



*Instituto Venezolano de Investigaciones Científicas*  
*Centro de Ecología*

Apartado 21827, Caracas 1020-A, Venezuela  
Tel / Fax: +(58-212) 504 1617 Email: [jonpaul@ivic.ve](mailto:jonpaul@ivic.ve)



July 28, 2004

Dr. Andrea H. Nouak  
Department V/9 - International Environmental Affairs  
Federal Ministry for Agriculture, Forestry, Environment and Water  
Management  
Stubenbastei 5  
A-1010 Vienna  
Austria

Dear Dr. Nouak,

I am writing on behalf of the National Red List Advisory Group (NRLAG), a subcommittee within the Red List Committee of the IUCN Species Survival Commission, and an advisory body for the national application of IUCN Red List criteria. We are conducting a survey of the 188 parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity, as part of a project designed to evaluate the current and potential uses of national threatened species lists. We would like to take this opportunity to request your assistance in providing information related to the creation and use of national threatened species lists in Austria.

As a party to the Convention on Biological Diversity, Austria has expressed a commitment to conserving and sustainably using biodiversity, including identifying and monitoring the important components of biological diversity that need to be conserved and used sustainably, and promoting the recovery of threatened species. The development of national threatened species lists is often an integral component of conservation programs and action plans directed toward conserving biological diversity. However, neither the extent to which such lists have been developed and incorporated into national conservation policies nor the issues related to elaborating these lists at a national level have been formally evaluated.

In an effort to improve the process of evaluating the status of national biodiversity, we would ask that you take the time to fill out the enclosed survey. This will allow the NRLAG to better serve the needs of nations undertaking national Red Listing efforts. We appreciate your time on this matter and respect your invaluable commitment to protecting the biodiversity with which we share the planet. Thank you in advance for your collaboration.

Yours faithfully,

Jon Paul Rodríguez  
Chair, National Red List Advisory Group

## Survey: IUCN Red List Criteria and National Threatened Species Listing

Contact information:

Dr Peter Zulka

Umweltbundesamt (Federal Environment Agency) Vienna,

Spittelauer Laende 5,

A-1090 Vienna, Austria,

[klaus-peter.zulka@umweltbundesamt.at](mailto:klaus-peter.zulka@umweltbundesamt.at)

1. Has a national threatened species list be developed for this country?

Yes  No

(Note: If more than one list has been developed for all taxa, please answer the questions with respect to the most recent list. If several lists have been created for different taxonomic groups, please answer the questions with respect to each list, e.g. select more than one time period, if necessary.)

2. If so, when was the list developed?

1980-1990:  1990-2000:  2000-2004:

3. If not, are there future plans to develop a national list of threatened species?

Yes  No

If Yes, when is it expected to be published?

4. Who developed or will develop the list (may select more than one)?

Governmental organization (ministry, department, wildlife agency, etc.)

Non-governmental organization

Regional IUCN-SSC office

Private organization

Other (please specify) \_\_\_\_\_

5. Were IUCN Red List criteria used in developing the list, or will they be, if the list has not yet been created? (If IUCN Red List criteria were not used in developing the list, please proceed to question #12)

Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No  \_\_\_\_\_

The Austrian concept aimed at full compatibility and comparability with IUCN risk classification results, however, the assessment procedure and the criteria were somewhat modified to (1) improve intelligibility of the assessment process, (2) to clarify the hierarchical expression of “threat” (3) to improve the congruence between range and trend data on the one hand and extinction risk (measured as extinction probability per unit time) on the other hand.

6. If IUCN Red List criteria were/ will be used, what version was it/ will it be?

1994 IUCN Red List Categories and Criteria

2001 IUCN Red List Categories and Criteria, version 3.1

7. If IUCN Red List criteria were/ will be used (even if they were modified), why were they selected as the criteria of choice? (select as many options as apply)

Objectivity

Quantitative nature of the criteria

Convenience of using an already-developed system

Reputation of the criteria

Previous and current global and regional use of the criteria (outside of the country in question)

Increased comparability between country in question and other regions in which the criteria have also been used

To allow assessments to be considered or incorporated into the global Red List

To evaluate/apply the new Regional Guidelines

Other (please specify) \_\_\_\_\_

clear definition of “threat” in terms of extinction probability per unit time (in particular criterion E) \_\_\_\_\_

8. Were the IUCN Regional Guidelines utilized when developing the list?

Yes  No \_\_\_\_\_

9. If the IUCN Regional Guidelines were not utilized, did the country develop its own set of regional guidelines or modify the IUCN criteria in any way?

Yes, our own regional guidelines were developed\_\_\_\_\_

Yes, the IUCN criteria were modified\_\_x\_\_

No\_\_\_\_\_

10. If the answer to question #9 is yes, what factors were considered in developing personalized regional guidelines or in modifying the IUCN criteria? (select as many options as apply)

Population status in neighboring countries

Threat status in neighboring countries (including entire regions such as “Europe”)

Threat status within the country

Global threat status

Percentage of global population found within the country/ Degree of endemism

Pattern or rate of decline

Biogeographical information

Conservation priority

Other (please specify) \_\_\_\_\_habitat availability, trends in habitat availability, direct human impact, range trends, immigration (according to IUCN Regional Guidelines)\_\_\_\_\_

11. Are there any publications or documents available that explain in detail the process of developing personalized regional guidelines or in modifying the IUCN criteria (if so, please specify where they can be obtained)?

Yes\_\_X

English: Zulka, K. P., Eder, E., Höttinger, H., Weigand, E. (2003): Threat descriptors and extinction risk – the Austrian Red List concept. In: de Iongh, H. H., Bánki, O. S., Bergmans, W., van der Werff ten Bosch, M. J.: The harmonization of Red Lists for threatened species in Europe. Proceedings of an International Seminar 27 and 28

November 2002, The Netherlands Commission for International Nature Protection,  
Mededelingen No 38, Leiden.

German:

Zulka, K. P., Eder, E., Höttinger, H., Weigand, E. (2001): Grundlagen zur Fortschreibung  
der Roten Listen gefährdeter Tiere Österreichs. Umweltbundesamt Monographie 135,  
Umweltbundesamt, Wien.

<http://www.umweltbundesamt.at/fileadmin/site/publikationen/M135.pdf>

---

No \_\_\_\_\_

12. If IUCN Red List criteria were not/ will not be used, please specify why not. (select as  
many options as apply)

There are special situations or restrictions specific to the country in  
question which IUCN criteria do not incorporate (please specify the  
restrictions \_\_\_\_\_)

The criteria are not specific enough for use at the national level

The criteria do not adequately allow the classification of certain  
taxonomic groups (please specify which groups \_\_\_\_\_ e. g. parasitic  
groups \_\_\_\_\_)

The criteria do not take into consideration conservation priority setting  
when classifying species

The criteria tend to over-estimate or exaggerate the threatened status of  
a species when applied at a national level

When the national list was developed, no regional guidelines for IUCN  
criteria existed

Other (please specify) \_\_\_\_\_

IUCN-criterion B requires a spatial scaling, that is what we essentially did to apply the IUCN  
criteria at national level.

13. What problems or issues have been encountered in the Red-Listing process that the National  
Red List Advisory Committee could potentially assist with or alleviate (related to the IUCN

criteria, the Regional Guidelines, national listing in general, etc.)? (select as many options as apply)

Lack of access to detailed global Red List data

Access is straightforward via Internet, yet invertebrates are somewhat underrepresented on the global IUCN list.

Lack of access to data from nearby countries (especially when applying the Regional Guidelines)

IUCN criteria are not easily applied to certain species or taxonomic groups (please specify \_\_\_\_\_ parasitic species \_\_\_\_\_)

IUCN criteria tend to exaggerate the threatened status when applied at a national level; e.g. the quantitative limits for each category are not appropriate for national use, especially in small countries (if true for certain taxonomic groups in particular, please specify which \_\_\_\_\_ many invertebrate groups are classified too high based on criterion B (poor coverage of true distribution, regional range restriction) \_\_\_\_\_)

Difficulties incorporating national assessments into global assessments

Difficulties understanding or applying the criteria in its current form

Vagueness of definitions of concepts used in the criteria hinder classification

Subcriterion “extreme fluctuations” of criterion B is not workable, since (1) all species fluctuate (more or less extremely), (2) data on these fluctuations are usually unavailable, (3) the relationship between population fluctuations and extinction risk is unclear (according to Lande 1993, *Am Nat.* 142 (5) 911ff, the relation  $r/V$  determines extinction risk, not  $V$  alone; “if the per capita growth has a mean larger than its variance ( $r > V$ , or  $c > 1$ ), the average persistence time under environmental stochasticity may be extremely long, even for populations of modest size”)

Other (please specify) \_\_\_\_\_ poor congruence between criteria A to D and criterion E (cf. Gärdenfors 2000 *Ecol. Bull.* 48, 181 ff., the problem has been addressed and a

solution has been proposed in the Austrian Red List concept)\_\_\_\_\_

14. Was the resulting national threatened species list reported to the IUCN global Red Listing Committee?

Yes\_\_\_\_\_ No\_\_x\_\_ (not yet, will appear in 2005)

15. Have the national Red List and/or the IUCN Red List criteria been incorporated into national conservation planning, policy and/or priority setting in any way?

National threatened species list: Yes\_\_\_\_\_ No\_\_x\_\_

IUCN Red List criteria: Yes\_\_\_\_\_ No\_\_x\_\_

Not yet, but incorporation into biodiversity assessment scheme is on the way.

16. How have the national Red List and/or the IUCN Red List criteria been incorporated into national conservation planning, policy and/or priority setting? (select as many options as apply)

The IUCN Red List criteria have been adopted as the criteria by which the “official” governmental threatened species list is created (i.e. the national Red List automatically becomes the governmental threatened species list).

(partly: in the province of Burgenland, species protection laws are linked to Red List status, the current Red List of Burgenland does not use the IUCN criteria, however)

A modified version of the criteria has been adopted as the criteria by which the “official” governmental threatened species list is created.

The national Red List developed using IUCN criteria is the baseline from which the government creates its official threatened species list (i.e. the governmental list is a selected subset of the Red List).

The national threatened species list is used to divert and or mediate development. Red Lists have been important tool in environmental impact assessment procedures.

The (national) threatened status of species according to IUCN criteria is considered in designating conservation priorities, planning conservation efforts and/or allocating conservation funds.

To date, no specific procedure has been worked out to close the gap between formal threat assessment and conservation priorities, however. For many species listed as threatened, no program or measurement plan exists.

Other (please specify) \_\_\_\_

The following steps are planned:

- (1) species in the highest threat categories are going to be monitored;
- (2) research and conservation concepts are designed for species listed in the highest categories. \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
Please feel free to elaborate on any of the above points, or on any other point of interest (use a separate sheet if necessary).

Please send the completed questionnaire to:

Jon Paul Rodríguez  
Centro de Ecología - IVIC  
Apdo. 21827, Caracas 1020-A  
Venezuela  
Tel / Fax: (+58-212) 504-1617, email: [jonpaul@ivic.ve](mailto:jonpaul@ivic.ve)