing, scheduled IUCN (or other) workshops; this can be easily done.

4) The process is supported by professional staff in the IUCN secretariat: Annabelle Cuttelod (currently on maternity leave) and Diego Juffe.

The Task Force has an International commitment. CBD Target 11 is critical to the function and objectives of the Task Force. Thus, there is a major demand for the mandate for the work of the Task Force.

Need to work across sectors and scales:

The global standards for identifying sites must not be pigeon-holed into a particular sector. And it must be recognised that it is important at the community level. Global designation of sites (i.e. at the global level) is also critical for application at the community level, by mobilizing conservation pride, action, refinement of land tenure etc.

Also, at national scales, government departments etc. are drawing on the WCPASSC information for land-use planning etc. The process is also important for directing decisions at intergovernmental conventions. And it is important for the private sector, for informing sustainable business decisions (e.g. IBAT) and working with high conservation value forest network.

How can interested users and collaborators engage with SSCWCPA Task Force?

- Web site presence.
- Google groups.
- Staff – Annabelle Cuttelod and Diego Juffe (based in Cambridge, UK office).

Tom Brooks circulated two index cards to each member of the audience and asked them for their comments on:

1) The most important application of the emerging standards for identification of sites of global significance.

2) What is the most pressing question or greatest concern about the process for consolidating the standards.

Each audience member was asked to identify on the cards their main thematic area of work: freshwater, marine, terrestrial, fungi, plants, invertebrates, vertebrates.

Discussion

Michael Samways (Chair, Invertebrate SG): we must not be too black-and-white about defining KBAs – they are not so well defined and can be variable. We must think about broader scale questions of delineation.

Ken Lindeman (Co-Chair, Snapper, Seabream and Grunt SG): habitat loss may be the biggest threat to terrestrial KBAs but this isn’t the case for marine, where it is overfishing. Therefore PAs might need to be discussed separately in terms of marine and terrestrial.
There are multiple applications:
- Directions to government; multi-scale planning.
- Applying terrestrial tools to marine tools.
- Defining international legislation.
- A higher profile for sites; more informed choices about conservation investments.

There are several values that can be derived from the applications:
- It is a multistage process; promoting unification of NGOs and other bodies for valuation of PAs.
- It involves NGOs in the development of policy.
- Post-hoc application of established PAs to check whether they were properly selected in the first place.
- Generally creates a more scientific and rigorous process (i.e. the process sets standards for identifying priority regions, and makes people think carefully about this as an essential process).

What is the importance of prioritisation of landscapes? Do sites that cut across multiple taxonomic groups for conservation represent the best investment?

Some questions to consider (raised by audience):
- Island systems – these frequently have high diversity, endemism and high impacts, thus, would they all be identified as KBAs?
- How does the process apply to freshwater systems? Would the process take account of connectivity between freshwater ecosystems?
- Some countries have very little available data; what do you do in those circumstances? How do you deal with developing versus developed countries?
- Also the deep sea is very data poor; how do we deal with those areas? Perhaps for the ocean biome we need to move from ‘expert driven’ analyses to ‘data driven’ analyses?
- Expert driven methods are not sufficient for the scale needed for achieving conservation.

Wrap up—answers from Tom Brooks

- To answer the questions of connectivity and movement (migration) ecotones, thus far the approaches have not considered scales beyond the site scale. But that does not preclude them from consideration under additional processes in the future.
- On marine analyses: there is a strong stream of work from marine programs from EBSA studies (led by Patricio Bernal in the IUCN secretariat). EBSA process has not been implemented yet using the criteria. There needs to be more discussion about this.
- On Data Deficient areas: these cut across taxonomic groups and the Task Force needs to find a balance between waiting for perfect data and being driven by incomplete data and need for new data. This will have implications for taxonomic coverage and for other aspects of how the criteria are applied.

The Task Force has a series of technical working groups addressing scientific, technical and organizational issues around the process. The Task Force wants input from a broad constituency. Feedback was requested to help the process, and people were encouraged to join working groups where appropriate.

Action Points
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agenda Item</th>
<th>Action Point</th>
<th>Lead</th>
<th>Others</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Development of SSCWCPA Task force under four initiatives | 1) Implementation of an International framing and review workshop – initially set as a final step but then recognized as being necessary to have this early in the process (summer 2012). This workshop will set the boundaries of the Task Force process and start the higher level framing of the process.  
2) Formation of technical working groups and the development of 'options papers' to lay out current experience and best practices for: criteria; delineation; documentation (process and workflow); application.  
3) Implementation Regional consultation workshops, probably starting with the Australasian region. It may be possible to hold these workshop by adding extra sessions to existing, scheduled IUCN (or other) workshops; this can be easily done. | | | | CBD Target 11 is critical to the function and objectives of the Task Force. Thus, there is a major demand for the mandate for the work of the Task Force. |
| Working across sectors and scales | Global designation of sites is also critical for application at the community level, by mobilizing conservation pride, action, refinement of land tenure etc. There are very specific, fundamental characteristics of importance at local scales. Also, at national scales government depts. etc. are drawing on the WCPASSC information for land-use planning etc. The process is also important for directing decisions at intergovernmental conventions. | | | | |
| Integrating EBSAs into the process | This has not happened yet. There needs to be further discussion. | | | | |
| Integrating data deficient areas into the process | Data deficient areas cut across taxonomic groups and the Task Force needs to find a balance between waiting for perfect data and being driven by incomplete data and need for new data. This will have implications for taxonomic coverage and for other aspects of how the criteria are applied. | | | | |
| Request for expert input and feedback | Task Force has a series of technical working groups addressing scientific, technical and organizational issues around the process. The Task Force wants input from a broad constituency. Feedback was requested to help the process, and people were encouraged to join working groups where appropriate | | | | |
Parallel: Consultations I: Priority setting and species—Jon Paul Rodriguez

One of the major challenges of threatened species conservation is the allocation of limited funds to priority species and their ecosystems (Mace et al. 2007, Wilson et al. 2009). Much of the scientific literature has focused on the identification of networks of protected areas for optimal representation of conservation targets (Kirkpatrick 1983, Scott et al. 1993, Margules and Pressey 2000), but there is a clear interest in investments focused on species as well, especially those threatened with extinction (Avery et al. 1995, Lambeck 1997, Eken et al. 2004, Rodríguez et al. 2004, Ricketts et al. 2005, McNeely and Mainka 2009, Parr et al. 2009). MBZ and SOS, both with close ties to SSC, are two of the leading species-focused conservation investors.

A typical threatened species conservation cycle has four general phases: assessment, planning, priority setting, and implementation and evaluation (Fig. 1). Assessment is a scientific process for compiling available information on a species and determining its status, threats, and other objective factors which may impact conservation. Planning consists of developing a portfolio of potential conservation actions that could potentially benefit the species, and designing a plan for their implementation and evaluation over time. Priority setting is necessary because financial and human resources are limited, actions may not all be equally effective, and practitioners may have particular expertise, so it is essential to identify the actions that would have the greatest conservation impact within budgetary and personnel constraints. Finally, actions are implemented and success is evaluated. As projects evolve and the status of species change, the cycle may repeat itself indefinitely.

![Figure 1. Stages of the species conservation cycle.](image)

Over the last three years, the SSC Steering Committee has examined the priority setting issue and is considering a revised species conservation cycle that divides priority setting into two distinct stages (Fig. 2). The first stage comes after assessment, and is based on criteria for selecting the species that would become the object of further planning. Once conservation plans and actions have been developed, a second priority setting stage allows for the best allocation of available resources.

![Figure 2. Stages of the revised species conservation cycle.](image)

On 17-18 October, 2011, a small group of people associated with SSC met in Caracas to examine the revised species conservation cycle (Fig. 3). Key challenges were examined, especially in the context
of SOS (represented by Luigi Boitani and Jean-Christophe Vié) and MAPISCO (Method for the Assessment of Prioritisation of International Species Conservation), a project developed by members of this group in collaboration with UNEP-WCMC and the British Government. A manuscript emerging from this workshop is expected to provide guidance to the broader species conservation community.

At the 2nd SSC Chairs’ Meeting in Abu Dhabi, with 32 meeting participants in attendance, we carried out a public consultation in order to 1) explore the interest of SSC members in priority setting in general and in SSC’s Steering Committee proposal in particular, 2) inform about the advances of MAPISCO, and 3) illustrate the challenges of priority setting by examining specific priority-setting questions that could be faced by different stakeholders, such as donor agencies, zoos or aquaria, and national red list assessor.

The feedback was very positive, and several of those present in our session indicated their interest in engaging further to test the proposed methods within their specific specialist groups.

Parallel: Consultations I: IUCN Guidelines on conservation trophy hunting—Rich Harris
Agenda points

- Intro of Rich Harris and his work with ungulates in China and central Asia.
- Background of consultation: three years in the making, impetus from Chinese trophy hunting situation, Cambridge workshop outcome was to explore the development of SSC standard.
- Explanation of usefulness of hunting statement.
- Description of process of guidelines thus far.
- Summary of informal pre-consultation discussion (evening of Feb 26, 2012).
- Goal of consultation: assessing SSC interest, support, risks and concerns.
- Topics for consultation: scope of statement (broad vs. narrow definition of hunting, specific vs. general guidelines), terminology, process, usefulness of a statement.

Discussion

- Scope
There exists a spectrum of terminology: guidance, guidelines and standards, endorsement, certification; concern that certification is a commercial level.

Guidelines vs. definition: guidelines risk being overly-prescriptive, only having a definition can avoid irrelevance and prescriptiveness.

Restrict guidelines to endangered species?

In some cases, it may be the habitat and not the species that is of conservation concern.

A consensus emerged that this document should be considered “Guiding Principles” rather than “Guidance”.

List of criteria that specifies the scope of the type of hunting considered by the statement:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of hunting we are interested in considering in this document</th>
<th>YES (within scope)</th>
<th>NO (outside scope)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not necessarily government</td>
<td>Subsistence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program-managed</td>
<td>Local commerce</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High monetary value (the hunt, not the species)</td>
<td>Routine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rare (removed: need to focus on value)</td>
<td>Citizen</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low volume</td>
<td>Common species</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>Ex-situ (fenced, “canned”)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Illegal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SSC Process for this initiative

- Check commonalities of SSC draft document with WWF statement; document was helpful to certain work of WWF; see internal WWF review of hunting programmes (ref. Sue Lieberman).
- Conceptual framework and guiding principles must precede the creation of guidelines.

Terminology and nomenclature

- It would be useful for Bison SG to not use the term “trophy” and eventual addition of captive hunting.
- Too many categories of hunting can confuse, are unhelpful, green-wash and undermine the nature of the activity.
- The consensus of the group was to use no adjectives to modify “hunting”, but to describe it clearly in the text. However, subsequently, those leading the drafting of this statement realized that this actually caused more problems than it solves. At
present, a draft is being prepared that uses the term “trophy hunting” but also describes clearly what is considered by the statement and what is not considered.

- Content
  - Text needs to be more explicit about what is condoned by guidelines (red flags).
  - Misuse: could emulate plant groups’ risk assessment to build cautionary aspects and levels of precaution into guidelines (suggestion by Steven Broad).
  - SSC is in a position to address hunting of endangered species.
  - Goal of guidelines: How to use hunting as a conservation tool? “Hunting with benefits?”
    - With the knowledge of the conservation community behind us, we can make a statement similar to “the benefits of hunting will be maximised if x, y, z”
      - Can provides guidance on how to maximise the conservation benefits.
  - A draft that incorporates most of the suggestions arising from this consultation is currently be prepared, and will be circulated widely within SSC for additional comments and revisions.

Parallel: Consultations II: Protected area outcomes—Stephen Woodley and Tom Brooks

Stephen Woodley (Co-chair, Joint SSCWCPA Protected Areas and Biodiversity Task Force)

Why does biodiversity continue to decline despite increasing coverage of protected areas globally? Possible answers:

- Protected areas not in right place.
- Protected areas are not working because they are too small, are unconnected, or are ineffectively managed.
- Protected areas do not have the right coverage.

The Conservation Biology paper on “One hundred questions of conservation importance” had identified the question of why PAs are not working well enough and how they could work better, so the Task Force is on solid ground.

Analyses of PAs have been conducted taking biological outcomes (population time-series data) as the dependent variable set: species population status; presence and absence; population trends etc. are dependent variables. Independent variables are a set of forty including: IUCN class of PA, management of PAs, various geographical features; various socio-economic variables etc. These analyses go into a modelling procedure, backed up with more detailed case studies.

Ecosystem level analyses show that PAs are working well in some areas (e.g. for keeping forest cover in South America), but in other areas (e.g. parts of Asia) this is not the case.

Projects in marine protected areas show that they do result in protection of many species including corals, rapid increase in fish biomass etc; others studies show it to be more complex and it depends on the region in question and the species present.

Craigie’s et al. work on mammals in African parks shows that:

- PA conservation effectiveness is a function of management effectiveness (in South Africa at least).
- Large bodied species tend to do better than small bodied ones. But larger protected areas do worse than smaller ones (probably skewed due to large parks in West Africa). Human population density and IUCN class do not have a strong effect, at least with these data.

As part of the Task force, there are detailed case studies underway for Africa (Jonas Geldman and Neil Burgess, University of Copenhagen) and Canada and Australia (Megan Barnes and Marc Hockings, University of Queensland).

A recent paper by Butchart et al. (2012) looked at changes in Red List Index for IBAs and AZE, and compare or align this with protected areas. IBAs and AZEs in protected areas have a far less rate of loss than IBAs and AZEs out of protected areas.

**SSCWCPA Task Force Outputs**

A preliminary analysis will be presented at IUCN WCC 2012 and the final results will be presented at World Parks Congress 2014. The IUCN SSC meeting in Abu Dhabi is a request for data for the analysis so that we may have more taxa and wider geographic coverage.

The Task Force has a partnership with the Living Planet Index (LPI). The Task Force wants to take those LPI data, combine them with protected areas data, and put this on the Protected Planet website. Then make this interoperable with the Management Effectiveness index. All data will be attributed, confidentially respected, and conservation needs will be respected. **The outcome will be linked to CBD (Target 11).**

**Progress to Date:**

- Literature review is out in peer review.
- Database has been designed.
- Time series for data must be on-going.
- Case Studies are on-going.

The Task Force wants decade-long time series date on biodiversity, populations, indexes, and abundances in and out of PAs. Data should cover all taxa and all trophic levels. Sample data sheets are available and show the type of information required. If you could share time-series data for populations inside and outside protected areas please contact (Stephen.Woodley@pc.gc.ca).

The following points were presented for debate in this session:

- A request for audience input on the design of the study (as outlined above).
- There is a need to understand issues around data sharing – all data will be formally and fully attributed and handled according to the needs of the donor.
- What is the best way to make use of this information? How do we apply the information in order to make protected areas effective? (E.g. in Guidelines, workshops, application to CBD, preparation of a Green List?).

**Discussion**

Michael Samways (Chair, Invertebrate SG): data to date make this not a study of ‘biodiversity’; rather is a study of large animals in warm parts of the world. The Task Force needs to be honest about this. Stephen Woodley recognizes this point and stated the Task Force is really trying to address this by getting more areas and more taxa. Invertebrate data are sought after but rarely available.
PJ Stephenson (Afrotheria SG): we need to think carefully about what data are available. For example, the LPI is a superb data set, but has huge gaps in areas that we are most worried about. We should not underestimate the challenge.

Tom Lacher (Texas A&M University): vegetation will give the best time series data; there are long running tropical projects; vegetation should be the foundation for this and then select the other taxa that you can add to this. Vegetation shows changes in community structure; responses to disturbance; extents etc.

Richard Kock (Co-Chair, Wildlife Health SG): what is the goal of this analysis? Who is going to use it and how will it be used? This will determine the kind of information you want to gather.

Stephen Woodley responded that the objective is to gather scientific data without a political agenda (i.e. without focusing too much on the questions of for whom or why) and then identify what characteristics of the data make them work for the analysis. The Task force wants to identify what factors make protected areas most effective.

The Task Force needs to look carefully at management of protected areas. There was a study of an Asian nature reserve that is tiger habitat, looking inside and outside the reserve. Some deer species populations are higher outside the reserve; some species are higher inside. Human activities are about the same inside and outside the reserves. Results suggest management of the reserves is important; it is important to build the capacity of management inside reserves. That should be the focus of WCPA.

- Stephen Woodley noted this is true in some places, but not in others.

Michael Samways: large scale ecological networks that join reserves work very well. Large animals use these networks. They are not the best habitats (e.g. forestry areas) but they provide a really important method of expanding the protected area in a way that also integrates other landscape needs (e.g. the need to use the resources); i.e. development of multiple use reserves and connecting corridors.

Is it possible to bring in the marine systems to the model suggested by the Task Force? They are three-dimensional, complex, and different in dynamics. They might not be easily integrated.

It is worth trying the model at least, to see if it works. But it might be too dangerous to compare apples and oranges (marine and terrestrial). Agree that we will need different analysis for marine areas.

Russ Mittermeier (Chair, Primate SG): the fundamental point is that PAs need to be implemented. If you look at the heavily impacted high priority areas in Madagascar, you see that anything that is not a protected area has totally lost its habitat.

- Tom Brooks agreed. If you look at what is happening in protected areas compared to what would have happened had we not made the protected area, the message is clear: the designation of the protected area has made a difference. But now we need to take that same argument and ask ‘what would have happened in the protected area if we had not adopted a certain management approach?’ We compare the results we have obtained from using a specific management plan with what would have happened if we had not used that plan, and therefore get an idea of how effective the plan is.

How can the Task Force facilitate better sharing of population time series data? Much of the data collection is done by academia and that is tied to the need to publish, which also means that people are less willing to share new data. People look at this as data donation and want to know how the
supplier is benefitting from donating data? People are nervous about donating data that then gets used in some other publication on which they have no representation.

There is concern in the academic community about how data are used once they are out of the authors’ hands (e.g. it is important to ensure that data about threatened species etc do not fall into the wrong hands). Stephen Woodley noted that most metadata studies are presenting synthesized studies that do not represent release of the core raw data, so people should not worry about loss of ownership or about sensitive data becoming public. A possible model is provided by the State of the World’s Sea Turtles (SWOT) – the team gathered data on sea turtles and published it through the annual SWOT booklet. The community needs to find a better way of presenting data in a way that can be cited as a publication and credited to the data providers in some way. Also important that all databases should be designed so that in a way that they count as recognized, online publications; e.g. also create a PDF and give it a Digital Object Identifier.

It was also noted that many people are not reluctant to give data; the problem is finding the time to actually find the data and extract it. It is necessary to find the time and resources to assimilate multiple datasets.

The IUCN Central and West Africa representative noted that access to unpublished data is very difficult. It is important to develop projects that allow faculty to have greater access to data.

NCEAS study is a good example of building a collaborative process of data-sharing. They were looking at time series data of more than twenty years. First they identified all the people they needed in order to provide the data, then they created a task force from the people, and they worked together to develop a project and have ownership of the project.

The Global Mammal Assessment was a very good example of a collaborative project where everyone’s input was recognized in co-authorship of the Science paper.

Ken Lindeman (Co-Chair, Snapper, Seabream and Grunt SG): the study design uses change in biodiversity as the dependent variable, but in marine examples biodiversity is rarely the dependent variable because national and international organizations are more interested in ‘resources’ (e.g. fisheries?) than species.

Tom Brooks: there is a need to develop a productive data sharing policy.

What are the best ways of making use of information?

- Green List – a positive incentive for better PA management.
- Tom Brooks – existence of population monitoring and the results are important for the development of the Green List.

Cyrie Sendashonga (Director, IUCN Global Policy Unit): commented on the sustainable development goals for Rio+20; it is important to continue the momentum on the current development goals due to end at 2015.

Important question to ask:

- What comes out of PA management?
- How do we contextualize it in terms of green economy?
- How will that feed into the sustainable development goals?

Michael Samways noted that we must look carefully at what works in PA management and what does not. PA management parameters like fire management, mega-herbivore presence, etc can be
two to five times more useful in maintaining biodiversity in its current state in the protected area than size and shape etc. of the protected areas. But more data are required.

Information on managing protecting information areas would be useful in West Africa. Guidelines would be very useful; this can then be used to inform capacity development.

Khaldoun Alomari (Regional Species Focal Point, IUCN ROWA): management plans should contribute to this initiative. Workshops are very helpful, in terms of face-to-face discussions.

IUCN Mesoamerica – it will be good if a draft can be shared with the regions; different regional offices work with the regional governments etc who are implementing action. The regional offices can put together workshops to bring together these stakeholders and get their input.

### Action Points

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agenda Item</th>
<th>Action Point</th>
<th>Lead</th>
<th>Others</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Data required by Task Force</td>
<td>The Task Force requests decade-long time series date on biodiversity, for populations, indexes, abundances in and out of PAs. Data should cover all taxa and all trophic levels. (Sample data sheets are available as guidance for the type of data required).</td>
<td><a href="mailto:Stephen.Woodley@pc.gc.ca">Stephen.Woodley@pc.gc.ca</a></td>
<td></td>
<td>As soon as possible</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Parallel: Consultations II: Red List of Ecosystems—Jon Paul Rodriguez

Approximately 25-30 people attended.

Jon Paul Rodriguez gave an initial presentation followed by discussion.

- The WCC 2008 adopted a resolution to develop a RL of Ecosystems.
- The recognized need to build on the experience gained by GSP in developing and running the RL of Species was emphasized.
- The RL of Ecosystems aims to capitalize on the 40+ years of remotely sensed data that now make this initiative possible.
- The RL of Ecosystems is seen as being complementary to the RL of Species.
- The methodology will be developed through a series of workshops in 2012/13.
- Version 3 of the criteria will be presented at the WCC 2012.
- A website will be set up within IUCN CEM.
- Core staffing and funding for the first phase of development are now in place.
- An assessment of the Americas aims to be completed during 2012-14.
- Standard protocols will be published online by 2015.
- The RL of Ecosystems will provide outputs sufficient to report on CBD Target 5 by 2020.
- A global assessment of all ecosystems should be completed by 2025.
The basic methodology and criteria are already presented in a published paper and through an example RL of Ecosystems completed for Venezuela and a few other countries.

The ecosystem classification will be largely based on that already employed for the Habitats classification in the RL of Species with an aim for being directly compatible.

The aim is to link the RL of Ecosystems and RL of Species via the spatial data and to link to National RLs of Species and the WDPA through a common classification of ecosystem types.

### Discussion

- There were questions on what happens in the period before we have a standard classification of ecosystems as people are already conducting these ecosystem assessments. Until a global assessment is completed the process will run through a series of regional assessments to be integrated at a later date.
- Specific concern was raised that it would be very difficult to come up with any single habitat and ecosystem classification that would work for all species and communities and that many would “fall through the cracks” – in particular for wetland plants.
- Anthropogenic habitats will be assessed against a “reference state” yet to be determined.
- It was proposed that there would be a network of SGs for ecosystems, and that it would be based on the model for the SSC.
- “Risk” to ecosystems will need to be clearly separated from “Priority setting”.
- The potential for an Index of Ecosystems (Cf. Species Red List Index) will be investigated with potential application to a “Green List” of ecosystems? It is possible such an idea will be proposed as a motion for the WCC.
- Some concern was raised as to how we might assess Ecosystem Function under Criterion A4—this needs to be investigated further.
- It was pointed out that the assessment appears to be based purely on changes in vegetation (using RS data)—it was suggested that impact to animal communities might be addressed under Criterion 4.
- The option for completing an assessment of historical condition was proposed such that we might obtain two status points for production of an index of change now, rather than having to wait for the first reassessment – this has been completed for some of the species groups already for the Species Red List Index and the methodology might be adapted to ecosystems.
- It was unclear how we would assess Ecosystem function and it was proposed that a few such “functions” need to be identified.
- The “ski jump effect” as noted for species also needs to be addressed for ecosystems (e.g. how would an ecosystem that has undergone significant decline in the past but is now stable be assessed?).
- Definition of the “Eliminated” Category was questioned as it will be hard to ever say that an ecosystem has completely disappeared as it does not have distinct boundaries etc. – unlike a species. This issue is being worked upon.
- It was also pointed out that it will be hard to measure the “rate of decline” of an ecosystem – for species it can be measured through a decline in numbers of individuals and an underlying theoretical basis for extinction risk – there is no such underlying theoretical basis for determining risk of ecosystem elimination – this is a concern.
- Assessment of Marine Ecosystems was highlighted as a problem given that there are no suitable RS data sets to use. Extent of a marine ecosystem will be very hard to assess so other attributes will need to be investigated.
• It was proposed that the Arctic might provide a very useful test case for applying the approach, given the current rate of loss of habitats.
• Analysis is underway in Venezuela to see how maps of threat to ecosystems might be generated from existing data on species in the RL of Species in order to compare the two approaches. It was also proposed that, given the time lag (in some cases recorded as forty or more years) between ecosystem collapse and degradation and loss of species an ecosystem assessment might prove useful as an advance warning for future species loss.

Parallel: Consultations II: Red List minimum documentation standards—Caroline Pollock and Andrew Rodrigues

In addition to the SSC participants, the other GSP staff present in the room were: Philip Bowles, Neil Cox, Craig Hilton-Taylor, Vineet Katariya, and Andrew Rodrigues.

The purpose of this session was to give the SSC Chairs a final opportunity to provide comments on the current minimum documentation requirements in order to help guide the Red List Technical Working Group for completing their review of these requirements.

The session opened with a short Power Point presentation giving an overview of the purpose of having minimum documentation for all Red List assessments, and the minimum documentation Standards consultation process; some groups within the SSC network are finding the current documentation requirements are overly demanding to be able to complete assessments for the red List and they have requested that these requirements be reduced.

As a reminder, the purpose of having documentation for Red List assessments is:
1. To clearly justify the assessment.
2. To allow the Red List web site to function properly.
3. To allow basic analysis of the Red List data.

The minimum documentation requirements consultation process started in 2011 and over 300 comments have already been received from the SSC network. Some of these comments related to issues other than the documentation requirements: these issues have been noted and will be handled through a different process.

The *Documentation Requirements for Taxa Included on the IUCN Red List* document was shown on screen (this is the document that was circulated in 2011 listing the documentation requirements for Red List assessments). The floor was opened for discussion on the required documentation for all assessments (i.e., the fields in SIS that must be completed before assessments can be accepted for publication).

Q&A

Responses from the GSP staff present in the room are given below each set of comments.

Numeric data:

Comments:
• Do these need to be completed even if the data are not available?
• For widespread Least Concern (LC) species (e.g. those that occur across half of Africa), is it necessary to record all of their locations and EOO?

• Royal Botanic Gardens Kew (RBG Kew) has also developed a useful tool for quickly calculating EOO: Geocat (www.geocat.kew.org).

**Responses:**

• The point is that where data are available for extent of occurrence (EOO), area of occupancy (AOO), number of locations, etc., this information should be recorded in the numeric data fields.

• For species that are very widespread, assessors do not need to spend time calculating exact EOO, AOO or number of locations; in SIS a range of figures can be entered to indicate that the area thresholds are well above the criteria thresholds (e.g. 20000-1000000000), or the field may be left empty but the narrative text should clearly explain that the taxon is widespread.

• In a recent assessment workshop in China, Geocat was used to calculate the EOO for around 300 species, which greatly helped the assessment process. This tool is also not restricted to plant assessments; it can be used for any taxon.

**Countries of Occurrence:**

**Comments:**

• For widespread Least Concern (LC) species it is very laborious to record all of their country occurrences in SIS. Is this really necessary for these species?

• It is also laborious having to enter the same data for a large group of species.

• Recording Country Occurrence for widespread marine species doesn’t work. Are EEZs (Economic Exclusion Zones) also taken into consideration in SIS?

**Responses:**

• For the RL web site to function properly and return accurate results, it is important to have the entire country occurrence ranges recorded for all taxa that have been assessed.

• Currently tools are being developed to create the country occurrence list directly from the GIS range map so that these can be added to SIS in bulk. The assessor will still need to look through the country list to make sure the list is accurate and to edit it accordingly, but it will reduce the time involved in populating these data fields in SIS. No time frame was given for when this tool will be available.

• In SIS, it is possible to do a ‘batch update’; this allows the user to enter information into one assessment account only then automatically copy that information into the same field for all of the remaining species in that dataset. This makes the task of entering the exact same information into many accounts much faster.

• For coastal species, and for species occurring in specific EEZs, the countries of occurrence should be recorded. SIS also includes fields to record FAO fishery areas and Large Marine Ecosystems.

**GIS range maps:**

**Comments:**
• There was some concern over supplying GIS range maps from those people who are not familiar with GIS software and also from those people who only have access to point locality data from collection record databases.

• It would be good to have three different symbols present on the range map to identify data that refer to accurate point observations, occurrence of the species within the country in general, and occurrence within a sub-country area in general.

• Is it absolutely necessary to show a range map for very rare species? Displaying their locations is a very sensitive issue that can result in increasing their extinction risk from collectors.

• For some species (e.g. DD, EX, EW), maps cannot be drawn because it is not possible to know where species came from.

  Responses:

• There is a tool currently being implemented where users can easily draw the spatial range for the species they are assessing.

• A range of spatial data are acceptable for the range maps, including polygons or point observation data.

• There is guidance already in place for mapping sensitive species; the map displayed can be vague (e.g. country level only is displayed), or a map omitted entirely.

• If a map is impossible because of lack of information, then one should not even be attempted. But it would need to be explained in the narrative text why a map is not possible.

  Current Population Trend:

This field causes much concern in the network and many comments were received on this during the session.

  Comments:

• The field is very subjective. Generally in workshops assessors tend to leave it blank or will record “unknown” no matter what the final assessment is.

• Often the data available to determine current population trend are not available or not robust, and this is a dangerous field to complete because assessors may guess the answer without any justification. So perhaps it is not a good idea to make this a required field.

• Can the current trend be obtained automatically from the criteria used in the Red List assessment? For example, if criterion A2 or C1 or C2 are used, can the current trend be automatically recorded as “decreasing”?

• If anything other than “unknown” is selected for this field, there should be a requirement to clearly justify and reference the selection. Otherwise, this is a dangerous field to include as a requirement. Perhaps a justification textbox should appear and require completion before the assessor can state ‘increasing’, ‘decreasing’ or ‘stable’. N.B. this would mean an ADDITION to the documentation requirements (new box to be completed in SIS) rather than reducing the documentation.

• What is the additional value of having this field? Does it really inform the RL assessment? Or make the RL web site search reliable? And if the population trend being recorded is subjective, this makes the field unreliable for analyses. Therefore it should not be a required field and should be handled with care.
Responses:

- In general, common sense must be used when completing this (and other) fields for the assessment. If the answer is unknown then that must be stated.

- It could be recommended that the default in SIS for this field be set to ‘Unknown’ for all assessments, requiring the assessors to change this if they have information to justify changing this to something else. However, for EX and EW taxa, an ‘unknown’ population trend is not appropriate (this is perhaps a technical issue that could be worked out in SIS).

- Better guidance could also be developed on how to complete this field; this may be helpful for assessors to know when they should record anything other than ‘unknown’ for current population trend.

System (terrestrial, freshwater, marine):

Comments:

- Estuarine species are not accommodated in this restricted selection of systems.

Responses:

- The purpose of these broad systems is to allow quick general searches on the web site.

- The habitats classification scheme includes a whole range of marine habitats, including estuaries and intertidal areas. All of these can be used to refine searches on the RL web site.

Habitats, Threats and Stresses Classification Scheme coding:

Comments:

- The threats and stresses codes are very time consuming to complete in SIS. If these codes are analysed, then fine. However, does having the power to analyse these codes really justify the time it takes to enter this information?

- Assessors do recognize the value for these codes for analysis, but if we want to get more species assessed, then anything that adds time to the process is a negative factor.

- The issue of whether the threats and stresses need to be included in the list of minimum requirements should be included on the agenda for the next Red List Committee meeting.

- Some habitats do not appear in the Habitats Classification Scheme list. It is more useful to describe the suitable habitats rather than use these restricted codes.

Responses:

- All comments on this (and the other minimum requirements) will be taken back to the Red List Committee, via the Red List Technical Working Group.

- For the habitat codes, where the very specific habitat used is not listed in the classification scheme the assessor should record the nearest general habitat from the list of codes and in the narrative text field describe the more specific habitats required by the species. The narrative text is also a requirement anyway, as this is what people primarily look at in the assessment account that appears on the web site.

General comments on the minimum documentation requirements:
Comments:

- The minimum documentation review process started with a cry for help from the plant community to get more assessments onto the RL. There is a very real risk of losing the plants community if the documentation requirements remain as they currently are; there have been suggestions that an alternative assessment system is set up for the plants. This is not what the plant network wants to do, but if the requirements are not reduced it may happen. If the plants community finds that the RL process is too complicated, then this is a serious issue.

- It is important that the SSC supports national assessment initiative (e.g. Brazil, South Africa, etc.) which have huge plant communities. If the RL process is too difficult, then an alternative system will be found.

- It is important that the amount of required documentation is kept to a minimum. As an example, Brazil has a lot of species to assess for its RL (many of these species are also endemics), so they have a lot of work to do on these. The overall aim is to conserve species. So it may be best to keep the minimum documentation requirements to what is essential to support the assessment.

- A lot of the documentation fields referred to are irrelevant for LC and DD species. From the perspective of trying to get lots of species through the process, minimum documentation standards may need to be lowered for LC species in particular.

- For the invertebrate groups, it would be useful to have a rapid assessment process and to then add more documentation to these assessments later.

- We are not really asking what our objectives are. What's the function of the minimum documentation for red listing? Is the purpose to have the minimum scientific data used for the assessment included to properly justify the assessment? The objective of having minimum documentation is extremely important. The documentation should be what is essential for the assessment; the rest of the documentation is just extra information. This issue is holding up major assessments.

- The RL is a database that provides data for analysis, but it is also for storing assessments, therefore we want to get assessments completed and into the database easily. The process has to focus on making the information one has as complete as possible and justifying the rigour of the assessment. Some documentation is not important for this.

- There is nothing in the documentation requirements that highlights associated organisms, which are important for some species (e.g. species that have a very close association with another species for pollination or egg dispersal, or a very specific food-source, etc).

- The issue of needing two reviewers for each assessment is turning out to be a problem (e.g. amphibians). It would be good to highlight this issue for discussion and review.

Responses:

- For rapid assessments, a tool was developed (RapidList) to help assessors to quickly go through a long list of taxa and quickly identify which species were likely LC or DD, and which were likely threatened. The threatened species could then be assessed more fully. However, after testing this, the plant groups felt that the assessment process wasn’t carried out properly using this tool and the preference was to do full assessment but with less minimum documentation.

- The main reasons for having documentation were highlighted again on the screen (see the three purposes listed in the introduction section above).

- For associated organisms, the current stress codes include options for “Loss of mutualism” and “Loss of pollinator”. However, there is no option for specifying the name of the associated species (e.g. in the same way invasive species are listed in SIS to allow assessors
to select the named invasives that affect the species). The narrative text fields can be used to provide more details on associated species and of the species being threatened by the loss of associated species.

- For the requirement for two reviewers, this issue has already been highlighted to the Red List Technical Working Group and will likely be discussed again at their next meeting.

A show of hands was requested for the recommendation that the minimum documentation requirements be restricted to only those fields that are critical to support the assessment itself and that all other additional fields become recommended or optional. The majority of people in the room agreed with this recommendation; there were no disagreements with the recommendation and only a few people abstained from voting one way or the other.

The above general recommendation, along with a summary of the session and the comments received via the email consultation, will be presented to the Red List Technical Working Group at their next meeting.

**Action Points**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agenda Item</th>
<th>Action Point Decisions</th>
<th>Lead</th>
<th>Others</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Doc. Requirements</td>
<td>Take all of the comments received via the email consultation and the session during the SSC Chairs’ meeting back to the Red List Technical Working Group to complete the review of the minimum documentation requirements.</td>
<td>Caroline Pollock, Craig Hilton-Taylor</td>
<td>Vineet Katariya, Ackbar Joolia</td>
<td>Next RLTWG meeting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Doc. Requirements</td>
<td>Develop clear guidance – and inform the network of where to find this guidance – on how to enter information into SIS (e.g. justification requirements for certain fields)</td>
<td>RLTWG</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Doc. Requirements</td>
<td>Ensure the above guidance is included in the Documentation Standards document.</td>
<td>Caroline Pollock</td>
<td></td>
<td>ASAP after the next RLTWG meeting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Parallel: Consultations II: IUCN technical guidelines on the management of ex situ populations for conservation—Phil McGowan and Onnie Byers**

**Background**

- Guideline revision proposed at CBSG meeting in Cologne, 2010.
- At Cologne, existing guidelines were found difficult to use.
- A proposal was put forward to the SSC Steering Committee in 2010.
- The revised guidelines would address specific issue of taking individuals (both whole organisms and living tissues) from wild, be non-taxon specific and apply to all life forms, apply to both situations where a taxon is not yet kept ex situ and to those where ex situ populations may already exist.
Steering committee comments

- When should a species be taken in and managed in captivity?
- There needs to be clarity on when it is appropriate to bring a species into captivity.

Steps or framework proposed (approved by SSC Steering Committee December 2010):

1. Compiling status review of species in the wild, including threat analysis.
2. Define roles that ex situ management will play in conservation of taxon in the wild.
3. Determine characteristics and dimensions of the ex situ population needed to fulfil conservation roles.
4. Define resources and expertise needed for ex situ management.
5. Make a decision that is informed and transparent.

Gerald Dick: mention of living tissues, can you explain this? Several times mentioned captivity, does it relate to type of management?

Phil McGowan: we need to have terminology discussions and clarify this as it has to be consistent with other SSC terminology.

Gordon McGregor Reid: you mention living organisms and tissues, in some cases it might be necessary to determine voucher collection, maybe museum-based activities with post mortem material that need to be carried out to make a scientific evaluation.

Phil McGowan: step 1 - Determine need for ex situ programs. What is their contribution for conservation to populations in the wild?

Floor: how can we use the existing captive populations? Phil McGowan: outside the scope of the current guidelines.

Gordon McGregor Reid: before you can consider the species in the wild you have to consider what was described in the taxonomic publication. Questionable to make assumptions about species, such as assume that a species is full species when it is not. In other words, don’t forget preliminaries before getting involved in a captive breeding situation.

Gordon McGregor Reid: very often there will be issues below the species-level. Species is just a starting pack, ex situ is not just about species, it could be at different levels of the taxonomic hierarchy.

Floor: in zoo populations, there are sometimes gaps on provenance, etc. that need to be addressed before zoos and aquaria embark on these programs.

Phil McGowan: guidelines developed to clarify the role of captive management. There is a lot more consultation that needs to be had on this.

Gordon McGregor Reid: there was a meeting last year facilitated by CBSG that tackled what we needed to know about species before embarking on a captive program. It would be useful to get some of that information.
Mark Stanley Price: two observations - there is nothing about decision-making when they go back to the wild. There is also an issue of intensively managed and extensively managed. Interactive management needed.

Phil McGowan: changed the terminology, but agree with what has been said.

Onnie Byers: if the terminology is changed, this would all change. Answer: It is the perception that would change.

Gordon McGregor Reid: agrees with Mark Stanley Price on the review of appropriate terminology; the minute you take an animal off its patch in the field it is not in-situ any more. It might be helpful to completely review the concept.

Floor: it seems like it is trying to address too many questions. Might it not be better to break down the issues into those that you want to answer?

Onnie Byers: as long as you don’t cause detriment to the wild population.

Floor: the issues are blurred, it seems that the key thing would be assessing whether removal of an individual from the field will be to the detriment of its population in the wild.

Phil McGowan: guidelines encourage people to think about whether they have what it takes to do a programme.

Floor: thinks the issue is whether it is a detriment or not, it seems that we are constantly mixing up those two issues into a single question.

Example of falconry: keeping species records, useful to keep these records to determine trends. These sorts of populations are valuable, they are insurance populations.

Gordon McGregor Reid: another weird situation - some USA fish don’t breed in their original rivers, don’t spawn there anymore, but rivers get re-stocked every year. Only see these species in the wild because they get artificially re-stocked.

Floor: guidelines need to take into consideration existing captive populations.

Floor: with plants, they are put into tissue culture and they are stored in a gene bank before they are actually needed. These surveys are not needed before they are put ex situ. There is a wide gene bank. Some plants cannot be easily put into tissue cultures, unless you have the seeds. It is good to be pre-emptive with plants

**Guidelines feedback**

Comments on section 1:

- Floor: for the first guideline re: status review – case where you have the imminent destruction of an area where you have a threatened species. Do you need to model the program strategy or go in directly and collect individuals?
- Phil McGowan: guidelines are objective and transparent. There might be criticisms, but specific things like this are going to be a judgement call.
- Guidelines can’t be so prescriptive.
- Floor: experiences with re-introduction guidelines – some are used against implementers. They are going to be used to beat anyone who wants to keep things in captivity.
- Gordon McGregor Reid: if genetic engineering has been involved in the process, will it be an issue?

Comments on section 2:

- Floor: taking a species out of the wild removes the species from the threat – need to be clear on wording, means and ends. So in a sense the conservation strategy is that the species is no longer available to that threat.
- Floor: maybe link more to Red List Categories and Criteria? At which point do you need to get them out of the wild and into captivity?
- Floor: the problem is the purity of the ex situ population from species and sub-species point of view, so need to know which individual is which. First approach would be to assess purity, to avoid hybridization, to remember the usefulness of pure groups.
- Gordon McGregor Reid: you might want to take sperm offsite as opposed to entire organism. Is that ex situ?
- Mark Stanley Price: we’re asking to address the wrong thing. What we are talking about is the contribution of ex situ organizations to intensive management. These institutions can provide services and skills. Intensive management can happen both in and out of the wild.
- Mark Stanley Price: what SSC is asking is not so much who, but what is the role of intensive management.
- Phil McGowan: not obvious how to answer those questions. This is response to the existing guidelines.
- Gordon McGregor Reid: a lot of the content is very good.
- Mark Stanley Price: no problem with content, it is primarily to do with reframing it.
- Floor: there is concern that there is still extraction from the wild for large mammals. It is still an issue determining when it is a problem and when it isn’t. One of the rationales is to remove them to zoos or reserves. A lot of the statements need to be revised. Cannot see sociological aspects of extracting from the wild reflected in the guidelines, in terms of ownership rights and perception.

Parallel: Consultations II: Relationships between alternative livelihood projects and conservation gain— Amanda Vincent and Jonathan Baillie

The Alternative Livelihoods workshop in Abu Dhabi was hosted by Amanda Vincent and Jonathan Baillie. The objective of the workshop was to explore the extent to which alternative livelihood initiatives have been successful as a conservation tool.
The workshop started with a presentation by Amanda Vincent and mid stream, a series of skits was performed by Jonathan Baillie and Claudio Campagna. These skits highlighted three different types of alternative livelihood projects:

1. Creating employment that is based on a healthy ecosystem: Here the western conservationist tried to convince the local representative that he should not hunt the gorillas, instead he should work for an ecotourism operation where he will make more money and for many years to come.

2. Compensation: Here the western conservationist tried to convince the local representative that if he did not kill seals then the town would be provided with a church, a school and he would get regular payments so that he could invest in a new livelihood.

3. Introducing a new livelihood option in the hope that it will reduce pressure on the biodiversity of interest. The western conservationist wanted to reduce pressure on fish stocks so gave the local representative some Cane rats, bees and tools for basket weaving. The conservationist made it clear that he thought that providing these alternatives was going to result in people fishing less and, as he was pretty certain it would work, he did not want to try and measure its level of success.

Amanda then finished her presentation by developing on the themes presented in the three skits.

Amanda and Jonathan then asked people to share any examples of success or failure in this area. After hearing a range of stories that highlighted the challenges of alternative livelihood projects, participants were asked for any examples of where a scenario like skit 3 has been known to have worked i.e. that there is data showing that the level or number of threats have decreased, or that the target species populations have increased. A basket weaving project in South America was mentioned, but then another participant that had been involved with the project made it clear that the operation relied on continued subsidies and was therefore not sustainable. Another potential success story was that of providing the people who train bears in India with alternative livelihoods. Apparently the bear training lifestyle is very difficult and the people who have done it for generations are eager to be provided with other options. In addition, the practice is probably unsustainable as it is illegal and there are no individuals willing to take up the occupation. However, it was unknown whether the provision of alternatives has had a demonstrably positive effect on bears in the area. Although a number of participants mentioned that they might know of successful examples that they would track down, none were submitted following the workshop. One of the main problems in finding examples of effective initiatives is that very few projects measure the success or failure of the alternative livelihood in reducing pressure on the species of concern.

The workshop participants felt it was essential that the conservation community made every effort to start reviewing the impact of alternative livelihood projects on both local communities and biodiversity.

A list of conditions for success were then discussed. The following were proposed:

1. The alternative livelihood offered should be identified by the community and be in keeping with the culture.
2. Livelihoods will often be building on a current potential income source.
3. Projects including alternative livelihoods should include experts in the field (probably not conservationists).
4. Projects should be established for some time, and all key actors identified, before any new livelihood initiative is initiated.
When alternatives are provided, new rules/legislation should be agreed to reduce the impact on the species or system of interest.

Monitoring and evaluation needs to be a critical component of any project.

The knock on effects of any new or improved livelihood should be thoroughly tested to ensure threats are not simply diverted.

Following the workshop a motion was submitted for the IUCN World Conservation congress requesting that the IUCN conduct a review of conservation focused alternative livelihood projects, and provide guidance on the conditions necessary for success.

Action Points

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agenda Item</th>
<th>Action Point Decisions</th>
<th>Lead</th>
<th>Others</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Please send examples to Amanda Vincent and Jonathan Baillie in order to help set up a positive framework.</td>
<td>All session participants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Plenary: What every group should know— Simon Stuart

This session focused on providing logistical information to the SSC and receiving feedback from the SSC Chairs on the meeting.

Claire Santer: provided information on SSC membership contact information and the e-bulletin.

Simon Stuart: provided information on legal status of SGs and utilizing the IUCN for advocacy.

- He emphasized the availability of IUCN and the GSP to support SSC members on advocacy issues.
- Legal status of SGs: It was noted that there is a need to maintain independence of the SSC and from IUCN as many SGs have relationships with other organizations. SGs can establish their own NGOs and manage their project money. They could also utilize IUCN to manage their finances and that IUCN would try and minimize overheads for project management.
- Taej Mundkur of Wetlands International offered to manage accounts for SGs working with wetland birds.

Jim Harris (Chair, of the Crane SG): Jim Harris provided a review of the relationship of the Crane SG with the International Crane Foundation (ICF) which hosts them. He articulated the strengths of the relationship with the host organization. The Crane SG utilized the ICF for raising funds, navigating through the CITES processes, as well as having representation at international events and meetings.

Dena Cator: provided a review of the contact information guide and explained where all the information was available for access including info on focal points within the Regional offices, GSP staff and contacts for different thematic areas.
Rachel Roberts: gave a review on communications with the SSC network. She suggested that members inform her about good stories and press releases in order to get them promoted within the IUCN network. This would provide more visibility and profile for the specialist groups and SSC members.

**Action Points**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agenda Item</th>
<th>Action Point</th>
<th>Lead</th>
<th>Others</th>
<th>Timeline</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Membership and contacts</td>
<td>SSC members to send Claire Santer contact information until the ERP system is fully deployed</td>
<td>SSC Network</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e-bulletin</td>
<td>SSC members to send Claire information on events and other news which they would like to include in the e-Bulletin by the beginning of each month.</td>
<td>SSC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SSC Newsletters</td>
<td>SSC members should inform Claire about any newsletters they want to make available to the network</td>
<td>SSC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist group logos</td>
<td>The Specialist group logos to be sent to SSC members</td>
<td>Rachel Roberts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advocacy</td>
<td>SSC utilize IUCN for advocacy issues. They should contact Jane Smart, Jean-Christophe Vié or Simon Stuart to help develop a strategy.</td>
<td>SSC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logos</td>
<td>SSC Logo needs to be utilized in tandem with the IUCN logo</td>
<td>SSC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Award Ceremony

Concluding the Chairs’ meeting was an award ceremony presided over by the Chair of the SSC, Simon Stuart. This event provided the senior leadership of IUCN and the SSC with an opportunity to express their gratitude and recognition to the volunteer experts of the SSC network who generously dedicate their time and expertise to species conservation and the preservation of biodiversity.

**The SSC Chair’s Citation of Excellence**

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

**IUCN Global Species Programme Freshwater Biodiversity Unit**

*In recognition of their exceptional leadership of the African Freshwater Biodiversity Assessment in collaboration with many SSC Members and partners*

**Dr Frédéric Launay**

*In recognition of his strategic vision and long term and committed service to the SSC, in particular as Chair of the Reintroduction Specialist Group and as a member of the SSC Steering Committee*

**Dr Gabriela Lichtenstein**

*In recognition of her committed and courageous service of the SSC as Chair of the South American Camelid Specialist Group*

**Dr Patricia Moehlman**

*In recognition of her long-term chairing of the SSC Equid Specialist Group, and her leadership of wild equid conservation in some of the most challenging regions of the world*

**Dr Sanjay Molur**

*In recognition of his extraordinary commitment to promoting the work of many SSC Specialist Groups in South Asia, and to advancing the Red List process nationally, regionally and globally*

**Caroline Pollock**

*In recognition of her outstanding dedication to the IUCN Red List over many years, her exceptional support and encouragement to SSC members, and her pioneering of Red List training*

**Dr Randall Reeves**

*In recognition of his leadership of whale and dolphin conservation worldwide, and his exceptional service as Chair of the SSC Cetacean Specialist Group over many years*

**Sampled Red List Index for Plants Project Royal Botanic Gardens, Kew**

*In recognition of their pioneering work in advancing plant assessments for the IUCN Red List of Threatened Species*

**Dr Andrew Smith**

*In recognition of his long-term involvement in mammal conservation in many parts of the world, especially China, and his exemplary chairing of the SSC Lagomorph Specialist Group over many years*

**Dr Jane Smart**
In recognition of her exceptional leadership of the IUCN engagement with the negotiations on the Strategic Plan of the Convention on Biological Diversity, and her unfailing championing of species and biodiversity within the IUCN Secretariat

Pritpal Singh Soorae
In recognition of his leadership of the Global ReintroductionPerspectives series, and his outstanding work as Programme Officer of the SSC Reintroduction Specialist Group over many years

Dr Jean-Christophe Vié
In recognition of his persistence, tenacity and skill in negotiating the establishment of the Save Our Species (SOS) Fund, and his longterm and committed support of the Species Survival Commission

Prof Grahame Webb
In recognition of his leadership to crocodilian conservation worldwide, his long-term service as Chair of the SSC Crocodile Specialist Group, and his thoughtful engagement with SSC on sustainable use

Doreen Zivkovic
In recognition of her unique and muchloved style of caring for and amusing the members of the SSC and the staff of the IUCN Species Programme over 24 Years

The Harry Messel Award for Conservation
This award, established in 2004 in honour of Professor Harry Messel, former Chair of the SSC Crocodile Specialist Group, recognizes emerging leadership in the SSC, especially from individuals who have made a specific contribution to species conservation on the ground through their leadership, as part of an SSC Specialist Group or Task Force.

Dr Viola Clausnitzer
In recognition of her leadership of Odonata Red List assessments, especially in Africa, and her chairing of the SSC Dragonfly Specialist Group

Dr Richard Emslie
In recognition of his scientific leadership and support for rhinoceros conservation in Africa and Asia, and his long service as Scientific Officer of the SSC African Rhino Specialist Group

Sonja Fordham
In recognition of her leadership of and vision in shark conservation worldwide, and her long service as Deputy Chair of the SSC Shark Specialist Group

Dr David Garshelis
In recognition of his leadership and vision in international bear conservation and management, his encouragement of bear conservationists worldwide, and his exceptional service as Co-Chair of the SSC Bear Specialist Group

Dr Barbara Goettsch
In recognition of her pioneering, visionary and exemplary leadership of the SSC Global Cactus Assessment, and her support of the SSC Cactus and Succulent Specialist Group

Dr Alexine Keuroghlian
In recognition of her innovative and energetic leadership of Peccary conservation and research in Brazil, and her valued participation in the SSC Peccary Specialist Group
The George Rabb Award for Conservation Innovation
This is a new award in honour of Dr George Rabb, Chair of SSC from 1989 to 1996, for outstanding innovation and creativity in species conservation in the context of the SSC. It is given to individuals in recognition of delivering transformational advances in conservation theory and practice.

Dr Robert Lacy
*In recognition of his pioneering work in the development of Population and Habitat Viability Assessment as a practical conservation tool, and his exceptional leadership as Chair of the SSC Conservation Breeding Specialist Group*

Dr H. Resit Akçakaya
*In recognition of his innovative work on how to handle uncertainty consistently in Red List Assessments, his leadership on the development of the Red List Guidelines and the Extinction Guidelines, and his chairing of the SSC Standards and Petitions Sub-Committee*

The Sir Peter Scott Award for Conservation Merit
This is the senior SSC award dating back to 1984, and honours Sir Peter Scott, Chair of SSC from 1963 to 1980. It is presented to individuals in recognition of exceptional service and leadership to species conservation over many years through their work with the SSC.

Dr Raoul Du Toit
*In recognition of his enduring commitment to the conservation of the black and white rhinoceros in Zimbabwe over the last 25 years*

Dr Susan Mainka
*In recognition of her pioneering work on the conservation of the Giant Panda, her leadership of the IUCN Species Programme, and her encouragement of conservationists worldwide, especially in Asia*

Dr Martin Brooks
*In recognition of his pivotal role in leading the conservation actions to end the decline of rhinos in Africa, and for his strategic leadership of the SSC African Rhino Specialist Group over 20 years*

Dr Anders Rhodin
*In recognition of his exceptional leadership over many years of international chelonian conservation, and for chairing the SSC Tortoise and Freshwater Turtle Specialist Group*

Prof Luigi Boitani
*In recognition of his inspirational commitment and participation in the leadership of the SSC over many years, including the Wolf Specialist Group, European Large Carnivore Initiative, Species Information Service, Global Mammal Assessment, Save Our Species Fund, Task Force on Biodiversity and Protected Areas, and Steering Committee*
**Conclusion**

As evidenced in the content of the report and the feedback received following the meeting, the second IUCN SSC Chairs’ meeting was a huge success. The plenary sessions provided a sense of the greater context of the work of the SSC, inspiring Chairs and other participants to continue their work effectively and strategically during the following quadrennium.

A survey has been circulated to all meeting delegates, the results of which will be used to inform the structure and content of the next Chairs’ meeting.

**Closing Thanks**

In addition to their generous donors, the Environment Agency – Abu Dhabi and the Mohammed Bin Zayed Fund, the SSC Chairs’ office and GSP staff wish to thank the meeting delegates for their energetic and constructive participation, and the numerous delegates who have greatly encouraged the staff with their overwhelmingly enthusiastic and positive feedback.
Annex 1: Report from the World Species Congress Working Group

World Species Congress

Purpose of the World Species Congress

The Congress will aim to influence the conservation movement and wider society:

• To put species in the centre of the conservation movement;

• To ensure that people and wider society value species and are prepared to commit to actions and policies on their behalf
Audience

In order to achieve the purpose of the Congress, it will be important to engage participants who represent both the conservation movement and wider society. For both the conservation movement and wider society, it will be important to identify opinion leaders who can take key messages and commitments beyond the event and convince others of their worth. The Congress should also plan for a strong web presence, generating interest in advance and ensuring that content is streamed live to a web-enabled public.

How the Congress will work

With the purpose in mind, the Congress will seek to create four types of outputs:

- Increasing the knowledge base
- Agreeing targets for future work
- Securing commitments from governments and donors
- Promoting messages designed to engage the imagination of the wider public
1. Knowledge Base

Increase in the knowledge base on:

- The value of species (including as components of ecosystems, links between species and genetic diversity, and support for human livelihoods);
- the status and trends of species;
- the current drivers of species loss; and
- the conservation responses and their effectiveness.

In order to accomplish this, carefully selected case studies and commissioned projects will be prepared in advance of the Congress.

2. Targets for Future Work

Agreement on targets for future work by the conservation movement, particularly around:

- Redefining values to achieve conservation;
- Filling knowledge gaps on the status and trends in species and the drivers of change;
- Assessing which conservation responses are working and which are not, and why; and
- Identifying the measures (action-based and policy-based) that most urgently need to be implemented in order to achieve biodiversity targets.
3. Commitments from Governments and Donors

Mirroring the targets for future work, a series of commitments from governments and donors to support the achievement of the targets specifically and species conservation more generally. The commitments should cover both increased conservation action and policy reform.

4. Messages to Wider Audiences

A series of messages designed to engage the imagination of the wider public on the value of species and the importance of species conservation
To ensure uptake of messages, and agreement on targets and commitments, IUCN and SSC will need commit to undertaking extensive work on the preparation of the Congress, particularly on

- Agreeing host country and fundraising for the Congress
- Preparing data updates and analyses designed to expand the knowledge base
- Securing the necessary support from all the key audiences, especially advance agreement on the target and commitments; and
- Identification of sessions and speakers to fit the purpose of the Congress

How The Species Congress Will Create Change
Target Audiences

World Species Congress
Messages and Means of Engagement During the Event

Governments

Individuals
Religious Leaders, Youth Icons, Wealthy Individuals, Journalists and Communicators

Sectors
Tourism, Development and Food Security, Pharmaceuticals and Health, Natural Resources and Energy

Finance
Donor Community, Finance Sector, Multilateral Banks

Setting Targets and Meeting Obligations

Opinion Leaders Who can Get the Message Out

Sectors That Must Lead Change

Investing in Solutions for Species

Structure and outputs of the Species Congress

DAY 1
Values of species
Structure: concurrent sessions exploring the traditionally defined values of species, from ethical to utilitarian

TARGET SETTING:
Value of species redefined

DAY 2
Status of Species
The definitive guide to the current status of species and conservation efforts around the world

TARGET SETTING:
Filling knowledge gaps (e.g., Assessments, trends of species within protected areas, etc)

DAY 3
Drivers of species change
Understanding what causes the loss of biodiversity and the options for change, large and small

TARGET SETTING:
Recommendations for changes in industry, green economy, societal change

DAY 4
Responses and solutions
A frank discussion and synthesis of what works and what does not, based on sound evidence

TARGET SETTING:
E.g., Conservation action plans, protected areas, management outside of protected areas

DAY 5
A new agenda for species conservation
Final agreement on messages to the public
Final agreement on targets
Unveiling of commitments from governments, donors, business sector leaders and the finance sector to support species conservation