

**IUCN UK National Committee EGM, AGM
and Members Meeting.**

31st May 2011

'Looking For-woods'

**The National Brewery Centre,
Burton-on-Trent**



Contents

<i>Extraordinary General Meeting</i>	2
<i>Annual General Meeting</i>	7
<i>Chair's Welcome & Introduction</i>	7
<i>Chair's 2010/11 Overview</i>	7
<i>Ways forward for IUCN UK</i>	7
<i>IUCN Council update – Simon Stuart</i>	9
<i>IUCN Strategic Plan- Jane Smart</i>	10
<i>Members' Meeting</i>	10
<i>Appendix 1: list of attendees</i>	10
<i>Appendix 2: notes from IUCN Charity meeting</i>	11

Extraordinary General Meeting

Background

It had come to the attention of IUCN UK National Committee in the second half of 2010 that a charity was being established in the UK by the IUCN Secretariat to be called IUCN UK. There had been no previous knowledge of IUCN intending to set up this charity and no consultation with the National Committee had taken place.

Following an ExCo meeting in January 2011 at which the matter was discussed, member bodies of the IUCN UK National Committee were informed and their responses collated. A response letter containing the key issues was then sent by the Chair to the Director General of IUCN.

CM explained that a preliminary meeting had been held at ZSL on 28th April 2011 between the ExCo and Jane Smart (JS) and Simon Stuart (SS) in order to gain an understanding of the rationale to establish the charity. The notes from that meeting were circulated to all members on 27th May and are also attached to these minutes.

JS introduced the background to the establishment of the charity in the UK. She offered her apologies for the manner in which the process to establish the Charity has occurred, particularly over the lack of communication. JS explained that the meeting at ZSL had been extremely useful and again covered the background activities of the IUCN in UK and the two main reasons for the requirement for a formal body.

Firstly, there are approximately 20 IUCN staff based in UK that report through to JS as a part of the Global Species Programme. Over the past 6 years it was apparent that IUCN as an

employer in UK was only 'quasi-legal' and that there was a need to ensure that the interests and rights of staff particularly in relation to human resources and administrative issues, such as pension provision, were properly represented. A number of further potential hurdles had been identified including the tenancy agreement with UNEP WCMC, and the relationship with insurance companies and banks.

Secondly, in relation to the issue of fundraising for the IUCN Programme: JS reiterated the fact that IUCN members are sovereign and that it is they who discuss, agree and adopt the IUCN Programme at World Conservation Congress.

The IUCN Red List is a 'One Programme' project (a partnership involving Members, Commissions (SSC) and Secretariat) and that while some core funding was available, the proposed charity is required in order to secure further funding to fill the budget gap for this IUCN priority flagship project.

There are already 10 members of the IUCN Red List Partnership in the UK - eg BirdLife International, BGCI, WildScreen etc., who contribute the equivalent of \$200K to the IUCN Red List work.

The formalisation of IUCN activities in the UK also provide an opportunity to discuss and realise the added value of IUCN in the UK - where the role of IUCN in the UK may perhaps have been lost over recent years (not a comment on the good work of the UK Committee), and there is now an opportunity to strengthen the synergy and outputs, particularly relevant in this current climate.

Issues and question raised by IUCN UK members:

SS reminded the meeting that the Save Our Species Fund which can only be accessed by organisations on the ground (Members; Partners) and not the IUCN Secretariat. There are also additional, new sources of funding within Europe that are not currently accessed by UK members. It was suggested that the new UK Manager, once appointed - could act as a bridge with the National Committee and possibly be co-opted to IUCN UK NC ExCo, if this was acceptable. There is also the possibility of an ex-Officio role for National Committee Chair on the Charity.

Questions:

ND – Asked for clarification on foreseeable implications for National Committee following the creation of the Charity

JS – IUCN Statutes don't allow National Committee to be same entity as the staff hosting body. Conversely the Charity cannot become the National Committee.

ND asked whether the issue surrounding the name of the charity and the apparent duplication of identity the UK had been resolved.

SS explained the name issues had not yet been resolved and that simply dropping the UK part as IUCN would cause duplication of another 'brand' as well as confusion with IUCN HQ based in Switzerland.

MP – Indicated that, whilst he imagined that most IUCN member organisations in UK would recognise the need for a legal entity to protect the status of staff and related reasons, he understood that most would be unhappy with IUCN-HQ fund-raising in UK in competition with its members. He noted also that it wasn't the best decision to use the working name 'IUCN UK' and recommended that it would be worth instructing the legal advisors to change the name, significantly, rather than accepting their comment that this would be difficult.

CM – Suggested 'Global Species Programme UK'

JS – Pointed out that there would be some limitations to such a specific name if in future the work programme changed or expanded substantially.

TS – Re-iterated MP's point - need to ask further advice from lawyers regarding the name for the Charity: Fully accepts the need to have something in place to avoid the legal problem. Real issue is funding and competition for it. Expressed concern that there are so many like-minded organisations in Cambridge that don't seem to communicate.

JS – Undertook to go back and seek additional legal advice on the issue of the name and try to identify a new mutually agreeable name

SS – Raised a few points regarding the IUCN Programme, fund-raising and competition. Only 2 ways to avoid competition: 1) Don't adopt /do not have a Programme; 2) Use membership dues to fund the Programme. Neither was going to happen. If there was a blanket policy of IUCN not raising funds within the states of member bodies then no work would be done anywhere in the world..Asked whether competition could be minimised and managed?

JS – Observed that this seems to be the nub of the issue

HF – explained that IUCN has IUCN Secretariat offices in Malaga and in Bonn. There is a National Committee in Spain and a large IUCN Membership in Germany. There is no obvious competition, and there are no problems between Members and Secretariat. This could be the same arrangement in UK.

MW – Noted that from the ZSL meeting there was a realisation that IUCN has been fund-raising in the UK for some time so in one sense nothing has changed. Is the intention to enhance fundraising and is there an opportunity to include UK members as partners?

JS – Thanked MW for refreshing this point. Only 20% for species programme comes from core – for the rest it is necessary to fundraise. BirdLife makes a significant in-kind contribution to IUCN Red List Programme. The staff time donated and technical support is fantastic, and a major support to IUCN, and stresses that it is difficult to put a price on this. Is this a different way of working?

RE - pointed out the current partnership between Wildscreen and IUCN on communications work.

JH – Scottish Environment LINK is not convinced that the competition issue is not a threat – he asked for 1) elaboration on types of funding envisaged and whether there was a platform for further development of the Peatland Programme across other parts of Europe.

JS - 1) Mainly EU sources but will seek whatever funding IUCN is eligible for 2)JS agreed that this could be an opportunity to pick up and develop the Peatland Programme.

TS - How would you know that toes and territories are not being stepped on? There is an increasingly diminishing pot so there needs to be a mechanism to avoid competition?

JS – in response asked how is this avoided now?

TS - Not easily; for instance RSPB and BirdLife encounter this problem.

JS – This is particularly the case where work programmes are very similar; she asked how do RSPB avoid 'stepping on toes' of the Wildlife Trusts for example? All agreed it was desirable to look for mechanisms to promote collaboration and information exchange.

JH – Cautious that 'another kid on the block' is not what is required in the UK at present.

CM – Noted that both collaboration and communication seemed to be fundamental here and would be crucial for the resolution of current issues and future working – referring to the previously made point that "members were sovereign" - members seem to leave the World Conservation Congress and wait for the Secretariat to do the work over the next four years. This culture needs to change to greater involvement and activity by Members if sovereignty is to be upheld.

CHT reminded the participants that five of the Red List Partners are UK organisations, so there is a real partnership already. He also cited an example where the Global Species Programme developed a Red List project involving a UK Member (who is not a red List partner) as a budgeted partner (Butterfly Conservation for European Red List Assessment work)

SS - Exemplified Red List, EDGE etc to demonstrate that things are improving on this front and a collaborative approach is becoming the norm.

HF – reiterated CM's last point but asks how does such a large organisation change its behaviour? There are 70 international NGOs in Europe that are IUCN members that have a global remit. There is a need to know why they joined IUCN - need to find out more of what members want from IUCN. A meeting will take place in Gland in mid-June to discuss this. Another example of the Secretariat taking Members wishes serious is the re-branding of the IUCN Programme Office for the Southern Caucasus as the Caucasus Coordination Centre in Tbilisi. Its role is to work with Members and partners and help to facilitate dialogue and collaboration and aim for common conservation goals

EE – Asked who else will be on the Board of Trustees?

JS – explained it was always the intention (and this is laid out in the Articles of Association) to have 3 non-IUCN staff / Council members on the board, in addition to JS and SS, and we will have the Chair of the National Committee as ex-officio Member. No choices made yet. Harriet Nimmo was on the Board of the charity, but she has now left. Harriet was there to strengthen communications. JS and SS would be interested to hear expressions of interest.

SS – On the subject of competition - SOS - It has already USD 12 million of GEF, World Bank and France, and we want to double it. The 'Cambridge charity' could help with fundraising for SOS. IUCN Secretariat manages the fund, but the grants will be for Members. This is an opportunity for fundraising FOR Members. IUCN Secretariat cannot be the beneficiary of this, needs to go elsewhere – to Members

SSo – Noted that it would be worth raising the issue around maximising collaboration with Members / National Committees at the next World Conservation Congress.

JS agrees.

CM – Noted that did not appear to be any progress on last IUCN Council Meeting motion to develop the National Committees. Where is the will to take this beyond a motion?

JH - Nagoya COP10 (the Aichi targets) does appear to have changed much future strategic thinking and offer good possibilities to align work with IUCN Programmes

TS – Recommended that some mechanisms should be agreed to prevent 'collisions'. Noted that the last five SSC Darwin projects from IUCN components had nothing to do with the Red List (N.B. JS said that in fact only two of these projects originated from the Cambridge office – one of which was in fact for the Red List (freshwater species).

DM - as Chair of the SSC Antelope Specialist Group – noted that people don't have time to horizon scan for 'other people's toes'. Need to remember that the power of the IUCN brand is one of the key levers for the IUCN Red List. He didn't believe it was possible to be fully coordinated and pointed out that the SSC work is 'non executive' in nature. He pointed out that IUCN does not do anything on its own. He said he didn't see a problem, as we want to collaborate.

CM - IUCN is a network, so all we do is in partnership with others.

MP – Asked whether IUCN-HQ had found a way of achieving charitable status for a body which comprises both NGO and governmental components and which advises governments; previous advice from the Charity Commission indicated that these elements would preclude charitable status.

JS and **HF** replied that this was not perceived as a problem.

JH - said in conclusion that he is generally happy with the outcome of the discussion and that he will report back to his members that the establishment of an IUCN Secretariat office in the UK is an opportunity for better collaboration.

CM, in drawing the debate to a conclusion, said that - this issue now needed to be used as an opportunity to strengthen the IUCN in the UK including the National Committee and the operations of the Charity. The National Committee therefore has to continue to communicate with the new entity. Do we accept that base level competition will exist but that ultimately benefits should outweigh the potential threats?

CM ended the discussion with the statement: “Let’s take advantage of this new arrangement. It is an opportunity to strengthen IUCN in UK”.

Annual General Meeting

The Chairman convened the 2011 Annual General Meeting for the IUCN UK National Committee and once again welcomed those in attendance.

2010/11 Overview:

The Chair noted that ExCo has discussed for many years how the IUCN UK National Committee ensures added value and avoids competition. There has been an ongoing deliberation to nail the niche and the role for the National Committee. Recent activities have pointed more towards a role of communication, dissemination and synergy. Perhaps from the key issues of the EGM there is an even greater need for this.

To assist in the delivery of the IUCN global programme through conferences in Edinburgh and London, the UK National Committee most recently teamed up with the climate charity Carbon Leapfrog to produce The Economics of Nature bringing together leading thinkers from across the finance, legal and business sectors to examine ways of meeting the challenges set out in the TEEB report. There was a small surplus generated from the two conference events held in 2010.

The National Committee has continued to support the IUCN UK Peatlands Programme and managed the Putting Nature on the Map project. More detail is provided on both the projects later in the programme.

The Chair stated that it had been a busy year representing over 30 member bodies and like many of its member organisations the committee continues to be vulnerable to financial pressures and constraints. However, the part-time secretariat and voluntary chair along with contributions of time from the ExCo members has ensured that work has been done throughout the year.

The following agenda items were merged:

The way ahead; UK input towards Bonn 2011(Pan Europe Regional Forum and Jeju 2012 (World Conservation Congress):

CEM: Draft IUCN Programme 2013-16: Members can contribute via the members portal:

Hans Friederich (IUCN) presented a European perspective. Preparations are underway for Jeju and the new programme based on a continuation of the 5 core themes. 2013 - 2016 The Core programme areas (CPA) remain the same as the 2009 -12 programme, but there will be greater emphasis put on the following:

Valuing and conserving Biodiversity

Sharing nature's benefits fairly and equitably

Stronger commitment to the mission.

The final draft of the draft programme is to be sent to members by April 2012 although the consultation is now online – we need to encourage IUCN UK members to engage with this process.

The City of Bonn is co-financing the next Regional Forum in September.

- **MW** - asked whether there has there been a shift towards a more human-centric approach with regard to 'valueing'?

JS – responded that all the values around the world regarding nature are to be included. A similar process would apply to environmental decision making. There is a belief that the current state of affairs is that the rich are benefitting more from nature.

- **JH** - commented that he was happy with approach but concerned about to the intonation of the phrase “managing ecosystems for improved food security”.

HF – noted that eyes should be drawn to the Managing Ecosystems section

- **DM** – warned readers to beware of the change of use of wetlands to rice paddies.

SS –agreed that the narrative no longer matches the working titles/slogans.

Action: HF to forward PPT presentation to the Secretariat to place on website.

Action: UK Secretariat to invite comments to be taken to Bonn and to orchestrate the consultation within the UK.

Any business brought before the Executive Committee:

No business was brought forward.

Annual budget, workplan and accounts:

A financial report for the year had been provided by the Treasurer Stuart Brooks and was presented by the Chair (see appended document). The IUCN UK National Committee has lost 4 members during the year but this, though regrettable, had minimal impact on the financial health of the National Committee. As mentioned earlier a slight surplus had been generated through the conferences and a decision had been taken earlier in 2011 not to spend the £10K allocated to website redevelopment pending resolution of the UK Charity issue.

Minutes to be approved from the 2010 AGM

These were approved

Nominations and elections to the Executive Committee

Martin Spray, representing the Wildfowl and Wetlands Trust as its CEO, was co-opted to the National Committee ExCo during 2010 and he wished to be formally elected at this meeting.

There was a nomination from Trevor Salmon for Jonathan Hughes to be elected to ExCo representing The Wildlife Trusts

MW tendered his resignation from ExCo due to accepting a post overseas – he was thanked by the Chair for his contribution to ExCo and the work of the UK National Committee. MW informed the meeting that Glyn Davies was happy to represent WWF UK on the Executive Committee in future.

The Chair reminded the meeting that he is expected to stand down at the next AGM upon the completion of the quadrennial term of office. ExCo will determine the process for seeking a replacement chair.

The post AGM composition of the National Committee ExCO for 2011/12 will therefore be as follows:

Elected

Chris Mahon (Chair and Commission on Education and Communication)

Stuart Brooks (Hon. Treasurer and Scottish Environment Link)

Martin Spray (Wildfowl and Wetlands Trust)

Glyn Davies (WWF-UK)

Bryan Carroll (Bristol Zoo)

Jonathan Hughes (The Wildlife Trusts)

Government representatives

Trevor Salmon (Defra)

Susan Davies (Scottish Natural Heritage – representing the UK statutory conservation agencies)

Co-opted

Mike Pienkowski (UK Overseas Territories Conservation Forum)

Nigel Dudley (World Commission on Protected Areas)

Sue Stolton (World Commission on Protected Areas)

Ed Edwards (Wildscreen – Commission on education and Communication)

Joanna Robertson (Hon Archivist)

Simon Stuart IUCN Council update:

Simon Stuart, as the Chair of the IUCN Species Survival Commission with a seat on IUCN Council, provided the following highlights from its last meeting.

- There were some ongoing key issues regarding engagement with the private sector, particularly Shell that has about 18 months to reach a conclusion.
- Melbourne is to host the World Parks Conference in 2014.
- Framework contributions from governments has dropped leading to a major shortfall in the budget. Poor forecasts for 2012. The UK is not a framework donor.
- Constituency - 24 new members passed. The application for membership of the IUCN World Conservation Union UK Sibthorp Trust has been held up due to the need for a name change.

Action: SS to forward power point presentation to Secretariat for the IUCN UK National Committee website.

CBD Strategic Plan for 2020

Jane Smart gave an overview of the new CBD Strategic Plan and in particular highlighted the Aichi targets and the potential for the UK National Committee to assist in their delivery and reporting.

The CBD strategic plan has some alignment with the IUCN Global Programme.

JS reported that TEEB in danger of going the same way as MEA if delivery and buy-in has not been achieved soon.

Key areas:

- Plans for sustainable production and consumption.
- At least halving the loss of habitat.
- Invasive species
- Coral reefs and other ecosystems threatened by Climate Change, Rising Sea levels etc.
- Coastal and marine areas.
- Species extinctions
- Genetic diversity of cultivated plants and domestic animals
- Facilitating the Strategic Plan - what is already being done?

CM – There would be some value in establishing a consensus from the UK on how it had delivered against CBD Aichi targets and the IUCN One Programme - agreed for the next WCC – and to join up with UK Government and ensure there is full recognition and action for the OT's. – To be discussed at the next ExCo meeting.

JH – Advised that it would be important to ensure capture of the current blockages and challenges to future delivery of the programme.

Presentations to Members meeting

Celebrating the UN International Year of Forests and “Looking For-woods”, presentations were delivered by Sophie Churchill, CEO, National Forest Company on ‘The National Forest’ and Dr Dan Hoare, Senior Regional Officer South-East, Butterfly Conservation: ‘Fragmented woodland landscapes’

Project updates were also given by Nigel Dudley on the IUCN UK Putting Nature on the Map project and Jonny Hughes on the IUCN UK Peatlands Programme.

Appendix I Attendees

Present: Chris Mahon (Chair), Rob Thomas (Secretariat), Mark Wright (WWF), Trevor Salmon (Defra), Mark Baxter (Defra), Janine Robinson (BIAZA), Tim Stowe (RSPB), Sarah Brennan (Falklands Conservation), Richard Edwards (Wildscreen), Sue Stolton (ExCo), Nigel Dudley (ExCo), Craig Hilton-Taylor (Red List Unit IUCN), Dr David Mallon (SSC Antelope SG), Paul Wilkinson (The Wildlife Trusts), John Gunn (Uni of Birmingham), Mike Pienkowski (UKOTCF) Martin Kaonga (A Rocha International), Sean Prendergast (PDNPA),

In attendance: Dr Jane Smart (Global Director, IUCN Biodiversity Conservation Group), Dr Simon Stuart (Chair, IUCN SSC), Dr Hans Friederich (IUCN Regional Director, Europe), Helen Miller (from 12.00) (Middlemarch Environmental)

IUCN UK Charity meeting ZSL 28th April 2011.

Present:

Chris Mahon (Chair), Jane Smart (IUCN), Simon Stuart (SSC), Mark Wright (WWF), Martin Spray (WWT), Rob Thomas (Secretariat) after 30 minutes, Janine Robinson (BIAZA)

Apologies: Bryan Carroll,

MAIN EMERGENT ISSUES:

- Chair IUCN UK welcomed participants and invited Jane Smart to comment on the topic of establishing the new entity in the UK, noting that concerns have been expressed by IUCN UK members.
- Jane Smart began by apologizing sincerely for the inadequate communication around the issue of the intended charity, an issue clearly of interest to members in the UK.
It was generally accepted that there had been a breakdown in communication leading to misunderstandings and discomfort about the perceived purpose of the new IUCN UK Charity.
- She explained the intended purpose of the charity which was 1) to ensure full legality and legitimacy for IUCN operations in UK with regard to employees based in the UK 2) to gain eligibility for raising funds to resource the parts of the IUCN Programme implemented by the Global Species Programme and Species Survival Commission (noting that the Programme is the body of work that the IUCN Members have specifically requested should be done at the World Conservation Congress). She also noted that this is on work which no member in the UK wishes to lead on. She also noted that this programmatic work was implemented on a global basis, and not with a UK focus.
- It was acknowledged that this rationale had not been made evident to many members in the UK.
- Through further discussion it became apparent that there is something of a disconnect and a lack of understanding in the UK about the added value of the organization. It was agreed by those present that this issue needs addressing and that increased communications and engagement would help. The Chair referred to the all important issue of trust – this needs to be re-established. All agreed this this was an all important issue for the future.
- The AGM should be used to explain the rationale for the new structure; once this was clarified all should work together to move forward on a new basis of trust and openness.
- Jane was asked to seek advice from IUCN's lawyer on whether the name of the charity could be changed from IUCN UK to IUCN to reinforce the fact that the operation of the charity is to support IUCN's work as a whole.
- She also agreed to seek advice on the possibility of refinement of the Articles of Association to again make clear that the work to be carried out pertains to IUCN globally.

There was a broader discussion of how to best utilise the IUCN AGM in May. It was agreed

that an opportunity was needed for members to discuss and ask questions on the formation of the new charity, it was also agreed that the event needed to focus on the opportunities and mutual benefits that could emerge from working together more cohesively as per the 'One Programme' approach.

Jane Smart offered to present an additional presentation to show the opportunity for members in the UK offered by the adoption of the new Strategic Plan for Biodiversity in Nagoya at COP10 in 2010. .

Simon Stuart gave an overview of the 'Save our Species Programme', which aims to distribute funds for conservation action on the ground to members and commission members – not the IUCN Secretariat needs to raise matching \$10m for the programme but well on the way to achieving this. This has come about in response to an increasing gap of funding and focus on species work despite the need for many species specific work to be continued.