



RESEARCH INSTITUTE
NATURE AND FOREST



Abstract Book: ‘Best practice of National Red Listing workshop,’ Belgium 27th September 2024

Supported by the Netherlands Ministry for Agriculture, Fisheries, Food security and Nature (LVVN)

1. Introduction

The primary reason for establishing Red Lists is to provide evidence-based assessments of a species' risk of extinction. The IUCN Categories and Criteria along with the Regional and National Guidelines offer an internationally recognised standard to follow, allowing for comparisons of conservation status between species, subpopulations and across borders. The present-day IUCN categories and criteria (Least Concern, Vulnerable, etc.) were established in 1997. Following an extensive review, in part due to a resolution from the World Conservation Congress in Amman (2000), several adjustments were made. IUCN Regional and National Red Lists adhere to IUCN Categories and Criteria for consistency, with the addition of "Regionally Extinct" and "Not Applicable." The IUCN Red List Unit in Cambridge updates the Global Red List of Threatened Species annually, and as of 2024, it has amassed 163,040 global species assessments.

In addition to the extra categories, simple definitions for key concepts such as population, sub-population, generation, reduction, extreme fluctuations, area of residence etc., were established to facilitate the application of the Regional and National Guidelines. In following these guidelines, one can evaluate the status of a species relative to the broader region, including adjacent populations which may influence population dynamics and likelihood of persistence. Depending on the results, a species may be "uplisted" or "downlisted" in its extinction risk category.

Red Lists are often used nationally to inform protected status, national legislation, and species management plans. Since the conservation status of a national population is adjusted or relative to that of neighbouring populations within the region, effective coordination and information exchange between countries is vital to inform these assessments and, effective conservation actions. For species with wide ranges, differing methods and national assessments can create challenges for coordinated conservation efforts. Moreover, Red Lists are one of the accepted indicators reported nationally to the CBD Global Biodiversity Framework. As that agenda advances, and regional commitments such as the adoption of the European Union's Nature Restoration Law (2024) are codified nationally, the importance of interregional and international "harmonisation" of these assessments will become more significant.

This "harmonisation" can take place in several forms:

1. Compiling national Red Lists in alignment with the IUCN Categories and Criteria and applying the IUCN Regional and National Guidelines (examples of European countries using this approach include Norway, Sweden, Finland and Switzerland).
2. Developing a supplementary Red List for a subset of species, following the IUCN methods for populations of interregional or international significance.
3. Reviewing existing Red Lists and applying an adaptation of the IUCN national and regional downlisting/uplisting approach to develop an adjusted IUCN equivalent status.

When considering the adjusted national status under this third approach, it is important to be cautious regarding the implications for national legislations and protective measures, particularly with nationally threatened species (and subspecies). In addition to ecological and population data, other factors such as cultural significance should be considered before any decisions are made about removing protective measures nationally.

National Red Lists can hold great political significance and it is recommended that national Categories and Criteria should be updated and aligned with the newest IUCN Categories and Criteria following one of the harmonisation strategies above. Furthermore, it is recommended to review and update national Red Lists at least every 10 years, yearly updates with the results made available online..

2. Background of the workshops scope by Hans de Iongh (Co-Chair ICENCA and Chair Leo Foundation)

IUCN NL has been a trusted contributor to the advisory group for National Red Lists at the Ministry of Agriculture and Nature Management (LNV) through the participation of Prof Hans de Iongh since 2003 and has especially supported the preparation of numerous National Red Lists using the gold standard IUCN Categories and Criteria system (C&C version 3.2.) in the Netherlands. The decision to draw up a second, IUCN C&C National Red List in addition to the Dutch National Red List with national criteria was taken by the Minister of LNV after an international seminar organised by the lead applicant from IUCN NL and the Institute of Environmental Sciences Leiden (CML) in 2002 (Conference proceedings: "<https://scholarlypublications.universiteitleiden.nl/handle/1887/15728>").

Whilst the first Dutch National Red List is published within the Government Gazette, the proposed second red list, which uses the IUCN standards, has enabled comparison of species trends in a regional and global context. Comparison is needed in order to detect and compare different trends of similar threatened species groups in different neighbouring countries, which might have a sink-source relationship. As such, the Netherlands occupies a unique position within Europe with these two red lists which follow different criteria systems, since so far, no other European country has adopted this approach.

In Europe, many governments and NGOs have generated national assessments of species extinction risk or conservation status (National Red Lists or Red Data books) using their own national criteria systems, yet few have lists following the objective and standardized IUCN standards or regional guidelines. Without standardisation, tracking regional progress towards biodiversity targets and informing coordinated approaches for species conservation can be hindered. To facilitate effective species conservation and interregional collaboration, ICENCA aims to promote the best practice of National Red Listing within the region through its network of IUCN members.

This mission is supported by a collaboration with the IUCN Red List Unit in Cambridge (<https://www.iucnredlist.org/contact/contact-page>), the IUCN National Red List Working Group and the red list program of the Zoological Society of London (<https://www.zsl.org/what-we-do/projects/red-list-index-project>) and the Belgian Biodiversity Platform ([Belgian Biodiversity Platform : About Us](#)). An “ad hoc working group on National Red Listing” has been set up for this purpose and an organising committee. in order to promote the best practice

of National Red Listing in an initial stage and to support the ZSL website and network and translations of the new IUCN guidelines for National Red Listing to sustain this promotion.

Preparations for the workshop were made during the ICENCA meeting in Yerevan in October 2023 and as a follow up national representatives were invited to attend the workshop on 27 September 2024 just before the start of the IUCN Regional Conservation Forum in 2024 (29/9 to 3/10) in Bruges in order to promote "best practices for National Red Listing" using the Dutch National Red Lists as a case study. The workshop provided a timely platform for open dialogue on the National Red List process, with a deep dive into the IUCN approach and to highlight the tools and support available.

3. Opening Remarks & Welcome Address by Dr Hilde Eggermont (Director of INBO / IUCN Vice President)

Welcome to the IUCN Workshop on Best Practices in IUCN Red Listing, and to the Research Institute for Nature & Forest (INBO). INBO is an independent research institute of the Flemish government, dedicated to supporting and evaluating biodiversity policy through monitoring and scientific research. In the opening address, we will emphasize INBO's role in coordinating the Red Lists for Flanders, and the importance of diverse knowledge, open science, and innovative monitoring techniques. Additionally, as an introduction to the workshop programme, we will briefly highlight the significance of National Red Listing as a tool to engage policymakers and the public, inform species-specific conservation actions, guide land and sea use planning, and direct investments.

4. Guidelines for Establishing a National Red List Programme Neil Cox - Co-Chair IUCN SSC National Red List Working Group, IUCN-CI Biodiversity Assessment Unit.

As the Global Biodiversity Framework (GBF) asks countries to report on trends of species extinction risk in national reporting to the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), they must ensure that red listing at the national scale is prioritised as part of National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plans (NBSAPs) and that National Red Listing programmes of work are established or strengthened - National Red List assessments allow countries to accurately track the status of species for which they are responsible. The presentation introduces a new National Red List guidance document which sets out the steps for establishing a National Red List programme. It may be used by all stakeholders involved in national biodiversity risk assessment: state-employed officials with the mandate to report on the status of indigenous species via their CBD focal points, civil society organizations interested in engaging in Red List activities, academics involved in creating the knowledge base for informing policies, and practitioners working on one or more taxonomic groups where the assessments are undertaken for all or a subset of species occurring within one country.

5. Using the IUCN Red List Criteria for Regional & National Red Lists by Caroline Pollock (Senior Programme Coordinator, IUCN Red List Unit)

Over the past twenty years, National Red Lists have become increasingly important tools for helping countries develop their biodiversity policies and conservation priorities. With the Red List Index also being adopted by CBD as one of the headline indicators for monitoring progress for the Global Biodiversity Framework, having a standard approach for National Red Lists is essential. The IUCN Red List Categories and Criteria were developed in the 1990s to assess the global status of species, and while this system works for national assessments of single-country endemic species, it is not ideal for national assessments of non-endemic species. However, in the early 2000s, IUCN released guidelines on how to use the IUCN Categories and Criteria for national Red List assessments. By following these guidelines, countries can assess species extinction risk in a standardised way, allowing National Red Lists to be directly comparable between countries.

6. National Red Listing in The Netherlands by Baudewijn Odé (Senior Project manager at FLORON – Plant Conservation Netherlands, Red List Coordinator at IUCN SSC Grasshopper Specialist Group)

In the Netherlands National Red Lists are published for 18 species groups. All are assembled using national categories and criteria and about half of these also have an assessment using IUCN categories and criteria. In national criteria a strong emphasis on trends since 1950 is used in assessing the species categories. Assessment is done by NGOs with knowledge of the species and access to generally large datasets.

The national categories are widely used in nature management, communication and partly also in legislation and should in a perspective of national species conservation not be abandoned. On the other hand, for some intrinsically relevant groups, like pollinators, no national red list using IUCN criteria is available.

It is advised to stick to a 10-year cycle for updating Dutch National Red Lists, realize a prompt formal publication (in relation to legal obligations) and to include the publication on nationalredlist.org. Preferably national criteria should be kept intact (in relation to legal obligations). However, it would be good to apply national IUCN criteria for a minimum set of species groups, coherent with other European countries' Red Lists. Finally, it would be good, if we would start learning from IUCN national lists on a European level.

7. National Red List Database and Website by Sophie Ledger (Zoological Society of London)

The National Red List website is a unique resource hub for countries developing or updating their National Red Lists. The initiative is stewarded by the National Red List Working Group of the IUCN SSC and hosted and managed by ZSL's Indicators and Assessments Unit. It provides users with a starting point to access tools and guidance to support their species assessment efforts and encourages the use of IUCN Red List methods, signposting Regional and National Red List resources. One of its most significant offerings is a central, easily searchable library of assessments and publications, which houses regional and National Red Lists (the National Red List Database). This allows practitioners to access a wealth of

information from around the world in a standardised format. Additionally, the platform serves as a free online database, enabling countries of all capacities to share their biodiversity data on an international stage, enhancing visibility and fostering potential collaborations.

New features launching around the Best Practices of National Red Lists Workshop in and ICENCA RCF in October 2024 will further benefit National Red List practitioners by providing them with greater autonomy over the representation of their country's data. National focal points will have the ability to register, curate, and submit their data directly through the platform, facilitating timely updates of assessments. Validation tools will encourage good data practices and use of National Red List data standards. Future developments will be driven by consultations with national focal points and will focus on refining the upload functionality to make it as user-friendly as possible. There will also be exploration into integrating with the IUCN Red List global website and other biodiversity databases. A data summary and visualisation tool are also in development, empowering countries to summarise and analyse the results of their Red List data in a simple and accessible format.

8. National Red Listing in France by Maud Lelièvre IUCN Councillor and Chair (French national committee for IUCN)

France is a biodiversity hotspot, ranking first in Europe for the diversity of amphibians, birds, and mammals. Metropolitan France alone is home to 40% of Europe's plant species and over 50% of habitats of community interest. These habitats, whether terrestrial or aquatic, face various threats, including reduced distribution and vulnerability. Notably, France is home to five terrestrial and two marine biodiversity hotspots, out of the 34 identified globally. A biodiversity hotspot is a region containing at least 1,500 endemic plant species but which has already lost over 70% of its original vegetation. Although these areas account for only 2.3% of the Earth's land surface, they harbour more than 50% of the world's plant species and 42% of terrestrial vertebrates. This exceptional richness underscores the critical need for focused conservation efforts.

To effectively preserve this diversity, it is crucial to monitor the status of species, track emerging threats, and establish priorities for action. The National Red List of Threatened Species serves as a vital tool in this regard. It helps to identify the most urgent conservation priorities, shape policies, and guide action strategies, while encouraging all stakeholders to contribute towards mitigating species loss. The Red List allows for a comprehensive evaluation of both the achievements made and the challenges ahead for France in its biodiversity conservation efforts.

Over the past 16 years, the French Committee of the International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN) and the PatriNat unit (OFB-MNHN-CNRS-IRD) have been compiling and analysing data, providing a clear overview of the state of biodiversity in both metropolitan France and its overseas territories. Since the launch of the National Red List in 2008, 17,367 species have been evaluated across France, with 2,903 currently classified as threatened. Unfortunately, 189 species have already gone extinct in France, including some that have disappeared globally.

These findings highlight the urgency of continuing and expanding conservation efforts in the face of ongoing biodiversity loss. By leveraging the scientific data gathered through the Red

List, France is better equipped to take targeted actions to protect its rich natural heritage for future generations.

9. National Red Listing in the Russian Federation by Anna Belousova (VNII Ecology) and Aleksei Zavarzin (VIR & All Russian Society for nature protection)

Russia has been a party to the Convention on Biological Diversity since 1992. Management of the Red Data Book of the Russian Federation remains the important tool for fulfilling the Russia's obligations under the Convention. The main difference from the majority of Red Lists including the Global one by the IUCN is that the species listed in the Russian Red Data Book fall under national legal protection.

The present legal framework requires the species listed in the Red Data Book to be all withdrawn from any economic use. Anthropogenic activities that lead to reduction of their populations in numbers and/ or deterioration of their habitats are prohibited. The Red Data Book of the Russian Federation is to be revised every 10 years and published in both digital and hard copies.

The species (subspecies, populations) that are included in the officially approved Red List are listed in the Red Data Book. The currently active red list of Animals was approved at the end of 2020 and subsequently published in the Red Data Books' volume "Animals" at the end of 2021. The Red list of Plants and Fungi was approved in 2023 with the volume "Plants and Fungi" ready for publication by the end of 2024.

Three approaches for assessing the status of species (subspecies, populations) are used for the new edition of the Red Data Book of the Russian Federation:

- the IUCN scale before 1994 (qualitative assessment);
- the "extinction risk assessment" (the currently used IUCN scale);
- the "scale of the degree and priority of protection measures under three environmental priorities".

Application of the IUCN 1994 scale remains in the 2021 edition to analyze dynamics for taxa included into previous editions of the Red Data Book (e.g. in 2001 "Animals" volume, 2008 – "Plants and Fungi" volume).

Introduced changes to the new List of animals are inter alia related to the results of applying of the IUCN quantitative criteria. For example, the most significant changes occurred in the "Invertebrates" group with 44.5% of species excluded from the Red Data Book, and 46.5% newly included. High proportion of excluded species is mainly due to the assessment of extinction risk using the quantitative criteria of the IUCN. Significant percentage of changes in invertebrates is also caused by the relative data deficiency for this group comparing to one for vertebrates. Furthermore 15% of birds were excluded, with 20% new added. These changes are caused by a revision of principles for listing species in the national Red Data Book – no vagrant species at the edge of their range are included and regional guidelines are used in assessment of the risk of extinction.

The legal framework and a set of protocols for maintaining the Red Data Books of the regions of Russian Federation have been formed since 1990. All regions of the Russian Federation have prepared and published several issues of Red Data Books. In about 14% of the regional Red

Data Books of the Russian Federation modern IUCN scale with quantitative criteria are used by 2022.

10. An overview of Red List assessments in Flanders (northern Belgium) and their use in nature conservation and policy by Geert De Knijf, Pieter Vanormelingen and Dirk Maes

Flanders has a long history in publishing red lists. In the first period regional criteria were used, but since 2011 the IUCN criteria were set as the standard. Most data that are used in recent red lists have been gathered in the online platform www.waarnemingen.be, a citizen science biodiversity data portal. A validation process ensures the data quality. Red lists are now available for 18 taxonomic groups (3680 species), several of which are already updated once or twice. Overall, 29% of species are threatened, another 14% are Near Threatened and 2% are Data Deficient.

Red lists provide a solid basis to prioritise conservation and policy actions for species and biotopes. Comparison of average species trends across different biotopes provides more insight into the most threatened biotopes. Mapping hotspots for red list species diversity points at the most important areas for conservation. Based on red lists, dedicated monitoring schemes and associated management and species action plans are devised. These should focus on both appropriate small-scale management at the sites with red list species present and on a larger spatial scale on the provision of a sufficient number of connected habitat patches.

11. National Red Listing of species in Poland by Andrzej Kepel, Michał Michlewicz Polish Society for Nature Conservation “Salamandra”, IUCN Polish National Committee

In Poland, the first comprehensive publication designed as a red list of species is the *List of threatened plants in Poland* (1986). It includes vascular plants, bryophytes, algae, macro fungi and lichens. Next the Polish red data books of animals (1992) and plants (1993) were published. At the beginning of the 20th century red books of plants (2001), vertebrates (2001) and invertebrates (2004), as well as red lists of animals (2002) and plants (2006) were published by the Institute for Nature Conservation of the Polish Academy of Sciences (in cooperation with other institutions). At that time, it chaired the IUCN Polish National Committee, so it was assumed that they were released in consultation with this Committee. They were therefore treated as a guide to priorities in nature conservation in Poland. In fact, they were based on the IUCN threat categories, but adopted with some modifications or in outdated versions. IUCN classification criteria were not applied. Instead, the discretionary judgement of experts was used. However, since good experts participated in the development of these lists, in most cases the assessments relatively well reflected the actual degree of threat of the species.

Last 25 years witnessed quite numerous publications titled “red list” or “red book” in Poland. They usually concerned specific groups of organisms and regions of Poland. There were also nationwide publications, such as red lists of: lichens (2003), archeophytes (2009) or fishes and lampreys (2009). They were issued by different scientific institutions without consultation with any IUCN body. Often modified or outdated IUCN categories were used, and usually no systematized criteria were invoked in the assessments. Nevertheless, these publications make an important contribution to expanding knowledge about the status of individual species.

The next stage opens with two publications: *Polish red list of pteridophytes and flowering plants* (2016) and *The red list of birds in Poland* (2020). The current IUCN criteria and categories for regional lists were already used in their preparation. In the assessment of each species, the criteria used are provided. The second of these publications has also been peer-reviewed and approved by the IUCN Polish National Committee.

Currently, the Polish Society for Nature Conservation “Salamandra” together with the IUCN Polish National Committee are preparing a new edition of the Polish red list of species. It is to operate on the model of the IUCN Red List – as a web service. Each species will be assessed by experts on a given taxon, and then the assessment will be peer-reviewed and adopted by the Polish IUCN Committee. Current IUCN criteria and categories will be used. A team of authors for vertebrates (except fish) is currently assembled. Together with the Polish Entomological Society, work has begun on completing the team for selected insect families. Service is ready for different taxonomic groups. This project has no financial support from public funds for the time being.

12. National Red Listing in Spain by J. Jesús Bellido López, Luis Santiago Cano-Alonso, Carmen Acedo, Javier Almunia, Ricardo G. Calmaestra and Jose Luis Tellería (IUCN national committee for Spain)

Spain is a biodiversity hotspot (refuge during glacial cycles, diverse topography and climate, oceanic and continental insularity, location between Atlantic Ocean and Mediterranean Sea). The country hosts small populations of species typical of central and northern Europe, Mediterranean and Macaronesian species, numerous marine species, and many endemics. Spain is home to over 85,000 species of animals, fungi, and plants, 54% of European species.

The IUCN Species Survival Commission (SSC) promotes National Species Specialist Groups to create networks of species experts, aiming to reverse biodiversity loss and address sustainability challenges. The Spain Species Specialist Group, established in February 2024, is the first in Europe and the ninth globally. Its formation involved the SSC, the IUCN Spanish Committee, the IUCN-SSC Macaronesia Species Conservation Centre, and the Ministry for Ecological Transition and the Demographic Challenge. Coordinators for fauna and flora identified and contacted scientific associations and taxonomic experts to participate.

Currently, there are 15 working groups (insects, spiders, butterflies, molluscs, cave invertebrates, fishes, sharks-rays-chimeras, amphibians and reptiles, terrestrial mammals excluding bats, bats, bryophytes, algae, lichens, vascular plants, and Macaronesian plants) with 139 specialists, 99 officially registered on the IUCN portal.

The development of a National Red List in Spain is crucial for standardizing species conservation efforts at national and international levels as well as to support other initiatives such as the KBAs identification process in the country. The Spain Species Specialist Group has undertaken several key actions to ensure compatibility with IUCN standards.

With NextGenerationEU funds, the Ministry for Ecological Transition is updating species status under the Birds and Habitat Directives. The specialist group is providing training and assistance to ensure species assessments align with IUCN criteria. This process involves:

- Identifying species and verifying their inclusion in the IUCN Species Information System.
- Conducting a pre-assessment to identify potential issues.

- Performing the final assessment.

A training workshop will be organized to unify criteria.

The next step will be the preparation of the National Red List. This action focuses on compiling species assessments at national level and integrating it into the broader IUCN framework. This Specialist Group will coordinate this integration to meet IUCN standards, enhancing the project's international relevance.

The SSC in Spain will promote the Red List through IUCN communication channels to increase visibility and accessibility to both national and international audiences.

The Ministry has committed to fund a training workshop and hired a bio-IT expert to coordinate assessments. The Specialist group has proposed to the Loro Parque Foundation to assess taxonomic groups not covered by the Ministry and plans to submit additional proposals for future funding. Major gaps include a lack of financial resources, limited specialist availability, and insufficient taxonomic expertise in some areas. Some taxonomic groups have proposed lists that, while not submitted to the IUCN, align with its criteria (e.g., vascular and non-vascular flora).

The aim is to launch a National Red List and its website by the end of 2025, integrating all assessments completed by then in alignment with the National Red List project.

13. National Red Listing in Kazakhstan by Roman Jashenko Institute of Zoology Republic of Kazakhstan, Scientific Society "Tethys"

The Red Data Book of Kazakhstan (then the Kazakh SSR) was first developed and published in 1978, and the issue included 87 species and subspecies of vertebrates, divided into two conservation status categories.

The second update of the Red Data Book of Kazakhstan was prepared in 1991. It included 129 species and subspecies of vertebrates (16 fish, three amphibians, ten reptiles, 58 birds, 42 mammals) and 105 species of invertebrates (96 insects, one crustacean, six molluscs, two worms).

The third update of the Red Data Book began in 1996 with the development of the first part (vertebrates) of the 1st volume (animals), which already included 125 species and subspecies of vertebrates. In December 2003, the second part (invertebrates) of this volume was also published, which included 96 species of invertebrates (annelids - 2, molluscs - 6, crustaceans - 1, arachnids - 2, insects - 85). For this second part (invertebrates), the IUCN criteria and categories were applied for the first time in Kazakhstan.

The fourth update of the Red Data Book of the Republic of Kazakhstan (part 1, vertebrates) in 2008-2010 was actually a reprint of the previous similar issue (1996) almost without changes, without applying the IUCN categories and criteria.

The fifth update of the Red Data Book in 2024 includes 135 vertebrate and 82 invertebrate animal species with a justified application of IUCN criteria and categories. According to the national legislation of Kazakhstan, it is a legal document that is an annotated and illustrated presentation of the List of rare and endangered species and subspecies of animals and plants (Resolution of the Government of the Republic of Kazakhstan). Including or removing species from the Red Data Book requires biological justification and is approved by members of the

interdepartmental zoological commission. The state program for maintaining the Red List (along with the Red Data Book of the Republic of Kazakhstan) was proposed by the Institute of Zoology for 2025-2027.

14. After Red Listing – Conservation Planning of European Pollinators By Ann-Katrine Garn – Director of Conservation at Copenhagen Zoo, Member of Conservation Planning Specialist Group Europe and Secretary of ICENCA

Confronted with hundreds, and sometimes thousands, of threatened species, many national and regional governments as well as other organisations with responsibilities for conserving wildlife, find it challenging to develop efficient, yet effective, methods of moving such large numbers of threatened species from Red List assessment to effective conservation action, at the pace demanded, and in a way that benefits from the knowledge, insights and support of key stakeholders.

The ‘Assess to Plan’ (A2P) process and associated multispecies planning (MSP) methodology developed by the Conservation Planning Specialist Group (CPSG) of the Species Survival Commission (SSC) of IUCN provides a workflow that addresses these challenges. A pilot project in Denmark applied this process to the Danish threatened hoverflies and serves as a model for multispecies planning at a national level.

15. Panel discussion

The day closed with a panel discussion with reflections and recommendations on the best practice of National Red Listing. The panel members included: Sophie Ledger (Zoological Society London), Kristijn Swinnen (Natuurpunt), Caroline Pollock (IUCN Red List Unit), Jon Paul Rodrigues (Chair IUCN-SSC), and Neil Cox (IUCN National Red List working group).

One important question for the panel was about national focal points for National Red Listing and what recommendations the panel had for them. The most important tips for new actors included exploring materials online that are readily available to them, such as national guidelines, and other National Red List units or databases, but also looking at training programs on the IUCN website and finding a “mentor” or liaison for help. Important in this respect is also to secure funding for the further development of the ZSL National Red List website and data base. The panel also agreed that a possible starting point for the development of new National Red Lists would be a focus on endemic species. There was a strong recommendation to consider applying the IUCN C&C for endemic species in National Red Lists, so that the assessment could be included in the IUCN global red list as well. This would prevent duplication of assessment effort. Furthermore, one panel member added that the integration of data of National Red Lists into academic courses might be a way for students to contribute to the collection of data needed to close data gaps. The panel also agreed that the data of older and new National Red Lists could be uploaded into the newly created National Red List website and data base of ZSL.

In case of new National Red Lists prepared with national criteria, the panel recommended, if funding allows, to consider the development of a second National Red List based on IUCN C&C for international comparison. Reference is made to the Dutch example, where since 2002 for most vertebrate taxonomic groups, besides red lists with national criteria also red lists are

prepared with IUCN C&C. It was suggested that IUCN National Red Lists are probably more objective than National Red Lists prepared with national criteria, which often have legal implications. But more importantly IUCN National Red Lists make it easier to compare these red lists between nations.

One other question was on how to deal with species that are probably threatened but are not on red lists because they are data deficient. Here the panel recommended to focus on more data gathering on such species and the creation of basic tools (e.g. databases) with indirect indicators (such as trends in habitat and pollution trends) that could help with an improved red list classification of such species. It was also suggested that National Red Lists could be used for raising funds for the protection of the threatened species but also of sympatric less threatened species.

It was noted that National Red Lists based on IUCN C&C not necessarily set priorities for funding of conservation programmes, but that policy makers and national governments will decide on priorities based on multiple factors. When talking about coming to a more balanced approach to strategies (use of policy makers) of red listing the panel recommended the promotion of other tools from IUCN, such as the National Red List index, the green list for species and of ecosystems, and the red list of ecosystems. The panel did agree that there are many tools available and that we might overstretch ourselves with them, but the tools do measure different things and have added value. The Reverse the Red initiative is a good example of a global initiative to apply these tools for conservation outcomes. The availability of training modules on the IUCN website is crucial to spread the use of these tools. The panel also mentioned that it is important to have an evidence-based system and that science needs to be independent from policy. Finally, interesting uses of National Red Lists such as the use of red list classifications by zoos, but also by artists and children were discussed. Another topic shortly discussed by the panel included how to tackle biodiversity risks and climate change and what they thought of the use of AI for National Red Listing.

ANNEX. Program Best Practice of National Red Listing Workshop Herman Teirlinck Building, Av. du Port 88, 1000 Brussels 27th September 2024

The workshop is organized as an initiative of the ICENCA and covers all IUCN regions of the committee in collaboration with the IUCN regional Offices, as well as the IUCN National Committee of the Netherlands, the Zoological Society of London (ZSL), IUCN SSC, IUCN Red List Unit Cambridge, IUCN National Red List Working Group, The Leo foundation, and the Belgian Biodiversity Platform. This workshop has been organised in partnership with the Regional Conservation Forum for Europe, North Central Asia, taking place Sept 30th - Oct 3rd, Bruges, Belgium. More details on the practical arrangements for attending both meetings can be found below.

Programme

Moderated by Divija Jata, Belgian Biodiversity Platform

8.30 - 9.00	<i>Registration and Coffee</i>
	<p>Introduction to workshop scope, Hans de Jongh (Co-Chair, ICENCA & Chair Leo Foundation)</p> <p>Opening remarks and welcome address, Hilde Eggermont (Vice President IUCN and Director INBO, Belgium)</p> <p>The role of the regional offices in national & regional red listing, Boris Erg (Director of IUCN-EURO)</p> <p>The importance of national and regional red listing, Jon Paul Rodrigues (Chair IUCN-SSC)</p> <p>Development of IUCN Guidelines for national red listing, Neil Cox (IUCN National Red List Working Group)</p> <p>Using the IUCN Red List criteria for regional & national Red Lists, Caroline Pollock (IUCN Red List Unit)</p>
11.00 - 11.20	<i>Break</i>
	<p>National red listing in The Netherlands, Baudewijn Odé (FLORON, The Netherlands)</p> <p>The role of the National Red List website and online network to support national red listing, Sophie Ledger (Zoological Society of London)</p> <p>The French example of national red listing, Maud Lelièvre (IUCN French national committee)</p> <p>Participants' discussion</p>
13.00 - 14.00	<i>Lunch</i>
	<p>National red listing in the Russian Federation, Anna Belousova (VNII Ecology, Russian Federation)</p>

	<p>National red listing of vertebrates in Poland, M. Michlewicz and A. Kepel (Polish Society for Nature Conservation "Salamandra")</p> <p>National red listing of birds in Armenia, Karen Aghababyan (BirdLinks, Armenia)</p> <p>Regional red listing in Flanders, Belgium, P. Vanormelingen (Natuurpunt, Belgium) and Geert De Knijf (INBO, Belgium), Pieter Vanormelingen (Natuurpunt, Belgium) and</p>
15.00 - 15.20	<i>Break</i>
	<p>National red listing in Spain, Jesús Bellido López (IUCN National Committee, Spain)</p> <p>National red listing in Kazakhstan, Aidyn Yeszhanov (Institute of Zoology, Kazakhstan)</p> <p>After national red listing - conservation planning of European pollinators, Ann-Katrine Garn (IUCN-SSC CPSG Europe, Copenhagen Zoo)</p> <p>National red listing in Romania, John Smaranda (Ministry of Environment, Waters and Forest, Romania)</p> <p>Panel discussion on best practice of national red listing: reflections and recommendations S. Ledger, K. Swinnen, C. Pollock, J. P. Rodrigues & N. Cox</p>
17.30 - 19.00	<i>Networking</i>

—