



## Fourth meeting of the SCB-ES Policy Committee Uppsala, Sweden, Feb 1-2, 2006

Sunnersta Herrgård, Sunnersta

### Schedule

Tuesday, January 30	Wednesday, January 31	Thursday, February 1	Friday, February 2
- first arrivals and conversations	- meeting started after lunch: 2 pm – 6 pm	- 8 am – 6 pm - evening meeting Swedish experts at Species Information Center & Biodiversity Centre: 7 pm – ca. 11 pm	- Field trip to Länna: County Administration Board: species action plans/ species monitoring - Linné's Hammarby

### Table of contents

1. Participants .....	2
2. Programme and documentation of results .....	3
Welcome and presentation of participants .....	3
Procedures .....	4
Review and revision of our action and strategy .....	4
What we have achieved so far – was it worthwhile? .....	4
Lessons learned .....	7
The (theoretical) need for action .....	7
SCB-Europe needs/expectations concerning our work .....	10
The opportunities for making a difference. What are our goals and strategies? .....	10
News and general information .....	11
3. Feedback from the new members.....	12
4. Summary of messages/requests to the BOD .....	12
5. Messages/requests to the Education Committee .....	12
6. Messages/requests to the Communications Committee .....	12
Appendix: Plan of work 2007 .....	14
Appendix: Biodiversity agenda 2007/2008,.....	16



## 1. Participants

	Present	Affiliation, contact, fields of interest, policy-relevant activities/experience
1. Anna Doronina (Russia) <a href="mailto:baccador@mail.ru">baccador@mail.ru</a>	1/30-2/2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>St. Petersburg University, Dep. of Botany</li> <li>Flora of NW-Russia (former Finland), vascular plants, biodiversity; connected with Env. Prot. Agency of Finland (gap analysis); experience with protected areas</li> <li>Participation in impact studies (pipelines), red data book</li> </ul>
2. Anna-Carin Andersson (Sweden)	1/30-2/2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Uppsala University, Dep. Evol. Functionality of Genomics</li> <li>population genetics, conservation biology, common shrew (PhD); lesser white-fronted goose; currently report on genetic diversity of species in Sweden; conservation/population genetics</li> <li>Guest</li> </ul>
3. Balint Bajomi (Hungary) <a href="mailto:bb@greenfo.hu">bb@greenfo.hu</a>	1/30-2/2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Prep. PhD work on reintroduction of endang. animals, systematic review; Univ. Budapest</li> <li>Hung. webpage on environment Greenfo.hu; journalist</li> <li>Supported meeting on conservation biology in Hung. and ECCB – public outreach</li> <li>Interested in media-related issues</li> </ul> <p>Comment: In May 2007 he has decided to become a member of the Communication Committee instead of the PC.</p>
4. Barbara Livoreil (France), member of the Board of Directors of SCB-ES <a href="mailto:BLivoreil@aol.com">BLivoreil@aol.com</a>	1/30-2/2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>leading research department of NGO (SOPTOM); self-funded institution for worldwide conservation of tortoises</li> <li>Chair of SCB-ES Communication Committee</li> <li>animal behavior, squirrels, birds, tortoises; especially Testudo hermanni hermanni</li> <li>PC comm.. since 2004, Canterbury</li> <li>Wants to be active in future</li> </ul>
5. Kiki Kati (Greece), member of the Board of Directors of SCB-ES <a href="mailto:kikikati@hotmail.com">kikikati@hotmail.com</a>	1/30-2/2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Lecturer of Biod. Conservation in Univ. of Ioannina</li> <li>Biodiversity research on several faunistic taxa, focusing on mountain ecosystems and on biodiversity indicators and reserve design issues.</li> <li>All research and action bridging practical conservation issues.</li> <li>Involved in several NGOs.</li> <li>Member of PC committee since 2004</li> </ul>
6. Lars Berg (Sweden)	2/1-2/2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Swedish Biodiversity Council. Has been a Swedish representative at a number of SBSTTA and CBD meetings</li> </ul> <p>Comment: In april Lars communicated that due to time reasons it will be difficult for him to serve as a member.</p>
7. Martin Dieterich (Germany), President elect of the SCB-ES <a href="mailto:Martin.Dieterich@uni-hohenheim.de">Martin.Dieterich@uni-hohenheim.de</a>	1/30-2/2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Lecturer Univ. Hohenheim</li> <li>Director of independent conservation institute at Singen</li> <li>Zoologist in botany department</li> <li>European chair of SCB-Working group on Ecological Economics and Sustainability Science (WGEESS)</li> <li>Interface Land-use/conservation; yellow-bellied toad; stream ecology</li> <li>Interest in interface science/policy – bridge discrepancy</li> </ul>
8. Nuria Selva (Poland/Spain) <a href="mailto:nuriaselva@poczta.onet.pl">nuriaselva@poczta.onet.pl</a>	1/30-2/2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Previous work at Mammal Research Institute, Bialowieza</li> <li>Assistant professor at Institute for Nature Conservation,</li> </ul>

		Krakow <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PhD scavengers, animal ecology. predators, carnivores</li> <li>• Activist experiences; Bialowieza campaign; highway plans; environmental impact studies</li> <li>• Happy to collaborate PC</li> </ul>
9. Per Sjögren-Gulve, (Sweden), host, member of the Board of Directors of SCB-ES <a href="mailto:Per.Sjogren-Gulve@naturvardsverket.se">Per.Sjogren-Gulve@naturvardsverket.se</a>	1/30-2/2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Swed. Env. Protection Agency (for 11 years)</li> <li>• Assoc. Prof. Conservation Biology Uppsala Univ. 1995</li> <li>• Participated in the creation of the European Section starting on 14 Sept. 2001. Board member since then.</li> <li>• Pop. ecologist; combined species focus – selected species as indicators representing complex systems; how to frame “conservation strategies in a uncertain world”</li> <li>• Use science in policy; improve communication between the ‘pharmaceutical’ and the ‘medical’ fractions of conservation</li> <li>• Had government assignment 2003-2004 to develop Sweden’s work with species action plans</li> <li>• Currently: assignment on genetic conservation</li> <li>• Observes processes of decision making</li> <li>• Contribut. to PC: among others, inform about things from the management and policy/decisions arena.</li> </ul>
10. Pierre Ibisch (Germany), Chair, member of the Board of Directors of SCB-ES <a href="mailto:pibisch@fh-eberswalde.de">pibisch@fh-eberswalde.de</a>	1/30-2/2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Professor for Nature Conservation, Faculty of Forestry, University of Applied Science Eberswalde, Germany</li> <li>• Used to be Head of international study programme “Global Change Management” (MSc); now dean of faculty</li> <li>• Interested in development of conservation concepts and regional planning, especially under global change; ecosystem approach; protected area management</li> <li>• Experience with government advice (Bolivia) - national biodiversity strategy, CBD, climate change mitigation</li> </ul>

**Absent and possibly not active in the future:** Paul Hatchwell, UK, moving to Mexico, would be glad to review documents; Jari Niemelä, Finland, has resigned.

**Absent but interested in participation:** Peter Pearman, Switzerland; Luigi Boitani, PC-Chair of SCB sees himself as an ex-officio member.

**Candidates for new members:** Daniel Isaksson, Sweden; Poland Ludwik Tomialojc, Wroclaw University

## 2. Programme and documentation of results

### Welcome and presentation of participants

Per Sjögren-Gulve welcomed the group. The Chair acknowledged the very careful preparation of the meeting and the intensive personal assistance provided by Per.

The Chair welcomed the participants. This meeting was considered important for the PC committee which will focus even more on concrete and strategic actions, especially after having achieved a better visibility (especially through the first European Congress of Conservation Biology at Eger, Hungary - ECCB). Previous meetings of the European Section – Policy Committee (ES-PC) have necessarily focused more on concepts and

organisation of the first activities. The first experiences with action, such as the resolutions and the EECB-related activities that have been implemented in the 'orientation phase' of the committee, now can serve as basis for a strategic planning and action. The committee is now reaching a turning point as this fourth meeting is thought to define more clearly what our role will be at the SCB and European level ultimately targeting the improvement of science use in conservation policies and practises. The planning of the committee's priorities and action has to be seen in the framework of the strategic planning of the global SCB and SCB-ES.

This fourth meeting also introduces Pierre Ibisch as the new chair of the ES-PC, acknowledging the important work achieved by Martin Dieterich (now president elect of SCB-ES and still a very active member of the ES-PC).

## Procedures

- a. **Protocol**
  - o Barbara offered to support the elaboration of the protocol.
- b. **Finance and administrative issues** (regarding this meeting)
  - o Travel cost and accommodation will be reimbursed by SCB; Martin pays accommodation and Anna's trip (Martin & Pierre handle it internally after being reimbursed by Owen)
  - o Participants present receipts to Owen (except Nuria)
  - o Voluntary 10% donation to SCB in principal, not feasible this time because PC members on the BoD financed through the BoD.
- c. **Work:** The group agreed to work in a participatory way permanently visualizing the progress of discussion on flip charts.

## Review and revision of our action and strategy

### What we have achieved so far – was it worthwhile?

The first step towards the elaboration of the final version of the strategy was a critical evaluation of the committee's activities and achievements since 2003.

History: 2003 officially established, first BOD meeting. Previous PC meetings: Eberswalde Dec. 2004, Le Luc Dec. 2005, Eger Aug. 2006

Achievements	Impact, consequences	Lessons learned
<u>Bialowieza resolution</u> , 2003 (to EU-Commission, natl. ministries), Bialowieza press release (2003), Bialowieza paper (Tomasz W., 2005) Process towards official multi-national NGO complaint	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Logging continues (no direct impact)</li> <li>• Response by Commissioner (recommending official complaint)</li> <li>• Initiative acknowledged in Poland (Nuria reports)</li> <li>• Rumour that actors in Brussels (EU comm..) were 'upset' because of</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It's worthwhile going for more initiatives related to specific sites of European relevance (e.g., Via Baltica)</li> <li>• But role is restricted to flag/highlight issues; possibly we cannot go into concrete research /action</li> <li>• Good example that we can and must be critical and advocate</li> </ul>

<p>initiated (only Poland and Germany at this point, NGOs from other countries still wanted to participate. Hellenic Ecological Society sent a complaint letter to Polish government)</p>	<p>Tomasz article</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Catalyzed active involvement of members in section's/PC's activities</li> <li>• Nuria's participation</li> <li>• No official complaint forms filled in so far</li> <li>• </li> <li>• Model initiative for how SCB PCs can work</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is good to use concrete local problems to address general issues (e.g., Bialowieza as example for exploitation of old-growth forests)</li> <li>• Need network for placing concerns and resolutions more effectively</li> <li>• Get reliable feedback from the site (earlier)</li> <li>• meaning?)Article: It would have been important to mention that it was an outcome of a PC initiative (e.g. acknowledgements)</li> <li>• Need network for placing concerns and resolutions more effectively</li> <li>• You need a lot of time and patience to bring conservation activities to an end (but see model Bialowieza).</li> <li>• We have to minimize internal (SCB) friction to be more efficient</li> </ul>
<p><u>Biodiversity resolution</u> "Expanded role for conservation scientists in EU conservation" (2005)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No EU response</li> <li>• It did not sell to the public/press</li> <li>• One preliminary request by BBC</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No personal press contacts available/used</li> <li>• Issue not spectacular / news-relevant enough; too abstract; not goal-oriented enough (no quantitative objectives)</li> <li>• reference to hands-on case examples increases likelihood for resolutions to be picked up by the media.</li> <li>• link resolutions to case examples</li> </ul>
<p>Contact other Policy Committees (of other sections) (2005)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Most sections responded being interested in exchange</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Generally low level of activity; we can not learn too much from others</li> </ul>
<p>Support of preparation of the first European Congress of Conservation Biology (2005/2006)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• First list of desirable symposia and workshops – several topics were inserted into the agenda and implemented (e.g. climate change)</li> <li>• Suggestions regarding key-note speakers were delivered</li> <li>• Conservation market was not implemented as</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• PC again should be (pro)active supporter of the next congress</li> <li>• Achieve a more integrative approach of the next congress: Propose name change to BOD – e.g. European Congress on Conservation Science, Practice and Policy</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>planned</li> <li>• Committee presentations done</li> <li>• Progress towards scientists conscious and willing to get involved in policy / socio-economic issues</li> <li>• Number of participating policy people / representatives of social/economical sciences and from practice was very low</li> </ul>	
Natura 2000 poster session at ECCB 2006	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Good starting point</li> <li>• Enthusiastic participation</li> <li>• Impossible to get a good policy-makers' representation (7 out of 25 countries)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More would have participated if they had known more about ECCB and the session/workshop etc. – chance to achieve much better results next time</li> </ul>
Natura 2000 workshop at ECCB 2006	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• About 200 people assisted, &gt; 60 completed questionnaire, 19 countries; 82% somehow involved in Natura 2000</li> <li>• Interest/ demand has been documented</li> <li>• A report has been produced of the WK results and sent to participants as a feedback</li> <li>• Idea of follow-up project has become more concrete (Kiki)</li> <li>• Contact to EUMON (Kiki/Barbara)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Workshop was not well organized (last minute changes)</li> <li>• Partially wrong people invited</li> <li>• Possibly worthwhile to be continued at the next congress (towards a monitoring of Natura 2000 implementation problems)</li> <li>• Next time: formulate more focused questions</li> <li>• We should have prepared a report about the congress, workshop, sessions etc. for European conservation journals (e.g. Germany) – and we still can do it</li> </ul>
ECCB message from Eger (to the EU ministerial meeting in Tuczno on Natura 2000)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Hundreds of participants (500?) of plenary sessions voted unanimously in favour of the message from Eger</li> <li>• Motivating experience for participants (“community feeling”, “making a difference”)</li> <li>• Message was delivered at Tuczno meeting – direct impact not measurable, but positive outcome of the meeting, produced a very good impression at the meeting</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Follow-up contact to Miko</li> <li>• Do it again! “Message from ...”</li> <li>• Be aware of meetings such as Tuczno which present lobbying opportunities – to be able to act in time – If desirable</li> </ul>

Establishment of the Committee and procedures (since 2003)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Good outreach towards membership (recruitment of new members)</li> <li>• PC members become active (e.g. in BOD)</li> <li>• Strategy document has advanced; identity becomes clearer; projects arising; cooperation among members</li> <li>• High level of motivation &amp; creativity (especially at meetings)</li> <li>• Role of PC pushing initiatives – partially it can spend more time on issues than the BOD</li> <li>• Progress made from more conceptual/ operational discussion to first actions</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Conserve the collaborative/ cooperative atmosphere</li> <li>• It is good to have participation of non-BOD members – their involvement should be further stimulated</li> <li>• It's worthwhile developing the strategy to become more impact and objective-oriented</li> </ul>
--	---	--

A positive and encouraging self-evaluation which stimulates new initiatives and further development of the committee. However, shortcomings and problems have been identified that will have to be addressed:

	<i>Impacts</i>	Lessons learned
<b>PC shortcomings underlying weaknesses</b>		
Availability of time	Time dedicated to PC is too short	Answer mails even if saying no
Virtual Workspace (proposed at Le Luc meeting)	Failed to become a useful tool	Failed because requires active involvement (proactive compared to mailbox) and needs a leader/moderator Try telephone conferences
Fundraising	Two annual meetings impossible Need to support members/meetings	Use students to run some projects SCB-ES-PC thesis program (Leonardo)

### The (theoretical) need for action

The group made a brainstorming exercise prioritising the most important conservation policy problems/challenges in Europe. The different points and questions that were raised can be classified in various categories.

#### UNDERLYING CAUSES OF THE PROBLEM

- Society, human needs and desires, and a short-term view, are the roots of the problem
- Economics (with short time-frame) have priority over conservation

- Short-term and small scale vision and goals in the mainstream policy arena

#### EFFICIENCY AND EFFECTIVENESS OF CONSERVATION LEGISLATION AND ACTION

- Are applied measures and strategies/policies sufficient for biodiversity conservation (2010)?
- Are European laws/directives efficient at stopping biodiversity loss?
- Compensatory measures never compensate for habitat loss (urban back to wild)
- Difficulties in referring to adoption of international approaches and policies (eg adaptive management, ecosystem approach, systematic conservation planning)
- Lack of permanent funding for Natura 2000
- Does a favourable conservation status (of a territory – designated, e.g. habitat types and species guarantee effective conservation)?
- Global change/climate change: static conservation approaches only.

#### ENFORCEMENT AND CONTROL

- Difficult in large areas (in many cases)
- Corruption
- EU: More difficult in new and recently joined countries (eg Romania)
- Are fines paid?
- Are fines effective in preventing bad practises?
- Cheating on environmental impact to get subsidies (agriculture, forestry...) because aware of the lack of controls
- Lack of guidelines and help to fill up complaints with the EU Commission

#### MANAGEMENT and USE OF NATURAL RESOURCES

- Consequences of pet trade of indigenous and exotic species on local diversity
- Sustainable hunting and harvesting
- Ability to preserve “pristine areas” (roadless/ wilderness areas)
- Neglecting scientific methods and results
- Inappropriate allocation of funds within CAP and CFP (biodiv not taken into account)
- Lack of proposed efficient mechanisms for achieving greater cooperation between conservation scientists and managers
- No reference to bad/good practices and examples

#### EFFICIENCY AND METHODOLOGIES OF RESEARCH

- What kind of research is absolutely needed to make significant progress towards the 2010 goal?
- How can we promote problem-oriented research?



- Use of indicators
- Monitoring protocols
- Lack of definition and guidelines to achieve “good” science.

#### EXPERTISE & INSTITUTIONAL RESPONSES

- Variety of parallel approaches by different networks working independently (redundancy?)
- A European or EU IMOSEB?
- Scientific expertise EEA
- Decreasing number of scientists (PhD level)
- Lack of attractiveness of scientific jobs (low salaries, little funding)

#### COMMUNICATION AND EDUCATION

- Poor communication of good and bad practises
- Poor exchanges between stakeholders, public and policy makers
- Lack of simple guidelines for people
- Need to increase interest of children and youth, and of retired people interested in nature, in monitoring biodiversity

In the course of the discussion some fundamental questions and concepts were addressed.

#### *What is policy?)*

- Systematic institutional responses to problems
- Executive vs legislative vs...
- For the sake of the greatest numbers

#### *Possible actions with regard to policy*

- Developing new policies from science (providing ideas and frame, not writing texts for expert audience, only)
- Change existing policies
- Monitor the accomplishment, effectiveness, efficiency of existing policies (case-studies)

#### *Scope of policy activities of the SCB-ES/PC*

- Geographical scope
- levels of intervention (SCB external, internal – root problems, conservation responses ...)

Lars Berg presents his SBSTTA experience/insights. Potentially powerful because experts have an important role in raising the appropriate questions. Secretariat draws up drafts for decisions and seeks expert input to do so. The COP then agrees or disagrees. Status of “experts” with respect to rigid science education varies. Half of the SBSTTA experts nominated from government agencies.

Perceived weaknesses in SBSTTA with respect to relevance of science half led to initiation of the IMOSEB process as the IPCC for biodiversity. UN Millenium Ecosystem Assessment is comparable to IPCC in ambition and scope. Therefore, people involved with the MEA have been instrumental in launching IMOSEB, i.e. fear that IMOSEB would disturb MEA mechanism not warranted from this perspective. IMOSEB now suggests to go on with MEA.

Afterwards, the relevant international players/mechanisms in conservation policy at the different policy levels and their linkages were discussed (e.g., global level: mainly *CBD-SBSTTA*<sup>1</sup>, COP, GEF, conventions' protocols, NGO, DIVERSITAS, *IMOSEB*<sup>2</sup>; Europe: conventions, EU, EU biodiversity strategy, EPBRs etc.). Aspects and elements of lobbying in Brussels were addressed. This exercise turned out to be a useful introduction to some basics of conservation policy especially for the new members of the committee.

### **SCB-Europe needs/expectations concerning our work**

In the global SCB's strategic plan for 2006-2010 policy work is represented by ambitious goals and objectives. The current draft of SCB-Europe's strategy adopts the SCB strategic goal and objectives:

Policy decisions of major international conventions, governments, organizations, and foundations are effectively informed and improved by the highest quality scientific counsel, analysis, and recommendations so as to advance the conservation of biological diversity.

#### Rationale and Strategic Impact

Resolution of most conservation issues will benefit from the application of scientific expertise and firm support from the SCB. We must seek opportunities to apply science to global and national policies affecting biodiversity. Our mission and values require that the SCB engage actively in policy to ensure that the highest quality scientific information is applied to conservation/biodiversity issues. To ensure good science informs and influences policy toward the conservation of the Earth's biodiversity, the values and expertise of the SCB must be recognized and actively sought by the public, policy makers, and key conservation institutions as a result of our expertise on the most relevant national, regional, and international conservation issues. In the next five years, the SCB will enhance its credibility and ability to advance the conservation of biological diversity and use of sound science in conservation-related decision making and policy.

### **The opportunities for making a difference. What are our goals and strategies?**

---

<sup>1</sup> Subsidiary Body of Scientific, Technical and Technological Advice of the Convention on Biological Diversity.

The ninth meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity (COP-9) will take place in Bonn from 19-30 May 2008. Around 5000 delegates are expected to attend. The CBD, like the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change and the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification, is one of the three Rio Conventions. Germany was among the first countries to sign the CBD. The CBD addresses all aspects of the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity at the three levels: genetic resources, species, and ecosystems/natural habitats. It has also become a major platform for debate about the relationship between the world trade regime and the multilateral environmental conventions, as well as a focal point for indigenous rights.

<sup>2</sup> International Mechanism of Scientific Expertise on Biodiversity

Taking into account the strengths, weaknesses and achievements of the PC, as well as the strategic context, the group worked on objectives that would allow the PC to make a difference without being unrealistically ambitious. Considering the high institutional complexity (there seem to be several parallel and redundant approaches by different networks working independently) it is rather difficult to get involved. Clearly, with the sparse financial and member resources SCB-Europe's PC cannot achieve a sufficient and systematic follow-up of the busy biodiversity agenda (see agenda of selected meetings in 2007/2008 in appendix) and be a significant player.

First, we ratify our former efforts of strategic planning especially related to our mission and vision:

**Mission:**

The Mission of the SCB-ES Policy Committee is to advance understanding for and action towards improved nature conservation in the policy arena. This includes both (a) exchange with the public and decision makers without compromising the scientific rigour of an academic association and (b) the involvement of conservation biologists in policy activities.

**Vision:**

Our vision is that the conservation of biodiversity is acknowledged as a key task in society in general, and within sustainable development schemes in particular, and that such recognition translates into real action towards the conservation of biodiversity. We see a Europe where people understand, value and subsequently conserve the diversity of life; we see the SCB-ES as a respected organization of conservation professionals acting toward biodiversity conservation as an expert advisor and, wherever necessary, advocate.

The group agreed on five strategic objectives that shall guide the action of the committee. These objectives consider impacts at different levels, both internal and external. Our target groups are not only policy makers, but especially conservation biologists and managers, and the SCB itself.

- **Objective 1: Generate interest, involvement and capacity of conservation biologists to effectively work with (policy) stakeholders**
- **Objective 2. Improve implementation of policy instruments**
- **Objective 3. Stimulate development of conservation legislation**
- **Objective 4. Contribute to effectiveness and good performance of SCB-ES**
- **Objective 5. Ensure sustainability and development of PC**

(These objectives were ratified by the BOD and have been included into the strategic plan of the SCB-Europe section.)

After the objective formulation concrete activities were suggested that will reflect our objective-based plan of work (see appendix).

## **News and general information**

- d. Report on the WGEES (SCB Working Group for Ecological Economics and Sustainability Science) (*Martin, European chair of the group*)
- e. *Need to change wording of the SCB-ES strategy referring to the PC (Martin)*

### **3. Feedback from the new members**

The new PC members and guests gave us their feedback about our meeting. Generally, it has been a very positive and encouraging report. Clearly we must be careful in using too many abbreviations or jargon, although the meeting provided a good introduction to the committee's history and activities as well as to some policy basics. One member expressed that more breaks would be appreciated as brainstorming is intensive. Most said that they are truly willing to get involved in our activities. Nuria Selva is already leading a task and supporting several others. The suggestion that Balint Bajomi may replace Per in being the link between the PC Committee and the Communication Committee will be considered; Balint wishes to be involved in the press releases and relationships with media and still evaluates which committee can benefit best from his expertise. Anna Doronina can be of great help in better understanding the situation in Russia.

### **4. Summary of messages/requests to the BOD**

- possibility for the committees to have "SCB students", for instance BSc or MSc students doing their thesis on a topic of interest for a committee, that would help us achieving more goals, especially when it requires lots of time (e.g. Case study collection; review of sustainable hunting policies in Europe...).
- importance to attract more policy stakeholders at the next ECCB meeting (see details [under Objective 1](#))
- revise whether the name of the next ECCB can be changed to become more inclusive and integrative
- procedures to ensure follow-up of our contacts with Ladislav Miko (DG Environment)
- response to the invitation of EUMon (context: Natura 2000 evaluation)

### **5. Messages/requests to the Education Committee**

- need to collect examples of good and bad practises to be used in educating people
- support for the development of summer schools is offered (include policy issues)
- possibility for the committees to have "SCB students", for instance BSc or MSc students doing their thesis on a topic of interest for a committee, that would help us achieving more goals, especially when it requires lots of time (e.g. Case study collection; review of sustainable hunting policies in Europe...).

### **6. Messages/requests to the Communications Committee**

The communication challenge was addressed repeatedly and is a cross-cutting issue of the Policy Committee. Several messages shall be discussed in the subsequent meeting of the Communications Committee:

- need to be able to develop webpages for special purposes, for instance surveys or case-study collection
- need to improve contacts with national representatives in the Natura 2000 project (problems with ECCB2006 poster session, too few attended)
- develop a support so that NGOs can ask SCB-ES for help and advice as long as the topic is of European concern and requires scientific expertise and/or backup
- increase network to better spread resolutions and press releases, and get feedback – Includes relationship with media at the European level.
- help other committees in avoiding jargon
- put some of Andrew's team (evidence-based...) on the website, including translation in various languages, to serve as examples of review and practises (good and bad)
- help PC with code of conduct for meetings (including future ECCB)

## **Appendix: Plan of work 2007**

### **Objective 1: Generate interest, involvement and capacity of conservation biologists to effectively work with policy stakeholders**

<b>Activities</b>	<b>Timeframe</b>	<b>Responsible</b>
1.1. Explore and suggest mechanisms for increasing communication/cooperation between scientists, managers and policy makers	2007/2008	Per
1.2. Accompany preparation of next ECCB and assure the adequate integration of policy issues <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- change name (Eur. Congress for Conservation Science)</li> <li>- Slogan "Putting science into practice"</li> <li>- Achieve participation of policy actors</li> <li>- Get back to "100 questions" initiative</li> <li>- Propose/ organize workshops and symposia (e.g., 2010 goal)</li> <li>- Develop idea of collect session summaries for policy-makers</li> </ul>	2007/2008 BOD meeting  2007/2008 BOD meeting 2008  2007/2008	PI  Martin, Per PI Nuria  PI
1.3. Integrate policy topics into planned Summerschool	BOD meeting 2007/2008	Kiki
1.4. Write and publish articles about science and policy <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Linné editorial</li> </ul>	Ongoing  Feb-Mar 2007	PC  Per
1.5. Contribute news to SCB newsletter (via secretary of section)	February 2007	Balint
1.6. Check newsletters for potential contributions	2007/2008	Barbara
1.7. Develop idea of study on conservation policy /practice involvement of academics	June 2007	Martin, Kiki

### **Objective 2. Improve implementation of policy instruments**

2.1. Continue and develop further case study collection on good/bad practice examples <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>➤ Natura 2000 implementation (feedback to ECCB workshop participants, submit new questionnaire etc.)</li> </ul>	2007/2008	Barbara, Nuria, Martin, Kiki
2.2. Start collection of cases referring to traffic infrastructure impacts (aiming at draft of resolution)	2007/2008	Nuria, Barbara, Kiki

### **Objective 3. Stimulate development of conservation legislation**

3.1. Realize a first appraisal to legislation on sustainable harvesting/ wildlife hunting / regulations	2007/2008	Kiki, Pierre
---	-----------	--------------

(theses)		
3.2. Realize a first appraisal to trade of potentially invasive species	2007/2008	Barbara

**Objective 4. Contribute to effectiveness and good performance of SCB-ES**

4.1. Guidelines for best practice of SCB-ES meetings (e.g. carbon-neutral meetings)	2007/2008	Barbara, Pierre, Balint
4.2. Support the BOD regarding contacts with policy stakeholders (e.g., ask for follow up of meeting with DG Environment)	2007/2008	(see with BOD)
4.3. Respond to SCB requests	2007/2008	PI

**Objective 5. Ensure sustainability and development of PC**

5.1. Explore funding opportunities	2007/2008	PC
5.2. Contact SCB-ES members, provide information on PC activities and solicit important issues	March 2007	Pierre, Balint

## Appendix: Biodiversity agenda 2007/2008,

3.-15. June 07	CITES COP14	Merbau	The Netherlands, The Hague
2 to 6 July 07	WG Protected Areas	Implementation protected areas, large intact forests, PA financing	UNESCO, Paris
July 2007 ???	NGO Conference on COP9 positions	Forests, agri, finance	Montreal, Canada
9 to 13 July 07	SBSTTA 12	Implementation, incentives, ecosystem approach	Montreal, Canada or Paris, France?
2008			
February 08	WG RI-2	Review of implementation	Montreal, Canada
February 08	SBSTTA-13	Forest Review, Agri review, Marine Biodiv, Protected areas	Montreal, Canada
Mar 08	WG 8(j); ABS 6	Access and benefit sharing regime	???
19-30 May 2008	CBD COP-9 with Biosafety Protocol MOP4	Ministerial Segment, Forest Review, Agri review, Marine Biodiv, Protected areas, Review of implementation	Germany, Bonn
June 2008	G20 meeting		???
October 2008	World Conservation Congress <sup>3</sup>	IUCN	Barcelona

<sup>3</sup> The World Conservation Union (IUCN) Council voted for Spain as the host country of the fourth World Conservation Congress in 2008. The World Conservation Congress, held every four years, is one of the world's largest and most diverse events devoted to improving how we manage our natural environment - together with human, social and economic development. [http://www.iucn.org/en/news/archive/2006/05/24\\_barcelona.htm](http://www.iucn.org/en/news/archive/2006/05/24_barcelona.htm)