## DECISIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dec. #</th>
<th>Council Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Agenda (Agenda Item 1)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C102/1</td>
<td>The IUCN Council, <strong>Adopts</strong> the agenda of its 102\textsuperscript{nd} Meeting, as revised. (<a href="#">Annex 1</a>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Director General's Strategic Objectives 2021 (Agenda Item 2.2)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C102/2</td>
<td>The IUCN Council, <strong>Approves</strong> the Director General’s Strategic Objectives for 2021. (<a href="#">Annex 2</a>)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>IUCN Work Plan and Budget 2021 (Agenda Item 3)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C102/3</td>
<td>The IUCN Council, <strong>On the recommendation of</strong> the Programme and Policy Committee, <strong>Takes note of</strong> the process to develop the 2021 Work Plan\textsuperscript{2}, and <strong>Requests</strong> the Secretariat to present the Work Plan as soon as it will be ready in March 2021 for Council's endorsement by the fastest possible process available at that time.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| C102/4 | The IUCN Council, **On the recommendation of** the Finance and Audit Committee, **Approves** the 2021 budget ([Annex 3](#)) and **Requests** the Director General to prepare:  
1) a sensitivity analysis based on less optimistic assumptions; and  
2) an implementation plan for the financial strategy. |
| **Green Status of Species Standard (Agenda Item 5.2 – Report of the Programme and Policy Committee)** |                                                                                                                                                              |
| C102/5 | The IUCN Council, **On the recommendation of** the Programme and Policy Committee, **Approves** the Green Status of Species Standard. ([Annex 4](#)) |

\textsuperscript{1} The definitive wording of decisions is subject to Council’s approval of the summary minutes in accordance with Regulation 52.

\textsuperscript{2} The process is described in the Report of the Programme and Policy Committee, cf. hereafter Annex 5 to decision C102/8 (pp. 1-2).
IUCN World Conservation Congress (Agenda Item 6)

C102/6 The IUCN Council,
On the recommendation of the 2020 Congress Preparatory Committee,
Decides that no further postponement of Congress shall be considered beyond the new dates in 2021 to be set in consultation with the Government of France;
Requests that the Secretariat and the Host Country propose a cut-off date at the same time as proposing the actual new Congress dates and report their analysis of situation and risks to the CPC in time for CPC and Council to make a decision prior to said cut-off date.

C102/7 The IUCN Council,
Considers that the planned Marseille Congress in 2021 is the ordinary session of the World Congress. However, in light of uncertainties whether it will be possible to hold the Congress physically or not, Council asks the Secretariat to prepare for a physical Congress and, if that is not possible, for a virtual process to discharge Congress’s essential statutory processes/issues, elections, motions etc.
In both cases, we would endeavour to ensure, with whatever technical aids, all eligible Members would be able to access Congress and participate in essential statutory processes.
Any decisions shall be made in consultation with the Host country. These decisions and the rationale behind them shall be communicated to IUCN Members and candidates.

Approval of the reports of the Council’s standing committees and the Congress Preparatory Committee

C102/8 The IUCN Council,
On the recommendation of the standing committees of the Council and of the Congress Preparatory Committee,
Approves the written reports of the standing committees of the IUCN Council and the Congress Preparatory Committee:
1. Programme and Policy Committee (Annex 5)
2. Finance and Audit Committee (Annex 6), and
3. Congress Preparatory Committee, as revised (Annex 7)
Requests the Programme and Policy Committee, in addition to preparing the draft IUCN Programme 2021-24 for submission to the electronic vote from 27 January to 10 February 2021, to consider the possibility of an amendment or addendum to the Programme on IUCN’s response to Covid-19 for discussion and approval at the IUCN World Conservation Congress in Marseille.

03.12.2020
## Agenda

### Agenda Item 1: Introduction by the President and approval of the agenda

*Following the 99th Council meeting (11 August 2020) which focused on Covid-19, the 100th meeting (14 September 2020) which focused on the 2020 Congress, and the 101st meeting which will deal with the question of when to hold the elections, Council will, during its 102nd meeting, focus on its oversight, strategic direction and fiduciary responsibilities as it usually does during its 2nd (physical) ordinary meeting of the year.*

### Agenda Item 2: Report of the Director General

- **2.1 Report of the Director General**
- **2.2 Director General’s strategic orientations/objectives for 2021**

### Agenda Item 3: IUCN Work Plan and Budget 2021

- **3.1 Work Plan 2021**
- **3.2 Budget 2021**
- **3.2.1 Recommendations of the FAC on the Budget 2021**
- **3.2.2 Comments by the IUCN Treasurer**

### Agenda Item 4: Performance of the Commissions (SSC, WCEL and WCPA)

### Break

### Agenda Item 5: Reports and recommendations from the standing committees

#### 5.1 Governance and Constituency Committee (GCC)

1. Proposals in follow-up to the Council’s Response to the External Review of IUCN’s Governance. (*for Council approval*)

#### 5.2 Programme and Policy Committee (PPC55)

1. Process for the development of the 2021 Work Plan (*for Council approval*)
2. IUCN Annual Progress Report 2019
3. Green Status of Species Standard proposed by SSC (*for Council approval*)
4. Report from the Council’s Global Oceans Focal Person
5. Follow-up on the 2016 Congress Resolutions requiring action from Council
6. Update on the online discussion of the draft IUCN Programme 2021-24 incl. any revisions proposed in relation to IUCN’s response to COVID-19
7. Update on evaluations
8. Any other business

#### 5.3 Finance and Audit Committee (FAC74)

1. Agenda
2. Financial update for 2020 and forecast for the year
3. Congress update
4. Resource mobilisation update
5. Review of the 2021 budget (*for Council approval*)
6. Report of the Head of Oversight
7. Report of the Risk Officer, including report of the FAC risk working group
8. Report of the Legal Advisor
**Agenda Item 6: IUCN World Conservation Congress**

6.1 Recommendations from the Secretariat and CPC pursuant to a request from the CPC (Report 8 September 2020) and the Bureau (decision B88/1 - 9 September 2020) on:

- a process how/when to decide whether or not to hold the Congress on the new dates, and
- the feasibility and cost of holding the Forum by virtual means in case it cannot be held on the new dates

6.2 Follow-up to the 101st Council Meeting

**Agenda Item 7: Celebration of the 60th anniversary of the IUCN World Commission on Protected Areas (WCPA)**
Introduction:

This document presents the Director General’s Strategic Objectives for 2021, which have been formulated in line with his vision for IUCN, presented at the 102nd Council (1 December 2020) in the Director General’s Report to Council, and with:

- the One Programme Charter;
- the IUCN Council Handbook (item §62 v1.1 October 2018) that establishes that the Director General’s performance objectives are to be formulated along five core areas (‘perspectives’);
- the IUCN Council’s response to the External Governance Review (2019) that established the need to add “People Management” as a sixth core area.

The Director General (DG)’s vision for IUCN, which brings together both inward- and outward-facing perspectives, underscore the 2021 objectives presented here and those that will follow across the quadrennium. This vision can be summarised as follows:

Inwards:
- Efficiency needs to be at the heart of IUCN’s operations
- IUCN needs to re-think its finances and income streams
- A greater sense of “one Secretariat” is needed worldwide

Outwards:
- IUCN should become a more relevant and influential political actor in the international arena, showing how nature offers a sustainable way forward
- The strength of the Union lies in its expertise, its networks and its capacity to mobilise

In 2021, the DG will focus on nine high-level priorities that are structured according to the five plus one core areas established in the IUCN Council Handbook for the performance objectives of the DG:

1. Strategic Leadership in Conservation (1.1. and 1.2.)
2. Fundraising and Financial Management (2.1. and 2.2.)
3. Operational and Change Management (3.)
4. Programme Management (4.)
5. External Liaisons and Public Image (5.1. and 5.2.)
6. People Management (6.)

DG’s 2021 Objectives

1. Strategic Leadership in Conservation

1.1. By the end of 2021, the DG’s Initiatives will have begun implementation and will be contributing to:
   i. Mobilise the Union (Members and Commissions);
   ii. Raise IUCN’s political profile and visibility in the global arena;
   iii. Extend IUCN’s influence beyond the conservation community into the agricultural, finance and education sectors.
1.2. By the end of 2021, the IUCN Secretariat will have:

i. Built momentum for the Post-2020 agenda, positioning the IUCN Congress as a springboard and a platform to raise ambition and commitment levels.

2. Fundraising and Financial Management

2.1. By the end of 2021, the IUCN Secretariat will have:

i. Developed a Resource Mobilisation Strategy that:
   a. envisages new business models and clear pathways for diversifying IUCN’s income streams;
   b. provides a rationale for investing in IUCN as a Framework Partner;
   c. includes regional /country level components;

ii. Sought to attract new Framework Partners;

iii. Deployed new funding mechanisms for its “Knowledge Products”.

2.2. By the end of 2021, the IUCN Secretariat will have:

i. Taken steps to improve its cost recovery from projects, particularly aimed at the costs of corporate functions;

ii. Defined means to direct core funding (unrestricted) towards innovation.

3. Operational and Change Management

3. By the end of 2021, the IUCN Secretariat will be making operational and managerial improvements through the:

i. Appointment of a Deputy Director General;

ii. Continuous oversight of the Business Continuity Plan;

iii. Review of its capacity and structural efficiency;

iv. Deployment of an Internal Communications Strategy;


4. Programme Management

4. By the end of 2021, the IUCN Secretariat will have:

i. Developed a ‘Nature 2030 Contributions Platform’ that offers a means to capture Union-wide contributions to the IUCN Programme;

ii. Improved its M&E capacities and tools.

5. External Liaisons and Public Image

5.1. By the end of 2021, the IUCN Secretariat will have:

i. Established novel partnerships with private sector, education and government entities;

ii. Expanded the IUCN Patrons of Nature initiative.

5.2. By the end of 2021, the IUCN Secretariat will have:

i. Deployed an External Communications Strategy;
ii. Launched a significant upgrade to the IUCN website;
iii. Launched the Open Project Portal for greater transparency and accountability regarding the Secretariat’s project portfolio;
iv. Upgraded the way IUCN’s ‘publishing house’ is steered and managed.

6. People Management

6. By the end of 2021:
   i. Staff will have been supported through the COVID-19 crisis;
   ii. The DG will be actively involved in strengthening the political leadership role of Regional Directors;
   iii. A staff mobility /rotation programme will have been rolled-out;
   iv. Investments will have been made in staff development programmes.
102nd Meeting of the IUCN Council

By conference call on 1 December 2020 from 10.00 AM to 2.15 PM UTC/GMT

**IUCN 2021 Budget**

Origin: Director General

REQUIRED ACTION

Council is invited to approve the IUCN 2021 Budget on the proposal of the Director General taking into account the recommendation of its Finance and Audit Committee.

The IUCN 2021 Budget will be discussed by the Finance and Audit Committee (FAC) on 24 November 2020.

The Director General will present the highlights of the IUCN 2020 Budget to Council (as part of his Report to Council) under Agenda Item 3.2 on 1 December 2020.

The 2021 Budget will be discussed by Council together with the recommendation of the FAC, and a decision will be taken.

Note:
The 2021 Work plan will be developed following approval of the 2021-2024 Programme by e-vote of IUCN Members (27 January to 10 February 2021) and will subsequently be presented to Council for approval.
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1. Introduction

The 2021 budget represents the first year of implementation of the 2021-2024 Financial Plan. The budget is based on the draft Financial Plan which will be approved in early 2021 by e-vote of the Membership. In the event that significant changes are made to the Financial Plan prior to its approval and in the event that such changes impact the 2021 budget, the 2021 budget will be revised and the revisions submitted to Council for approval in 2021.

Budget summary

A breakeven result is budgeted for 2021. The total budget is CHF 143m, a significant increase on the forecast for 2020 (CHF 123m), driven by a growing project portfolio and the expectation that Covid-19 restrictions will be gradually lifted during the course of 2021.

Significant investment in resource mobilisation will be made in 2021 together with initiatives to increase operational efficiency and to increase the level of operational costs funded by the project portfolio. Taken together, these initiatives will lay the ground work for building reserves in future years.

External context

The Covid-19 emergency has impacted programme implementation during the course of 2020 and could continue to do so in 2021. The impact on 2021 will depend on when a vaccine becomes widely available. In the event that the pandemic persists well into 2021, the impact on programme implementation and the financial health of IUCN could be significant.

The pandemic poses implementation challenges as on-the-ground, community based activities depend on the free movement of individuals and normal working practices. Although IUCN has been exploring new ways of working, a significant proportion of the work of IUCN require on the ground actions, either directly by IUCN staff or through its partners. Consequently, in the event that travel restrictions and the need for social distancing continue into 2021, this could impact implementation rates. There is also a risk that governments and multilateral agencies prioritise direct interventions to sustain their economies and to provide social assistance, thereby reducing available funding for conservation and environmental programmes.

Although the Covid-19 pandemic creates risks for IUCN, it also creates opportunities. The increased awareness of the linkages between a healthy planet and healthy people provides IUCN with programmatic and fundraising opportunities. The relevance of the IUCN programme to a green post-Covid economic recovery and its contribution to reducing the likelihood of future zoonotic diseases will be key to maintaining and growing funding.

Overall Financial Situation

IUCN’s overall financial situation has weakened over the last four years. Unrestricted reserves have fallen from a level of CHF 19.5m at the end of 2016 to a forecast level of CHF 17.6m at the end of 2020. At the same time, risks have increased. A growing portfolio and the expansion of grant making programmes and projects implemented through partner organisations has increased the level of financial risk taken on by IUCN. The Covid-19 pandemic has also added significantly to the financial risks as it has negatively impacted programme delivery.
On a more positive note, the project portfolio has shown steady growth over the last 4 years and this is expected to continue. This has been driven to a large extent by growth in funding from the Green Climate Fund and Global Environment Facility. There has also been growth in funding from bilateral government donors and multilateral donors, driven by a focus on large-scale programmatic initiatives that are aligned with donor priorities.

At the end of September 2020 the total value of IUCN’s project portfolio under implementation was CHF 522m, and projects in development were valued at CHF 201m, a significant increase on previous years, as shown in figure 1. The portfolio includes GEF projects totalling CHF 61m and GCF projects totalling CHF 112m.

**Figure 1: Total project portfolio, CHF million**

![Graph showing total project portfolio, CHF million](image)

Figure 2 shows income trends over the last 7 years together with the forecast for 2020 and the budget for 2021. The most significant change is the growth in project restricted income which reflects the growth in the project portfolio. Expenditure on several large projects secured in 2019 and 2020 will ramp up in 2021.

**Figure 2: Income trends, CHF million**

![Graph showing income trends, CHF million](image)

Figure 3 shows further analysis of the unrestricted income trend, broken down into its three main components: membership dues, framework income and other unrestricted income.
Membership dues are stable. The number of Members continues to grow, though primarily in categories B and C (National and international non-governmental organisations and Indigenous Peoples’ Organisations), as shown in Figure 4. Although a dip in the number of Members is expected in 2021, following the rescission of Members in arrears, this is not expected to have a significant impact on the level of Membership dues in 2021.

Framework income declined significantly over the period 2013-2018 but is now showing signs of recovery and is expected to increase marginally in 2021, as shown in Figure 3.

### 2. Key financial challenges

The key financial challenges faced by IUCN in 2021 are:

1. **Covid 19** could continue to impact programme implementation in the first half of 2021, and possible longer, depending on when a vaccine becomes widely available. In respect of the project portfolio, Income is earned as expenditure is incurred. Consequently, delays in implementation result in a reduction of funding for operational costs. This presents a problem for the funding of infrastructure costs, the majority of which are fixed in the short to medium term. Covid-19 could also lead to a reduction in Membership dues as a result of an increase in the risk of non-payment by Members facing financial difficulties.
2. **The 2020 Congress.** The budget assumes that the Congress will be held sometime in 2021. However, there is a significant risk that it will not go ahead as planned as it is not possible to predict the evolution of the Covid-19 pandemic. Assuming it does go ahead, the level of income that will be realised is difficult to forecast as it will depend on the willingness of people to travel and their perception of the risk of attending a major event. Postponing Congress has also added significantly to the costs of the event. Consequently, there is a significant risk that the Congress will end with a financial deficit. In the event of cancellation, and depending on the point of cancellation, a deficit of up to CHF 5 million could be realised. In the event that the Congress goes ahead but attendance is low, a deficit of between CHF 1-2 million could be realised. No provision has been made in the 2021 budget for potential Congress losses.

3. **Funding.** The bulk of IUCN’s funding, excluding Membership dues, comes from European donors. Although this has resulted in a high level of stability and predictability IUCN will need to diversify funding to ensure long term growth.

4. **Value for money, cost effectiveness and efficiency.** In order to ensure efficient and cost effective delivery of the 2021-2024 programme, IUCN will need to pursue organisational change to ensure that its structures and technical capacity are fit for purpose. Growth in the project portfolio provides opportunities for economies of scale; however, these will only be realised if the organisation is structured for efficient delivery.

5. **Reserves.** At the end of 2019 IUCN unrestricted reserves stood at CHF 17.6 million. The current reserves target stands at CHF 25 million. This will be reviewed in 2021, taking into consideration the risks faced by IUCN. A Congress deficit would result in a further reduction in IUCN reserves. This could constrain IUCN as it would reduce its ability to take on risk and develop new areas of work.

### 3. Implementation of the Financial Plan 2021-2024

The 2021 budget represents the first year of implementation of the Financial Plan 2021-2024. The Plan sets out a series of targets. These have been taken into consideration in the development of the 2021 budget. Table 1 - taken from the Financial Plan - shows the targets set and how they are addressed in the 2021 budget.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increase membership dues</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>2021–2024</td>
<td>The Financial Plan foresees a change in the methodology for assessing the dues of category B and C Members. The change will only be applicable from 2022 and is subject to approval by the Membership. No increase is budgeted in 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintain current level of framework income</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2021–2024</td>
<td>An increase of 5% is budgeted in 2021, surpassing the target.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase value of project portfolio:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The portfolio has increased by 17% compared to the 2020 budget, surpassing the target.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• GEF/GCF</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Other</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>Year-on-year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target</td>
<td>Value</td>
<td>Period</td>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase annual level of restricted income and expenditure</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>Year-on-year</td>
<td>A 25% increase is budgeted compared to 2020. However, a major part of the increase relates to “catch up” in respect of delays to project implementation caused by Covid-19.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase level of operational costs funded by cost recovery</td>
<td>From 63% to 70%</td>
<td>2021–2024</td>
<td>The budget level for 2021 is 61%. Work on the full cost recovery model will be taken forward in 2021 with the objective of increasing the level of recovery.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-staff operating costs not to exceed 20% of total operating costs</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>2021–2024</td>
<td>The budgeted level of non-staff operating costs for 2021 is 20%, in line with the target.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grow income from foundations and philanthropy</td>
<td>From 9% to 12% of total income</td>
<td>2021–2024</td>
<td>An additional investment of CHF 0.5m has been made in resource mobilisation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grow income from private sector</td>
<td>From 3% to 5% of total income</td>
<td>2021–2024</td>
<td>The investment in resource mobilisation includes a position to further relationship with the private sector.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase reserves</td>
<td>CHF 3m</td>
<td>2021–2024</td>
<td>The 2021 budget does not see an increase in reserves but a significant investment is being made in resource mobilisation which should result in reserve increases in future years.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4. Budget summary

Table 2 shows the overall budget, analysed between unrestricted and restricted income and expenditure. The **Overall result** (Surplus/(deficit) budgeted for 2021 is breakeven. The total expenditure budget for 2021 is CHF 143.5m, comprising unrestricted expenditure of CHF 30.4m and restricted expenditure of CHF 113.1m. Each major budget line is described below the table.
Table 2: Budget summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unrestricted income and expenditure</th>
<th>2019 Actual</th>
<th>2020 Forecast</th>
<th>2021 Budget</th>
<th>2021 Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Membership dues (net of provisions)</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Framework income</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other unrestricted income</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total income</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>29.8</td>
<td>33.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating expenditure</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>32.7</td>
<td>28.7</td>
<td>31.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investments</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total expenditure</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>32.7</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>33.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operating result</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td>-0.6</td>
<td>-0.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfers from designated reserves</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surplus/(deficit)</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Restricted income and expenditure</th>
<th>2019 Actual</th>
<th>2020 Forecast</th>
<th>2021 Budget</th>
<th>2021 Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>89.1</td>
<td>90.0</td>
<td>113.1</td>
<td>99.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IUCN activities</td>
<td>33.1</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>40.2</td>
<td>61.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementing partner activities</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IUCN staff costs</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>37.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect costs</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditure</td>
<td>89.1</td>
<td>90.0</td>
<td>113.1</td>
<td>99.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excess of income over expenditure</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total income and expenditure</th>
<th>2019 Actual</th>
<th>2020 Forecast</th>
<th>2021 Budget</th>
<th>2021 Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>120.9</td>
<td>122.1</td>
<td>142.9</td>
<td>132.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expenditure</td>
<td>121.1</td>
<td>122.7</td>
<td>143.5</td>
<td>132.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfers from designated reserves</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surplus/(deficit)</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a) Unrestricted income and expenditure

Unrestricted income is budgeted at CHF 29.8m.

Membership dues are budgeted at CHF 11.7m. This is lower than the forecast for 2020 of CHF 12.4m. The reduction takes into account Members in arrears who may be rescinded at the 2020 Congress and also the increased risk of non-payment as a result of the Covid-19 pandemic. The amount is budgeted is after deduction of a provision of CHF 0.5m for late payment or defaults.

Framework income is budgeted at CHF 12.5m. This is CHF 0.7m higher than the forecast for 2020. The budget is based on indications received from existing framework partners and one new framework partner that is expected to join in 2021.

Other unrestricted income is budgeted at CHF 5.6m. Other unrestricted income includes income from Patrons of Nature (CHF 1.4m), rental and service fee income from 3rd parties (CHF 1.5m), the in-kind value of tax exemptions (CHF 1.5m) and other sundry income (CHF 1.2m). Total unrestricted income is CHF 2.2m
lower than the forecast for 2020. The forecast for 2020 includes in-kind staff of CHF 1.0m – nothing has been included for 2021. In the event that in-kind staff are contracted there will be no impact on the result as the value of in-kind staff is included as both an income and an expense. The other key reason for the overall reduction is a reduction by regional programmes.

**Unrestricted expenditure** is budgeted at CHF 30.4m. This comprises:

- **Operating expenditure** is budgeted at CHF 28.7m. This is CHF 4.0m lower than the forecast for 2020; however, this is partly due reclassifications. Investments are disclosed as a separate line in the 2021 budget, where as they were included in operating expenditure in 2020 and previous years. In addition, CHF 1.0m of the reduction relates to in-kind staff: nothing has been included for 2021 (see explanation under other unrestricted income). The remaining difference reflects general cost reductions. Operating expenditure includes provisions of CHF 0.5m for foreign exchange losses and project losses.

- **Investments** from unrestricted funds are budgeted at CHF 1.7m. See section 6 for further details.

**Transfers from designated reserves** are budgeted at CHF 0.6m. This amount represents costs to be incurred in 2021 to be funded by designated reserves (funds set aside in previous years for specific activities in future years). The main constituent is costs to be incurred by the IUCN Commissions in relation to the 2020 Congress and the 2nd World Environmental Law Congress, both of which have been postponed and are assumed to take place in 2021.

**b) Restricted income and expenditure**

Restricted income and expenditure are budgeted at CHF 113.1m. IUCN recognises restricted income as expenditure is incurred and hence income and expenditure are equal. The total amount is significantly higher than the 2020 forecast (CHF 90m). The increase reflects the growth in the project portfolio, particularly in respect of GEF and GCF projects, and the fact that several major projects signed in 2019 and 2020 will enter into their main implementation phases in 2021. In addition, the Covid-19 pandemic constrained expenditure in 2020 and a degree of “catch up” is expected in 2021, provided that restrictions on the movement on people are relaxed in the regions where IUCN is most active.

As shown in fig 5, the growth in project expenditure is driven both by an increase in expenditure by implementing partners, which is budgeted to increase from CHF 27.7m in 2020 to CHF 38.0m in 2021, and a growth in IUCN activities, which is budgeted to increase from CHF 26.7m to CHF 40.2m.

**Figure 5: Trends in project expenditure, CHF million**
5. Analysis of the 2021 budget by funding source

Table 3 below presents the 2021 budget by funding source. This analysis shows which funding source funds which costs. The analysis provides a basis for assessing whether each funding source is being appropriately or optimally used.

The following principles have been applied:

**Unrestricted income**

- **Membership dues** are used primarily to fund Union functions such as Governance, Constituency support, Congress, and support to the IUCN Commissions (51%). The balance contributes to the funding of programme support functions such as Global Communications (branding, IUCN website, media relations etc.), Strategic Partnerships (resource mobilisation) (10%) and IUCN corporate functions (39%). The latter includes the Office of the Director General, Union systems and risk provisions.

- **Framework income** is unrestricted programmatic funding. Consequently, it is used primarily to fund functions that further the implementation of the 2021-2024 Programme, such as programme development and coordination; programme innovation and knowledge generation; and representation, relationship management and collaboration.

- **Other unrestricted income** is used primarily to fund corporate costs. Other unrestricted income includes service income of CHF 1.3m received from IUCN tenants and in-kind income of CHF 0.5m in respect of donated assets. Both service income and in-kind income are matched with the associated costs.

**Restricted income**

- **Congress income**, which comprises registration fees, exhibition sales and sponsorship income, funds Congress expenditure.

- **Project restricted income** is income generated from the IUCN project portfolio. It funds the associated project expenditures, including IUCN staff costs associated with project delivery and indirect project costs.
Table 3: Analysis of the 2021 budget by funding source, CHF

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Unrestricted</th>
<th>Restricted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Membership</td>
<td>Framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Income</strong></td>
<td>11,700,000</td>
<td>12,543,560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Expenditure</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regional programmes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IUCN activities</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementing partners’ activities</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff costs</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate services</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>754,523</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme development and coordination</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>703,053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Representation, relationship mgt, collaboration</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1,473,711</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constituency support</td>
<td>2,069,585</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-total</strong></td>
<td>2,069,585</td>
<td>2,931,287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Global programmes</strong></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IUCN activities</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementing partners’ activities</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff costs</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations support</td>
<td>- 592,000</td>
<td>80,807</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporate services</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>548,346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programme development and coordination</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5,120,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRAFFIC</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-total</strong></td>
<td>6,660,346</td>
<td>301,262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Programme support</strong></td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning, monitoring and evaluation</td>
<td>- 771,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strategic partnerships</td>
<td>153,000</td>
<td>818,297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEF/GCF coordination</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>152,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global communications</td>
<td>1,062,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-total</strong></td>
<td>1,215,000</td>
<td>1,741,297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Union</strong></td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governance</td>
<td>874,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congress</td>
<td>394,814</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HQ Constituency support</td>
<td>647,186</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commission operating funds</td>
<td>1,300,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commission support unit</td>
<td>352,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCF</td>
<td>250,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-total</strong></td>
<td>3,818,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Corporate</strong></td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of the DG, legal, oversight</td>
<td>1,872,000</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance, HR, IT, General services</td>
<td>2,375,415</td>
<td>174,585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk provisions (forex, deficits)</td>
<td>350,000</td>
<td>200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-total</strong></td>
<td>4,597,415</td>
<td>374,585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Innovation</strong></td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovation and organisational development</td>
<td>- 836,045</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sub-total</strong></td>
<td>- 836,045</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>11,700,000</td>
<td>12,543,560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Total expenditure

Figure 6 presents graphically the total expenditure figures from table 3 by organisational component.

Figure 6: Budget breakdown by organisational component

![Budget breakdown by organisational component](image)

57% of the total budget is allocated to regional programmes. This is broken down by region as shown in figure 7.

Figure 7: Regional programme budgets

![Regional programme budgets](image)

Regions with the highest level of expenditure are Asia, West and Central Africa and Eastern and Southern Africa, which together account for 66% of total regional expenditure.

Evolution of the funding model

IUCN’s intention over the course of 2021 and future years is to increase the level of corporate costs funded by the project portfolio, thereby “freeing up” a portion of the Membership dues so that a higher percentage can be invested in activities that advance the development and impact of the Union.

The objective is to make the project portfolio self-sustaining through improved cost recovery mechanisms so that growth in the portfolio does not need to be subsidised by unrestricted income. Unrestricted income would, however, still be used for programme development and coordination, and for ensuring programme coherence and impact.
6. Investments

Investments of CHF 1.7m are planned in 2021 with the objectives of diversifying and increasing funding; strengthening accountability and programme quality through improved monitoring; and supporting programme innovation and organisational development.

Table 4 shows the main investments anticipated in the 2021 budget. Items with a value are new investments. Portfolio developments and general IT developments are recurring investments.

Table 4: Planned investments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strengthening resource mobilisation and relationship management</td>
<td>CHF 500k</td>
<td>The capacity of the Strategic Partnerships Unit will be strengthened with the objective of increasing the level of unrestricted funds to support innovation, programme coherence and Union development. This will be achieved by targeting new framework partners, philanthropy and the corporate sector.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strengthening accountability and transparency on the use and allocation of resources</td>
<td>CHF 420k</td>
<td>The capacity of the Planning, Monitoring, Evaluation and Risk function (PMER) will be significantly increased. This responds to internal assessments and recommendations made in the 2020 External Review to increase capacity in this area. The additional investment will ensure that the PMER unit has the capacity to set standards, oversee quality assurance, measure performance across the Secretariat and facilitate necessary and periodic evaluations on key programmatic topics. Investment will also be made to reinforce a monitoring, evaluation and learning culture throughout the entire Secretariat.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development of a platform to capture Members’ contributions to the IUCN Programme</td>
<td>CHF 30k</td>
<td>The 2021–2024 Programme is a programme for the Union. To demonstrate delivery against programme targets a platform will be developed that will allow Members to register their contributions to the achievement of the overarching impact targets. An initial investment for scoping will be made in 2021.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Document management</td>
<td>CHF 150k</td>
<td>As part of a broader digitalisation strategy, investment will be made in the development of a document management system. The initial scope will be to support financial processes. The system will be expanded in subsequent years to cover other areas, e.g. HR, project management. Investment in year 1 represents scoping, design and system selection.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portfolio development</td>
<td>Included in the operational budgets of programmes</td>
<td>Unrestricted allocations are made to both regional and global programmes to support project development and programme coherence.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 7. Staffing and staff costs

Staff levels are expected to increase from a current level of 816 to 850 over the course of 2021. Staff levels have shown a progressive decrease since 2016 when they stood at 1,022 to the current level. This reflects a move to larger projects and growth in the implementing agency component of the project portfolio, both of which involve a higher percentage of activities being undertaken by partners. The projected growth in staffing levels in 2021 reflects the growth in the overall budget, particularly the project component.

The total budgeted 2021 staffing cost is CHF 54.3m (2020 Budget CHF 53.0m). Staff costs are budgeted to be funded as shown in Figure 8. Comparative figures are shown for previous years’ budgets.

#### Figure 8: Funding of staff costs

![Funding of staff costs (2019-2021)](image)

2021 staff costs and the source of funding is generally in line with the 2020 budget. Core funds (unrestricted income plus HQ indirect cost recovery) funds 47% of staff costs, whereas projects and other sources fund 53% of staff costs.

CHF 4m is budgeted to be funded from B-projects, i.e. projects currently under negotiation/development. This represents a risk to IUCN as the funding of staff is dependent on realisation of the projects. The value is, however, relatively low and the risk manageable. In many cases, staff have fixed term contracts linked to the...
duration of ongoing projects. Contracts are not extended or new staff taken on until new project agreements are signed.

8. Project portfolio

Table 5 shows the total value of the portfolio, number of projects and budgeted expenditure for 2021.

Table 5: Project portfolio headline numbers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Projects under implementation</th>
<th>Projects in development</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Value of projects</td>
<td>CHF 522,601,047</td>
<td>CHF 200,841,628</td>
<td>CHF 723,442,675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of projects</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budgeted expenditure in 2021,</td>
<td>CHF 84,516,109</td>
<td>CHF 28,564,174</td>
<td>CHF 113,080,283</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The total value of IUCN’s project portfolio at 30 September 2020 was CHF 724m, comprising projects under implementation of CHF 523m and projects under development of CHF 201m. These figures include all projects that will continue into 2021. Projects that are currently under implementation that will finish before the end of 2020 are not included in the above figures. The portfolio includes GEF and GCF projects with a combined value of CHF 173m (approx. 25% of the total portfolio).

Total budgeted expenditure for 2021 is CHF 113m, comprising expenditure on projects currently under implementation of CHF 84m (75%) and expenditure on projects in development of CHF 29 million (25%). The latter are projects where the contracts are expected to be signed before the end of 2020 or during the course of 2021. Expenditure on GEF and GCF projects is budgeted at CHF 24m in 2021.

Fig 9 below shows the geographical distribution of budgeted expenditure in 2021.
Figure 9: 2021 Project budget by Statutory State, Operational Region and Globally tagged projects

This figure shows the projected 2021 budget (M CHF) in Statutory States, Operational Regions, Globally-funded projects and Headquarters represented by the size of the circles. The legend indicates the projected budget size according to these categories. It includes B (factored by the probability of funding) and C list projects.

1 This figure shows the projected 2021 budget (M CHF) in Statutory States, Operational Regions, Globally-funded projects and Headquarters represented by the size of the circles. The legend indicates the projected budget size according to these categories. It includes B (factored by the probability of funding) and C list projects.
Figure 10 shows the contribution of 2021 budgeted expenditure to the IUCN programme areas and impact targets.
All IUCN projects contribute to the achievement of the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). IUCN has mapped project budgets to the SDGs as a proxy indicator of contribution to each SDG.

Figure 11: 2021 budgeted expenditure by SDG

| SDG.15 - Life on land       | 36.9% |
| SDG.14 - Life below water  | 11.6% |
| SDG.13 - Climate action    | 23.0% |
| SDG.12 - Responsible       | 3.5%  |
| SDG.11 - Sustainable       | 1.5%  |
| SDG.10 - Reduced inequalities | 1.0% |
| SDG.09 - Industry          | 0.8%  |
| SDG.08 - Decent work       | 0.4%  |
| SDG.07 - Affordable        | 0.8%  |
| SDG.06 - Clean water       | 6.0%  |
| SDG.05 - Gender equality   | 3.2%  |
| SDG.04 - Quality education | 0.3%  |
| SDG.03 - Good health       | 0.5%  |
| SDG.02 - Zero hunger       | 0.9%  |
| SDG.01 - No Poverty        | 3.4%  |

9. Funding of the budget

Figure 12 shows 2021 budgeted project expenditure by major donor. The top 3 donors are multilateral agencies, the largest being the European Commission. The majority of the other top donors are government agencies, though 3 foundations are also included. In terms of geographical spread, there is a concentration of European donors. A similar picture is seen with framework donors (not included in the below chart) where 6 out of 8 partners are European government agencies. Diversification of the donor base will be pursued by investing in resource mobilisation that targets new framework partners, philanthropy and the corporate sector (see Section 6: Investments).
10. **Reserves**

Figure 13 shows the movement in IUCN’s reserves from 2015 and the projection to the end of 2021. Unrestricted reserves totalled CHF 17.6m at the end of 2019. They are forecast to remain at this level at the end of 2020 and end of 2021, reflecting the breakeven nature of the budget. The current target for unrestricted reserves is CHF 25m. This will be reviewed during the course of 2021 and adjusted, if necessary, so that it is aligned with the financial risks faced by IUCN.

Designated reserves are forecast to decrease from a level of CHF 1.8m at the end of 2019 to a level of CHF 0.6m at the end of 2021 as they are used for their intended purposes.
11. **Risks Inherent in the Budget 2021**

The main risks for 2021 are:

1. **Delays in project implementation**

   Project expenditure is budgeted at CHF 113m, a 35% increase on the 2020 forecast of CHF 90m. The increase reflects: 1) the expectation that expenditure levels will increase as the Covid-19 pandemic subsides; and 2) an expanding project portfolio. However, there is no certainty that The Covid-19 pandemic will subside in early 2021 and therefore, despite a growing project portfolio, IUCN may continue to face implementation challenges.

   Delays in project implementation would result in lower levels of cost recovery and an increase in the risk of staff costs not being fully funded. It would also result in a reduction in the funding of corporate costs by the project portfolio, meaning a higher portion would have to be funded from unrestricted income. A total of CHF 29m of project expenditure is budgeted to come from contracts not signed as at 30 September 2020. This is significantly higher than the comparative level for the 2020 budget (CHF 19m), and represents an increase in risk.

   Risk response: The rates of project implementation and cost recovery will be monitored on a monthly basis in order to identify areas of concern and action needed. Staff contracts will be aligned with the duration of signed project contracts to the extent possible. Conversion rates of projects under development will be monitored and a risk assessment performed at the end of each quarter. If the level of conversions is low, budget modifications will be considered.

   Risk Level: Tier 2 – High.

   Risk Owner: Global and Regional Directors

2. **The IUCN Congress does not go ahead**

   IUCN has made significant investment in the 2020 Congress. Postponement of Congress has resulted in additional unbudgeted costs. The 2021 budget assumes that the Congress will go ahead sometime in 2021 and that the full investment will be recovered from Congress income, namely registration fees, exhibition income and sponsorships. In the event that the Congress is cancelled, losses of up to CHF 5.0m could be incurred as the investment would need to be written off.

   Risk response: Congress costs are being actively managed. The Congress will be actively marketed and virtual run-up events held to maintain interest. Relationships with exhibitors and sponsors will be actively managed to limit the risk of contract cancellations.

   Risk Level: Tier 1 – Very high.

   Risk Owner: IUCN Council/Director General

3. **Framework agreements not signed**

   At the time of preparation of the 2021 budget, no agreements with framework partners for the period 2021-2024 had been signed. Although, indications from framework partners are positive, there is a significant risk that the level of framework income budgeted may not be achieved. The fact that the
2021-2024 Programme will only be approved in January 2021 adds to the risk as framework partners link their funding to the approved IUCN Programme.

Risk response: A meeting of the framework partners is planned for December 2020. Discussions with partners will continue into 2021 with the objective of securing agreements as early as possible in 2021.

Risk Level: Tier 2 – High.

Risk owner: Director of Strategic Partnerships

4. **Non-payment of membership dues**

Members may decide to withdraw from IUCN or delay payment of membership dues. This could happen for a variety of reason, e.g. Members experiencing financial difficulties in light of the Covid-19 pandemic, or Members reassessing the value of membership. The impact could be particularly high if State Members in the higher dues categories were to withdraw.

Risk response: A provision of CHF 0.5m has been made in the 2020 budget for non-payment of membership dues. A Membership strategy has been developed and this will be rolled out during 2021. The strategy will strengthen IUCN’s value proposition.

Risk Level: Tier 2 – High.

Risk Owner: Global Director - Union Development Group

5. **Exposure to foreign exchange fluctuations**

Several of IUCN’s Framework contributions (Sweden, Norway, Finland, France, US) are received in currencies that are not closely aligned with the Swiss franc. It is possible that the actual Swiss franc value of contributions will be lower than projected in the 2020 budget. In addition, IUCN receives and spends funds in a variety of currencies for projects and this creates a foreign exchange risk.

Risk response: In respect of the core budget, which is set in Swiss francs, the risk of foreign exchange losses is mitigated by a hedging strategy using forward currency contracts. IUCN policy is to hedge a minimum of 50% of the foreign exchange exposure related to Framework agreements. In respect of the project budget, a natural hedging strategy is adopted whereby project assets and liabilities are balanced to the extent possible. A general provision of CHF 0.3m is also included in the budget for exchange gains and losses.

Risk Level: Tier 4 – Low.

Risk Owner: Chief Finance Officer
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I. INTRODUCTION

The decline of many species towards extinction has largely focused conservation efforts on ensuring that species remain extant. However, conservationists have long recognized the need to complement this by aiming to recover depleted populations throughout a species' range and to restore species to ecosystems from which they have been extirpated.

Recognizing this need, the International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN) called for the development of objective criteria for Green Lists of Species, Ecosystems and Protected Areas (IUCN and WCPA 2017). Resolution WCC-2012-RES-41 of the 2012 World Conservation Congress requested that "the Species Survival Commission (SSC)… conduct international scientific consultations to develop objective, transparent and repeatable criteria for Green Lists that systematically assess successful conservation of species."

In response, the Species Survival Commission convened a Task Force on Assessing Conservation Success under the auspices of the IUCN Red List Committee to oversee the development of this Standard. The Task Force developed a framework for measuring species recovery and conservation impact (Akçakaya et al. 2018), which proposed a definition of a fully recovered species based on viability, functionality, and representation, and defined four metrics to quantify the importance of conservation for a species. This framework was tested across a range of taxa between 2018 and 2021 to ensure wide applicability, and resulting changes are captured in this Standard.

To ensure full understanding of IUCN Green Status of Species assessments, it is very important to refer to the latest versions of all the following documents:

1. Background and Guidelines for the IUCN Green Status of Species, which accompanies this Standard, and which will be periodically updated (referred to in the remainder of this document as Background and Guidelines);
2. IUCN Red List Categories and Criteria (IUCN 2012a);
3. Guidelines for Using the IUCN Red List Categories and Criteria (IUCN 2019);

II. PREAMBLE

1. Purpose

The IUCN Green Status of Species has five main objectives:

(i) To provide a standardised framework for measuring species recovery;
(ii) To recognize conservation achievements;
(iii) To highlight species whose current conservation status is dependent on continued conservation actions;
(iv) To forecast the expected conservation impact of planned conservation action; and
(v) To elevate levels of ambition for long-term species recovery.

These objectives together encourage conservation towards species recovery, throughout a species’ range. They are represented by a Species Recovery Score, and by four conservation impact metrics (Conservation Legacy, Conservation Dependence, Conservation Gain, Recovery Potential), which are quantified as differences between the Green Score of the species in different time steps or under different scenarios.

2. Scope

The definitions and metrics of the Green Status of Species can be applied to any species except microorganisms. Species can be assessed under this protocol regardless of their Red List category, and regardless of whether they have been subject to conservation measures. For practical reasons (see section V.3), Green Status of a species should be assessed after, or concurrently with, the Red List assessment of that species.

3. Species recovery

In this standard, a Fully Recovered species is defined based on viability, functionality, and representation (see definition in section III). Viability is the first requirement that is essential but not sufficient for recognizing a species as recovered. To be considered Fully Recovered, a species must also exhibit its ecological interactions, functions, and other roles in the ecosystem, and occur in a representative set of ecosystems and communities throughout its range. The viability and functionality aspects are addressed in the assessment of the state of the species’ population in each spatial unit (see sections IV.1, V.3.c and V.3.d), and the representation aspect is addressed by making the assessment in all spatial units across the species’ range (see sections IV.1 and V.2). The definition based on these characteristics is used to measure a species’ recovery, expressed as the Green Score, which in turn is used to define four conservation impact metrics to quantify the importance of conservation for the species (see section III, Definitions).

4. Relation to the IUCN Red List

Green Status assessments are not an alternative to extinction risk assessments through the IUCN Red List, but provide complementary information. The results of a Green Status assessment (Species Recovery Score and Category, and the conservation impact metrics and categories) should be considered together with the IUCN Red List category of species. There is not a simple and general relationship between the Red List status and Green Status of species. Species that have been recovering may still be threatened; species that have not recovered may not be threatened; and species with high values of the conservation impact metrics may or may not be at risk of extinction. The Red List and Green Status provide separate but related and complementary assessments of the conservation status of a species.

Some issues that are relevant for Green Status assessments, e.g., terms used to define viability, are covered in the Red List Guidelines; thus, assessors should also consult the most recent version of the Guidelines for Using the IUCN Red List Categories and
Criteria (IUCN Standards and Petitions Subcommittee 2019), as they are updated on a regular basis.

5. Relation to conservation planning and priorities

Green Status Assessments are not meant to replace the process for establishing recovery objectives, targets and goals, which is a part of the conservation action planning process that brings together all stakeholders in the planning process, and that is the ideal and appropriate venue to set conservation targets and priorities. Instead, Green Status Assessments aim to be a useful and integral part of this planning process, and to reflect the targets and aspirations which are set within this process. Species conservation or recovery plans are often developed with conservation measures and actions covering a relatively short time horizon (e.g., five or ten years); this is reflected in the Conservation Gain metric. These plans are usually nested within a longer-term vision, which may often be 50-100 years. The Recovery Potential metric is aligned with this long-term vision. The time frame for Recovery Potential is set at 100 years, to link explicitly to the vision statements in many conservation strategies and action plans. The Recovery Potential should ideally be based on the long-term vision statement of a recognized action planning process, involving considered and appropriate stakeholder engagement. Conservation planning processes also often build upon past conservation actions and evaluations of conservation impacts in different parts of the species’ range, as well as the species’ short-term conservation needs. These are captured in the Conservation Legacy and Conservation Dependence metrics.

III. DEFINITIONS

1. Absent (state of a spatial unit)
A species is said to be Absent in a given spatial unit if it does not occur there in the wild, despite the spatial unit being a part of the species’ range. This is one of four possible states for a spatial unit population (with Present, Viable, and Functional).

2. Conservation action
Any human activity for which biodiversity conservation is a stated intention, even if the activity is not for the sole, or primary, purpose of biodiversity conservation, and even if its budget is from sources other than conservation programmes.

3. Conservation Dependence
A conservation impact metric that measures the impact of ongoing conservation actions, defined as the predicted change in the Green Score of the species in the short-term future (10 years) if all conservation actions were to cease, beginning today. The metric is calculated as the difference between the Current (or Current baseline) Green Score and the Future-without-conservation Green Score (see section IV.1, IV.2, V.5.c, and Figure 1).

4. Conservation Gain
A conservation impact metric that measures the impact of ongoing and planned conservation actions, defined as the predicted change in the Green Score of the species in the short-term future (10 years) if ongoing and planned future actions are implemented effectively. The metric is calculated as the difference between the Current
5. Conservation Legacy
A conservation impact metric that measures the impact of conservation actions that have been conducted to date, defined as the difference between the species’ Current Green Score and its Counterfactual Current Green Score (see section IV.1 and Figure 1).

6. Conservation impact category
Each conservation impact metric can be expressed as either a percentage or using categories. For each of the four conservation impact metrics, the categories are: Negative, Zero, Low, Medium, High, or Indeterminate (see section IV.3).

7. Conservation impact metric
One of four measures of the importance of conservation actions for the species: Conservation Legacy; Conservation Dependence; Conservation Gain; and Recovery Potential. Each metric is calculated as the difference between two Green Scores.

8. Counterfactual
A hypothetical scenario of what the status of the species would have been today in the absence of past conservation actions; it is used to determine the Counterfactual Current state in each spatial unit, and the Counterfactual Current Green Score (see section IV.1)

9. Ecological function of a species
The totality of the species’ interactions, determining its influence on, or contribution to, ecosystem processes, and the patterns of intra-specific interactions, behaviour and social dynamics that are characteristic of that species (see section V.3.d).

10. Ecological functionality of a population
The extent to which the population in a spatial unit fulfils the ecological function or functions of the species in a particular time and place (e.g., a spatial unit), as determined by its size, density and demographic structure (see section V.3.d).

11. Expected additional range
The areas that are strongly expected to become suitable and inhabited by the species in the next 100 years, taking into account range shifts resulting from climate change and other global and local processes, as well as conservation translocations (IUCN Standards and Petitions Committee 2019).

12. Fully Recovered
A species that is viable and ecologically functional in every part of its range. The Green Score is defined relative to this condition. This definition and the conservation impact metrics that are based on it apply not only to species that have previously declined, but also to taxa that have not declined (irrespective of whether or not they have been the focus of conservation so far). However, taxa that fit this definition but have not benefitted from conservation are categorized as Non-Depleted. A Fully Recovered (or Non-Depleted) species has a Green Score of 100%.
13. **Functional (state of a spatial unit)**
A spatial unit population is said to be Functional if it fulfils the ecological function(s) of the species; i.e., it has the attributes (including, for example, abundance, density and demographic structure) that enable it to interact with other species, contribute to ecosystem processes, and/or display patterns of intra-specific interactions, behaviours and social dynamics that are characteristic of the species. This is one of four possible states for a spatial unit population (with Absent, Present, and Viable). See section V.3.d and Background and Guidelines section 4.5.

14. **Green Score**
A numerical value between 0% and 100%, representing how close the species is to being Fully Recovered. A value of 0% means the species is Extinct or Extinct in the Wild, and 100% means it is Fully Recovered. The Green Score is calculated based on the state (Absent, Present, Viable or Functional) in each spatial unit, and can be calculated for past, current, short-term future, and long-term future time periods, and for alternative scenarios (i.e., with conservation at various levels (past, current, planned, aspirational), or without conservation). These different Green Scores are used to calculate the conservation impact metrics for each species, and species are placed in categories based on these four metrics.

15. **Indigenous range**
The distribution of the species, generated from current and historical (written or verbal) records, or physical evidence of its occurrence, accounting for all known, inferred or projected sites of occurrence (IUCN 2012a), including past conservation translocations (IUCN Standards and Petitions Committee 2019) but not including vagrancies. Where direct evidence is inadequate to confirm previous occupancy, the existence of suitable habitat within ecologically appropriate proximity to observed range may be taken as adequate evidence of previous occupation (IUCN SSC 2013).

16. **Parts of the range**
See "spatial unit."

17. **Present (state of a spatial unit)**
A spatial unit population is said to be Present if the species occurs but is not Viable or Functional in the spatial unit. This is one of four possible states for a spatial unit population (along with Absent, Viable and Functional).

18. **Range**
The spatial distribution of the species, comprising its indigenous range and expected additional range. For Conservation Legacy, the range is defined only as the indigenous range. For the other three conservation impact metrics, which involve the future of the species, the range can be defined as the combination of its indigenous range and expected additional range, depending on when the expected additional range is expected to become occupied. See section V.1.b.

19. **Recovery Potential**
A conservation impact metric that quantifies conservation aspiration or ambition, defined as the maximum plausible improvement in the status of the species with
sustained conservation efforts and conservation innovation over the long-term (100 years). See section IV.1 and Figure 1.

20. Rescue effect
The process by which the extinction risk in a spatial unit is decreased because of propagules immigrating from other spatial units. A propagule is a living entity capable of dispersal and of producing a new mature individual (e.g., a spore, seed, fruit, egg, larva, or part of or an entire individual). Gametes and pollen are not considered propagules in this context (IUCN 2012b).

21. Spatial unit
A subdivision of the species’ range in which the state of the species is assessed as Absent, Present, Viable, or Functional. See Delineating spatial units in section V below.

22. Spatial unit population
The set of individuals of a species in a spatial unit (cf. "population" in IUCN 2012, 2019). Also referred to as "population in a spatial unit."

23. Species Recovery Category
A measure of how close the species is to Fully Recovered, based on the Species Recovery Score and the thresholds stated in section IV.3.

24. Species Recovery Score
A measure of how close the species is to Fully Recovered, based on the observed, estimated, inferred, or suspected condition of the species at the time of assessment (shown in Figure 1 as the Current Green Score). It can be plotted as a function of time, based on condition at each time step, depicting the species’ progress (or otherwise) towards full recovery.

25. State
The condition of the species in a spatial unit, assessed as one of four ordinal categories: Absent, Present, Viable, and Functional. These categories are assigned weights (see section V.3), which are combined, using Equation 1 below, to give the Green Score. State can be determined for past, current, short-term future, and long-term future time periods, and for alternative scenarios (with and without conservation). States are in a nested hierarchy, so that a spatial unit population that is assessed as Viable is also Present by definition, and a spatial unit population that is assessed as Functional is by definition also Viable and Present. Therefore a score of Functional can only be applied to spatial units that are both Viable and Functional (but see section V.3.d).

26. Subpopulation
Subpopulations are defined as geographically or otherwise distinct groups in the population between which there is little demographic or genetic exchange (typically one successful migrant individual or gamete per year or less) (IUCN 2012a; see IUCN Standards and Petitions Committee 2019 for guidance).
27. **Viable (state of a spatial unit)**

A spatial unit population is said to be Viable if the species has a low risk of extirpation in the spatial unit, as determined by the regional IUCN Red List category. See Section V.3 for details.

**IV. CRITERIA**

1. **Green Score**

The state in each spatial unit is assessed as one of four ordinal categories: Absent, Present, Viable, and Functional (see section V.3. for details). A Green Score ($G$) for the species is obtained, based on the states in all spatial units, with the equation (Equation 1):

$$G = \frac{\sum_{s} W_s}{W_F \times N} \times 100$$

where $s$ is each spatial unit, $W_s$ the weight of the state (Absent, Present, Viable, or Functional) in the spatial unit, $W_F$ is the weight of the Functional state, and $N$ is the number of spatial units. The denominator is the maximum possible score attained when all spatial units are assessed as Functional. Thus, a Green Score is calculated as a percentage of Fully Recovered. For Current and Counterfactual Current scores, the denominator is based on the number of spatial units in the indigenous range only (not including the expected additional range).

Different Green Scores are calculated based on current, short-term future, and long-term future time periods, and alternative scenarios, as listed in Table 1. Conservation impact metrics (e.g., Conservation Legacy, etc.) are calculated as differences between two Green Scores, as detailed in section V.
Table 1. Names and descriptions of the scenarios under which Green Score can be calculated. Note that all Green Status assessments require at least the ‘Current’ scenario; assessing conservation impact requires at least one other scenario.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Green Score</th>
<th>Scenario and time period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Current</td>
<td>The Green Score at the time of the assessment (the same as the Species Recovery Score at that time).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counterfactual Current</td>
<td>What the value of the Green Score would have been today in the absence of past conservation actions. See section V.4.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Baseline</td>
<td>Predicted value of the Green Score in the short-term future (10 years), considering the likely benefits of conservation actions that are currently in place or very likely to be in place within 1 year. If the Current Baseline scenario is not specified, it is assumed to be the same as Current. See section V.5.c.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future-with-conservation</td>
<td>Predicted value of the Green Score in the short-term future (10 years), considering the likely benefits of conservation actions that are currently in place or are planned for implementation during this time window. See section V.5.a.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future-without-conservation</td>
<td>Predicted value of the Green Score in the short-term future (10 years), assuming any ongoing conservation actions stop today, and no new actions are implemented. See section V.5.b.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long-term Potential</td>
<td>Predicted value of the Green Score in the long-term future (100 years), given sustained and effective conservation action and innovation. See section V.5.d.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Conservation impact metrics

For any given species, four conservation impact metrics are calculated as a difference between two Green Scores (see Figure 1):

Conservation Legacy  = Current – Counterfactual Current  
(measuring the impact of conservation actions conducted to date)

Conservation Dependence = Current Baseline – Future-without-conservation
(both measuring the short-term future effect of ongoing and planned conservation actions)

Conservation Gain = Future-with-conservation – Current Baseline

Recovery Potential = Long-term Potential – Current  
(measuring the long-term future effect of plausible conservation effort and innovation)
Figure 1. Graphical representation of the conservation impact metrics as differences in the degree of recovery of the species (percent of Fully Recovered, measured as the Green Score; equation 1). Solid-black line: observed change in the Green score of the species. Dashed-black line: (counterfactual) past change expected in the absence of past conservation efforts. Dotted-black lines: future scenarios of change expected with and without current and future conservation efforts. Vertical arrows represent the conservation impact metrics: Conservation Legacy: Benefits of current and past conservation (current – counterfactual current); Conservation Dependence: Expected change in the short-term future in the absence of ongoing conservation (current baseline – future without conservation); Conservation Gain: Expected improvement in the short-term future with ongoing and planned conservation (future with conservation – current baseline); Recovery Potential: Possible improvement with long-term conservation (long-term potential – current). In this example, the Current Baseline (see section V.5.c) is assumed to have the same value as the Current score; see Background and Guidelines for the same graph with an alternative assumption.

3. Categories and thresholds

For most purposes, the numerical (percentage) values of Species Recovery Score and the four conservation impact metrics, including their uncertainties (see section V.8 below), should be reported. However, categorical results may be more appropriate for some uses and audiences (see section V.8). Therefore, each metric is divided into categories, in order to (i) provide context and allow interpretation of the percentage value of the metric, and (ii) highlight cases of outstanding conservation impact, dependence, or potential.
The Species Recovery Score (SRS) can be reported either numerically (from 0% for extinct to 100% for Fully Recovered), or categorically. Species Recovery Categories, are based on the best-estimate, minimum, and maximum values of the SRS (\(SRS_{\text{best}}\), \(SRS_{\text{min}}\), \(SRS_{\text{max}}\) respectively) and the best-estimate value of Conservation Legacy (\(L_{\text{best}}\)), and are assigned according to the following rules, which are applied in the order listed until the condition given for a category is met.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Condition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indeterminate</td>
<td>If ((SRS_{\text{max}} - SRS_{\text{min}}) &gt; 40%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Depleted</td>
<td>If ((SRS_{\text{best}} = 100%)) and ((L_{\text{best}} = 0%))</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fully Recovered</td>
<td>If (SRS_{\text{best}} = 100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly Depleted</td>
<td>If (SRS_{\text{best}} &gt; 80%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately Depleted</td>
<td>If (SRS_{\text{best}} &gt; 50%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Largely Depleted</td>
<td>If (SRS_{\text{best}} &gt; 20%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Critically Depleted</td>
<td>If (SRS_{\text{best}} &gt; 0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extinct in the Wild</td>
<td>If (SRS_{\text{best}} = 0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The category for each of the four conservation impact metrics is determined based on the conditions listed below. For each metric, the rules are applied in the order listed until the condition given for a category is met. In these conditions, best-estimate, minimum, and maximum values of the conservation impact metrics, and the best-estimate values of the Green Scores (such as Current and Counterfactual Current) are used. For each metric, the High category can be achieved in one of three ways: the numerical value is more than 40%; the numerical value is small but represents avoidance of extinction; or the numerical value is small but is substantial compared with the best or medium estimate of the Current score. For information on the thresholds, see the Background and Guidelines.

**Conservation Legacy categories**, based on the best-estimate, minimum, and maximum values of the Conservation Legacy metric \((L_{\text{best}}\), \(L_{\text{min}}\), \(L_{\text{max}}\) respectively):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Condition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indeterminate</td>
<td>If (L_{\text{min}} &lt; 0%) and (L_{\text{max}} &gt; 40%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>If (L_{\text{best}} &gt; 40%), or (L_{\text{best}} &gt; 0%) and Counterfactual Current(=0) (i.e., extinction prevented), or (L_{\text{best}} &gt; \frac{1}{2} \cdot \text{Current}) (i.e., substantial legacy relative to current score)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>If (L_{\text{best}} &gt; 10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>If (L_{\text{best}} &gt; 0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zero</td>
<td>If (L_{\text{best}} = 0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>If (L_{\text{best}} &lt; 0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note**: The character \(\cdot\) is the mathematical operator for multiplication (same as \(\times\)).

**Conservation Dependence categories**, based on the best-estimate, minimum, and maximum values of the Conservation Dependence metric \((D_{\text{best}}\), \(D_{\text{min}}\), \(D_{\text{max}}\) respectively):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Condition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indeterminate</td>
<td>If (D_{\text{min}} &lt; 0%) and (D_{\text{max}} &gt; 40%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>If (D_{\text{best}} &gt; 40%), or (D_{\text{best}} &gt; 0%) and Future-without-conservation(=0) (i.e., would go extinct without conservation), or (D_{\text{best}} &gt; \frac{1}{2} \cdot \text{Current}) (i.e., substantial dependence relative to current score)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>If (D_{\text{best}} &gt; 10%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Conservation Gain categories, based on the best-estimate, minimum, and maximum values of the Conservation Gain metric (\(G_{\text{best}}, G_{\text{min}}, G_{\text{max}}\), respectively):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Condition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indeterminate</td>
<td>If (G_{\text{min}} &lt; 0%) and (G_{\text{max}} &gt; 40%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>If (G_{\text{best}} &gt; 40%), or (G_{\text{best}} &gt; 0%) and Current=0 (i.e., would remain EW without conservation), or (G_{\text{best}} &gt; 1 \cdot \text{Current}) (i.e., substantial recovery relative to current score)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>If (G_{\text{best}} &gt; 10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>If (G_{\text{best}} &gt; 0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zero</td>
<td>If (G_{\text{best}} = 0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>If (G_{\text{best}} &lt; 0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Recovery Potential categories, based on the best-estimate, minimum, and maximum values of the Recovery Potential metric (\(P_{\text{best}}, P_{\text{min}}, P_{\text{max}}\), respectively):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Condition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Indeterminate</td>
<td>If (P_{\text{min}} &lt; 0%) and (P_{\text{max}} &gt; 40%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>If (P_{\text{best}} &gt; 40%), or (P_{\text{best}} &gt; 0%) and Current=0 (i.e., would remain EW without conservation), or (P_{\text{best}} &gt; 2 \cdot \text{Current}) (i.e., substantial recovery relative to current score)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>If (P_{\text{best}} &gt; 10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>If (P_{\text{best}} &gt; 0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zero</td>
<td>If (P_{\text{best}} = 0%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>If (P_{\text{best}} &lt; 0%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

V. PROCEDURES

The following procedures are the main components of a Green Status assessment. These procedures are discussed in detail in the Background and Guidelines for the IUCN Green Status of Species, which will evolve over time to incorporate guidance on using new types of data that may become available, and new advances in analysis methods.

1. Determining range

a. Determining Indigenous Range

The indigenous range (see definition) is based on all known, inferred and (spatially) projected sites of occurrence, both current and historical. It includes conservation translocations that conform with IUCN Standards and Petitions Subcommittee (2019), but not vagrancies. For recovery objectives to be ambitious and aspirational, and to avoid shifting baselines, indigenous range should be based on the distribution at a date that is as early as feasible, while recognizing that going too far back would increase uncertainties due to scarcity of data. Ideally, this date would be set to “a time before human beings were the most important element limiting species’ distributions” (Sanderson 2019). However, variation among species in terms of data availability and quality means that such a criterion would result in assessments that may not be comparable. Therefore, species in the same geographic region and under similar threats
should have similar benchmark dates for determining indigenous range (Stephenson et al. 2019). Based on analysis of trends in historical data on habitat cover and human populations (from Klein Goldewijk et al. 2011), a default benchmark date of 1750 CE is appropriate in most regions and is in line with the IPCC definition of the start of the industrial era. This benchmark date can be modified (see Background and Guidelines), but should not be earlier than 1500 CE or later than 1950 CE.

b. Determining Expected Additional Range

Expected Additional Range includes only those areas that are: (i) not part of the indigenous range; and (ii) are currently suitable or strongly likely to become suitable in the next 100 years; and (iii) are strongly likely to become occupied by the species in the next 100 years, with or without human assistance (provided those with human assistance conform with IUCN Standards and Petitions Committee 2019). This likelihood can be assessed based on modelling (e.g. of climate-induced shifts), planned translocations, or empirical observation of range shifts.

Because of the time horizons commonly used to project range changes due to climate change, expected additional range would normally be used only for the long-term future (i.e., for calculating the Long-term Potential). Unless some SUs within the expected additional range can become occupied, or become focus of conservation efforts, in the next 10 years, short-term future scenarios (for calculating Conservation Dependence and Conservation Gain) do not have to consider expected additional range.

c. Managed and Introduced Individuals

For both indigenous and expected additional range, only "wild" individuals of the species should be considered in determining the state in each spatial unit. For the definition of "wild", see the current version of the Red List Guidelines (IUCN Standards and Petitions Committee 2019), section 2.1.4.

For both indigenous and expected additional range, wild subpopulations resulting from introductions outside the indigenous range of the species should be considered in determining the state, provided certain conditions are met (see the current version of the Red List Guidelines [IUCN 2019], section 2.1.3).

2. Delineating spatial units

Spatial units are used to incorporate representation, one of the three requirements of a Fully Recovered species (see II.3). A Fully Recovered species occurs as a set of functional populations across a representative set of ecosystems and communities across its range. A practical way of assessing this condition is to determine the state of the species in each of several spatial units that comprise its range, delineated to represent the variation of ecological conditions or settings within the range of the species. The spatial units must be chosen carefully because the Green Score is sensitive to the number of units. Because spatial units are valued equally in the calculation of Green Scores, they should be defined to represent areas of similar importance for the species' conservation, both with respect to overall representation and with respect to conservation action, across the full extent of the species' indigenous range and expected additional range.
Spatial units can be delineated by subpopulation, ecological and geographical features, and location, or a combination of these. Species-specific subdivisions based on species biology, such as subpopulations (defined in IUCN Standards and Petitions Committee 2019), are preferred. Subspecies, stocks, genetic units, flyways, evolutionarily significant units, and discrete population segments are all conceptually related to IUCN’s definition of subpopulation. Although not species-specific, divisions based on ecoregions, habitat types, or ecosystem types can also be used to define spatial units because they are defined based on ecological criteria and thus capture the different ecological settings in which a species exists or existed. Geographical features (e.g., watersheds, islands, lakes, mountain ranges) can be proxies for subpopulations. Recent fragmentation of the species into “subpopulations” as a result of human activity is not an appropriate basis to delineate spatial units, if these “subpopulations” were historically connected. Finally, areas defined by their vulnerability to a specific threatening process (”locations” in IUCN [2019]) can be used to define spatial units, on the assumption that the status of the species will be similar throughout an area that is similarly threatened.

Many restricted range species may be assessed based on a single spatial unit, or two spatial units (e.g., one for the extant range and one for the extirpated range). This may also be the case for a species that has always existed in a very specific type of ecosystem or a species whose function is similar in the different ecological settings it exists in. For other species, three or more spatial units may be necessary to represent the variety of ecological conditions and contexts that the species occurs or has occurred in.

3. Assessing the state in a spatial unit

State in each spatial unit is assessed sequentially in the order Absent, Present, Viable, Functional. The definitions of Absent, Present, and Viable require the use of Red List categories; thus, the assessors should consult the latest versions of the Red List documents (IUCN 2012a, 2012b, IUCN Standards and Petitions Committee 2019). Assessors should document the most likely state in each spatial unit as well as the minimum and maximum plausible states, to reflect the level of uncertainty. The guidance for Regional Red Listing should be used unless there is only one Spatial Unit for the whole species.

a. Assessing Absence

The species is Absent in a spatial unit if its Red List category in the spatial unit is Extinct (EX), Extinct in the Wild (EW), Regionally Extinct (RE), Critically Endangered (Possibly Extinct) (CR(PE)), or Critically Endangered (Possibly Extinct in the Wild) (CR(PEW)). For methods to determine the Extinct category vs. the Possibly Extinct tags, see the current version of the Red List Guidelines. The weight for Absent in Equation 1 is 0.

b. Assessing Presence

The species is Present in a spatial unit if it occurs (i.e., not Absent), and either (i) its regional Red List category in the spatial unit is threatened, i.e., Vulnerable (VU), Endangered (EN) or Critically Endangered (CR), but not CR(PE) or CR(PEW), or (ii) the category is Near Threatened (NT) and the spatial unit population is undergoing "continuing decline" in population size, as defined by IUCN Standards and Petitions
Committee (2019). In spatial units that lack mature individuals, the presence of immature individuals (including seed banks) qualify the spatial unit as Present. Similarly, spatial units with extinction debt (i.e., lack of recruitment will cause eventual local extinction) are assessed as Present, not Absent. A regional Red List assessment (IUCN 2012b) requires provisions for the possibility of rescue effect as a result of immigration from other spatial units, and may result in downlisting of the threat category, e.g., from VU to NT (see IUCN 2012b). The state in the spatial unit should be based on the category after any such applicable adjustment to the threat category.

The default weight for Present in Equation 1 is 3. Assessors may choose instead to give the weight that corresponds to the specific regional Red List category for the population in the spatial unit: 1.5 for CR, 2.5 for EN, 3.5 for VU, or 4.5 for NT with continuing decline (see Background and Guidelines for an explanation of these fine-resolution weights). If the Red List category is DD, use the weights for Absent (zero) for the minimum value and Functional (9) for the maximum value.

c. Assessing Viability

The species is considered Viable in a spatial unit if a regional IUCN Red List assessment (IUCN 2012) of the species in that spatial unit results in a designation of Least Concern (LC); or a designation of Near Threatened (NT) and the spatial unit population is not undergoing "continuing decline" in population size, as defined by IUCN Standards and Petitions Committee (2019). A regional Red List assessment (IUCN 2012b) requires provisions for the possibility of rescue effect as a result of immigration from other spatial units, and may result in down-listing of the threat category, e.g., from NT to LC (see IUCN 2012b). The state in the spatial unit should be based on the category after any such applicable adjustment to the threat category.

The default weight for Viable in Equation 1 is 6. The assessors may choose instead to give the weight from the following list that corresponds to the specific regional Red List category in the spatial unit: 5.5 for NT without continuing decline, or 6.5 for LC. If the category is DD, use the weights for Absent for the minimum value and Functional for the maximum value.

d. Assessing Functionality

Functionality, like viability, is assessed within each spatial unit. This requires assessing each spatial unit relative to functions that comprise the most important roles of the species. Although these functions may not be easy to determine, incorporation of functionality whenever possible is a critical element of an aspirational conservation vision. However, consideration of functionality in the context of species recovery should not be misinterpreted as prioritizing conservation of species based on their functional importance.

Unlike the other states (Absent, Present, and Viable), Functional is not based on Red List criteria (but see section on the relationship of Viability and Functionality in Background and Guidelines). Functionality can be determined directly, by considering the interactions of the species and its contributions to ecosystem processes; or indirectly, by looking for symptoms of reduced functionality, analogous to the Red List approach of identifying symptoms of reduced viability (Akçakaya et al. 2020). When a function cannot be identified for a species, a number of proxies can be used to assess
functionality, including population density or age structure in areas of low human impact or at a historical baseline.

Although, in principle, a population can contribute to a particular ecosystem process even when at a high risk of extirpation, for the purposes of the Green Status assessment process, the Functional score is only applied to spatial units that are also Viable. An exception is the rare case of a spatial unit with a naturally small (<1000 mature individuals) population which is performing its ecological functions at baseline levels, but which would not meet the criteria for Viable because it would be assessed as VU under criterion D on the Red List. If such a spatial unit population is not declining, is not under a specific threat, and does not meet other criteria for VU, it may be assessed as Functional.

If the spatial units are based on subpopulations, then a spatial unit is scored as Functional if the subpopulation is Functional as defined above. If spatial units are not based on subpopulations and there are multiple subpopulations per spatial unit, a spatial unit is considered Functional if more than half of the subpopulations in that spatial unit are Functional (but if using finer-scale weights, the threshold is different—see below).

The default weight for Functional in Equation 1 is 9. The assessors may choose instead to give the weight from the following list that corresponds to the proportion of subpopulations within the spatial unit that were assessed as Functional: 8 for <40%, 9 for 40-70%, 10 for >70%.

4. Developing the Counterfactual Current scenario

The Counterfactual Current scenario is an alternative present, envisaged in order to determine what the Current Green Score would have been had no conservation action taken place in the past. Developing the counterfactual scenario requires determining how the totality of all conservation actions from 1950 onwards has affected the population trajectory of the species across this time period, to be able to estimate what the state would have been today in each of the spatial units if those conservation actions had not taken place. Counterfactual thinking is a common tool in conservation (see Background and Guidelines for more details and instruction).

In developing the counterfactual scenario, the types of information to consider include population size and trends, changes in distribution and habitat availability, severity, scope and intensity of threats, and all conservation actions that have been put into effect since the start of main conservation actions. Conservation actions that were in place at 1950 and all that came after should be considered. Assessors should state the starting year of the past conservation actions considered in their assessment. In addition, assessors should consider information on the effectiveness of each type of conservation action within the broader context of changes in pressures and conservation opportunities for the species in the spatial unit.

If no past conservation action has been taken, then the counterfactual current scenario is the same as the current scenario.

5. Developing future scenarios

A future scenario projects the future state in each spatial unit under different assumptions, for the purpose of calculating Conservation Gain, Conservation
Dependence, and Recovery Potential metrics. The types of information to consider in developing future scenarios are similar to those for the Counterfactual Current scenario discussed above. The assessor should consider both current threats and plausible future threats. Future threats should be based on specific evidence (such as development plans, socioeconomic projections, etc.) and should not be speculative.

a. Future-with-conservation

For the Future-with-conservation scenario (for assessing Conservation Gain), the assessors should in addition consider the likely effects of all conservation interventions that are currently in place or are planned during the 10-year assessment window. However, assessors should not consider conservation actions that are thought of but not planned (e.g., if no clear aims, cost estimates, or time frames are specified), or conservation actions that are planned but are not expected to be initiated within the 10-year window. For planned actions, assessors need to make realistic assumptions about (i) the probability that the action will be implemented, and (ii) the probability that the conservation actions will have a positive effect on a species’ population in a given spatial unit. For actions in place, the assessors should consider (ii). The likely benefits expected from these conservation measures should be discounted by these probabilities.

b. Future-without-conservation

For the Future-without-conservation scenario (for assessing Conservation Dependence), the assessors should consider the likely effects of all conservation interventions that are currently in place or are planned, and then remove their effects from the projections, similar to removing the effects of past conservation actions in a counterfactual scenario.

c. Current Baseline

The two future scenarios described in the previous sections (a and b) are compared to the Current Baseline scenario in order to calculate the Conservation Gain and Conservation Dependence metrics. Current Baseline assesses the likely state of the spatial unit population after 10 years, based on current ongoing conservation action only (including actions which are highly likely to be implemented within one year, with funding and permissions in place), considering both current threats and plausible future threats. Future threats should be based on specific evidence (such as development plans, socioeconomic projections, etc.) and should not be speculative. The Current Baseline scenario accounts for the potential for ongoing decline or recovery of a spatial unit population regardless of planned conservation action or its withdrawal. If the assessors do not wish to calculate a Current Baseline, then by default it is taken to be the Current status.

d. Long-term Potential

For the Long-term Potential scenario (for assessing Recovery Potential), the assessors should envision the plausible conservation effort and innovation which could occur over the next 100 years. This includes actions which could be taken to eliminate threats and opportunities for habitat restoration and increased connectivity. This scenario must be realistic, considering the biological limitations of the species (e.g., generation time and maximum rate of population increase) and its habitat (e.g., rates of regeneration). It also needs to be realistic in terms of social, cultural and economic factors (e.g., projected trends in urbanization), but the long-term potential should not be limited by current
political or budgetary constraints. This scenario is compared to the Current status (not the Current Baseline) in order to assess Recovery Potential. Long-term Potential is not meant to be an accurate prediction, because it would be impossible to accurately predict all the natural, social, economic, and technological changes to happen in the next 100 years. Rather, it is meant as a reasonable expectation of how much the species could recover, given what is known today.

6. Incorporating uncertainties

Uncertainty about the state of the species (Absent, Present, Viable, Functional) in each spatial unit and for each scenario should be explicitly stated by specifying: (i) the lowest plausible state; (ii) the highest plausible state, and (iii) the most likely (best) state. These uncertainties are propagated to calculate the minimum and maximum values of the four conservation impact metrics (see Background and Guidelines, and Akçaşakaya et al. 2018, Appendix S1).

7. Documenting assessments

To ensure assessments are fully justified and to allow assessment data to be analysed, a set of minimum supporting information is required. These data facilitate transparency and repeatability and enable users to search and find information easily on the website. The Background and Guidelines for the IUCN Green Status of Species provides guidance on the following: (i) Required supporting information for all Green Status assessments; (ii) Required supporting information under specific conditions; and (iii) Recommended supporting information. Note that the Documentation Standards will be updated from time to time.

8. Communicating assessment results

How the results of an assessment are presented depends on who would use them and how. For some audiences, only one or two of the four conservation impact metrics may be relevant; for others all four can be presented. For most analyses involving multiple species, and for most research purposes, the numerical (percentage) values of the four conservation impact metrics, and their uncertainty bounds, should be used. For other purposes, the results may be communicated as a combination of these numerical results and categories, consistent with the categories and thresholds specified above (see Categories and thresholds, IV.3).

9. Regional (including national) assessments

Green Status assessments at regional spatial scales are possible, but require careful considerations of the "indigenous and expected additional range" and "parts of the range" aspects of the definition of Fully Recovered. It is strongly recommended that regional assessments (including national assessments) are done only after the first two steps of the global assessments are completed: determining the indigenous and expected additional range, and delineating spatial units.

To the extent possible, the species’ range considered in a regional assessment should involve one or more of the spatial units of the global assessment in their entirety. In other words, regional or national assessments should avoid dividing a spatial unit determined and delineated for the purposes of a global assessment. Including whole
spatial units (of the global assessment) in regional assessments will make it possible to combine results of two or more regional assessments, and therefore facilitate the information flow from regional to global assessments.
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Opening of the meeting

The PPC Chair, Jan Olov Westerberg, opened the meeting at 13:05 and welcomed members of PPC and staff.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PPC/1</th>
<th>Process for the development of the 2021 Work Plan</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Purpose of the agenda item</strong></td>
<td>Given that Members are currently considering draft IUCN Programme 2021-2024, ahead of the electronic vote in January 2021, the PPC is invited to consider the progress in the development of the Work Plan for 2021 (with a view to make a recommendation to Council at its next meeting).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Brief summary of the discussion</strong></td>
<td>Stewart Maginnis, Global Director Nature-based Solutions Group, made a short presentation highlighting that this will be the first Work Plan based on the Programme 2021-24, currently being discussed online. He emphasized the importance of having a clear line of sight in terms of progress in the delivery of the IUCN Programme. Even though the draft Programme is presently under discussion, the Secretariat has advanced on the preparation of the Work Plan with the establishment of an output to outcome framework that aligns delivery of our portfolio of projects with the intended programmatic impacts. In concluding his presentation, Stewart alluded to the tentative timeline and next steps as illustrated below aiming at completing the Annual Work Plan by the end of March 2021 for approval by Council before uploading in the Project Portal:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A few comments and questions were made by PPC members. They focused on the relationship between the outputs and outcomes and the intended impacts, the different timeframes that we are now considering with the adoption of a 10-year overarching Programme framework, the 4-year portfolio results framework and the year by year annual work plan, and finally on the role of Commissions in the later.

**Conclusions**

The IUCN Council, on the recommendation of the Programme and Policy Committee, takes note of the process to develop the 2021 Work Plan and requests the Secretariat to present the Work Plan as soon as it will be ready in March 2021 for Council’s endorsement by the fastest possible process available at that time.

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4th Dec</td>
<td>Finalise draft of working draft of portfolio results framework</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11th Dec</td>
<td>Regions and Thematic Units notified to begin to prepare draft work plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13th Jan</td>
<td>Regions and Thematic Units begin to prepare draft work plans (making provision for any changes included in the published Programme)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12th Feb</td>
<td>Unit level work plan drafts completed and draft consolidated annual work plan initiated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17th Feb</td>
<td>Incorporation of final amendments to both consolidated and unit work plans based on e-vote results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Modifications to Project Portal begin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20th March</td>
<td>Annual work plan completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30th April</td>
<td>All annual work plans uploaded in revised Project Portal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**IUCN Annual Progress Report 2019**

*Purpose of the agenda item*

The Programme and Policy Committee is invited to take note of the IUCN Annual Report 2019.

*Brief summary of the discussion*

Cyrie Sendashonga, Global Director, Programme and Policy Group, made a brief update. She mentioned that the Annual Report 2019 providing a review of progress on the third year of implementation of the IUCN Programme 2017-2020 as it nears completion. was not yet finalised at the time of the last Council meeting in February 2020. Since then, key data on finance and implementation of the IUCN Programme was made available, and the Annual Report 2019 has been completed and distributed. Council had received the document containing the IUCN Annual Progress Report 2019.

**Conclusions**

The Programme and Policy Committee *takes note* of the update on the IUCN Annual Report 2019.
**Purpose of the agenda item**
The PPC is invited to approve the IUCN Green Status of Species Standard developed by the Species Survival Commission.

**Brief summary of the discussion**
Jane Smart, Global Director, Biodiversity Conservation Group, briefly presented on behalf of Jon Paul Rodriguez, Chair of SSC. Briefly recalling the mandate received through Resolution WCC-2012-RES-41 of the 2012 World Conservation Congress which requested SSC to conduct international scientific consultations to develop objective, transparent and repeatable criteria for Green Lists that systematically assess successful conservation of species, Jane explained that SSC had convened a Task Force on Assessing Conservation Success under the auspices of the IUCN Red List Committee to oversee the development of this Standard. The Task Force developed a framework for measuring species recovery and conservation impact, which proposed a definition of a fully recovered species based on viability, functionality, and representation, and defined metrics to quantify the importance of conservation for a species. The resulting Green Status of Species constitutes a standardized framework for species conservation. Jane mentioned that the Standard is now ready for approval and roll-out.

PPC members briefly discussed whether the Standard needed to be brought to the Membership’s attention at the Members’ Assembly during Congress. PPC reflected that Council is entitled to approve the Standard and that a motion was not necessarily needed to get it through by Members. They suggested looking into the various ways through which the Standard can be brought to the Members’ attention, discussed with them and promoted, perhaps during Forum sessions at Congress.

**Conclusions**

The IUCN Council,

On the recommendation of the Programme and Policy Committee, approves the Green Status of Species Standard

---

**Report from the Council’s Global Oceans Focal Person**

**Purpose of the agenda item**
PPC is invited to hear an update on the work on oceans since the last meeting in February 2020 by Peter Cochrane, Council’s Global Oceans Focal Person. Peter had prepared a presentation which PPC members received before the meeting.

**Brief summary of the discussion**
The presentation highlighted the near achievement of the 10% target on marine protected areas (MPAs) in 2020, the postponement of the BBNJ negotiations, and noted that draft Operational Guidelines for potential World Heritage in areas beyond national jurisdiction are currently under review by IUCN. The presentation further noted the increasing role of ocean in the global dialogue, as evidenced at the UN Biodiversity Summit, the momentum the 30x30 target is gaining, the updated maritime strategy of the EU Green Deal and the numerous blue papers released by the High-Level Panel on the Sustainable Ocean Economy.

Peter noted that a key take away for oceans and 2020 was that while many meetings didn’t happen, IUCN and many other organisations have been very active, especially working with some leading governments e.g. on post 2020 targets (30 x 30), and with the financial and banking sectors - noting the number of blue funds and new funding instruments that have been launched this year.
IUCN’s Marine and Polar Programme has been actively engaged in all the above-mentioned developments and for the first time in a long time participated in the 39th meeting of CCAMLR and the Arctic Council meeting. Some of the events planned for next year include the kick-off event of UN Decade of Ocean Science for Sustainable Development and the OurOcean2021.

Conclusions

The Programme and Policy Committee notes with appreciation the update on oceans.

PPC/5

Follow-up on the 2016 Congress Resolutions requiring action from Council

Purpose of the agenda item
Update on the eleven 2016 Resolutions requiring action from Council.

Brief summary of the discussion
Cyrie Sendashonga provided an update on the Hawai‘i Resolutions requiring action by Council, in particular those that fall under the remit of PPC. Key tasks were completed for 5 of the Resolutions, including the archiving of obsolete Resolutions, the adoption by Council of EICAT, the development and approval of a policy statement on primary forests, the declaration of Astola Island as a marine protected area and the principles of a draft policy on synthetic biology and biodiversity conservation (RES 6.001, 6.018, 6.045, 6.052, and 6.086). There have been other major developments in remaining Resolutions, such as the creation of the Urban Alliance with a number of different activities, in particular the ongoing development of an Urban-Nature Index (RES 6.029 – Jonny Hughes); the launch of the Global Fund for Ecosystem-Based Adaptation, the Global Standard on Nature-based Solutions, and guidance to countries for integrating nature-based solutions in their NDCs (RES 6.056 – Angela Andrade). On the latter, Stewart Maginnis mentioned IUCN’s close engagement with the upcoming UNFCCC-COP26 UK Presidency as NBS advisor and the possibility to continue to do so for COP27 to be held in Africa.

Kristen Walker informed that the Summit of Indigenous Peoples’ Organizations would have a particular focus on COVID and post-COVID (6.075), and that in regard of ICCAs, they are working on publication to be launched during Congress (RES 6.030).

Some of these Resolutions have follow-up actions in recently adopted Marseille Resolutions and in the yet-to-be-voted-on motions.

Conclusions

The Programme and Policy Committee notes with appreciation the update on the 2016 Resolutions requiring action from Council.

PPC/6

Update on the online discussion of the draft IUCN Programme 2021-24 incl. any revisions proposed in relation to IUCN’s response to COVID-19

Purpose of the agenda item
PPC will hear an update on the progress of the online discussion of the draft IUCN Programme 2021-24 that will be open until 3 December 2020.

Brief summary of the discussion
The Chair invited Cyrie Sendashonga and Amran Hamzah, lead facilitator of the online discussion, to provide an update noting however the low level of activity of Members in the online discussion of the Programme so far.
Cyrie shared the observation by the Chair regarding the low level of engagement of Members in the online discussion so far but also recalled that this has been the case for the online discussion of motions that concluded earlier in the year and that Members tend to comment towards the closing date. She briefly referred to the comments made by Professor Richard Ottinger, Pace Law School, calling for the inclusion of renewable energy as part of IUCN work programme. She noted that these comments are not new and had been made at previous Congresses already and through different channels. She recalled that at the 2016 WCC, the Members Assembly had rejected a similar amendment that was seeking to introduce work on renewable energy in the context of phasing out fossil fuels as a thematic area in the IUCN Programme 2017-2020.

Amran briefly recalled the 3 main clusters of comments received so far: 1) from the Japan National Committee on the process of the online discussion and clarification on the development of the web-based platform for capturing Members’ contributions to the Programme; 2) from Professor Ottinger already mentioned by Cyrie; and 3) from the Norwegian Environmental Agency which were more of an editorial nature.

Following a question on the status proposed consultation with Members regarding IUCN responses to COVID19, the PPC Chair explained that the process was somehow stalled and the Working Group that was initially proposed had not made any progress.

On the issue of COVID and how to integrate wider health-environment considerations into the Programme of IUCN, Sean Southey asked whether it wouldn’t make sense to already form a PPC small group to consider this issue closely as it is likely to emerge. John Robinson also asked PPC to reflect on whether IUCN should (and how) take into consideration the findings in the reports and work that has been carried out recently on the subject of the environment and pandemics by IPBES and GEF for example.

Peter Cochrane noted that there are several specialist groups within the Commissions that are addressing the environment-health and well-being linkages (WCPA, CEESP, CEM) and suggested that the Programme should certainly reflect on the destruction of nature, wildlife trade and zoonotic diseases specifically and assumed that some Members would make this point (rather than leave it to PPC). He also pointed out at the fact that the word ‘zoonotic’ doesn’t appear in the draft Programme.

Cyrie asked PPC to further reflect on its role in the revision of the Programme – is it to propose editorial changes to modify the Programme or to provide guidance on the process to modify the Programme. She also asked if the latest IPBES report is as authoritative to be referenced in the IUCN Programme, noting that there were different views from some in IUCN regarding the robustness of the evidence-base in the IPBES report in question.

The PPC Chair recommended to further discuss this at the next PPC meeting which should take place soon after the closing of the online discussion on 3 December. He encouraged PPC members to think about concrete proposals for discussion at that meeting including on the process and timeline for completing the revised document in time for its publication for the e-vote in accordance with the timeline that was communicated to the Membership. In this regard, he asked Cyrie to also check with Luc De Wever on procedural aspects and update PPC accordingly at its next meeting.

Conclusions
**Update on evaluations**

*Purpose of the agenda item*
Téa Garcia-Huidobro (a.i. Head of Planning, Monitoring, Evaluation and Risk Management) presented an annual update on evaluations.

*Brief summary of the discussion*
In 2020, 11 project evaluations were completed as well as the external review of IUCN Programme 2017-2020. The management response will be released next week ahead of the 102nd meeting of the Council at the same time as the external review. It is expected that the review will provide crucial information for the implementation of the upcoming programme. The results show that there have been substantial improvements over the last programme 2013-2016. A number of findings and areas requiring improvement relate to the difficulty of successfully measuring the effectiveness of the programme and its ability to generate impact due to the lack of a robust monitoring programme.

Overall, the results of the review were satisfactory. Reviewers provided 4 big recommendations:
- Build a results-based programme: clearly integrating projects, thematic programmes into the Global Programme.
- Transform IUCN into a learning organisation: will require improving the M&E system to better capture lessons learned.
- Clarify resource mobilization and place innovation at its centre: IUCN’s acknowledge the need to develop a resource mobilization strategy but dealt with innovation in a separate manner, while acknowledging the role of innovation as a lever for increasing funding.
- Accompany change processes outlined above.

For 2021, at the Secretariat portfolio level, 24 evaluations are planned. At the more strategic level, the 2017-2020 French Framework Agreement will undergo an evaluation.

The presentation was well received. Jonny Hughes cautioned against delving too much in complex theories of change, and considered that while it is important that we strive for impacts, attribution is complicated in the real world and that the response to some of these recommendations needs to be proportionate and not go overboard in trying to map out precise impact trajectories.

*Conclusions*

The Programme and Policy Committee *notes with appreciation* the update on evaluations.

**Closing of the meeting**
The PPC Chair thanked everyone and closed the meeting at 15:40.
### Approval of the agenda

The Finance and Audit Committee approved the agenda as presented.

### Financial update for 2020 and forecast for the year

**Purpose and background**

The CFO presented the financial update for 2020 and forecast for the year.

The result at the end of October is a deficit of CHF 0.2m which is in line with the budgeted result for the period.

The forecast for the year-end is breakeven; however, there are several risks that could adversely impact the result when the year is closed. These are:

1) **Congress** – the forecast assumes that costs incurred in 2020 (except those funded by core allocations) will be carried forward and covered by Congress income when the event occurs in 2021.
2) **Project deficits** – there could be a requirement to make provisions for projects that have been adversely impacted by Covid-19.
3) **Additional accruals** may be necessary for staff leave earned but not taken. Many staff have delayed taking leave due to Covid-19 restrictions.
4) In accordance with the decision taken by FAC in its 69th meeting (FAC.69/11) to use reserves to fund the WCEL Congress, an allocation will need to be made at the year-end.

**Investment Portfolio update:**

The portfolio is down by 1.5% from the start of the year, accounted for by:

- 0.77% reduction due to currency effects
- Impact of COVID-19 on investments
- Negative interest rates in Switzerland
Summary of the discussion

The FAC commended the Secretariat for working towards a break-even budget by year end, despite the uncertainties in 2020.

The Treasurer asked if IUCN is required to provision for Congress costs in 2020. The CFO responded that IUCN is not required to do so but that preparatory costs incurred in 2020 should be recognised in 2020. IUCN does not have a specific accounting policy for Congress but IFRS guidance requires losses to be recognised in the year that they are incurred (i.e. 2021 in the event of a Congress loss). This matter will be discussed with the statutory auditors and their advice sought.

The FAC noted that a break-even result for 2020 is being targeted. However, if additional costs are incurred on the four items listed above, which cannot be fully quantified at this stage, a deficit may result. Any such deficit will reduce undesignated reserves brought forward of CHF 17.6m. Additionally, if a transfer is made from undesignated to designated reserves on account of the WCEL conference, undesignated reserves at year end will decrease accordingly.

The FAC requested that the financial impact of the four items that could adversely impact the financial result be quantified in the next few week and shared with the FAC.

Conclusion

The Finance and Audit Committee TOOK NOTE of the results to 31 October and the forecast for the year. The Committee noted that a break-even forecast was an optimistic scenario and requested that the impact of the four items that could adversely impact the result be quantified to the extent possible and that the figures be shared with the FAC before the year end.

FAC.74/3 Congress update

Purpose and background

The Congress Manager gave an update on the Congress Budget financial forecast for 4 different scenarios, namely;

1. Congress goes ahead in 2021 without significant change to the current configuration – projected deficit CHF 1.5m
2. As scenario 1 but with e-elections for president and Council – projected deficit CHF 1.6m
3. Cancellation of Congress – projected deficit CHF 4.2m
4. Virtualisation of Congress – projected deficit CHF 3.3m
She explained the scenarios and the basis of the assumptions made.

Summary of the discussion

The FAC commended the Congress team for the work they had done so far despite the uncertainties arising from the Covid-19 pandemic.

The FAC noted that the scenarios detailed in the report. They recommended that a variant of scenario 1 be produced that would assume that a vaccine would be widely available in time for people to travel for congress. The secretariat, noting that information on a possible global vaccination programme and related costs was unknown, agreed to add a scenario with such an assumption.

The FAC was informed that CPC would consider a calendar of events at its next meeting that will influence when certain decisions will be made. As such, the FAC role was to look at the cost implications of each of the choices and advise Council on how those will affect IUCN from a financial point of view.

The FAC noted the importance of agreeing plans with the host government, noting that the CHF 2.2m direct cash investment by the host government could be at risk if IUCN were to arrive at a conclusion that did not have the buy-in of the host government.

Conclusion

The Finance and Audit Committee TOOK NOTE of the financial projections for various scenarios for Congress and requested that a variant of scenario 1 be prepared with the assumption that a vaccine would be available for delegates to attend a physical meeting.

Addendum: revised paper (FAC 74.3 revised) provided on 30 November 2020

The Secretariat subsequently developed an alternative scenario that assumed the availability of a vaccine. This scenario assumes an attendance level of 85% of participants compared to the Hawaii Congress. The projected deficit is CHF 0.9m.

Other scenarios were also updated post FAC meeting and the projected deficits revised as follows:

- Scenarios 1 and 2: CHF 1.8m
- Scenario 3: 4.0m
- Scenario 4: 2.8m
Resource mobilisation update

Purpose and background

The Director of the Strategic Partnerships Unit (SPU) presented a report on resource mobilisation. The report is an update for 2020 and an outlook on 2021 on Framework funding, Patrons for nature, and project funding as well as a summary of plans to strengthen IUCN’s internal Resource Mobilisation capacity from 2021 moving forward.

- Covid-19 pandemic has made resource mobilization difficult in 2020 but IUCN is adapting as necessary.
- Framework income for the intersessional period 2017-2020 has exceeded budgeted amounts for the period by CHF 4m, specifically due to funding increases by Sweden and Switzerland.
- Negotiations for 2021-2024 Framework commitments are underway.
- Delayed Congress, and consequently the delay in approving the 2021-2024 Programme, is influencing the negotiations for the signing of new framework contracts. Sweden and Switzerland have agreed to extend the current partnerships to 2021 to bridge this gap.
- Negotiations are underway with Denmark to re-join as a Framework Partner from 2021. A four-year Framework Agreement is expected to be signed before the end of 2020.
- IUCN will be looking at doubling the number of Patrons over the next four years.
- The project portfolio value at the end of October 2020 stood at CHF523 million with the European Commission still leading as IUCN’s largest donor, followed by Germany, the GEF, the USA, the Green Climate Fund and Sweden.
- CHF 500K per year will be invested over the next 3 years to increase the capacity of the Strategic Partnerships Unit, specifically to:
  - Increase funding from Philanthropy and Foundations in the USA,
  - Focus on new Framework funding sources, and
  - Increase funding from the private sector.

Summary of the discussion

The FAC commended the Strategic Partnership unit for the continued engagement with partners, and especially in ensuring the return of Denmark as a Framework donor, despite the challenging fundraising environment.

The Head of the Strategic Partnership unit, in answering questions from members, indicated that;
- The Terms of Reference of the External Review were largely based on the OECD DAC criteria such as Relevance, Efficiency, Impact, Sustainability, and Gender and Social Inclusion.
- The objective of the review was to evaluate the overall performance of the IUCN Programme 2017-2020 to ensure the accountability of IUCN towards its Members, donors and other stakeholders.
- The recommendations and IUCN’s responses will be shared with all relevant parties and will be posted on the IUCN website.

The Director General informed the FAC of his desire to enhance the role of SPU, as well as to work with other Secretariat functions to find new innovative ways of generating unrestricted income. He noted that the current level of IUCN reserves was not adequate in light of the risks faced by the organisation and that the level could only be increased by budgeting and realising a surplus. This in turn could only be achieved through new business lines that included a profit margin or through membership dues. Increasing unrestricted income was also essential for investment purposes and to provide operational flexibility.

**Conclusion**

The Finance and Audit Committee TOOK NOTE of the Resources Mobilisation update and supported the Director General’s initiatives to increase unrestricted income.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FAC.74/5</th>
<th>DEC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Review of the 2021 budget</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Purpose and background</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The CFO presented a summary of the 2021 draft budget.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A breakeven budget is proposed. The highlights of the proposed budget include;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Total budget: CHF 143m (Forecast for 2020: CHF 123m)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Healthy and growing project portfolio: +CHF 500m</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Significant investments foreseen: CHF 2.0m</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Resource mobilisation: CHF 0.5m</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ to generate unrestricted income as a base for building reserves in future years</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Strengthening accountability: CHF 0.4m</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ monitoring results and impact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Innovation and organisational development: CHF 0.8m</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>He highlighted the following key financial challenges and risks:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>– Reserves were low: CHF 18m</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Summary of the discussion

The FAC commended the CFO and the Secretariat for the Budget presented.

The Director General informed the FAC of his desire to steer IUCN such that;
- Projects budgets were always breakeven and were not being subsidised by unrestricted income
- IUCN grows its unrestricted income sources and volume by tapping into new partners
- IUCN seeks and implements innovative ways of creating new business models so as to grow funding for both investments and reserves

The FAC commended the DG on pursuing new business lines for growing unrestricted income, noting that FAC has made recommendations to this effect previously.

The Treasurer, noting that the 2021 budget was a step on a longer journey, commented that;
- The budget is based on optimistic assumptions given the risks and uncertainties foreseen in 2021. The inherent risks needed to be quantified
- It is essential to have a long term plan for growing investments and reserves, beyond the annual budgeting exercise and the four-year financial plan
- Cost effectiveness/efficiency should be evaluated for the entire Secretariat

Prior to the FAC meeting, the Treasurer had shared other comments on the budget with FAC members and the Secretariat. The FAC took note of these comments and the responses provided by the CFO.

The CFO informed the FAC that the Secretariat will prepare a sensitivity analysis on the budget to address the risk issues raised by the Treasurer.

The FAC requested the Secretariat to prepare and present to the Committee an implementation plan for the financial strategy that would go beyond the 2021 budget.

The chair proposed that the FAC task force could be reconvened to review and advise on the implementation plan.
**Conclusion**

The FAC recommends that Council approves the 2021 Draft Budget as presented, noting the need for the Secretariat to prepare and share with the FAC a longer-term implementation plan for the financial strategy and a sensitivity analysis of the 2021 budget.

**Draft decision**

The IUCN Council, on the recommendation of the Finance and Audit Committee, approves the 2021 budget and requests the Director General to prepare:

1. A sensitivity analysis based on less optimistic assumptions; and
2. an implementation plan for the financial strategy.

**FAC.74/6 Report from the Head of Oversight**

**Purpose and background**

The Head of Oversight (HoO) presented her report which covered:

- Insights on IUCN’s Corporate Governance, Risk Management and Compliance (GRC) framework
  - In a Volatile, Uncertain, Complex and Ambiguous (VUCA) world, an integrated approach to GRC is important with more upstream thinking and decision-making required
  - GRC can support IUCN with accountability and oversight framework and ESG reporting
  - IUCN is maturing in the areas of controls and risk
  - Compliance is an area of donor focus and IUCN is weaker in this area
  - Of the ten indicators presented, ethics and compliance are the two areas recommended to be strengthened in IUCN

- Internal Audit, Advisory, and Consulting services
  - There was a significant increase in the level of advisory services provided by the Oversight unit to management, performed at the expense of internal audit work. Over 45 advisory services were provided by the HoO in 2020.
  - The Oversight Unit (OU) is supporting management in developing an integrated whistle-blower policy and anti-money laundering / countering the financing of terrorism (AML/CFT) policy.
  - In 2020, the OU presented a conceptual integrity framework and approach to the Governance and Constituency Committee (GCC).
• A summary of integrity events and internal investigations
• Steps taken to update and modernise the Oversight Unit:
  o In September 2020, IUCN Director General approved:
    1. The IUCN Internal Audit, replacing the 2015 IUCN Policy on Internal Audit
    2. The IUCN Investigation Charter

**Summary of the discussion**

The Treasurer asked if there were any plans to outsource any of the work of the Oversight Unit. The HoO replied that there is no current plan to outsource any work of the Oversight unit.

The FAC noted that with increasing donor demands and a growing project portfolio, which brings additional risks, the demands on the Oversight unit were growing.

In response to a question on the optimum level of resources for the Oversight Unit, the HoO noted that organisations of a similar size to IUCN had significantly higher levels of resources.

The FAC noted that the Oversight Unit resource gap needed to be addressed, as did weaknesses in Ethics and Compliance work.

The Chair asked the HoO to present the GRC integrated framework reporting at a future FAC meeting.

**Conclusion**

The Finance and Audit Committee TOOK NOTE of the report from the Head of Oversight, and APPROVED: 1) the IUCN Internal Audit Charter (2020); and 2) the IUCN Investigations Charter (2020).

The Finance and Audit Committee recommended to the Director General that the Oversight unit resources be increased in line with the increasing levels of risk and demands on the Oversight Unit.

---

**FAC.74/7 Report of the Risk Officer, including report of the FAC risk working group**

**Purpose and background**

The Risk Officer presented an update of the Enterprise Risk Management Framework and the Risk Register, including a report of the FAC Risk working Group.

Key Items included;
• The inherent risk for Corporate Governance Risk related to COVID-19 had been reduced as a result of:
  o Increased number of meetings of Bureau and Council
  o Intensified communication among Council Members,
  o Commission's reports on COVID-19 potential actions (COVID-19 resources), and
  o Specific COVID-19 Council meeting.
• Measure to reduce the likelihood of the residual risk for Corporate Governance were considered. These could take the form of:
  o Long-term financial planning, scenarios, and implementation of strategic decisions, and
  o Strengthening communication and feedback mechanisms to analyse the funding opportunities and impact on portfolio implementation using risk management approaches.
• The FAC Risk Working Group met in November 2020 to review the triggers, causes and planned mitigation measures related to Governance risk. It was decided that this working group would meet more regularly.
• Financial Risks linked to COVID-19 pandemic:
  o Financial Risk management residual likelihood changed from high to medium
  o IUCN Congress residual likelihood changed from high to very high
  o A risk of solvency of partners and grantees had been added to the Risk Register to reflect the likely effects of COVID-19 on IUCN’s partners. This is rated high for inherent risk and medium for residual risk.
• The expression of risk appetite that IUCN is prepared to take has not changed from 2019. FAC is asked to re-endorse the Risk Appetite Statement for 2020. The Risk Officer will undertake an in-depth review of IUCN’s Risk Appetite Statement in 2021, in consultation with the Secretariat and FAC

Conclusion

The Finance and Audit Committee TOOK NOTE of the update on the Enterprise Risk Management Framework, and the Corporate Risk Register. The FAC took note of the Risk Appetite Statement and that no changes were required at this point.

FAC.74/8 Report of the Legal Adviser

Purpose and background

The Legal Advisor presented an overview of the existing legal actions against or by IUCN, key statistics, a summary description of major cases, and developments since the last meeting of the FAC.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Summary of the discussion</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Legal Advisor responded to various questions posed by the committee.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Conclusion**

The Finance and Audit Committee TOOK NOTE of the update on legal issues pertaining to legal actions by and against IUCN.
Participants:
CPC: Jennifer Mohamed-Katerere (Chair), Andrew Bignell, Mamadou Diallo, Hilde Eggermont (partially), Francesco Gaeta (Host Country), Sixto Incháustegui, Malik Amin Aslam Khan (partially, proxy to the Chair), Kathy MacKinnon, John Robinson, Yann Wehrling (Host Country), Nihal Welikala.

Regrets: Ali Kaka (proxy to the Chair), Ana Tiraa

Host Country observers: Marc Strauss

Process and date for confirming viability of in-person event
At its last meeting on 1 September 2020, the CPC concurred that no third postponement should be considered by Council, but that instead, it was necessary to agree on a cut-off date by when to confirm the viability of the in-person event. On 24 November, the Committee considered the process and options presented by the Secretariat which compared three different cut-off dates in terms of impact (190 days, 130 days and 70 days before Congress). It noted that while most costs increase proportionally on a monthly basis, there are some key tipping points where costs will increase substantially for IUCN (4 months/2 months). In general, the later the cut-off date to cancel the event, the higher the unrecoverable expenditures for IUCN, Host Country, session organisers, exhibitors, and participants and the more adversely the relationships with sponsors, exhibitors and partners are affected. On the other hand, the evolution of the pandemic remains unpredictable and a decision about viability of the in-person event seven months before is likely premature.

The Host Country informed the Committee that France was strongly supportive of IUCN’s suggestion to hold the Congress in September 2021 and considers it feasible to officially announce the new dates before the end of 2020. However, the publishing of the new dates must be made jointly through an official announcement at a time to be agreed between IUCN and the Host Country as this was very sensitive given the current lockdown situation in France.

In general, the Host Country needs to announce the dates at the latest nine months before in order to be able to handle all public procurement processes and would urge to set the cut-off date at least four to four and a half months prior to the Congress as to minimize financial liabilities on its side. The cut-off date thus could be determined at the same time as the new dates for the Congress.

The Committee concurred that in order for Council to take a decision on the cut-off date, a general assessment of the situation and risk forecast should be undertaken by the Secretariat and the Host Country, and that such assessment should be conducted just shortly before the decision-making. Such assessment will need to be very broad analysis on the global situation of the pandemic and its management. The assessment could also consider specific criteria such as travel bans, the recommendations of local or national authorities on the possibility of holding events in France, the projected vaccine availability at a global level, as well as the ability to apply for visas.
The CPC requested the Secretariat and Host Country to assess the availability of the vaccine at global level and consult the WHO in that process as well as include WHO recommendations on international travel at that time. The Committee also noted that the French government or European authorities may impose vaccination for travellers coming to France or Europe or attending events and that airline carries might do the same and this would have to be taken into account in the assessment. CPC discussed whether IUCN could impose a vaccine obligation for its participants but concurred that this is likely unrealistic. The key criteria for the Host Country in the assessment will be whether the French authorities will allow large events.

CPC concluded that at this point it seems that a cut-off date around 130 days before Congress is likely the best period to confirm the Congress and asks Secretariat and the Host Country to make a concrete proposal for a cut-off date to CPC and Council when proposing the actual Congress dates.

**DRAFT COUNCIL DECISION**

Council,

On the recommendation of the 2020 Congress Preparatory Committee,

DECIDES that no further postponement of Congress shall be considered beyond the new dates in 2021 to be set in consultation with the Government of France;

REQUESTS that the Secretariat and the Host Country propose a cut-off date at the same time as proposing the actual new Congress dates and report their analysis of situation and risks to the CPC in time for CPC and Council to make a decision prior to said cut-off date.

---

**Feasibility of a virtual Forum and part of the Members’ Assembly as a fall-back option**

At its last meeting on 1 September 2020, the CPC requested the Secretariat to study whether a virtual Forum could be a fall-back option in case an in-person event proves to be not viable. The study presented by the Secretariat analyses best practice and lessons learnt from other events with comparable experiences (conversion of an in-person to a virtual event) in the last months.

The overarching lesson is that an in-person event cannot be merely transposed to a virtual event but that format, programme and session types need to be adapted. Certain event types are difficult to transpose and session organisers and speakers require specific coaching. Depending on the timing of decision-taking, finding technical providers may prove to be a challenge given the large number of virtual events.

Three scenarios for virtualizing the Forum (including the strategic sessions of the Members’ Assembly which can be virtualized in the same way) have been analysed in the study:

- **Scenario 1**: In-person Forum is fully virtualized (6-day event, 9 months lead time)
- **Scenario 2**: Forum is replaced by a High-Level virtual conference (sessions organised by IUCN only) (3-day event, 4.5 months lead time)
- **Scenario 3**: Forum is replaced by simplified virtual event, blending in events from Call for proposals (5-day event, 6 months lead time)

For all scenarios, it is very difficult to assess the budgetary impact because at this time projections on income are highly speculative. All scenarios have their pros and cons. At this point there is no recommendation by the Secretariat for a scenario other than the recommendation not to pursue option 1, as it appears too complex and costly to implement. For scenario 3, it was noted that a political challenge would have to be resolved in selecting the shortlist of sessions that would be maintained in the virtual format.
The Secretariat noted that virtualising the Congress was not an alternative or an implementation plan to consider at this point, but only a “Plan B” in case the in-person Congress cannot be maintained. It also noted that the current plans for the Congress already include virtual elements such as the fully virtualized speaker pitches and the live-streaming of key sessions (hybrid event) as well as remote participation by speakers.

The Host Country highlighted that at this point in France was not considering the possibility of a virtual event and noted that at this time was not considering virtualization. France will continue to make every effort to make a physical Congress happen. A successful physical Congress, with a diversity of participants and agenda items remains France’s priority and all procurements will continue to be organized based on this objective. However, should an in-person Congress prove not to be viable, France was ready to work with IUCN on a virtual format once that point was reached.

The CPC commended the Secretariat for the study which clearly outlines the scenarios and noted that there was no need for a decision at this time. It also noted that a sequential decision would be required by Council – first a no-go decision regarding the in-person event at the cut-off date, followed by a decision on whether to virtualise the Congress and which scenario. Three members of the Committee noted that scenario 1 was too complex and should not be further considered. The CPC noted that the timeline for deciding the first step and the preparation time needed for a virtual event are not fully aligned (at least not for scenario 3). One Committee member noted that scenario 3 might be difficult to implement as continuously engaging participants from all time zones over 5 days would be a challenge; a 3-day event may be more reasonable.

The Committee did not ask any further work from the Secretariat on the scenarios at this point but all Committee members were invited to send questions and ideas to the CPC which will then be forwarded to the Secretariat. The issue will be discussed again at a future Committee meeting at the beginning of 2021.

**Update on discussions with the Host Country regarding Congress**

In addition to the timeline provided under agenda item 1, the Host Country informed the Committee that the government will reply to the letter of the Director General and also want to engage in a periodical exchange between the State Secretary Bérangère Abba and the IUCN Director General.