

Report of the Congress Preparatory Committee acting as Appeals body to IUCN Members 24 April 2025

The motions process is a fundamental element of IUCN's governance and constitutes a means through which IUCN Members set IUCN's general policy, influence conservation priorities and find support for moving commitments into action, as set out in the first Motions Working Group [update](#), published on 26 March 2025.

In accordance with IUCN Statutes and the Rules of Procedure of the World Conservation Congress (*Rule 62ter* and *Rule 62quarto*), the Congress Preparatory Committee (CPC) established by Council decides any appeal from a proponent and cosponsors against the classifications, exclusion or amendment of their motion by the Motions Working Group (MWG).

In accordance with *Rule 62quarto*, three individuals representing the common interests of Members but who are not themselves members of the Council or personally involved with the motions process were also selected to join the CPC for the appeals process.

The individuals appointed were selected according to the following criteria:

1. A good knowledge of IUCN and previous Congress(es);
2. An understanding of and sensitivity to the diversity of interests of IUCN State/Government and I/NGO and IPO Members and/or Commissions;
3. Representation of at least one State/Government Member and one I/NGO/IPO Member from different regions;
4. No personal involvement in the motions process.
5. Ensuring gender balance within the CPC.

Following the MWG communication of the accepted and rejected motions, the appeals process was launched on the 26 March 2025. By the deadline of 9 April 2025, the CPC acting as appeals body had received 38 appeals. The CPC only had one 2-hour meeting to decide on all the appeals, but all CPC Appeals Body members were provided all appeals (the text of the original motion, the MWG opinion, and the text of the appeal) well in advance and asked to input their recommendation into a shared Excel file, to facilitate discussion.

After careful consideration of each of the appeals, the CPC acting as appeals body communicated its decisions, by 24 April 2025, to all proponents and co-sponsors of motions under appeal. The CPC acting as appeals body decided to accept 14 appeals and those 14 motions were posted online in the Congress website alongside the 124 motions initially accepted by the MWG. The CPC acting as appeals body has put together this short report with some explanations and reflections on the process. The appeals body and CPC note that two members of the CPC recused themselves from discussion of several motions, for those motions for which they or their organization had been a proponent or co-sponsor.

The CPC acting as an appeals body would like to assure all IUCN Members that we appreciate the effort they put into proposing, consulting, preparing and submitting motions. At no time did the appeals body members consider an appeal based on whether they liked a motion or not; their sole consideration was whether the statutes were complied with and whether or not the decision of the MWG was correct. Some Members have expressed disappointment because their motions or appeals were rejected, and we sympathize. We encourage these Members to continue engaging enthusiastically with IUCN and the motions process as the success of the motions process can only be ensured if we all commit to support it. As we aspire to make our processes more efficient and transparent, we would like to explain the various steps followed to ensure the quality of the motions and to ensure that Members' concerns are well addressed. We also strongly encourage Members whose motions were not accepted, including those whose appeals were rejected, to engage actively with the discussion and adoption of both the 2026-2029 IUCN Programme and the 20-year vision; we believe many of their points and concerns are reflected in both documents, or can be included.

The rationale of the Congress Preparatory Committee acting as Appeals body when accepting or rejecting appeals

At the outset of the process, all CPC members declared conflicts of interest and recused themselves from taking part in the discussion and decision of motions in the development of which they had been personally involved, or their organization was a proponent or co-sponsor. None of the members of the CPC were also members of the Motions Working Group. Two CPC members recused themselves from particular motions.

As mentioned above, the Congress Preparatory Committee acting as appeals body, carefully reviewed each of the 38 submitted appeals, of which **14 appeals were accepted**, and **24 appeals were rejected**.

Based on the rationales received from the Motions Working Group, the appeals body was able to review the appeals in detail before reaching their conclusions on whether or not to uphold the rationales of the MWG or not. The CPC acting as appeals body was of the opinion that the appeals made the case that these 14 motions had sufficient elements to respond to concerns raised by the Motions Working Group and to comply with Rule 54, and that submitting them to the online discussion would enable Members to comment and edit as needed. It ensured that all the requirements for the admissibility of motions were fulfilled. The appeals body took all decisions by consensus. When there was a divergence of views, which occurred in a few cases, discussions took place until consensus (not unanimity) was achieved; voting was not required.

Regarding the **rejected appeals**, these fell in one or both of the following groups:

Category	Reason	Example or Clarification
1. Already Addressed	Motion themes already included in the IUCN Programme or Commission mandates.	Motion overlaps with current 2026–2029 Programme draft.
2. No Policy Change Proposed	Motion does not introduce or amend IUCN's general policy as required by Rule 54(a)i.	Motion reiterates existing Resolutions or initiatives rather than proposing new policy.
3. Invalid Appeal Submission	Appeal modifies the original motion rather than contesting the MWG's rationale.	Edits submitted instead of arguments rebutting the MWG decision.
4. Legal/Statutory Conflicts	Recommendations require Statutory changes, which motions cannot address.	Proposal alters membership criteria or governance structure.
5. Clarity & Feasibility Issues	Motion is vague, lacks precision, or outlines goals that are not realistically achievable.	Operative paragraph too broad; outcomes not actionable.

Some preliminary reflections following the appeals process

The CPC acting as appeals body was faithful to the Rules set out in the IUCN Statutes and Regulations, and Rules of Procedure. There is always room for improvement and both the CPC and the MWG welcome constructive comments and suggestions by all IUCN constituencies on how to improve the process further.

The following reflections from the CPC acting as appeals body are intended to contribute to this effort.

Improved implementation of current IUCN Resolutions and Recommendations continues to be critical. IUCN constituencies are encouraged to find ways to increase implementation of active Resolutions and Recommendations and not resort to proposing new motion(s) that cover the same or similar issues at each Congress. We also encourage Members to consult the Resolutions and Recommendations database (not only at the time of submission of new motions) in order to be better acquainted with IUCN's general policy and importantly, to contribute to the regular reporting on implementation of Resolutions and Recommendations.

The CPC would like to stress that there are other ways in addition to the motions process whereby Members and IUCN constituencies at large can participate in IUCN governance processes and influence IUCN's general policy. For instance, for some issues it may be more effective to provide inputs to the IUCN Programme rather than propose new motions. The CPC recommends that in the next cycle, Members be provided the opportunity to review the second draft of the Programme before submitting their motions. Members are also reminded that they can use the online discussion of motions to align their positions on similar issues and approaches. Members can also have an impact



on the work of the IUCN Commissions when adopting the mandates of the Commissions or commenting on their work during Congress. Members may also contribute to additional policy guidance developed from time to time by the IUCN Council.

The CPC acting as an appeals body in particular was concerned regarding the timing of the IUCN Programme. Some motions were rejected on the grounds that the issues could be addressed in the programme, and their motions were sent to the PPC; the PPC did address those issues, but Members were not provided an updated programme document before the deadline for appeals. Indeed, appeals were due April 9th, but Members will not see the updated draft 4-year programme until July. This creates a feeling of a lack of transparency, and the CPC recommends adjusting timelines accordingly for the next Congress.

The CPC acting as an appeals body also felt there was insufficient time for it to deliberate, and in future more time should be provided.

The CPC action as an appeals body also found that in some cases, Members edited their motion to address concerns of the MWG. In future, if that is to be allowed or disallowed, Members should be informed in advance of the appeal deadline.

In general, clearer guidance should be provided to Members.

Congress Opportunity for Members to address any additional issues

During the Members' Assembly in Congress, the Chair of the Congress Resolutions Committee will present a report on the lessons learned and other reflections about the motions process as a whole. This will also be an opportunity for all IUCN Members to provide any feedback and concrete proposals for improvements to the process - including proposals for further amendments to the Rules of Procedure of the World Conservation Congress.

Members of the Congress Preparatory Committee acting as appeals body

Susan LIEBERMAN, Chair
Ramiro BATZIN
Sonia CASTANEDA RIAL
Peter COCHRANE
Said DAMHOUREYEH
Hilde EGGERMONT
Ali KAKA
Imen MELIANE
Ramon PEREZGIL
Kristen WALKER
Nihal WELIKALA

Host Country representatives:

Ahmed Esmail ALSAYED ALHASHMI
Hiba AL SHEHHI

Additional members:

Miradije GERGURI (Government representative)
Houssine NIBANI (NGO representative)
Erica McCREEDY (IPO representative)

Conflicts of Interest

Susan Lieberman – Recused herself from three appeals (S057, S003, S058)
Kristen Walker – Recused from two appeals (S192, S123)

Appeal #	Motion sub #	Original title	CPC decision	Translation / Final text
1	S063	<u>Identifying Key Geoheritage Areas for safeguarding geoheritage sites of global significance and move towards a holistic nature conservation</u>	Appeal accepted	The Congress Preparatory Committee acting as Appeals Body (Appeals Body) accepts the appeal on the basis that the document referred to, Key Geoheritage Areas guidelines, is readily available and may easily be referred to, thereby meeting the requirements laid on Rule 54(a) iii., which states that motions shall contain technically sound and coherent arguments.
2	S057	<u>Maintaining, enhancing and restoring ecological integrity in conservation action</u>	Appeal rejected	The Congress Preparatory Committee acting as Appeals Body (Appeals Body) agrees with the decision of the MWG and its rationale to remit the motion for consideration in the context of the IUCN Programme. As such, we regret to inform you that the appeal has been rejected. Proponents are encouraged to review the draft programme when it is issued.
3	S119	<u>Support for the global upscaling of holistic landscape management and restoration (HLMR) for terrestrial and aquatic ecosystems</u>	Appeal rejected	We regret to inform you that the Congress Preparatory Committee acting as Appeals Body (Appeals Body) has rejected the appeal on the basis that the Members did not provide evidence to counter the MWG decision but submitted edits to their motion instead. The appeals process does not allow for Members to amend their original motion but rather to provide information and arguments as to why the MWG's decision should be reversed. The Appeals Body recommends that the proponents pursue their approach through the implementation of the IUCN Programme 2026-2029.
4	S088	<u>Logistical and financial support for IUCN National, Regional and Interregional Committees</u>	Appeal rejected	Whilst Congress Preparatory Committee acting as Appeals Body (Appeals Body) recognises that the motion raises important points, the recommendations made would contradict the IUCN Statutes if adopted. These recommendations require Statutory amendments, and these are not addressed in the motion. We therefore regret to inform you that the Appeals Body upholds the decision of the Motions Working Group decision and the appeal has been rejected.
5	S117	<u>Supporting Climate Education as a Key Component of IUCN's Nature-Based Solutions (NbS)</u>	Appeal rejected	The Congress Preparatory Committee acting as Appeals Body (Appeals Body) determined that the appeal does not adequately address the concerns previously raised by the Motions Working Group, namely the lack of precision in the motion text and the fact that the motion does not propose a modification to IUCN policy. The Appeals Body upholds the decision of the MWG and therefore we regret to inform you, that your appeal has been rejected.
6	S003	<u>OMNIBUS MOTION ON NATURE CRIME</u>	Appeal rejected	We regret to inform you that your appeal has been rejected. The Congress Preparatory Committee acting as Appeals Body (Appeals Body), however, encourages the proponent and co-sponsors to contribute constructively by providing comments during the online discussion of the Motion and as appropriate on the mandates of the IUCN Commissions and the draft IUCN Programme 2026-2029.
7	S026	<u>Conservación de los Conocimientos, Usos y Lugares Tradicionales de la Geodiversidad</u>	Appeal rejected	The Appeals Body has carefully reviewed the appeal and decided to reject it, upholding the decision of the Motions Working Group to remit the motion for consideration within the framework of the IUCN Programme. The Appeals Body is of the view that the subject matter of the motion is appropriately addressed in the current draft of the Programme. The proponents are therefore encouraged to provide their input during the formal programme consultation process once it is opened to Members.

Appeal #	Motion sub #	Original title	CPC decision	Translation / Final text
8	S058	<u>Implementing the Global Species Action Plan to catalyse and scale up species conservation actions</u>	Appeal rejected	The Congress Preparatory Committee acting as Appeals Body (Appeals Body) agrees with the decision of the Motion Working Group to remit the motion for consideration in the context of the IUCN Programme. As such, we regret to inform you that the appeal has been rejected. The Appeals Body encourages the proponent and co-sponsors to review the draft programme when it is issued.
9	S038	<u>Big cat conservation: Connectivity, coexistence, coordination - an integrated, large-scale approach</u>	Appeal rejected	The Congress Preparatory Committee acting as Appeals Body (Appeals Body) decided to uphold the decision of the Motions Working Group. The mechanism called for in the motion is not a change in policy. Therefore, we regret to inform you that your appeal has been rejected. The Appeals Body is of the view that the subject matter of the motion can be better addressed in the current draft of the Programme and the proponents are encouraged to provide their input during the formal consultation process once it is opened to Members.
10	S074	<u>Advancing Citizen Science to Support and Democratize Conservation</u>	Appeal accepted	The Congress Preparatory Committee acting as Appeals Body (Appeals Body) found that the appeal presents a compelling case that the motion contains distinct elements that go beyond the scope of the draft 2026–2029 IUCN Programme. While the Motions Working Group had remitted the motion to the Programme and Policy Committee of the IUCN Council for potential inclusion in the Programme, the appeal correctly highlights that the motion's request—specifically for the Director General to develop an IUCN strategy and action plan, and to establish a task force on citizen science engagement, including areas such as nature crime and defender protection—extends beyond what is currently addressed in the draft Programme. The Appeals Body therefore accepts the appeal.
11	S184	<u>Recognising and Reporting Ecological Corridors</u>	Appeal accepted	The Congress Preparatory Committee acting as Appeals Body (Appeals Body) found that the appeal presents a compelling case that the motion contains distinct elements that go beyond the scope of existing Resolutions and Recommendations, thereby meeting the the admissibility criteria in the IUCN Statutes. The Appeals Body therefore accepts the appeal.
12	S068	<u>Enhancing and Transforming the Management of Migratory and Straddling Marine Biodiversity</u>	Appeal rejected	The Congress Preparatory Committee acting as Appeals Body (Appeals Body) considers that the appeal does not sufficiently address the concerns raised by the Motions Working Group regarding the feasibility and reasonableness of achieving the outcomes set out in the operative paragraph of the motion. Therefore, we regret to inform you that your appeal has been rejected.
13	S176	<u>Strengthening Mechanisms for Public Participation in Environmental Policymaking</u>	Appeal rejected	We regret to inform you that Congress Preparatory Committee acting as Appeals Body (Appeals Body) has decided to uphold the decision of the Motions Working Group, and the appeal has been rejected. The Appeals Body agrees that the motion does not introduce new elements beyond existing IUCN policies and programmes, nor does it propose a modification to IUCN policy. The content of the operative paragraphs could be effectively addressed within the mandate of the World Commission on Environmental Law (WCEL) in particular, and the Appeals Body encourages the proponent and co-sponsors to engage through comments on the draft 2026–2029 Programme and relevant Commission mandates.

Appeal #	Motion sub #	Original title	CPC decision	Translation / Final text
14	S160	<u>Integrating Nature-based Education with traditional knowledge and sustainable practices for planetary health and well-being</u>	Appeal rejected	The Congress Preparatory Committee acting as Appeals Body (Appeals Body) concurs with the assessment of the MWG that the motion does not introduce new elements beyond existing IUCN policies and programmes, nor does it propose any modification to current policy. The operative paragraph of the motion could be effectively addressed within the existing mandates of the Commissions—particularly the Commission on Education and Communication (CEC) and therefore we regret to inform you that the appeal has been rejected. The Appeals Body encourages the proponent and co-sponsors to engage through comments on the draft 2026–2029 Programme and the mandates of the relevant Commissions.
15	S021	<u>Pour un Pacte international relatif aux droits environnementaux</u>	Appeal rejected	The appeal presents a detailed legal argument asserting that the motion meets the criteria set out in Rule 54 and is not already reflected in existing IUCN policy. However, Congress Preparatory Committee acting as Appeals Body (Appeals Body) concluded that the appeal does not sufficiently address the core concerns raised by the Motions Working Group (MWG), in particular the requirement for motions to propose a modification of IUCN policy, rather than reiterate elements of previously adopted Resolutions and Recommendations. On this basis, we regret to inform you that the Appeals Body has decided to reject the appeal and uphold the decision of the MWG.
16	S020	<u>S'assurer du maintien et du déploiement d'un réseau d'aires protégées résilient et connecté dans un contexte de changement global</u>	Appeal rejected	The Appeals Body considered the appeal in detail and concluded that it does not provide sufficient grounds to overturn the decision of the MWG, agreeing with MWG that the motion does not introduce new elements to existing IUCN policies or programmes, nor does it propose a modification of IUCN policy on the issue. The key themes addressed in the motion, such as ecological connectivity and the role of protected areas as nature-based solutions, are already appropriately reflected in the draft 2026–2029 Programme. For these reasons, the Appeals Body has decided to reject the appeal. The proponents are encouraged to share their perspectives during the forthcoming discussions on the draft Programme.
17	S070	<u>Halting the chemical pollution by textile industries in the water bodies of Southern and South-eastern Asia</u>	Appeal rejected	We regret to inform you that after careful consideration, the Appeals Body has decided to reject the appeal. Notwithstanding this, the Appeals Body considered that the operative paragraphs could be included in the mandates of the relevant IUCN Commissions and the proponents are encouraged to share their perspectives during the forthcoming discussions on the draft Programme and the Commission mandates.
18	S151	<u>Antarctic and Southern Ocean Resolution</u>	Appeal rejected	We regret to inform you that the Congress Preparatory Committee acting as Appeals Body (Appeals Body) has decided to uphold the decision of the Motions Working Group to remit the motion for consideration under the IUCN Programme, and therefore the appeal has been rejected. The Appeals Body found that the proposed motion primarily seeks to implement the recommendations of a Task Force that was established to advance the objectives of previously adopted Resolutions. Given that the Task Force has effectively integrated Antarctic issues into the current draft Programme, the Appeals Body considers that a new Resolution is not necessary at this time. Proponents are encouraged to provide input through the Programme consultation process.

Appeal #	Motion sub #	Original title	CPC decision	Translation / Final text
19	S089	Strengthening the consideration of biodiversity in corporate supply chains	Appeal rejected	The Congress Preparatory Committee acting as Appeals Body (Appeals Body) concluded that the appeal does not provide sufficient grounds to overturn the decision of the MWG and agrees with MWG that the operative paragraphs of the motion are quite broad and vague, leaving much of the interpretation to the reader. The key themes addressed in the motion, such as biodiversity in corporate supply chains, are already appropriately reflected in the draft 2026–2029 Programme. For these reasons, the Appeals Body has decided to reject the appeal and uphold the decision of the MWG. The proponents are encouraged to share their perspectives during the forthcoming discussions on the draft Programme.
20	S153	Nature and Mental Health	Appeal rejected	The Congress Preparatory Committee acting as Appeals Body (Appeals Body) concurs with the Motions Working Group and its rationale to remit the motion for consideration in the context of the IUCN Programme. Therefore, we regret to inform you that the appeal has been rejected. The Appeals Body invites the proponents and co-sponsors of the motion to share their perspectives during the forthcoming discussions on the draft Programme.
21	S112	Strengthening human-nature connectedness to advance transformative change for nature	Appeal accepted	The Congress Preparatory Committee acting as Appeals Body found that the appeal presents a compelling case that the motion contains unique elements that are not currently part of existing work of IUCN, or active Resolutions, in particular, in terms of monitoring efforts and engagement of Commissions beyond CEC. The appeal is therefore accepted.
22	S039	Stratégie mondiale de conservation de la haute mer basée sur les outils de gestion par zone, dont les aires marines protégées	Appeal accepted	The Appeals Body reviewed the appeal and whilst it agrees with the MWG that the BBNJ Agreement has not yet entered into force, it is open for ratification and the motion is therefore timely. The Appeals Body therefore accepts the appeal and supports advancing the motion for consideration by the IUCN Membership at the World Conservation Congress but notes that the motion would require significant additional funding, without which, the motion (if adopted) could not be delivered.
23	S076, S077, S078	Reconocer inequívocamente y apoyar eficazmente el papel crucial de conservación de los territorios de vida y de sus custodios: verdad y reconciliación (1/3)	Appeal accepted	The Congress Preparatory Committee, acting as Appeals Body (Appeals body), recognised that the appeal raised important points. While the submission of the motion did not meet the required formatting guidelines, the Appellate Body decided to offer the proponents the opportunity to revise their proposal and to work with the CPC to merge the three motions into a single one.
24	S101	Strengthening protective measures for protected areas against unsustainable tourism development	Appeal accepted	The Congress Preparatory Committee acting as Appeals Body (Appeals Body) reviewed the appeal and after careful consideration decided to accept it. The Appeals Body considered that a case had been made that a motion directed at actions in a specific country should be required to have consulted with the Government in that country but agree that this is not always possible. Further, the Appeals Body felt that the proponents had provided sufficient evidence of engagement with Local Authorities, and consultation with Members and Commissions on this issue in their appeal.
25	S200	Protecting the Sápmi forest: safeguarding biodiversity and Indigenous livelihoods	Appeal accepted	The CPC acting as Appeals Body (Appeals Body) considered that the appeal demonstrated that the development of the motion benefitted from a broad consultation and therefore accepts the appeal.

Appeal #	Motion sub #	Original title	CPC decision	Translation / Final text
26	S159	Strengthening Business Engagement In Climate Adaptation For Preservation Of Biodiversity And Ecosystems	Appeal accepted	The Congress Preparatory Committee acting as Appeals Body (Appeals Body) found that the appeal presented compelling arguments demonstrating that the motion seeks to influence the policies and actions of third parties. On this basis, the Appeals Body decided to accept the appeal and move the motion forward for consideration by the Members.
27	S177	A moratorium on genetically engineering wild species in natural ecosystems	Appeal accepted	The Congress Preparatory Committee acting as Appeals Body (Appeals Body) decided to accept the appeal, having felt that the proponents had presented convincing arguments that their proposal is not a duplication of existing IUCN Resolutions but offers a complement to Resolutions. Specifically, the motion introduces greater specificity and operational clarity regarding the application of the Precautionary Principle in the context of rapidly advancing genetic engineering technologies and their potential use in natural environments and responds to rapidly evolving technological developments not yet addressed in current policy frameworks.
28	S157	IUCN Knowledge Product Solvency through Voluntary, Member-facilitated Private-sector Engagement	Appeal accepted	The Congress Preparatory Committee acting as Appeals Body (Appeals Body) considered that the arguments presented provided evidence that, if accepted, the motion would add to IUCN policy and actions, thereby meeting the requirements of Rule 54(a) i., that states that a motion needs to propose or modify IUCN's general policy and therefore accepts the appeal.
29	S064	Nature knows no borders: transboundary cooperation in response to border walls	Appeal rejected	The Congress Preparatory Committee acting as Appeals Body (Appeals Body) found that the proponent and co-sponsors did not provide evidence to counter the MWG's decision, submitting instead edits to their motion. The appeals process does not allow for Members to amend their original motion but rather to provide information and arguments as to why the MWG's decision should be reversed. Therefore, we regret to inform you that your appeal has been rejected. The Appeals Body recognises that this is an important issue and recommends the proponents pursue their approach through the relevant IUCN Commissions and their mandates.
30	S133	Recognition of the International Marine Protected Areas Congress as the global MPA community for effective marine biodiversity conservation organized by a host country, jointly with IUCN and WCPA	Appeal accepted	The Congress Preparatory Committee acting as Appeals Body (Appeals Body) decided to accept the appeal. The Appeals Body considered that the arguments presented provided evidence that the motion does in fact meet the requirements of Rule 54(a) i., as it modifies and proposes changes to existing IUCN policy, in particular as it relates to IMPAC and its governance.
31	S163	Planificación estratégica de las energías renovables: la conservación de la Naturaleza en el centro	Appeal rejected	The Appeals Body rejected the appeal on the basis that the Members did not provide evidence that the motion modifies or proposes new IUCN policy. The Appeals body recommends the proponents pursue their work on these issues through the relevant IUCN Commissions.

Appeal #	Motion sub #	Original title	CPC decision	Translation / Final text
32	S138	Reconocimiento y fortalecimiento del Corredor Biológico Transfronterizo del Oeste Ibérico como modelo de conectividad ecológica y desarrollo sostenible	Appeal rejected	The Appeals Body carefully considered the appeal and decided to reject it. It concurred with the MWG's assessment that the motion does not propose modifications to, or development of, new IUCN policy. The Appeals Body recommends that the proponents pursue this issue through the IUCN Secretariat and the relevant Commissions, particularly the World Commission on Protected Areas (WCPA) and the World Commission on Environmental Law (WCEL).
33	S139	Conservación integral de ecosistemas estratégicos: Selva Paranaense y Reservas Privadas	Appeal rejected	After careful consideration, the Appeals Body rejected the appeal on the basis that the proponents did not adequately respond to the MWG concerns. Further, the operative paragraphs go beyond the scope of what IUCN can do. The Appeals body recommends the proponents pursue their work on this issue through Secretariat and the WCPA.
34	S170	Addressing the Direct Exploitation of Wild Species	Appeal accepted	The Congress Preparatory Committee acting as Appeals Body (Appeals Body) considered that the author and co-sponsors of the motion presented solid arguments as to how this motion would modify and propose changes to existing IUCN policy, if adopted. Further, the appeal demonstrated that operative paragraph 5 does go beyond 2020-Res 131 and Members should be given the opportunity to consider it. Therefore, the Appeals Body accepts the appeal.
35	S055	Alerte sur l'impact de l'activité aurifère en Amazonie	Appeal rejected	The Appeals Body rejected the appeal on the basis that the Members did not provide evidence to address the MWG's concerns and submitted a vastly changed motion. The appeals process does not allow for Members to amend their original motion but rather to provide information and arguments as to why the MWG's decision should be reversed.
36	S052	Upholding indigenous peoples and local communities' rights to sustainable use in the face of harmful national and international legislation.	Appeal rejected	The Congress Preparatory Committee acting as Appeals Body (Appeals Body) concurs with the assessment of the MWG that the motion does not amend existing IUCN policy. The Appeals Body also noted that certain elements of the motion would effectively alter membership criteria and would require amendments to the IUCN Statutes and this falls outside the scope of a motion. Therefore, we regret to inform you that Appeals Body decided to reject the appeal and uphold the decision of the MWG.
37	S192	Advancing biodiversity finance with a human-rights-based approach	Appeal accepted	The Congress Preparatory Committee acting as Appeals Body (Appeals Body) considered that the Proponents presented sound arguments as to how this motion does contain sufficient specificity and precision, therefore meeting the admissibility criteria set out in the IUCN Statutes. After careful consideration, the Appeals Body decided that the appeal is accepted.
38	S123	Recognising, identifying and providing sustained political, technical and financial support for conservation in indigenous and traditional territories	Appeal rejected	The Congress Preparatory Committee acting as Appeals Body (Appeals Body) recognised the importance of the work outlined in the operative paragraphs of the motion but agrees with the MWG that this is already part of IUCN's policy work and therefore does not meet the requirement set out in Rule 54(a) i., "a motion needs to propose or modify IUCN's general policy". Therefore, we regret to inform you that your appeal has been rejected.