
Š f – † ‘ ‡ • ‘ Ž — — ‹ ‘ • • f ...

A study to develop monitoring for results of IUCN Resolutions and Recommendations

This study delivers the first phase of the work needed to respond to Objective 4 of the 2012 Congress Evaluation and provides preliminary findings.

February 2014

Prepared by Julie Griffin, Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation Unit (PM&E), with support from Hanna Helsing, Global Policy Unit, and Alex Moiseev, PM&E

Contents

Executive summary.....	3..
Purpose and approach.....	3.....
General discussion.....	3.....
Main findings.....	4
Sample of Resolutions and Recommendations considered by this study.....	6..
Introduction, objectives and methodology.....	9.....
Introduction and rationale.....	9.....
Purpose.....	9
What can be monitored or evaluated?.....	10.....
Methodology and sample.....	11.....
Part I: Purpose	

f < • ^ < • † < • %o •

The main findings of the report and summaries of related recommendations are given below. Please see the end of the full report for the detailed recommendations (page 39).

Main findings – Part 1: Purpose and content of Resolutions: The Motions process was established and is still defined by the Statute as a mechanism for Members to collectively set IUCN policy and make programmatic recommendations for conservation. In practice it has become a system that is frequently used as a platform by single Members to elevate their issues to the international level. It is still essential to the democratic processes that make IUCN a membership union. If the Motions process has a dual purpose to achieve conservation and 'achieve Union', a system to measure results should embrace both.

Resolutions aim for results in three areas:

1. IUCN governance
2. IUCN policy on conservation issues
3. Recommendations for conservation action within and beyond IUCN ('programmatic actions')

The majority of Resolutions simultaneously set policy for IUCN (and others) and guide action (2 and 3), because most policies and policy influencing statements are induced from the actions rather than presented as stand alone policy.

Summary recommendations Define the specific purpose(s) of the

Main findings, Part 3 – Implementation: Approaches to implementation are varied but the majority lack coordination and planning. The absence of guidance or definitions of roles and responsibilities is apparent and leads to lack of ownership. There

14	The importance of adaptation and disaster risk reduction in coastal areas	59	Ecosystems	
15	The importance of assessing the water needs of wetlands in order to preserve their ecological functions	68	Ecosystems	
16	Protection of the deep ocean ecosystem and biodiversity from the threats of seabed mining	79	Marine	
17	Integrating protected areas into climate change adaptation and mitigation strategies	86	Climate change	
18	Solar cooking and its contribution to healthy and resilient ecosystems and communities	91	Energy	No responses/ not studied
19	Promoting and supporting community resource management and conservation as a foundation for sustainable development	92	Human well r being	
20		95	Human well r being	Andes

30	Conservation of rhinoceros species in Africa and Asia	138	Species	
31	The conservation of hammerhead sharks in the Mesoamerican Region and the marine corridor in the Eastern Tropical Pacific	146	Species	
32	Mountain Protected Areas	148	Protected Areas	
33	Transboundary ecological corridors in the Western Iberian Peninsula	149	Protected Areas	
34	Support for the Bonn Challenge on restoration of lost forests and degraded lands	158	Ecosystems	No responses/ not studied
35	Ensuring the conservation of Chilean Patagonia's forests	159	Ecosystems	
36	Preservation of oasis ecosystems	160	Ecosystems	No responses/ not studied
37	Conserving coastal ecosystems to reduce risks in coastal areas in Africa	168	Marine	
38	To enhance the community procedures to improve the management of coastal fishing	170	Marine	
39	Sustainable use of abundant biological resources	179	Human well r being	

- x What factors⁵ contributed to or inhibited the implementation and results of the Resolutions and Recommendation approved in Jeju?

Secondary evaluation questions for first phase of the study (up to January 2014):

- x Do the Resolutions support or launch work that would not have been

However, with Resolutions UCNs interested in understanding what difference the Resolutions make on the outcomes within its sphere of influence, for example on its ability to raise funds, build support, influence policy outcomes, raise awareness or achieve conservation.

Methodology and sample

Data sources

This report builds on the Congress Evaluation undertaken by the Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation Unit (PM&E) in 2012 and resolution tracking undertaken by the Global Policy Unit (GPU) in 2013. In 2012, a purposeful sample of 50 Resolutions was provisionally selected as a basis for generalization to the full set of 183. 36 of 50 Motion sponsors were available in Jeju to be interviewed about their expectations and plans for monitoring. This study focused on the same sample for the sake of continuity, although only 34 could be studied in depth because several resolutions received no responses.

From September 2013 to January 2014, interviews in person or by telephone/Skype were held with people directly involved in drafting, implementing or monitoring Resolutions in the sample⁸. Desk research of best practices for monitoring conservation and policy influence for conservation was also undertaken, as

Datasource	Number
Resolutions studied	34
Resolutionspecificinterviews	65 (14 interviews per Resolution)
Generalinterviews	7
Totalinterviews	72
Hoursspenton interviews	Approximately80 hours (excludingtime for scheduling, preparationandcleaningdata)

Limitations of the study

The findings and results of this study are based on a sample and require follow up monitoring, and therefore should be viewed as preliminary and indicative. One of the greatest values of this study has been the compelling stories and examples that have emerged.

Interviews provided the basis for understanding the intended results and underlying assumptions about how interventions will lead to results. Nonetheless data collected through interviews can only provide stakeholders' perceptions of change, a limitation that this study addressed by using three interviews per Resolution. For subsequent monitoring and evaluation, a less time and resource intensive approach for data collection should be considered because resources for follow up to fully respond to the evaluation questions are not currently in place and will need to be identified.

The main limitations are: small sample size of Resolutions studied due to time/resource constraints; low response rate from Members; high number of respondents who gave speculative answers because they were responding on behalf of someone else in their organisation who had had closer involvement with the Motion; and, inability to triangulate perspectives for nine of the 34 resolutions studied for which only one interview could be obtained (due to non responses). The perspectives of non respondents and a control group (e.g. stakeholders of a Resolution that are uninvolved in implementation, or Members that do not use the Motions process) are therefore not reflected in this study.

Despite sending two and sometimes three emails and a phone call, 23 of 39 Motion sponsors (59%) could not be reached. Of the 39 focal points we attempted to contact, four could not be reached (10%). The majority of Motions in the sample were sponsored by INGOs or NGOs. Of the Motions sponsored by Government Agencies (GA) or States, 50% of the respondents could not be reached. In total, two GA members, two State members and 13 NGO/INGO members were interviewed.

Part I: Purpose and content of Resolutions

An analysis undertaken by GPU in 2013 showed that 88% of the Jeju Resolutions and Recommendations simultaneously make policy statements⁹ and recommend conservation action. The text review of the sample of Resolutions and the interviews reveal that each one may have elements (operative paragraphs) that:

1. Call for changes in IUCN governance
2. Establish IUCN policy on conservation issues
3. Advise on conservation work, including action on the ground and policy influencing beyond IUCN

Policy statements can be induced by statements about conservation action. Of the 161 Resolutions that contain policies or policy influencing statements, 141 express UCN's position on specific conservation or related issues. For this reason Resolutions cannot simply be separated into three distinct piles for different treatment, but instead most Resolutions could have both policy and action results.

Purposes and benefits of the Motions process

This study has observed the following objectives and benefits of the Motions process, including where there are shortcomings:

Defining IUCN Policy: IUCN's policy positions on conservation issues are drawn from the statements made by the Membership through Resolutions. The Motions process is the only mechanism for Members to formally shape UCN policy. In a preliminary analysis by GPU, 161 of 183 Resolutions adopted at Jeju were found to contain policies or policy influencing statements. In most cases the policy can be induced from the action, though it is sometimes unclear (e.g. Resolution 121).

There is no formal mechanism for ensuring compliance with policy set by Resolutions or for putting it into practice to achieve conservation results. Measuring the effect of Resolutions for policy would require identifying the objective for each policy or policy influencing statement.

Democratic process to amend the Programme: Paragraph 51 of the Statutes states that Motions affecting the Programme should be dealt with as amendments¹⁰. Motions are just one mechanism for Members to influence the Programme because as of 2011 the Programme is developed with consultation from Members through several mechanisms: consultation at Regional Conservation Fora during which the subject of any draft Motions may get included, and comments submitted through an electronic consultation. The 2013-2016 Programme also took the Resolutions adopted in Barcelona in 2008 into consideration.

⁹ "Policies and policy influencing statements" in the context of this testing included: 1) Policy statements expressing UCN's position vis à vis specific conservation or conservation related matters or policy statements that provide the means for defining a position (n=141); 2) Policies that pertain to internal governance matters of the Union (n=22); 3) Policies on a decision on how a knowledge product or activity will be funded (n=4).

¹⁰ §51, IUCN Statutes: "Discussion of the ~~tbrdf~~ \$€Đ ‡2Đ |Ž! dá EÔt8b Æ@Xæ(Á#X ó w 6; 'šžç" _3 ĐÀ 0

Several interviewees noted the lack of clear reporting on how Motions had influenced the Programme, particularly how they affected priorities of Secretariat staff. Even when Resolutions relate to the Programme or influence it, implementation may be constrained.

The Congress Evaluation found that the large number of Resolutions that need to be managed, monitored, and in many cases implemented overwhelm the Resolutions Working Group, Members at the Members' Assembly and the Secretariat. However, the interviews revealed diverging views on whether there are too many Resolutions or not. This points to an unarticulated disagreement about the purpose of Resolutions that underlies whether or not IUCN should have 10 policy or 200 action Resolutions.

State members who are involved in international negotiation through various other intergovernmental meetings are less and less willing to spend time debating the high number of IUCN Resolutions (see Congress Evaluation). For example, all US State and Agency members effectively disregarded the majority of Resolutions as customary law by abstaining from voting on a number of motions as a statement. Several respondents speculated whether other State members might do the same, or stop participating without making an official statement, or that potential future State members might be discouraged from joining IUCN.

Fulfilling and exceeding IUCN's statutory obligations (by providing Members, Commissions and Secretariats a democratic way to work together): Resolutions allow all Members, from NGOs to States, to express what they want to achieve and put this on an international stage. The result is that Members use the Resolutions to serve their own needs. For example, one Member believed that submitting a Motion demonstrated its leadership on an issue and used this to "make a strong signal about its commitments". When asked about intended results, interviewees expressed varying definitions of a "successful Resolution":

- r Getting a motion adopted
- r Implementing what the resolution says
- r Having more attention and resources dedicated to the conservation issue
- r Achieving results/outcomes (even if not clearly articulated in the resolution)
- r Measurable impact on the ground (achieving conservation)

This highlights that individual Resolutions may not always be a starting point for action, but instead a milestone in a longer term influencing strategy focused elsewhere, or as an end point that marks achievement in terms of policy influence. Seen in this way, the Motions process is both an important part of the Union's democracy but also a 'service' to Members.

The current interest in measuring results achieved by Resolutions has yet to acknowledge and prioritize within the different definitions of success. See the Annexes for a table of monitoring options for each of these objectives.

A platform to bring international attention to local issues: One noticeable recurring type of theory of change is the logic that elevating a local, national or regional issue to the international level (through adoption as an IUCN Resolution) will have a local effect. Resolutions are also used by Members to elevate individual or national concerns to international level, for example:

"We were trying to make sure it [the Recommendation] took on board what mattered to range states [of the species]. Many resolutions are 'noise' emanating directly from the West, without discussion or input from the range states themselves. This Recommendation is different because we hoped that it would be appreciated by the range states." (Implementer)

These Resolutions in particular should be closely followed up for monitoring, especially in light of the Motions Advisory Group's preliminary recommendations to separate regional and global resolutions. Views from the interviews diverged on the value or need to separate regional from global resolutions.

Word cloud of themes from TJ (fr)10(om)]TJ /TT3 1 Tf /omle0 TD 0 Tc <00033.8(pec4 1 Tf .2248 0 TD .0029 Tc [

“There is this philosophical idea that the Secretariat should not really help [in preparing motions] which is fundamentally flawed. It seems based on a presumption that the Secretariat is tainted or not objective, or that it is only a facilitator, or incapable of being objective. We should not have a strong voice

Few Resolutions clearly articulate causes and effects or the intended results that could be measured.

Example of good Motion preparation process

Jeju Resolution 28: Conservation of the East Asian Australasian Flyway and its threatened waterbirds, with particular reference to the Yellow Sea

Resolution 28 demonstrates how a collaborative and consultative

Part 3: Implementation

'... — • < ... f - < • %o f • † Ž — • † • %o • † • † † ... ' • • † • † f - < ' • •

Evaluation questions:

How are Resolutions communicated to relevant stakeholders?

How are Resolutions perceived by relevant stakeholders?

Interview

Several respondents assumed that all constituents of the Union would automatically be aware of the Resolution, including its specific intentions because it was an

Ž f •• < • % á • - ” f - ‡ % < ... < • ’ Ž ‡ • ‡ • - f - < ‘ • f • † TM ‘ ” • < • % f • f • < ‘ •

Interview questions:

How do motion sponsors contribute to the implementation of Resolutions?

Interview questions:

Is there an action plan or implementation plan? How have you been involved in the implementation since it was adopted?

To what extent have you been in contact about this Resolution or any of the other implementers with IUCN focal point for this Resolution?

Key

A number of respondents had

"If we had not had this conversation I would have never understood what the Secretariat's supposed to do, [the Resolution] callson someone to do something'...

Part 4: Results and factors for success

Evaluation questions:

What were the results of the Resolutions and Recommendations adopted in Jeju?

Do the Resolutions support or launch work that would not have been undertaken otherwise? What concrete actions are taking place due to the adoption of Resolutions?

What factors contributed to or inhibited the implementation and results of the Resolutions and Recommendations approved in Jeju?

Interview questions: Have any results already been achieved? If the Resolution did not exist, which of these would not have happened?

If the Resolution contributes to work that was already ongoing, what additional effect will the Resolution bring? If the Resolution aimed to start new work: has the new work begun yet?

Have any additional resources (financial or in kind) been allocated to achieving the main results because of it being a resolution?

What conditions will be needed to achieve the results? In other words, what are the factors for success?

Key findings: Most respondents expected their Resolution to accelerate ongoing work, but in most cases it is too early to

not started or not reported on. It should be noted that the tracking report asked focal points about “actions undertaken” and the interviews asked about “results achieved”.

GPU tracking of implementation status for all Resolutions, November 2013, n=183

Initiated, underway, ongoing or completed	161
Not started or no report	22

In contrast, the analysis from this study shows that despite implementation having started after the first year few Resolutions appear to have led to any noticeable change in conservation. Of the 34 Resolutions studied, 24 have made no measurable additional contribution to any of the results the

08010

vote on Resolutions. These unique characteristics appear to serve a niche role in global environmental governance. As such, it is unsurprising that when a Member develops an IUCN Resolution, it is one additional tool among others; and that Resolutions are most useful under the specific circumstances not well served by other intergovernmental conservation platforms. One case of Members using the Resolution process specifically because it offered a non-threatening process that could be used to bring State parties together was Resolution 28 (see box, page 21).

"003>Tj /TT2 1 Tf .2248 0 TD .0009 Tc (it)Tj /TT1 1 Tf .5675 0 TD 0 Tc <0003>Tj /TT2 1 Tf .2248 0 TD .00

Partnerships strengthened, stakeholders created By working together to draft a Motion, the various constituentsof IUCN strengthened ties.

Consensus building: The consultation

4. Political will/engagement of national governments	9	
5. Proactive engagement of IUCN Secretariat (HQ and regions) on the issue	6	Secretariat
6. Availability of human resources	5	
7. Commission involvement	4	Commissions
8. Key Members engaging in implementation of Resolutions	3	Members
9. Whether the issue is covered by the IUCN programme	3	Motions Working Group implementation

Part 5: Monitoring for results

Evaluation questions: Track the relevance and impact of resolutions over the next 2-3 years.

What were the results of the Resolutions and Recommendations adopted in Jeju?

Interview question: What could be measurable indicators for each of these results?

Key findings: Current monitoring of Resolutions focuses on activities undertaken by Secretariat. Members demonstrate a lack of interest and commitment to monitoring. An overhaul of the monitoring system would first require clarification of the purpose of the Motions process, supported by reform of the Motion submission and voting process. In the short term, monitoring can be improved through small adjustments, such as shifting from activities monitoring to results monitoring, and making a stronger push to expand the focus of monitoring from the Secretariat to the Union.

The aim of this study was to identify the early results achieved by Resolutions and a system through which further results can be captured. This section highlights the recent progress in monitoring by the Secretariat. However, the current context under which Motions are developed and implemented hinders the ability to easily re-orient the current tracking system to measure results. Current limitations and the elements needed for an appropriate system are discussed below.

Current Resolution tracking

IUCN has made a significant improvement in monitoring Resolutions in recent years. Since 2008 the Secretariat has reported annually to Council on its contribution to the implementation of all Resolutions adopted at the most recent World Conservation Congress, and in 2013 Council requested that the scope be expanded to include Commission and Members' contributions. Resolutions are not tracked beyond the four include

System Council of a of a

The current tracking system is a good way to find out if anyone in the Union is undertaking any actions related to the Resolution topics, but focal points often report general information that does not address progress on the specifics of the Resolution. Only two focal points' reports in 2013 clearly linked actions or results to specific objectives of the operative paragraphs with a tendency of most to report on thematically related activities that were not necessarily delivering the specific outcomes of the Resolution. Tracking each specific action listed in all the operative paragraphs would be an unwieldy, time-consuming process of questionable value. To understand conservation results, including policy results, a results-focused monitoring approach is needed. For policy in particular, intermediate results will be important to track.

The tracking data gathered so far is substantial and provides excellent insight to what the Secretariats are doing on the large number of issues in the Resolutions. It deserves to be tracked.

("SMART") Unfortunately the majority of Resolutions are not formulated this way. The respondents were asked to identify one to two main results for their Resolution and suggest indicators that could be used to measure achievement. Overall, indicators identified were Resolution specific and would not lend themselves to aggregation, such as:

- r Development and use of knowledge and information
- r Raised awareness
- r Improved governance
- r Improved action, including conservation management measures and resources allocated
- r Land use or protected area coverage

It is important to note that despite the interest in measuring impacts of Resolutions, none of these are indicators that would measure impact. The table in the Annexes could guide a discussion of measuring achievement of activities, results/outcomes and impact.

Time horizon: Resolutions are only monitored up until the next Congress (four year time horizon). Respondents were asked whether the intended impacts of the Resolution would be observable in the four year time frame before the next Congress. Only a few expected this to be possible. Resolutions were frequently described as part of longer term transformational processes that are difficult to measure over short time periods.

Developing a system to measure results

Objectives for a monitoring system

A system to measure what Resolutions achieve must be based on a clear Resolution

It is hard to say what form Motions will take in the future considering the proposal by the Motions Advisory Group to reform the submission and voting process and put in place more stringent criteria for Motions. Answering the question of whether the primary purpose of the Motions process is to set policy or to guide conservation will guide how 'success' is measured. For example, if each Resolution is treated and monitored as a project, this would signal that guiding

The focal point system presents an opportunity to support broad monitoring if some adjustments can be made, including better selection of focal points earlier in the Motions process and clearer guidance.

Challenges Motion sponsors' attitudes towards monitoring

In compliance with WCO Res 4.011 Development of an automated system to record members' actions on Resolutions and Recommendations to improve reporting at, and between, World Conservation Congresses, between 2010 and 2012 an online portal through the web based system (using SharePoint) enabled Members to update their contributions to Resolutions and view others'. Interviewees reported that very little data was added by Members during that time. The system was closed down when the software underpinning it (Sharepoint) could no longer be supported by IUCN's new online database to search for all Resolutions that will eventually also provide a joint platform for participatory reporting on progress is under development (March 2014).

Interviews held in Jeju 2012 with Motion sponsors at the time of adoption of their Motions showed that of the 34 Resolutions studied, just 10 were planning to monitor the ~~long~~ ^{longer} ~~ere~~ ^{new}

Recommendations

The following are preliminary

(mandated in Resolution text or not)
19. Within IUCN's sphere of influence

3. Strengthen the Motions review process in line with the overhaul of the submission process. The Motions Working Group should have clear criteria for evaluating compliance of each Motion with the factors for success. The Secretariat should be more strongly involved, for example by appointing focal points earlier in the process that get involved in both Motion review and reporting after eventual adoption (see recommendation 9 below).

Implementation

4. Improve support for implementation of existing body of Resolutions to ensure that more Resolutions are fully implemented and achieve their intended results. For future Resolutions this requires improved planning by supporting the Motions submission process reform. It also requires clarification of roles and responsibilities for implementation in principle. This should be widely communicated and possibly offered as part of policy capacity building, to all Members, Commission and Secretariat staff. Implementation guidance

11.5.19 by TD 0 0 511072110 100

8. Strengthen the

Annexes

Interview protocol

Resolution or Recommendation (number and title):		
Respondent name:	Title, organisation:	Role for Resolution (focal point, motion sponsor or implementer/stakeholder):
Date:		

Introduction and why we are doing these interviews/surveys:

- x The Secretariat already tracks action taken for all resolutions and recommendations but this study focuses on results and issues for implementation
- x The main purpose of the interview is to find out what helps a resolution succeed or what prevents that, how the resolution itself contributes to achieving the work, and to find out what results could be monitored.
- x We are currently interviewing three people per resolution for a sample of approximately 35 resolutions to monitor the results and impact.

Questions for motion sponsor only (if interviewed in Jeju):

1. Have any of the results expected in the first year been achieved?
2. If there was a plan for monitoring in Jeju: Has any monitoring started?

Questions:

1. What was your role in preparing the motion?
2. How have you been involved in the implementations since it was adopted? Is there an action plan to guide implementation of the resolution?
3. How frequently have you been in contact about this resolution with any of the other implementers or the IUCN focal point for this Resolution?
4. Has the Resolution been formally communicated to any of the people who are asked in the text to implement it? Have you received a response?
5. Has the Resolution been used since it was adopted? Can you give a specific example?

What are the most important results expected from this Resolution? Please give 1 or 2.

- x What could be measurable indicators for each of these results?

Monitoring options that address the various perspectives on a successful Motion

Definition of a successful Motion What you want to achieve	Monitoring strategy What you need to measure	Feasibility Data available? Measurement possible?
Getting a motion adopted	Number of motions Factors for successful development of a motion	Yes
Implementing what the resolutions says	Indicators of achievement of each operative paragraph	Yes, but very time consuming because Resolutions are very detailed (or unclear)
Having more attention and resources dedicated to the conservation issue	Uptake in component work plans Level of funding Number of people who say they work on the issue within and beyond IUCN Number of Resolutions that are considered "Directly related" to an IUCN Programme Results based indicators	Yes, through GPU tracking Yes Maybe – survey of the Union. Proxy indicators for wider uptake. Yes, through GPU tracking

Achieving results/outcomes (even if not clearly articulated in the resolution)

Only if clearly defined. Defining results if GPU