

Conservation Planning Processes Working Group Report

2008 CBSG Annual Meeting, Adelaide, Australia

Participants

Brad Andrews, Anne Baker, Heribert Hofer, Susan Hunt, Robert Lacy, Phil Miller, Clifford Nxomani, Graeme Phipps, George Rabb, Yasumasa Tomita, Jonathan Wilcken, Ros Wilkins,

Background

Bob Lacy discussed CBSG's association with an SSC Task Force charged to review the performance of Action Plans and to look at ways of improving outcomes. A document has been produced "Strategic Planning for Species Conservation – aimed in the first instance at SSC groups.

The new document, is just now available from IUCN on their website:

<http://intranet.iucn.org/webfiles/doc/SSC/SCSOversview.pdf> for an overview pdf document; or

<http://intranet.iucn.org/webfiles/doc/SSC/SCSHandbook.pdf>

for the full document PLUS substantial appendices.

Bob noted that there is a need to engage all stakeholders from the start, but many biologists don't know how to engage stakeholders, so need training or assistance of other SSC groups and disciplines.

Strategic Plans need to be produced with many stakeholders, not just the biological experts.

So questions:

1. What does 'saving a species mean'?
2. Then, what barriers will stop us from achieving that, then
3. Every threat thus identified needs and objective, then
4. SMART tasks to get to specifics

PHVAs are in the middle of this strategic process of (1) Vision, (2) PHVA and then (3) Implementation. We don't get into (3) specific actions/ tasks, and we haven't usually done (1) above but kind of assume it. We do a piece of the whole.

SCS covers 1-3 of this in principle, but is not prescriptive.

Could be that CBSG is the best group to facilitate SCS because we currently are in the middle of the process, PLUS SCS process requires training – which is CBSG's strength and potential role for promoting the process.


There are a series of possible future CBSG workshops that could serve as vehicles for application of the Task Force's SCS approach. We could try out the SCS process and see how well it work.

SCS not restricted to a population or a species. Could be one species or more.

Initiates Action Planning involving a prioritization of the conservation urgency across species. The SCS process occurs after this takes place externally.

The need to conduct an explicit risk assessment process was seen as an important component of any species conservation planning project. There were concerns that the SCS might not be too applicable for species with very wide ranges across many countries.

Phil Miller drew a diagram about Range Wide Priority Setting (RWPS) featuring jaguars across Central and South America. This workshop process is used by The Wildlife Conservation Society (WCS), with an emphasis on GIS data assembly and analysis to determine high-priority species conservation areas. He drew in how CBSG would approach this classically with a series of range-state PHVA workshops as a follow-up to the broader RWPS process. Thought of another way, RWPS is somewhat analogous to CBSG's CAMP process but at more of a single-species level.



CBSG has the obvious skills for this as we have analogous situations to consider – even the MetaModel Manager which links various species and threats is somewhat an analogue of what SCS is looking at achieving, however it is recognized that this metamodeling process could end up being too complex. Such an approach is desirable – but can we realistically be all things to all people, or might we risk losing people?

Questions were asked about Catastrophe Planning instancing Hurricane Prediction in Florida, where a \$15B loss was predicted. Insurance industry became interested. So is Risk Analysis included? Have to consider future threats. Google on Catastrophe Planning for more info.

The group agreed that mass collaboration and communication tools may play a key role in addressing the mechanics of planning.

Some felt that training was the key component dropping out of all of this, and thought that the Regional CBSG groups would be the appropriate nodes of delivery.

Might need different levels of representation from the same stakeholder groups depending on what level of discussion eg Head of Nat Parks if looking to Vision (1) component of SCS, but Park Managers when looking at (3) implementation.

There is a tension between the value of multiple meetings with different stakeholder domains and the logistical complexity of multiple meetings.

There are time limitations of PHVA workshops and of having done PVAs for a workshop ahead of time as a way of leveraging time constraints of PHVAs. This may encourage the development of strategic visions for species conservation, as well as more explicit considerations of the implementation phase of conservation planning processes.

Regarding SCS step (1) we can do individual interviews ahead of time – looking at key issues. Key concerns come out of that, and mentioned how mass collaborative technology and tools such as wikis would be ideal for that.

We already have some examples, such as the Hyaena Action Plan where questions were asked 6 months ahead of time. This had made the PHVA more efficient – and had delivered on SCS (1).

SCS process requires training, which is a clear strength of CBSG and our potential role in promoting the process. It was identified that TRAINING specialist groups on process was a benefit.

The group discussed reviewing Action Plans such as Cranes to see what is missing in the current SCS process.

Some group members felt that the evident heterogeneity usually points to needs for training.

CBSG could be the ideal group to take a leadership role in promoting and implementing SCS goals in this rather than waiting for direction from the SSC.

Recommendation from Working Group is that CBSG take the lead, especially in training via the CBSG Regional Groups.

www.vortex9.org/SCShandbook.pdf