



Proceedings of the Members' Assembly

World Conservation Congress
Marseille, France
3–10 September 2021



Proceedings of the Members' Assembly

World Conservation Congress
Marseille, France
3–10 September 2021

The designation of geographical entities in this book, and the presentation of the material, do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of IUCN concerning the legal status of any country, territory, or area, or of its authorities, or concerning the delimitation of its frontiers or boundaries.

The views expressed in this publication do not necessarily reflect those of IUCN.

Published by: IUCN, Gland, Switzerland

Copyright: © 2022 IUCN, International Union for Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources

Reproduction of this publication for educational or other non-commercial purposes is authorised without prior written permission from the copyright holder provided the source is fully acknowledged.

Reproduction of this publication for resale or other commercial purposes is prohibited without prior written permission of the copyright holder.

Recommended citation: IUCN (2022). *Proceedings of the Members' Assembly: World Conservation Congress, Marseille, France, 3–10 September 2021*. Gland, Switzerland: IUCN.

Compiled and edited by: Tim Jones, Chief Rapporteur of the Members' Assembly to the Marseille Congress

Printed by: ABP Project Sàrl, Switzerland

Available from: www.iucn.org/resources/publications

The text of this book is printed on PEFC-certified paper, 115 g/m2.

Table of contents

Minutes of the Members' Assembly of the World Conservation Congress held in Marseille, France.....	1
Annex 1 – The Marseille Manifesto	85
Annex 2 – Statements by State Members: the United States Government, South Africa and Canada.....	91
Annex 3 – Table of motions (and other key decisions) adopted by the World Conservation Congress, with corresponding Resolution or Recommendation numbers and titles	95
Annex 4 – Summary of online discussion and voting on motions ahead of the Members' Assembly	103
Annex 5 – Heads of Delegation of IUCN Members taking part in the Members' Assembly.....	113

Minutes of the Members' Assembly of the World Conservation Congress held in Marseille, France

3–10 September 2021

Note: Except if specified otherwise, all decisions of the Members' Assembly were taken by electronic vote. The electronic voting record for each decision is available from the Congress website. In these Minutes, the relevant voting record reference number is given in brackets above each decision. All declarations of vote made by Members in relation to motions (including those concerning motions approved by electronic vote prior to the Congress) have been published alongside the final, approved texts of the motions concerned. Declarations and formal statements 'for the record' made or announced orally during plenary Sittings, whether relating to motions or other decisions of Congress, are also recorded in these Minutes.

The Marseille Congress was attended in person by some 6,000 delegates. However, in the run-up to the Congress, IUCN and the host country, France, recognised that travel restrictions linked to the COVID-19 pandemic meant that many IUCN Members would be unable to attend in person. As a result, focus was placed on the development of an online platform which would enable as many Members as possible to join the Congress virtually. During the course of the Congress, live webcasts were viewed by 3,114 distinct registered viewers from 186 countries, accounting for a total of 20,400 hours of live on-line viewing. Members were also able to follow proceedings through subsequent online playback of the live sessions. Statistics collected by IUCN showed that registered online participants were 55% female, 43 % male and 2% undisclosed or gender non-conforming. Almost one-third were younger than age 35.

Opening Ceremony of the World Conservation Congress

The opening of the Congress took place on Friday 3 September under the patronage the **President of the Republic of France, Emmanuel Macron**.

The event commenced with series of artistic performances followed by five key-note speakers, journalist **Asha Sumputh** acting as Master of Ceremonies.

IUCN President Zhang Xinsheng underlined the urgent calls by scientists to safeguard the benefits provided by nature or to pay a terrible price. He recognised the value of gender equality and called for addressing the imbalance in how societies share access to nature.

Audrey Azoulay, Director-General, UN Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO), highlighted the need to protect 30% of the planet by 2030, and to reinforce the role of nature education in school curricula, and called for more women in science.

Li Keqiang, Premier of the State Council, China, emphasised China's prioritisation of sustainable development based on harmony between man and nature. He said promoting multilateralism, Nature-based Solutions, and a circular economy were essential in the post COVID-19 recovery period.

David Ige, Governor, State of Hawaii, United States, reiterated Hawaii's commitment to implementing the 2030 marine conservation goals, stressing that the island state sits squarely at the forefront of climate change.

Benoît Payan, Mayor of Marseille, France, observed that while cities were at the forefront of protecting biodiversity, they had also become "custodians of a garden that is dying." He considered that the statement by former French President Jacques Chirac, that "our house is on fire," was still relevant today, adding that "our house is still on fire, and we continue to stoke the flames". Moreover,

the “hubris of our humanity” meant the planet had reached its limit. He stressed the need to build resilient cities, including through rethinking ecosystems and agriculture, and urged putting humanity ahead of profit.

The centrepiece of the opening ceremony was an interactive panel debate moderated by **Barbara Pompili, Minister of the Ecological Transition, France**.

President Macron noted that climate was inextricably linked to the preservation of biodiversity and ecosystems, and that upcoming global meetings would further cement this linkage.

Minister Pompili said the World Conservation Congress needed to place ecosystem conservation at the heart of a post COVID-19 world. She emphasized that all countries needed to share the responsibility of developing the post-2020 global biodiversity framework.

Sebastião Salgado, Brazilian social documentary photographer and photojournalist, recalled that the world depended on the Amazon for its enormous concentration of biodiversity and important carbon sequestration function. Lamenting its poor state due to land conversion for agriculture, among other factors, he called for: a planetary ban on Amazon wood products; electrification of Amazonian indigenous areas using renewable energy; and a fair-trade system based on non-predatory economic models.

Frans Timmermans, Executive Vice-President for the European Green Deal, European Commission, bemoaned the considerable loss of biodiversity globally, particularly in forest ecosystems. However, he expressed hope this could be turned around by: sharing scientific knowledge; acting in an integrated manner; and working at local, national, and international levels to re-establish the lost balance among ecological, economic, and social interests.

Mahamadou Issoufou, former President of Niger, highlighted how humanity was living on borrowed time with the ecological debt to future generations increasing daily. He stated that despite not having significant responsibility for environmental degradation, the African Union was taking action to address it, focusing especially on the Great Green Wall initiative.

Christine Lagarde, President, European Central Bank, said financial and economic stability was impossible without nature and ecosystem services. She highlighted that humanity’s reliance on oxygen, water, and nourishing food was undervalued and frequently excluded in economic assessments. She noted that biodiversity bolstered the resilience of societies and economies, and highlighted Nature-based Solutions to climate change.

Gilbert Houngbo, President, International Fund for Agricultural Development, called for reorienting climate funding and harmonising the collection and use of data. He suggested that, at a minimum, 30% of climate funding should be earmarked for investments in biodiversity.

Kyriakos Mitsotakis, Prime Minister, Greece, highlighted various threats facing the Mediterranean Sea, including marine pollution and unsustainable fishing and transport. Outlining national priorities, he committed to reduce overfishing, declaring that, by 2030, 10% of territorial seas would be ‘no take’ reserves.

Highlighting the European Green Deal, **Charles Michel, President, European Council**: called for banning single-use plastics; urged increasing the number of protected areas; and highlighted the important role of polar ice caps in global climate regulation.

President Macron stressed that the destinies of humanity, climate, and nature were inseparable, noting that the economic impact of nature was underestimated. Regarding the protection of living soils, President Macron highlighted ongoing initiatives and focused on pesticides, noting that non-chemical substitutes and resistant plants could lead to the phasing-out of pesticides, while maintaining

competitiveness. On forests, he called for a clear strategy to fight against “imported deforestation”, focusing on specific products that were currently produced in an unsustainable manner, including soybeans and palm oil.

With respect to the ocean, **President Macron** emphasised the fight against plastic, stressing the need to prevent plastic pollution, including through education. He drew attention to the North and South Poles, highlighting the need for an international legal agenda on global public assets. On instruments and methodology, he called for an agenda that would provide a common, clear, and transparent valuation of biodiversity, to put pressure on financiers to protect biodiversity. He concluded by stating the need to reinvent trade policies to be consistent with climate and biodiversity policies, expressing optimism that continuing fight for a sustainable future would lead to success.

Harrison Ford, actor and Vice-Chair of the Board of Directors, Conservation International, urged people to get to work for justice, mother nature, indigenous peoples, marginalised communities, and all of Earth’s inhabitants. “By preserving just a fraction of the Earth’s irreplaceable ecosystems,” he said, “we can protect our wildlife, air, water, food, jobs, and climate.” He added, “please remember, reinforcements are on the way. They’re sitting in lecture halls now, venturing into the field for the very first time, leading marches, organising communities, but they’re not here yet. In a few years, they will be here, in rooms like this, and the world will be better for it.”

As the culmination of proceedings, **President Macron** formally declared the IUCN World Conservation Congress open.

Note: The information on the opening ceremony of the World Conservation Congress is based on the [summary report](#) of the Earth Negotiations Bulletin, International Institute for Sustainable Development – IISD.

1st Sitting of the Members’ Assembly

Saturday 4 September 2021 (08:15–10:30)

Agenda item 1.1 – Opening remarks by the IUCN President

An opening address was made by the **President of IUCN** (Mr Zhang Xinsheng). Although he and many other delegates had been unable to travel to Marseille because of COVID-19 restrictions, all delegates would have the opportunity to participate remotely. He welcomed all participants, whether present in person or joining online. In view of his own virtual attendance, he had decided to delegate the chairing of sittings of the Members’ Assembly to selected IUCN Councillors present in Marseille. The Chair of the 1st Sitting would be Mr Ali Kaka (Kenya), one of the Vice-Presidents of IUCN.

The **Chair** (Mr Ali Kaka) warmly welcomed all delegates, both Members and Observers, participating in person and online, and declared the 1st Sitting of the Members’ Assembly open. He introduced those present with him on the podium, including the **Director General** Bruno Oberle, **Congress Director** Enrique Lahmann, **Congress Procedural Adviser** Prof. Surya Subedi, **IUCN’s Legal Adviser** Sandrine Friedli Cela, **Members’ Assembly Manager** Luc De Wever, and the **Candidate Chair of the Credentials Committee** Jenny Gruenberger.

Agenda item 1.2 – Appointment and first progress report of the Congress Credentials Committee

The **Members’ Assembly Manager** explained the use of the electronic system for requesting the floor, speaking, voting, and making points of order. He also briefed delegates on how to communicate

with the Congress secretariat to submit written texts of interventions, as well as declarations or explanations of voting positions.

The **Chair** referred Members to Congress Documents CGR-2021-1.1/1 Rev *Terms of Reference and membership of the Committees of Congress*, CGR-2021-1.1/1-Annex 1 Rev *Credentials Committee of the Congress Draft Terms of Reference*, and CGR-2021-1.1/1-Annex 7 *Council proposal to Congress for the membership of the 2021 Congress Committees*. He invited the Assembly to approve the proposed composition of the Congress Credentials Committee.

Congress took the following decision [[voting record](#)]:

DECISION 1

Congress APPROVES the Terms of Reference and the membership of the Credentials Committee:

Jenny GRUENBERGER (Bolivia) Chair
Angela ANDRADE (Colombia)
Jesca ERIYO OSUNA (Uganda)
Ramon PEREZGIL (Mexico)
Bhoke WEREMA (Kenya)
Xiaohong JIANG (China)

The **Chair** noted that the candidates for membership of the Credentials Committee had already begun working in anticipation of the Committee's formal establishment. He invited the newly appointed **Chair of the Credentials Committee** to present a brief progress report.

The **Chair of the Credentials Committee** (Jenny Gruenberger) explained the speaking and voting rights of different categories of participant in the Members' Assembly, and drew attention to the online accreditation system, which enabled Members to secure rights to speak and/or vote during the Assembly, to assign their Head of Delegation, and to assign proxy holders. She confirmed that the system would remain open during the Congress and encouraged Members to complete the accreditation procedures prior to opening of the 2nd Sitting of the Members' Assembly on 8 September.

Ms Gruenberger reported that the total voting potential held by IUCN Members in good standing was:

Category A (States and Government Agencies): 261 votes
Categories B & C (International and National NGOs and IPOs): 1,192 votes

Of these potential votes, the voting power of accredited Members represented at the World Conservation Congress, as of 19:00 hrs on Friday 3 September 2021 was:

Category A (States and Government Agencies): 132 votes (51%)
Categories B & C (International and National NGOs and IPOs): 598 votes (51%).

Agenda item 1.3 – Adoption of the Agenda

The **President** referred the Assembly to Congress document CGR-2021-1.3/1 Rev *Draft Agenda of the IUCN World Conservation Congress*. The draft Agenda had been adjusted following the postponement of the Congress in 2020, and item 1.7 had been included following the request by ten Member organisations for a grace period to pay their 2020 membership dues because of financial difficulties resulting from the COVID-19 pandemic. A total of 13 Member organisations whose delegates had been unable to travel to Marseille had also requested that all Motions be referred to an

online vote within one month of the end of the Congress, giving all members an equal chance to vote. The Congress Preparatory Committee of Council had recently agreed to include this request as item 3.2 of the revised draft Agenda. The Assembly was now invited to adopt the revised Agenda, including item 1.7 comprising the draft decision contained in document CGR-2021-1.7/1 *Grace period for payment of the 2020 membership dues in light of the exceptional circumstances created by the Covid-19 pandemic*, and item 3.2 comprising the motion contained in document CGR-2021-3.2/1 *Motion calling for an online vote on all motions following the Congress*.

Congress took the following decision: [[voting result](#)]:

DECISION 2

Congress APPROVES the Agenda for the 2021 World Conservation Congress.

Agenda item 1.4 – Appointment of the Resolutions, Finance and Audit, Governance, and Programme Committees of the Congress

Referring to Congress Documents CGR-2021-1.1/1-Rev *Terms of Reference and membership of the Committees of Congress* and its Annexes 1 to 6 containing the Terms of Reference for each Committee, the **Chair** noted that the composition of the Congress Steering Committee was defined by Rule 15 of the Rules of Procedure and so did not require a decision of Congress. Membership of the Congress Steering Committee was as follows:

Xinsheng ZHANG (China) (President), Chair
Jennifer MOHAMED-KATERERE (Zimbabwe/South Africa)
Malik Amin Aslam KHAN (Pakistan)
Andrew BIGNALL (New Zealand)
John ROBINSON (USA)
Mamadou DIALLO (Senegal)
Ali KAKA (Kenya)
Kathy MACKINNON (UK)
Ana TIRAA (Cook Islands)
Sixto INCHAUSTEGUI (Dominican Republic)
Mark STRAUSS and Francesco GAETA (Host country representatives) (France)
Bruno OBERLE (Director General)

The **Chair** noted that the draft Terms of Reference of the Congress Steering Committee, as well as the proposed Terms of Reference and membership of the Congress Resolutions Committee, Finance and Audit Committee, Governance Committee and Programme Committee, were being submitted for approval under this Agenda item. The proposed composition of each Committee was contained in Congress Document CGR-2021-1.1/1-Annex 7 *Council Proposal to Congress for the membership of the 2021 Congress Committees*.

The **African Wildlife Foundation** raised a Point of Order concerning the membership of the Congress Resolutions Committee. The candidate from the Africa Region had needed to stand down, meaning that the proposed composition now lacked regional balance.

The **Chair** invited nominations for a new member of the Resolutions Committee from Africa.

African Wildlife Foundation nominated Malan Lindeque, ResourceAfrica, to serve on the Congress Resolutions Committee.

Congress took the following decision [[voting result](#)]:

DECISION 3

Congress APPROVES the Terms of Reference and membership of the following Committees of the 2021 World Conservation Congress:

Congress Resolutions Committee

Jon Paul RODRÍGUEZ (Venezuela), Chair
Said DAMHOUREYEH (Jordan), Deputy Chair
Michael HOŠEK (Czech Republic)
Hilde EGGERMONT (Belgium)
Teina MACKENZIE (Cook Islands) (appointed in 2019 as per Regulation 29)
Anaid VELASCO (Mexico) (appointed in 2019 as per Reg. 29)
Will GARTSHORE (USA) (appointed in 2019 as per Reg. 29)
Malan LINDEQUE (Namibia)
Jean-Baptiste D'ISIDORO (Host Country Representative); Béatrice GALIN (Deputy Host Country Representative) (France)

Congress Finance and Audit Committee

Ayman RABI (Palestine), Chair
Nihal WELIKALA (Sri Lanka/UK)
Rick BATES (Canada)
Marco Vinicio CEREZO BLANDÓN (Guatemala)
Norbert BAERLOCHER (Switzerland)
Simon STUART (UK)
Victoria KOSMATOVA (Russia)
Caitlin BRANDT (Canada)
Peter MILLS (South Africa)
Alex ZHANG (China)

Congress Governance Committee

Amran HAMZAH (Malaysia), Chair
Tamar PATARIDZE (Georgia)
Erastus KANGA (Kenya)
Ana DI PANGRACIO (Argentina)
Bibiana SUCRE (Venezuela)
Thokozani MKHIZE (South Africa)
Christine DAWSON (USA)
Ann-Katrine GARN (Denmark)
Pauline NANTONGO KALUNDA (Uganda)
Keping MA (China)

Congress Programme Committee

Jan Olov WESTERBERG (Sweden), Chair
Kristen WALKER-PAINEMILLA (USA)
Shaika Salem AL DHAHERI (United Arab Emirates)
Mangal MAN SHAKYA (Nepal)
Mikhail YABLOKOV (Russia)
Razeena OMAR (South Africa)
Kevin CHANG (USA)

Agenda item 1.5 – Presentation by the Resolutions Committee about the schedule of Contact Groups for all motions including motions to amend the Statutes and other IUCN governance issues, about the process for motions on urgent and new topics, and submission for adoption of the Procedures and Code of Conduct for Contact Groups

The **Chair** acknowledged the commitment and high quality of work undertaken by the Motions Working Group of Council, now transformed into the Congress Resolutions Committee. It had not been an easy task and thanks were due to the whole team.

The **Chair of the Congress Resolutions Committee** (Jon Paul Rodríguez) briefed Members on schedule, procedures and Code of Conduct for Contact Groups that would be discussing motions. He thanked Sonia Peña Moreno, Motions Coordinator, and her team from the Secretariat for the excellent support provided to the work of the Motions Working Group and the Congress Resolutions Committee. In conformity with Council decision C/104/3 (taken on 22 June 2021), the Resolutions Committee had scheduled virtual meetings of Contact Groups, at least for a first reading, in conformity with Rule 56 of the Rules of Procedure. The schedule for virtual Contact Groups, beginning already on 4 September, could be found online as part of the official Congress Programme. Depending on the outcome of these virtual discussions, and in case of difficulty in reaching a consensus text, the Resolutions Committee might decide, in accordance with Rule 56 (d) to establish in-person Contact Groups for selected Motions. The Procedures and Code of Conduct for Contact Groups (approved by Council in February 2020) should be approved by Members during the present Sitting and he was therefore tabling them for adoption. Mr Rodríguez summarised the provisional timetable for discussing and voting on Motions during the plenary sessions of the Members Assembly, notably at the 3rd Sitting on 8 September, the 4th and 6th Sittings on 9 September, and the 7th and 8th Sittings on 10 September. He recalled that the deadline for submission of new and urgent motions, in conformity with the Rules of Procedure, would be the close of the 1st (current) Sitting on 4 September. So far, 19 such submissions had been received and would be considered by the Congress Resolutions Committee during the evening of 4 September. The proponents would be notified by email, probably during 5 September, of the Committee's decision concerning admissibility of each motion. Accepted new and urgent motions would be posted on the Congress website (in the three official languages) and become part of the overall motions process, including the establishment of Contact Groups. Members were therefore urged to check regularly for updates to the Official Programme online. Accepted new and urgent motions relevant to the IUCN Programme 2021–2024 would be referred to the Congress Programme Committee for its attention. Finally, with regard to governance-related Motions, the Resolutions Committee had already scheduled initial discussions in virtual Contact Groups, but the Congress Governance Committee, which would be following deliberations closely, might decide to organise further Contact Groups if necessary.

IUCN Vice-President and Regional Councillor Mr Amin Malik Khan, referred to two new and urgent motions that he wished to bring forward in relation to the Presidential Election, for which he himself was a candidate. The first of these sought the suspension of the Presidential election pending a debate among all candidates to take place during the Congress. The second new and urgent motion referred to Resolution 19.06 *North-South Proportionality and Equality of Opportunity* adopted at the 19th session of the IUCN General Assembly in Buenos Aires, Argentina, in 1994. Operative paragraph 1 of that Resolution stipulated that IUCN Presidential candidates should come from economic regions other than that represented by the Director General. This was not the case for one of the candidates in the current Presidential election – a point that had been raised in recent weeks by the Pakistan National Committee and by the Regional Committee for South and East Asia.

The **Chair** commented that these were weighty motions. He would give time for consultations with the Procedural Adviser, the Legal Adviser and the Election Officer and return to the matters raised later in the Sitting.

Editorial note: The conclusion of discussions on this topic, summarised in the following paragraphs, took place at the end of the 1st Sitting but are reported here for continuity and convenience.

The **Election Officer** (Prof. Nilufer Oral) subsequently stated that she and the **Deputy Election Officer** (Prof. Rahmat Mohamad) had considered the new and urgent motions submitted by Mr Khan, as well as the IUCN Statutes & Regulations and the practices followed during Presidential elections since 1994. They were in full agreement that the provision of Resolution 19.06 quoted by Mr Khan applied to nominations by Council, not nominations from Members. Furthermore, the Statutes had not been amended to reflect the provisions of that Resolution. The spirit of the Resolution was to ensure diversity but there was nothing in the current Statutes that precluded Presidential nominees from the same economic region as the incumbent Director General. With regard to the new and urgent motion proposing a debate among candidates during the Congress, such a debate had been foreseen on the condition that all three candidates were physically present in Marseille. This condition had been transmitted to all candidates by letter on 21 July 2021 and no objection had been received from any of them. All candidates had been requested to advise, at the earliest possible time, if they would be present in Marseille. One candidate had subsequently advised that they would not be travelling to Marseille. The remaining candidates were therefore notified on 26 August 2021 that a decision had been taken not to proceed with the debate. A last-minute change to this would be both unfair and disruptive to a painstakingly planned election process.

The **Chair** noted the opinion of the Election Officer and stated that he did not intend to open a debate on the matters raised. He would give Mr Khan an opportunity to comment, but any further concerns should be referred to the Congress Steering Committee.

Mr Amin Malik Khan observed that the new and urgent motions should be considered by the Congress Resolutions Committee, not by the Elections Officer. He would submit his two proposals to the Congress Resolutions Committee and, in case of rejection, would appeal to the Congress Steering Committee in line with the Rules of Procedure.

The **Chair of the Congress Resolutions Committee** recalled that proposals for new and urgent motions should be submitted to the Committee using the template provided for the purpose.

The **Chair** opened the floor to voting on adoption of the procedures and Code of Contact for Contact Groups.

Congress took the following decision [[voting result](#)]:

DECISION 4

Congress APPROVES the procedures and Code of Conduct for Contact Groups.

Agenda item 1.6 – Presentation of the *Marseille Manifesto* process

The **Chair** noted that building on the positive experience of the Hawai'i Commitments, the Congress Preparatory Committee had put in place a process now known as the *Marseille Manifesto* to prepare a compelling and externally facing statement of outcomes from the Congress. Council had designated Jennifer Mohamed-Katerere (Zimbabwe/South Africa) to lead the process, working alongside the Secretariat's Nature-based Solutions Group, headed by Mr Stewart Maginnis. He invited Ms Mohamed-Katerere to address the Assembly.

Jennifer Mohamed-Katerere outlined five elements that it had been decided should characterise the *Marseille Manifesto*, namely that it should be:

- A communique from IUCN and its partners to the world that was pithy, succinct and engaging;
- Clearly encapsulating a number of strategic messages from Congress;
- Globally relevant and containing important commitments;
- Ambitious and action orientated; and
- Building on what IUCN is already doing.

The **Congress Preparatory Committee** had established a Task Force, whose members she thanked for their important work. That group had framed a general structure for the document and a broad process for its further development, under the aegis of the Congress Steering Committee and a ‘Friends of the Chair’ group that would be responsible for provision of advice. It was envisaged that the *Marseille Manifesto* would highlight partnerships and collaboration, the participation of local communities, indigenous peoples, resource custodians, youth, and those who are economically and socially marginalised. It was also proposed that the *Marseille Manifesto* should focus on three thematic areas:

- Post-COVID nature-based recovery;
- The post-2020 agenda and the biodiversity crisis; and
- The climate emergency (recognising the interlinkages between the biodiversity crisis and the climate emergency).

On 30 August 2021, the **President** had written to Members requesting expressions of interest to join the Friends of the Chair group, with these to be submitted to a dedicated email address before 12:30 CET on 4 September 2021, meeting clearly stated requirements for key information. The aim was for the Friends of the Chair to be composed of ten Members, plus a representative of the host country, and for the group to be regionally and gender diverse with all membership categories represented. As most of the applications so far had come from national NGOs, expressions of interest would be especially welcome from indigenous people’s organisations, states and state agencies, and international NGOs. The final composition would be determined by the Congress Steering Committee on the morning of 5 September and the group would meet from 5 to 8 September to develop the *Marseille Manifesto* that it was hoped would be adopted by acclamation at the 8th Sitting of the Members’ Assembly on 10 September. A draft of the statement would be posted on the Congress website on 6 September and all registered participants would be able to review and comment on the draft so that it was not only the Friends of the Chair group that would influence its final shape and content.

Agenda item 1.7 – Council motion granting postponement of the obligation to pay the 2020 dues to IUCN Members which have been in arrears of paying them as a direct result of the pandemic

The **Chair** noted, as detailed in Congress document CGR-2021-1.7-1 *Grace period for payment of the 2020 membership dues in light of the exceptional circumstances created by the COVID-19 pandemic*, that this item referred to a new and urgent motion being brought before Congress by Council, following representations from several Members that had faced difficulties in paying their membership as a consequence of the COVID-19 pandemic. When Council had approved, in September 2020, the Membership Dues Guide for 2022–2024, it had also established a lower dues category for Members with less income. However, the IUCN Statutes did not provide for exceptions to the suspension of voting rights for Members who were more than one year in arrears. In order to recognise the exceptional impact of the pandemic, Council was therefore proposing a grace period for payment of 2020 dues, extending until 31 December 2021, for Members declaring on their honour that their inability to pay 2020 dues was a direct result of the pandemic. With the agreement of Bureau, the Secretariat had contacted all 83 Members who had not yet paid their 2020 dues (as of 2 August 2021) inviting them to submit such declarations, if applicable, via a dedicated electronic link. By 20 August 2021, ten Members had applied for a grace period under these conditions.

Council was strongly recommending adoption of the Motion, which would require a two-thirds majority in both ‘houses’ (membership category A and categories B & C combined), as it had the effect of temporarily suspending article 13 (a) of the Statutes. If approved, the ten Members concerned would have the ability to vote during the present Congress. If the Motion was rejected, these Members would not have voting rights.

The **Chair** opened the floor to voting.

Congress took the following decision [[voting result](#)]:

DECISION 5

Congress ADOPTS the proposal of Council to grant postponement of the obligation to pay the 2020 dues to IUCN Members which have been in arrears of paying them as a direct result of the pandemic.

2nd Sitting of the Members’ Assembly

Wednesday 8 September 2021 (08:30–12:30)

Declaring the 2nd Sitting of the Members’ Assembly open, the **Chair** (Regional Councillor and IUCN Vice-President Mr Ali Kaka) welcomed all delegates and invited the **President** (Mr Zhang Xinsheng), participating online, to provide his opening remarks.

Opening remarks by the IUCN President

The **President** (Mr Zhang Xinsheng) welcomed IUCN Members, both delegates present in Marseille and those participating virtually, to the Members’ Assembly. He thanked the Congress Steering Committee, Commissions, Director General and Secretariat for their efforts in organising the meeting and expressed particular gratitude to the Government of France and the people of Marseille for hosting the Congress.

The **President** noted that as the IUCN Congress was the first major international environmental meeting in 2021, to be followed by the Conferences of Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD COP15) in Kunming, China, and the UN Framework on Climate Change Conference of the Parties (UNFCCC COP26) in Glasgow, United Kingdom, it was important in two ways. First, it played an important role in shaping the conservation agenda, and secondly, as it was occurring during the global pandemic, it underscored the interrelationship between humans and nature, and the need to mainstream nature conservation.

Finally, the **President** confirmed that he would continue to participate remotely in the Members’ Assembly. Because Vice-President Ms Ana Elizabeth Tiraa (Cook Islands) would be unavailable, and the other Vice-Presidents were election candidates, he had asked Mr Ali Kaka (Kenya) to chair the current sitting, and three additional IUCN Councillors, Ms Jennifer Mohamed-Katerere, Justice Antonio Benjamin and Mr Mamadou Diallo, to chair other sittings of the Assembly.

The **Chair** thanked the President and called on the **Chair of the Credentials Committee** (Ms Jenny Gruenberger) to provide an update on accredited voting power.

Ms Gruenberger reported that:

The potential voting power held by IUCN Members in good standing was:

Category A (States and Government Agencies): 268 votes, representing 139 Members

Categories B & C (International and National NGOs and IPOs): 1,201 votes, representing 1,100 Members

As of 19:15 hrs on Tuesday 7 September 2021, the voting power of accredited Members represented at the 2021 World Conservation Congress was:

Category A (States and Government Agencies): 175 votes – 99 Members (65%)

Categories B & C (International and National NGOs and IPOs): 740 votes – 681 Members (62%).

Agenda item 2.1 – The Director General’s Report and introduction to the discussion of issues of strategic importance for the Union

IUCN Director General (Bruno Oberle) presented his report (Congress Document CGR-2021-2.1/1 *Report of the Director General on the Work of the Union since the IUCN World Conservation Congress, Hawai’i, 2016*) covering four specific areas: looking back (2017–2020); the key challenges; efforts to address these challenges; and plans for the future. Since he had only joined IUCN in 2020, he noted that credit for earlier achievements was due to his predecessors, Grethel Aguilar Rojas, former Acting Director General and now IUCN Deputy Director General, and Inger Andersen, the previous Director General.

He noted that the structure of the IUCN Programme 2017–2020 was aligned with the United Nations’ Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs). Those SDGs with the strongest links to the global goals of IUCN were SDG 15 – Life on Land, and SDG 13 – Climate Action, followed by SDG 14 – Life Below.

Dr Oberle drew attention to key financial, organisational, and political challenges confronting IUCN. Financially, he noted that membership dues were stable, the project portfolio was growing, and the organisation was evolving as an implementing agency. There was thus a need to ensure that Members were organised to deliver. A growing portfolio came with increasing risks, that were currently not adequately covered by IUCN’s reserves.

He stressed the need for high-quality portfolio management. There was strong support from many framework donors, but the distribution of such donors needed to be more globally representative to maximise legitimacy, and new business models were needed to make this happen.

Organisationally, IUCN needed to strengthen its structure so that it was well-positioned to deliver through its regional offices, thematic programmes and corporate units in a more coherent and integrated way. Dr Oberle outlined recent staff changes, including the creation of three new Deputy Director Generals. There was a need for the Union, its Members and Commissions to cooperate more closely, and for closer engagement with Members to ensure greater efficiencies and impact.

Political challenges related to IUCN’s influence in the policy arena. While the Union produced much of the knowledge vital to these discussions, its voice was often weak in international negotiations. This challenge could be addressed with a greater emphasis on the Union as a whole, and less on its constituent parts.

The new Nature-based Recovery Initiative had demonstrated that Members were undertaking impressive projects in this area of work. CBD COP15 presented an important opportunity for the Union to raise its collective voice to ensure that the post-2020 global biodiversity framework was strengthened and more impactful.

Looking ahead, Dr Oberle emphasised that a core message concerned the necessity to reach out to other communities. While IUCN was strong in its core activity of conservation, biodiversity was continuing to decline. There was a need for the Union to reach out to other sectors, to recognise those

sectors as potential partners, and to understand how different sectors could be reformed to deliver greater benefits for biodiversity.

Further elaborating on his priorities, the **Director General** highlighted several initiatives:

- The new Nature Contributions Platform: this tool allowed the Union to show the sum of its activities and impact. Once the platform was running, third parties might be invited to join.
- Sustainable Agriculture: this required working with farmers but also modifying the entire agricultural system, including eliminating harmful subsidies and integrating nature.
- The IUCN Academy: today, the Union was training leaders of tomorrow with the knowledge of yesterday. There was a need to provide practical knowledge, including from different cultures, to help advance the conservation agenda. The new IUCN Academy was designed to build capacity and produce leaders at all levels.
- Data for Nature: one of IUCN's priorities was to generate knowledge to improve decision making. To influence investments, for example, it was necessary to be online 24 hours per day. IUCN's data should be available in all regions of the world and in real time. IUCN should be a part of this emerging area, and the newly created Science and Data Centre was designed to help integrate and scale up this work.
- Finance for Nature: this was another area where IUCN could have great leverage and influence. This work was under way and further decisions on the way forward were expected soon.

Finally, the **Director General** noted that there would be additional opportunities at the Congress to discuss how biodiversity and climate change were influencing public health, and how economies could be strengthened in a post-pandemic world.

The **Chair** invited comments or questions from the floor.

Centre Africain de Recherches Forestières Appliquées et de Développement (Cameroon) raised a question on the way forward for agricultural practices in developing countries, where mechanisation was often extremely environmentally destructive.

The **Director General** remarked that agriculture was under-invested in the global south and over-subsidised in the north, adding that IUCN remained aware of the contrasting national circumstances in different regions of the world, especially with regard to funding and subsidies allocated to the agricultural sector

Fundación ALTROPICO (Ecuador) raised issues relating to IUCN funding from industries harmful to the environment, which were not coherent with IUCN's conservation objectives.

The **Director General** responded that IUCN only engaged with private-sector companies whose activities and environmental impact had been thoroughly analysed. He noted that it would be a missed opportunity not to work with companies that met IUCN's engagement criteria.

The **IUCN National Committee of Bangladesh** observed that the IUCN Programme did not come with operational guidelines; it was important to ensure adequate balance between the perspectives of developing and developed countries.

The **Director General** responded that he would be pleased to discuss such matters further with Members.

Vice-President and Regional Councillor John Robinson stressed the importance of reaching out to Members through National and Regional Committees. He pointed out that the Director General's report had not specifically included the linkages between activities undertaken by the IUCN Secretariat, the National and Regional Committees and the Commissions.

The **Director General** agreed with the contention that IUCN must make the best use of available knowledge and expertise across the Union.

The **Centre for Sustainable Development** (Iran) reported on worsening land subsidence, environmental and soil degradation in Iran and the fact that some Iranian Member organisations had been unable to pay their membership dues.

Agenda item 2.2.1 – Report on the results of the *IUCN One Nature, One Future Global Youth Summit*

The **IUCN Programme Officer for the Commission on Education and Communication** (Camila Perez Gabilondo) reported that the Global Youth Summit had taken place in two parts: a fully virtual event in April 2021, followed by a hybrid event on 3 September during the current Congress. The virtual event had included over 15,000 registered participants from around the world and engaged youth and young professionals from over 170 countries in two weeks of youth-led and youth-focused sessions. Priority issues for young people, highlighted in the briefs that emerged from the virtual event, included the rights of nature, green jobs, nature education and the digital divide, among others.

The **IUCN Forum Deputy Manager** (Hannah Moosa) reported that at the follow-up hybrid event, the Director General had presented the IUCN response to the review of youth engagement and intergenerational partnership undertaken in 2020. She affirmed that IUCN would:

- Finalise a new IUCN Youth Strategy by 31 December 2021 that built on the review and the outcome documents from the IUCN Youth Summit 2021;
- Constitute an IUCN Youth Advisory Committee to support the implementation of the new Youth Strategy; and
- Establish a new Heritage, Culture and Youth team with a mandate to support youth in IUCN.

Ms Perez Gabilondo finished by thanking the young people who had engaged in the process, as well as the Members who had supported it, namely: Parks Canada Agency, Ocean Wise Conservation Association, Rainforest Trust, Canadian Wildlife Federation, and Sustainable Forestry Initiative Inc., Fondo de Conservación El Triunfo A.C., as well as the Conservation Leadership Programme (a partnership between Wildlife Conservation Society, BirdLife International, and Fauna & Flora International). She also thanked the Post-2020 Biodiversity Framework – EU Support project for enabling young people to be represented at the Marseille Congress.

Agenda item 2.2.2 – Alliance Report on the results of the *IUCN Summit for Cities, Local Authorities and Subnational Governments*

Russell Galt, Head of **IUCN Urban Alliance** reported on the IUCN Summit for Cities, Local Authorities and Subnational Governments that took place on 3 September 2021. During the summit, mayors from several cities around the world had announced bold and ambitious actions for nature recovery and to tackle climate change, including a commitment to reach carbon neutrality by 2030. Four technical roundtables had taken place on the topics of Nature-based Solutions, financing recovery, revising environmental rights and advancing ecological urbanism. During the Summit, IUCN Urban Alliance unveiled the Urban Nature Index; the European Commission announced plans to enter into a Memorandum of Understanding with IUCN centred on Nature-based Solutions; and the Mayor of San Francisco announced a new partnership with IUCN Urban Alliance.

Mr Galt shared the following key messages:

- On finance: it was not enough to build back better; it was essential that we went further, reimagining our society to build a truly ecological civilisation. There was also a need for subnational governments to receive international development finance.
- Nature-based Solutions offered an opportunity to transition from artificial insecurity to a world of natural abundance.
- On environmental rights: every individual around the world had a fundamental human right to inhabit a clean, safe and biodiverse environment, including in cities.
- It was the opinion of IUCN Urban Alliance that IUCN would be unable to realise its vision without the full, active cooperation of subnational governments.

Agenda item 2.2.3 – Strategic discussion on: *The influences of biodiversity loss and climate change on public health*

IUCN Deputy Director General Stewart Maginnis opened the discussion by stressing the importance of integrated approaches to the fundamentally linked issues of climate change and biodiversity loss, and their combined impacts on human health. These interlinked challenges also presented opportunities, opening the door to approaches such as Nature-based Solutions and the One Health approach. Realising the need to accelerate action at the intersection of these topics, an addendum to the draft IUCN Programme for 2021–2024 had been prepared in June 2021. The discussion to follow would be moderated by a representative of the World Health Organization and would feature four distinguished invited panellists, preceded by two keynote video addresses.

H.E. Josaia Voreqe Bainimarama, Prime Minister of Fiji in his keynote address noted that human pressure was driving more than one million species to extinction. Human health was affected in many ways by climate change, and he drew attention to the destruction of numerous healthcare facilities in Fiji by cyclone Winston in 2016, which had been followed by an increase in infectious disease. Another example had been the outbreak of Ebola in West Africa in 2014–2016, which had been caused by bats displaced by habitat destruction. Fiji was responding strongly to these threats and was planting 30 million trees and expanding the area covered by mangroves. These biodiversity restoration programmes were being supplemented by the strengthening of environmental legislation. Holistic, ecosystem-based strategies were needed to integrate the management of land, water and air. Fiji was supporting Nature-based Solutions, preventing damage to ecosystems, and adopting innovative approaches to coastal engineering.

Dr Tedros Adhanom Ghebreyesus, Director General, World Health Organization, in his keynote address, stressed that the COVID-19 pandemic had underscored a fundamental lesson, that health, ecosystems and climate were intimately linked. The scale of response would have to meet the scale of the challenge. Humanity would have to work together, and One Health approaches would be essential. The IUCN Expert Working Group on Biodiversity, Climate, One Health and Nature-based Solutions would have an important role to play, working to protect the natural environment and to make the world safer, fairer and more sustainable for everyone.

Mr Maginnis thanked the keynote speakers, and invited **Dr María Neira, Director of the Department of Environment, Climate Change and Health, World Health Organization**, to moderate the panel discussion.

The **Moderator** stressed the need to address biodiversity loss as the world recovered after the COVID-19 pandemic. Governments were allocating resources on a major scale to building back better, but what was really required was to build forward in a sustainable, healthy manner. This would improve human, animal, social and economic health.

The panel discussion would be held in two parts: Part 1 would focus on climate change, biodiversity loss and public health: interlinked challenges and opportunities; and Part 2 on mobilising partnerships and synergies to integrate nature, climate and health.

Part 1: Interlinkages between climate change, biodiversity loss and public health

The four panellists were:

- **Hindou Oumarou Ibrahim, Association des femmes peules et peuples autochtones du Tchad** and a member of the Expert Working Group on Biodiversity, Climate, One Health and Nature-based Solutions;
- **Billy Karesh, Executive Vice President of EcoHealth Alliance;**
- **Julia Miranda Londoño, Deputy Chair of the IUCN World Commission on Protected Areas;** and
- **Hans-Otto Pörtner, Co-Chair of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) Working Group 2.**

Hindou Oumarou Ibrahim said that for indigenous people, the links between the environment, climate and health were a part of everyday life. Drinking water, food and medicines all came from the natural world. The impacts of climate change were accelerating in her community as never before, and the loss of biodiversity and medicinal plants were having impacts on health. Her community lived in harmony with nature as well as with each other and knew how to prevent the transfer of disease from animals to humans.

Billy Karesh said that it was obvious how human health was connected to the environment, and that humanity should have built better resilience earlier, and not been surprised by the COVID-19 pandemic. There would be a need to implement better risk-reduction strategies after the pandemic.

Julia Miranda Londoño drew attention to the technical evidence in published documents about the links between climate, biodiversity and health. This was an area where IUCN could make important contributions to the world and to policy makers. COVID-19 had arrived in a society already weakened by poor diets and other health issues partly caused by degraded ecosystems. In Colombia, the Environment and Health Departments were working together with the goal of developing healthy living habits, including visits to protected areas and enjoyment of nature.

Hans-Otto Pörtner stressed the importance of science as a basis for solutions to these issues and provision of evidence for action. Intergovernmental bodies provided a unified view of science and a basis for strong international cooperation. The most important decade yet for climate policies was beginning, and implementation would be a key issue. The extent to which the current crises were intertwined was becoming very clear, as shown by the COVID-19 pandemic. This outlook was still not shared by many policy makers, for whom it remained unclear that solving the climate issue required simultaneous solving of the issue of biodiversity loss.

The Chair invited questions from the floor.

The **International Council of Environmental Law** stressed the importance of protected areas and their role in reducing the chances of spillovers of zoonoses, and invited the Panel to consider how protected areas could best be conserved, and in particular how governments could be persuaded of the importance of providing resources for this.

Kilimanjaro Animal Centre for Rescue, Education and Wildlife (C.R.E.W.) (Tanzania) noted that air quality had improved during the pandemic, and that visits to zoos had increased.

Así Conserva Chile (Chile) asked how medical ethics centred on human health could be reconciled with environmental ethics with a more holistic vision. Longer lifespans were increasing the human population at the expense of the environment, affecting the coexistence of the two worlds.

The **Moderator** pointed out that a key question was how best to ensure the conservation of protected areas. A wider understanding of the connections between conservation of protected areas and conservation of human health and wellbeing was needed. Enhanced cross-sectoral collaboration would have an important part to play in this.

Ms Oumarou Ibrahim replied that protected areas should not only exist to maintain ecosystems; it was also important to maintain balance and diversity in ways practiced by indigenous people. People had realised the importance of nature for human mental health during the pandemic, and there was now a greater willingness to conserve nature. Working together in effective partnerships would be key to achieving this.

Mr Karesh stressed in his response that a diversity of approaches was needed at different scales. Indigenous peoples and local communities who lived in protected areas should play a key role in their management. Environmental organisations needed to engage with the development of national action plans for health, and there was a wider need for engagement between people and organisations that had not previously worked together, including environment, health, agriculture and security. The question of ethics was important because activities benefitting people often had detrimental effects on the environment. The pandemic had brought wide realisation of the connections between people and nature, and this provided opportunities for engagement with a wide variety of partners.

Ms Miranda Londoño pointed out the importance of communicating with people about the benefits of protected areas for our health and our species, and as an important part of the recovery of the planet and its genetic resources. Appropriate strategies, budgets and communication would show the world the value of protecting these areas.

Mr Pörtner stressed the inter-connectedness of stabilising the climate, conserving protected areas and other issues such as conserving soil. The developed world needed to learn from indigenous peoples about sustainable use. Policy action at global scales had been effective and he considered that this was making the necessary difference. There was a price to pay for negative activities that ignored scientific evidence, and this was becoming more widely understood. Immediate actions were needed, and long-term strategies were essential.

Part 2: Mobilising partnerships

The **Moderator** opened the second part of the discussion, asking the panel to consider how silos in conservation could best be broken down, and what partnerships were needed to enhance cross-sectoral collaboration.

Ms Oumarou Ibrahim saw an urgent need for more effective partnerships moving from talk to action. Current levels of investment were inadequate, and this transition would require long-term funding. Indigenous communities often provided balance in ecosystems and were ready to engage.

Mr Karesh pointed out that partnerships tended to occur among like-minded individuals and organisations, but that the best outcomes were often achieved by more diverse partners with different ways of thinking. There was great scope for cooperation between biodiversity conservation interests, industry and business, which would be of mutual benefit for all.

Ms Miranda Londoño observed that IUCN excelled at integrating sectors. There was a need to build constituencies so that people appreciated the health benefits and other values offered by protected areas. Green businesses ensured that local communities benefitted from their neighbouring protected

areas, and park rangers could become involved in these activities. She ended with two slogans: ‘Healthy Ecosystems, healthy parks, healthy people’; and ‘Nature for all’.

Mr Pörtner suggested that communities would feel more secure if biodiversity loss and climate change were being tackled effectively. These issues were fast rising-up the policy agenda, and Multilateral Environmental Agreements needed to better define the requirements necessary to meet their goals. He thought that IUCN could play a stronger role in the international network identifying solutions.

The **Moderator** thanked the panellists and opened the floor to questions.

The **European Association for the Conservation of the Geological Heritage – ProGEO** (Sweden) stressed that biodiversity was underpinned by geodiversity, and that soils were of fundamental importance for agriculture.

Unnayan Onneshan (Bangladesh) pointed out that poor international cooperation was delaying the end of the global COVID-19 pandemic. Decades of public health cuts by national and World Bank austerity programmes had taken a huge toll. The dominance of neoliberal economic approaches in recent decades had been hugely destructive, and a paradigm shift in economic practice was urgently needed.

Ms Oumarou Ibrahim responded that indigenous peoples took a holistic view of the natural world and considered all elements of the environment to be interrelated. Agriculture and biodiversity were an integral part of human health.

Ms Miranda Londoño pointed out the need for stronger legal frameworks, and stronger political will to implement strategies on biodiversity and human wellbeing. Transformation of agriculture would be a huge and necessary task, resulting in production of food at a more local level and in more sustainable ways.

Mr Karesh said that the environmental damage caused by agriculture was driven by demand for large volumes of food at low cost. Environmental costs should be included in food pricing, but this would make it unaffordable for many. Approaches were needed that did not unduly increase the costs of production, and there was a need for honest discussions of this issue.

Mr Maginnis warmly thanked the Moderator, the panellists and all participants in the discussion. He noted the importance of recognising the interlinkages between sectors, and the requirement to act quickly and together. It was important to remember that the most effective partnerships often involved cooperation with unfamiliar sectors beyond like-minded groups, where participants felt challenged. He closed the discussion by introducing a video message from the **Executive Secretary of the Convention on Biological Diversity, Elizabeth Maruma Mrema**.

Ms Mrema noted that nature provided benefits to human health, and that human pressures such as degradation of natural resources, climate change and pollution had opposite effects in individuals and communities. Social inequality meant that the poorest were hit hardest by these impacts. A draft of the post-2020 global biodiversity framework promised reductions in pollution and improved access to green and blue spaces, and a draft Global Action Plan for 2021–2030 identified specific action areas for leveraging biodiversity, with interlinkages to human health. She concluded by stressing the importance of Nature-based Solutions and the One Health approach within the post-2020 global biodiversity framework.

Agenda item 2.3 – Report of the IUCN President and Council

The **Chair** introduced the **President of IUCN**, who presented his report (Congress Document CGR-2021-2.3/1 *Report of the IUCN Council*) by live video link. He considered opportunities for IUCN's future place in the world, achievements, and way of working, under the theme 'Back to the Future'. There had been a lot to celebrate within IUCN over the last five years, and while the organisation continued to be a central player in advocating conservation, the trio of global environmental emergencies nevertheless threatened the very existence of humanity. Action in the current decade would be of pivotal importance. There were strong opportunities for 'Building Back Better' in the aftermath of the COVID-19 pandemic and IUCN was playing a major role in transformative change for meeting existential needs, and for just and equitable pathways. Key questions now were how to get the best results possible while being adaptive, and what could be learned from IUCN's 73-year history as it moved into its organisational future.

The Council had aimed to reinforce the Union with solidarity, and to find unity in diversity. A culture of consensus-building underpinned all efforts in a One Union approach. The main driving force had been strengthening the membership, and Council had provided strategic direction towards a more globalised organisation. The Council had also provided leadership during the COVID-19 pandemic, which had highlighted the crucial role of nature in most of the world's crises. Reform of the Union was needed, and the scale of current challenges required transformational rather than incremental change. Now was the time for IUCN to use its unsurpassed interdisciplinary and trans-disciplinary expertise to increase its global influence.

The President's recommendations to the newly elected Council included rebuilding the Union's governance structures – for which the groundwork had already been set. There was also a need to develop a 20-year strategy vision and plan for the Union, and to make IUCN more agile and responsive. It would be essential to continue enhancing engagement among all components of the Union, and especially with the Members. A continuing commitment was required to clear, transparent and respectful communication between the governance bodies.

3rd Sitting of the Members' Assembly

Wednesday 8 September 2021 (14:00–18:15)

The **President** (participating by video link) opened the 3rd Sitting of the Members' Assembly and requested Justice Antonio Benjamin, Councillor and Chair of the World Commission on Environmental Law to chair the Sitting.

Ambassador Masahiko Horie, Regional Councillor for South and East Asia, took the floor and invited delegates to listen to the song '*We Love You Planet!*' written and performed by Iruka, **Goodwill Ambassador for IUCN** since 2004. Due to the pandemic, Iruka had been unable to travel from Japan to Marseille. She had therefore sent a video of her performance and a message wishing all delegates a successful Congress.

Agenda item 3.1 – Report from the Election Officer on the results of all elections

The Bangladesh National Committee raised a Point of Order referencing Resolution 19.06 *North-South Proportionality and Equality of Opportunity* adopted at the 19th session of the IUCN General Assembly in Buenos Aires, Argentina, in 1994. Operative paragraph 1 of that Resolution stipulated that IUCN Presidential candidates should come from economic regions other than that represented by the Director General. As one of the Presidential candidates in the current election was from the same region as the present Director General there was a conflict with the provisions set out in Resolution 19.06.

The **Chair** gave the floor to the **Legal Adviser of IUCN** (Sandrine Friedli Cela) who observed that as the Point of Order referred to the Presidential election, and as the voting in that election had been concluded, the Point of Order was not timely.

The **Chair** ruled that he would proceed with the agenda for the 3rd Sitting.

At the invitation of the **Chair**, the **Election Officer** (Prof. Nilufer Oral) took the floor. She recalled that as part of preparations for the current Congress, a Deputy Election Officer had been appointed for the first time in the history of IUCN. She considered this to be a welcome and wise step. Prof. Oral confirmed that all aspects of the election process had been based on full consultation and agreement between herself and the Deputy Election Officer, both of whom had done their utmost to ensure fairness and integrity. Neither she nor her Deputy had engaged in one-to-one communication with candidates in any of the contested elections. The Deputy Election Officer had taken particular responsibility for overseeing the conduct of the Presidential election.

The **Deputy Election Officer** (Prof. Rahmat Mohamad), joining the Assembly virtually, echoed the words of the Election Officer, confirming that all decisions had been taken jointly, but that the results had also been verified independently by both himself and the Election Officer.

The **Election Officer** presented the results of the elections for Regional Councillors, Commission Chairs and Treasurer. The result for the position of President was announced by the **Deputy Election Officer**. The results of the elections were as follows:

Regional Councillors

Africa

Brian CHILD (Zimbabwe)

Ali KAKA (Kenya)

Imèn MELIANE (Tunisia)

Gloria UJOR (Nigeria)

East Europe, North and Central Asia

Carl ARMIRGULASHVILI (Georgia)

Vilmos KISZEL (Hungary)

Samad-John SMARANDA (Romania)

Meso and South America

Marco Vinicio CEREZO BLANDÓN (Guatemala)

Ana DI PANGRACIO (Argentina)

Ramón PEREZGIL SALCIDO (Mexico)

Bibiana SUCRE (Venezuela)

North America and the Caribbean

Frederick (Rick) BATES (Canada)

Sixto J. INCHÁUSTEGUI MIRANDA (Dominican Republic)

Susan LIEBERMAN (USA)

Oceania

Peter COCHRANE (Australia)

Lolita GIBBONS-DECHERONG (Palau)

Catherine IORNS (New Zealand)

South and East Asia

Kazuaki HOSHINO (Japan)
Keping MA (China)
Vivek MENON (India)
Hasna Jasimuddin MOUDUD (Bangladesh)
Jong Soo YOON (Republic of Korea)

West Asia

Shaikha Salem AL DHAHERI (United Arab Emirates)
Said Ahmad DAMHOUREYEH (Jordan)
Ayman RABI (Palestine)

West Europe

Hilde EGGERMONT (Belgium)
Maud LELIEVRE (France)
Sonia CASTAÑEDA RIAL (Spain)

Commission Chairs

Commission on Ecosystem Management (CEM)

Angela ANDRADE (Colombia)

Commission on Education and Communication (CEC)

Sean SOUTHEY (Canada/South Africa)

Commission on Environmental, Economic and Social Policy (CEESP)

Kristen WALKER-PAINEMILLA (USA)

Species Survival Commission (SSC)

Jon Paul RODRÍGUEZ (Venezuela)

World Commission on Environmental Law (WCEL)

Christina VOIGT (Germany)

World Commission on Protected Areas (WCPA)

Madhu RAO (India/UK)

Treasurer and President

Treasurer

Nihal Senanayake WELIKALA (Sri Lanka/UK)

President

Razan AL MUBARAK (United Arab Emirates)

Congress endorsed the election results by acclamation.

The **Chair** thanked all candidates and congratulated those who had been elected. He expressed gratitude to the Election Officer, her predecessor Prof. Denise Antolini, and to the Deputy Election Officer, observing that, in his view, IUCN provided a model for the conduct of democratic elections.

Agenda item 3.2 – Motion calling for an online vote on all motions following the Congress

The **Chair** invited the **Chair of the Congress Resolutions Committee** to present the Committee's report on this item.

The **Chair of the Congress Resolutions Committee** (Jon Paul Rodríguez) recalled that this item had been approved for addition to the agenda during the 1st Sitting, held on 4 September 2021. The text of Motion M *Calling for an online vote on all motions following the Congress*, which proposed moving the vote on all remaining motions onto an electronic platform after the Congress, had since been discussed by a Contact Group and the resulting text was now available in all three languages for plenary to consider and vote on.

Ministère des Affaires étrangères et du Développement international (France) and **Comité national de l'UICN** (France) urged Members to reject Motion M, observing that a quorum was present in Marseille and that postponing the taking of clear decisions in Marseille would send the wrong message at a time when the wider world was looking to IUCN for guidance in the run-up to the forthcoming UNFCCC and CBD COPs.

International Council of Environmental Law – ICEL requested the Legal Adviser to give an opinion on whether Motion M was consistent with the IUCN Statutes and Rules of Procedure. The Statutes were regarded as a treaty by State Members and should therefore not be amended on a piecemeal basis.

The **Chair** declared that as he himself was a member and President of Council of ICEL, he would voluntarily recuse himself from chairing the current agenda item, if so requested.

The **Legal Adviser** (Sandrine Friedli Cela) observed that the Rules of Procedure did not provide for a time-limited or motion-specific change to the Rules as a matter of course. However, there was a possibility to suspend a Rule of Procedure in certain circumstances. In view of the exceptional nature of the COVID-19 pandemic and considering that the Rules had provided for online voting since 2015, a motion allowing for motions to be voted on after the Congress could be admissible. However, given the Statutory implications, the permission of the Members Assembly would be required. Motion M had been tabled and accepted for inclusion in the motions process during the 1st Sitting, and permission had therefore been duly given.

The **Chair** invited comments from the **Procedural Adviser** (Prof. Surya Subedi), who stated his support for the opinion given by the **Legal Adviser**.

Department for Environment (Fiji), **Endangered Wildlife Trust** (South Africa), **Synchronicity Earth** (UK) and **The WILD Foundation** believed that rejection of Motion M would have the effect of disenfranchising Members who had been unable to travel to Marseille as a result of the pandemic. They further underlined that full and effective participation in the Congress, including Contact Groups, was challenging for Members who were joining discussions remotely.

Department of Environmental Management, Makerere University (Uganda) and **Eco Foundation Global** (China) indicated their support for Motion M.

Centre de Suivi Ecologique (Senegal) and **Liga de Defensa del Medio Ambiente – LIDEMA** (Bolivia) supported the position taken by the Government of France and the French National Committee and confirmed that they would be voting against Motion M.

The **Chair** called for a procedural vote on whether a vote on Motion M would violate the IUCN Statutes and Rules of Procedure.

The **Legal Adviser** reiterated her previous advice.

The **Chair** confirmed that a ‘Yes’ vote would mean that Motion M was considered a violation of the Statutes and Rules of Procedure and there would be no further consideration of the Motion. A ‘No’ vote would mean that Motion M did not violate the Statutes and Rules of Procedure and that a discussion and vote on the Motion itself could proceed. A simple majority was required.

The procedural motion was displayed on screens in the plenary hall: “Does Motion M and the process of voting on this motion violate the Statutes?”

The **Chair** opened the vote on the procedural motion.

Congress took the following decision [[voting result](#)]:

DECISION 6

Congress DOES NOT APPROVE the proposition that Motion M would violate the IUCN Statutes and Rules of Procedure.

The **Legal Adviser** noted that the vote on the substance of Motion M would require a two-thirds majority in both Category A and Categories B & C combined to be approved, due to its implications for the Statutes and Rules of Procedure.

At the request of the **Czech Union for Nature Conservation**, the **Chair** extended the voting time to one minute to facilitate the casting of proxy votes.

The **Chair** opened a vote on Motion M.

Congress took the following decision [[voting result](#)]:

DECISION 7

Congress DOES NOT APPROVE Motion M.

The WILD Foundation (USA) asked the Legal Adviser to clarify which Statute or Rule of Procedure required a two-thirds majority for the motion to be carried. The overall process followed under this agenda item had been very unclear.

The **Legal Adviser** referred to Article 19 of the Statutes stating that, “The World Congress shall consist of the duly accredited delegates of the Members of IUCN meeting in session”. This clearly referred to Members being physically present or having made provision for proxy voting. The impact of Motion M would be to temporarily suspend this element of the Statutes and would therefore require a two-thirds majority, similar to amendments to the Statutes made under Article 107 of the Statutes.

Agenda item 3.3 – Update of the Resolutions Committee on progress of the discussions in Contact Groups, followed by discussion and vote on motions

The **Chair of the Resolutions Committee** (Jon Paul Rodríguez) presented the Committee’s update on the status of motions. He confirmed that the following six motions were ready for consideration by plenary, following resolution of all matters raised in corresponding Contact Groups. All were available online in the three IUCN languages.

- Motion 013 *Protection of Andes-Amazon rivers of Peru: the Marañón, Ucayali, Huallaga and Amazonas, from large-scale infrastructure projects*
- Motion 044 *Actions to strengthen food sovereignty and security of indigenous peoples and peasant communities*
- Motion 048 *Renunciation of the Doctrine of Discovery to Rediscover care for Mother Earth*
- Motion 069 *Protection of deep-ocean ecosystems and biodiversity through a moratorium on seabed mining*
- Motion 084 *Taking action to reduce light pollution*
- Motion 118 *Reinforcing the protection of marine mammals through regional cooperation*

Motion 069 was being submitted to plenary in its original form, without amendment, whereas the other five motions were submitted as amended by the relevant Contact Groups.

The work of the Contact Groups for the following motions had been completed and the corresponding texts would soon be ready, in three languages, for consideration by plenary:

- Motion 021 *Planning [of maritime areas] [of the maritime area] and biodiversity [and geodiversity] conservation*
- Motion 034 *[Climate Change and Biodiversity Crisis] [Promoting integrated solutions to the climate change and biodiversity crises]*
- Motion 039 *Protecting environmental human and peoples' rights defenders and whistleblowers*
- Motion 062 *Towards a Policy on Natural Capital*
- Motion 101 *Setting area-based conservation targets based on evidence of what nature and people need to thrive*
- Motion 125 *Strengthening the protection of primary and old-growth forests in Europe and facilitating their restoration where possible*

Mr Rodríguez provided progress reports on a further seven motions that were currently still under active consideration by Contact Groups, namely: Motion 003 *[Establishing a Climate Change Commission] [Establishing an Inter-Commissional Cross-Sectoral Task Force on the Climate Crisis] [Establishing an IUCN Climate Task Force]*, Motion 024 *Restoring a peaceful and quiet ocean*, Motion 040 *Develop and implement a transformational and effective post-2020 global biodiversity framework*, Motion 045 *Recognising and supporting indigenous peoples' and local communities' rights and roles in conservation*, Motion 067 *Reducing the impacts of the mining industry on biodiversity*, Motion 075 *IUCN Principles on Synthetic Biology and Biodiversity Conservation* and Motion 126 *Advancing conservation and sustainable use of marine biological diversity in the ocean beyond national jurisdiction*.

He reported that a total of 22 new and urgent motions had been presented to the Congress Resolutions Committee. Of these, two did not fulfil the specified criteria of being co-sponsored by Members from two IUCN Statutory regions; one motion had been presented by a non-Member and was therefore disqualified; and one had been submitted after the deadline and so could not be considered. Of the 18 new and urgent motions that passed the initial statutory requirements and checks, nine had been accepted by the Resolutions Committee, one had been referred to the Congress Governance Committee, and eight had been rejected. The Congress Steering Committee had received eight appeals against the rejection decisions reached by the Congress Resolutions Committee.

Of the new and urgent motions that had been accepted by the Congress Resolutions Committee, the following were already under active consideration by Contact Groups.

- Motion 130 *Strengthening sustainable tourism's role in biodiversity conservation and community resilience*
- Motion 131 *Ensuring adequate funding for the IUCN Red List of Threatened Species*

- Motion 132 *Controlling and monitoring trade in croaker swim bladders to protect target croakers and reduce incidental catches of threatened marine megafauna*
- Motion 133 *Call to withdraw draft-permit exploration of fossil fuels underneath UNESCO World Heritage Site Wadden Sea*
- Motion 136 *Protecting the Okavango from oil and gas exploitation*

In addition, first meetings of Contact Groups had been scheduled for Motion 129 *Avoiding the point of no return in the Amazon protecting 80% by 2025* and Motion 134 *Grand Inga Dam project development* had been scheduled.

Stop Ecocide International Ltd (UK) indicated its wish to raise a Point of Order in relation to Motion 003.

The **Legal Adviser** observed that Motion 003 had not yet been tabled for the consideration of plenary, so a Point of Order would not be valid.

With regard to new and urgent motions that had not been accepted by the Resolutions Committee, the **Legal Adviser** noted that, as per Rule 52 (c) of the Rules of Procedure, it was the prerogative of the Congress Resolutions Committee to decide if new and urgent motions met the specified criteria. Once the Resolutions Committee had made this determination, there was an appeal process under Rule 55. This tasked the Congress Steering Committee with deciding whether to uphold or overturn the decision of the Resolutions Committee. However, the Members' Assembly itself was ultimately empowered to confirm, or not confirm, the decisions of the Congress Steering Committee.

The **Chair** underlined that those who felt aggrieved by the appeal rulings made by the Congress Steering Committee could make a direct request for the issue to be considered by the Members' Assembly. In the interests of time, such requests should be submitted later that same day, 8 September 2021.

The **Chair** then proceeded to voting on the six motions that the Chair of the Congress Resolutions Committee had indicated were ready for plenary consideration.

Congress decided to approve the following motions, without further amendment:

Motion 013 – *Protection of Andes-Amazon rivers of Peru: the Marañón, Ucayali, Huallaga and Amazonas, from large-scale infrastructure projects*

DECISION 8

Congress ADOPTS Motion 013.

[\[voting record\]](#)

State and agency Members of the United States abstained during the vote on this motion.

Motion 044 – *Actions to strengthen food sovereignty and security of indigenous peoples and peasant communities*

DECISION 9

Congress ADOPTS Motion 044.

[\[voting record\]](#)

State and agency Members of the United States voted against this motion.

State Member **France** provided the following explanatory statement for the record concerning the vote of the French delegation on Motion 044:

“For France, the references to the UNDROP are interpreted on the basis of the universality, indivisibility, interdependence and interrelatedness of all human rights.”

Motion 048 – *Renunciation of the Doctrine of Discovery to Rediscover care for Mother Earth*

DECISION 10

Congress ADOPTS Motion 048.

[\[voting record\]](#)

State and agency Members of the United States abstained during the vote on this motion.

Motion 069 – *Protection of deep-ocean ecosystems and biodiversity through a moratorium on seabed mining*

DECISION 11

Congress ADOPTS Motion 069.

[\[voting record\]](#)

State and agency Members of the United States abstained during the vote on this motion.

Motion 084 – *Taking action to reduce light pollution*

DECISION 12

Congress ADOPTS Motion 084.

[\[voting record\]](#)

Motion 118 – *Reinforcing the protection of marine mammals through regional cooperation*

DECISION 13

Congress ADOPTS Motion 118.

[\[voting record\]](#)

The Chair of the Governance Committee (Amran Hamzah, Malaysia) provided updates on the 12 governance-related motions (Motions A to L, respectively) that had been submitted prior to the Congress and one new and urgent motion (Motion N *Enabling effective attendance and participation of Members in future sessions of the World Conservation Congress*) presented by the Members during the current Congress. An additional governance-related motion, Motion M, had already been voted on, during the current Sitting. Motions A to L had been discussed in Contact Groups that met between 5 and 8 September 2021, whilst a Contact Group for Motion N was being arranged.

Mr Hamzah reminded Members that all governance-related motions were available online and that those recommended as being ready for plenary consideration were published in the three official languages. This applied to six motions: Motion C, Motion D, Motion E, Motion F, Motion G, and Motion I.

Governance Motion C – *Establishment of an elected indigenous Councillor position*

The **Chair of the Governance Committee** stated that this motion had been reviewed by a Contact Group on 5 September 2021. The Contact Group had recommended that the Motion be submitted without amendment. The Congress Governance Committee had reviewed the advice of the Contact Group and recommended that Motion C be presented to the Members' Assembly without amendment.

The **Chair** opened the vote on Governance Motion C.

The **Members' Assembly** adopted Governance Motion C without amendment.

DECISION 14

Congress ADOPTS Governance Motion C.

[\[voting record\]](#)

Governance Motion D – *Modification of the term “Regional Councillor”*

The **Chair of the Governance Committee** stated that this motion had been reviewed by a Contact Group on 5 September 2021. The Contact Group had recommended that the Motion be submitted without amendment. The Congress Governance Committee had reviewed the advice of the Contact Group and recommended that Motion D be presented to the Members' Assembly without amendment.

The **Chair** opened the vote on Governance Motion D.

The **Members' Assembly** adopted Governance Motion D without amendment.

DECISION 15

Congress ADOPTS Governance Motion D.

[\[voting record\]](#)

Governance Motion E – *To protect the intellectual independence of the knowledge-based and evidence-based work carried out by the Commissions and Secretariat of IUCN.*

The **Chair of the Governance Committee** stated that this motion had been reviewed by a Contact Group on 5 September 2021. The Contact Group had recommended that the Motion be submitted with amendments. The Congress Governance Committee had reviewed the advice of the Contact Group and recommended that Motion E be presented to the Members' Assembly as amended by the Contact Group.

The **Chair** opened the vote on Governance Motion E.

The **Members' Assembly** adopted Governance Motion E as amended by the Contact Group.

DECISION 16

Congress ADOPTS Governance Motion E, as amended.

[\[voting record\]](#)

Governance Motion F – Role of Commissions in National and Regional Committees

The **Chair of the Governance Committee** stated that this motion had been reviewed by a Contact Group on 6 September 2021. The Contact Group had recommended that the Motion be submitted without amendment. The Congress Governance Committee had reviewed the advice of the Contact Group and recommended that Motion F be presented to the Members' Assembly without amendment.

The **Chair** opened the vote on Governance Motion F.

The **Members' Assembly** adopted Governance Motion F without amendment.

DECISION 17

Congress ADOPTS Governance Motion F.

[\[voting record\]](#)

Governance Motion G – Clarification of conditions for readmission of former State Members

The **Chair of the Governance Committee** stated that this motion had been reviewed by a Contact Group on 5 September 2021. The Contact Group had recommended that the Motion be submitted without amendment. The Congress Governance Committee had reviewed the advice of the Contact Group and recommended that Motion G be presented to the Members' Assembly without amendment.

The **Chair** opened the vote on Motion G, noting that adoption would require approval by a majority of at least two-thirds in membership category A and in membership categories B & C combined.

The **Members' Assembly** adopted Governance Motion G without amendment.

DECISION 18

Congress ADOPTS Governance Motion G.

[\[voting record\]](#)

Motion I – Functions of the IUCN Treasurer

The **Chair of the Governance Committee** stated that this motion had been reviewed by a Contact Group on 5 September 2021. The Contact Group had recommended that the Motion be submitted without amendment. The Congress Governance Committee had reviewed the advice of the Contact Group and recommended that Motion I be presented to the Members' Assembly without amendment.

The **Chair** opened the vote on Motion I, noting that adoption would require approval by a majority of at least two-thirds in membership category A and in membership categories B & C combined.

The **Members' Assembly** adopted Governance Motion I without amendment.

DECISION 19

Congress ADOPTS Governance Motion I.

[\[voting record\]](#)

The **Chair of the Congress Governance Committee** confirmed that all Governance motions ready for consideration by the 3rd Sitting had now been dealt with. He thanked all Members for their hard work.

Before proceeding to the next agenda item, the **Chair** gave the floor to **Councillor Jennifer Mohamed-Katerere** who provided details on how Members could submit comments on the draft Marseille Manifesto, which was now available online in three languages.

The **Chair** noted that the **President** and **Director General** had suggested that Members who wished to submit questions about their respective reports to Congress, presented during the 2nd Sitting, could do so by email until 9 September at 14:00 hrs. Answers would be provided during subsequent Sittings, either later on 9 September, or on 10 September.

Agenda item 3.4 – Reports of the following IUCN Commissions including Awards established by these Commissions: WCEL, WCPA, SSC

The **Chair** informed Members that, due to time constraints, there would only be one Commission report, namely that of the World Commission on Protected Areas (WCPA), during the 3rd Sitting. The Reports of WCEL and SSC would be held over to the 4th Sitting.

In a pre-recorded video, the **Chair of WCPA**, Dr Kathy MacKinnon, presented highlights of the Commission's report for 2017–2021, contained in Congress Document CGR-2021-3.3/1 Annex 2. She reported on progress under each of WCPA's Global Targets (Valuing and Conserving Nature, Governance, Nature-based Solutions) and briefly reviewed the Commission's work to further science and good practice, and capacity building, and to contribute to IUCN's respond to the COVID-19 pandemic. In the run-up to the current Congress, WCPA had, together with the IUCN Global Protected Areas Programme, run an online platform *Vital Sites: the Road to Marseille*. This had comprised over 30 online events since June 2020, involving more than 4,000 participants worldwide.

World Commission on Protected Areas Awards

The **Chair of WCPA** recalled that the recipients of the Kenton R. Miller Award – which celebrated individuals taking bold steps in ensuring the long-term sustainability of protected areas by developing and applying innovative policies, scientific knowledge, technologies, field practices, or governance models – had been announced during an online ceremony in 2020, as:

- Nizar Youssef Hani, Shouf Biosphere Reserve (Lebanon)
- Pedro Estêvão Muagura, Gorongosa National Park (Mozambique)

The Fred Packard Award for outstanding service to protected areas had been presented to nine individuals:

- James Barnes (USA)
- Silvana Campello (Brazil)
- Penelope Figgis A.O. (Australia)
- Sarat Babu Gidda (India)
- Dan Laffoley (UK)

- David MacKinnon (Canada)
- Denise M. Rambaldi (Brazil)
- Pedro Rosabal (Switzerland)
- Romeo B. Trono (Philippines)

The first ten recipients of the new International Ranger Awards, announced in an online ceremony earlier in 2021, were:

- Giorgi Abramishvili (Georgia)
- Offossou d'Andous Kissi (Côte d'Ivoire)
- Ninfa Carianil (Colombia)
- Chhay Reap community crocodile wardens (Cambodia)
- Sergey Erofeev (Russia)
- Mahindra Giri (India)
- Team Menabe Antimena (Madagascar)
- Anety Milimo (Zambia)
- Aung Zaw Myint (Myanmar)
- Sathish Sundaram (India)

Agenda item 3.5 – Presentation of the laureate(s) of the John C. Phillips Memorial Medal and the Harold Jefferson Coolidge Memorial Medal, and approval of the laureate(s) for Honorary Membership of IUCN

The **Chair** invited **IUCN Regional Councillor for Meso and South America**, Mr Lider Sucre, to host the presentation of the IUCN Awards.

John C. Phillips Memorial Medal presentation

Councillor Sucre recalled that the John C. Phillips Memorial Medal had been presented at every IUCN Assembly and Congress since 1963. The awardee was selected by a jury composed of five serving members of the Governance and Constituency Committee of the IUCN Council. Distinguished recipients of the Award had included His Royal Highness Prince Bernhard of the Netherlands, Mrs Indira Gandhi, His Majesty Sultan Qaboos Bin Said of Oman, Professor E. O. Wilson, Dr Luc Hoffmann, Sir David Attenborough, and the last awardee, Dr Maria Tereza Jorge Pádua, each of whom had contributed their vision, wisdom and perseverance to furthering the global conservation cause. He had great pleasure in announcing that the esteemed recipient of the John C. Phillips Memorial Medal in 2021 was **Mr Alfred Oteng Yeboah** (Ghana), in recognition of his outstanding service to international conservation.

Expressing deep gratitude for the award, Mr Alfred Oteng Yeboah said that:

“Nature has rights and these rights must be respected. We must always remain convinced that Nature has its own way of survival and will bounce back one day, sooner or later but hopefully when it does bounce back, it will not be with revenge. I have always been convinced that if we are able to protect biodiversity, then land degradation and climate change will be things of the past. While I am the one receiving this award, I would like to recognise with gratitude a number of individuals and institutions that have supported the work that I have set out to do, including IUCN, the Government of Ghana and African delegations at several UN sponsored meetings.”

Presentation of the Harold Jefferson Coolidge Memorial Medal

Councillor Sucre recalled that this award was presented to a conservation professional who had made outstanding contributions to the conservation of nature and natural resources. The Medal had first been awarded in 2008 in honour of one of the founders of IUCN and the awardee was selected by a jury consisting of five serving members of the Governance and Constituency Committee of the IUCN Council and three eminent conservation leaders. He announced that the recipient of the Harold Jefferson Coolidge Memorial Medal was **Dr Lisa Dabek** (USA), founding director of the Tree Kangaroo Conservation Programme in Papua New Guinea, in recognition of her outstanding work on the conservation and protection of tree kangaroos.

Since Lisa Dabek had been unable to travel to Marseille to receive the award in person, Mr Sucre invited **Mr Russell Mittermeier**, former IUCN Councillor from 2004 to 2012 and IUCN Vice-President from 2008 to 2012, to collect the award on her behalf.

Dr Dabek conveyed her gratitude in a video message, saying:

“I would like to thank IUCN and its Council for this great honour. It is fitting that I am the first woman to receive this honour and I stand before you today representing all women conservation scientists. My ambition is to teach and inspire the next generation of nature conservationists and to support young women to be equal partners in conservation.”

Presentation of IUCN Honorary Membership

Councillor Sucre recalled that Honorary Membership was dedicated to the recognition of those individuals who had made exceptional contributions to furthering the goals of the Union and had been bestowed on deserving individuals since the establishment of IUCN in 1948. He had great pleasure in announcing that the four recipients of the IUCN Honorary Membership, in recognition of their many years of outstanding service in nature conservation in their respective countries and worldwide, were:

- Jane Goodall (UK)
- Chief Raoni Metiktire (Brazil)
- Assad Serhal (Lebanon)
- Richard Watling (Fiji)

Congress confirmed, by acclamation, the awarding of IUCN Honorary Membership to the above-named individuals.

DECISION 20

Congress CONFERS IUCN Honorary Membership on Jane Goodall (UK), Chief Raoni Metiktire (Brazil), Assad Serhal (Lebanon) and Richard Watling (Fiji).

The **Chair** thanked Councillor Sucre and offered congratulations to all laureates and awardees.

Drawing the Awards Ceremony to a close, the **President** congratulated all laureates and thanked everyone who had contributed to a special evening.

4th Sitting of the Members' Assembly

Thursday 9 September 2021 (08:30–12:30)

The **President** welcomed delegates to the second day of the Members' Assembly and expressed regret that his interventions would be limited due to his virtual participation. He introduced the Chair for the 4th Sitting of the Members' Assembly, **Vice-President Malik Amin Aslam Khan**.

The **Chair** invited the **Chair of the Credentials Committee** (Jenny Gruenberger) to provide an update on the participation data of accredited Members.

Ms Gruenberger reported that the potential voting power held by IUCN Members in good standing was:

Category A (States and Government Agencies): 268 votes

Categories B & C (International and National NGOs and IPOs): 1,202 votes

As of 9 September 2021, the voting power of accredited Members represented at the 2021 World Conservation Congress was:

Category A (States and Government Agencies): 180 votes (67%)

Categories B & C (International and National NGOs and IPOs): 765 votes (64%).

Agenda item 4.1 – Discussion of issues of strategic importance for the Union and reports from the Summits (continued)

Agenda item 4.1.1 – Report on the results of the *World Summit of Indigenous Peoples and Nature*

The **Chair** invited **Graciela Coy**, representative of Ak'Tenamit, Indigenous Q'eqchi' woman from Guatemala, and **Paul Kanyike Sena**, Director, Indigenous Peoples of Africa Co-ordinating Committee (IPACC), Indigenous Maasai, to present the results of the World Summit of Indigenous Peoples and Nature.

Ms Coy outlined the self-determining and participatory planning for the World Summit, which had been held virtually between January and August 2021.

The main results had been:

- The launch of the Global Indigenous Agenda for the Governance of Indigenous Lands, Territories, Waters, Coastal Seas and Natural Resources;
- Some donors had expressed interest in dialoguing with IPOs to find ways to support the implementation of the Global Indigenous Agenda; and
- A space for dialogue was opened between the IPOs and the IUCN Director General.

The high-level priorities on the Global Indigenous Agenda were concerned with:

- Collective indigenous rights and governance of territories;
- Promotion of Indigenous solutions to conserving biodiversity and addressing the climate crisis;
- Influencing the Post COVID-19 recovery and food-security agendas; and
- Increasing and strengthening indigenous leadership.

The way forward would involve implementing the Global Indigenous Agenda, growing and strengthening the Indigenous Peoples and Conservation Programme, and growing and strengthening Indigenous membership and participation in the governance of IUCN.

Agenda item 4.1.2 – Strategic discussion: Structuring economies in a post COVID-19 world

The **Chair** introduced the **Moderator** of the strategic discussion, **Angela Andrade** (Colombia), Senior Climate Change and Biodiversity Policy Director, Conservation International and Chair of the IUCN Commission on Ecosystem Management.

Ms Andrade stressed that while the COVID-19 pandemic had presented challenges to people and nature, recovery from the pandemic offered opportunities for Nature-based Solutions, especially in land use, where there were major issues concerning governance. Resources would be mobilised on a massive scale to facilitate economic recovery from the pandemic and care would be required to ensure that recovery was as sustainable as possible. The discussion to follow would start with presentations from different areas of IUCN's constituency, with contributors comprising two governmental representatives, one NGO representative, and one IUCN staff member.

The **Moderator** concluded her introduction with a short practical exercise during which she asked all delegates to identify two or three urgent priorities that should be central to a strategy for structuring economies in a post COVID-19 world, and to spend two to three minutes discussing these with the person nearest to them, as a way of stimulating thought and debate.

The **Moderator** introduced the first speaker, **Oh Il Young, Senior Government Manager, Republic of Korea and IUCN Strategic Partnerships Unit, IUCN–Republic of Korea.**

Mr Young delivered a presentation entitled *Nature based Recovery in South Korea*. Presidential leadership and multiple ministries were driving an ambitious Green New Deal in the country, with a strategy for carbon neutrality by 2050. Financial investment was growing in nature-based projects including carbon sequestration, restoration of wetlands, urban forestry, and marine waste management. Institutional approaches to nature-based recovery included new legislation, a new funding mechanism – the Climate Change Fund – and development of a nature-based strategy for climate change mitigation and adaptation. Strong indicators and targets had been established to facilitate scaled-up investment, and Nature-based Solution projects for climate mitigation and adaptation were under development. Mr Young concluded by proposing a global nature-dedicated financial body and suggesting the establishment of a Green Climate and Biodiversity Fund.

The **Moderator** thanked Mr Young, and introduced the next speaker, **Hédi Chebili, General Director of Environment and Quality of Life, Ministry of Local Affairs and Environment, Tunisia.**

Mr Chebili reminded delegates of the extent of economic damage caused by the COVID-19 pandemic, and characterised this as mother nature being fierce and showing her claws. The creation and restoration of natural ecosystems would be an important part of the recovery from economic decline caused by the pandemic. In Tunisia, support from Germany had allowed the development of a sustainable economic model based on green investment and Nature-based Solutions. An energy transition was planned, involving the use of hydrogen power, and acceleration of electrification of transport, and innovation in building construction and biodiversity conservation. Green jobs would be promoted through taxation policy and promotion of a circular economy, while investment in infrastructure that was resilient to climate change would be achieved through decisive political will set in a global vision. This would all require new methods, considerable means, and strong cooperation.

The **Moderator** thanked Mr Chebili and introduced **Andrea Athanas, Programme Design Director in Europe** for the **African Wildlife Foundation**.

Ms Athanas recalled a meeting convened by IUCN 60 years ago in Arusha, Tanzania where an agenda for the conservation of wildlife in newly independent African states had been established. The Arusha Manifesto recognised African wildlife as an integral part of the future of livelihoods and wellbeing, and the Prime Minister of Tanzania, Julius Nyerere, had written that in accepting the trusteeship of African Wildlife, participants should do everything in their power to ensure that their children and grandchildren would be able to enjoy a rich natural inheritance. Ms Athanas pointed out that the Arusha Manifesto had failed. It was now essential to transition to a model of development with the well-being of people and nature at its heart, involving a profound rethink of economic systems. She proposed three ways forward:

- Investing in nature as if it mattered. 82% of parks in Africa suffered from chronic underfunding. There were solutions such as trust funds, but there was a need for massive scaling up of efforts.
- Making productive systems work for people and nature. Landscapes and seascapes were mosaics, with individual pieces reinforcing one another. The African Wildlife Foundation was working in Tanzania with rice, sugar and cocoa farmers to integrate forest management and other sustainable practices into their production systems. It had also established systems of governance to support forests and wetlands. These activities had the effect of creating public trust and resilience. Such systems were undermined by the commodification of global supply chains.
- Putting people at the centre. Humanity and nature were in danger because mankind was unable to control production and consumption. Indigenous peoples could provide solutions. Smallholder farmers produced 70-80% of the world's food and it was crucial that they were included in solutions to transition to a resilient future. Likewise, small businesses and young entrepreneurs were overshadowed by big business, and there was a need to invest in their sustainable future.

Ms Athanas concluded by saying she had never seen opportunities such as those available in the aftermath of the pandemic for putting people and nature at the centre of economic development.

The **Moderator** stressed the need to accelerate solutions to a whole series of urgent and pressing issues that would require new financial means. Nature-based Solutions would be a basic tool for putting people and nature at the centre of economic systems, and local communities had a role whose importance needed to be emphasised.

The **Moderator** invited **Sonia Peña Moreno, Coordinator Global Biodiversity Policy and Governance, IUCN Secretariat**, to present the IUCN Director General's Initiative on a Nature-based Recovery.

Ms Peña Moreno emphasised the importance of a post-pandemic recovery that was nature positive. She presented two key objectives of the IUCN Initiative: first, ensuring that economic investment did no additional harm to nature and livelihoods, and secondly, directing at least 10% of overall recovery investment towards Nature-based Solutions. A core part of the work was engagement with Members, Commissions and IUCN constituents at large, as together they offered a powerful network. She reported on two virtual Member meetings organised in 2021 to discuss challenges and opportunities, as well as the results of a survey that identified lack of political will, followed closely by lack of knowledge, as key challenges. She underlined that IUCN had the expertise to present background data and provide scientific and technical advice to make the case for a nature-based recovery, but that a collective effort would be required to achieve real impact. In this regard, further regionally focused conversations with Members were planned for later in 2021.

Facilitated discussion

The **Moderator** invited questions and comments from delegates, including those participating virtually.

Unnayan Onneshan (Bangladesh) pointed out that the pandemic had widened the economic gap between developing and developed countries. The economic impact of COVID has particularly affected the most vulnerable and poor. It was crucial to align debt restructuring with development goals for developing countries and to place renewed focus on environmental and social dimensions. A concerted effort – a ‘whole of society, whole of world’ approach – was required, with people at the centre for an inclusive, just, and fair world.

Patronato de la Reserva Paisajística Nor Yauyos Cochas (Peru) said that local markets had enabled smaller communities to continue activities throughout the pandemic, something not possible in cities. The survival of a society depended on local economic systems and a diversification of solutions was required.

Fundación Biosfera del Anahuac A.C. (Mexico) emphasised the need to include indigenous communities and to train them in regaining rights to the use of their territories.

Centre de Suivi Ecologique (Senegal) remarked that the issue of securing economies must entail a reorientation at international level. There was a need for more concrete actions, including the effective utilisation of the funds available.

In response to a question regarding the type of mechanisms needed at various scales for the evaluation and monitoring progress, **Ms Peña Moreno** highlighted the need for robust indicators to track policies and measures. It was not enough to redirect investments; it was just as important to demonstrate impact and to ensure the right policy framework is put in place.

Mr Oh Il Young added that monitoring and evaluation were critical and emphasised the need to develop a financial tracking system that could increase transparency concerning financial flows directed towards climate change and biodiversity.

Department of State, Bureau of Oceans and International Environmental and Scientific Affairs (USA) welcomed the discussion and noted the issues raised were key to President Biden’s ‘America the Beautiful’ initiative, which aimed to protect 30% of the nation’s lands and waters. The US recognised IUCN’s important role in developing tools to support Members in the implementation of effective Nature-based Solutions.

Ministère de l’Environnement (Tunisia) asked whether IUCN aimed to build a stronger health and ecosystem programme. The **Moderator** invited panellists to reflect on how IUCN could include the One Health approach in private and state strategies.

In response, **Ms Athanas** acknowledged the extensive knowledge present in the room, which underscored the power of the Union. She stressed the opportunities ahead, with IUCN contributing through guidelines and knowledge products, which should be directed towards decision makers taking actions that impacted livelihoods. Such knowledge products should consider not only the global system, but also (and especially) local systems to enable the transition to more resilient economic recovery.

Adding to the discussion, **Mr Chebili** reflected on the fact that CBD COP14 had been the first time that biodiversity was included in discussions around agriculture, land management and industry among others. He stressed the importance of giving substance to ideas to translate them into action.

To a question from a virtual participant, **Ms Peña Moreno** commented on the need to ensure that the measures proposed for economic recovery did not negatively impact biodiversity. The emphasis should be on policies and measures that contributed to the greening of economic recovery. This could be done by putting in place sound indicators to monitor trade-offs and potential negative impacts that might be harmful to nature and livelihoods. In addition, **Ms Athanas** stressed the need to look to governance systems, to include local and indigenous peoples, and to promote agency.

Building on previous interventions, the **Moderator** asked panellists about the role IUCN should play in facilitating a unified voice.

Mr Chebili called for a knowledge-based society and a coordinated approach between states and organisations. **Mr Young** added that IUCN had an important role in providing guidance on how to advance an science-/evidence-based approach, given its unique governance structure and the diversity of the Union's membership.

After thanking the panellists and the audience, the **Moderator** closed the session, remarking on the need for IUCN to speak on the topic with single, clear voice.

The **Chair** thanked Ms Andrade for moderating an interesting debate.

Agenda item 4.2 – Reports of IUCN Commissions including Awards established by these Commissions

The **Chair** recalled that the Chair of the World Commission on Protected Areas, Kathy MacKinnon, had presented her report during the 3rd Sitting. The 4th Sitting would now receive reports from as many of the other Commission Chairs as time allowed.

The **Chair of the Species Survival Commission – SSC** (Jon Paul Rodríguez) presented the Report of the Species Survival Commission for 2017–2020 (contained in Congress document CGR-2021-3.3/1 Annex 3). He presented the updated structure and governance framework of SSC for the intersessional period 2020–2024 that had been adopted by IUCN Members in February 2021 and provided information on the networks of the Commission and highlighted major achievements.

He summarised five key components of SSC's work:

- Network – enhancing and supporting the SSC network to further significant outcomes across the species conservation cycle;
- Assess – informing the world about the status and trends of biodiversity, thus providing measures for the health of the biosphere;
- Plan – enhance collaborative, inclusive and science-based strategies, including policy change, to ensure the most effective species conservation actions;
- Act – improving the status of biodiversity, by convening and mobilising actions involving governments, academia, civil society and the private sector; and
- Communicate – expanding the effectiveness of IUCN's species conservation work through strategic and targeted communications.

He drew attention to the appointment of Vivek Menon (also a newly elected Councillor) as Deputy Chair of SSC. There had been a 26% increase in SSC membership since 2017, with a total of 10,600 members from 174 countries working in 164 Specialist Groups. A major priority for the coming year would be the diversification of SSC membership and of the SSC Steering Committee, giving particular consideration to age, gender, expertise and geographical origin. At present, 70% of Commission members were male and 30% female, with an average age of over 60 years. It was noted that the work of SSC largely depended on alliances and cooperation with various organisations, with

Centres for Species Survival playing a critical role. Currently SSC was working on the establishment of three new centres, with an additional six under consideration. In conclusion, despite the COVID pandemic, most of the work of the Commission continued, albeit with some reorganisation being required.

Mr Rodríguez recalled that a number of SSC awards had been announced and presented during the run-up to the Marseille Congress.

The **Peter Scott Award for Conservation Merit** was presented to individuals in recognition of exceptional service and leadership to species conservation over many years through their work with the SSC. The 2019 recipients were:

- **George Archibald** in recognition of leadership of crane conservation worldwide;
- **Dr Nicole Duplaix** in recognition of her commitment to the SSC for more than fifty years;
- **Vololoniaina Jeannoda** in recognition of leadership of the Madagascar Plant Specialist Group;
- **Frédéric Launay** in recognition of his leadership in SSC for almost 30 years, chairing the Reintroduction Specialist Group;
- **Anslem Lawrence de Silva** in recognition of commitment to reptile and amphibian research and conservation in Sri Lanka;
- **Dr David Mallon** in recognition of his contribution through SSC to large mammal conservation in Asia and Africa; and
- **Randall Reeves** in recognition of leadership of the Cetacean Specialist Group.

The **George Rabb award for Conservation Innovation** was presented to individuals in recognition of delivery of transformational advances in conservation theory and practice. The 2019 recipients were:

- **Wendy Foden** in recognition of her innovative, dynamic and thoughtful leadership of SSC's work on climate change; and
- **Lisa Dabek** in recognition of her leadership and innovation in the conservation of tree kangaroos and her commitment to conservation and local people in Papua New Guinea for more than three decades.

The **Harry Messel Award for Conservation Leadership** was presented to individuals in recognition of exemplary service to SSC. The 2019 recipients were:

- **Ariadne Angulo** in recognition of her strategic, focused and tireless leadership of amphibian conservation within SSC;
- **Andre Botha** in recognition of his leadership for vulture conservation in Africa since 2004 and co-chairing of the IUCN SSC Vulture Specialist Group;
- **Malin Rivers** in recognition of successful management of the Global Tree Assessment.
- **Pritpal Soorae** in recognition of more than 20 years of dedicated service to the SSC Conservation Translocation (formerly Reintroduction) Specialist Group; and
- **Laurent Tatin** in recognition for developing and leading the Crau Plain Grasshopper Conservation Strategy in France.

The **SSC Chair** concluded his report by listing the recipients of the 2019 SSC Chair's Citation of Excellence, which had been awarded to 37 Specialist Groups and other components of SSC in recognition of outstanding contributions to any of the Key Species Results established under the Species Strategic Plan.

The Chair of the Commission on Environmental Law (WCEL), Justice Antonio Benjamin, presented WCEL's Report to the Congress (contained in document CGR-2021-3.3/1 Annex 1). He recalled how the governance structure of the Steering Committee of the Commission, which was constituted by a majority of women (9/11), sent a strong message about gender balance in the areas of knowledge and social science. While mentioning the influence of the Commission's 1,500 members in over 130 countries – 85% of which were State Members of IUCN – he reminded delegates that more work needed to be done in Africa, as the biodiversity of the planet could not be protected if Africa was forgotten.

Among the ten Specialist Groups of the WCEL, particular attention was drawn to those focused on compliance and enforcement, ethics, and climate change. In relation to the first of these, law could only function if correctly implemented and enforced, and this should therefore be a priority of the Commission. Likewise, ethics was a core value of IUCN and there was a duty to integrate conservation ethics, human rights ethics and management ethics in all of the actions of IUCN and its Members. Finally, regarding climate change, IUCN should not deviate from its main objective of biodiversity conservation and should integrate climate change at the centre of its conservation actions.

Justice Benjamin applauded the election of the new **WCEL Chair, Christina Voigt**, as a leader in climate change law. In addition, he recognised the registration of the Global Judicial Institute for the Environment in Switzerland as one of most significant achievements in nine years, and thanked **IUCN Councillor Norbert Baerlocher** for facilitating this action. For the first time, a large number of Supreme Court Justices were Members of IUCN. WCEL had supported the creation of the IUCN Academy of Environmental Law – a brainchild of **Professor Nicholas Robinson** – which was now chaired by **Prof. Rosa Liza Eisma Osorio** of the Philippines.

Finally, the **WCEL Chair** recommended that delegates should consult online the Brasília Declaration of Judges on Water Justice (2018) and the IUCN World Declaration on the Environmental Rule of Law (2016), as good examples of laws created outside of regular bureaucratic international law processes.

The Chair of the Commission on Environmental, Economic and Social Policy (CEESP), Kristen Walker-Painemilla, presented her report (contained in Congress document CGR-2021-3.3/1 Annex 4). She drew attention to efforts to increase the Commission's visibility and membership, which had grown 68% (+1,300 members) since 2017, and presented the new CEESP logo developed to better represent the Commission's work.

Ms Walker-Painemilla summarised CEESP's main accomplishments, particularly highlighting the work carried out with indigenous communities and their increased engagement in IUCN's governance and global policy. A partnership with Communities, Conservation and Research Network (CCRN) had led to the organisation of the Communities, Conservation and Livelihoods Conference in Halifax in 2018 and the publication of a book, *Communities, conservation and livelihoods* in February 2021. Post-Congress, an innovative report would be published on the impact of migration of people and conflicts with nature conservation.

She introduced the new CEESP Roadmap 2021–2025 with its increased focus on justice, equity and inclusion, and greater emphasis on economics and finance from an equity perspective. The Roadmap also prioritised the integration of traditional knowledge with Western science, and increased work on oceans and climate. The Commission's campaign to 're-imagine conservation' was encouraging thinking 'outside the box' to achieve the system-level changes required for much greater impact.

The presentation of CEESP Awards was announced as follows:

- The **Honorary CEESP Chair's Award** was presented to **Aroha Mead** from the Ngati Awa and Ngati Porou Maori tribes of Aotearoa in New Zealand, for her voice as an indigenous woman.
- The **CEESP Agent of Change Award** was presented to **Adalberto Padilla** from IUCN Honduras for his support for indigenous peoples on the issue of governance.
- The **Conservation Practitioner Award** went to **Jessica Campese** for her work with CEESP and in particular on the Natural Resource Governance Framework.

Ms Walker-Painemilla concluded by highlighting the need for greater protection for environmental defenders. She invited the Assembly to stand and observe a minute's silence. Delegates raised flowers, each one representing one of the 331 environmental defenders who had lost their lives in 2020.

Following the minute's silence and sustained applause as a mark of respect and gratitude, the **Chair** opened the floor to comment and questions from Members on any of the Commission Reports.

COORF Wildlife Society (India) commented on the vulnerability of fishing communities to sea-level rise. Millions were being invested in major infrastructure projects in coastal areas, and communities were being displaced, but these infrastructure projects would themselves also become vulnerable to sea-level rise. IUCN was requested to red-flag this issue.

Fisheries Action Coalition Team – FACT (Cambodia) observed that biodiversity and ecosystems were crucially important for human beings, but all trends were negative in terms of human impacts on nature, especially the impacts of the richest. The Marseille Congress had not seriously engaged the private sector as one of the most important stakeholders. There was a need for a specific emergency-response platform to address the issues effectively; this could not wait another four years until the next IUCN Congress.

The **Chair** recalled that a private-sector summit had taken place just before the Members' Assembly.

Centre for Conservation and Development (Iran) did not have much faith in talk of a post-COVID nature recovery. Wiping away the human footprint of centuries in a few years was not possible and nature conservation was not yet included as a priority in most government policies and budgets.

The **Chair** acknowledged that other Members were asking for the floor but advised that the time available for this item during the 4th Sitting had come to an end. He was therefore closing the Sitting. The final Commission reports and further discussion would be taken up by the 5th Sitting.

5th Sitting of the Members' Assembly

Thursday 9 September 2021 (14:00–18:15)

Agenda item 4.2 – Reports of the following IUCN Commissions including Awards established by these Commissions: CEESP, CEM, CEC (continued from 4th Sitting)

The Chair of the Commission on Ecosystem Management – CEM (Angela Andrade) presented highlights of the Commission's report, available in full as Congress document CGR-2021-3.3/1 Annex 5, recalled the mission and objectives of the CEM, outlining its five priority areas: Ecosystem Governance, Red List of Ecosystems, Ecosystem Resilience, Nature-based Solutions and Culture and Ecosystem Management.

She highlighted the work of the Commission's 16 thematic groups and 17 Specialist Groups and Task Forces and noted that CEM now had 2,000 members, 25% of which were young professionals, often working as regional co-chairs, with increasing influence. Climate change had been an area that Commission Members had been working on for many years, including in the international policy arena.

Ms Andrade announced the presentation of two CEM awards:

- The **Luc Hoffmann Award 2020** was presented to **Prof. David Keith of Australia**, in recognition of his long professional career, proposing the Red List of Ecosystems and developing the typology; and
- The **Young Professional Award 2020**, was presented to **Jessica Rowland**, also of Australia, for her leadership and contribution to the development of ecosystem indicators and policies, among others.

The **Chair of the Commission on Education and Communication – CEC** (Sean Southey) provided an overview of CEC's work over the last five years, as detailed in Congress document CGR-2021-3.3/1 Annex 6. He thanked CEC's Deputy Chair Katalin Czippán, CEC Programme Officer Camila Perez Gabilondo and IUCN Deputy Forum Manager Hannah Moosa, for their support in organising and running the Youth Summit.

Mr Southey reported that CEC had reached the milestone of 2,000 members and planned to continue to build its membership, particularly in regions where representation was currently weaker. He noted that CEC had worked on increasing diversity and gender balance. As a result, almost 29% of CEC members were now young professionals.

He highlighted several flagship projects, such as 'NatureForAll', which was launched at the IUCN Congress in Hawai'i, and currently had more than 500 partner organisations from 80-plus countries, about half of which were IUCN Members. During the pandemic, CEC had created the 'Discovery Zone', a platform of educational resources for parents and students in multiple languages, and the Commission had also launched a 'Nature Storytelling Toolkit' to help experts articulate, edit and amplify their voices and those of communities – all from the convenience of their phone. Going forward, CEC planned to join other Commissions to support the *re-imagine* conservation campaign and to focus more on education.

Mr Southey concluded by announcing the presentation of CEC awards.

- The **CEC Chair's Award** was presented to **Parks Canada**; and
- The **Young Professional's Award** went to **Carlos del Ángel Estrada Marcos** of Mexico.

Last but not least under this agenda item the **Commission Chairs** announced the presentation of the **All-Commission Chairs Award for Extraordinary Commitment to IUCN Congress Director Enrique Lahmann** and the **IUCN Congress organising team**. This announcement was greeted with warm applause from the Assembly.

Agenda item 5.1 – Discussion of issues of strategic importance for the Union and reports from the Summits

Agenda item 5.1.1 – Report on the results of the CEOs Summit

The **Chair** (John Robinson, IUCN Vice-President and Regional Councillor for North America and the Caribbean) welcomed the **Director of IUCN’s Business and Biodiversity Programme** (Gerald Bos) to the stage and invited him to report on the IUCN CEOs Summit.

Mr Bos reported that the first ever CEO Summit at an IUCN World Conservation Congress had taken place on 3 September with the participation of more than 15 CEOs from various sectors of the economy, including the largest employers’ association in France, which represented 19,000 enterprises – small, medium and large. The Summit was divided into three panels, focusing on different strategic issues: the need for effective collaboration; ways in which to accelerate the energy transition towards a low carbon economy; and the enabling conditions for moving to a nature-positive and inclusive economy. By way of follow-up to the Summit, several important commitments had been announced by private-sector companies, including the launch of new nature-positive strategies from Holcim and L’Occitane.

Agenda item 5.1.2 – Strategic discussion: Building a culture of conservation through new alliances and strengthening the agency of key actors

The strategic discussion was facilitated by **Sean Southey, Chair of the Commission on Education and Communication – CEC**.

Mr Southey introduced the topic by highlighting the importance of creating a conservation culture of ‘care for nature’. He welcomed **Kevin Chang** to the stage for a live musical performance.

Following the musical interlude, **Mr Southey** invited Members to reflect on culture as a forest that grew from seeds, with interactions between larger and smaller trees. He highlighted the importance of soil and the richness of the soil ecosystem of which humans were the custodians. He invited delegates to participate in a rapid interactive survey, before introducing three keynote speakers.

Dr Margaret Otieno (Kenya), **CEO, Wildlife Clubs of Kenya**, reminisced about the first time that she had set eyes on wildlife as a little girl, which had led her to discovering her calling in life: conservation and protection of nature. She explained how the work of the Wildlife Clubs of Kenya enabled children and young people to engage and interact with nature – which dovetailed neatly with the aims of the NatureForAll initiative. Dr Otieno also emphasised the importance of education as a strong ally for conservation and highlighted the importance of having environmental education as part of the school curriculum. She issued a call to IUCN Members and the Commissions to come together and ensure that nature remained alive for current and future generations. She ended by explaining how she would like to expand the NatureForAll movement across Africa and eventually the world.

Jessica Sweidan, IUCN Patron of Nature, spoke of the importance of diversity in dealing with challenges and crises. She reported how the involvement of indigenous communities in Brazil and India had been key in conserving nature. Finally, she emphasised that the finance sector had grown increasingly interested in supporting conservation actions and while the sector was not interested in ‘one size fits all’ solutions, there was a wish to see long-term, systemic change.

Ms Xiye Bastida (Mexico) emphasised that the key to ethical conservation efforts was diversity and the inclusion of diverse backgrounds and points of view, because only through understanding one another would the world grow. She pointed out the importance of the power of local communities and indigenous wisdom in conservation action and that caring for nature should be at the heart of a culture aimed at reaching a state of balance between humans and nature.

Mr Southey thanked the keynote speakers and also **Synchronicity Earth** for providing photos for the preceding presentations. He invited the **Chair of the Species Survival Commission** (Jon Paul Rodríguez) to take the floor.

Mr Rodríguez moderated a panel discussion exploring how different sectors of society, from indigenous peoples to the private sector, could work together and with IUCN to bring about transformational change around the nature-culture relationship. He welcomed the first panellist, **Helen Crowley, Head of Sustainable Sourcing and Nature Initiatives at Kering**, highlighting the need to create alliances and partnerships with other sectors to achieve a culture of change.

The **Moderator** posed the following question: “What are the two biggest insights and learning from your work that could transform IUCN and the way we work with the private sector in the future?”

Ms Crowley responded that there had been tremendous change over the past few years in terms of awareness, willingness, and incentives for nature conservation and Nature-based Solutions on the part of the private sector. She emphasised three key aspects: the importance of empathy; co-creation of solutions; and the need for clarity on the mutual roles and terms of engagement for IUCN and the private sector.

The **Moderator** invited the second panellist, **Valérie Verdier, Chairman of the Board and CEO of the French National Research Institute for Sustainable Development** to address the question: “As a governmental organisation, how would you challenge and work together with the global community of governments (local and national), to support the transformative change we need to create a culture of conservation and care?”

Ms Verdier began by quoting Bernard Le Bouyer de Fontenelle who had once said “our folly is to believe that all of nature without exception is destined for our own use”. She highlighted the importance of working with the private sector, and observed how the culture of sharing, and listening had been growing throughout the world. It was her belief that the future of conservation would rely on training, conversation and communication. Ms Verdier also stressed the significance of ‘La Francophonie’, the diverse French-speaking community around the world, as an opportunity that should be harnessed.

The **Moderator** asked **Mr Ramiro Batzin** (Guatemala), **IUCN Councillor and Indigenous Peoples representative** (participating via online video link), to respond to the question: “How do we work together with indigenous peoples to combine ancestral and modern knowledge in the pursuit of cultures around the globe that honour different ways of understanding?”

Mr Batzin reminded the Assembly that it was the ‘Day of the Network’ in the Mayan calendar and that for IUCN to establish dialogue, it first needed to listen. It was crucial to highlight that there were several different approaches to the conservation of nature and all should be recognised as valid and equal. He recalled the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP) and especially the principle of free, prior and informed consent. He stressed the importance of consulting people, seeking consensus, and achieving consent and urged all IUCN membership categories to work together to figure out a strategy for the future. Youth were key in transmitting information to communities and stimulating conservation actions.

The **Moderator** asked the final panellist, **Ms Swetha Stotra, from the Global Youth Biodiversity Network (GYBN)**, to speak to the following question: “We all know about the frustration and anxiety of young generations, when looking at older people like me who haven’t done enough. What do you think is the path forward to combine the power of love and urgency? What can IUCN do to help create support for the movement that builds on both love and frustration so that we ensure actions take place on the ground NOW?”

Ms Stotra affirmed that young people were indeed tired of seeing the same injustices, destruction, inequalities, and broken promises that had been repeated over decades. The point was how to bring in enough love to kick urgency into action, but there could be no love without justice. She stressed the importance of changing values and behaviours, of learning to value indigenous and the diverse knowledge systems around the world, creating justice through rights-based approaches, and enabling greater dialogue. Civil society had little or no trust in government and decision-makers but this trust could be earned back by showing that people in power could be empathetic. Decision makers must always make decisions with youth rather than for (and without) youth.

The **Chair of the IUCN Commission on Environmental, Economic and Social Policy – CEESP** (Kristen Walker-Painemilla) drew the strategic discussion to a close by summarising a number of the key messages that had been highlighted by panellists and calling on Members and the other components of the Union to work with IUCN’s Re-imagine Conservation initiative by listening to and understanding others, thinking ‘outside the box’, responding to and supporting youth, and building a new and stronger conservation movement that treated climate and biodiversity as two sides of the same coin.

Following a screening of a short video promoting Reimagine Conservation, the **Facilitator** invited delegates to participate in a final interactive exercise to identify the most important topics that IUCN needed to reimagine for building a new culture for conservation. Among the issues highlighted were governance, rights, representation, and diversity of languages.

Closing the agenda item, the **Chair** thanked CEESP and CEC for enabling the Assembly to address ‘conservation culture’ and capturing the excitement around this topic that was present at the Congress.

Agenda item 5.2 – Report of the Programme Committee and adoption of the draft Addendum to the IUCN Programme 2021–2024 ‘Impacts and implications of the COVID-19 pandemic and health on the IUCN Programme Nature 2030’

At the request of the **Chair** (Vice-President and Regional Councillor John Robinson) invited **Kristen Walker-Painemilla, Chair of CEESP and member of the Congress Programme Committee**, to present the Committee’s report.

Ms Walker-Painemilla recalled that in 2018 the Union had initiated the preparation of the new global Programme – Nature 2030. That work was based on extensive consultations with Members, followed by a final drafting and an electronic vote that had adopted the new IUCN Programme 2021–2024 in February 2021. That Programme had a timespan of 10 years and set the framing for activities in all parts of the Union to support concrete and tangible positive impacts for People, Land, Water, Oceans and Climate using five pathways to transformative change summarised in five words: Recognise, Retain, Restore, Resource and Reconnect.

However, work to implement the Programme had been, was being and would continue to be significantly impacted by the effects of the COVID-19 pandemic on lives, livelihoods, societies and nature. Council had therefore decided to produce an Addendum to the Programme with the title “*Impacts and implications of the COVID-19 pandemic and health on the IUCN Programme Nature 2030*”. The draft of that Addendum had been opened to an electronic consultation and, following final drafting and editing, submitted by Council to the Members’ Assembly for consideration and adoption. The draft before the Assembly reflected a consensus reached after three Contact Group meetings and one meeting of a smaller drafting committee. The Congress Programme Committee commended the draft for adoption.

She concluded by thanking all who had invested time, energy and passion in both the Programme and the draft Addendum.

The **Chair** recalled that the Programme itself had already been approved by electronic vote. He invited comments from Members on the draft Addendum.

African Wildlife Foundation welcomed the hard work of the Council and Secretariat in preparing an important and timely Addendum but questioned the wisdom of aiming for “no risk of pathogen spillover”, as mentioned in section 3.1.2. **African Wildlife Foundation** was therefore proposing an amendment to read “no significant risk”.

The **Chair** asked if there was any objection to this amendment.

International Council of Environmental Law (USA) supported the amendment and flagged in relation to p6 (English text) that the world had the tools right now to significantly prevent future pandemics and spillovers but was not using them. All states had legislation for environmental impact assessments. There was a need to add robust analysis of ways of preventing spillover events.

Natural Resource Defence Council – NRDC (USA) did not support the amendment proposed by African Wildlife Foundation. The Addendum to the Programme was a statement of aspirations. No ‘significant’ risk of a global pandemic that had taken four million lives was not acceptable.

African Wildlife Foundation took note of the intervention from NRDC but took the view that pathogen spillover did happen and while it was desirable for the risk to be as low as possible, aiming for no risk could ultimately lead to a situation where humans lived in a bubble without any interaction with nature.

The **Chair** opened a vote on the amendment proposed by African Wildlife Foundation to insert the word ‘significant’.

Congress took the following decision:

DECISION 21

Congress APPROVES the amendment to the Addendum to the IUCN Programme tabled by African Wildlife Foundation.

[\[voting record\]](#)

The **Chair** opened a vote on the Addendum to the IUCN Programme as amended.

Congress took the following decision:

DECISION 22

Congress ADOPTS the Addendum to the IUCN Programme *Impacts and implications of the COVID-19 pandemic and health on the IUCN Programme Nature 2030* as amended in plenary.

[\[voting record\]](#)

Agenda item 5.3 – Report on the meeting of all recognised National and Regional Committees and Country Focal Points.

A report on the Global Meeting of National and Regional Committees and Country Focal Points held in Marseille on 3 September 2021 was presented by **Chris Mahon – IUCN National Committee for the United Kingdom / Sibthorp Trust** and **Ann-Katrine Garn – IUCN National Committee for Denmark / Copenhagen Zoo**. They recalled that the message of the corresponding meeting held during the Hawai'i Congress had been to encourage IUCN to be ‘more whale’, by being bigger, being

bolder and making a splash. The meeting in Marseille had received and discussed regional presentations from South and East Asia, Eastern and Southern Africa, West Europe, Caribbean, South America, and Meso America, and had also discussed the Contributions for Nature platform. There were currently 67 National Committees and seven officially recognised Regional Committees. Country Focal Points were not formally recognised but were valuable points of contact in States which either did not have a National Committee or had few IUCN Members. The Global Group for National and Regional Committee Development, composed of representatives of the 8 IUCN statutory regions through their Regional Committees, had met quarterly on 16 occasions since its inception in 2016. The Global Group was committed to placing 'Re-imagine Conservation' on the agenda for its next meeting. A new initiative had been the creation of the first IUCN Interregional Committee for Europe, North and Central Asia (ICENA) and it would be interesting to see how this developed. Finally, the meeting had welcomed Governance Motion F on the Role of Commissions in National and Regional Committees and had broadly welcomed Motion H concerning Establishment, operating rules and oversight of National, Regional and Interregional Committees.

Centre for Media Studies (India) welcomed the idea of inter-regional collaboration but noted that in some cases there was no effective coordination of IUCN Members at national level, due in large part to lack of engagement from government.

The newly elected Regional Councillor for South and East Asia (Mr Vivek Menon) from the **Wildlife Trust of India** observing that there was a National Committee in India that had not been very active, committed to energising the National Committee and hoped to meet soon to address the concerns raised by the Centre for Media Studies.

COORG Wildlife Society (India) encouraged IUCN to engage directly with policy makers in countries where there was no active National Committee.

Sungi Development Foundation (Pakistan) was concerned by the shrinking space for civil society under pressure from governments. The IUCN Congress should send a clear statement to governments that they should provide space for civil society to address issues relating to natural resources and biodiversity.

The **Chair of the Bangladesh National Committee speaking as Vice-Chair of the Regional Committee for South and East Asia** noted that the **Chair of the Regional Committee** had joined the Congress remotely. The region was interested in exploring the possibility of an interregional committee for Asia and wished to learn from the experience of ICENA to look at opportunities for joining together with East Asia and Oceania.

Mr Mahon and **Ms Garn** noted that committees varied greatly in size and in the challenges they had to deal with. However, common solutions could often be found through dialogue. They encouraged Members who were concerned about the lack of an effective National Committee to contact the Global Group for National and Regional Committee Development.

Congress Steering Committee decision on appeals against decisions made by the Congress Resolutions Committee to reject motions on new and urgent topics

The **Chair** (Vice-President John Robinson, USA) read the following statement on behalf of the **Congress Steering Committee**:

“The Steering Committee has reviewed the eight appeals received within the deadline. The appeal for the motion entitled ‘Support to countries that are center of origin and genetic diversification of very important cultivated species in the development of the categories and criteria to elaborate their national red lists of varieties and breeds at risk’ was not considered as it was received one hour after the deadline.”

The Steering Committee reviewed the original motions, the reasons for rejection by the Resolutions Committee as well as the arguments provided by the appellants for the following eight motions. [see table below]

The Steering Committee members individually reviewed the appeals received and considered the arguments presented by the appellants. Nine of the twelve Steering Committee members provided their assessment of the appeals and the final decision was taken by tally of the votes. For all eight motions, the majority of the Steering Committee members considered that the Resolutions Committee’s decision to reject the motion was justified and the arguments brought forward by the appellants were not able to convince them otherwise.”

Title of motion	Reason for rejection by Congress Resolutions Committee and Congress Steering Committee
<i>Transition to a zero-emission maritime industry in the face of climate change</i>	The motion did not meet the admissibility criteria of article Rule 52 (b) requiring support from Members from 2 regions
<i>Support for establishing an international crime of ecocide</i>	Not a new issue
<i>Planting the right tree in the right place for the right purpose</i>	Not a new issue
<i>Ensuring Ambient Health: Averting the Next Pandemic</i>	Not comprehensive in scope or rigorous and coherent in structure, and therefore does not meet Rule 54 (a)iii.
<i>Adoption of a One Health approach to nature conservation and protection, to mitigate risks to human and animal health and well-being</i>	Motion does not present technically sound and coherent arguments (Rule 54 (a) iii)
<i>Urge the government of Cameroon to stand by its commitment to protect the Ebo Forest, Littoral Region, Cameroon, for the benefit of both wildlife and local people</i>	Does not fulfil the new and urgent criteria
<i>Addressing the risk of future pandemics and biodiversity loss from exploitation and trade in wild species</i>	Does not meet criterion 54 (a)iii (contain technically sound and coherent arguments)
<i>Putting ethics into action throughout IUCN programme and activities</i>	While the object of the motion is new – the recent publication of the IUCN French Committee Manifesto – it does not require an immediate response from the World Conservation Congress

Natural Resources Defense Council (USA) made the following statement for the record:

“Thank you for the additional information about the Steering Committee deliberations on appeals. It was confirmed yesterday at the 3rd session that Rule 55 gives the Congress the authority to change decisions of the Congress Steering Committee on motion appeals. We rise to ask our fellow members to use that authority now to overturn to the decision of the Congress Steering Committee to reject the new and urgent motion ‘Addressing the risk of future pandemics and biodiversity loss from exploitation and trade in wild species’.

The motion was duly submitted on time, in the proper format, and in full compliance with all rules of procedure. The motion has 34 cosponsors from around the world, including four State Members. It asks the Congress to take a strong, unambiguous position on the need to

reverse biodiversity loss and protect all people from zoonotic disease pandemics such as the COVID-19 pandemic by recommending specific actions to address exploitation, use and trade in wild animals, guided by science.

The causes of pandemics are the same global changes that drive biodiversity loss and climate change, according to the 2020 IPBES Workshop Report on Biodiversity and Pandemics. Chief among them is wildlife trade and consumption. This Congress will be considering important new and urgent motions related to the One Health approach and the post-COVID needs and rights of Indigenous Peoples and local communities who sustainably use wildlife. But we have not been afforded the opportunity to fully consider how to address wildlife trade and consumption, which is a primary driver of extinction and of pandemics.

Therefore, we respectfully request that the new and urgent motion be distributed to the IUCN membership, along with our grounds for appeal, so that the Members can determine whether the rules of procedure were followed and whether the motion should be considered. We urge our fellow members from around the world to allow this motion to move forward and be debated by the Congress. We cannot afford – and it would be irresponsible of us – to wait any longer to address these important issues.”

Re:wild (USA) supported the statement of Natural Resources Defense Council.

The **Chair** noted that the Assembly was being asked to consider overturning the decision of the Steering Committee to reject the motion in question. However, this was not the time to debate the substance of that motion. He put the following question to a vote: “Do you agree to overturn the decision of the Congress Steering Committee?”

Congress took the following decision:

DECISION 23

Congress DOES NOT APPROVE overturning the decision of the Congress Steering Committee to reject the appeal relating to the new and urgent motion ‘*Addressing the risk of future pandemics and biodiversity loss from exploitation and trade in wild species.*’

[\[voting record\]](#)

The **Chair** confirmed that the decision of the Congress Steering Committee to reject the appeal concerning the new and urgent motion ‘*Addressing the risk of future pandemics and biodiversity loss from exploitation and trade in wild species*’ stood. The motion would not be admitted for further consideration.

Natural Resources Defense Council (USA) raised a Point of Order and questioned the legitimacy of the vote that had just taken place without anyone having seen either the motion itself or the substance of the appeal.

The **Chair** advised that the vote had concerned the process followed, not the motion itself. Natural Resources Defense Council had stated its case, a vote had been held and the decision of the Congress Steering Committee had been confirmed.

Center for Environmental Ethics and Law (USA) made the following statement for the record:

“We must interpret our statutes under the framework of the most fundamental principles of the rule of law – national and international. Failing to do so is an abuse in and of itself, and in addition to the harms this abuse causes.

Yesterday, we the Members Assembly, witnessed the rejection of eight appeals of emergency motions, and today we heard a brief overview of standard reasons for rejections.

We, the members, sponsors, and co-sponsors, were given no names of those who have made these decisions. We do not know if there were conflicts of interest. We do not even know how many there were. We should not be judged by faceless judges.

And this is a practice not limited to the Congress Steering Committee – the appellate body – for our motions. This is the same process of the Motions Working Groups, the Resolutions Committee – there is no knowledge of the decision-makers and vague and inconsistent application of the statutes. This is a pattern across the Motions process. And many members can and are willing to give evidence to that.

For any agreement or issue of law and governance – private or public – the fundamental principles of law must be followed: (1) due process; (2) transparency and/or access to information; and (3) equality before the law. These are the most basic human rights, and we remind you that they are universal, they exist not because they are written down, but because we are simply human.

We are calling on you – our leadership – to take this issue very seriously; and understand the importance and role of motions to members. It is our freedom of association and participation in this Union. It is our freedom of speech in this body.

How seriously you take motions is how seriously you take members.

Therefore, in order to remedy this violation of basic rights, we formally and respectfully request the following, that the Presiding Officer of the World Conservation Congress (WCC) establish the means to satisfy the following requests:

- (1) That the Motions Working Groups, the Resolutions Committee, and the Congress Steering Committee provide and make public – and in an easy and accessible way – the names of their members and the minutes of their meetings, noting decisions and voting actions taken.*
- (2) That the Resolutions Committee provide and make public the specific and particular reasons for the approvals and the rejections of all emergency motions submitted.*
- (3) That the Congress Steering Committee provide and make public the specific and particular reasons for each of the (9) rejected appellations.*
- (4) And once performed, that the Presiding Officer of the WCC provide us the opportunity to approve or deny whether to vote on these motions.*
- (5) And lastly, and at a later date, ensure that the newly elected Council take these matters into consideration for appropriate rule changes for the motions process.*

We cannot accept separate, unequal, or unfair application of our rules. This is not about one particular motion or rejection, but on the process that governs our voice in this Union.”

The **Chair** considered that the fundamental principles and values cited by the Center for Environmental Ethics and Law were felt strongly by all Members. He invited the Legal Adviser to comment.

The **Legal Adviser** noted that the composition of the Congress Resolutions Committee and Congress Steering Committee had been approved during the 1st Sitting on 4 September, so the names of the members of those committees were a matter of record. Whilst it was appropriate for the Congress Steering Committee to provide clarification of its reasoning in determining appeals on new and urgent motions, when asked to do so, there was no obligation for the Committee to provide detailed minutes of its meetings.

The **Chair** stressed that IUCN was an organisation rooted in transparency. This had not been a ‘faceless judgement’ but there was clearly a need to ensure better awareness of the processes in place.

Stop Ecocide International Ltd (UK) supported Natural Resources Defense Council and Center for Environmental Ethics and Law and called for its own new and urgent motion ‘*Support for establishing an international crime of ecocide*’ also rejected by the Congress Resolutions and Steering Committees to be reconsidered.

The **Chair** stated that the Assembly was again being asked by a Member to consider reversing the decision of the Steering Committee to reject the appeal on the motion in question and he would put the matter to a vote.

Stop Ecocide International Ltd raised a Point of Order and asked to elaborate on the motion so that Members would know what they would be voting on.

The **Chair** reiterated that such a vote was about the process followed, not the substance of the motion. He opened a vote on the question: “Do you agree to overturn the decision of the Congress Steering Committee?”

Congress took the following decision:

DECISION 24

Congress DOES NOT APPROVE overturning the decision of the Congress Steering Committee to reject the appeal relating to the new and urgent motion ‘*Support for establishing an international crime of ecocide*’.

[\[voting record\]](#)

The **Chair** confirmed that the decision of the Congress Steering Committee to reject the appeal concerning the new and urgent motion ‘*Support for establishing an international crime of ecocide*’ stood. The motion would not be admitted for further consideration.

Natural Resources Defense Council (USA) moved that the incoming Council of IUCN be tasked with conducting a review of the Congress motions process, including the appeals procedure.

The **Chair** noted that he was obliged by time constraints to close the 5th Sitting but invited Natural Resources Defense Council to restate their proposal at the start of the 6th Sitting, which would follow a short break.

6th Sitting of the Members’ Assembly

Thursday 9 September 2021 (18:45–20:45)

Steering Committee decision on appeals against the Resolutions Committee’s decision to reject motions about new and urgent topics (continued)

The **Chair** (Vice-President John Robinson, USA) recalled that the 5th Sitting had been discussing the Congress motions process. General concerns had been raised about the transparency of the process, with specific concerns cited in respect of the review and appeals procedures for new & urgent motions. He invited the Procedural Adviser to comment.

The **Procedural Adviser** (Prof. Surya Subedi) stated his view that the decision-making process in IUCN was as democratic as it could get. He recalled the relevant Rules of the Rules of Procedure, in particular Rules 52, 54 and 55. The Congress Steering Committee was required to provide its reasoning concerning the criteria for ‘new’ and ‘urgent’ under Rule 52 (c). The Congress Steering Committee had duly provided a summary of its reasoning in upholding the decision of the Congress Resolutions Committee to reject the appeals on eight motions. In the case of two motions, the decision of the Steering Committee had been referred to the Assembly, giving Members the final say on whether the corresponding decisions should be upheld or not. Providing detailed reasoning in writing for the Steering Committee’s decision on each new and urgent motion would not be practical in the time available.

At the invitation of the **Chair**, the **Natural Resources Defense Council** (USA) restated the proposal it had initially tabled at the end of the 5th Sitting:

“The IUCN Council is requested to undertake a full evaluation of the process for consideration, review, approval or rejection, appeal, and action by the Congress under Rule 55, of new and urgent (“emergency”) motions under consideration by the World Conservation Congress and make recommendations for changes in the procedures and statutes as necessary. The Council should consult the membership on lessons learned from the Marseille Congress and convene an online discussion process on any proposed recommended changes.”

The **Chair** confirmed that this proposal would be included in the Proceedings of the Members’ Assembly and referred to the incoming Council for its consideration.

Instituto de Derecho y Economía Ambiental (Paraguay) supported the statement made by Center for Environmental Ethics and Law during the 5th Sitting. The Rules of Procedure should be interpreted under the general principles of law, including due process, equality before the law, transparency and access to information. Members didn’t know who had taken decisions concerning new and urgent motions. Simply stating that a motion was “not urgent” was insufficient on its own to warrant rejection of a motion. It would not take that much time to provide detailed reasoning; assuming that relevant discussions were minuted, it was simply a matter of uploading the minutes for Members to read. Denial of the opportunity during the 5th Sitting to raise the main elements of rejected motions so that Members could reach informed decisions further undermined transparency and freedom of expression.

The **Chair** again recalled that during the 1st Sitting the names of all those serving on Congress Committees had been approved by a vote of Members. There was indeed a high degree of transparency – a core value of what IUCN stood for. The reasons for rejection of proposed new and urgent motions had been made available to proponents and a more complete rationale (but not detailed minutes) was also available with regard to the decisions of the Congress Steering Committee.

International Council for Environmental Law suggested that one of the difficulties might be that the 1st Sitting had taken place when Members were still undergoing accreditation. Everyone was willing to give some space to the current Congress due to the challenges of holding it during a pandemic. Nevertheless, the proposed review and reform of the appeals process should go forward to the new Council, and Members who had encountered difficulties should be invited to send their comments to the Director General for forwarding to Council. In the spirit of cooperation, IUCN could always make improvements and this was an opportunity to do so.

The **Chair** concluded the discussion by acknowledging that the proposed review would be an appropriate way to proceed.

Agenda item 6.1– Update from the Congress Resolutions and Governance Committees on progress of discussion in Contact Groups, followed by discussion and vote on motions

The **Chair** (Vice-President John Robinson, USA) invited the **Chair of the Congress Resolutions Committee** (Jon Paul Rodríguez) to present the Committee's latest progress report.

Mr Rodríguez reported that Contact Groups had met on 8 September for Motions 126, 130, 131, 132, 133, 136 and Governance Motion A, whilst Motions 003, 040, 075, 129, 135 and Governance Motion N had been discussed in Contact Groups on 9 September. He proceeded to present, one-by-one, the motions that were ready for plenary consideration and voting.

Motion 021 – *Planning of maritime areas and biodiversity and geodiversity conservation*

The **Chair of the Congress Resolutions Committee** noted that constructive discussions had led to a consensus text after one Contact Group meeting. Some amendments had been made, but no truly contentious issues had arisen.

The **Chair** opened the vote on Motion 021, as presented to plenary.

Congress took the following decision:

DECISION 25

Congress ADOPTS Motion 021.

[\[voting record\]](#)

State and agency Members of the United States abstained during the vote on this motion.

Motion 039 – *Protecting environmental human and peoples' rights defenders and whistleblowers*

The **Chair of the Resolutions Committee** indicated that consensus on the text had been reached after two Contact Group meetings. Some amendments had been made, including a reference to a resolution of the Conference of the Parties under the UN Convention Against Corruption, which all participants had agreed to.

The **Chair** opened the vote on Motion 039, as presented to plenary.

Congress took the following decision:

DECISION 26

Congress ADOPTS Motion 039.

[\[voting record\]](#)

Motion 125 – *Strengthening the protection of primary and old-growth forests in Europe and facilitating their restoration where possible*

The **Chair of the Resolutions Committee** reported that the Contact Group had met once and worked very efficiently to reach consensus.

The **Chair** opened the vote on Motion 125, as presented to plenary.

Congress took the following decision:

DECISION 27
Congress ADOPTS Motion 125.

[\[voting record\]](#)

State and agency Members of the United States abstained during the vote on this motion.

Motion 130 – *Strengthening sustainable tourism’s role in biodiversity conservation and community resilience*

The **Chair of the Resolutions Committee** noted that the Contact Group had met for the first time on 8 September and had concluded its work.

The **Chair** opened the vote on Motion 130, as presented to plenary.

Congress took the following decision:

DECISION 28
Congress ADOPTS Motion 130.

[\[voting record\]](#)

Motion 131 – *Ensuring adequate funding for the IUCN Red List of Threatened Species*

The **Chair of the Resolutions Committee** reported that the Contact Group had completed its work.

The **Chair** opened the vote on Motion 131, as presented to plenary.

Congress took the following decision:

DECISION 29
Congress ADOPTS Motion 131.

[\[voting record\]](#)

State and agency Members of the United States abstained during the vote on this motion.

Motion 132 – *Controlling and monitoring trade in croaker swim bladders to protect target croakers and reduce incidental catches of threatened marine megafauna*

The **Chair of the Resolutions Committee** indicated that the Contact Group had met on 8 September and engaged in a very constructive discussion, reaching consensus on a slightly amended text. After the Contact Group had concluded its work, the State Member **Germany** had submitted additional amendments to the text.

The **Federal Ministry for Environment, Nature Conservation and Nuclear Safety – BMU** (Germany) confirmed its proposal to delete references to evaluation of listing on CITES Appendices in operative paragraphs 1 a and 2, noting that IUCN was not the competent authority to evaluate CITES listings.

The **Chair** confirmed that neither the Species Survival Commission nor IUCN more widely had jurisdiction on CITES issues.

Secretaría de Medio Ambiente y Recursos Naturales (Mexico) called for a correction to the IUCN Red List category for totoaba croaker (*Totoaba macdonaldi*) from ‘Threatened’ to ‘Vulnerable’.

The **Chair** invited comments on the amendments proposed by State Member Germany.

Faunam A.C. (Mexico), co-sponsor of the motion, recommended retaining operative paragraph 1 a. without amendment, but deleting the reference to CITES in operative paragraph 2. In addition, **Faunam A.C.** supported the proposed correction of the Red List category for totoaba croaker.

Wildlife Conservation Society, also a co-sponsor of the motion, underlined that there was ample precedent in IUCN Resolutions and Recommendations for including recommendations for CITES listings.

Centro Intercultural de Estudios de Desiertos y Océanos A.C. (Mexico) favoured retaining references to CITES.

In response to a question from the **Ministry of Environment** (Japan) the **Chair of the Resolutions Committee** clarified that the text of the amendments proposed by State Member Germany were available online on the Congress motions page.

Faunam A.C. (Mexico) suggested that the proposed amendments be voted on one-by-one.

The **Chair** opened a vote on the proposed amendment to delete references to CITES in operative paragraph 1 a.

Congress took the following decision:

DECISION 30

Congress DOES NOT APPROVE deletion of references to CITES in operative paragraph 1 a of Motion 132.

[\[voting record\]](#)

The **Chair** confirmed that no vote was required on the second amendment, to delete reference to CITES in operative paragraph 2, given that this amendment depended on approval of the first amendment, which had not been the case. He further noted that the third amendment, to change the Red List category from ‘Threatened’ to ‘Vulnerable’, was merely a correction and not an amendment per se, and so did not require a vote. The correction was approved by acclamation.

The **Chair** opened the vote on Motion 132, including the correction of the Red List category.

Congress took the following decision:

DECISION 31

Congress ADOPTS Motion 132, as corrected.

[\[voting record\]](#)

State and agency Members of the United States abstained during the vote on this motion.

Motion 133 – *Call to withdraw draft-permit exploration of fossil fuels underneath UNESCO World Heritage Site Wadden Sea*

The **Chair of the Resolutions Committee** indicated that the Contact Group had been attended by a dozen Member representatives and discussions had gone smoothly.

The **Chair** opened the vote on Motion 133, as presented to plenary.

Congress took the following decision:

DECISION 32

Congress ADOPTS Motion 133, as presented to plenary.

[\[voting record\]](#)

State and agency Members of the United States abstained during the vote on this motion.

Motion 136 – *Protecting the Okavango from oil and gas exploitation*

The **Chair of the Resolutions Committee** reported that the Contact Group had met at lunchtime on 8 September and had completed its work.

The **Chair** opened the vote on Motion 136, as presented to plenary.

Congress took the following decision:

DECISION 33

Congress ADOPTS Motion 136.

[\[voting record\]](#)

State and agency Members of the United States abstained during the vote on this motion.

The **Chair of the Resolutions Committee** provided information on the remaining motions that were either being prepared for plenary consideration and voting, or still under discussion in Contact Groups. It was noted that Motion 101 *Setting area-based conservation targets based on evidence of what nature and people need to thrive*, had been in preparation for submission to plenary, but feedback had been received from a Member about possible inaccuracies in the text when compared with discussions in the Contact Group. The Congress Resolutions Committee had therefore decided to not put the motion to a vote at the present time.

WILD Foundation (USA) and **Yellowstone to Yukon Conservation Initiative (USA)** were concerned that hard-won consensus in the Contact Group, which had attracted more than 60 participants, was at risk of being undone. They sought clarification of any concerns raised.

The **Chair of the Resolutions Committee** read feedback that had been received from one Member stating that proposed amendments to operative paragraph 3 had been dismissed by the Contact Group moderator.

Ministry of Environment (Japan) noted differences in operative paragraph 2 of the text of Motion 101 as published on the motions webpage compared to what was agreed in the Contact Group.

Synchronicity Earth (UK) noted that it had also seen some concerns relating to the preambular text.

The **Chair of the Resolutions Committee** advised that the Secretariat had informed him that the text posted online was not the final version agreed by the Contact Group. He requested that all specific feedback relating to Motion 101 be submitted in writing for consideration by the Resolutions Committee. An announcement would be made on the morning of 10 September with regard to any remaining open issues, so that a Contact Group could be scheduled during the day.

In response to a question from **EcoCiencia, Fundación Ecuatoriana de Estudios Ecológicos** (Ecuador) the **Chair of the Congress Resolutions Committee** confirmed that Motion 129 was being translated, ready for presentation to plenary as soon as possible.

The **Chair of the Congress Governance Committee** (Amran Hamzah) provided an update from the Committee, recalling that six of the thirteen governance-related motions submitted to Congress had been approved during the 3rd Sitting of the Members' Assembly. The Committee was now presenting a further three motions that were ready for plenary consideration and voting.

Governance Motion H – *Establishment, operating rules and oversight of National, Regional and Interregional Committees*

The **Chair of the Congress Governance Committee** reported that the Contact Group had proposed a small amendment to the text. The resulting text had been reviewed by the Governance Committee, which had agreed to present the motion to the Members Assembly, as amended by the Contact Group.

Congress took the following decision:

DECISION 34

Congress ADOPTS Governance Motion H, as amended by the Contact Group.

[\[voting record\]](#)

Governance Motion K – *Improvements to the motions process to put a cap on the number of abstentions in order for a motion to be adopted*

The **Chair of the Congress Governance Committee** reported that the Contact Group had agreed that the right to abstain was fundamental, and that abstentions could not be counted as votes cast, no matter the number of abstentions (in conformity with Article 32 of the IUCN Statutes). Therefore, the Contact Group, following discussions with the Legal Adviser, had reached consensus to recommend withdrawal of the Motion. The Governance Committee had further consulted with the Legal Adviser and determined that it would be up to the Members Assembly to decide on a proposition to withdraw the motion or to vote on the original motion.

The **Chair** put a proposal to withdraw Governance Motion K to the vote, noting that a simple majority would be sufficient.

Congress took the following decision:

DECISION 35

Congress APPROVES withdrawal of Governance Motion K.

[\[voting record\]](#)

Governance Motion L – *Improvements to the motions process regarding the majority required to adopt motions*

The **Chair of the Governance Committee** reported that the Contact Group considered that the Motion should be better supported. The Contact Group had therefore recommended that IUCN Members should (a) ask the incoming Council to consider the question of mechanisms to allow for more discussions to reach consensus; and (b) ask Council to consider whether motions as defined by Rule 48bis of the Rules of Procedure (for instance, governance motions, motions that influence policy or actions of third parties) may require a different qualifying majority of votes for approval. The Governance Committee was therefore proposing that the Assembly should defer Governance Motion L for further consideration by Council.

The **Chair** put a proposal to defer Governance Motion L to the vote, noting that a simple majority would be sufficient.

Congress took the following decision:

DECISION 36

Congress APPROVES deferral of Governance Motion L for further consideration by Council.

[\[voting record\]](#)

The **Chair of the Congress Governance Committee** noted that the remaining four governance-related motions not yet considered by plenary would be presented and voted on during the 8th Sitting of the Members' Assembly.

7th Sitting of the Members' Assembly

Friday 10 September 2021 (08:30–12:30)

Agenda item 7.1 – Finances of IUCN

The **IUCN President** (Zhang Xinsheng) opened this agenda item by answering questions from Members that had been submitted by email following the presentation of his report during the 2nd Sitting. The President recalled the importance of the engagement of IUCN Members for the effectiveness of the Union and the need to ensure a balance between the global north and global south in terms of membership. He underlined the need to strengthen south-south cooperation and to increase the capacity and resources of IUCN regional offices for implementing national programmes. IUCN was currently re-structuring its Secretariat by hiring experts from the global south to implement regional programmes and by training regional Secretariat staff in relation to IUCN's global vision. Among the efforts to improve diversity within the Union, the hiring of young professionals had significantly increased, with special attention to gender equity. Several Commissions had also made great efforts to increase the representation of youth in their teams.

The President introduced **Mamadou Diallo** (Regional Councillor for Africa), as the chair for the 7th Sitting. It was noted that item 7.2 (IUCN Gender Strategy) was being moved to the 8th Sitting, during the afternoon of 10 September.

Agenda item 7.1.1 – Update from the Director General on the finances of IUCN

The **Chair** gave the floor to the **Director General Bruno Oberle** and invited him to present his report on this item.

The **Director General** referred Members to Congress Documents CGR-2021-2.1-1 *Report of the Director General*, CGR-2021-7.1-1 *Report of the Director General and Treasurer on the Finances of IUCN in the Intersessional Period 2016–2020* and the CGR-2021-7.3-1 *Audit Report and Financial Statements 2020*. He first presented the financial results from 2016 to 2020 indicating that membership and project incomes had been rather stable, except for 2020 when the pandemic had several impacts, including delays in implementation of some components of the IUCN Programme. The year ended with a deficit of CHF 2.4 million after reserve adjustments. The deficit was primarily a result of the postponement of the Congress and the need to make a provision of CHF 1.7m for projected losses. In addition, the low level of project implementation had contributed to the deficit. He recalled the need to take actions to reverse the declining trend of IUCN reserves over the past 4 years. He presented the Financial Plan 2021–2024 as approved by electronic vote in February 2021. He displayed how the forecast growth of project portfolios and wider programmes was associated with significant increase in funding from multilateral agencies (e.g. Global Environment Facility, Green Climate Fund, EU). Finally, he summarised the main challenges facing IUCN, as well as the opportunities and actions being taken to ensure the organisation’s financial sustainability. In particular, the contribution from the programme portfolio to IUCN corporate costs should further increase, whilst there was a need to improve the Union’s capacity for innovation in identifying new business models and attracting support from private foundations.

Agenda item 7.1.2 – Report of the Treasurer on the finances of IUCN

The **Treasurer** (Nihal Welikala) presented information on IUCN’s financial performance during the intersessional period. He noted that the Director General had already covered the approved and audited financial performance of IUCN over the last four years, and that he would add comments on IUCN’s overall financial strategy and model. He confirmed that the pandemic had aggravated existing financial pressures, in particular, that governments would probably seek to ensure the maximum impact of their investments, which might shape the form of their funding over next years. He recalled IUCN strengths its unique character associated with its network of Members, Commissions and Secretariat, and that financial sustainability in a pandemic-hit world could be achieved through strategic agility and speedy implementation of adaptive change. He recapped that to increase IUCN’s financial capacity, the new Council and the Secretariat would need to consider at least six factors:

- Investing in growth and development: in relation to this, the framework of a medium-term capital investment road map within which individual decisions could be taken, would be helpful. This should include well-structured and transparent investment criteria and an efficient approval and monitoring process
- Positioning the project portfolio: the sustainability of portfolio growth was dependent on IUCN’s ability to be competitive and profitable, especially its financial capacity to take risks and to invest for the future. Carefully assessed risk-based pricing, project acceptance criteria, and close monitoring were all essential management tools.
- Building reserves: a structured, time-bound implementation plan would help the new Council to guide the way to speedy achievement of financial targets.
- Diversifying revenues: IUCN needed to explore the large non-governmental funding space, sustainable, private environmental, social and governance (ESG) funding globally for the current half-year alone amounted to close to USD 350 billion.
- Competitiveness: the costs of the present centralised and global organisational infrastructure and the overall business risk profile, were two key components of competitiveness that IUCN’s Council and Secretariat together would need to assess in working out optimal answers.
- Governance: there was a need for diversity and an increase in specialist financial experience. The new Council should put financial matters high on its agenda. It could draw on external expertise to support the work of its committees and there should be an efficient exchange of information with the Secretariat.

Agenda item 7.1.3 – Report of the Congress Finance and Audit Committee and approval of the Audited Financial Statements for the year 2020

The **Chair** gave the floor to the **Chair of the Finance and Audit Committee of Congress – FACC** (Ayman Rabi) to report on the Committee’s findings and recommendations regarding the audited financial statements presented to the Assembly for approval.

The **Chair of FACC** recalled that the Approval of the Financial Plan 2021–2024, the Financial Statements for the years 2016, 2017, 2018 and 2019, and the appointment of the auditors for the years 2021 and 2022 had already be confirmed by electronic voting in February 2021. He confirmed that the CHF 2.4 million deficit was primarily a result of the pandemic, specifically, the additional costs resulting from postponement of the Congress and the low levels of project implementation. FACC was making five specific recommendations to address the financial issues facing IUCN:

- Review and assess the resources required by the Oversight Unit to enable it to fulfil its mandate;
- Roll out an internal control self-assessment exercise as required by the IUCN Internal Control Policy;
- Revise contract templates to allow for cancellation of contracts in the event of conflicts of interest;
- Improve controls around the Time Management System; and
- Strengthen IT controls around the user rights of system administrators;

Subject to these actions being taken up, FACC was recommending that the Members’ Assembly should approve the Financial Statements for the year 2020.

The Finance and Audit Committee of Council had reviewed each of the motions before Congress in order to assess their implications for the Financial Plan. Every motion had been allocated to one of six categories: (1) negligible impact; (2) related to ongoing work; (3) requiring significant fundraising; (4) requiring a high level of Secretariat coordination; (5) requiring unrestricted funding; (6) financial implications cannot be easily assessed. FACC was recommending that Finance and Audit Committee of Council should review and make recommendations to improve the process, timing and effectiveness this component of the Committee’s work to consider issues such as how to best to optimise the timing of this work in relation to the overall motions process; provide guidance on the potential costs that should be considered and provided when submitting a motion; and to clarify responsibilities for implementation and fundraising.

The **Chair** invited comments or questions from Members.

Sociedad Geológica de España (Spain) identified a need to assess the financial implications of motions that had been approved online prior to the Congress.

The **Chair of FACC** agreed that clearer procedures for approval of motions were needed, and this especially applied to motions with implications for financial planning.

Wildlife ACT Fund Trust (South Africa) cautioned against expanding the membership so widely that organisations and individuals not aligned with the vision of the Union became Members. The delegate proposed the establishment of a screening process for prospective Members.

The **Director General** agreed that it was important for new Members to fit the profile of the Union, but recalled that there was an established process for determining acceptance as a Member of the Union.

Centre Africain de Recherches Forestières Appliquées et de Développement (Cameroon) asked how a budget surplus had been achieved in 2020 despite the COVID-19 pandemic.

The **Director General** replied that the Union's expenditure consisted of two parts, one to support the Secretariat and the other to support programmes and projects. The COVID-19 pandemic had reduced the levels of implementation of activities on the ground, resulting in savings, mostly in the area of salaries, and also in items such as staff travel.

Bahrain Women Association - for Human Development (Bahrain) requested clarification about the categories of income included under 'independent income' in the table of income.

The **Director General** replied that the biggest category of income under this heading was income from philanthropy, an area where he saw opportunities for an increase. The Patrons for Nature group were major contributors under this category. Other income also included items such as rental income and income from sale of assets at the end of projects.

Association Marocaine pour la Protection de l'Environnement et du Climat requested clarification on how the deficit noted by the audit affected regional offices and Secretariat structures noting that there seemed to be a contradiction between the reported surplus and the findings of the audit.

The **Director General** found no contradiction between the findings of the audit and what he had presented. Both the surplus and the deficit had been reported by the Chair of the Finance and Audit Committee.

Instituto de Ecología Aplicada de la Universidad San Francisco de Quito (Ecuador) expressed a wish for clarification of the process for approval of proposed motions. The institute had proposed Motion 130, 'Strengthening sustainable tourism's role in biodiversity conservation and community resilience' which did not require a high level of funding.

The **Chair of FACC** replied that motions sponsored by Members were currently grouped into six categories, one of which covered motions with no implications for financial planning. He clarified the role of the Chair of the Finance and Audit Committee in alerting Members to the financial implications of motions. These motions required approval by the Members' Assembly.

The **Centre for Media Studies** (India) asked if an analysis was available of the regional breakdown of expenditure.

The **Director General** replied that data were available at this level within the Secretariat, but that they were too detailed and complex to readily present in summary. The data had been shared with Council and the Finance and Audit Committee. Any Member was free to ask for information such as this.

Goncol Alapitvany (Hungary) asked about the availability of funding for National and Regional Committees to empower their activities. The delegate hoped this issue could be a priority for consideration by the new Council.

Unnayan Onneshan (Bangladesh) saw opportunities for the newly elected President to bring in more Framework funding and increased support from philanthropy. The delegate shared the concern of the delegate from Hungary about resourcing of National Committees. He saw a need for a process that distributed a share of national membership dues to National Committees to allow them to function effectively.

The **Director General** replied to the concerns of both Goncol Alapitvany and Unnayan Onneshan regarding the possibility of using a portion of the membership dues to support National Committees. Such changes were always possible, but with a fixed level of funding being available, increases in expenditure in one area would inevitably lead to reductions elsewhere. He recognised the importance to donors of having a local presence and effective coordination, which could benefit the project portfolio, and this issue could be reconsidered by the Council. Regarding funding from Framework Partners and philanthropy, it was his intention to expand the group of Framework Partners and to reach out to the philanthropy world. He saw possibilities in these areas for the whole Union.

The **Ministry of Forestry, Fisheries & Environment** (South Africa) suggested the possibility of strengthening the competence of the Council and its Committees by seeking external expertise on financial matters. The delegate proposed establishing a budget with the purpose of improving the financing of the Union in this way.

The **Director General** pointed out that the Council already enjoyed the services of external experts who added to Council's knowledge and provided long-term oversight and strategic direction, often on a *pro bono* basis. He saw a possibility of using professional services, as suggested by the South African Ministry of Forestry, Fisheries and Environment for particular analyses on specific topics.

The **Treasurer** agreed that additional expertise could be recruited on a *pro bono* basis and observed the need to balance needs against the available expertise. He noted that this was an area for the Council and the Finance and Audit Committee to discuss in the future.

Mlup Baitong (Cambodia) stressed the difficulty that some organisations in developing countries, in particular indigenous peoples' organisations, had in paying their membership dues. The delegate's organisation had recently joined IUCN as Member and had difficulty meeting its dues commitment. He asked the Council to consider ways of providing funds to support Members in developing countries to pay their dues and implement their conservation programmes. He also noted that if conservation could take place together with development, local livelihoods would benefit. Environmental activists and small communities in Cambodia were being threatened by private companies. Outsiders were encroaching and did not want local communities to take action.

The **Chair of FACC** pointed out that the Council had considered a grace period for Members for whom the COVID-19 pandemic had caused particular hardship, and a motion proposing this had been approved during the 1st Sitting of the Members' Assembly on Saturday 4 September 2021. He recalled that the Director General had expressed a wish for more implementation of activities by Members, and it was hoped that involving Members in projects would help address the shortage of funds for implementation. This was a high priority for discussion by Council.

The **Director General** noted that membership dues had recently been reshaped, and a new category had been established with a low level of dues to address the needs of Members in financial distress.

OMCAR Foundation (India) expressed gratitude for the approval by the Members' Assembly of the grace period for paying membership dues. Regarding support for National Committees, it was the opinion of the delegate that membership dues should be paid by the respective governments, and that IUCN should ask governments to fund their National Committees.

The **Director General** replied that it was a fundamental task of the Members to decide on how their membership dues were spent, and that this could be discussed at any time. He agreed with the delegate from India, but this was a personal point of view. Continued support would be provided to assist Members in participating in IUCN Congresses.

Sungi Development Foundation (Pakistan) referred to the recent process of dues assessment and asked whether external factors had been considered when evaluating the level of fees, considering the decrease in available external sources of funding.

Prior to opening a vote on the Audited Financial Statements for the year 2020, the **Chair** requested an update from the Credentials Committee on the status of accreditation.

The **Chair of the Credentials Committee** reported that the total number of potential votes held by IUCN Members in good standing was:

Category A (States and Government Agencies): 268 votes

Category B (International and National NGOs and IPOs): 1,202 votes

Of these potential votes, the voting power of accredited Members represented at the 2021 World Conservation Congress, as of 19:00 hrs on Thursday 9 September 2021 was:

Category A (States and Government Agencies): 180 votes (67%)

Category B (International and National NGOs and IPOs): 773 votes (64%).

The **Chair** opened a vote on adoption of the Audited Financial Statements for the year 2020.

Congress took the following decision:

DECISION 37

Congress **ADOPTS** the Audited Financial Statements for the year 2020.

[\[voting record\]](#)

Agenda item 7.3 – Update of the Resolutions Committee on progress with the discussions in Contact Groups, followed by discussion and vote on motions

The **Chair** (Regional Councillor Mamadou Diallo, Senegal) invited the Chair of the Resolutions Committee to present the motions ready for voting.

The **Chair of the Resolutions Committee** (Jon Paul Rodríguez) provided an update on the status of the motion process and noted that a lot of progress had been made. He presented an update on progress in the Contact Groups and then moved on to those motions ready for plenary discussion and voting.

France Nature Environnement (France) provided a comment on Motion 067, highlighting that the text agreed by the Contact Group was not available online. They requested the text to be made available prior to putting the motion to a vote.

US Department of State, Bureau of Oceans and International Environmental and Scientific Affairs (USA) made the following statement for the record:

“On behalf of the U.S. government and its agency members of IUCN, the Department of State Bureau of Oceans, Environment and Science and the U.S. Embassy in Paris extend their deepest thanks to France for hosting this World Conservation Congress, particularly given the various and formidable challenges of the moment. France’s commitment to hosting an organized, safe, and productive Congress created the foundation for this successful week, a commitment equal to France’s ambition to protect and conserve biodiversity in France and around the world.

As always at IUCN Congresses, we have found this week the energy, passion, commitment, creativity, and resolve of IUCN members and participants to be truly inspiring. We value the

IUCN Congress as the venue for members to come together to share our different experiences and approaches to advance our common goal of conserving nature and recognizing nature's centrality to many of our greatest common challenges, from health to equity to tackling the climate crisis. We commend IUCN and members' commitment to promote dialogue and information sharing on different approaches dealing with conservation challenges, and the work to elevate women, youth, and indigenous peoples' role in setting IUCN's conservation agenda and delivering the IUCN Program of Work.

We appreciate the collaborative and constructive discussions held during this congress, including in contact groups on motions that were brought before the Members Assembly for vote. We feel it is important to review and provide guidance on all of the motions. However, we prioritize engagement on those motions that reflect the concerns of the broader membership or are most relevant for IUCN's Program of Work. We maintain our view that there are some types of motions on which it may not be appropriate for us, as a government, to engage or negotiate.

Among these are motions directed primarily to a single government or group of governments on national, bilateral or regional issues. We often lack sufficient factual information about such issues and believe that responses to these motions are best left to the country or countries affected. We will not take a position as a government on such motions, except as they have direct implications for the U.S. Government. In such instances, we may provide a statement for the record to help clarify the issues raised and provide our perspective.

A second group of issues are those focused on global issues that we agree are important but that are topics of ongoing international policy debate in, or infringe on the independent legal mandates of, other fora, such as climate change, and biodiversity of areas beyond national jurisdiction. We respect the interest of members in issues of global concern and we share many of these interests, especially on emerging issues such as the role of ecosystems in food security and the importance of the illegal trade in wildlife. However, we do not intend here to take national government positions on the particular views presented in these IUCN motions or to vote on the outcome.

As we have in the past, the United States will submit brief statements clarifying U.S. views on many of the motions before the Congress. We will submit these statements in writing and ask that they be placed in the Congress proceedings with their respective motions. In keeping with our past practice, we are also providing a list for the record of those resolutions on which the U.S. Government has refrained from engaging.

We request that this statement be entered in full for the record in the report of this Congress.

Congratulations everyone on a successful Congress."

Motion 045 – *Recognising and supporting indigenous peoples' and local communities' rights and roles in conservation*

The **Chair of the Resolutions Committee** reported that discussions in the Contact Group had been concluded on 9 September and that the motion was ready for plenary consideration.

Eco Foundation Global (China) and **Balipara Tract & Frontier Foundation** (India) stated their support for the motion, noting the importance of involving indigenous peoples and local communities, and the threat of external interference on indigenous lands.

The **Chair** opened the vote on Motion 045 as presented to plenary.

Congress took the following decision:

DECISION 38

Congress ADOPTS Motion 045.

[\[voting record\]](#)

State Member France provided the following explanatory statement for the record concerning the vote of the French delegation on Motion 045:

“France wishes to recall its interpretative declaration made upon the adoption in 2007 of the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples.”

Motion 062 – *Towards a policy on Natural Capital*

The **Chair of the Resolutions Committee** reported that the correct text that had been missing some paragraphs on 9 September, had been published, and the motion was ready for consideration and vote.

Eco Foundation Global (China) spoke in support of the motion, highlighting in particular Principle 13. The principles proposed reflected well what was required for the cohabitation of people and nature bridging the gap between theory and practice.

The **Chair** opened the vote on Motion 062, as presented to plenary.

Congress took the following decision:

DECISION 39

Congress ADOPTS Motion 062.

[\[voting record\]](#)

State and agency Members of the United States abstained during the vote on this motion.

France Nature Environnement (France) enquired about the status of Motion 067 – *Reducing the impacts of the mining industry on biodiversity*, which did not yet appear to be available online.

The **Chair of the Resolutions Committee** reported that an error had been found in the version initially posted and the text was currently being checked. The vote on this motion would be deferred until the text had been finalised and posted in the three languages.

Motion 126 – *Acting for the conservation and sustainable use of marine biological diversity in the ocean beyond national jurisdiction*

The **Chair of the Resolutions Committee** indicated that the second Contact Group had concluded its work on 8 September. The text was now ready for consideration and vote.

The **Chair** opened the vote on Motion 126 as presented to plenary.

Congress took the following decision:

DECISION 40

Congress ADOPTS Motion 126.

[\[voting record\]](#)

State and agency Members of the United States abstained during the vote on this motion.

Motion 129 – *Avoiding the point of no return in the Amazon protecting 80% by 2025*

The **Chair of the Resolutions Committee** indicated that discussions had already concluded and consensus on the text had been reached. The text was published and ready for vote.

Coordinadora de Organizaciones Indígenas de la Cuenca Amazónica – COICA (Ecuador) thanked the Members' Assembly for giving a voice to the indigenous peoples of the nine countries of the Amazon Basin. They highlighted the need for an implementation plan and that more needed to be done beyond approving Motion 129. Political will and a concrete plan were needed to put a halt to the suffering experienced by indigenous peoples.

This intervention was met with applause by the Members' Assembly.

The **Chair** noted that the applause showed the commitment of the international community towards the protection of the Amazon and indigenous peoples' communities.

The **Chair** opened the vote on Motion 129, as presented to plenary.

Congress took the following decision:

DECISION 41

Congress ADOPTS Motion 129.

[\[voting record\]](#)

The approval of the motion, by an overwhelming majority, with no vote against from any membership category, was met with applause and cheers by the Members' Assembly.

State and agency Members of the United States abstained during the vote on this motion.

The **Chair of the Resolutions Committee** confirmed that this concluded the consideration of motions ready for plenary. He provided an overview of the status of motions still under discussion in Contact Groups.

The **Chair** gave the floor to the **International Council of Environmental Law** to make a statement for the record that was subsequently delivered to the Secretariat in writing, as follows:

“The Contact Group on Motion 034 had a consensus. The Resolutions Committee sent a new text back to the contact group delegating parts of the consensus. This undermines the voice and the role of IUCN Members in their good faith participation in contact groups, and needs to be reviewed by Council as one of the problems of this World Conservation Congress. The link to the Center for Environmental Legal Studies consensus text is here:

https://iucncongress2020.org/sites/www.iucncongress2020.org/files/motions/cels_amendment_034_secs_2a_2b.pdf

Closing the 7th Sitting, the **Chair** reiterated that item 7.2 would be taken up during the 8th Sitting.

8th Sitting of the Members' Assembly

Friday 10 September 2021 (14:00–20:20)

The 8th Sitting was chaired by **Mr Ali Kaka, Regional Councillor for Africa** (first part of the Sitting), and **Mr Mamadou Diallo, Regional Councillor for Africa** (second part of the Sitting).

The **Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs** (UK) made the following statement for the record concerning Motion 126 – *Acting for the conservation and sustainable use of marine biological diversity in the ocean beyond national jurisdiction*, adopted during the 7th Sitting:

“The United Kingdom supports the critical role that the IUCN plays in bringing members together from diverse areas to have the space to discuss, share knowledge and experiences on conservation issues we are all currently facing.

The UK has been actively involved in the Conference this year with officials taking part both in Marseilles and in the virtual contact groups and events. We applaud the efforts of the IUCN on organising such a hybrid event that allows for wide and diverse participation of members, making sure that those that cannot travel, still have a voice in discussions. These are of course difficult and sensitive topics to discuss and of the utmost importance in getting right, if we are to bend the curve of biodiversity loss starting now.

With that in mind the UK would like to make a statement on Motion 126 - Acting for the conservation and sustainable use of marine biological diversity in the ocean beyond national jurisdiction. This motion focuses on a topic of the utmost importance to the UK, concluding negotiations of a new implementing agreement under the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea on the conservation and sustainable use of marine biodiversity of areas beyond national jurisdiction as soon as possible in 2022.

Given the importance of these negotiations, it is imperative that the text within this motion is right and reflective of current discussions. However, a key part of the text on marine protected areas (OPI.b.i) was unclear and included language that could have implications for other international negotiations taking place. The timing between publication of the revised text online in the late evening and the vote the following morning did not allow enough time to consider that text, and wider consequences, in full. That is why the UK took the position to abstain in voting on this motion.

However, our abstention must not detract from our ambition for the ocean, calling for at least 30% of the global ocean to be protected through effective marine protected areas by 2030 and for concluding negotiations on the BBNJ Agreement as soon as possible – both of which were central in the outcome documents from the UK's G7 presidency this year. We will continue to maintain momentum during this intersessional period, working with others, to ensure we arrive at the final BBNJ intergovernmental conference next year in the best possible place.

The UK would like to thank the Congress for the opportunity to share this statement.

We request that this statement be entered in full for the record in the report of this Congress.”

Asociación Centro Científico Tropical (Costa Rica) raised a Point of Order, requesting a technical correction to the text of Motion 034 that had been presented by the Ministry of Environment and Energy of Costa Rica.

The **Chair** confirmed that this observation would be referred to the Chair of the Congress Resolutions Committee.

Agenda item 8.1 – Final report of the Congress Governance Committee and vote on any motions on IUCN governance including amendments to the Statutes that have not yet been voted on

The **Chair** invited the **Chair of the Congress Governance Committee** (Amran Hamzah) to present an update on the status of the remaining four governance-related motions.

Governance Motion A – Including subnational governments in IUCN’s membership

The **Chair of the Governance Committee** recalled that this topic had been on at the agenda of the 2012 and 2016 IUCN World Conservation Congresses and that the Contact Group had therefore been able to draw on a wealth of experience and knowledge during its deliberations. The Contact Group had agreed on a revised definition of ‘subnational government’ to reflect the diversity under this heading. The Contact Group had also agreed on a voting structure that – by adding a collective vote of 1 to the Government Agency category – was designed to recognise the sovereignty of state governments while still ensuring that the voices of subnational governments be heard. The Governance Committee had agreed to submit the motion, as amended by the Contact Group to the Members’ Assembly.

Vice Consejería de Medio Ambiente, Planificación Territorial y Vivienda, Gobierno Vasco (Spain), **Dirección de Gestión Ambiental del Gobierno Autónomo Descentralizado de la Provincia del Carchi** (Ecuador), **Vice Consejería de Medio Ambiente, Planificación Territorial y Vivienda, Gobierno Vasco** (Spain) and **Comité National de l’UICN** (France) all expressed their support for the motion.

ICLEI – Local Governments for Sustainability (Germany) did not support Motion A, arguing that – among other reasons – the motion contained a misguided voting system, was not inclusive, and did not take into account the concerns of the IUCN Members who had rejected similar motions in 2012 and 2016.

The **Chair** opened the vote on Governance Motion A, as amended by the Contact Group.

Congress took the following decision:

DECISION 42

Congress ADOPTS Governance Motion A.

[\[voting record\]](#)

Agenda item 7.2 – Discussion and adoption of “Developing a comprehensive gender approach at IUCN” (deferred from 7th Sitting)

The **Chair** invited Councillor Jenny Gruenberger, on behalf of the Council Gender Task Force (GTF), to present the findings of the GTF, as contained in Congress document CGR-2021-7.2/1 *Developing a comprehensive gender approach at IUCN*.

Ms Gruenberger explained the objectives, activities, and recommendations of the GTF. She gave an overview of gender composition within the IUCN Council, Commissions, and the National and Regional Committees. She also briefly described the knowledge gaps, gender mainstreaming levels, and desire for improvement among the IUCN Membership and Secretariat.

She ended with a series of recommendations, as follows:

- Council to:
 - Set up a whole-system structure for gender mainstreaming through an IUCN standing Gender Strategy and Action Plan;
 - Revise IUCN Statutes and Regulations, Council Handbook and other guiding documentation;
 - Revise the number of Regional Councillors, or commit to a rotating majority; and
 - Raise awareness and building capacities of IUCN Member organisations.

- Commissions to:
 - Emphasise commitments to non-discrimination, inclusivity and gender-responsive approaches in IUCN Commissions;
 - Strengthen communication between IUCN Commissions and IUCN Secretariat gender experts and young professionals; and
 - Facilitate capacity building and awareness raising sessions on gender and social inclusion in conservation for Steering Committees.

- National and Regional Committees to:
 - Revise Committees' constitutional documents and bylaws;
 - Mainstream gender in the National and Regional Committee agendas;
 - Raise awareness and build capacities of IUCN Members; and
 - Strengthen communication and provide spaces for collaboration.

- Secretariat to:
 - Strengthen gender equality and women's empowerment as fundamental components of the IUCN Programme;
 - Enhance programme and project planning and approval systems to systematically screen for risks and proactively promote gender equality;
 - Increase attention to gender responsive action within projects;
 - Enhance capacity building and knowledge generation;
 - Enhance gender mainstreaming in the IUCN evaluation system and strengthen accounting for gender outcomes; and
 - Develop a human resources action plan to continue advancing gender mainstreaming and diversity.

The **Chair** opened a vote on adoption of document CGR-2021-7.2/1.

DECISION 43

Congress **ADOPTS** the proposal for “Developing a comprehensive gender approach at IUCN” contained in Congress document CGR-2021-7.2/1.

[\[voting record\]](#)

Agenda item 8.1 – Final report of the Congress Governance Committee and vote on any motions on IUCN governance including amendments to the Statutes that have not yet been voted on

The **Chair** invited the **Chair of the Governance Committee** to resume his presentation of the remaining governance-related motions.

Governance Motion B – *Election of Regional Councillors resident in dependent territories*

The **Chair of the Congress Governance Committee** recalled the discussions on the challenges of regional representation, and that the Contact Group recommended that there should not be more than one Regional Councillor from the same State. The Governance Committee, upon the recommendation of the Contact Group, had agreed to submit the amended motion to the Members Assembly.

Para la Naturaleza (USA) stated its support for the motion as it would ensure that the voices of dependent territories were heard within the Union.

Faunam A.C./PG7 (Mexico) noted that the provisions of Motion B needed to take into account the modification of the term Regional Councillor that had been made through Governance Motion D, adopted during the 3rd Sitting on 8 September.

The **Chair** confirmed that this would be taken into account when finalising the text of Motion B. He opened the vote on Governance Motion B on the understanding that terminology would be harmonised to follow that adopted through Governance Motion D.

Congress took the following decision:

DECISION 44

Congress ADOPTS Governance Motion B, subject to editorial harmonisation of terminology with Governance Motion D.

[\[voting record\]](#)

Governance Motion J – *Development of a new 20-years Strategic Vision, inclusive of a Financial Strategy and Strategic Plan for the Union*

The **Chair of the Congress Governance Committee** reported that the Contact Group had reached consensus on proposed amendments, and the Governance Committee had agreed to submit the motion as amended by the Contact Group, to the Members' Assembly.

The **Chair** opened a vote on Governance Motion J, as presented to plenary.

Congress took the following decision:

DECISION 45

Congress ADOPTS Governance Motion J.

[\[voting record\]](#)

Governance Motion N – *Enabling effective attendance and participation of Members in future sessions of the World Conservation Congress*

The **Chair of the Congress Governance Committee** reported that the Contact Group had agreed amendments to the text and the Congress Governance Committee had recommended that it should go forward to the Members' Assembly as amended.

The **Chair** opened a vote on Governance Motion N, as presented to plenary.

Congress took the following decision:

DECISION 46

Congress ADOPTS Governance Motion N.

[\[voting record\]](#)

The WILD Foundation (USA) made the following statement for the record on behalf of 27 Members:

“This statement is on behalf of 27 member organizations from Algeria, India, Kenya, Lebanon, Namibia, New Zealand, South Africa, Tunisia, United Kingdom, United States of America and Uruguay.*

Respectfully, understanding the extraordinary circumstance in which our colleagues planned this Congress – yet after deep consideration, discussion with members, and consultation with legal counsel -- we would like to register our concern about numerous inconsistencies on procedures at this Congress, and specifically on Motion M, which called for a post-Congress on-line vote accessible by all Members. We will submit this text to be included in the permanent record and report of the Congress.

We are extremely concerned by the overreach of the Congress Steering Committee in sending an email to members only a few days after the entire Council decided to propose Motion M to the Members' Assembly, an action that we consider to be an inappropriate attempt to influence the vote on a substantive matter before the Members. Also, the scheduling of an unexpected second contact group (after the first contact group had reached consensus agreement) resulted in some of us missing discussions on other important motions.

We are dismayed that the Legal Advisor of IUCN ruled that Motion M required a two-thirds majority. Our considered opinion, after legal counsel on interpretation of the statutes, is that it should have only needed a simple majority as it did not propose a change to the Statutes.

Chair, we are deeply concerned that the handling and the outcome of Motion M has further strengthened the feeling of disenfranchisement and exclusion by many members of our Union. This must be addressed. While one can have a narrow reading that the motion failed because of a tie in the government house, we urge the new Council to consider and respect that the motion represented the true feelings of members. The motion had a majority in the NGO and IPO house, and half of the Category A members represented here voted in favour. We note that many of the members not represented in Marseille chose not to give their proxies and were given no opportunity to voice their views at all because members joining virtually in a supposedly hybrid Congress had NO means to intervene and have their voices heard during any session of the Members' Assembly.

At this Congress, we have created a grave precedent of disregarding key principles of our democratic governance. However, we celebrate and congratulate Members on the results of our elections, in which all Members could vote, and urge the new Council and officers to deeply reflect on what has happened in this Congress and to move decisively to heal our

Union. We have much work to do, and the voice of our Union must be clear and united. Thank you.

**Submitted on behalf of: Wild Foundation, USA; Ministry of Local Affairs and Environment, Tunisia; Association Tunisienne de Taxonomie ATUTAX, Tunisia; Exploralis, Tunisia; Association pour la Protection de l'Environnement et le Développement Durable de Bizerte, Tunisia; Notre Grand Bleu, Tunisia; Association 'Les Amis des Oiseaux', Tunisia; Mouvement Ecologique Algérien, Algeria; The Shouf Cedar Society, Lebanon; Center for Environmental Ethics and Law, USA; Natural Resources Defense Council, USA; A Rocha International, UK; Ministerio de Vivienda, Ordenamiento Territorial y Medio Ambiente, Uruguay; CORDIO East Africa, Kenya; Resource Africa, South Africa; Resource Africa, UK; African Wildlife Foundation, Kenya; Wilderness Foundation, South Africa; Environment and Conservation Organisations, New Zealand; Stop Ecocide International, UK; Wildlife Conservation Trust, India; Watamu Marine Association, Kenya; Oceans Alive Trust, Kenya; Wildlife ACT Fund Trust, South Africa; Cheetah Conservation Fund, Namibia; Endangered Wildlife Trust, South Africa; and Namibia Nature Foundation, Namibia."*

The **Chair of the Congress Governance Committee** concluded this item by recognising the efforts of all those involved in the process of the motions that had proposed amendments to the IUCN Statutes.

Agenda item 8.2 – Final report of the Resolutions Committee, followed by discussion and vote on motions

The **Chair** invited the **Chair of the Resolutions Committee** to continue his presentation on the motions for consideration by the Members' Assembly. The Chair of the Resolutions Committee began with those motions that had been finalised, translated, and posted on the IUCN Congress website and were now ready for plenary discussion and voting.

Motion 024 – Restoring a peaceful and quiet ocean

The **Chair** opened a vote on Motion 024, as presented to plenary.

Congress took the following decision:

DECISION 47
Congress ADOPTS Motion 024.

[*\[voting record\]*](#)

State and agency Members of the United States abstained during the vote on this motion.

Motion 067 – Reducing the impacts of the mining industry on biodiversity

Eco Foundation Global (China) expressed support for the motion, stating that it could be a source of inspiration for action.

Ministère des Affaires étrangères et du Développement international (France) made the following statement for the record:

"France is in favour of this motion, which aims to regulate extractive activity and make more efficient use of primary resources.

These provisions are already implemented at national level. In 2015, France took up the issue of the optimisation of resources and recycling. However, recommendation no. 7 of this motion cannot be supported as it stands. The use of recycling and alternative materials will not stop the production of primary raw materials. The available alternative technologies provide limited solutions. Finally, France has adopted a national strategy for the exploration and exploitation of the deep seabed, and is taking part in the international work by the ISA to consider the rational exploitation of these resources.”

The **Chair** opened a vote on Motion 067.

Congress took the following decision:

DECISION 48

Congress ADOPTS Motion 067.

[\[voting record\]](#)

State and agency Members of the United States abstained during the vote on this motion.

Asociación Centro Científico Tropical (Costa Rica) stated its support for Motion 034 [*Climate Change and Biodiversity Crisis*] [*Promoting integrated solutions to the climate change and biodiversity crises*], yet to be tabled in plenary, and recalled the request it had made at the start of the 8th Sitting for a technical error in the text of the motion to be corrected.

The **Chair** adjourned the 8th Sitting at 15:30 hrs to allow the **Congress Resolutions Committee** and Secretariat time to finalise the text and translations of the remaining motions yet to be tabled in plenary.

The 8th Sitting reconvened at 16:30 hrs to consider Motion 101.

Motion 101 – *Setting area-based conservation targets based on evidence of what nature and people need to thrive*

The **Chair of the Congress Resolutions Committee** reported that the Contact Group for this motion had met and finalised the text, which was now ready for plenary discussion and voting. The Contact Group had made three amendments following earlier consideration of this motion during the 6th Sitting.

The **Chair** (Regional Councillor Mamadou Diallo, Senegal) opened the floor to comments from Members.

The **Yellowstone to Yukon Conservation Initiative** (USA) remarked that Members did not need to re-open what had already been discussed and agreed in the Contact Group.

The **Chair** clarified that he was not seeking to re-open the conversation from the Contact Group but wanted to give Members the possibility to take the floor if they so wished.

There being no requests for the floor, the **Chair** opened a vote on Motion 101, as presented to plenary.

Congress took the following decision:

DECISION 49

Congress ADOPTS Motion 101.

[\[voting record\]](#)

State and agency Members of the United States abstained during the vote on this motion.

The **Chair** observed that as no further motion texts were yet available in all three languages, the 8th Sitting would once more be adjourned. He asked all delegates to show patience as the Congress Secretariat worked hard to process the relevant texts as quickly as possible.

The 8th Sitting reconvened to consider further motions.

Motion 137 – *Affirming the right of Indigenous Peoples and local communities to sustainably manage and utilise wild resources in the context of COVID-19.*

The **Chair of the Congress Resolutions Committee** invited the Members Assembly to read the text, which had very recently been posted in all three languages.

Following a pause to enable Members to consider the text, the **Chair** invited comments from the floor.

There being no requests for the floor on this motion, the **Chair** opened the vote on Motion 137, as presented to plenary.

Congress took the following decision:

DECISION 50

Congress ADOPTS Motion 137.

[\[voting record\]](#)

State and agency Members of the United States abstained during the vote on this motion.

The **European Association for the Conservation of Geological Heritage – ProGEO** (Spain) intervened to request a technical correction, and harmonisation of the English and Spanish texts, in part of Motion 062, already adopted during the 7th Sitting.

The **Chair** invited **ProGEO** to submit the proposed corrections in writing and confirmed that they would be taken into account.

Motion 003 – *[Establishing a Climate Change Commission] [Establishing a Global IUCN Climate Crisis Action Platform]*

The **Chair of the Congress Resolutions Committee** reported that the text of Motion 003 posted on the Congress website reflected the closest that the Contact Group had been able to get to consensus. The remaining point of disagreement concerned whether the mechanism to be established should be a Climate Change Commission or a Global Platform. This was reflected in square-bracketed options for the title of Motion 003, as well as in the operative paragraphs. He requested that the IUCN Legal Adviser be invited to present a recommendation for how to proceed.

The **Chair** invited the **Legal Adviser** to take the floor.

The **Legal Adviser** (Sandrine Friedli Cela) presented the following statement:

- 1. The motion was accepted by the Motions Working Group (MWG) in 2019, with slight amendments.*
- 2. The motion was then submitted to the online discussion.*
- 3. During the online discussion, some IUCN Members expressed the view that the intent of the motion could be better attained through a different means, e.g. a Task Force or similar rather than a Commission and made alternative proposals to this effect; such alternative proposals were integrated in bracketed form in the revision of the motion following the second reading on 3 March 2020. This version with the bracketed part was referred to the Congress for further discussions and vote.*
- 4. Because of diverging views, the MWG decided to refer the matter to the Members' Assembly for continued debate and vote in accordance with Rule 62quinto (b), as was also suggested by the proponents and co-sponsors.*
- 5. During the Contact Group at this Congress, both the initial motion and the alternative proposals were discussed; because of diverging views it was not possible to find a consensus text.*

Point of Order

The proponent and co-sponsors raised a Point of Order disputing the validity of what I will call the alternative proposal, made in the form of amendment, based on two grounds:

- a) The original version and intent of Motion 003 was the creation of a climate change commission, which is distinct and different from the purpose of a task force. This means that the proponent considers that the amendment should not be considered as it would not directly relate to the text of the original motion and that the amendment would therefore be out of order;*
- b) The alternative proposal proposed as amendment would not be allowed because it would merely repeat the content of a previous resolution and would therefore not be in order.*

As IUCN's Legal Adviser, I was asked to provide a legal opinion and I have shared my conclusion and proposal for the way forward on the procedural issue with the contact group in writing. I am pleased to give you now the rationale for this conclusion as follows.

Assessment of the validity of the Point of Order and way forward on the procedural issue

Let me address the second argument (b) first regarding the link of the amendment with a previous resolution adopted by the World Conservation Congress in 2016:

The Council formed a climate change task force in 2012 which ended in 2016. Through Resolution 056 adopted in Hawai'i, Members requested Council to continue with an appropriate governance mechanism for overseeing ongoing development of IUCN's climate change policies and engagement. Consequently, a climate change task force was established under the Programme and Policy Committee of the IUCN Council to undertake this effort.

While the Resolution adopted at the 2016 Congress refers to a Task Force on climate change, it appears that it was referring to a previous climate change Task Force (from 2012).

The alternative proposal is no longer about the establishment a Council Task Force but about the establishment of a Global IUCN Climate Crisis Action Platform. Because the proposal to

establish a task force was raised during the online discussion, Rule 54 (a)vi no longer applies since it relates to the requirements for admissibility of motions by the MWG or the Resolutions Committee. I therefore consider that this argument does not hold.

Regarding the relevance of the alternative proposal regarding the establishment of a Global IUCN Climate Crisis Action Platform proposed as an amendment to the original motion:

Pursuant to Rule 59 (a) an amendment shall relate directly to the text which it is sought to alter. To my understanding, the intent of the alternative proposal, which is meant to replace the original motion with another proposal, is the same in that both options are demanding a new and powerful structural response by IUCN through mobilizing and coordinating the work of the different components of IUCN to address the climate change crisis but the means proposed to address this issue is different (i.e. a Commission or a Platform).

CONCLUSION:

1. I consider that this is a borderline case and that in this situation it is difficult to conclude the appropriateness of such amendment. Since the question at stake is very sensitive as we can see with the divided views and is of great importance for the Union, I consider it preferable that the Members' Assembly decide whether it accepts that this alternative proposal regarding the establishment of a Global IUCN Climate Crisis Action Platform instead of a Commission be tabled as an amendment to the original Motion 003, rather than the Chair making a ruling on the matter based on the advice of Legal Adviser and the Procedural Adviser. Such procedural questions should be voted upon first with a simple majority of the vote casts in both houses.

2. Should the Assembly approve that the amendment be considered as in order, then the alternative proposal regarding the establishment of a Global IUCN Climate Crisis Action Platform would be voted by the Assembly before the original motion itself, pursuant to Rule 60.

3. Should the Assembly reject that the amendment be considered as in order, then the Assembly would vote only on Motion 003, which aims at establishing a Climate Crisis Commission.”

The **Chair** stated his intention to proceed to a vote on the admissibility of the proposed amendment to establish a Global Climate Crisis Platform, rather than a Commission. He would then proceed to a vote on the substance of the amendment (if admitted as being in order), followed by a vote on the motion as a whole – either with the amendment or in its original form.

The **Coastal Area Resource Development and Management Association** (Bangladesh) expressed strong support for the original text of Motion 003.

The **Chair of the IUCN World Commission on Environmental Law – WCEL** (Antonio Benjamin) expressed his view that this was one of the most important motions the Assembly would be discussing. He underlined that the present debate was procedural and not on the substance of the motion. The Rules of Procedure were very clear, and Article 59 stated that amendments could be presented in respect of any part of a motion. There was agreement in the most fundamental aspects of the motion but not in terms of the institutional mechanism for moving forward. He believed it was important to allow for the amendments to proceed, especially given that the amendments had not been made with the purpose of defeating the intent of the motion but – on the contrary – were seeking to strengthen it.

The **Chair** reminded Members to confine their comments to procedural matter as to whether or not the amendments should be admitted as being in order.

Unnayan Onneshan (Bangladesh) supported the comments of the **Chair of WCEL**.

NatureServe (USA) considered that the Assembly should decide on the two options given that the Contact Group had been unable to reach consensus after five vigorous discussions.

Hawai'i **Conservation Alliance** (USA) strongly urged Members to reject the proposed amendments and to vote in favour of establishing a Commission, a position supported by **Coastal Area Resource Development and Management Association** (Bangladesh) and **Groupe Action pour l'Enfance au Sahel** (Mali).

A lengthy procedural debate ensued, with interventions from the **Chair of WCEL**, the **Legal Adviser**, **Hawai'i Conservation Alliance**, (USA), **Forêts et Développement Rural** (Cameroon) and **SEO/BirdLife Sociedad Española de Ornitología** (Spain).

The **Procedural Adviser** (Prof. Surya Subedi) observed that the discussion appeared to be going around in circles. He recommended careful reading of Rules 59, 60 and 62 of the Rules of Procedure. It was clear that Rule 62 (which he proceeded to read verbatim) required the amendments to be considered first, prior to consideration of the motion as a whole.

Hawai'i Conservation Alliance (USA), speaking as the Member that had originally raised the Point of Order regarding the procedural admissibility of the amendments to Motion 003, offered to withdraw the Point of the Order in the interests of time.

The **Chair** expressed his appreciation of this offer and noted that the discussion could move on to the substantive merits of the proposed amendments.

Society of Canton Nature Conservation (China) suggested that Rule 56 of the Rules of Procedure required the motion to be deferred to the next Congress.

International Council for Environmental Law (USA) and **Association Sénégalaise des Amis de la Nature** concurred that deferral for Council to consider ahead of the next Congress would be the appropriate option if the Assembly was unable to reach consensus.

Coastal Oceans Research and Development – Indian Ocean (Kenya) concurred that more time was needed for in-depth reflection. It was not possible to do this in the final hour of the Members' Assembly.

The Chair of WCEL observed agreement on the basic premise of the debate that climate change was the most urgent threat to humanity and biodiversity and this was reflected in both texts. IUCN had already done a lot on the issue but could do much more. The big question was 'How could IUCN do more and better?'. The best option was something that was not in a silo, but integrated and coordinated the components of IUCN. The problem of a Commission was that it didn't have the power under the Statutes to coordinate the other Commissions or to convene the other components. The most that a Commission could do was to convene its own members. We should not be afraid of new horizons and we should concentrate on the spirit. That's why something bigger than a Commission was being proposed.

Hawai'i Conservation Alliance (USA) considered that IUCN Commissions did have considerable authority and power.

Comité national de l'IUCN France was in favour of a Commission but did not consider the two options to be in conflict; the point was that all the resources of IUCN should be activated.

National Committee of IUCN Members, Denmark considered that a Global Platform was the best alternative. Placing climate issues with a single Commission would be a big mistake.

The **Chair of the Commission on Environmental, Economic and Social Policy** implored the Chair to draw the discussion to a conclusion.

The **Chair** opened a vote on the amendments to the title and operative Motion 003 that would establish a Global Platform on Climate Change in place of a Commission on Climate Change.

Congress took the following decision:

DECISION 51

Congress DOES NOT APPROVE the amendments to Motion 003.

[\[voting record\]](#)

The **Chair** opened a vote on the original text of Motion 003.

Congress took the following decision:

DECISION 52

Congress ADOPTS Motion 003.

[\[voting record\]](#)

Motion 040 – *Develop and implement a transformational and effective post-2020 global biodiversity framework*

The **Chair of the Congress Resolutions Committee** confirmed that the text was now ready for consideration by the Members' Assembly

The **Chair** opened a vote on Motion 040, as presented to plenary.

Congress took the following decision:

DECISION 53

Congress ADOPTS Motion 040.

[\[voting record\]](#)

State and agency Members of the United States abstained during the vote on this motion.

Motion 075 – *Towards development of an IUCN policy on synthetic biology in relation to nature conservation*

The **Chair of the Congress Resolutions Committee** confirmed that the text was now ready for consideration by the Members' Assembly. The Contact Group had been unable to reach consensus on four proposed amendments to the motion. These amendments were shown in square brackets. In each case, option 1 was the original text, option 2 was the bracketed proposed amendment.

The **Chair** indicated his intention of proceeding to a vote on the proposed amendments.

Pro Natura / Friends of the Earth Switzerland speaking also on behalf of **Fundación Ambiente y Recursos Naturales – FARN** (Argentina), **Friends of the Earth Hungary**, **German League for Nature, Animal Protection and Environment** and **POLLINIS** (France) made the following statement for the record:

“We are of the opinion that the process leading up to the wording of the motion and the work in the contact group was flawed.

Firstly the IUCN Task Force and Technical Sub-Group on Synthetic Biology and Biodiversity Conservation produced an unbalanced report that failed to address social, cultural and ethical considerations. It failed to address risks properly, did not address a range of uncertainties and unknowns about synthetic biology and its implications, and failed to name that most applications of synthetic biology are genetic modification and other new forms of genetic engineering.

Secondly the composition of the Sub-Group of the Task Force was inappropriate in two ways:

- 1. While not the fault of its members, many had a financial interest in the development and use of Synthetic Biology.*
- 2. It did not draw on the full and broad range of expertise necessary for such a report, including anthropology, ecology, sociology, value risk assessment and the direct input of Indigenous people and other guardians of nature.*

Furthermore, the result of consultations on this report undertaken with IUCN members introduced important elements to take into consideration, but these elements were not integrated in the motion draft.

Several key paragraphs in the motion failed to represent the range of issues that needed to be addressed in developing a meaningful policy and inclusive process.

Consequently, this led to a conflict of positions in the contact group, as well as in the drafting group, that could not be overcome.

We would like to stress the importance for a balanced process in the elaboration of policy on a subject with so many unknowns as it is the case for Synthetic biology that takes into consideration the whole scale of views in our Union.

As a result, the motion that is now presented to the Congress has crucial text still bracketed. For us the inclusion of the bracketed text is necessary to enable the development of a policy that is in line with different positions in the IUCN constituency and previous resolutions.

We call on IUCN members present to support the inclusion of the text in the brackets and to vote for option 2. Faced with the potentially severe impacts of gene drive technology, IUCN should refrain from supporting further development and field trials on gene drives for conservation or other purposes until an IUCN policy supported by all is adopted.”

Wildlife Conservation Society – WCS (USA) made the following statement for the record:

“It is clear from all of the statistics that we are losing the war to conserve the world’s biodiversity. Our current tools are helping us win some battles, and we would be worse off without them. But it is clear they are insufficient. We need to explore all potential additional technologies to help us. As a conservation community, we are at the cutting edge on use of remote sensing and tracking technologies. But to turn the tide, we also need to remain open minded to other potential tools – which might include one or more tools in the genetic realm through synthetic biology. Motion 075 is calling for IUCN to develop a policy to guide us as

we do that. Recognizing the complexities of the rapidly evolving field, such a policy is critically important if we are indeed to explore all potential new tools to conserve species – the potential benefits of such tools, as well as their potential risks. This policy can only be truly useful to IUCN's members if it is neutral, open-minded, and based on the best possible knowledge and science – as is IUCN's greatest strength. Thus, WCS encourages members to vote for the motion, and for all options within it that would maintain the open-minded neutral approach to the pros and cons. That will be critical if the policy's outcome will be to support biodiversity conservation in our rapidly-changing and challenging world.”

Re:wild (USA) strongly supported the statement made by WCS.

Wildlife Trust of India was concerned that large parts of the motion did not command consensus. There was a need for innovative and cutting-edge solutions, and this needed Members to reject all of the bracketed text and to vote for option 1.

Pro Natura / Friends of the Earth Switzerland reiterated its opinion that the work of the Contact Group had been flawed and that it urged Members to vote for inclusion of the bracketed text by supporting option 2.

Ministry of Forestry, Fisheries & the Environment (South Africa) did not agree with the first bracketed amendment and would therefore be supporting option 1.

German League for Nature, Animal Protection and Environment stated that its position was very critical of genetic engineering overall and therefore very strongly in favour of option 2 and inclusion of all the bracketed text. Members were encouraged to make an informed decision.

Ministère de l'Environnement, de l'Économie verte et du Changement Climatique (Burkina Faso) supported the original text of the motion and did not support the bracketed amendments.

The **Chair** indicated that he would open a vote on the amendment to Motion 075.

Faunam A.C. (Mexico) raised a Point of Order seeking clarification about which amendment Members were being asked to vote on.

The **Chair of the Congress Resolutions Committee** clarified that the Assembly was being asked to vote on the first bracketed amendment, which he proceeded to read verbatim. A 'Yes' vote meant voting for the inclusion of the amendment and the removal of the brackets; a 'No' vote meant deleting the text in brackets.

The **Chair** opened the vote on the first amendment to Motion 075.

Congress took the following decision:

DECISION 54

Congress ADOPTS the first amendment to the preamble of Motion 075 (Option 2, retention of the bracketed text and removal of the brackets)

[\[voting record\]](#)

State and agency Members of the United States voted against this motion.

The **Chair** opened the vote on the second amendment to Motion 075.

Congress took the following decision:

DECISION 55

Congress ADOPTS the second amendment to the preamble of Motion 075 (Option 2, retention of the bracketed text and removal of the brackets).

[\[voting record\]](#)

State and agency Members of the United States voted against this motion.

Referring to the third proposed amendment to Motion 075, the **Chair of the Congress Resolutions Committee** observed that there were two options. The alternative that differed most from existing policy was Option 1 so in conformity with the Rules of Procedure, that option would be considered first. If the result of the vote was to approve Option 1, Option 2 would be discarded.

Island Conservation (Kenya) supported Option 1.

The **Chair** opened the vote on the third amendment to Motion 075.

Congress took the following decision:

DECISION 56

Congress ADOPTS the original text (Option 1) of paragraph 2 d of Motion 075 (rejecting the proposed amendment, Option 2, shown in brackets).

[\[voting record\]](#)

The **Chair of the Congress Resolutions Committee** stated that the fourth and final proposed amendment to Motion 075 concerned the last sentence of the first paragraph in the Annex. A ‘Yes’ vote would retain the text in brackets; a ‘No’ vote would delete it.

The **Chair** opened the vote on the fourth amendment to Motion 075.

Congress took the following decision:

DECISION 57

Congress ADOPTS the amendment to the Annex of Motion 075 (Option 2).

[\[voting record\]](#)

State and agency Members of the United States voted against this motion.

The **Chair** opened a vote on Motion 075 as a whole, as amended by the results of the four previous votes on the specific proposed amendments to the text.

Congress took the following decision:

DECISION 58

Congress ADOPTS Motion 075, as amended in plenary.

[\[voting record\]](#)

State and agency Members of the United States voted against this motion.

Motion 134 – *Protecting the Lower Congo River from large hydro-electric dam developments*

The **Chair of the Congress Resolutions Committee** confirmed that the text was now ready for consideration by the Members' Assembly

The **Chair** opened the vote on Motion 134, as presented to plenary.

Congress took the following decision:

DECISION 59

Congress ADOPTS Motion 134.

[\[voting record\]](#)

State and agency Members of the United States abstained during the vote on this motion.

The **Chair of the Congress Resolutions Committee** confirmed that preparation of the remaining two motions was still being finalised. These would be made available as quickly as possible.

Agenda item 8.3 – Presentation and welcome by acclamation of the *Marseille Manifesto*

Councillor Jennifer Mohamed-Katerere, Chair of the Congress Preparatory Committee Task Force on the Marseille Manifesto, recalled the inclusive process that had resulted in the *Marseille Manifesto*. Two letters from the President had been circulated to Members prior to the Congress, providing information about plans to capture and communicate the content of Congress outcomes, including commitments made, at the same time underlining this was not intended as a policy statement. Preparatory work had been undertaken by a Task Force of the Congress Preparatory Committee, which had established the broad themes, an overall framework and set out the process for developing the document. During Congress, three meetings had been held of the Friends of the Chair group constituted in line with the criteria introduced during the 1st Sitting on 4 September 2021, with composition of that group reflecting regional and membership diversity. A draft of the *Marseille Manifesto*, in the three languages of IUCN, had been made available online on 8 and 9 September for review and comment by all Members.

Referring to the final document, **Ms Mohamed-Katerere** emphasised that it captured key commitments from Forum events, noting that a bottom-up process had been followed, through which event organisers had been encouraged to seek ambitious commitments from participants. Delivery of these commitments would be tracked and monitored through the 'Contributions to Nature' platform.

Ms Mohamed-Katerere proceeded to read in full the final text of the *Marseille Manifesto*, which had just been published online (see Annex 1).

Congress welcomed the *Marseille Manifesto* by acclamation.

DECISION 60

Congress WELCOMES the *Marseille Manifesto*.

The **Chair** thanked all who had contributed to the *Marseille Manifesto* and asked the Secretariat and the incoming Council to set great value by it.

Agenda item 8.2 – Final report of the Resolutions Committee, followed by discussion and vote on motions (continued)

The **Chair** referred the Assembly to the two remaining motions not yet considered by plenary.

Motion 034 – *Integrated solutions to the climate change and biodiversity crises*

The **Chair of the Congress Resolutions Committee** (Jon Paul Rodríguez) referred to bracketed text in operative paragraph 2 d. This was a proposed amendment that the Contact Group had been unable to reach consensus on. The Members' Assembly was required to discuss and vote on the proposed amendment. A majority 'Yes' vote would result in the acceptance of the amendment and removal of the brackets; a majority 'No' vote would lead to deletion of the bracketed text.

International Council of Environmental Law (USA) strongly supported retention of the amendment and removal of the brackets.

The **Chair** opened a vote on the proposed amendment to paragraph 2 d of Motion 034.

Congress took the following decision:

DECISION 61

Congress ADOPTS the amendment to operative paragraph 2 d of Motion 034.

[\[voting record\]](#)

The **Chair** opened a vote on the whole of Motion 034 as amended.

Congress took the following decision:

DECISION 62

Congress ADOPTS Motion 034 as amended in plenary.

[\[voting record\]](#)

Motion 135 – *Promoting human, animal and environmental health, and preventing pandemics through the One Health approach and by addressing the drivers of biodiversity loss*

The **Chair of the Congress Resolutions Committee** confirmed that the text of Motion 135 was now available in the three official languages and ready for discussion and voting.

Kilimanjaro Animal Centre for Rescue, Education and Wildlife (C.R.E.W.) (Tanzania) made the following statement for the record:

“Noting the causes of pandemics, like this one, it is undeniably associated with how society treats animals, including wildlife held in captivity (ex situ) and wet market.

Recognizing that animals are sentient beings that require our respect and protection, their mental, physiological and physical health encompasses the concept of their ‘well-being’.

Bringing attention to the internationally recognized five freedoms of animals and specifically captive wildlife; namely the freedom from thirst, hunger and malnutrition, freedom from unnatural discomfort, freedom from unnatural pain, injury and disease, freedom to Express and maintain natural behaviour and freedom from fear, distress, abuse and neglect.

With the aim to decrease transfer of zoonotic diseases through the one health motion 135 there should be societal responsibility and commitment towards the individual animals well-being.

Calling attention to some governments struggling to recover from the pandemic, they begin to look to new avenues of wildlife tourism/utilization in the form of wildlife ranches, farms and zoos.

It is concerning that sometimes wildlife policies and decision-making focuses on benefiting from wildlife utilization without addressing, regulating and monitoring the humane care and handling of wildlife in ex situ.

Reference to wildlife trade must also consider the actual well-being of the animals who are innocent victims and deserve our advocacy and committed protection.

We believe human health and animal well-being are equally important, and one does not necessarily supersede the other. Empathy towards and subsequent protection of wildlife, especially those victims of wildlife trade, is a human responsibility and needs to be included in this motion.

We request an intervention in the text of motion 135 to include the text: in paragraph 6 adding 'well-being' after the word 'animal'; and in section 7 i adding 'well-being' behind 'animal'.

We are new members. We ask for dialogue among members as well as non-members to find common ground and collaborative mission to be inclusive to the concept of wildlife protection and well-being.

Let us join the herd of humanity living in respect and harmony with the world's wildlife, their ecosystem and the planet we humans share with nature One nature one future

Please accept the request to add the word 'well-being' in two places of the motion. Thank you."

International Fund for Animal Welfare (IFAW) made the following statement for the record, speaking also on behalf of **Asociación Rescate y Conservación de Vida Silvestre – ARCAS** (Guatemala), **Born Free Foundation** (UK), **Natural Resources Defense Council** (USA) **Re:wild** (USA), **Sharkproject Austria e.V.**, **Sharkproject Germany**, **Sharkproject International e.V.** (Switzerland), **Wildlife Conservation Society – WCS** (USA), **The Wilderness Foundation** (USA), and **The WILD Foundation** (USA):

"Members from among our organisations participated in the contact group on Motion 135. We welcomed the efforts and spirit of engagement among the participants, which have largely improved this motion.

We are fully supportive of a call to countries to adopt a One Health approach to prevent future pandemics, including many of the related actions highlighted in this motion. Therefore, we will support this motion.

However, as with amendments made yesterday to the Addendum to the programme and in Motion 137, we regret the insertion of dangerous qualifiers around the word risk. These are subjective, open to wide interpretation, and limit ambition in terms of truly tackling pathogen spillover and preventing the next pandemic.

We should, of course, focus our initial prevention activities in areas that we know to pose the most significant risk. However, are we, as the conservation community, really willing to tolerate even a small amount of risk if the outcome would be another global pandemic that, once again, costs the lives of millions of people and trillions of dollars in economic damage?

Our goal should be to prevent ANY pathogen spillover, and we should work tirelessly to attain this goal. All efforts must be taken to prevent pandemics at source—which is in most cases the human/wildlife/environment interface.

We will support this motion. But we urge Members to reflect carefully on their ambitions, and on what level of risk they are willing to entertain, if we truly intend to avoid ever again seeing a pandemic of zoonotic origin that takes such a devastating toll on human lives, livelihoods and economies.”

The **Chair** put the amendments proposed by Kilimanjaro Animal Centre for Rescue, Education and Wildlife (C.R.E.W.) to a vote.

Congress took the following decision:

DECISION 63

Congress ADOPTS the amendments to Motion 135.

[\[voting record\]](#)

State and agency Members of the United States abstained during the vote on this motion.

The **Chair** put the whole of Motion 135, as amended, to a vote.

Congress took the following decision:

DECISION 64

Congress ADOPTS Motion 135, as amended in plenary.

[\[voting record\]](#)

Closing the 8th Sitting, the **Chair** thanked the Congress Governance and Resolutions Committees for their work and expressed gratitude to all Members for their patience as the texts of motions had been translated and posted prior to final discussion and voting in plenary.

9th Sitting of the Members' Assembly

Friday 10 September 2021 (20:35–22:03)

The Closing Ceremony of the 2021 IUCN World Conservation Congress was hosted by environmental journalist **Ms Asha Sumputh**. She noted that a window of hope was opening on the world as participants left Marseille with commitments and concrete actions to take forward. She introduced a musical and visual performance entitled “*Our dancing nature*”.

Ms Sumputh commented that the IUCN Congress had been one of the first hybrid international events since the beginning of the pandemic and that it had attracted large number of both on-site and virtual participants. A particular highlight had been the participation of youth. The adoption of the *Marseille Manifesto* sent a strong signal by listing concrete commitments, including the One Ocean Summit announced by President Macron during the Opening Ceremony. She introduced a video retrospective of the eight days of the Exhibition, Forum and Members' Assembly.

Ms Bérangère Abba, Secretary of State for Biodiversity, Government of France, thanked all participants for coming to Marseille. She acknowledged that not everyone had been able to attend in person, but that on-site and virtual participants had come together to tackle biodiversity challenges. She stressed that climate change and biodiversity loss had a cost and that more needed to be done to achieve the commitments that states have made. She highlighted the uniqueness and diversity of species found in the Mediterranean commending the efforts to restore marine biodiversity. France had committed to bringing 5% of Mediterranean marine areas under strong protection by 2027. Furthermore, France was championing an international treaty on plastic pollution and planned to table a resolution on this topic at the United Nations Environmental Assembly. Ms Abba stressed that although the IUCN Congress had come to an end, it was only the beginning of a long conversation. Despite the challenges of organising a hybrid event, it had been a great success, with more than 25,000 members of the public and over 100 schools visiting the Exhibition. She noted the adoption of motions, highlighting in particular the recognition of indigenous peoples' knowledge, the One Health approach, and the joint work of communities. She concluded her speech by stressing the important messages to the world included in the *Marseille Manifesto*.

Agenda item 9.1 – Recognition of outgoing members of the IUCN Council

IUCN Director General (Bruno Oberle) made his closing remarks and honoured outgoing members of the IUCN Council. He started by acknowledging that the Congress had been a success against all odds and that it had enabled participants to join discussions in-person and virtually. He noted that there were more than 5,000 on-site participants, more than 3,000 virtual participants and over 25,000 visiting members of the general public, who had participated in countless events. The IUCN Congress remained a unique global environmental parliament, where governments, NGOs and indigenous peoples' organisations had a voice. Dr Oberle emphasised that the decisions made at Congress would drive actions on climate change and the biodiversity crisis in the crucial decade to come. He recalled the title of the Marseille Congress – 'Resilience is in our Nature' – and stressed that "*the time for fundamental changes is now*". He concluded by acknowledging the work of the IUCN Secretariat staff, the Commissions, and all Members.

The **Director General** presented the outgoing Regional Councillors and Commission Chairs with certificates of appreciation for their service during the last intersessional period.

Agenda item 9.2 – Message from the President Elect

In her first speech addressing the IUCN Congress, the **President Elect** (Razan Al Mubarak, United Arab Emirates) noted that she was only the second woman elected to the IUCN Presidency in 72 years, and the first from the Arab world. She thanked the City of Marseille and the Country of France for their hospitality and for having ensured the health and safety of all participants. She further extended her appreciation to all IUCN Secretariat staff for making the IUCN Congress a success. Not only had the hybrid Congress exceeded expectations in terms of participation, but also in terms of election turnout. Ms Al Mubarak committed to working hand-in-hand with the Director General to bring harmony across IUCN and to never lose sight of what nature demanded of IUCN. She thanked the outgoing President and congratulated the newly elected Council. Upon reflection on the achievements of the last few days, she noted that nature needed IUCN to step up and to take strong,

bold and ambitious steps. In closing, she reminded participants of the ethical duty to care for nature and biodiversity and to recognise the contribution of nature and biodiversity to humanity.

Agenda item 9.3 – Closure of the IUCN World Conservation Congress by the outgoing President (including a closing speech from a representative of the Host Country)

Ms Asha Sumputh welcomed **Mr Benoît Payan, Mayor of Marseille** to the stage.

Mr Payan congratulated the President-elect on her election and said that the main conclusion that could be drawn from the Congress was clear: only the actions of humankind could save the planet and all living things from extinction. He reminded the audience that only 10 years remained to contain climate change, and to halt the sixth mass extinction of biodiversity, that the ecological emergency was an emergency for all and that it was not reserved for international conferences. He also recalled the important commitments that the City of Marseille made to protect its biodiversity, including to reach carbon neutrality by 2030. He welcomed the adoption of Governance Motion A allowing sub-national governments to become full Members of IUCN and noted the City of Marseille's intention to apply for membership. He concluded by reflecting that: *“To the CBD COP15 we send a message: hear us and take action – the whole world is watching you.”*

Mr Didier Réault, Vice President of the Aix-Marseille Provence Metropolis and Councillor of the Bouches-du-Rhône Department thanked IUCN for organising the World Conservation Congress in Marseille and emphasised the importance of reminding each and every citizen that they could also participate in the protection of environment and nature and that actions could be more impactful if everyone combined forces. He also recalled the wealth of biodiversity in the Provence region, including several protected areas, some of which are located in metropolitan areas, such as the Parc national des Calanques.

Emphasising the wealth of discussions that occurred during the 10 days of the Congress, **Ms Anne Claudius-Petit, President of the Commission Energy Transition, Waste Strategy, Air Quality** thanked all delegates and partners for participating and shared some of the initiatives undertaken by the region, including the preservation and replanting of forests as part of the Bonn Challenge, a call for zero plastic in the Mediterranean, and collaboration with other countries, such as Costa Rica. She observed that the Congress was a collective investment with local partners and communities and echoed Mr Payan's words on the benefits of full IUCN membership for sub-national governments.

The **President** (Zhang Xinsheng) expressed heartfelt gratitude to the host country France and highlighted the importance of the Congress as a true milestone leading towards a new era of ecological civilisation and building a shared future for all life on earth. He highlighted three characteristics that made the Congress in Marseille a success: it was a hybrid and resilient Congress that had concluded concrete commitments in the *Marseille Manifesto*; it had served as a kick-off to forthcoming Conferences of the Parties under the Convention on Biological Diversity and the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change; and it had allowed for the forging of new partnerships to promote integrated action on biodiversity and climate change. He concluded: *“The road ahead of us is circuitous, but the future is bright. Let us forge ahead with action, action and action!”* and declared the Marseille World Conservation Congress closed.

Annex 1 – The Marseille Manifesto

The IUCN World Conservation Congress in Marseille comes to a close in the midst of a global pandemic, and escalating climate and biodiversity emergencies. This exacerbates inequalities within and among countries and reinforces global divides.

The climate and biodiversity emergencies are not distinct, but two aspects of one crisis. Unsustainable human activity continues to compound the situation, and threatens not only our own survival but the foundation of life on Earth. We cannot separate ourselves from nature: we are part of nature, and depend upon it for our lives and livelihoods. Our response to these emergencies must be mutually reinforcing. For example, measures designed to address climate change must not lead to further biodiversity loss.

Humanity has reached a tipping point. Our window of opportunity to respond to these interlinked emergencies and share planetary resources equitably is narrowing quickly. Our existing systems do not work. Economic “success” can no longer come at nature’s expense. We urgently need systemic reform.

Yet there is reason to be optimistic. We are perfectly capable of making transformative change and doing it swiftly. During the global pandemic, we have changed our behaviour to protect our health, and the health of those around us. Fundamental change is again needed if we are to build societies that value, protect, and invest in nature. To invest in nature is to invest in our collective future.

The IUCN Congress recognises that we have *one nature, one future* and so commits to:

Respecting and harnessing the perspectives and agency of all citizens – especially youth¹, the leaders of the future, who constitute almost a fifth of the global population. The rights of indigenous peoples and local communities underpin their central role in conservation, as leaders and custodians of biodiversity. The agency of those who are marginalised, whether economically, socially or politically, including women must be enhanced. IUCN recognises that it is these groups who are most affected by the climate and nature emergencies, and that they also offer innovative solutions to them. IUCN, its Members and partners commit to supporting and strengthening their agency, promoting diversity and inclusivity in leadership and throughout our work. Around the world, those working to defend the environment are under attack. This includes communities and frontline workers like rangers. IUCN commits to work to protect environmental defenders. Further, IUCN urges its Members and partners to use the IUCN Natural Resource Governance Framework to strengthen inclusivity and equity more generally.

Pursuing collaboration and partnerships. To find common ground and encourage action, we must embrace diversity of opinion, framed by scientific evidence, and promote teaching and learning. This will allow us to work across disciplines and sectors, and adopt solutions that draw on the widest variety of experience, knowledge and traditions. It is time to broaden our perspectives. More cooperation, especially between countries, is needed to reinforce international and regional efforts. IUCN, as a convener and inclusive, democratic forum, stands ready to facilitate and build partnerships that enhance the capacity of our Members: State, civil society, and indigenous peoples’ organisation (IPOs).

Local action as a powerful tool for change, which complements action at other scales. The Congress commits to fostering a new approach with a meaningful role for all, from grassroots

¹ 15-24 years’ old

organisations to governments and communities to corporations. Our new approach must recognise everyone's responsibility, and guide them to act for nature and our future. IUCN encourages all citizens to do so wherever they are; be it in cities, farms, at sea, in workplaces, or schools.

IUCN Members and partners renew their commitment to work together to address the COVID-19 pandemic and the biodiversity-climate crisis, reaffirming that people and nature are at the heart of our pledges. These crises are destroying the lives and livelihoods of hundreds of millions of people.

Countering the impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic

The pandemic makes clear our unsustainable relationship with nature. It amplifies the social, economic, and health inequities within and between societies, and between the Global North and the Global South. The links between people and nature mean that these issues can be resolved together. We need to conserve nature to maintain our own resilience. We must ensure more inclusive and just decision-making as we rebuild from the pandemic. This is an opportunity to recognise the rights and agency of indigenous peoples and local communities more fully, as set out in the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples.

The Congress encourages governments, civil society, and the private sector to restore a positive relationship with nature and people by:

Promoting investments in nature. Governments are now committed to stimulate economies. This generates a unique opportunity to create sustainable jobs, accelerate the just transition to a low carbon and sustainable blue economy, respect and engage communities, especially indigenous peoples and youth, end harmful investments and redirect them towards those that contribute to nature. IUCN urges governments to implement a “nature-based recovery”. To do so will provide public investments, and encourage the private sector and civil society to invest. At least 10% of the total global recovery investments should protect and restore nature, and the remainder must do no additional harm.

Transitioning to a nature-positive economy. More than half of the global economy is linked to nature. While using Nature-based Solutions to help countries recover is strongly supported, we must look to the long-term. IUCN urges governments to reform financial, economic, and regulatory systems and end subsidies that harm nature. Adopting a circular economy approach could help preserve critically-important global commons such as the ocean. Furthermore, IUCN implores corporations and other investors to screen new investments for their impacts and dependencies on nature in a scientifically rigorous manner and take appropriate action.

Prioritising investments in nature that advance social justice and inclusion. New investments, though well-intentioned, can exacerbate existing inequalities if not designed carefully. Particular efforts must be made to include marginalised groups, and importantly, realise the agency of women, youth, local communities and indigenous peoples in investments in Nature-based Solutions. IUCN encourages governments and the private sector to adopt the IUCN Global Standard for Nature-based Solutions, and ensure that investments benefit nature, are sustainable and contribute to social and economic equity. The United Nations is requested to show leadership by recognising and implementing the right to a safe, clean, healthy and sustainable environment.

Halting biodiversity loss by committing to a transformative, effective, and ambitious post-2020 global biodiversity framework

The next months will largely determine how countries address the biodiversity emergency. Decisive and collaborative action is imperative at the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) COP-15 and beyond. If we are to secure the future of life on the planet, we must halt the loss of biodiversity by 2030 and achieve ecosystem recovery and restoration by 2050.

The IUCN Congress urges governments, the private sector, non-governmental organisations (NGOs), indigenous peoples' organisations and community-based organisations to take actions that drastically reduce the causes of biodiversity loss, and drive transformative changes across all sectors. This includes a shift in cultural relationships with nature to ensure its conservation, restoration, and sustainable use.

Understanding transformed ecosystems better, including agricultural landscapes and coasts, is critical for biodiversity. It also benefits people, climate and nature. Biodiversity and conservation matter everywhere. We must address the factors that diminish life, and the one health we share with animals and the environment. Pollutants, including those from agriculture and industry, destroy the biodiversity of soils, water, land and the ocean. These must be phased out. To sustain a healthy ocean we must end plastic pollution and overfishing. The Congress urges citizens to pursue nature conservation in their neighbourhoods and communities, develop ecological and regenerative approaches that promote biodiversity, and restore habitats to boost and sustain productivity.

Committing to an ambitious, interconnected and effective site-based conservation network that represents all areas of importance for biodiversity and ecosystem services is crucial. Such a network must recognise the roles and custodianship of indigenous peoples and local communities. Their diverse use of biodiversity can be compatible with effective conservation. Marine and terrestrial protected areas must be no-go zones for damaging industrial activities. The Congress implores governments to set ambitious protected area and other effective area-based conservation measure (OECM) targets by calling for at least 30% of the planet to be protected by 2030. These targets must be based upon the latest science, and reinforce rights – including Free Prior Informed Consent – as set out in the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples. IUCN must boost the agency of indigenous peoples and local communities, and reduce biodiversity loss at scale. Governments are encouraged to use IUCN's protected area management categories, and the many tools developed by IUCN to support such efforts. Application of the IUCN Green List of Protected and Conserved Areas Standard, for example, will ensure that areas are effectively managed and equitably governed to deliver long-term biodiversity outcomes. Intact land and seascapes need to be fully protected from industrial-scale activities, including deep seabed mining. In this respect, ambitious quantitative targets are insufficient unless there is commitment to effective implementation and meaningful funding for conservation.

Mobilising partnerships is vital in order to accelerate restoration on land and in the ocean, and to achieving greater impact by reaching larger audiences. The Congress calls on governments, NGOs and other actors to ensure that restoration benefits nature, aligns with science, recognises and respects traditional and other knowledge systems, acknowledges the diverse uses of ecosystems and builds alliances between the biodiversity and climate change communities.

Fostering effective conservation of species, ecosystems and genetic diversity is essential for the recovery of biodiversity, including soil and agro-ecological diversity. IUCN and its Members and partners, commit to work to conserve genetic diversity, avoid species extinction, and promote the sustained recovery of biodiversity and healthy ecosystems on land and in our seas. It will do this by helping governments and other stakeholders to use the available conservation tools and resources. The Congress urges governments to accommodate biodiversity in all policies, programmes, and strategies and in particular, those to tackle the climate crisis. Congress also calls for action to improve our understanding of the links between human, animal and environmental health. Action is needed to improve the sustainable use of natural resources, reduce deforestation, promote sustainable food production and account for and eliminate the negative environmental impacts of international trade.

Confronting the risks and impacts of the climate emergency

The average global temperature has increased by approximately 1°C above pre-industrial levels. The events of 2021 – catastrophic floods, heatwaves, and wildfires – remove any doubt that greenhouse gas emissions from human activity are destabilising established ways of life in developing and rich economies alike. Indigenous peoples as well as coastal, island, and dryland communities are hit hardest by the impacts of the climate emergency, although they contributed the least. Importantly, they possess traditional knowledge that contributes to effective solutions. Some scientists worry that we are now close to an irreversible tipping point. The Congress urges ambitious and effective action, including at UNFCCC COP 26 and beyond. Governments must act to limit greenhouse gas emissions, strengthen adaptation, and drive a just transition to a low carbon economy.

Reducing greenhouse gas emissions urgently across all sectors worldwide to limit the temperature rise to less than 1.5°C and achieve carbon neutrality by 2050 is imperative. Global warming threatens our global goals, and those economies that have benefited most from fossil fuels must now lead the way in reducing emissions. The Congress calls for the decarbonisation of the global economy, and decoupling economic growth from the use of fossil fuels. Governments should rapidly phase out all support for carbon-intensive energy generation and halt international investments in fossil fuels while ensuring that this transition is equitable.

The Congress urges governments and the private sector to ensure that those who are most vulnerable are not abandoned in this transition, and do not bear the costs of it. New green technologies must not become drivers of the loss of land rights. Equally, any negative effects on ecosystems that might arise from the response to climate change, including from emerging technologies and industries, must be avoided.

The Congress implores governments to implement *Nature-based Solutions* while significantly reducing fossil-fuel emissions. Nature-based solutions could provide around 30% of the mitigation required by 2030 while helping to protect vulnerable communities and countries from the impacts of climate change. These solutions also contribute to conserving biodiversity and supporting jobs, livelihoods and health. The ocean sequesters carbon but is increasingly damaged by warming, deoxygenation, and acidification from greenhouse gas pollution. IUCN encourages governments to integrate Nature-based Solutions as part of their commitments under the Paris Agreement, and to apply the IUCN Global Standard for Nature-based Solutions during implementation. IUCN also urges all non-state actors to include Nature-based Solutions in their commitments under the UNFCCC's Race to Zero and Race to Resilience initiatives.

Optimising the global response requires action from all, and for all to be able to act: IUCN, through its Members and partners, commits to supporting new coalitions to effectively and responsibly implement Nature-based Solutions that address the climate-biodiversity crisis. Furthermore, acknowledging initiatives such as the Glasgow Finance Alliance for Net-Zero, the Congress stresses the fundamental importance of mobilising climate-related finance from all sources. These must be sufficient to achieve the ambition of low greenhouse gas emissions and climate-resilient development as reflected in the Paris Agreement.

THE IUCN WORLD CONSERVATION CONGRESS'S COMMITMENT TO ACTION

At the World Conservation Congress, hosted by France in Marseille, September 2021, IUCN Members and partners commit to deliver on the following actions as a substantive and significant contribution to the post-pandemic recovery and the biodiversity-climate crisis. These commitments will be documented and monitored through the IUCN Contributions to Nature Platform. The Union will report back on progress achieved at the next World Conservation Congress.

- Under the leadership of Western Indian Ocean states, IUCN and partners commit to support the establishment and implementation of the Great Blue Wall Initiative, the first regionally connected network to develop a regenerative blue economy to the benefit of 70 million people, while conserving and restoring marine and coastal biodiversity
- IUCN commits to support and prioritise the implementation of the first IUCN Global Indigenous Agenda for the Governance of Indigenous Lands, Territories, Waters, Coastal Seas and Natural Resources, a self-determined strategy developed and owned by indigenous peoples, as a contribution to the work of the Union and global conservation. Its implementation shall be guided by the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (UNDRIP).
- The UNFCCC High Level Champions for Climate Action and IUCN are establishing a partnership to enhance and accelerate global and regional net-zero initiatives by non-State actors that systematically integrates nature and Nature-based Solutions and deliver on the Race to Zero, Race to Resilience, mobilising climate finance while supporting the post-2020 biodiversity agenda.
- Over 30 subnational governments, cities, partner organisations and IUCN agreed to expand universal access to high-quality green spaces and to enhance urban biodiversity in 100 cities, representing around 100 million citizens by 2025, and assessing their impact according to the IUCN Urban Nature Index.
- Five multi-national companies – Kering, Holcim, L’Occitane, LVMH, Pernod Ricard – with a combined annual turnover of USD 92 billion and close to 300,000 employees committed to restore and enhance biodiversity through nature-positive corporate strategies and actions. These commitments will be integrated into their operational landscapes and supply chains, measured and reported on.
- Greece committed to reduce overfishing by establishing no-takes zones in 10% of their territorial waters by 2030 and to reduce marine plastic pollution by 60%.
- El Salvador, Belize, Pakistan, Chile and Region Sud, France committed to restore a collective total of 5.5 million hectares, increasing the total Bonn Challenge commitments to over 215 million hectares, while the Government of Germany has allocated €20 million to IUCN to establish a Forest Landscape Restoration technical expert hub.
- The International Hydropower Association has committed to a clear no-go commitment to operations within World Heritage sites that is binding on all its members. They will also continue to work with IUCN to explore how this commitment can be expanded to cover other categories of protected areas.
- 15 new country commitments to the IUCN Green List Standard, totalling more than 30 million hectares of protected and conserved areas, bringing the number of participating ‘Green List’ countries to more than 70 worldwide.
- IUCN Members, supported by the IUCN National and Regional Committees, commit to deliver contributions to the Nature 2030 IUCN Programme and global goals for nature, and document those through the "Contributions for Nature Platform".

At the World Conservation Congress, the host country France committed to:

- Achieve 30% of protected areas nationally by 2022 and 5% of its Mediterranean maritime area under strong protection by 2027, 25 times more than the current area.
- Help advance the international agenda for the protection of the oceans by organising, in conjunction with the UN, a One Ocean Summit.
- Accelerate the fight against imported deforestation and protect forests with the Alliance for the Conservation of Rainforests.

- Promote a treaty on plastic pollution.
- Include financial risks linked to the loss of biodiversity in economic and financial analyses and strengthen investments favourable to biodiversity, in particular, Nature-based Solutions to support the ecological transition in agriculture, forests, soils and carbon sinks.

Annex 2 – Statements by State Members: the United States Government, South Africa and Canada

Statement of the United States of America IUCN World Conservation Congress Members Assembly Marseille, France

On behalf of the U.S. government and its agency members of IUCN, the Department of State Bureau of Oceans, Environment and Science and the United States Embassy in Paris extends their deepest thanks to France for hosting this World Conservation Congress, particularly given the various and formidable challenges of the moment. France's commitment to hosting an organized, safe, and productive Congress created the foundation for this successful week, a commitment equal to France's ambition to protect and conserve biodiversity in France and around the world.

As always at IUCN Congresses, we have found the energy, passion, commitment, creativity, and resolve of IUCN members and participants this week to be truly inspiring. We value the IUCN Congress as the venue for members to come together to share our different experiences and approaches to advance our common goal of conserving nature and recognizing nature's centrality to many of our greatest common challenges, from health to equity to tackling the climate crisis. We commend IUCN and members' commitment to promote dialogue and information sharing on different approaches dealing with conservation challenges, and the work to elevate women, youth, and indigenous peoples' role in setting IUCN's conservation agenda and delivering the IUCN Program of Work.

We appreciate the collaborative and constructive discussions held during this congress, including in contact groups on motions that were brought before the Members Assembly for vote. We feel it is important to review and provide guidance on all of the motions. However, we prioritize engagement on those motions that reflect the concerns of the broader membership or are most relevant for IUCN's Program of Work. We maintain our view that there are some types of motions on which it may not be appropriate for us, as a government, to engage or negotiate.

Among these are motions directed primarily to a single government or group of governments on national, bilateral or regional issues. We often lack sufficient factual information about such issues and believe that responses to these motions are best left to the country or countries affected. We will not take a position as a government on such motions, except as they have direct implications for the U.S. Government. In such instances, we may provide a statement for the record to help clarify the issues raised and provide our perspective.

A second group of issues are those focused on global issues that we agree are important but that are topics of ongoing international policy debate in, or infringe on the independent legal mandates of, other fora, such as climate change, and biodiversity of areas beyond national jurisdiction. We respect the interest of members in issues of global concern and we share many of these interests, especially on emerging issues such as the role of ecosystems in food security and the importance of the illegal trade in wildlife. However, we do not intend here to take national government positions on the particular views presented in these IUCN motions or to vote on the outcome.

As we have in the past, the United States will submit brief statements clarifying U.S. views on many of the motions before the Congress. We will submit these statements in writing and ask that they be placed in the Congress proceedings with their respective motions. In keeping with our past practice, we are also providing a list for the record of those resolutions on which the U.S. Government has refrained from engaging.

We request that this statement be entered in full for the record in the report of this congress.
Congratulations everyone on a successful Congress.
Thank you.

**Statement for the record by State Member South Africa concerning
the IUCN motions process**

Note: This statement was submitted to the Secretariat on the closing day of the Congress (10 September 2021) but was not actually tabled during Sittings of the Members' Assembly.

“The Ministry of Forestry, Fisheries and the Environment also noted with serious concerns the use of Nature Based Solutions in most of the approved motion including motion 008; 036; 073; and 078. This term is not an approved term under the UN structures and there is no consensus on the definition.

The Ministry also noted with disappointment that IUCN continue to set-up structures which works in parallel with the UN Structures. The formation of the new Climate Change Commission as the 7th IUCN Commission is not encouraged since there are well established bodies (i.e. IPCC and IPBES) that support the mandated Rio Conventions to deal with the challenge of climate change, biodiversity and ecosystems. In addition, the Climate Change activities is embedded in the 6th Commissions, therefore the creation of the new structure will unnecessarily duplicate work. Motion 34 may assist with achieving the same objectives instead of establishing a new structure. The Ministry does not support this motion in its entirety.

The Ministry also noted the approval of Motion 132, in particular operative paragraph 1 (a) which REQUESTS the Director General and the Species Survival Commission (SSC) to: by 2023 produce an analysis on the impacts of the demand for and trade in fish maws on croaker species and threatened marine megafauna and evaluate the effectiveness of listing croakers in the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES). It is not the mandate of the IUCN to evaluate the listing, the IUCN's role should be to provide research support and allow CITES to perform their mandate.

The Ministry suggest that IUCN Council evaluate the process of submitting motions with the view of improving the processes to allow that motion like this are sifted before they are brought to the Members Sitting for voting.”

Statement for the record by State Member Canada explaining its vote on policy motions

Note: This statement was submitted to the Secretariat after the Congress (on 20 September 2021) and was not tabled during Sittings of the Members' Assembly.

“Canada is in a federal election period. As such, its Caretaker Convention applies and policy positions cannot be confirmed. Therefore, Canada has abstained on all policy motions at this time.”

Annex 3 – Table of motions (and other key decisions) adopted by the World Conservation Congress, with corresponding Resolution or Recommendation numbers and titles

Motion number	Res-Rec ID	Title
001	WCC-2020-Res-001-EN	Archiving Resolutions and Recommendations meeting retirement criteria, consolidating policy and future reviews
002	WCC-2020-Res-002-EN	Strengthened institutional inclusion concerning indigenous peoples
003	WCC-2020-Res-110-EN	Establishing a Climate Change Commission
004	WCC-2020-Res-003-EN	Transforming global food systems through sustainable land management that is aligned to the UN SDGs
005	WCC-2020-Res-004-EN	Urgent action against the grass <i>Cortaderia selloana</i> outside of its natural distribution range
006	WCC-2020-Res-005-EN	Promoting harmony between cranes – flagships for biodiversity – and agriculture
007	WCC-2020-Res-006-EN	Declaration of priority for the conservation of tropical dry forests in South America
008	WCC-2020-Res-007-EN	Developing agroecological practices as nature-based solutions
009	WCC-2020-Res-008-EN	Protecting rivers and their associated ecosystems as corridors in a changing climate
010	WCC-2020-Res-009-EN	Protecting and restoring endangered grassland and savannah ecosystems
011	WCC-2020-Res-010-EN	Preventing conflicts of interest related to chemicals and plant protection products
012	WCC-2020-Rec-011-EN	The fight against imported deforestation
013	WCC-2020-Res-111-EN	Protection of Andes-Amazon rivers of Peru: the Marañón, Ucayali, Huallaga and Amazonas, from large-scale infrastructure projects
014	WCC-2020-Res-012-EN	Aquatic biodiversity conservation of shallow marine and freshwater systems
015	WCC-2020-Res-013-EN	Supporting the Lower Mekong Basin countries with the transboundary management of water resources, ecosystems and biodiversity
016	WCC-2020-Res-014-EN	The importance of a cross-border approach to prioritise biodiversity conservation, adaptation to climate change and risk management in the Río de la Plata Basin
017	WCC-2020-Res-015-EN	Cooperation on transboundary fresh waters to ensure ecosystem conservation, climate resilience and sustainable development
018	WCC-2020-Res-016-EN	Conservation of spring ecosystems in the Mediterranean region
019	WCC-2020-Res-017-EN	Protection of natural flows of water for the conservation of wetlands
020	WCC-2020-Res-018-EN	Valuing and protecting inland fisheries
021	WCC-2020-Rec-112-EN	Planning of maritime areas and biodiversity and geodiversity conservation
022	WCC-2020-Res-019-EN	Stopping the global plastic pollution crisis in marine environments by 2030
023	WCC-2020-Rec-020-EN	Protection of herbivorous fish for improved coral community
024	WCC-2020-Res-113-EN	Restoring a peaceful and quiet ocean
025	WCC-2020-Rec-021-EN	Halting biodiversity loss in the insular Caribbean

World Conservation Congress / Marseille, France, 3–10 September 2021

026	WCC-2020-Res-022-EN	Establishment of a mid-frequency active (MFA – 1 to 10 KHz) sonar moratorium for maritime military exercises conducted in Macaronesia
027	WCC-2020-Res-023-EN	Reducing impacts of incidental capture on threatened marine species
028	WCC-2020-Rec-024-EN	For an improved management of drifting fish aggregating devices (FADs) in purse seine fisheries
029	WCC-2020-Res-025-EN	Ecosystem conservation, restoration and remediation in the ocean
030	WCC-2020-Res-026-EN	International cooperation on marine pollution from sunken vessels
031	WCC-2020-Res-027-EN	Seascapes working for biodiversity conservation
032	WCC-2020-Res-028-EN	Updating of the legislation to stop the pollution of oceans caused by the discharging of wastewater by ships
033	WCC-2020-Rec-029-EN	For the urgent global management of marine and coastal sand resources
034	WCC-2020-Res-114-EN	Integrated solutions to the climate change and biodiversity crises
035	WCC-2020-Res-030-EN	Enhancing the resilience of coastal areas in the face of climate change, biodiversity crisis and rapid coastal development
036	WCC-2020-Res-031-EN	The implementation of Nature-based Solutions in the Mediterranean Basin
037	WCC-2020-Res-032-EN	Ocean impacts of climate change
038	WCC-2020-Res-033-EN	Promoting biodiversity preservation through environmentally friendly energy transformation measures
039	WCC-2020-Res-115-EN	Protecting environmental human and peoples' rights defenders and whistleblowers
040	WCC-2020-Res-116-EN	Develop and implement a transformational and effective post-2020 global biodiversity framework
041	WCC-2020-Res-034-EN	Ecological integrity in the post-2020 global biodiversity framework
042	WCC-2020-Res-035-EN	Promoting IUCN leadership in the implementation of the UN Decade on Restoration 2021–2030
043	WCC-2020-Res-036-EN	Declaration of global priority for conservation in the Amazon Biome
044	WCC-2020-Res-117-EN	Actions to strengthen food sovereignty and security of indigenous peoples and peasant communities
045	WCC-2020-Res-118-EN	Recognising and supporting indigenous peoples' and local communities' rights and roles in conservation
046	WCC-2020-Res-037-EN	Strengthening the Global Judicial Institute on the Environment and the Global Institute of Prosecutors for the Environment
047	WCC-2020-Res-038-EN	Treating organized crime having an impact on the environment as a serious crime
048	WCC-2020-Res-119-EN	Renunciation of the Doctrine of Discovery to Rediscover care for Mother Earth
049	WCC-2020-Rec-039-EN	Australia's extinction crisis and national environmental law reform
050	WCC-2020-Res-040-EN	Implementing international efforts to combat the sale of illegal wildlife products online
051	WCC-2020-Res-041-EN	Ensuring funding to secure rights and secure ecologies
052	WCC-2020-Res-042-EN	Protection of the environment in relation to armed conflict

World Conservation Congress / Marseille, France, 3–10 September 2021

053	WCC-2020-Res-043-EN	Enhancing implementation of the Convention on Biological Diversity through National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans (NBSAPs)
054	WCC-2020-Res-044-EN	Climate crisis legal toolkit
055	WCC-2020-Res-045-EN	Global Indigenous Network for Aquaculture (GINA)
056	WCC-2020-Res-046-EN	Creation of the Ombudsperson for Future Generations
057	WCC-2020-Res-047-EN	Law enforcement regarding commercial trade in tigers and tiger parts
058	WCC-2020-Res-048-EN	Contributions of the Conservation-enabling Hierarchy to the post-2020 CBD framework
059	WCC-2020-Res-049-EN	Mainstreaming the Cerrado in international cooperation and global environmental funds
060	WCC-2020-Res-050-EN	Measuring the effectiveness of environmental law using legal indicators
061	WCC-2020-Res-051-EN	Regional agreement on access to information, public participation and access to justice in environmental matters in Latin America and the Caribbean
062	WCC-2020-Res-120-EN	Towards a Policy on Natural Capital
063	WCC-2020-Rec-052-EN	Dams in the Alto Paraguay River Basin, the Pantanal and the Paraguay-Paraná Wetland System
064	WCC-2020-Res-053-EN	Promoting sustainable and ethical mining practices in Africa
065	WCC-2020-Res-054-EN	Engaging the private sector to combat wildlife trafficking
066	WCC-2020-Res-055-EN	Guidance to identify industrial fishing incompatible with protected areas
067	WCC-2020-Res-121-EN	Reducing the impacts of the mining industry on biodiversity
068	WCC-2020-Res-056-EN	Biodiversity financing
069	WCC-2020-Res-122-EN	Protection of deep-ocean ecosystems and biodiversity through a moratorium on seabed mining
070	WCC-2020-Res-057-EN	Accounting for biodiversity: encompassing ecosystems, species and genetic diversity
071	WCC-2020-Res-058-EN	Safeguarding coral reefs from harmful chemicals in sunscreen
072	WCC-2020-Res-059-EN	Combating the illegal trade in lion body parts and derivatives
073	WCC-2020-Res-060-EN	Promotion of the IUCN Global Standard for Nature-based Solutions
074	WCC-2020-Res-061-EN	Partnerships and further development of a Global Ecosystem Typology
075	WCC-2020-Res-123-EN	Towards development of an IUCN policy on synthetic biology in relation to nature conservation
076	WCC-2020-Res-062-EN	Role of children and youth in nature conservation
077	WCC-2020-Res-063-EN	Urgent call to share and use primary biodiversity in situ data
078	WCC-2020-Res-064-EN	Promoting conservation through behaviour-centred solutions
079	WCC-2020-Res-065-EN	Enhancing knowledge of natural resource conservation and alternative sustainable energy models through faith-based organisation networks
080	WCC-2020-Res-066-EN	Generalising alternative practices and techniques to the use of synthetic pesticides
081	WCC-2020-Res-067-EN	Call for Nature in Cities agendas and strengthening the IUCN Urban Alliance

World Conservation Congress / Marseille, France, 3–10 September 2021

082	WCC-2020-Res-068-EN	Greater Blue Mountains World Heritage Area
083	WCC-2020-Res-069-EN	Eliminate plastic pollution in protected areas, with priority action on single-use plastic products
084	WCC-2020-Res-124-EN	Taking action to reduce light pollution
085	WCC-2020-Res-070-EN	Combating soil degradation and artificialisation
086	WCC-2020-Res-071-EN	Wildlife-friendly linear infrastructure
087	WCC-2020-Res-072-EN	Importance for the conservation of nature of removing barriers to rights-based voluntary family planning
088	WCC-2020-Res-073-EN	Ecological connectivity conservation in the post-2020 global biodiversity framework: from local to international levels
089	WCC-2020-Res-074-EN	Geoheritage and protected areas
090	WCC-2020-Res-075-EN	Transboundary cooperation for conservation of big cats in Northeast Asia
091	WCC-2020-Res-076-EN	Building and strengthening wildlife economies in Eastern and Southern Africa
092	WCC-2020-Res-077-EN	Effects of the increase in the use of paper as a substitute for plastic on plantations of timber species
093	WCC-2020-Res-078-EN	Conservation, restoration and sustainable management of mangrove ecosystems
094	WCC-2020-Res-079-EN	Linking in situ and ex situ efforts to save threatened species
095	WCC-2020-Res-080-EN	Recognising, reporting and supporting other effective area-based conservation measures
096	WCC-2020-Res-081-EN	Strengthening national spatial planning to ensure the global persistence of biodiversity
097	WCC-2020-Res-082-EN	Reducing marine turtle bycatch: the important role of regulatory mechanisms in the global roll-out of Turtle Excluder Devices
098	WCC-2020-Res-083-EN	Ensuring the compatibility of human activities with conservation objectives in protected areas
099	WCC-2020-Res-084-EN	Global response to protected area downgrading, downsizing and degazettement (PADDD)
100	WCC-2020-Res-085-EN	Rewilding
101	WCC-2020-Res-125-EN	Setting area-based conservation targets based on evidence of what nature and people need to thrive
102	WCC-2020-Rec-086-EN	Strengthening mutual benefits of mobile pastoralism and wildlife in shared landscapes
103	WCC-2020-Res-087-EN	Urgent measures to safeguard the globally important Atewa Forest, Ghana
104	WCC-2020-Res-088-EN	Conservation of the natural diversity and natural heritage in mining environments
105	WCC-2020-Rec-089-EN	Preventing the extinction of the Great Indian Bustard (<i>Ardeotis nigriceps</i>) in India
106	WCC-2020-Res-090-EN	Continental conservation priority for the jaguar (<i>Panthera onca</i>)
107	WCC-2020-Res-091-EN	Global Conservation of rhino rays (Rhinidae, Glaucostegidae, Rhinobatidae)
108	WCC-2020-Res-092-EN	Adapting traditional medicine to achieve social and environmental sustainability

World Conservation Congress / Marseille, France, 3–10 September 2021

109	WCC-2020-Res-093-EN	A call for increased consideration of genetic diversity in IUCN planning and actions
110	WCC-2020-Rec-094-EN	Safeguarding the Endangered narrow-ridged finless porpoise (<i>Neophocaena asiaeorientalis</i>) in the Yellow Sea
111	WCC-2020-Res-095-EN	Conservation of seahorses, pipefishes and seadragons (family Syngnathidae)
112	WCC-2020-Res-096-EN	Maximising return on conservation investments and sustainable development: eradicating invasive alien species (IAS) to conserve island biodiversity and benefit society
113	WCC-2020-Rec-097-EN	National Plan for the Sustainable Management of the Guanaco in Argentina
114	WCC-2020-Res-098-EN	Saving the world's otters
115	WCC-2020-Rec-099-EN	Strengthening great ape conservation across countries, in and outside of protected areas, involving local actors
116	WCC-2020-Res-100-EN	Building Madagascar's capacity to counter the threat from invasive species
117	WCC-2020-Res-101-EN	Addressing human-wildlife conflict: fostering a safe and beneficial coexistence of people and wildlife
118	WCC-2020-Rec-126-EN	Reinforcing the protection of marine mammals through regional cooperation
119	WCC-2020-Res-102-EN	Improving process and action to identify and recover 'Extinct in the Wild' species
120	WCC-2020-Res-103-EN	Action against Asian songbird trafficking
121	WCC-2020-Res-104-EN	Next IUCN World Parks Congress
122	WCC-2020-Res-105-EN	Conserving and protecting coral reefs through the post-2020 global biodiversity framework
123	WCC-2020-Res-106-EN	Protection of Kakadu World Heritage site and rehabilitation of the Ranger uranium mine and Ranger Project Area
124	WCC-2020-Res-107-EN	Reducing the impact of fisheries on marine biodiversity
125	WCC-2020-Res-127-EN	Strengthening the protection of primary and old-growth forests in Europe and facilitating their restoration where possible
126	WCC-2020-Res-128-EN	Acting for the conservation and sustainable use of marine biological diversity in the ocean beyond national jurisdiction
127	WCC-2020-Res-108-EN	Deforestation and agricultural commodity supply chains
128	WCC-2020-Rec-109-EN	Increasing funding for biodiversity in developing countries
129	WCC-2020-Res-129-EN	Avoiding the point of no return in the Amazon protecting 80% by 2025
130	WCC-2020-Res-130-EN	Strengthening sustainable tourism's role in biodiversity conservation and community resilience
131	WCC-2020-Res-131-EN	Ensuring adequate funding for the IUCN Red List of Threatened Species
132	WCC-2020-Res-132-EN	Controlling and monitoring trade in croaker swim bladders to protect target croakers and reduce incidental catches of threatened marine megafauna
133	WCC-2020-Rec-133-EN	Call to withdraw draft-permit mining of fossil fuels underneath UNESCO World Heritage Site Wadden Sea
134	WCC-2020-Res-134-EN	Protecting the Lower Congo River from large hydro-electric dam developments

World Conservation Congress / Marseille, France, 3–10 September 2021

135	WCC-2020-Res-135-EN	Promoting human, animal and environmental health, and preventing pandemics through the One Health approach and by addressing the drivers of biodiversity loss
136	WCC-2020-Res-136-EN	Protecting the Okavango from oil and gas exploitation
137	WCC-2020-Res-137-EN	Affirming the right of Indigenous Peoples and local communities to sustainably manage and utilise wild resources in the context of COVID-19
A	WCC-2020-Dec-138-EN	Including subnational governments in IUCN’s membership
B	WCC-2020-Dec-139-EN	Election of Regional Councillors resident in dependent territories
C	WCC-2020-Dec-140-EN	Establishment of an elected Indigenous Councillor position
D	WCC-2020-Dec-141-EN	Modification of the term “Regional Councillor”
E	WCC-2020-Dec-142-EN	To protect the intellectual independence of the knowledge-based and evidence-based work carried out by the Commissions and Secretariat of IUCN
F	WCC-2020-Dec-143-EN	Role of Commissions in National and Regional Committees
G	WCC-2020-Dec-144-EN	Clarification of conditions for readmission of former State Members
H	WCC-2020-Dec-145-EN	Establishment, operating rules and oversight of National, Regional and Interregional Committees
I	WCC-2020-Dec-146-EN	Functions of the IUCN Treasurer
J	WCC-2020-Dec-147-EN	Development of a new 20-year Strategic Vision, inclusive of a Financial Strategy, and Strategic Plan for the Union
N	WCC-2020-Dec-148-EN	Enabling effective attendance and participation of Members in future sessions of the World Conservation Congress
Decision 149*	WCC-2020-Dec-149-EN	Nature 2030 - IUCN Programme 2021–2024*
Decision 150	WCC-2020-Dec-150-EN	Addendum to the IUCN Programme 2021–2024
Decision 151*	WCC-2020-Dec-151-EN	IUCN Financial Plan 2021–2024*
Decision 152*	WCC-2020-Dec-152-EN	IUCN Membership Dues Guide*
Decision 153*	WCC-2020-Dec-153-EN	Commission Mandate CEC*
Decision 154*	WCC-2020-Dec-154-EN	Commission Mandate CEM*
Decision 155*	WCC-2020-Dec-155-EN	Commission Mandate CEESP*
Decision 156*	WCC-2020-Dec-156-EN	Commission Mandate SSC*
Decision 157*	WCC-2020-Dec-157-EN	Commission Mandate WCEL*
Decision 158*	WCC-2020-Dec-158-EN	Commission Mandate WCPA*

Decision 159	WCC-2020-Dec-159-EN	Developing a comprehensive gender approach at IUCN
Decision 160	WCC-2020-Dec-160-EN	The Marseille Manifesto
Decision 161	WCC-2020-Dec-161-EN	Election of the IUCN President, Treasurer, Chairs of Commissions and Regional Councillors 2021–2025

Decision items marked by * were adopted by IUCN Members during the electronic vote of Members in February 2021. For details, refer to [*Annex 4 Summary of online discussion and voting on motions ahead of the Members' Assembly*](#).

All Recommendations, Resolutions and other Decisions are available at:
<https://portals.iucn.org/library/resrec/search>

Annex 4 – Summary of online discussion and voting on motions ahead of the Members’ Assembly

Motions submitted by IUCN Members

Online discussion and voting on 109 motions submitted by Members was completed in October 2020. As a result of ongoing uncertainty about the date and format of the Congress due to the Covid-19 pandemic, Members decided overwhelmingly that, “*as an exception to Rule 62septimo of the Rules of Procedure of the World Conservation Congress, the motions adopted by this electronic vote become effective at the close of this electronic vote on motions*”. Consequently, the 109 motions that Members adopted by electronic vote entered into force as IUCN policy as of late October 2020. A further 19 motions submitted by Members were forwarded to the Members’ Assembly for further debate and were not subject to electronic voting. Further details can be found here:

<https://www.iucncongress2020.org/event/members-assembly/motions>

Governance-related motions

Following online discussion during the period October to December 2020 of nine motions covering proposals to amend the IUCN Statutes, as well as other governance issues, the Governance and Constituency Committee of Council decided to forward all nine motions to the Members’ Assembly for further discussion and not to submit them for electronic voting in early 2021 as initially foreseen. Further details can be found here:

<https://www.iucncongress2020.org/event/members-assembly/amendments-iucn-statutes>

Other Congress decisions

As a result of the postponement of the Congress, IUCN Council decided to submit a number of additional key items of Congress business (including the IUCN Programme and Financial Plan for 2021–2024, other financial and membership matters, and Commission Mandates) to an electronic vote early in 2021. Online discussion of these items took place from 22 October to 3 December 2020 and electronic voting took place between 27 January and 10 February 2021. The remainder of this document summarises the outcomes of the online discussion and electronic voting for the 12 decisions concerned, as follows:

- D01 IUCN Programme 2021–2024
- D02 IUCN Financial Plan 2021–2024
- D03 Proposal for Membership Dues
- D04 Rescission of Members’ rights whose dues are in arrears
- D05 Appointment of External Auditors
- D06 Audited Financial Statements for the period 2016–2019
- D07 Proposed Mandate for the Commission on Education and Communication (CEC)
- D08 Proposed Mandate for the Commission on Ecosystem Management (CEM)
- D09 Proposed Mandate for the Commission on Environmental, Economic and Social Policy (CEESP)
- D10 Proposed Mandate for the Species Survival Commission (SSC)
- D11 Proposed Mandate for the World Commission on Environmental Law (WCEL)
- D12 Proposed Mandate for the World Commission on Protected Areas (WCPA)

Motion D01 IUCN Programme 2021–2024

Summary of the online discussion

Substantive comments and proposed amendments were submitted by 19 IUCN Members.

The Center for Environmental Legal Studies – CEL (United States of America – USA) and International Council of Environmental Law – ICEL (USA), requested reconsideration of IUCN Council’s decision to reject Motion 40107 *Adding Mitigation of Energy Causes of Climate Change to Programme 2021–2024*. The IUCN Secretariat noted that the Programme and Policy Committee of Council (PPC) had taken into account the decision of Members at the 2016 Members’ Assembly to reject a similar amendment proposing the addition of a theme on energy in the IUCN Programme 2017–2020. In response, CEL and ICEL considered that the threats associated with climate change had grown exponentially in severity and threat, warranting reconsideration of Motion 40107. The PPC reconfirmed its decision to reject Motion 40107 but undertook to strengthen narrative sections of the Programme 2021–2024 in relation to climate change and the need to move away from fossil fuels.

In response to a question from the Japan National Committee of IUCN Members, the IUCN Secretariat clarified that the purpose of the ‘digital platform’ foreseen in Section 8 of the draft Programme 2021–2024 was to document the contributions of the whole Union to realisation of the Programme, and hence delivery against the Sustainable Development Goals, Paris Agreement, and post-2020 global biodiversity framework.

The Margaret Pyke Trust (UK) underlined that the draft Programme 2021–2024 should highlight the linkage between human health and environmental health as a two-way relationship.

The World Resources Institute, supported by Thinking Animals Inc., Wildlife Conservation Society, International Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies, Conservation International, Natural Resources Defense Council and National Whistleblower Center (all USA-based), as well as Culture and Environment Preservation Association (Cambodia), called for the draft Programme 2021–2024 to address explicitly the impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic. The Margaret Pyke Trust and Parks Canada Agency (PCA) concurred but advocated that this should be addressed in the context of wider human and environmental health interactions. PCA tabled a number of specific proposed amendments. The IUCN Species Survival Commission (SSC) Wildlife Health Specialist Group provided information on SSC’s development of a situation analysis on the linkages between wildlife and the emergence of infectious diseases in humans. Parks Victoria (Australia), supported by Australian Government Department of Agriculture, Water and Environment, proposed amendments highlighting the people-nature nexus as critical for biodiversity conservation. In response to these, PPC undertook to prepare, in conjunction with the IUCN Secretariat, an Addendum to the Programme addressing linkages between conservation and human health.

Wildlife Conservation Society, Natural Resources Defense Council (NRDC), National Whistleblower Center and Earth League International further considered that the Programme should give more attention to the significance of direct exploitation of species, especially through wildlife trade and wildlife crime. NRDC tabled a number of specific proposed amendments.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs and International Development (France) proposed additions to broaden the vision of conservation set out in the draft Programme.

The Norwegian Environment Agency tabled a number of specific proposed amendments.

Antarctic and Southern Ocean Coalition (USA) called for the Programme to put the weight of IUCN into efforts to secure new Marine Protected Areas in the Southern Ocean.

Sustainable Forestry Inc. – SFI (USA) called for IUCN and its Members to maintain focus on the key role of sustainably managed forests in securing positive global biodiversity outcomes. SFI also urged a wide view of ‘green jobs’ beyond conventional ‘rural livelihoods’.

In addition, statements of general support for the Programme were submitted by four Members.

Taking into account the comments and proposed amendments submitted, a revised text was prepared by PPC and submitted for the online vote.

Outcome of the electronic vote

DECISION 1

On the proposal of the IUCN Director General and with the approval of the Council in accordance with Article 88 (e) of the Statutes, IUCN Members **APPROVED** the IUCN Programme 2021–2024.

The result of electronic voting between 27 January and 10 February 2021 was as follows:

Motion D01	YES	NO	ABSTAIN*
Category A	140 (100%)	0	3
Category B	710 (99%)	5 (1%)	18

*Abstentions are not counted as votes cast (IUCN Statutes, Article 32).

Motion D02 IUCN Financial Plan 2021–2024

Summary of the online discussion

In response to points raised by the National Whistleblower Center (USA), the Chief Financial Officer noted that approximately CHF 1 million of core (unrestricted) resources were currently invested in dedicated fundraising support, with a similar amount invested in global communications, representing in each case about 3% of IUCN’s unrestricted budget and less than 1% of its total budget. He provided additional details of where these investments were located. The 10% increase in membership dues is based on the application of the Membership Dues Guide to be voted on in accordance with motion D03, and anticipated growth in the membership over the period 2021–2024. A consultation with the membership had taken place in late 2019 and early 2020 with regard to proposed changes to the dues methodology. The Financial Plan was supported by an Operational Plan, which was referenced in the document. In addition, it would be supported by an implementation plan to be developed in the first part of 2021.

The Ministry of the Environment of Finland enquired whether an assessment of the risk of losing Members as a result of the revised dues system has been undertaken.

In addition, statements of general support were submitted by two Members.

Outcome of the electronic vote

DECISION 2

On the proposal of the IUCN Director General and with the approval of the Council in accordance with Article 88 (e) of the Statutes and Article 91 of the Regulations, IUCN Members **APPROVED** the IUCN Financial Plan 2021–2024.

The result of electronic voting between 27 January and 10 February 2021 was as follows:

Motion D02	YES	NO	ABSTAIN*
Category A	132 (99%)	1 (1%)	8
Category B	651 (99%)	6 (1%)	68

*Abstentions are not counted as votes cast (IUCN Statutes, Article 32).

Motion D03 Proposal for Membership Dues

Summary of the online discussion

Substantive comments were received from seven IUCN Members. Fundación Ambiente y Recursos Naturales (Argentina) considered the proposal fair and reasonable, noting that many other membership organisations took into account the overall budget of members, not only operational budgets. Cornell Botanic Gardens (USA) felt that ‘venue-based’ organisations, including botanical gardens, would struggle to afford dues based on their overall budgets and that the proposed new dues structure was unfair. Thinking Animals Inc. (United States of America – USA), National Whistleblower Center (USA), Antarctic and Southern Ocean Coalition (USA) all proposed deferring this Motion for consideration by the Members’ Assembly during the forthcoming IUCN Congress. Association Sénégalaise des Amis de la Nature (Senegal) suggested that Council should assess on a regional basis the reality of the situation confronting Members unable to pay their dues. Environment and Conservation Organisations of New Zealand (New Zealand) was generally supportive but noted it would be important for all Members to know the level of dues to be paid in 2021. In addition, one Member indicated general support for the Motion.

Outcome of the electronic vote

DECISION 3

On the proposal of the IUCN Council, IUCN Members

1. **ADOPTED** the proposal for membership dues, according to Article 20 (f) of the IUCN Statutes (Annex 1); and
2. **MANDATED** the 2021–2024 Council to:
 - CONTINUE THE WORK achieved by the 2016–2020 Council on:
 - a. the issue of dues for venue-based organisations and government agencies;
 - b. the issue of the value of membership and Members facing difficult financial situations and not being able to pay their dues; and to
 - SUBMIT both proposals to IUCN Members by electronic vote before the next Congress.

The result of electronic voting between 27 January and 10 February 2021 was as follows:

Motion D03	YES	NO	ABSTAIN*
Category A	122 (94%)	8 (6%)	13
Category B	621 (96%)	27 (4%)	82

*Abstentions are not counted as votes cast (IUCN Statutes, Article 32).

Motion D04 Rescission of Members' rights whose dues are in arrears

Summary of the online discussion

No substantive comments or proposed amendments were received from IUCN Members. Statements of general support for the proposal as drafted were submitted by two Members.

Outcome of the electronic vote

DECISION 4

IUCN Members **CONSIDERED** the list of IUCN Members whose membership dues are two or more years in arrears and **VOTED** to rescind all the remaining rights of those Members.

The result of electronic voting between 27 January and 10 February 2021 was as follows:

Motion D04	YES	NO	ABSTAIN*
Category A	93 (87%)	14 (13%)	36
Category B	524 (90%)	58 (10%)	146

*Abstentions are not counted as votes cast (IUCN Statutes, Article 32).

Motion D05 Appointment of External Auditors

Summary of the online discussion

No substantive comments or proposed amendments were received from IUCN Members. Statements of general support were submitted by three Members.

Outcome of the electronic vote

DECISION 5

At the recommendation of the IUCN Council, IUCN Members **APPOINTED** PricewaterhouseCoopers as IUCN External Auditors for the years 2021 to 2022 and **REQUESTED** that Council appoint the External Auditors for the years 2023 to 2024 following a competitive selection process.

The result of electronic voting between 27 January and 10 February 2021 was as follows:

Motion D05	YES	NO	ABSTAIN*
Category A	120 (98%)	3 (2%)	20
Category B	659 (99%)	6 (1%)	63

*Abstentions are not counted as votes cast (IUCN Statutes, Article 32)

Motion D06 Audited Financial Statements for the period 2016–2019

Summary of the online discussion

No substantive comments or proposed amendments were received from IUCN Members. Statements of general support were submitted by two Members.

Outcome of the electronic vote

DECISION 6

IUCN Members **APPROVED** the audited Financial Statements for the years 2016 to 2019 *submitted* by the Director General.

The result of electronic voting between 27 January and 10 February 2021 was as follows:

Motion D06	YES	NO	ABSTAIN*
Category A	128 (98%)	2 (2%)	10
Category B	654 (100%)	3 (0%)	73

*Abstentions are not counted as votes cast (IUCN Statutes, Article 32)

Motion D07 Proposed Mandate for the Commission on Education and Communication (CEC)

Summary of the online discussion

No substantive comments were received from IUCN Members.

Outcome of the electronic vote

DECISION 7

On the proposal of the IUCN Council, IUCN Members **APPROVED** the mandate for the IUCN Commission on Education and Communication (CEC) for the period 2021–2024.

The result of electronic voting between 27 January and 10 February 2021 was as follows:

Motion D07	YES	NO	ABSTAIN*
Category A	135 (100%)	0 (0%)	8
Category B	708 (100%)	0 (0%)	20

*Abstentions are not counted as votes cast (IUCN Statutes, Article 32)

Motion D08 Proposed Mandate for the Commission on Ecosystem Management (CEM)

Summary of the online discussion

No substantive comments were received from IUCN Members.

Outcome of the electronic vote

DECISION 8

On the proposal of the IUCN Council, IUCN Members **APPROVED** the mandate for the IUCN Commission on Ecosystem Management (CEM) for the period 2021–2024.

The result of electronic voting between 27 January and 10 February 2021 was as follows:

Motion D08	YES	NO	ABSTAIN*
Category A	135 (100%)	0 (0%)	8
Category B	705 (100%)	2 (0%)	22

*Abstentions are not counted as votes cast (IUCN Statutes, Article 32)

Motion D09 Proposed Mandate for the Commission on Environmental, Economic and Social Policy (CEESP)

Summary of the online discussion

Substantive comments were received from four IUCN Members. Instituto de Investigaciones Marinas y Costeras José Benito Vives de Andreis (Colombia) submitted three specific text amendments to the ‘Vision’ and ‘Programme Priorities’ section of the Proposed Mandate for CEESP. National Whistleblower Center (USA), supported by Earth League International (USA) enquired about the role of the CEESP Green Criminology Specialist Group, proposed a specific reference in the Mandate to CEESP’s contribution to combating natural resource crime, and urged recognition for the importance of whistleblowers under the Programme Priority ‘effective and equitable governance’. Earth League International also called for the Strategic Approaches and Programme Priorities to address the role of CEESP in responding to the COVID-19 pandemic. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs and International Development (France) submitted an amendment making explicit reference to the Paris Climate Agreement in the Programme Priority on ‘re-thinking nature and economics’. In addition, statements of general support were received from two Members.

Taking into account the comments and proposed amendments submitted, a revised text was prepared and submitted for the online vote.

Outcome of the electronic vote

DECISION 9

On the proposal of the IUCN Council, IUCN Members **APPROVED** the mandate for the IUCN Commission on Environmental, Economic and Social Policy (CEESP) for the period 2021–2024.

The result of electronic voting between 27 January and 10 February 2021 was as follows:

Motion D09	YES	NO	ABSTAIN*
Category A	130 (100%)	0 (0%)	13
Category B	704 (100%)	1 (0%)	23

*Abstentions are not counted as votes cast (IUCN Statutes, Article 32)

Motion D10 Proposed Mandate for the Species Survival Commission (SSC)

Summary of the online discussion

Substantive comments were received from 10 IUCN Members. Antarctic and Southern Ocean Coalition (United States of America – USA) proposed inclusion of Antarctica and Southern Ocean/areas beyond national jurisdiction under SSC Objectives and Programme Areas. National Whistleblowers Center (USA) called for reference to the COVID-19 pandemic – and possible future pandemics – in relation to wildlife, and further urged inclusion of combating wildlife trafficking

within SSC's Objectives. Association of Zoos and Aquariums (USA) agreed that SSC could play an important role in addressing wildlife trafficking. Natural Resources Defense Council – NRDC (USA) submitted an amendment making explicit mention of the findings of the 2019 IPBES Report. NRDC supported the comments of the National Whistleblowers Center in relation to wildlife trafficking but considered that mention of trafficking/illegal wildlife trade should be broadened to refer to all direct exploitation of species. NRDC further proposed including a reference to the precautionary principle within the Objectives section of the draft SSC Mandate, and submitted specific amendments to eight Key Species Results (KSRs): 2, 4, 5, 7, 9, 11, 14 and 15. Referring to KSR 4, Thinking Animals Inc. (USA) called for IUCN in general to make greater efforts to publicise the work of SSC and the other Commissions. Wildlife Conservation Society – WCS (USA) tabled specific proposed amendments to KSRs 2, 10, 12 and 13. International Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies – IATWA (USA) generally supported the draft Mandate but felt that SSC should support sustainable and legal trade as a conservation tool. IATWA concurred with the text revisions to KSR 13 submitted by WCS but felt clarity could be improved by further adjustment to one phrase. Ministerio para la Transición Ecológica y el Reto Demográfico (Spain) drew attention to an error in the Spanish text.

In addition, there were two general statements of support for the SSC Mandate as originally drafted.

Taking into account the comments and proposed amendments submitted, a revised text was prepared and submitted for the online vote.

Outcome of the electronic vote

DECISION 10

On the proposal of the IUCN Council, IUCN Members **APPROVED** the mandate for the IUCN Species Survival Commission (SSC) for the period 2021–2024.

The result of electronic voting between 27 January and 10 February 2021 was as follows:

Motion D10	YES	NO	ABSTAIN*
Category A	135 (100%)	0 (0%)	8
Category B	703 (99%)	7 (1%)	21

*Abstentions are not counted as votes cast (IUCN Statutes, Article 32)

Motion D11 Proposed Mandate for the World Commission on Environmental Law (WCEL)

Summary of the online discussion

Substantive comments, including proposals for additions or other amendments, were received from six IUCN Members. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs and International Development (France) proposed that fighting environmental crime be included among WCEL's Objectives. National Whistleblower Center (USA), supported by Natural Resources Defense Council (USA), Earth League International (USA) and International Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies (USA), noted that the draft Mandate did not refer to either WCEL's role in responding to the COVID-19 pandemic and future pandemics, or to its role in combatting environmental and natural resource crime, and proposed corresponding amendments to the Objectives and Priorities sections of the draft Mandate.

Environment and Conservation Organisations of New Zealand endorsed the comments made by the National Whistleblower Center and proposed further amendments to the Vision and Objectives sections of the draft Mandate. In addition, there were two general statements of support for the WCEL Mandate as originally drafted.

Taking into account the comments and proposed amendments submitted, a revised text was prepared and submitted for the online vote.

Outcome of the electronic vote

DECISION 11

On the proposal of the IUCN Council, IUCN Members **APPROVED** the mandate for the IUCN World Commission on Environmental Law (WCEL) for the period 2021–2024.

The result of electronic voting between 27 January and 10 February 2021 was as follows:

Motion D11	YES	NO	ABSTAIN*
Category A	132 (100%)	0 (0%)	11
Category B	696 (100%)	3 (0%)	25

*Abstentions are not counted as votes cast (IUCN Statutes, Article 32)

Motion D12 Proposed Mandate for the World Commission on Protected Areas (WCPA)

Summary of the online discussion

Comments were submitted by eight IUCN Members. Of these, three were statements of general support for the WCPA Mandate. Antarctic and Southern Ocean Coalition (United States of America) and Environment and Conservation Organisations of New Zealand called for WCPA's Mandate specifically to include areas beyond national jurisdiction and to support the establishment of Marine Protected Areas in the Southern Ocean and Antarctica. National Whistleblower Center (USA) urged that the Mandate be updated to include WCPA's role in addressing (a) the impacts of COVID-19 and future pandemics on protected areas, and (b) natural resource crime. Earth League International (USA) supported the latter proposal and further called for WCPA's mandate to include support for rangers as frontline defenders. Thinking Animals Inc. (USA) recommended provision for more proactively enlisting the private sector in the establishment and management of protected areas. Environment and Conservation Organisations of New Zealand suggested a number of potential additional areas for WCPA engagement, including protection of extra-terrestrial areas, such as the Moon or Mars.

Taking into account the comments and proposed amendments submitted, a revised text was prepared and submitted for the online vote.

Outcome of the electronic vote

DECISION 12

On the proposal of the IUCN Council, IUCN Members **APPROVED** the mandate for the IUCN World Commission on Protected Areas (WCPA) for the period 2021–2024.

The result of electronic voting between 27 January and 10 February 2021 was as follows:

Motion D12	YES	NO	ABSTAIN*
Category A	134 (100%)	0 (0%)	8
Category B	709 (100%)	3 (0%)	14

*Abstentions are not counted as votes cast (IUCN Statutes, Article 32)

Annex 5 – Heads of Delegation of IUCN Members taking part in the Members' Assembly

STATES

Algeria

Ministère de l'Environnement
Samia KADRİ

Australia

Australian Government
Department of Agriculture, Water
and Environment
Erin TOMKINSON

Azerbaijan

Ministry of Ecology and Natural
Resources of Azerbaijan
Firuddin ALIYEV

Bangladesh

Ministry of Environment and
Forest
Mr Iqbal Abdullah HARUN

Belgium

Politique scientifique fédérale
Divija JATA

Burkina Faso

Ministère de l'Environnement, de
l'Économie verte et du
Changement Climatique
Mr Check Sidi Mohamed
TRAORE

Canada

Parks Canada Agency - Agence
Parcs Canada
Caitlin WORKMAN

China

Ministry of Natural Resources
Yuli SHI

Costa Rica

Ministerio de Ambiente y Energía
Ms Shirley RAMÍREZ CARVAJAL

Côte d'Ivoire

Ministère de l'Environnement, de
la Salubrité Urbaine et du
Développement Durable
Mr Degrâce N'DA KOGNAN

Cyprus

Ministry of Agriculture, Rural
Development and Environment of
Cyprus
Ms Elena STYLIANOPOULOU

Czech Republic

Ministerstvo životního prostředí
Ms Libuse VLASAKOVA

Egypt

Egyptian Environmental Affairs
Agency
Dr Ayman HAMADA

Estonia

Keskkonnaministeerium
Mr Hanno ZINGEL

Fiji

Fiji Department of Environment
Joshua WYCLIFFE

France

Ministère des Affaires étrangères
et du Développement international
Ms Sylvie LEMMET

Georgia

Ministry of Environmental
Protection and Agriculture of
Georgia
Teona KARCHAVA

Germany

Bundesministerium für Umwelt,
Naturschutz und nukleare
Sicherheit
Julia REINARTZ

Guinea

Ministère de l'Environnement, des
Eaux et Forêts
Mr Aboubacar OULARE

Japan

Ministry of Foreign Affairs of
Japan
Mr Hitoshi KOZAKI

Jordan

Ministry of Environment of Jordan
Mr Raed BANI HANI

Kenya

Ministry of Tourism and Wildlife
Prof. Fred SEGOR

Korea (RK)

Ministry of Environment, Republic
of Korea
Ms Hye-In SUH

Kosovo

Ministry of Environment, Spatial
Planning and Infrastructure
Mr Ismail HETEMAJ

Kuwait

Environment Public Authority
Dr Abdullh ALZIDAN

Luxembourg

Ministère de l'Environnement, du
Climat et du Développement
durable
Mr Claude ORIGER

Madagascar

Ministry of Environment and
Sustainable Development
Mrs Baomiatotse RAHARINIRINA

Mexico

Secretaría de Medio Ambiente y
Recursos Naturales
Mr FERNANDO CAMACHO-
RICO

Monaco

Ministère des Relations
Extérieures et de la Coopération
de Monaco
Mrs Céline VAN KLAVEREN-
IMPAGLIAZZO

Nepal

Department of National Parks and
Wildlife Conservation
Mr Hari BHADRA ACHARYA

New Zealand

Department of Conservation
Kate RUSSELL

Niger

Ministère des Affaires Etrangères,
de la Coopération et de
l'Intégration africaine et des
Nigériens à l'extérieur
Ms Aminata Boubacar AMADOU

Oman

Environment Authority
Sulaiman AL AKHZAMI

Pakistan

National Council for Conservation
of Wildlife, Ministry of Climate
Change
Muhammad Arslan MEER

Panama

Ministerio de Ambiente
Mr Abdul OLCESE

Peru

Ministerio del Ambiente
Mr José ALVAREZ ALONSO

Rwanda

Ministry of Environment
Beatrice CYIZA

Senegal

Ministère de l'Environnement et
du développement durable
Mr Baidy BA

Seychelles

Ministry of Agriculture, Climate
Change and Environment
Ralph AGRIPPINE

South Africa

Ministry of Forestry, Fisheries &
The Environment
Mr Vongani MARINGA

Sweden

Regeringskansliet (Sweden)
Mr Michael LOFROTH

Switzerland

Office fédéral de l'environnement
Mr Norbert BAERLOCHER

Thailand

Department of National Parks,
Wildlife and Plant Conservation
Ms Peeranuch Dulkul KAPPELLE

The Netherlands

Ministerie van Landbouw, Natuur
en Voedselkwaliteit
Mr Hayo HAANSTRA

Tonga

Ministry of Meteorology, Energy,
Information, Disaster
Management, Environment,
Climate Change &
Communications (MEIDECC)
Mrs Atelaite MATOTO

Tunisia

Ministère de l'Environnement
Mr Hedi CHEBILI

Turkey

Ministry of Agriculture and
Forestry
İsmail ÜZMEZ

United Arab Emirates

Ministry of Climate Change and
Environment
Hiba Obaid Mohammed AL
SHEHHI

United Kingdom

Department for Environment,
Food and Rural Affairs
Trevor SALMON

United States of America

US Department of State, Bureau
of Oceans and International
Environmental and Scientific
Affairs
Christopher SNIPES

**GOVERNMENT AGENCIES
WITH STATE MEMBER**

Australia

Zoos Victoria
Ms Jenny GRAY

Czech Republic

Agentura ochrany přírody a krajiny
CR
Dr Jan PLESNIK

Ecuador

Dirección de Gestión Ambiental
del Gobierno Autónomo
Descentralizado de la Provincia
del Carchi
Mr Guillermo HERRERA
VILLARREAL

Gabon

Agence Nationale des Parcs
Nationaux du Gabon
Dr Aurélie KOUMBA PAMBO

Germany

Deutsche Gesellschaft für
Internationale Zusammenarbeit
(GIZ) GmbH
Dr Alejandro VON BERTRAB

Bundesamt für Naturschutz
Ms Barbara ENGELS

Iraq

Centre for Restoration of the Iraqi
Marshlands and Wetlands
Dr Hydar ALI

Environmental Sciences
Department
Dr Siraj ABDULLA

Japan

Ministry of the Environment,
Japan
Mr Keisuke TAKAHASHI

Jordan

National Center for Research and
Development
Mr Mohammed FAQEH

Korea (RK)

Korea National Park Service
Mr Jinkwang KIM

Kuwait

Kuwait Institute for Scientific
Research
Ms Ouhoud AL-RAGAM

Norway

Norwegian Environment Agency
Mr Olav NORD-VARHAUG

Panama

Dirección de Gestión Ambiental
de la Alcaldía de Panamá
Mr Luis Fernando NORATO

South Africa

Ezemvelo KZN Wildlife
Dr Thokozani MKHIZE

Spain

Departament d'Acció Climàtica,
Alimentació i Agenda Rural,
Generalitat de Catalunya
Ms Anna BARNADAS I LÓPEZ

Fundación Biodiversidad
Mrs Elena PITA

Vice Consejería Sostenibilidad
Ambiental, Gobierno Vasco
Dr Manu MONGE GANUZAS

United Arab Emirates

Environment Agency Abu Dhabi
Dr Salim JAVED

**GOVERNMENT AGENCIES
WITHOUT STATE MEMBER**

Austria

Bundesministerium für
Klimaschutz, Umwelt, Energie,
Mobilität, Innovation und
Technologie
Mrs Viktoria HASLER

Benin

Centre National de Gestion des
Réserves de Faune
Abdel Aziz BABA-MOUSSA

Croatia

Ministarstvo gospodarstva i
održivog razvoja
Mr Daniel SPRINGER

Dominican Republic

Ministerio de Medio Ambiente y
Recursos Naturales
Mr Federico Alberto FRANCO

Guatemala

Ministerio de Ambiente y
Recursos Naturales de
Guatemala
Mr Juan Carlos DÍAZ
CONTRERAS

Honduras

Universidad de Ciencias
Forestales
Dr Emilio ESBEIH
CASTELLANOS

Indonesia

Directorate General Ecosystem
and Natural Resources
Conservation, Ministry of
Environment and Forestry
Mr Ir. WIRATNO

Ireland

Department of Housing, Local
Government and Heritage
Mr Alan MOORE

Jamaica

National Environment & Planning
Agency
Ms Andrea DONALDSON

Mozambique

Administracao Nacional das
Areas de Conservacao
Mr Pejul SEBASTIAO

North Macedonia

Ministerstvo za životna sredina i
prostorno planiranje / Uprava za
životna sredina
Mr Vlatko TRPESKI

Portugal

Instituto da Conservação da
Natureza e das Florestas
João NUNES

Romania

Ministerul Mediului, Apelor si
Padurilor
Mr Samad-John SMARANDA

Uganda

Uganda Wildlife Authority
John MAKOMBO

NATIONAL NGOs

Albania

Ruajtja dhe Mbrojtja e Mejedisit
Natyror ne Shqiperi
Dr Aleksander TRAJCE

Institute for Nature Conservation
in Albania
Dr Genti KROMIDHA

Armenia

Foundation for the Preservation of
Wildlife and Cultural Assets
Mr Ruben KHACHATRYAN

Austria

Vienna Zoo-Schoenbrunner
Tiergarten GmbH
Mr Stephan HERING-
HAGENBECK

Sharkproject Austria
Dr Iris ZIEGLER

Bahrain

Bahrain Women Association - for
Human Development
Ms Mahnaz KADHEMI

Bangladesh

Coastal Area Resource
Development and Management
Association
Mrs Hasna Jasimuddin MOUDUD

Unnayan Onneshan
Dr Rashed Al Mahmud TITUMIR

Bangladesh Unnayan Parishad
Dr Nilufar BANU

Community Development Centre
Mr Kamal SENGUPTA

Center for Environmental and
Geographic Information Services
Mr Motaleb Hossain SARKER

Center for Natural Resource
Studies
Dr M. Mokhlesur RAHMAN

BRAC
Mr Abu Sadat Moniruzzaman
KHAN

WildTeam
Dr Md. Anwarul ISLAM

Prokriti O Jibon Foundation
Mr Abdul Muqeed MAJUMDAR

Bangladesh Environmental
Lawyers Association
Mr Md. Khurshed ALAM

FRIENDSHIP
Ms Runa KHAN

Environment and Social
Development Organization
Ms Siddika SULTANA

Benin

Initiatives pour le Développement
Intégré Durable
Mr Kolawolé Said
HOUNKPONOU

Nature Tropicale
Mr Joséa DOSSOU-
BODJRENOU

Benin Ecotourism Concern
Afiwa Sylvie NOUMONVI

Union des Associations
Villageoises de Gestion des
Réserves de Faune (U-AVIGREF)
de la Pendjari
Mr Yantibossi KIANSI

Centre de Recherches et d'Action
pour le Développement des
Initiatives à la Base
Mr Pascal GNANHO

Benin Environment and Education
Society
Mr Maximin DJONDO

Bolivia

Centro de Apoyo a la Gestión
Sustentable del Agua y el Medio
Ambiente "Agua Sustentable"
Ms Paula PACHECO
MOLLINEDO

Fundación Natura Bolivia
Mr Milton HUAYRAÍ'A ARAUCO

Liga de Defensa del Medio
Ambiente
Ms Magdalena MEDRANO

Bosnia and Herzegovina

Udruga Dinarica/WWF Adria in
Bosnia and Herzegovina
Mr Fabien TECHENE

Brazil

Associação de RPPNs e Outras
Reservas Privadas de Minas
Gerais
Ms Monica TAVARES DA
FONSECA

Instituto O Direito por um Planeta
Verde
Mr Fernando Reverendo Vidal
AKAOUI

Instituto de Pesquisas Ecológicas
Ms Ángela PELLIN

Associação de Preservação do
Meio Ambiente e da Vida
Ms Carolina SCHAFFER

Instituto Sociedade, População e
Natureza
Ms Suzanne SCAGLIA

Instituto de Manejo e Certificação
Florestal e Agrícola
Mr Roberto HOFFMANN
PALMIERI

Bulgaria

Bãlgarska Fondatzia
Bioraznoobrazie
Mr Petko TZVETKOV

Burkina Faso

Africa's Sustainable Development
Council
Dr Aimé Joseph NIANOGO

Association de Gestion des
Ressources Naturelles et de la
Faune de la Comoé-Léraba
Mr Mamadou KARAMA

Association pour la Gestion de
l'Environnement et le
Développement
Mr Alain TRAORE

Association Nodde Nooto
Mr Oumarou Boureima CISSE

Association pour la Promotion des
Oeuvres Sociales
Zacharie Kabetau Wend
TIEMTORE

Burundi

Association Protection des
Ressources Naturelles pour le
Bien-Etre de la Population au
Burundi
Mr Alexis NIKIZA

Association Burundaise pour la
protection de la Nature
Mr Arsène MANIRAMBONA

Cabo Verde

Associação para a Defesa do
Ambiente e Desenvolvimento
Januario NASCIMENTO

Cambodia

The NGO Forum on Cambodia
Dr Vannara TEK

Fisheries Action Coalition Team
Mr Senglong YOUK

Mlup Baitong
Mr Sophana OM

Culture and Environment
Preservation Association
Mrs Luy REAKSMEY

Cameroon

African Marine Mammal
Conservation Organisation
Aristide TAKOUKAM KAMLA

Environment and Rural
Development Foundation
Mr Louis NKEMBI

Centre d'Appui aux Femmes et
aux Ruraux
Paul BATIBONAK

Plateforme Nationale des
Organisations Agro-Sylvo-
pastorales et halieutiques du
Cameroun
Bakari BOBBO

Cameroon Wildlife Conservation
Society
Dr Gordon AJONINA

Centre International de Promotion
de la Récupération
Mr Roger TCHUENTE

Centre Africain de Recherches
Forestières Appliquées et de
Développement
Mr Benjamin TCHOFFO

Organisation pour la Nature,
l'Environnement et le
Développement du Cameroun
Monique Catherine BISSECK
EPSE YIGBEDEK

Forêts et Développement Rural
Laurence WETE NKOUGUEP-
SOH

Cameroon Environmental Watch
Prof. NGOUFO ROGER

Canada

Calgary Zoological Society
Mr Axel MOEHRENSCHLAGER

Canadian Wildlife Federation
Mr Frederick John BATES

Regroupement national des
conseils régionaux de
l'environnement du Québec
Mr Martin VAILLANCOURT

Nature Québec
Audrey-Jade BÉRUBÉ

Chad

Alliance des Défenseurs des
Droits Humains et de
l'Environnement au Tchad
Mr Daoud NANDJEDE ABBA

Chile

Comité Nacional pro Defensa de
la Fauna y Flora
Mr Mauricio VALIENTE
OLIVARES

Así Conserva Chile
Mr Andrés Pinto ESPINOSA

China

China Biodiversity Conservation
and Green Development
Foundation
Junyan CHEN

Society of Entrepreneurs &
Ecology
Mr Yong ZHU

Eco Foundation Global
Ms Lihua BAO

The Society of Canton Nature
Conservation
Ms Yedan LI

Colombia

Fundación Natura
Ms Clara Ligia SOLANO
GUTIERREZ

Fundación ProAves de Colombia
Ms Sara Inés LARA
HERNÁNDEZ

Fundación Humedales
Ms Mariana RODRIGUEZ MELO

Fundación Pro-Sierra Nevada de
Santa Marta
Mr Santiago GIRALDO PELÁEZ
Instituto Sinchi
Mrs Luz Marina MANTILLA

Instituto de Investigación de
Recursos Biológicos Alexander
von Humboldt
Mr Hernando GARCÍA
MARTÍNEZ

Comoros

Dahari
Mr Hugh DOULTON

Congo

Réseau des Acteurs de la
Sauvegarde des Tortues Marines
en Afrique centrale
Mr Alexandre GIRARD

Conservation de la Faune
Congolaise
Dr Pierre OYO

Alliance nationale pour la nature
Gondet Annie Scholastique

Costa Rica

Asociación Centro Científico
Tropical
Mr Alexander GONZALEZ VEGA

Asociación Costa Rica por
Siempre
Dr Pia PAABY-HANSEN

Asociación Terra Nostra
Mr Esteban BERMÚDEZ

Czech Republic

Ceský svaz ochránců přírody
Mr Martin BOUDA

Denmark

Zoologisk Have København
Ms Ann-Katrine GARN

Dominican Republic

Grupo Jaragua
Prof. Yvonne ARIAS CORNIELLE

Ecuador

ECOPAR -Corporación para la
investigación, capacitación y
apoyo técnico para el manejo
sustentable de los ecosistemas
tropic

Mr Didier Christian SÁNCHEZ
SEGOVIA

Fundación Futuro
Latinoamericano
Mr Pablo LLORET ZAMORA

Instituto de Ecología Aplicada de
la Universidad San Francisco de
Quito
Ms Susana CÁRDENAS

Corporación Grupo Randi Randi
Ms Carla VALDOSPINOS

Fundación para el Desarrollo de
Alternativas Comunitarias de
Conservación del Trópico
Mr Mauricio Santiago LEVY
ORTIZ
EcoCiencia, Fundación
Ecuatoriana de Estudios
Ecológicos
Ms Carmen JOSSE MONCAYO

Fundación Charles Darwin para
las Islas Galápagos
Mr Rakan Ammar Zahawi

Egypt

El Maktab El Arabi Lei Shabab
Wal Biah
Ms Ghada AHMADEIN

France

Fédération des conservatoires
d'espaces naturels
Dr Alain SALVI

Réseau des Grands Sites de
France
Ms Soline ARCHAMBAULT

PANTHERA FRANCE
Mr Grégory BRETON

Société Française pour le Droit de
l'Environnement
Michel DUROUSSEAU

Reserves Naturelles de France
Emmanuel MICHAU

Fédération Française de
Spéléologie
Ms Marie Clélia LANKESTER

Fondation d'Entreprise Biotope
pour la Biodiversité
Mr Frédéric MELKI

France Nature Environnement
Jean-David ABEL

Association Française des
Entreprises pour l'Environnement
Ms Claire TUTENUIT

POLLINIS
Mr Nicolas LAARMAN

Muséum National d'Histoire
Naturelle
Denis DUCLOS

Noé Ms Valérie COLLIN	Guinea Bissau Grupo de Apoio à Educação e Comunicação Ambiental "PALMEIRINHA" Mr Nicolau MENDES	Centre for Wildlife Studies Dr Sreedhar VIJAYAKRISHNAN
Fédération Française des Clubs Alpins et de Montagne Hélène DENIS		Indian National Trust for Art and Cultural Heritage Mr Manu BHATNAGAR
Fédération des parcs naturels régionaux de France Mr Eric BRUA	Honduras Asociación para el Manejo Integrado de Cuencas de La Paz y Comayagua Mr Róger FERNÁNDEZ PAVÓN	Environmental Resources Foundation Mr Vipul SHARMA
Association des amis de la forêt de Fontainebleau Michel VALLANCE	Colegio de Profesionales Forestales de Honduras Ms Nora Christhell ARGUETA CARDONA	The Corbett Foundation Mr Kedar GORE
SystExt Mrs Aurore STEPHANT	Fundación Chito y Nena Kafie Ms Paola MARTÍNEZ	Network for Certification and Conservation of Forests Mr Sachin JAIN
Georgia Centre for Biodiversity Conservation & Research Mr Irakli SHAUGULIDZE	Fundacion para el Desarrollo Empresarial Rural Mr José David ERAZO	Keystone Foundation Mr Sumin George THOMAS
Field researchers` Union - CAMPESTER Mr Ioseb NATRADZE	Asociación Ecológica de San Marcos de Ocotepeque Mr Victor SARAVIA	Wildlife Trust of India Mr Vivek MENON
Germany Deutscher Naturschutzring Mareike IMKEN	Comité para la Defensa y Desarrollo de la Flora y Fauna del Golfo de Fonseca Ms Dina MOREL	India Water Foundation Mr Arvind KUMAR
Zoo Leipzig GmbH Prof. Jörg JUNHOLD	Proyecto Aldea Global Mr José Vidal LANZA CARDONA	Aaranyak Dr Bibhab TALUKDAR
Zoologische Gesellschaft für Arten- und Populationsschutz e.V. Dr Jens-Ove HECKEL	Hungary Goncol Alapítvány Mr Vilmos KISZEL	Centre for Media Studies Ms Vasanti RAO TERRE Policy Centre Dr Vinitaa APTE
Zoologischer Garten Köln Mr Theo PAGEL	Magyar Természetvédők Szovetsége Tom WAKEFORD	OMCAR Foundation Dr Balaji VEDHARAJAN
Naturschutzbund Deutschland Mr Thomas TENNHARDT	Iceland Landvernd, landgraedslu- og umhverfisverndarsamtök Íslands Tryggvi FELIXSON	Indonesia The Samdhana Institute Incorporated Ms Anny ANDARYATI
SHARKPROJECT Germany e.V. Dr Iris Ziegler	India Balipara Tract & Frontier Foundation Mr Saurav MALHOTRA	Iran Center for Conservation and Development of Sustainable Ecosystems (ZIPAK) Dr Mina ESTEGHAMAT
Ghana A ROCHA GHANA Mr Seth APPIAH-KUBI	Centre for Environment Education - Nehru Foundation for Development Mr Kartikeya SARABHAI	Jordan Jordanian Society for Organic Farming Dr Mohammad MAJDALAWI
Guatemala Asociación Rescate y Conservación de Vida Silvestre Mrs Miriam MONTERROSO DE HELWIG	Salim Ali Centre for Ornithology and Natural History Dr Rajah JAYAPAL	Royal Botanic Garden Mr Hatem TAIFOUR
Fundación para la Conservación de los Recursos Naturales y Ambiente en Guatemala Ms LILLIAN YVONNE RAMIREZ MATIAS	IORA Ecological Trust Saurindra Narayan GOSWAMI	Basmet Elkhair Women Charity Association Ms Buthayna AL ZU'BI
Asociación Amigos del Bosque Mr Francisco Khalil DE LEÓN BARRIOS	Wildlife Conservation Trust Dr Anish ANDHERIA	The Royal Marine Conservation Society of Jordan Mr Mohammad AL-TAWAHA
Alianza de Derecho Ambiental y Agua Mrs Jeanette NOACK	Applied Environmental Research Foundation Dr Archana GODBOLE	Arab Women Organization of Jordan Ms Nawal HADDADIN
Fondo para el Sistema Arrecifal Mesoamericano Ms María José GONZÁLEZ	COORG Wildlife Society Mr Cheppudira MUTHANNA	International Research Center for Water, Environment, and Energy Dr Mohammed Abu Dayyeh MATOUQ

Jordan BirdWatch Association Prof Fares KHOURY	Lebanon Society for the Protection of Nature in Lebanon Alice BAGHDADI	Ms María Teresa GUTIÉRREZ MERCADILLO
West Asia - North Africa (WANA) Institute Ms Reem ALHADDADIN	Association for the Development of Rural Capacities Mr Ali EZZEDDINE	Centro Intercultural de Estudios de Desiertos y Océanos A.C Dr Nélide BARAJAS-ACOSTA
Arab Group for the Protection of Nature Ms Mariam AL JAAJAA	Lebanon Reforestation Initiative Ms Samara EL-HADDAD	Herpetario de la Facultad de Ciencias, Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México Mr Roberto ROMERO RAMÍREZ
Horizon for a Green Environment Mr Rami EL-AKHRAS	Green Hand Organization Mr Zaher REDWAN GHADI	Fondo de Conservación El Triunfo A.C. Ms Ana Carolina IZAGUIRRE
Future Pioneers for Empowering Communities' Members in the Environmental and Educational Fields Mahmoud AL HUSSIEN	Mr FADI GHANEM Al Shouf Cedar Society Mr Nizar HANI	Hombre Naturaleza A.C. Silvana LICEAGA GESUALDO
The Jordanian Hashemite Fund for Human Development Mr Muttasim AL HAYARI	Madagascar Valan-javaboovary nasionaly eto Madagasikara Mamy Andrianarisoa RAKOTOARIJAONA	Grupo Autónomo para la Investigación Ambiental A.C. Mr Marco Antonio GONZÁLEZ ORTIZ
Royal Society for the Conservation of Nature Mr yehya KHALED	Fondation Tany Meva Mr Claude FANOHIZA	Instituto para el Desarrollo Sustentable en Mesoamerica Ms Cristina REYES
Dibeen Association for Environmental Development Ms Hala MURAD	Fondation pour les Aires Protégées et la Biodiversité de Madagascar Mr Alain RAHARIJAONA	ECOPIL ARTE CREA CONCIENCIA A.C. Mr Luis Zúñiga HERNÁNDEZ
Princess Alia Foundation Mr Ali HAWASHIN	FANAMBY Tiana ANDRIAMANANA	Fondo Mexicano para la Conservación de la Naturaleza A.C. Ms Ana Laura BARILLAS GOMEZ
Jordanian Society for Desertification Control and Badia Development Mr Islam MAGAYREH	Malawi Malawi Environmental Endowment Trust Ms Karen PRICE	ALTERNARE A.C. Ms Karen VEGA GARCÍA
Jordanian Beekeeper's Union Mr Ahmad DAOUR	Mulanje Mountain Conservation Trust Mr Carl BRUESSOW	Fondo para la Biodiversidad CONABIO Ms Sofía TREVIÑO HERES
Hashemite Fund for Development of Jordan Badia Mr Khaled MARAFI	Malaysia Malaysian Nature Society Dr Ahmad ISMAIL	Pronatura Península de Yucatán A.C. Mr Efraim Antonio ACOSTA LUGO
University of Jordan Dr Said DAMHOUREYEH	Maldives Live & Learn Environmental Education Ms Zameela AHMED	Faunam A.C./PG7 Prof Ramón PEREZ-GIL
Kenya Oceans Alive Trust Des BOWDEN	Mali Association Malienne pour la conservation de la faune et de son environnement Mr Moriba NOMOKO	Reforestamos México A.C. Mr Ernesto HERRERA
Community Action for Nature Conservation Nyokabi WEREMA	Groupe Action pour l'Enfance au Sahel Mr Drissa KONE	Fundación Biosfera del Anahuac A.C. Mr Jurgen HOTH
Wildlife Clubs of Kenya Dr Mary Margaret OTIENO	Oeuvre Malienne pour le Développement des Zones Arides Mr Ibrahim SEMEGA	Centro Mexicano de Derecho Ambiental Mr Gustavo ALANIS ORTEGA
Coastal Oceans Research and Development - Indian Ocean (East Africa) Dr David OBURO	Mexico Pronatura, A.C. Mr Rogelio Manríquez MARTÍNEZ	Mongolia Hustai National Park Trust Mr Dashpurev TSERENEDELEG
Watamu Marine Steven TROTT	Fondo para la Comunicación y la Educación Ambiental A.C.	Morocco Réseau Association Khnifiss Mr Salek AOUISSA
Wildlife Direct Kenya Trish SEWE		Association Marocaine pour la Protection de l'Environnement et le Climat Dr Brahim HADDANE
Conservation Alliance of Kenya Mr Steve ITELA		

Observatoire pour la Protection de l'Environnement et des Monuments Historiques
Mr Mustapha SIDI BEN SALAH

Groupe de Recherche pour la Protection des Oiseaux au Maroc
Lahrouz SAID

Association des Enseignants des Sciences de la Vie et de la Terre
Prof Mohamed GHAMIZI

Namibia

N/a'an ku se Foundation
Dr Rudie JANSEN VAN VUUREN

Namibia Nature Foundation
Ms Frances CHASE

Nepal

Wildlife Watch Group
Mr Babu Krishna KARKI

Wildlife Conservation Nepal
Mr Prasanna YONZON

Samrachayan Bikash Foundation
Mr Juddha Bahadur Gurung

Khoj Tatha Bikas Kendra, Nepal
Mr Ramdhyan Prasad YADAV

Centre for Rural Technology
Mr Hari Gopal GORKHALI

Watawaranka Lagi Yuwa Sanjal
Mr Sanot ADHIKARI

Batabaraniya Susan Karya
Samuha Nepal
Mr Sanot ADHIKARI

Sana Standhari Prani
Samrakshan Tatha Anusandhan
Foundation
Ms Kabita KARKI

Nepal Forum of Environmental
Journalists
Mr Nimesh REGMI

Women in Environment/Mahila
Batabaran Samooaha
Mr Sanjeev POUDEL

Digo Bikash Aviyaan Kendra,
Nepal
Mr Saurav Kumar SHRESTHA

Human Welfare and Environment
Protection Centre
Mr Bharat Raj DEVKOTA

Himali Prakriti
Dr Hem Sagar BARAL

New Caledonia

Climate Change and
Environmental Sustainability
Programme, Pacific Community
Olivier AUGUIN

Nicaragua

Fundación Nicaragüense para la
Conservación-Fundación
COCIBOLCA
Dr Raúl LACAYO SOLÓRZANO

Asociación Club de Jóvenes
Ambientalistas
Mr Jaffar MANZANAREZ

North Macedonia

Macedonian Ecological Society
Metodija VELEVSKI

Stichting Connecting Natural
Values and People Foundation
Mark RUPA

Pakistan

New World Hope Organization
Mr Muhammad Ajmal KHAN

Sungi Development Foundation
Mr Malik SHAHBAZ

Thardeep Rural Development
Programme
Mr Aftab HUSSAIN BALOACH

Pakistan Rural Initiatives for
Emergency Preparedness,
Response and Development
Mr Yasir IQBAL

Palau

Palau Conservation Society
Mrs Lolita GIBBONS-
DECHERONG

Palestine

Biodiversity and Environmental
Research Center
Prof Mohammed SHTAYEH

Land Research Center
Mr Mohammad HASSASNEH

Union of Agricultural work
Committee
Mr Fuad ABU SAIF

Panama

Asociación Centro de Estudios y
Acción Social Panameño
Mr Daniel HOLNESS

Fundación para la Protección del
Mar
Mr Ricardo WONG

Fundación Amador-BIOMUSEO
Mr Luis Alfredo MIRANDA
ESPINOZA

Papua New Guinea

Tenkile Conservation Alliance
Mr Jim THOMAS

Paraguay

Instituto de Derecho y Economía
Ambiental
Mr Ezequiel SANTAGADA

Fundación Moises Bertoni
Mr Daniel JACQUET PAGESKI

Peru

Asociación Amazónicas por la
Amazonía
Ms Rosa Karina PINASCO VELA

Centro de Conservación,
Investigación y Manejo de Áreas
Naturales - Cordillera Azul
Dr Lily RODRIGUEZ BAYONA

Derecho, Ambiente y Recursos
Naturales
Mrs Cristina LOPEZ WONG

Eco Redd
Mr Pedro José CARRILLO
ARTEAGA

Asociación Peruana para la
Conservación de la Naturaleza
Ms Diana LEO LUNA

ProNaturaleza - Fundación
Peruana para la Conservación de
la Naturaleza
Mr Michael DE LA CADENA

Patronato de la Reserva Paisají-
stica Nor Yauyos Cochas
Ms Carmela LANDEO SÁNCHEZ

Fondo Nacional para Areas
Naturales Protegidas por el
Estado
Mr Anton Willems DELANOY

Asociación para la Investigación y
el Desarrollo Integral
Dr Yolanda RAMIREZ
VILLACORTA

Philippines

Mindoro Biodiversity Conservation
Foundation, Inc.
Ms Apolonia Marie Grace
DIAMANTE

Poland

Polskie Towarzystwo Ochrony
Przyrody "Salamandra"
Dr Andrzej KEPEL

Puerto Rico

Para la Naturaleza
Ms Neida PUMAREJO-CINTRON

Rwanda

Association Rwandaise des
Ecologistes
Mr Aloys NSABIMANA

Action pour la Protection de
l'Environnement et la Promotion
des Filières Agricoles
Mr Oscar NZABONIMPA

Rwanda

Rwanda Wildlife Conservation
Association
Dr Olivier NSENGIMANA

Senegal

Association pour la préservation
des écosystèmes océaniques
sénégalais
Abou N'DAW

Association Sénégalaise des
Amis de la Nature
Mr Djibi SEYDI

Centre de Suivi Ecologique
Mr Taibou BA

Groupe de Recherche et d'Etudes
Environnementales
Mr Ibrahima FALL

Partenariat Régional pour la
Conservation des Zones Côtières
Marico DEMBA

Seychelles

Island Conservation Society
Dr Gerard ROCAMORA

Sierra Leone

Environmental Foundation for
Africa
Mr Tommy Stephen GARNETT

South Africa

Conservation Outcomes
Mr Greg MARTINDALE

Wildlife ACT Fund Trust
Mr Mark GERRARD

ResourceAfrica South Africa
Malan Lindeque

Endangered Wildlife Trust
Dr Harriet DAVIES-MOSTERT

Spain

Liga per a la Defensa del
Patrimoni Natural
Prof M. Purificació CANALS

Centro de Extensión Universitaria
e Divulgación Ambiental de
Galicia
Mr Carlos VALÉS

Fundació Catalunya-La Pedrera
Mr Miquel RAFA I FORNIELES

Loro Parque Fundación
Mr Javier ALMUNIA

Fundación Naturaleza y Hombre
Mr Carlos SÁNCHEZ MARTÍNEZ

Sociedad Geológica de España
Dr Manu MONGE GANUZAS

Aula del Mar - Malaga Asociación
para la Conservación del Medio
Marino
Mr Juan Antonio LÓPEZ JAIME

SEO/BirdLife, Sociedad Española
de Ornitología
Dr Juan Carlos ATIENZA

Suriname

Foundation Amazon Conservation
Team Suriname
Mrs Jessica GEORGE

Sweden

Stiftelsen Nordens Ark
Dr Mats HÍ-GGREN

Switzerland

Pro Natura / Friends of the Earth
Switzerland
Ms Sarah PEARSON PERRET

Swiss Academy of Sciences
Dr Eva SPEHN

Tanzania

Chuo Cha Uhifadhi Na Usimamizi
Wa Wanyama Pori (CAWM)
Jafari KIDEGESHO

Kilimanjaro Animal Centre for
Rescue, Education and Wildlife
(C.R.E.W.)
Patricia McCauley TERHELL

Climate Action Network Tanzania
Dr Sixbert MWANGA

Thailand

Thai Society for the Prevention of
Cruelty to Animals
Dr Surapon DUANGKHAE

Thailand Environmental Institute
Foundation
Ms Benjamas CHOTTHONG

The Netherlands

Stichting CHIMBO
Dr Annemarie GOEDMAKERS

Leo Foundation
Prof Hans DE IONGH

Togo

AGBO-ZEGUE ONG : Association
Togolaise pour la Conservation de
la Nature
Mr Kokou Toviho John GAGLO

Tunisia

Notre Grand Bleu
Mr Ahmed SOUKI

Association Tunisienne de
Taxonomie
Ms Faouzia CHARFI

Association Les Amis des
Oiseaux
Mr Hichem AZAFZAF

Association pour la Protection de
l'Environnement et le
Développement Durable de
Bizerte
Dr Najoua BOURAOUI

Uganda

National Association of
Professional Environmentalists
Ms Sostine NAMANYA

Bwindi Mgahinga Conservation
Trust
Mr Mark DAVID

The Environmental Conservation
Trust of Uganda
Ms Pauline KALUNDA

Busitema University Faculty of
Science and Education
Nagongera Campus
Dr Edward ANDAMA

United Arab Emirates

Mohamed bin Zayed Species
Conservation Fund
Mr Nicolas HEARD

United Kingdom

The Wildlife Trusts
Craig BENNETT

Plantlife International
Karen INWOOD

World Land Trust
Mr Richard CUTHBERT

Conflict and Environment
Observatory
Mr Doug Weir

Stop Ecocide International Ltd
Ms Shirleen Sing Joo CHIN

ResourceAfrica United Kingdom
Dr Liz RIHOY

Wildfowl & Wetlands Trust
Tomos AVENT

Forest Peoples Programme
Ms Helen TUGENDHAT

On the EDGE Conservation
Dr Nisha OWEN

The Sibthorp Trust
Mr Chris MAHON

Zoological Society of London
Dr Andrew TERRY

Synchronicity Earth
Ms Anna HEATH

Royal Society for the Protection of
Birds
Ms Nicola CROCKFORD

Population Matters
Mr Andrew HOWARD

United States of America

Conservation X Labs, Inc.
Dr Alex DEHGAN

The Nature Conservancy
Mrs Linda KRUEGER

Center for Environmental Legal
Studies
Victor TAFUR

Rasmussen Family Foundation
Dr Paul SALAMAN

Galapagos Conservancy
Dr Paul SALAMAN

Rainforest Trust
Mr Mark GRUIN

Environmental Defense Fund
Ms Doria GORDON

Advocates for the Environment,
Inc.
Mr Dean WALLRAFF

Environmental Law Program at
the William S. Richardson School
of Law
Mr David FORMAN

Yellowstone to Yukon
Conservation Initiative
Ms Marie-Eve MARCHAND

Center for Environmental Ethics
and Law
Dr Kathryn GWIAZDON

Earth Day Network
Ms Kathleen ROGERS

Thinking Animals, Inc.
Ms Bonnie WYPER

Center for Biodiversity and
Conservation, American Museum
of Natural History - New York
Dr Eleanor STERLING

The Pew Charitable Trusts
Masha KALININA

Tropical Resources Institute (Yale
School of Forestry and
Environmental Studies)
LORENA BENITEZ

Atkinson Center for a Sustainable
Future - Cornell University
Prof John TOBIN-DE LA PUENTE

Quebec-Labrador Foundation,
Inc. - U.S.
Mr Brent MITCHELL

Re:wild
Dr Russell MITTERMEIER

Natural Resources Defense
Council
Paul TODD

Hawai'i Conservation Alliance
Foundation
Mr Randy KENNEDY

Cornell Botanic Gardens
Dr Christopher DUNN

Safari Club International
Foundation
Dr Christopher COMER

National Whistleblower Center
Mr Scott HAJOST

The WILD Foundation
Mr Vance MARTIN

Venezuela
PROVITA
Ms Bibiana SUCRE SMITH

VITALIS A.C.
Dr Diego DIAZ MARTÍN

Zimbabwe
BirdLife Zimbabwe
Shingirai SAKAROMBE

INTERNATIONAL NGOS

Belgium
International Association for
Falconry and Conservation of
Birds of Prey
Julian MÜHLE

European Bureau for
Conservation and Development
Mrs Despina SYMONS
PIROVOLIDOU

Fédération des Associations de
Chasse et Conservation de la
Faune Sauvage de l'UE
Sabrina DIETZ

Cameroon
Alliance pour la Conservation des
Grands Singes en Afrique
Centrale
Mr Guillaume TATI

Costa Rica
Asociación Mesoamericana para
la Biología y la Conservación
Dr Guisselle MONGE ARIAS

Czech Republic
Unie Ceskych a Slovenskych
Zoologických Zahrád
Martin HOVORKA

Denmark
Nordic Hunters' Alliance
Mr Johan SVALBY

Egypt
Arab Network for Environment
and Development
Dr Emad ADLY

France
Association Les Eco Maires
Mrs Maud LELIEVRE

Tour du Valat
Mr Jean JALBERT

Germany
Global Nature Fund
Thies GEERTZ

ICLEI - Local Governments for
Sustainability - Africa, NPC
Stefania ROMANO

Hungary
International Council for Game
and Wildlife Conservation
Luna MILATOVIC

Kenya
African Wildlife Foundation -
Kenya HQ
Mrs Andrea ATHANAS

Liechtenstein
Commission Internationale pour la
Protection des Alpes
Serena ARDUINO

Mexico
Forest Stewardship Council A.C.
Ms Anakarina PEREZ OROPEZA
Namibia
Cheetah Conservation Fund
Dr Laurie MARKER

Nepal
International Centre for Integrated
Mountain Development
Dr Srijana Joshi RIJAL

Peru
Fondo Verde
Mr Juan MEDINA CASTRO

Senegal
ENDA - Tiers Monde
Mrs Aby DRAME

South Africa
Game Rangers Association of
Africa
Mr Peter MILLS

Spain
International Council of
Environmental Law
Prof Nicholas ROBINSON

World Association of Zoos and
Aquariums
Mr Martín ZORDAN

Sweden
The European Association for the
Conservation of the Geological
Heritage
Mr Manu Monge GANUZAS

Switzerland
SHARKPROJECT International
e.V.
Dr Iris ZIEGLER

World Business Council for
Sustainable Development
Mrs Nadine MCCORMICK

World Wide Fund for Nature -
International
Prof. Jonathan HUTTON

Tanzania
Western Indian Ocean Marine
Sciences Association
Mr Arthur TUDA

Thailand

International Network of Engaged
Buddhists
Ms Wansiri RONGRONGMUANG

The Netherlands

Wetlands International
Teresa ZUNA

European Association of Zoos
and Aquaria
Ms Myfanwy GRIFFITH

Uganda

Conservation Through Public
Health
Stephen RUBANGA

United Kingdom

International Institute for
Environment and Development
Mr Philip FRANKS

BirdLife International
Ms Melanie HEATH

Fauna & Flora International
Mrs Pippa HOWARD

A Rocha International
Ms Sarah FRENCH

United States of America

Paso Pacifico
Ms Eliza WOOLLEY

Society for Ecological Restoration
Dr James HALLETT

Island Conservation
Carolina TORRES TRUEBA

Conservation International
Ms Kristen WALKER-
PAINEMILLA

Wildlife Conservation Society
Dr Elizabeth L. BENNETTE

Turtle Conservancy
Dr Russell MITTERMEIER

Sustainable Forestry Initiative,
Inc.
Mr James GRIFFITHS

International Fund for Animal
Welfare
Rikkert REIJNEN

NatureServe
Dr Sean O'BRIEN

AFFILIATE

France

Institut national de recherche pour
l'agriculture, l'alimentation et
l'environnement
Ms Claire WEILL

Centre de Coopération
Internationale en Recherche
Agronomique pour le
Développement
Mr Didier BAZILE

Institut de Recherche pour le
Développement
Estienne RODARY

United States of America

The Living Desert Zoo and
Gardens
Dr James DANOFF-BURG

National Tropical Botanical
Garden
Dr Chipper WICHMAN

NATIONAL COMMITTEES

Bangladesh

Bangladesh National Committee
of IUCN Members
Dr Rashed Al Mahmud TITUMIR

Benin

Comité National des Membres de
l'IUCN au Bénin
Mr Joséa DOSSOU-
BODJRENOU

Burkina Faso

Comité national des Membres de
l'IUCN du Burkina Faso
Mr Oumarou Boureima CISSE

Burundi

Comité national des Membres de
l'IUCN du Burundi
Mr Alexis NIKIZA

Cambodia

Cambodia National Committee of
IUCN Members
Mr Sophana OM

Cameroon

Comité national des Membres de
l'IUCN du Cameroun
Prof. NGOUFO ROGER

Chile

Comité Nacional de Miembros de
Chile de la UICN
Mr Mauricio VALIENTE
OLIVARES

Costa Rica

Comité Nacional de Miembros de
Costa Rica de la UICN
Mr Luis Diego MARIN
SCHUMACHER

Denmark

Denmark National Committee of
IUCN Members
Ms Ann-Katrine GARN

Ecuador

Comité Nacional de Miembros de
Ecuador de la UICN
Mr Didier Christian SÁNCHEZ
SEGOVIA

France

Comité national de l'IUCN, France
Mrs Maud LELIEVRE

Guatemala

Comité Nacional de Miembros de
Guatemala de la UICN
Mr Francisco Ramiro BATZIN
CHOJOJ

Jordan

Jordan National Committee of
IUCN Members
Mr Raed BANI HANI

Kenya

Kenya National Committee of
IUCN Members
Dr Mary Margaret OTIENO

Kuwait

Kuwait National Committee of
IUCN Members
Dr Samira OMAR

Malawi

Malawi National Committee of
IUCN Members
Mr Carl BRUESSOW

Mali

Comité national des Membres de
l'IUCN du Mali
Mr Drissa KONE

Morocco

Comité national des Membres de
l'IUCN du Maroc
Dr Brahim HADDANE

Nepal

Nepal National Committee of
IUCN Members
Mr Prasanna YONZON

Pakistan

Pakistan National Committee of
IUCN Members
Mrs Amra JAVED

Panama

Comité Nacional de Miembros de
Panamá de la UICN
Mr Ricardo WONG

Peru

Comité Nacional de Miembros de
Perú de la UICN
Mr Jaime NALVARTE ARMAS

Poland

Poland National Committee of
IUCN Members
Dr Andrzej KEPEL

Senegal

Comité national des Membres de
l'IUCN du Sénégal
Mr Djibi SEYDI

South Africa

South Africa National Committee
of IUCN Members
Mr Mark GERRARD

Spain

Comité Nacional de Miembros de la UICN en España
Mr Juan Antonio LÓPEZ JAIME

The Netherlands

IUCN National Committee of The Netherlands
Mr Coenraad KRIJGER

Tunisia

Comité national des Membres de l'UICN de Tunisie
Ms Faouzia CHARFI

Uganda

Comité national des Membres de l'UICN de l'Uganda
Ms Pauline KALUNDA

United Kingdom

United Kingdom National Committee of IUCN Members
Mr Stephen GRADY

United States of America

United States National Committee of IUCN Members
Dr Christopher DUNN

REGIONAL COMMITTEES

Comité régional des Membres de l'UICN pour l'Afrique centrale et occidentale
Mrs Laurence WETE
NKOUGUEP-SOH

Comité Regional de Miembros de la UICN de Mesoamérica
Mr Ernesto HERRERA

Eastern and Southern Africa Regional Committee of IUCN Members
Dr Harriet DAVIES-MOSTERT

Comité Regional de Miembros de la UICN de Sudamérica
Mr Roberto HOFFMANN
PALMIERI

INDIGENOUS PEOPLES ORGANISATIONS

Bangladesh
Bolipara Nari Kalyan Somity
Ms Hla Shing NUE

Gram Unnayan Sangathon
Mr Chaing Seing MOUNG

Ecuador

Coordinadora de Organizaciones Indígenas de la Cuenca Amazónica
Mr José Gregorio DÍAZ MIRABAL

Guatemala

Asociación Ak'Tenamit
Mr Steve DUDENHOEFER

Peru

Asociación Interétnica de Desarrollo de la Selva Peruana
Ms Tabea CACIQUE

Federación Nativa del Río Madre De Dios y Afluentes
Mr Daniel RODRIGUEZ

South Africa

Indigenous Peoples of Africa Coordinating Committee
Mr Paul Kanyinke SENA

Sweden

Ajtte, the Swedish museum for Saami culture and the mountain region
Mr Jan-Olov WESTERBERG

United States of America

Kua`aina Ulu `Auamo
Mr Kevin CHANG



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