



Oceania Regional Conservation Forum

Main Report including Summary and Key Issues



Table of acronyms

EIA	Environment Impact Assessment
FASU	Framework of Action for Strengthening the Union
GDP	Gross Domestic Product
IPCC	International Panel on Climate Change
IPO	Indigenous and Tribal Peoples' Organizations
IUCN	International Union for Conservation of Nature
NGO	Non Government Organization
TOR	Terms of Reference

Table of Contents

Table of acronyms	2
Introduction	4
The Agenda	4
IUCN Programme 2017-2020	5 — 6
World Parks Congress 2014	
Feedback on the IUCN Programme 2017-2020	6 — 7
Response: IUCN Director General, Inger Andersen	8
Oceania Regional Plan 2017-2020	9
Feedback: Oceania Regional Plan 2017-2020	10
Towards 2020	11— 13
Governance	16 — 25
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Indigenous and Tribal Peoples' Organizations - Proposal for a separate Category/sub-category, Local and Regional Government Authority, Feed back Local and Regional Government Authority, Members' Assembly's sole authority to establish IUCN's mission and change the nature, powers, and rights of its membership Feedback on Members Assembly sole authority to establish IUCN's mission and change the nature, powers, and rights of its membership Feedback on the Motions Process Update of the Motions, procedures, nominations of councillors and resolutions platform Motions Process Resolutions Platform 	
Side events, Commissions & National Committees	26
Planet at the Crossroad: World Conservation Congress 2016	27
IPBES: Why IUCN members should engage?	28
Climate change and Biodiversity offsets	29
Conclusion	30
Appendices	31—33

Introduction

The Oceania Regional Conservation Forum was held from the 13th to the 15th of July 2015, at the Great Council of Chiefs complex in Suva, Fiji. The aim of the meeting was to bring together members of the International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN), and selected representatives from IUCN Commissions in Oceania in preparing the 2016 IUCN World Conservation Congress. Over 40 participants attended the meeting. Of significance, is the attendance of the IUCN Director General, Inger Andersen, Union Development Group Global Director, Dr Enrique Lahmann, commission chairs which included Aroha Mead of the Commission on Environmental, Economic, and Social Policy, Dr Simon Stuart of the Species Survival Commission, Justice Antonio Benjamin the chair of the World Commission on Environmental Law and Dr Peter Smith, the Regional Vice Chair for the Commission on Ecosystems Management.

The keynote address was delivered by the Assistant Minister for Environment in Fiji, Hon. Lorna Eden.



In her speech, Ms Eden encouraged members in Oceania to know each other better and understand how the vision of IUCN can be best advanced. IUCN members, guests, and the secretariat were accorded an indigenous Fijian traditional ceremony of welcome as a token of approval for the use of the land. The ceremony marking a beginning of a journey was performed by the armed forces in Fiji.



The Agenda

The programme was divided into six parts and while the most part addressed governance issues the meeting also took into account efforts and different programmes which can be built upon or developed within Oceania to advance conservation. The main components of the agenda included:

- IUCN Programme 2017-2020
- IUCN Oceania Regional Plan 2017-2020
- IUCN Governance
- Motions Process
- Resolutions (Including Oceania Related Resolutions)
- World Conservation Congress
- Other regional matters



IUCN Programme 2017—2020

The ORCF discussed early drafts of the IUCN Programme 2017—2020 and the IUCN Regional Implementation Plan. The idea was to bring the Membership to endorse the two documents before the formal approval of the document at the IUCN Congress. The programme addresses the dissemination of knowledge, of science, policy, and practice of conservation, and the fair and ecologically sustainable and fair use of natural resources. The session called for inputs and feedback from Members and Commissions on the draft IUCN Programme 2017-2020 to be submitted for approval to the 2016 Congress. It also identified mechanisms and suggestions for concrete arrangements for Members' and Commissions' involvement in implementing the IUCN Programme at the global level. The forum focussed strengths, challenges, and regional, national, and subnational levels under the 'One Programme Charter'. The IUCN Biodiversity Conservation Group Global Director, Dr Jane Smart introduced the draft IUCN Programme 2017-2020. What is different about this global programme? It links up strategies of generating knowledge, influencing policy and delivering results are intertwined, for example using knowledge to influence policy and conservation action; generating new science from successes in the field and using policy to influence scaling up successful approaches. The global programme also links up delivery designing portfolios around programme priorities with a similar approach so that the organisation can learn, generate evidence to build science and influence policy. The programme also aims to make engagement of Members and Commissions a transparent core of our strategy for generating knowledge, delivering results on the ground and influencing policy and governance.

Members were urged to link the regional implementation plan to the global programme. Members also identified approaches, solutions, and threats regarding key regional and global biodiversity issues that need to be discussed in-depth during the Members'

World Parks Congress 2014

Penelope Figgis, WCPA Vice Chair – on the World Parks Congress

In her presentation, Ms Figgis noted that four canoes to mark the World Parks Congress 2014 were symbolic. Ms Figgis discussed that 160 countries represented at the WPC 2014. The Promise of Sydney has four components and these include the vision, innovative species, disease, and promises. The vision addresses the problem of addressing the balance between nature and humanity and acknowledges nature as the basis of every aspect of human life. The second approach is that conserving nature is inclusive and envelopes urbanization where progress, and not regress *is encouraged*. The theme of the WPC outcome is "*Scale up, Invigorate, Inspire, Engage minds and hearts, Ecosystem services*." The third approach is innovative where the learning network provides a basis for engagements. About 150 recommendations were presented and called for transformative change. An important component emphasised is the learning network of IUCN. Under the fourth and last approach are solutions and promises. While the Pacific had a few pledges, ongoing dialogue for transformative change is critical. Ms Figgis also noted that conservation targets were developed, although not enough is being done in protected areas. Other important issues raised during the WPC 2014 to be considered at the regional level include a critical biodiversity tool needed in the right places to identify key biodiversity areas and to prioritize critical areas for conservation. Traditional knowledge with climate change, wildlife crime,



Feedback on the IUCN Programme 2017—2020

invasive species and the Green List endorsed.

Connectivity is missing, particularly in climate change where a need to promote natural solutions is important. *People need to understand intact natural systems for holding carbon and the need to improve the UNFCCC.* Landscape connectivity to adaptation and mitigation and the need for health and wellbeing were also raised during the forum.

On traditional knowledge, expanding the range of models being developed for indigenous peoples and the world heritage nominations on protected areas which involve local communities is required. Local knowledge can be embedded in strategies around the world. On a different note, the issue of disaster reduction and the role of the natural environment were brought up.

Improve legislation and Governments are to be encouraged to improve decision making particularly and in areas like policy framework, law making support is required.

Inspiring a new generation where youth and kids learn to appreciate nature. IUCN leads a new global movement? How can it bring new leaders into the dialogue and actions? WCPA Marine Park has two youth in leadership roles.

In building capacity, a need for professionals with the right equipment and tools to carry out training was brought up. Brighten outlook for World Heritage and a need for credible list and credible process where the Oceania region can lead in this area. Fostering a new social compact looking at ethics and how to achieve goals in society?

Protected areas are a core issue. The highlights were the stress on progress and not regress where the priority is on marine, governance, diversity, indigenous rights and knowledge and commitment. Members need to commit to taking part – and reach out to young people, encourage council to embrace working with commissions. Closer integration is needed.

*Presentation made by Sally Barnes,
Director of National Parks, Australia*



Marine protected areas have arrived in the protected area space and new ideas and the interconnectedness of the oceans and new technology are now available. Parks are not islands and are linked to land, and local people. A relook at how economics, cultures, and other issue link to locals who should feel like they are the custodians is needed.

On governance the link to local benefits and people is critical and respectful dialogue is a key tool. Poverty reduction between living in a protected area and living outside one is an important issue as is the role of young people as the world faces ecological, social, and environmental challenges.

The state of the planet was highlighted and how young people can be engaged to take part in advocating, creating awareness and sharing experiences on conservation efforts. A message shared widely is that the future generation is here and they have to live with these problems now, handing debt over to the youth. Getting the environment to assist with our wellbeing and health can be explored where healthy parks lead to healthy life. Partnerships needs to be reinvigorated and be solutions oriented. Members and commission members noted that the global program is nested in regional programs and needs to be captured. The approach, ensuring the effective delivery of

Feedback on the IUCN Programme 2017-2020

the programme will need to be articulated particularly if the Union in this region (Oceania, Australia, and secretariat, members, and commission members) is to realize the aspirations of the global programme under the One Programme approach. Addressing the diminishing access to science and environmental justice and participatory approach are crucial when developing the Programme. Often scientists unable cannot speak out and IUCN should be involved providing a platform for this voice.

Trade agreements and the impacts on conservation are often neglected. Governments are reluctant to pass legislation in favour of the environment and indigenous people because of the possibility of investor stating dispute claims. Responsibility along with rights: what does “rights of nature” mean? Rights become an entitlement or “right to use” that override responsibilities which is not evident in the IUCN plan.

IUCN has a problem on the ground, leveraging capabilities of its member groups are not done properly and this can be due to challenges in the implementation structure. A recommendation made is that the global program should have a strategy to strengthen networks. This is in recognition of what the network is doing and how to include it in the planning process. Members in Oceania considered urbanization and a need to set urban parks and although urban parks are not highlighted in protected areas, access to parks and the role of the new generation were noted especially when protected areas have the connotation of being locked away and not being accessible. Questions raised included what is practical when discussing engagement of resources? Should more efforts be put into addressing the outcomes of these forums? A sea of humanity with pockets of nature, protected areas and threats are significant to understand. What are the signs that regression is happening in the protected areas? Baselines and data are essential for surveys and assessments particularly in monitoring regression

and success.

Ten years ago during a forest conservation meeting in New Zealand, four generations of people were in attendance and the engagement of young people was an important step towards generational transfer. Climate change motivates youth in NZ and biodiversity and climate change need to be promoted to youth as well. Commission leaders and specialist groups are encouraged to bring on a young individual to be involved in their work.

Healthy parks, healthy people resonated deeply during the forum in Fiji. Health through biodiversity is alienating and a connection to nature through traditional knowledge should be acknowledged. Environmental law and health policy should be integrated and new research made available to support work on law and health. The theory of change and evidence of good information does not motivate the change IUCN wants to see. Citizen engagement to allow change needs to come out. The global programme needs to be clearly prioritized. Climate adaptation and mitigation should also be prioritized.

Antarctica

This is significant in a global context, particularly as it relates to understanding climate change. IUCN should influence and lead Antarctica initiatives. IUCN should attend meetings and lend expertise to the issues. Antarctica is performing no better than most of the globe against Aichi targets. IUCN should lend expertise and resources to the Antarctica challenge. IUCN sees the interconnections between global systems and recognized Antarctica and its connections with the rest of the world.

IUCN's move to emphasising regions obscures global connections. Some members in New Zealand expressed their disappointment to see IUCN seat was unoccupied at the Antarctica Conference. The conference was conducted in spite of IUCN, not because of IUCN. Discussion about evidence vs. cre-



do: evidence is important, but the evidence is that people have not changed just because of new knowledge.

Evidence says knowledge is not the key to change. Humans are creatures of habit and norms and the dissonance between behaviours and values are obvious. IUCN has developed ecological economics and new paradigms of thinking about natural resources; governance of human impacts and use of natural resources and systems rather than just conservation.

The global programme should be focussed on the three pillars, and the “One Programme” approach. Utilising new expertise to take these pillars forward is important. How will this pan out? What are the roles of the different arms of the Union? Three pillars are a powerful base to reach out into society. Outcomes are not specific enough to assess results and a sense of urgency should be included. Others outside could be drawn if the document was more inclusive.

The efforts of IUCN Oceania Regional Office (IUCN ORO) in Papua New Guinea were acknowledged. Communication document is problematic since it does not begin with an inspiring position. Pages 5-6 rights-based or right-of is used a lot; this term can be misread by others. Health sector links biodiversity to human health. This global programme should reflect this linkage. Health and wellbeing could be integrated in all three pillars. Conservation and glob-

al health bodies can work together. A right to health is enshrined, using language from other organizations helps with communication. Having particular challenges listed could limit, highlighting individual examples is more useful.

Response: IUCN Director General, Inger Andersen

The Director General acknowledged the feedback members had provided and noted that “rights” should be refined with a balance. She also highlighted that health has been raised before with many researches carried out.

The IUCN Programme 2017-2020 needs to go beyond these walls and actioned. The union must talk to economic and financial, health sectors and climate change. Trade regimes should be more deeply reflected in the document.

Antarctica is an issue and not addressing it would be remiss. This will require a better understanding of the issues and what IUCN can do. Arctic programme exists, Antarctica programme should exist. See that the programme is made of many regional pieces and the global issues must never be lost as they need to work together. Starting with an inspiring vision is a good idea. *We hold the future, what we do will determine what will happen in perpetuity.* The IUCN Oceania Regional Plan 2017-2020 regional will be re-drafted after feedback from members. In presenting the document, Regional Pro-

Oceania Regional Plan 2017-2020

gramme Coordinator Mason Smith emphasised that the document was in gestation and the finalization of the plan will be expected in 2016. The plan echoed the aspirations set in the IUCN Global Programme 2017—2020.

How does the plan for the regional office fit into the global programme? How can IUCN develop the thinking about Antarctica, which is not a designated region of the IUCN?

The Australian Committee of IUCN was of the view that Australia needed to be included in the Oceania regional plan. The committee also raised the issue of the energy transformation of carbon. What is it members in Australia can do, committing their own resources? How can the plan include Australia? And how can they help support the delivery of the plan? Get clarity of the strategic elements of the plan. Australia can give input and to help, for example, addressing reefs towards 2050 and in view of working with the traditional owners of Cape York and alignments with regional strategies. Is it helping Oceania delivering the document or are members saying certain things can be done together under the One Programme approach?

Programmatic advances can contribute to goals especially as nature is everyone's business. Our observations regarding the plan focussed on Pacific islands and strengthening the capacity of members was highlighted. The Plan should be made by members, not the secretariat although this can be challenging. Pacific island countries and members should be empowered and if members possess the capacity to contribute then this should happen.

Engaging commissions

The wealth of this huge network is not maximized. There must be a specific commitment to work with commissions when needed. Partners needed to be identified with the focus that simple things can make the world of difference. Meetings with regional vice chairs should be convened and targets set. One ex-

ample is that a commission is expected to recruit three0 members in a region over a time.

The devolution of global program should be led by regions. What is the knowledge basket in this region? Is it easier to mobilize commissions? Good practices of good governance happen beyond legal frameworks and community involvements, multi stakeholder engagements work well because legal frameworks can be restrictive. Reposition the work to make roles clear from the IUCN global program down to the region. How are regional programs being completed? Is it time for the Oceania plan to include Australia and New Zealand?

Traditional knowledge and cultural identity have not been included in the plan and the need to recognize this is critical.

While discussing green economy, members raised the question of commitment to mining. What is green mining? Is it consistent with IUCN guidelines on engagement with the private sector? Are more risks than benefits associated with this and are the Pacific a good model for the rest of the world? Deep sea mining is an issue. The Nauru agreement has been approved by forum and should be looked into. The Pacific Islands' Forum provides the means of submission to the region.

Using the commission's expertise, the union can scale up work in culture and conservation and Commission members can build the capacity of members. Commission members in Australia need to be recognized. A perception prevails that Melanesia gets more focus, and not as much as Polynesia. Currently, two groups provide support to island ecosystems and these are the island ecosystem management and the invasive species group. The work the two groups offer needs to be mapped out. Members in Australia talked about being included in the Oceania plan. The question for the secretariat is how these can be dealt with and how can reporting and monitoring be undertaken to measure goals in the plan. The secretariat cannot make a commitment to document an issue for someone else to be held accountable. The secretariat can

Feedback: Oceania Regional Plan 2017-2020

invite people and members, but cannot make a commitment. The goals and targets must be identified beforehand.

The ORCF heard that Fiji and other countries in the region have their own strategies and questions were asked about whether the programme of work is driven by projects? Is the work program limited to the current staff of IUCN? How can the commission members add value to this work program? How can IUCN help countries with concern for species with national significance but may not be on the red list? How can IUCN members help with forestry and protected areas?

How can IUCN further add value to the Environment Impact Assessment (EIA) process? Fiji needs help with addressing prosecuting those that violate environmental laws. Accountability for delivery by Australia and New Zealand for their specific projects needs to be clear? The direction this relationship is heading will need to be agreed upon. IUCN is project dependent, not project driven. Some projects lack the funding required, but commitment is greater than just delivery of outcomes.

A generous consensus to improve IUCN ORO and the involvement and implementation is set out in the final document. How do can the organisation strengthen the role of focal points? The lack of membership, lack of activity of members, and having the same consultants for all projects is a challenge.

The dialogue needs to continue. A call for a different plan resonated with the view that value is to be added to the work of IUCN. There is a need to strengthen integration and Pacific Islands' Framework of Regionalism to support IUCN. Goals need to be in line with both the global and region's goals however. Commission members have a lot to offer to the secretariat and a participatory process with the aim of engaging the union is a strength commissions bring. Members were concerned with the formation of working groups and decision making behind closed doors. How do the global problems get picked up by the regional plan? Biodiversity beyond national jurisdictions? What is

happening with this? What is green mining and green seabed mining? What harm is being caused? Why is IUCN not involved in Pacific island fisheries management? Can IUCN engage in northern hemisphere countries in fisheries issues? The framework for the Pacific Regionalism is a good starting point as it shows the gaps in policy interventions. Recommendations to map key biodiversity areas and the resilience of key species and vulnerable species were noted. How can the resilience of species be expanded? Is there a climate change policy for valuing and conserving nature?

The Antarctica continues to emerge from Oceania and how does IUCN address this. Do you attach it to the region with the global side issue? On the issue of Pacific fisheries – IUCN is an observer. Does IUCN can fill this? Where does IUCN add value to fisheries? IUCN is leading in bêche-de-mer and involved in coastal fisheries. IUCN does not have the resources to be involved in everything. What are the connectivity and deliverables within this programme? Fisheries are not a budget issue and finding the right person for the fisheries' role is critical. Bring technical expertise, but also can “play the game.” The World Commission on Environmental Law specialist group on oceans presented at the Hamburg tribunal for IUCN three months ago and IUCN was extensively quoted.

The IUCN Director General's presentation was an abbreviated version of the presentation to the IUCN council in May 2015. She said her first impressions of the IUCN construct led her to realize the structure of the organization has changed since 1948 and the it is not as visible or impactful. The State of Conservation was highlighted particularly biodiversity, forest landscape restoration, protected areas and the presence of a “paper park syndrome.” Can management, water scarcity, policy influencing, proud legacy sustain future. The reinvention of the organization is necessary.

Conservation Finance

Towards 2020



There is a huge gap in financing, which is not being appropriately addressed, and reluctance to engage with private sector needs to be raised and handled.

The DG highlighted success stories which included the Mangroves for the Future in 10 Asian Countries plus the Seychelles, Access to Genetic resources and benefit sharing (ABS) in Latin America and Caribbean, Climate Change Adaptation in Kenya and Uganda. She noted that IUCN will progress to achieving Aichi Targets by 2020. Strengthening the organization to meet the enormous pressures which include a population of 9 billion people by 2050 and the challenges of urbanization and dealing with an increasingly urbanized society is required.

The Red List

The observed red list index shows improved conservation results over the counter-factual red list index from 1996-2008 without conservation.

Scaling Business Environment

IUCN sets standards on Key Performance Indicators for conservation practices, but when you are outside, it causes concern to recognize others outside the environmental conservation space are not aware of what IUCN does. Strengthening the membership experience, and drawing on members should be pursued. Membership ranges in size, scale, and de-

mand, but all deserve attention and deserve IUCN to be attuned to their needs.

Current Challenges

Influence, and working on setting policy, and the resolution development process seems on steroids. Two hundred resolutions are far too many proposals to take into the WCC and derail the collective with too many voices. "When you are in a collective, everyone needs to shift a little so there's room for one more making those shifts will get us where we need to be."

Science & Knowledge

Making sure of the impact and availability of science and knowledge is important and the information people have been generating and the research published by IUCN members is not known and readily accessible. What are the communications & brand needs? IUCN needs to be a better and a world-class conservation leader influencing policy makers, media, and public for a sustainable future. What is needed to shift the organisation or get there? Effective communications throughout the union and to strengthen the scientific base of IUCN as the go to organization is inevitable and to impact on conservation influence of IUCN must expand to drivers beyond conservation and environmental challenges, arguably this should be the vision for 2020.

With concerted leadership by IUCN and its members, conservation positive actions mainstreamed at the policy and "on the ground" levels where Aichi targets are achieved and nature-based solutions are a mainstay of the economic development model.

IUCN programmes will need to be moving from "retail to wholesale" and a merged and impactful global and regional initiative is needed. The strong focus on application of conservation science (policy and on the ground), support to members to build conservation capacity and scale up conservation approaches where grant-making platforms are expanded.

Leverage the IUCN brand for increased impact IUCN by 2020



These include GEF, SOS, Green Climate Fund and more. Improved Science and Knowledge Management where knowledge is created, curated, and disseminated is important.

Outreach & Communications

Enhance the global voice for conservation beyond the environmental world. The IUCN brand; where a sharp, effective, streamlined communications and outreach needs to be strengthened. IUCN is vibrant conservation community in a Union that works in synergy and the WCC in Hawaii is a springboard for this idea.



Develop strategic shifts for enhanced governance and effectiveness of the Union, adaptive governance – promote dynamism and evolution of the Union. Conversations need to be had and responsive drafting is required so that legislators will read and understand strategies and policies presented to them. The membership, mainly the state and government agency must significantly increase.

Measuring Impact

How can results on “biodiversity positive” growth be measured? IUCN should be a destination career choice for conservation and environment professions.



Often too much time and energy are dedicated into managing small-scale projects that do not meet the value needs of the project portfolio. Improved science and knowledge management is necessary. The total publications and downloads have been strong and healthy, and there is an increase in peer-reviewed publications. At the top of downloads is the Eco-tourism guide from 1996, followed by the 1997 Red List of Threatened Plants and Turning the Tide: The Eradication of Invasive Species.

Membership has steadily increased, largely in the NGO sector, with three members now. Oceania is flourishing steadily while Western Europe and East Asia is the largest regions.

In the next 18 Months a four year programme that is both innovative and ambitious will be developed. The priority and strategic focus must be on science at

IUCN by 2020: Secretariat Programme

IUCN, build resource economics and conservation finance skills, strengthen corporate communications and develop a membership strategy.

All of these should allow enhanced donor engagement, stronger financial base, better service to members, enhance policy and on the ground impact.

If we do not help all sectors understand the value of nature-based solutions, we will see collapse, and the Earth will go on without us. On enhancing the impact, branding should not be understood from a marketing context.

When the UN is mentioned, a concept of what the UN is and pops into mind. This rarely happens with IUCN. Repositioning website redesign, social media, and the 2016 Conservation Congress will all help with upcoming awareness. To meet shifts and strengthen the Union;

- Influence
- Funding
- Members
- Science & Knowledge
- Secretariat work

We need to think about one Union, one Programme, and one “brand”. We need to collaborate more actively, have the members promote and champion the IUCN membership. The FASU survey did not see all the responses needed to use to strengthen the Union.

Feedback— DG’s Statement

The ownership of the IUCN membership is often thin. Some individuals may have thought it was good to join IUCN, but they do not promulgate what it means to be a member of IUCN to their departments or organizations. For example, a government department could encourage many of its members to become commission members, or share information to three other people in the organization and when one person

with responsibilities moves on there is always someone to fill the void and continues to share knowledge and understands the role of IUCN.

Organizational continuity is something HQ has struggled with, and found many times when the main contact leaves, the whole history of the relationship is lost.

Many contacts as the organization want to add and they will receive the same information as the primary focal point. However, the organization should nominate and inform IUCN who they want to receive the information. Fortunately, with the electronic systems, easy to

add names & additional email addresses. How do we access that wealth of individual expertise? As an ex-government employee and a commission member, for example, many EU positions are not open to non-EU members, which detract from the ability to work for IUCN.

Ecosystem services and the decline are agreed to entirely. The paradox of the environmentalist is how to note the increase in development and human wealth index with the decline of the ecosystem services and convince governments to address this. Not shut the commissions, but how can they be used more.

The conversation is about how to take stock of why things work the way they do, the need for shifts, and in IUCN’s history, commissions were added when challenges were raised. Do commissions have the same areas of focus, and what happens when something new comes their way? Without the strength of the volunteer network, what would IUCN be?

As far as accessing positions for HQ, work permits for everyone may be provided there are three people in England, with over 800 in the Secretariat. In the re-





gional and country offices, there's a diverse mix of staff from all over the world.

Regarding the paradox and economists IUCN is barking up the wrong tree. Before, joining IUCN, Inger worked for the World Bank, where a team developed an approach to cost of environmental degradation in terms of pollutants. To what degree does pollution shave off Gross Domestic Product (GDP) (poor water, asthma cases, etc.?) In a low-growth environment, four points off the GDP is significant.

We have yet to determine what ecosystem degradation, species loss, etc. contributes to GDP degradation and human development challenges. With IUCN's rigorous research, this can be addressed and presented.

IUCN needs to be strong and not apologetic about the need for brand awareness which is key to developing the authoritative voice it wants to become. The aspiration to be world-class should be highlighted. World-class professions should be involved in IUCN, not just the scientists, but also individuals working in marketing, communications, and finance. The union has yet to follow through on policy influ-

ence, and science and knowledge and the capacity to carry out these needs must be strong a focus when setting programmatic priorities in planning. Capacity building and capacity to carry out is critical, and that is why this must be strongly reflected in the programme.

We need to think about the motions and to choose where we place our chips, and for the Conservation Congress in 2016, it must be crystal clear what comes out of the discussions.

Inside IUCN are many projects, programmes, and organizational systems and the reality of donor-funded programmes need to be addressed with donor discussions, the Director General said.

Members noted that often it feels as though there's an issue of scale, diversity, and resilience. The emphasis on one union, one programme, not only one brand, but one voice. Scale may be good but some large-scale projects may be too big for some people. The motion process may be deemed crucial by many members and important for NGOs. The opportunities to work before the congress are not

Towards 2020



largely available. The website and portal are dreadful and technical issues that have been noted over the years. On research versus science. The disagreements between natural resource economics and the ecological economics should be addressed differently.

What are the core messages for change and is a single voice the best way to frame them. The motion process is important for NGOs, and it might not be the best way to spend the time of a thousand delegates, and a balance can be found between the two.

Social sciences and research are all part of the knowledge basket. IUCN needs to reach into economic sectors where the conservation language is there. Reaching the same place will need to mainstream ecology, and economics, and the green economy story must be addressed in the economic space.

“Heightening our audacity” stood out as a phrase to hold onto. The motion and resolution process – looked first at the outcomes of the

World Parks Congress – overtaken by the outcomes. How is the process rationalized and how can the key messages be heightened (among all the good things going on?). What can the organisation do as part of this journey? Can members and committee assist conveying some of the messages coming through.

The national committees and the strength of national level discussions and rapport will leave organizations in the position to make larger scale decisions. The knowledge and evidence based policy stances is important, especially on how politicians do not largely know the difference between good science and bad science – will the general understanding of science be so low in society across the board that IUCN can contribute to raising the baseline to help make the information easier to digest? On the National Geographic’s “War on Science” there is a mention of climate denial, anti-vaccination, not knowing the difference, and coming out against prevailing science.

The International Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) has pronounced itself year on year with the heftiest, most detailed and best-referenced science, and still being denied. Reaching out to young people is crucial. Young people act from the heart. They are the decision makers of tomorrow, and that movement needs to be taken by IUCN.

The ORCF provided an opportunity for Members to familiarize themselves with the preparations for and

the rules for the conduct of the Members’ Assembly. The Members’ Assembly at Congress is the highest decision making body of IUCN. In this sense,



Governance

ORCF discussed governance issues which included the three proposals from the Council or Members for governance improvements and reforms, including new Member categories (Indigenous Peoples Organizations, Local, and Regional Governments), and other possible amendments to the Statutes. The IUCN Global Director, Union Development Group, Dr Enrique Lahmann attended the Forum and provided guidance and explanations on all issues relating to governance.

Indigenous and Tribal Peoples' Organizations - Proposal for a separate Category/sub-category

The chair of the Commission on Environmental, Economic and Social Policy, Councillor Aroha Mead, presented on indigenous and tribal peoples' organizations and noted that IUCN had been involved over the years in the discussions to better reflect in the membership of IUCN the group as an integral part of IUCN resolutions and policy.

The organization now has eight indigenous peoples' organizations as members and others have applied and have been rejected. Resolution 7 in Jeju set up a working group of council, members, and indigenous and or tribal peoples' organizations, and technical staff represents the needs of indigenous/tribal people.

There is a general agreement that indigenous and tribal peoples' organizations should be recognized within IUCN. The need to create a new membership category has been identified; one that will guarantee

the formal recognition of these groups within the IUCN's structure and system, in a way that is both significant and practical. The options are whether to set up a new category i.e. Category D with right to vote or the establishment of a sub-category within Category B, known as "Indigenous and Tribal Peoples' Organizations" (IPOs).



Feedback IPOs

How are indigenous people defined? Is this under imposed authorities of colonization? Aroha recognizes the group needs to develop a tight definition of Indigenous Peoples. One reason has been denied acceptance after applying for membership is that for some IPOs conservation is sometimes not

the primary goal, but instead self-determination or self-advancement. A primary inhibiting reason of allowing more IPOs into the IUCN membership roster is a lack of definition which is now being explored. With the category D proposal, could you give us more information? The idea for category D comes from systematically working through the pros and cons of putting them as a sub-category of Category A, which has been recognized by most parties as a step too far. A sub-category of Category B was discussed as an option to provide voting rights. The option was Category B sub-category or a new Category D entirely.

Any decision that is taken at the Members' Assembly has to have approval in both categories of voting members. They must receive majority votes in both houses. One option in resolution 7 was the possibility of the fourth voting category, specifically for IP-



Os. Some concerns raised are how the decisions will be made within the members' assembly? Would a third voting category require enough of the other two categories to pass? Or would a majority be needed from all three categories? This has been introduced to get feedback from the members so the working group can put forth a proposal to the council so the World Conservation Congress 2016 in Hawaii may serve as the forum for a vote.

What is the primary motivation for the IPOs groups? Is it for recognition as a category, or a desire to vote? I'm wondering how linked they are that is the recognition and the ability to contribute to the policy making of IUCN.

The question about the separation of sub-categories, and then the next question – would that category have a vote was mentioned. Is there a need for a majority in each category, or would voting be amalgamated as part of the non government organization (NGO) category? The governments have a majority, and then there's a majority of everyone else. Has the working group thought of this? Would that be a way to maintain the balance for the governments and non government members? There are several nuances between the optional arrangements as well.

One issue the working group has been working on is establishing the sub-category within Category B for IPOs with their own criteria for admission. The idea would be to maintain the balance between the Category A and B in the decision making process. This has been considered as a solution to this question. This is interesting because it has the potential to move the organization beyond the majoritarian system. It would help to acknowledge the sovereign status of indigenous people. Have you thought about how it would work with three voting categories? One of the first steps was considering the use of Category A as the place to put IPOs in recognition of self-determination and sovereignty. It quickly became clear the designation would not fit within IUCN definitions. They are not sovereign nations, so can they be disregarded as an option because it would be limited. It would only include those from mostly developed world nations who've gone into first nation status with the states. It would not include most of the developed world. This was put aside. Category B remained seeing that C did not have voting options. A definitive answer about how

Governance

the voting would work will soon be determined because more technical work needs to be carried out. A renewed mandate from the membership is needed to explore the idea.

If there is a preference to develop sub-category of B, it would be helpful to know.

Oceania, a region where national NGOs and even national governments could be indigenous organizations and the view of legitimate representative and place-based organizations will be useful to inform decisions. The discussion about being a fourth category under category A, or under Category D is another matter for deliberations. There are many ways this matter can be addressed and the first being what constitutes an IPO. Beyond the definition, there is voting power under Congress. A vote has to be won under both categories to pass. If a third category is added, the simple balance will be disturbed, and a mechanism has to be developed to account for a majority in one house and a rejection in the other two, or majority in two and a rejection in the third. Local authorities would add an increasing level of complexity to the voting component. What is the fundamental rights of members and how this gets exercised.

During the forum a member noted that presently a problem is that states do not have to measure up to agree with the objectives of IUCN but NGOs, whether national or international, must meet the objectives. and here the intention is to bring in two more categories that do not have to measure up to agreeing with the objectives of IUCN. While many organizations share that concern, the organisation appreciates the insight and what they can teach us. Other groups are hell-bent on various forms of extractive activity and benefit. This applies to Local government and some IPOs. Legitimacy for the place is contested strongly, and rightly, as the world is not organized according to bright-line separations of where people are. This alignment with the Union is important in thinking about where we are and what to do.

Some years ago there was a strong move in council to include corporations as members. Is this a new admission category? IUCN organizes a business week, and it would have been in 2007 – talking about big corporations coming to it. They were offered, whether they would like membership in the IUCN. The answer was no, and their answer was “we want to have collaborations and work with IUCN, because it has proper seal and systems and is the platform to engage with organizations working on conservation. If IUCN wants to raise its profile, its membership has to be focussed on this.

The exploration of a whole new government system that moves beyond the majoritarian system would be good to explore. As majoritarian systems have a vehicle for oppression of indigenous peoples. In terms of mandates, this was obtained in resolution from Jeju. Here, there is a systematic presentation to all regional forums and to gather feedback. This is the second after the one in the US. A misconception in creating an opportunity for IPOs to become members to circumvent the membership process will not occur because member must go through all the process of meeting standards of commitment to the environment to become members.

According to Justice Antonio, the World Commission on Environmental Law (WCEL) had been working on the local government concept for 12 years and it was a complex matter.

We concluded the commission itself has reached the level of input it can give, and this is a political decision. The proper forum is the membership of the Union, not the commission. It has been implicit in this discussion, but should be made explicit. This is a debate about power – about veto power in the Union. Establishing a third or fourth category makes the Union more complicated and dilutes the power base of the States. Several members have raised concerns regarding this issue. (Justice Antonio, WCEL Chair) Its complex and both options have pros and cons. Category B is not an NGO category, and the organi-

Governance

zation is not automatically assigned NGO status by putting them into category B. In terms of actual voting membership. The organisation is not expecting a flood of indigenous membership after this, but expect a growth over time if the option is taken.

Local and Regional Government Authority

Regional councillor Andrew Brignell presented the proposal to include local and regional government authority in the membership particularly when local governance had been addressed in the past two congresses. In 2008 and in 2012, both at the World Congress in Barcelona and Jeju respectively considered expanding the membership to include local and regional government authority. At the 2012 Congress the proposal (Council's second option) to expand membership was defeated by a narrow margin. This proposal revives the motion and address the lack of clarity in the categorization of potential members that belong to local and regional governments.

Feedback Local and Regional Government Authority

Local governments vary hugely across the world. They are not consistent animals, and they have different constitutions that govern them. Local governmental authorities do not have the same foundation, and sometimes they have more independent ability to deal with environmental and conservation management.

Members' Assembly's sole authority to establish IUCN's mission and change the nature, powers, and rights of its membership

The IUCN Statutes Part XVII Articles 101 –103 provides Council with the authority to amend the IUCN Regulations using a set of prescribed procedures which include communication to Members before the second-and-final vote. ECO New Zealand put forward

a proposed amendment to the IUCN Statutes. This formal proposal to amend the Statutes was not received in time to meet the statutory deadlines for the Jeju Congress, but a call was made where the next Council would take up this matter and develop a proposal for a member vote (by electronic ballot in the first half of the current term) which was aimed at making clear the Members Assembly's sole authority regarding establishing the IUCN membership.

Feedback on Members Assembly sole authority to establish IUCN's mission and change the nature, powers, and rights of its membership.

The Council is planning to amend article 101 of the statutes to restrict Council authority to amend the Regulations regarding matters which address the nature of the membership; Amend Article 102 of the Statutes to clarify and strengthen the existing required procedure for Council to communicate with, and invite and respond to comments from Members on any proposed amendments to the Regulations approved by Council in the first of the two prescribed readings.

The nature of the membership could only be determined by members directly. There are two schools of thought, one believes the existing statutes should remain unamended, as the Council has learned its lesson, and the Council needs authority in case something arises during the intercessional period. The second says the Council has done this once, and the statutes will ensure this does not occur again.

The 2012 Congress had a resolution to have members of the committee advise Council. The advisory group only had two meetings by telephone.

Originally the language regarding what makes up an NGO, and the power of members, not just the nature of the Union. Members may be uneasy that the Council trimmed back the congress. Yet, decisions of the last Council have been circulated and the word-

Governance

ing is in the council minutes. The consultation process will start in due course.

Justice Antonio Benjamin (WCEL)

What I would like to suggest, as I suppose we will be using the same template from the regional forum. Here, we are not asking the members to amend article 101 in member, but also the nature and rights of membership. Not power, but its rights. My suggestion we take this into consideration. Only members can decide what the rights are they have, not their representatives. Just a minor change – “and rights of the membership”.

It has taken time to draft the words to be consistent with the rest of the statute. As you change the words of the statutes, it can have unintended consequences, and to think through the applications of what those words might be.

In the previous discussion on changes to local government and

IPOs, I assume the council is putting together drafting of the different options so the members will have the different options before them.

On the members' assembly sole authority question that will now come as a formal consultation from the Secretariat. Reforms proposed through the consultations on the Framework of Action for Strengthening the Union (FASU) (on the basis of the six questions of the Union Portal discussion in 2014).

Members were also informed of proposals for motions to be presented by the Oceania Members to the 2016 World Conservation Congress and how to

submit a proposal. Of importance are proposals about issues that warrant a discussion at a regional level with the purpose of assessing support for such proposals during the Forum and/or to identify solutions that might address the underlying issues removing the need for them to be submitted as a Congress motion were discussed.

The Resolution Platform

The Resolution platform is an online tracking system, was launched a few months ago and the system will be a way for members to state and report on how the resolutions have been implemented.

All members and the secretariat, councils and commissions can see responses on the resolutions plat-

form. This is reported once a year to council. To access the platform, use the username and password assigned for the Union Portal and search for the resolution. Available to anyone that can access the system. Searches on existing resolutions



before proposing a new motion can be performed, Members can read about the updates and the status of the existing resolution. Can this be used for reporting on implementing the resolution?

All members are required and encouraged to use it and give feedback on the resolution. Once the report is filled in it cannot be deleted. It can be added - but make sure that no wrong information is uploaded. The ongoing report is collected from the council and they use this for policy making. There has been an emphasis to remove the redundant resolutions. The status of IUCN is that the most recent resolu-

Governance

tion will be the one adopted if conflicting resolutions emerge.

A suggestion from the ORCF proposed a motion on how the tracking system and motion process works so that the secretariat can do the monitoring and evaluation of the two new systems. This consumes a lot of secretariat resources and constitutionally this needs to be determined by Congress. A look at the two new processes needs to be done and this will need to be reported to the members.

Update of the Motions, procedures, nom-



inations of councillors and resolutions platform

In April 2015, members endorsed a plan to change the traditional motion process. The result was 98 percent for category A and 92 percent for category B with members voting in favour of the plan and this was approved. This means that amendments to IUCN statutes and rules of procedure will lead to the harmonization of dates and plans. Under decision 16 procedures, propose amendments, especially in terms of deadlines and the submission of proposals to members through electronic vote were reviewed. The process for delegation heads, electronic procedure, shorten accreditation process was simplified. This requires changes in the rules of procedure

where one deadline in the proposal for submissions of proposal.

Are members allowed to submit motions on their own? A motion working group has been formed to make the process strict hence members can study the proposal and make informed decisions beforehand.

Consultation process happens first and a notice often sent eight weeks before it takes place and five weeks after the consultation deadline. The council will make any amendments that may be required and the first formal notice will be circulated from the 22nd of August 2016 which is to be followed by the second notice. A suggestion was made that the information is available before the meeting starts. The regional office was requested to collate the summary of the results and a brief explanation of the implications of this result. The vote of each individual member is public. The explanation of the consequences is also available in the online portal. The statutes only provide for one round of votes with the



possibility that no candidate gets clear majority. The statute only covers how to solve if there is a tie between candidates. A proposal to be elected, candidate must get absolute majority in both category A and B and if not, then a second round should be held between the two candidates with the highest ranking. Consult with membership to get an opinion



on whether to maintain one round of voting or to introduce 2nd round between the two candidates. Another item discussed was whether statutes require that two names or three names are proposed. Council agreed that only two names should be presented. Interest from the council to put this proposal to the members and get their feedback.

If there are multiple candidates for the presidency, should there be two rounds of voting? What happens in a tie? A candidate must get absolute majority in both voting categories A and B.

Are there cases where the commission chairs are in the same situation? Can the same rules apply to commission chairs? Instead, of 2nd round of voting, have a preferential voting ranking system. If there is no clear majority in the first round, no need for round two. This would mean one round of voting and two rounds of counting. If there are three candidates, each member will show a ranking of their candidates and the candidate with the fewest votes is removed, and then re-ranked based on the preferential votes. The secretariat noted the suggestion on preferential voting and its application. It also noted the suggestion the possibility of this system being applied to the election of commission chairs? The mandate from council deals with the presidential election and this was noted.

Motions Process

The aim of this session is to explain the new motion process for the members' assembly that the members have agreed to put in place. The motions working group was established by council. Motions submitted by members will be discussed online with two months of electronic debate. The support of members to assist in the facilitation of the process of debate is needed. There are motions that will need to be discussed at the congress, or where the working group has determined that a consensus cannot be reached electronically.

A motion working group is a council working group, and an email has been sent out to nominate members to be part of the working group. Representatives from various groups should be represented, especially during consultations. However, resources to implement a resolution and who should provide the necessary resources can be communicated in the motions proposals and clear guidelines about the resourcing of resolution implementation to be developed.

The new motion process seems to raise more issues and it should include the 10 conditions in as part of the circulation. What details are required for the debate process? Resolutions that need resources and types of conditions will be addressed by the council. The council is empowered to give motions, but these



are not treated differently. The members will talk about the ideas as part of the debate, but not required to be reported on.

IUCN was requested to circulate the email list of the members before a consultation happens. Moderation of motion process will belong to the working group. This requires a significant amount of human resources. The role of the secretariat to provide technical services for scientific data or technical help and the notion that the secretariat can do that job was raised. There are several motions and discussions will be set up for each motion and a member can take part in the motion of their choice. A neutral moderator will be assigned for each discussion. A commission expert assigned to each discussion. The consultation process is not well defined, and often difficult to determine expectations. The council saw this as a learning- by-doing process and will improve it if possible. The portal will be used to the great-

est extent and measures and suggestions will be taken to congress for the improvement.

A suggestion was made that the secretariat discloses salaries for the costs that need to be part of the resources on motions when required. All members will know how the system will be sorted by the end of November 2015. Motions will be displayed in the three working languages of IUCN can be translated to other two using google translator.

Proposals that are similar in nature and can be synergized. A past motion on the reclamation of land from the Yellow Sea proposed by the Government of Korea was merged and the state member was also

listed as the proponent. So, the merging of motions needs to sort out the proponents as well to ensure the intentions are not lost and remain in the proposal.

Launched a few months ago the resolutions platform is a system which members can report on





how the resolutions have been implemented. The resolutions platform is both an online tracking system and a database.

All members of the secretariat, members, and councils and commissions can see this response. This is reported once a year to council. You can use your username and password and search for the resolution. Available to anybody that can access the system.

You can search for the existing resolutions before proposing a new motion and read on the updates and the status of the existing resolution is and can be used for reporting on implementing the resolution. All members are encouraged to use it and give feedback on the resolution. Are these reports easy to search with contributors listed? Is there a process in around how the resolution is finalized and completed? Once the report is filled, it cannot be deleted. It can be added – but make sure that the right



Discussions

information is uploaded. The ongoing report is collected from the council and used for policy making. Is there any exercise going through the resolutions and looking at the redundant resolutions by the council?

There has been an emphasis to remove the redundant resolutions. The status of IUCN is that the most recent resolution will be the one adopted in case of conflicting resolutions. Suggest that from this meeting to propose a motion on how the tracking system and motion process works so that the secretariat can do the monitoring and evaluation of the two new systems. Can resolutions be retired as they consume a lot of resources? Constitutionally, this will be determined at Congress together with a review of the two new processes which will



then be reported to members. Oceania members and commission members could take up the challenge of supporting and promoting the vision for a just world that values and conserves nature.



Side events



Four side events were organised during the Oceania Regional Conservation Forum. These included:

- Why and how should we use traditional knowledge in Red List assessments?

This was organised by the Commission on Environmental, Economic and Social Policy (CEESP) and Species Survival Commission (SSC).

- Trends and Challenges of Environmental Law: A Dialogue with IUCN Oceania Members.

This was convened by the World Commission on Environmental Law (WCEL) and IUCN Oceania Regional Office (ORO).

- Healthy Parks, Healthy People

This side event was convened by Parks Victoria and looked at the importance of incorporating healthy parks and healthy people in conversations, in projects and in programmes as well. The evidence is clear and far-reaching. Spending time in the natural environment – in places like parks - is good for your mind, body and soul. Healthy Parks Healthy People seeks to reinforce and encourage the connections between a healthy environment and a healthy society.

The fourth side event was a demonstration of the Union Portal where new members were given the opportunity to share trials faced in accessing the portal and profiles.

Commissions & National Committees

Commission chairs and heads of National Committees were also given the opportunity to present and profile the work undertaken in their respective areas of expertise and focus. The objective of the presentations was to encourage greater collaboration across the union in Oceania from the regional office, to members, national committees and commission members under the One Programme approach.

Presenters included:

- Ms Aroha Mead – Chair of Commission on Environmental, Economic and Social Policy (CEESP)
- Justice Antonio Benjamin –Chair of World Commission Environmental Law (WCEL)
- Dr Simon Stuart – Chair of Species Survival Commission (SSC)
- Dr Neil Gilbert –Chair of the New Zealand Committee of IUCN
- Dr Paul Sinclair – Chair of the Australian Committee for IUCN (ACIUCN)
- Mr Peter Smith – Regional Chair of Commission on Ecosystem Management (CEM)
- Ms Penelope Figgis – Vice Chair of World Commission on Protected Areas (WCPA)



Planet at the Crossroad: World Conservation Congress 2016

From a Governance perspective, the World Conservation Congress is the highest decision making body of IUCN. However, the Congress is much more than that a decision making body, it is also the only global summit that brings together every aspect of conservation. It is held every four years and aims to improve how natural environment for human, social and economic development is managed. The Congress is a unique platform that brings together leaders of all levels, from governments and international NGOs to academia and grassroot organizations, indigenous people, local governments, business, UN agencies and social organizations. For Hawai'i promoting a strong participation from the younger generation, including students and young professionals. The next Congress will take place in Hawai'i from the 1st to the 10th of September 2016. This will be the first time in the 67 years of IUCN that the Congress is held in US soil. Hawai'i is a microcosm of many of the conservation challenges and opportunities. It is one of the richest areas of endemism, but it is also one of the regions with the highest number of endangered species. It faces challenges from invasive species and climate change, but also is able to showcase innovative solutions and alternatives. In the words of President Obama in his letter of support to the proposal to host the 2016 Congress, "Hawai'i is one of the most culturally and ecological rich areas in the United States, with a wealth of unique natural resources and a distinctive traditional culture that draws from the United States and the Asia-Pacific region."



The Congress will be held in the Hawai'i Convention Centre, which is a first class facility, large enough to accommodate all the Congress needs, including the Conservation Campus. It offers excellent technical facilities and lots of light and open spaces. The Convention Centre is located within walking distance of Waikiki and its hotels, restaurants and other facilities. The three objectives of the WCC 2016 are to inspire, strengthen and mobilize the union and the Congress will launch the Hawai'i commitments for globally transformative and innovative conservation initiatives to meet the critical challenges and opportunities of our time, including the imperative to scale up action on biodiversity and sustainable development goals. The Congress has two main parts and these are the forum and the members' assembly. The Forum is a hub for public debate and brings people from many disciplines together to discuss about the most pressing conservation issues. The Forum provides an opportunity to showcase results, share knowledge and reach consensus on the future of conservation. In that way the Forum provides space for debates, workshops, dialogues, roundtable discussions, training courses and partnership building events. The Members' Assembly, is a unique environmental parliament that brings together Governments and NGOs –large and small, national and international, to decide on IUCN's general policy, debate and approve the Global Programme and financial plan and to elect the Council of IUCN. In addition there is an exhibition that runs over the full length of the congress where Members and others can showcase their solutions to sustainability issues.

Taholo also presented on plans the secretariat in Oceania has in mind with emphasis on indigenous culture, with a target on oceans and a practical 2020 commitment. It is likely there will be a Pacific pavilion and emphasis on a celebrating culture and conservation.



IPBES: Why IUCN members should engage?

The Intergovernmental Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services in an independent intergovernmental body which is open to all member countries of the United Nations. It was created by governments in response to concerns about the lack of policy-relevant



information to tackle threats to biodiversity, the decline of biodiversity and ecosystem services at unprecedented rate and that the world failed to reach the CBD target of significant reduction of loss by 2010. The IPBES was set up to deliver reliable, independent and credible information on the status of biodiversity and to inform policy decisions. It is not a panel, suggesting more inclusion of other knowledge

systems (Indigenous and local knowledge, business sectors) and has a strong buy-in expected by setting an inclusive, transparent process. This process ranges from terrestrial, marine, coastal, and inland water

ecosystems and the complex relationships between

biodiversity, ecosystem services, and people, including the needs of those who depend directly on biodiversity and the health of ecosystems for their livelihoods.

In presenting the IPBES to members during the ORCF, Laurence Perianin of the Science and Knowledge Unit in the IUCN secretariat in Gland, Switzerland encouraged members to be involved in the IPBES. She reiterated resolution—WCC-2012-Res-117 which calls for the operationalization of the Intergovernmental science-policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services (IPBES). In doing so, the resolution encouraged state members to support the functions of IPBES of knowledge generation, assessments, policy support and capacity building by taking urgent action to ensure that the key steps for the operationalization of an effective and efficient entity are undertaken. Furthermore, it urged governments and requested the director general and other relevant organizations, to collaborate in their efforts to ensure relevant and appropriate capacity building and technology transfer for effective participation of developing countries, Small Island Developing States and countries with economies in transition.



The resolution also called on IUCN Members and governments, to provide resources to support the implementation of the capacity building component of the IPBES work programme, considering that capacity building is a critical priority for the implementation of the IPBES work programme in many developing

countries.

Climate change and Biodiversity offsets

IUCN is developing a biodiversity offsets policy and the IUCN Council. Biodiversity offsets are measurable conservation outcomes resulting from actions designed to compensate for significant residual adverse biodiversity impacts arising from development plans or projects after appropriate prevention and mitigation measures have been taken. During the RCF in Oceania, attendees were given a brief on climate change and biodiversity offsets. Councillor Brendan Mackey explained that biodiversity offsets are a reality, deeply embedded in policy, statutes, governance, ad hoc regimes, and voluntary regimes. At this point IUCN does not have a policy on biodiversity offsets but provides a clear direction for the use of offsets, collaborate with other partners making use of biodiversity offsets, and promote high standards for these offsets. The opportunity for IUCN to set the standard for biodiversity offsets on the global scale exists but a great deal of thought will be put into a context specific policy.

In the last meeting, council recognized a policy gap existed, and also the complexity of it developing a biodiversity offset. Under this council, there is a policy working group needed to make recommendation for a biodiversity offset policy.

Members requested that all comments relating to a consultation on the policy be made publically available on the website and requested a section for private comments. Currently, there is a biodiversity offset network, promoting a mitigation hierarchy. The Australia government representative Sally Barnes noted

that there needs to be some one to do the road testing for developing these offset policy. She also highlighted the need to set out clearly where offsets can be appropriately used or not (in small ecosystems, it may not be appropriate to use an offset.)and finding the balance is key. Questions raised also included the following:

- How long has offsets been ongoing?
- Is there any research to judge their effectiveness? What is the result of these?
- What does biodiversity offsets mean for island countries in the Pacific as this is new?
- What researches has been done to inform the formulation of the biodiversity offset policy?

The RCF heard that at this time there is a lack of monitoring and auditing in offset schemes

and IUCN is involved both biodiversity offsets and a clear climate plan because it impacts humans, nature, and thus conservation. Policies need to be agreed upon and must be consistent with our mission.

On climate change, a task force to assist the secretariat liaise with other members and help articulate IUCN's climate related plans, positions and actions should be incorporated into the union and taken up until 2020. The opportunity to reflect some policy options particularly those relating to ecosystem based mitigation and adaptation have been highlighted and can be used to help communities.



Conclusion

In closing the ORCF, IUCN Director General, Inger Ander commended members to make a change in the world. Many members have been involved in IUCN longer than others and trust must be earned. The planet needs insight, knowledge, science and most of all commitment.

Challenges before us are bigger than ever before and inner strength and a loud voice or we will fail ourselves and the next generation. I asks for trust; our work is larger than any of us, we must work together. I sees a region in peril, but determined with a commitment to make a difference. If what we did yesterday did not make the change then we need to shift a little to try to make the change tomorrow. This conference has been intense with strong views, which are valid and passionate. In meetings with politicians they are concerned and looking to IUCN for help to bring together experts and indigenous knowledge for solutions. What inspires each person is what makes IUCN.

The three day meeting ended with a better understanding of IUCN. Members, commission members and the secretariat were able to network discuss ways to improve internal collaboration, partnership and cooperation in the true spirit of the One Programme Charter. A follow-up meeting was proposed to be held in February in New Zealand to firm and confirm the IUCN Regional Plan 2017-2020. The meeting in a form of an informal dialogue is an opportunity to share information, experiences, and ideas regarding governance, issues, motions, and resolutions and preparations the IUCN World Conservation Congress. An opportunity for members and commission members in Oceania to discuss and support IUCN Oceania Secretariat throughout the inter-sessional period and the progress of implementing the regional plan remains.



Appendices

Appendix 1: Agenda

Oceania Regional Conservation Forum

Great Council of Chiefs, Suva - Fiji, 13-15 July 2015

Agenda

The forum provided a platform for members to deliberate on concerted efforts to the realization of a just world that values and conserves nature. It also provided an opportunity for IUCN Members and selected representatives from IUCN Commissions in Oceania to prepare for the 2016 IUCN World Conservation Congress.

Sunday, 12 July 2015

Constituent meetings – organised by National Committees

Monday, 13 July 2015

Great Council of Chiefs Meeting Complex

08:30 – 10:00 Opening Session

The Oceania Regional Conservation Forum (ORCF) will be officially opened.

10:00 – 10:30 Morning Tea

10:30 – 10:45 Organization of the Meeting (

10:45 – 11:20 Session 1: IUCN Oceania in Review 2012 - 2015

11:20 – 13:00 Session 2: IUCN Intercessional Programme 2017 – 2020

13.00-14.00 Lunch

14.00 – 14:45 Session 2, Part II: IUCN Intercessional Programme 2017 – 2020 : Incorporating the Promise of Sydney

14:45 – 15:15 Session 3, Part I: IUCN Oceania Regional Plan

15.15 – 15.45 Break – Afternoon Tea

15:45 – 17:00 Session 3, Part II: IUCN Oceania Regional Plan

18.00 – 21:00 Opening Reception hosted by the Fiji Government, Grand Pacific Hotel

Tuesday, 14 July 2015

08:30 – 10:00 Session 4: IUCN towards 2020

10:00 – 10:30 Morning Tea

Appendices

Agenda continued

10:30 – 12:00 Session 5: The Commission & National Committees

12:00 – 13:00 Session 6: IUCN Governance, Part I (Plenary)

13:00 – 14:00 *Lunch*

Side Event: Why and how should we use traditional knowledge in Red List assessments? Commission on Environmental, Economic and Social Policy (CEESP) and Species Survival Commission (SSC), Great Council of Chiefs Members Lounge.

14.00 -15.00 Session 6: IUCN Governance, Part I

15:00 – 15:30 Afternoon Tea

15.30 – 16.15 Session 7: Governance, Part II - Update of the Motions Procedures, Nomination of Councillors & Resolutions Platform

16.15 – 17.00 Session 8: Biodiversity Offsets & Climate Change Policy Options

17:30 – 20:30 *Side Event*

Wednesday, 15 July 2015

08:30 – 10:00 Session 9: “*Planet at the Crossroads*” – the 2016 World Conservation Congress

10:00 – 10:30 Morning Tea

10.30 – 11.15 Session 10: The Intergovernmental Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services – Why Members should be engaged

11.15 – 13.00 Session 11: Motions Process

13.00 – 14.00 Lunch

Side Events: Healthy Parks, Healthy People – Members Lounge.

Union Portal Demonstrations and use for new members – Breakout room 2

14.00 – 15.00 Session 12: Other Regional Matters

15.00 – 16.00 Session 13: Concluding Remarks

16.00 – 16.30 Afternoon Tea

END OF FORUM

18.00 – 21.00 Island Night at Fiji Museum

Appendices

Appendix 2: List of Participants

Dr Brendan Mackey, Griiffith University, Australia

Ms Catherine Wallace, Environment and Conservation Organizations of New Zealand

Mr Christopher Phillip, WWF - New Zealand

Ms Diana Shand, Environment and Conservation Organizations of New Zealand

Ms Frances Horsley, Parks Victoria

Dr Hugh Govan, Locally Managed Marine Area Network

Mr James (Jim) Thomas, Tenkile Conservation Alliance

Mr Jeff Smith, Australian Network of Environmental Defender`s Offices Ltd.

Mr Jointly Sisiolo, Ministry of Environment, Conservation and Meteorology

Mr Jolame Nemani, Fiji National University

Ms Katherine Zischka, ACIUCN

Ms Kathryn Campbell, Parks Victoria

Mr Kelvin Passfield, Te Ipukarea Society

Mr Marika Tuiwawa, University of the South Pacific

Mr Mark Christensen, New Zealand Conservation Authority

Mr Michael Mangawai, The Ministry of Lands and Natural Resources

Dr Neil Gilbert, Antarctica New Zealand

Mr Noe Yalap, Palau Protected Areas Network Fund

Dr Paul Sinclair, Australian Conservation Foundation

Dr Peter Cochrane, WCPA

Dr Peter Smith, IUCN Commission on Ecosystem Management

Ms Sally Barnes, Department of the Environment, Australia

Mr Samuela Namosimalua, Fiji Environment

Dr Simon Stuart, Species Survival Commission

Mr Sioneheke Leolahi, Niue Island United Association of Non Government Organizations

Ms Ta'hirih Hokafonu, Ministry of Meteorology, Energy, Information, Disaster Management, Environment, Climate Change & Communications (MEIDECC)

Ms Teina Mackenzie, Te Ipukarea Society

Mr Trinison Tarivonda, Department of Environmental Protection and Conservation

Mr Wade Oestrich, Department of Environment and Heritage Protection

Mr Rahul Chand, Department Environment

Ms Leba Mataitini, Commission on Education and Communication

Dr Hugh Grant, World Commission on Protected Areas

Mr Kiniviliame Keteca, Observer, USP

Mr Aminiasi Qareqare, Acting Director Environment, Fiji

Mr Eleni Tokaduadua, Department of Environment, Fiji

Mr Sele Tagivuni, Department of Environment, Fiji

Ms Inger Andersen, Director General, IUCN

Dr Enrique Lahmann, Global Director, Union Development Group, IUCN

Dr Jane Smart Global Director, Biodiversity and Conservation Group, IUCN

Rev. Jeremaia Waqainabete, Eco-theologist, Methodist Church of Fiji

All IUCN Oceania Regional Office Staff



INTERNATIONAL UNION
FOR CONSERVATION OF NATURE

WORLD HEADQUARTERS
Rue Mauverney 28
1196 Gland, Switzerland
Tel +41 22 999 0000
Fax +41 22 999 0002
www.iucn.org