Addendum
Proposed review and petitions processes for Key Biodiversity Areas

The IUCN WCPA/SSC Joint Taskforce on Biodiversity & Protected Areas convened a workshop on 6–9 Nov 2013, hosted by the Brazilian Ministerio do Meio Ambiente in Brasilia, to recommend structures and processes for governance of the identification of Key Biodiversity Areas. Due to time constraints, two issues could not be resolved in Brasilia: organization of the review process and of the petitions process.

To address these gaps, the Joint Taskforce convened a one-day dedicated workshop on 21 Jan 2014 in Cambridge, UK. The following individuals were present: Leon Bennun (BirdLife International), Thomas Brooks (IUCN), Annabelle Cuttelod (IUCN), Lincoln Fishpool (BirdLife International), Mike Hoffmann (SSC Chair's office), Penny Langhammer (Task Force Co-chair), Jane Smart (IUCN), Simon Stuart (SSC Chair), and Stephen Woodley (Task Force Co-chair). Ernesto Enkerlin (WCPA Chair) and Kathy MacKinnon (WCPA Deputy Chair) sent their apologies. The proposal outlined in this addendum reflects the consensus recommendations from this follow-up meeting.

1. Review process

1.1 Brasilia recommendations and subsequent discussions

The Brasilia working group recommended four key phases in the KBA identification workflow process: i) Expression of Interest; ii) Nomination (open to anyone); iii) Review (through consultation within and beyond IUCN); and iv) Endorsement (by IUCN). It also recommended that KBA Focal Points, who would be regional specialists and/or taxonomic/biome specialists (and who would collectively form a KBA Review Committee accountable to the KBA Committee) would serve to support the entire identification workflow.

The workshop recommended an emphasis on support for improving proposals, and thorough review of the available information and its application, in an early stage of the process. It was envisioned that much of the review of species-site relationships, delineation, and application of the criteria would take place during "nomination development", before the data are officially submitted to IUCN for review. An open forum could give anyone with relevant knowledge the opportunity to comment or to add information. The review process would then be streamlined and mostly involve consistency checking of the data. This proposal caused confusion in Brasilia about what was entailed in "review" and who exactly would be involved.

Subsequent to the Brasilia workshop, a memo outlining a revised, three-stage process and a clearer, simplified terminology was circulated by Leon Bennun and Thomas Brooks. This became the starting point for the 21 Jan discussion.

1.2 Revised proposal for review process

To resolve confusion over the review and endorsement stages, the participants of the 21 Jan meeting articulated precisely what they envisioned at each stage. By differentiating between steps (discrete time-limited actions) and stages (the phase of work triggered by the step in question), the group proposed a revised process that everyone could accept. The process consists of five discrete steps with four stages of work in between:

Step	Stage that follows	Status of site	Description
1. *Expression of interest*			Proposer submits expression of interest to KBA Central Unit to identify one or more KBAs for a region or taxa/ecosystem. KBA Central Unit assigns a KBA Focal Point.
	Proposal Development		Proposer works to identify and delineate KBAs, compiling data for each site, and consulting relevant stakeholders. Process is guided by the KBA Focal Point to ensure quality submissions.
2. *Proposal*		Proposed KBA	Proposer submits KBA data online to IUCN for review
	Review		KBA Focal Point i) works with the proposer to ensure minimum documentation requirements are met and to make initial checks, and ii) co-ordinates input from relevant Commissions (by invitation), other relevant organisations and individuals (by invitation) and through an open forum. Continues until all issues arising are satisfactorily resolved.
3. *Nomination*		Reviewed KBA	Proposer submits revised data to IUCN as the official nomination of sites for KBA status. KBA Focal Point approves nomination online.
	Consistency checking		IUCN KBA Central Unit checks for consistency of application of the standard. Where appropriate, the KBA Review Sub-committee can require an audit for the accuracy and appropriateness of information used.
4. *Endorsement*		Endorsed KBA	IUCN endorses the KBAs and makes data available via the website
	Reassessment		Data are compiled that may affect whether a site qualifies as a KBA: changes in knowledge or status of either the biodiversity feature triggering the KBA criteria, or the site itself.
5. *Update*			KBA data are updated every 8-12 years

Any individual or organization interested in undertaking KBA identification should submit an *Expression of Interest* to IUCN. An IUCN KBA Central Unit, essentially the equivalent of the Red List Unit in Cambridge, assigns a KBA Focal Point (who might or might not be IUCN staff) to support proposal development. KBA Focal Points have experience in applying the KBA methodology and can provide training as required. They also have knowledge of previous or ongoing KBA identification processes in the region, to ensure that existing KBAs are taken into consideration in the identification of KBAs for new biodiversity features.

In the **Proposal Development** stage, the proposer works to identify and delineate KBAs, compiles the minimum standard documentation required for each site, consults with relevant stakeholders, and receives input from the KBA Focal Point. When complete, the data are submitted online to IUCN as a *Proposal* for review, and at this point the site(s) would be termed a "Proposed KBA**".**

In the subsequent **Review** stage, the KBA Focal Point works with the proposer to carry out initial checks on the information used and the way in which the standard has been applied (e.g., regarding criteria, thresholds, and delineation). Once this internal review has been satisfactorily completed, sites are subjected to an external review. Reviews would involve the following:
   1) Automated invitations to review to existing IUCN Commission structures, including to some or all of the below, as relevant:

a. SSC Red List Authorities for application of the thresholds and criteria to relevant taxon-site relationships (automated by taxon)
b. Equivalent CEM structures for equivalent application to ecosystems (automated by ecosystem)
c. WCPA regional mechanisms (automated by region)
d. CEESP regional mechanisms (automated by region)
2) Other solicited expert reviewers, as necessary and appropriate, at the discretion of the respective KBA Focal Point
3) Open online forums established specifically to facilitate open-review by interested parties (akin to those already in use for species).

KBA Focal Points would share the names of potential reviewers with the Review sub-committee to reduce potential conflicts of interest. Although a number of reviewers may be invited or solicited, a minimum of one external review of the KBA data is required provided this is sufficient to cover all aspects of the proposal. KBA Focal Points would co-ordinate the review process, distributing proposals for review, receiving the reviews, returning these to the proposer, and repeating until the reviewers and KBA Focal Point were satisfied that criteria, thresholds and delineation guidelines had been applied appropriately, and that the information used was sound. A site successfully completing the review stage would be called a "Reviewed KBA".

The proposer then makes an official *Nomination* of the sites for KBA status by submitting online the revised data to IUCN. Pending approval by the KBA Focal Point, the IUCN KBA Central Unit conducts **Consistency Checking** of the data, a light-touch check for consistent application of the criteria, thresholds, and delineation guidelines across regions and taxa/biomes. At the request of, or in discussion with, the Review Sub-Committee, it also could include an audit of the underlying information, including species-site relationships. Whether or not to undertake an audit would be decided on a case-by-case basis.

When all issues have been addressed, the Review Sub-Committee and KBA Central Unit make an *Endorsement* of the sites on behalf of IUCN, and the KBA data are made available via the website. At this stage a site is termed "Endorsed KBA".

To ensure that KBA data do not become obsolete once sites are endorsed, proposers should undertake **Reassessment** every 8-12 years. The reassessment should track the following changes that may affect KBA status of a site:
- actual status of biodiversity feature at the site (e.g. species becomes locally extinct)
- actual status of biodiversity feature globally such that significance of site changes (e.g. species is downlisted from VU to NT following policy interventions)
- knowledge of the biodiversity feature at the site (e.g. point locality record discovered to be an error)
- knowledge of biodiversity feature globally such that significance of site changes (e.g. a species triggering criterion B1 is found at three additional sites)

Reassessed sites are submitted online as an *Update* after a maximum of 12 years; sites that have not been reassessed after 12 years are flagged as "in need of update". Further discussion is needed on the process for delisting sites if found to no longer meet global or sub-global KBA criteria and thresholds.

1.3 Operationalizing the Review and Consistency Checking processes

The review process outlined above cannot work on a volunteer basis alone and is dependent on a set of KBA Focal Points whose positions do not currently exist. Focal Points could be drawn from IUCN Regional programmes, NGOs conducting KBA work (e.g. BirdLife International), universities, or potentially government agencies.

The Review sub-committee from which the Focal Points are drawn will need to be dynamic to respond to changing needs. Resources to support the work of KBA Focal Points will need to be raised, both centrally and through individual projects. It is envisioned that the KBA Focal Points would report to the chair of the Review sub-committee, although reporting structures need further consideration.

In addition to the Focal Points, there is a need for a small KBA Central Unit within IUCN to handle Expressions of Interest, conduct consistency checking, maintain the database and website, and support integration with other IUCN knowledge products. The IUCN Secretariat does not currently have the capacity to support KBA identification and review.

2. Petitions process

It is recommended that the KBA petitions process be analogous to that for the IUCN Red List of Threatened Species. Petitions against the listing of a site as a KBA can be made by anyone, but only with respect to data, criteria, thresholds, or delineation. It is not possible to change listings for political, emotional, economic or other reasons. Every effort should be made to reach an agreement between the petitioner and the proposer of the site without the need to enter formally the petitions process, but if it is not possible to come to a consensus, then the matter is referred to a Petition Working Group. The Petition Working Group structure would be a small committee of fixed membership, with Co-Chairs appointed by the SSC and WCPA Commission Chairs, and reporting directly to them, not to the KBA Committee. Its Terms of Reference would be broadly similar to those for the Standards & Petitions Sub-Committee of the IUCN Red List of Threatened Species, i.e., spanning both:
1) Handling of petitions processes post-Endorsement
2) Maintaining the (electronic) KBA Guidelines as these are revised over time.