

World Parks Congress Evaluation

Consolidated Staff Feedback Notes on the Management & Operational Aspects of the Congress

Compiled by
the IUCN Evaluation Team

January 2004



Preface

This report is a supplement to the main World Parks Congress Evaluation report.

These notes represent the consolidated feedback from approximately 150 IUCN staff who worked at the World Parks Congress (WPC) on one or more operational teams implementing the Congress.

The data was collected from staff on three different occasions:

1. A semi structured staff feedback session facilitated by the Evaluation team on the day following the close of the WPC in Durban, September 18, where staff were asked to identify what worked and what did not work in the functional areas for which they had responsibility at the Congress, why, and suggestions for improvements specifically with the Bangkok Congress in mind..
2. An email survey of all staff during the weeks following the Congress (September 18 – October 30) asking the same questions.
3. A special session of CNG (Conservation Network Group) chaired by the Director, Global Programme where technical programme staff at HQ provided additional feedback.

Staff responses have been consolidated and edited somewhat to eliminate duplication and overlap of comments, but to the greatest extent possible the text remains a direct record of staff comments. No attempt has been made to prioritize the comments.

The summary paragraphs at the beginning of each section appear in the text of the overall Evaluation Report in Section 8 Efficiency Issues, with a reference to the availability of this report as the complete record of comments of staff.

For more information, or for copies of the main WPC Evaluation Report please contact the IUCN Monitoring and Evaluation Office at – Evaluation@iucn.org

Table of Contents

1. Strategic Leadership and Management.....	7
2: Rapportage, Plenaries and Symposia	11
Rapportage	11

Field Trips	44
Security.....	44
General logistics	45

1. Strategic Leadership and Management of the Congress

Summary

Detailed staff feedback:

The Durban debriefing session addressed three major areas related to the Strategic Management of the Congress –

1. Content Management
 - § Maintaining the strategic focus
 - § Integrating and matching events / inputs to outputs
2. Partners, Fund Raising and PR
 - § Resourcing the event
 - § Resourcing the future

- § Strategic positioning of IUCN
- 3. Decision Making
 - § Before the event – governance, information to support decision making.
 - § During the event – governance, information for decision making and control, staff management (enough of the right skills matched to jobs needed)

What worked

Management and leadership

- § Funding was adequate to run the event
- § Strategic management of issues as they emerged worked – team was adaptable and flexible, decisive
- § Management created and maintained a positive spirit of the Congress
- § Congress governance had a clear structure – WPC Executive was a decision making body
- § The top team had backup for managing the event
- § There was an incident control structure, and trouble shooting on site was effective
- § The scope of the workshop streams reflected a diversity of issues
- § Top management had clear roles and were equally empowered
- § Networking opportunities were excellent
- § The exhibition space was an excellent addition to the Congress, and should be used to maximum potential in Bangkok;

What did not work

- § Weak leadership from top WCPA officials before and during the WPC
- § The high profile of IUCN top management in comparison with WCPA leadership
- § The programme was too dense and had insufficient flexibility – felt like 7 separate meeting streams
- § Management control of the workshop streams was largely outside of IUCN hands. In some cases these worked well. In others, the results were less than exemplary with clear weaknesses in pre-planning, organisation, management, generating outputs.
- § Management of the workshop streams and plenaries was inconsistent and lacked quality control (operational management of the plenaries was excellent but did not have the authority to make the changes that were necessary).
- § Coordination between the events was weak. Running the workshop process in parallel with the recommendations and output processes (the CBD Statement and Durban Accord) was too complicated and weakened the consensus building process.
- § As a once in a decade event, the WPC fell short of its potential and the high standard it should have achieved given a decade to plan for it.
- § The lack of a clear strategy for engagement of donor representatives present during the Congress and poor use of the event for strategic fund raising – few (none?) proposals prepared to take advantage of the many funders and partners who were there. Overall fundraising was not professional enough, and host country fundraising was inadequate.

Improvements needed

§ IUCN must exercise greater organisational involvement and management input (or outright

What did not work

- § Too many sessions to keep track of, frequent changes in the programme and inadequate detailed programme information made it difficult for rapporteurs to know what was happening;
- § Relationship with Communications was not adequate – getting information to them on time – focal points were not appointed as requested
- § Weak link between outputs process and rapportage process. Rapporteurs did not receive final versions of some outputs.
- § Durban Accord and CBD Process not well thought through in advance made it hard for the rapportage team to know what was going on and respond adequately.
- § Team of IUCN staff rapporteurs were not in place prior to Congress so considerable effort was wasted on site getting this organized.
- § Poor preparation for workshop stream / cross cutting theme rapporteurs meant many arrived in Durban with no idea of what they were supposed to do – in spite of guidelines that were prepared in July. This needs extra time and effort at HQ.

Improvements needed

- § HQ Programme management needs to play a large role
- § Early planning for rapportage team – identify them well in advance, meet and clarify responsibilities and process
- § Rapporteurs in workshops streams should have direct link with the Communications group
- § Assign someone to coordinate the outputs process with rapportage function
- § Ensure that staff are available to complete their full responsibilities and pulled away for some other assignment.
- § Rapporteurs should be provided with a laptop computer to enter reports on the spot – this would save considerable time.
- § Provide tea or drinks to rapporteurs while they are writing non stop for hours in sessions.
- § Ensure that rapporteurs have several languages between them – this will help the accuracy of the reporting since translation is not always clear.

Plenary and Symposium

What worked

- § Opening Plenary was inspiring but should have ended it after Mandela, Mbeki and Queen Noor
- § Staff team work and leadership was excellent
- § The number of people for plenary management was sufficient
- § Effective adaptation to changes in agenda despite short notice and lack of detailed programme information
- § Able to provide to chairs with adequate briefing
- § Good preparation beforehand
- § Clear aims / assignments of responsibilities – who needs to do what, clear role of the team – where responsibilities stopped and where others were responsible
- § Good cooperation with South Africa Teams – conference technical communication staff

- § Closing day plenaries were redesigned well on the spot and implemented well giving participants and staff a sense of closure.

What did not work

- § Plenaries were far too long, with too much political correctness – could have been about one third the length and still retained the inspiring speeches.
- § Management of the opening plenary was poor – no briefings of speakers or ensuring that presentations were appropriately vetted and to ensure that they used current relevant information (ref to China and Cropper presentations in particular).
- § Symposia content – mixed quality – some excellent presentations, some very poor, many were too long and rushed, and chairing was poor in many cases.
- § Use of plenaries to deal with key Congress outputs was not effective – unclear procedures, not well thought out in advance
- § Plenary – Africa Day – speakers clearly not properly briefed, session not well planned or managed - repetitive presentations
- § Finding speakers was difficult (locating and recognizing them)
- § Changes in programme at short notice
- § Inadequate support facilities for photocopying
- § Poor time management by Chairs of sessions, with no corrective action by management.

Improvements needed

- § Content management – senior management need to be more involved
- § Have much shorter plenaries with short high level inspiring speeches – like Mandela, Mbeki and Queen Noor – could have ended the Opening Plenary after those speakers and left people on a high note
- § Resist political pressure to ‘add on’ to plenaries and find other ways of giving political people the profile that is required (but keep to a minimum).
- § Vet all presentations – do not allow inappropriate presentations (like the one from China regarded as propaganda by many) or ones with inaccurate or out of date information.
- § Earlier planning and management of plenaries and symposia
- § Ensure briefing and management of speakers – ensure presentations are not repetitive so that the sessions add to one another
- § Use plenaries used more strategically for key messages
- § Provide more professional communications input and assistance for key messages in presentations
- § Use a variety of techniques for plenaries, symposia to avoid endless ‘talking heads’ presentations and Power Point – consider interview techniques, drama, but when questions are used ensure that only one question at a time is asked. Consider using professional journalists to ask questions.
- § Better time management to allow for more time for interaction with plenary speakers from floor
- § Better selection of Chairs with skills for time management and chairing
- § Use Intranet for improved plenary coordination and speakers room

- § Provide pigeon holes for staff and participants or other ways to contact people during the Congress – lists of names and photos of people with hotel contact details in order to be able to contact speakers early.

3. Outputs – Durban Accord, Recommendations, CBD

Detailed Staff Feedback

Overall – all outputs

What worked

- § Combination of a WCPA focal point and an IUCN Secretariat focal point for all outputs was useful to balance views.

- § Division of responsibilities worked well – supported by clear TOR and implemented by reliable people
- § Daily assessment of progress at the Executive meetings facilitated the identification of problems and how to address them
- § The opportunity to involve people from many networks in the outputs, and the diversity of delegates representing different parts of the world and various agendas lent credibility to the process
- § The process was open and once participants became involved it allowed them to contribute easily.

What did not work

- § Too many outputs – some were not really outputs of the Congress but were products completed (UN List) or ongoing (PALNET) activities.
- § The process of producing level 1 outputs was widely criticized for lack of coherence, overlaps and variability in quality.
- § Not enough time for quality control of outputs. A committee should have been formed to review all outputs before being released to all participants.
- § Many outputs were seen as ‘cooked’ in advance, despite efforts by staff to involve participants early. This is a double edged sword and both sides need to be recognized pros and cons need to be weighed carefully by management.
- § Workshop reports were not available for the preparation of the outputs.
- § Over reliance on the use of the Web with no alternate process provided for those who do not have access to Web. Regional processes should have been used to ensure greater coverage.
- § Weak regional involvement in the development of the outputs.
- § The printed draft amended version was provided too late for participants to react to it.
- § The quality of the revised final versions were constrained by the lack of time available to include the views of participants.

- § The product included all the right elements.

What did not work

- § Time constraints to review final draft and proof read translations.
- § Difficulty in incorporating regional inputs – some language barriers, time constraints
- § No clear guidance on the final format of the Durban Accord during preparation of the Congress.
- § Comments from workshop streams came late.
- § Durban Accord Action Plan process could have been seen as a post Congress product with more time to focus it on the actions for the world, and those for WCPA and IUCN.
- § There was loss in the inclusion of comments due to constant interruptions. In the drafting process it would be good to identify two people instead of one – one in charge of logistics and getting comments and answering participants questions, and the other in charge of including the contents.
- § Could have started a day earlier with open comments session so that the flow of comments is more spaced out.

Recommendations

What worked

- § Open consultation process
- § Respect for the process – keeping it open and respecting all ideas
- § Preparatory process for the recommendations facilitated the process of identifying key issues and helped to gain consensus during the Congress
- § Staff pitched in to work with little regard to staff level
- § Buena disposicion del equipo para trabajar
- § Strong involvement of indigenous communities and experts working with them.
- § Good timing of recommendations process made it possible to organize several meetings for participants to provide more accurate inputs.

What did not work

- § Lack of clarity of the legal and political purpose of the recommendations process – how official, for what purpose, for what audience.
- § This lack of clarity led to confusion and tensions on how to manage the process on site.
- § Late intervention in the planning of the process by management caused unnecessary staff and WCPA tensions that led to a rift in the process.
- § Recommendations were drafted in parallel to workshops thus only partially benefiting from the outputs of the workshops.
- § Too many simultaneous meetings to allow for balanced discussion – you had to go to the meeting that was essential to your interests resulting in a small number of interested people in that issue preparing the recommendation. There was not enough time to think through the issues that arose in discussion.
- § Too much ‘word smithing’ but little real substantive discussion in the time available.

- § In a meeting of 15 people, with 5 from interest groups, there is serious potential for unbalanced discussion and biased input.
- § Not clear how to incorporate regional perspectives.
- § Cross cutting theme recommendations did not have a large enough forum for discussion - only whoever managed to find out where evening meetings were taking place came. They were not discussed in workshop streams.
- § Recommendations did not specify short, medium, long term for monitoring purposes.
- § Over reliance on the use of the Web to obtain comments may have skewed participation, need alternate mechanisms to include non web users through more regional and national processes.
- § Communications during the meetings were sometime difficult as the official language was English while major issues were addressed in Spanish.
- § Some good recommendations (like poverty) and others inappropriate (like PALNet).

Recommendations for improvements of outputs

- § Keep to a minimum the number of key outputs. Clarify what are inputs to the Congress, and what key products are needed as outputs. Participants should be able to identify with the outputs, and have adequate chance for involvement.
- § Start the process well in advance with full involvement of regional and national offices. Ensure that regional processes support the development of outputs by developing agreed TORs for all the IUCN regional office involvement one year before the event. Plan and budget resources and staff support for this involvement.
- § Fully incorporate communications team earlier in the process.
- § Have fewer simultaneous meetings to allow for more participation in the key outputs.
- § Provide means of balanced participation and in-depth discussions so that people do not feel the outputs are decided only by a few.
- § The process for the development and adoption of outputs like the CBD message needs to be crystal clear, fully credible, justifiable and legally unassailable.
- § Organizers should always get legal advice in the planning and design stages of these processes – should refer WCC issues now to the Legal Advisor.
- § Match the potential value of the proposed outputs with the work and process involved in developing and getting approval of outputs – limit the effort for those with little chance of having major influence.

4. Workshops

Summary

Of the aspects of the workshops that staff felt worked well, these pertained mainly to aspects of individual workshop streams that were well focused, well chaired, with knowledgeable presenters, and those workshops that used a range of techniques effectively, such as interviewing a panel, group interviews, and engaged the audience in interactive discussions of key issues. When there was good coordination early in the stream and clear roles and responsibilities for the team supporting the workshop, this led to more focused and coherent Outputs. The participation of indigenous peoples in

Detailed Staff Feedback

What worked

- § Some workshops had well focused themes, in contrast with others which were too vague and broad
- § Good planning led to some streams covering key issues by knowledgeable presenters
- § Workshops that dealt clearly with recommendations with ample time for discussion provided the strongest inputs to the recommendations process, and a clear focus for the workshop discussions.
- § Some workshops had good facilitation and chairing.
- § A range of techniques were used effectively in some workshops such as interviewing a panel, group interviews, and engaging the audience in an interactive discussion of key issues.
- § Speakers who were well briefed gave more focused and concise presentations allowing more time for discussion.
- § Some workshop Websites made information and papers available before the event.
- § Communication equipment in the centre worked well (overhead projectors and screens) and equipment support from the staff was generally good.
- § Staff were well briefed in the centre

- § Small break out groups were noisy and too small in some cases, and inflexible seating in big halls for sub-workshops was not appropriate.
- § No arrangements had been made for workshop stream leaders to have photocopies made for their workshops
- § Distribution of workshop related materials was chaotic – messy – no one in charge. Tables were piled high with jumbled up material.
- § Basic information on changes of venue, time, etc. was not well communicated and led to confusion and frustration. The Programme brochure was hard to follow - print and format too small. Delegates were often lost and had difficulty choosing what to follow , ended up going in and out of workshops.
- § IUCN professional staff were not able to participate in workshop discussions (both to contribute and / or learn) or to get an overview of the other workshops because they were either a rapporteur or focal point in one stream with no flexibility to move around.
- § Lack of adequate support to IUCN focal points in workshops from other staff who were assigned to assist in workshops but did not show up to help.
- § Lack of communication between stream leaders and rapporteurs led to a last minute rush in preparations for rapporteurs in some streams.
- § Lack of coordination between WPC management and workshop staff – no team meetings or briefings, no reports back or re-allocation of duties if necessary.
- § Communication among staff was difficult - pigeon holes, screens /bulletin boards were needed for staff.

Workshop Content

- § IUCN Programme management was not involved enough in the preparation of the programme of the workshops – better control was needed, much earlier engagement would have helped to ensure that IUCN input was integrated into the workshop content.
- § There were significant gaps in the content of streams and sub-streams.
- § Content inputs from regional processes were either not used or not used effectively to enrich the overall programme. In general the Congress did not integrate or synthesize regional inputs well.
- § IUCN staff could not attend workshops because they had to work elsewhere.
- § Workshops generally did not handle the discussion of recommendations effectively, often rushing the discussion, with inadequate time to agree on recommendation contents.
- § Need to manage controversial issues better.
- § IUCN freshwater expertise was noticeably absent from the Congress programme and at the Congress itself.
- § Mixed views on the Finance Stream – some said it provided good coverage of the issues, while others felt that the Finance stream did not deal adequately with key issues (valuing protected areas benefits, cost-effectiveness of current spending on Protected Areas, from national & global perspective, recent experience & future potential of development offsets as a means of mobilizing new funding for Pas).
- § Finance stream organizers did not allow enough time for discussion of their 2 recommendations (on PA financial security and Private Section), resulting in flawed process and poor coordination of amendments to Durban Accord, Action Plan, Recommendations, and to CBD.
- § Finance stream should have had private sector participants involved in overall organization and planning.

- § Limited representation of business, and business issues in workshops. Plenary presence of business was good for show but not substance.
- § Too much attention given to one particular interest, mining. Lack of overall interaction between business and protected areas.

Recommendations for Improvements

- § IUCN management must retain control over the design and implementation of the workshop

5. Registration, nomination process, sponsored delegates, VIPS

Summary

Despite considerable challenges with the nomination, registration and VIP process, staff felt there were a number of positive aspects that should be highlighted. These included the ability of the staff team to remain positive and helpful to each other during a very difficult time at the beginning of the Congress; the innovation and adaptive abilities of the functional senior managers on-site; the secure and efficient management of large amounts of money on-site for sponsored delegates; the well prepared support team; the efficiency and helpfulness of direct suppliers from South Africa (A/V computers, ICC) was seen as crucial to the problem solving that was required on-site; the availability and flexibility of Regional Directors in assisting in the management of VIPs; good support and sharing of experience in protocol issues from South Africa VIP staff; and, the fast track for VIPs to register (using scanned photos) was effective although organized late.

Of the aspects that did not work well, staff highlighted the following – the nomination, invitation and hotel booking process was too complicated and created confusion about who was invited and who could register; the local arrangements for registration were not delivered as planned and greatly compromised the efficiency of registration process resulting in considerable delays, inefficiencies and frustrations for both staff and delegates. Some workspaces for staff were insecure and less than adequate, and the general location of the registration area was too far away from the rest of the Congress activities.

Poor communication with the Congress Secretariat resulted in registration staff not being able to inform delegates properly at times, and security problems (stolen delegates' bags) created shortages for delegates who were last to register. Too many applications for sponsorship were received to be covered by the funds available. This was combined with confusion about who was considered a VIP and who was not. Together these led to problems in sorting out sponsorships and VIPs arrangements in the first few days. Airport pickups for VIPs were problematic. The VIP lounge was functional but not attractive and too far from the venue.

Suggestions focused mainly on the need for senior management to ensure that all Host Country agreements are signed well in advance, and that clear and positive Host Country relationships are maintained. Local arrangements for registration facilities should be clarified and checked thoroughly ahead of time, and the registration system delivered and setup well in advance of the opening. The registration area should be secure and located conveniently within the venue site. The application and hotel booking process should be straight forward, with early confirmation provided to delegates concerning acceptance and hotel booking details.

Detailed Staff Feedback

Registration and nominations

What worked

- § Staff remained positive and helpful throughout a difficult time
- § Support from IUCN staff – teamwork under extremely difficult circumstances. Individuals from different regions gelled together as effective and functional units, supported each other.
- § Innovative solutions such as Day Passes helped.
- § Friendliness
- § Direct suppliers from South Africa – A/V computers, ICC were efficient and helpful – their assistance was crucial.
- § Volunteer assistance – support from non registration staff who came to help out was greatly appreciated
- § Bags for volunteers were appreciated.

What did not work

- § The nomination, invitation and hotel booking process was too complicated and difficult and did not work – confusion created about who was invited and who could register
- § Poor local planning by host country – the design for registration was sent but communication and follow-up were not adequate
- § Technical and logistical problems on site created delays and inefficiencies
- § The team had less than 24 hours to install the system
- § Inadequate support from South Africa – no fax and phone lines
- § Communication problems – need better input to staff meetings
- § Registration in South Africa – issues due to complex system
- § Sponsorship process needs to be decentralized to regions
- § Volume and flow of participants at registration was greater than anticipated
- § Poor working conditions – not appropriate work spaces at all for staff
- § Unsafe working when it was raining because the electrical cables got wet
- § Registration area was too far away and isolated from the rest of the Congress activities
- § Poor communication with the Congress Secretariat – not well informed on what was going on.
- § Lack of cooperation from the South Africa organizers.
- § Bags for delegates – stolen – not enough in the end for all who should have had them.

Setup / installation issues

- § No adequate registration area allocated in the Congress centre – small space finally installed at the last minute – cold, wet, windy, insecure.
- § Poor setup – vast crowds funnelled through small spaces

- § Computers – internet lack of functionality, availability – computers installed less than 24 hours before official opening
- § Internet often off line.
- § Lack of support by badge production team – unwilling to surrender or share space.

Recommendations

- § Make basic registration data available on site – contacts, lists of participants, notice board for people looking for people, improved badges with larger names and areas of interest. This would help to improve networking among participants.
- § Train more people for registration tasks so that some can have breaks and people can be reassigned.

Sponsored delegates system

What worked

- § Large amounts of money were handled safely and efficiently on site for cash payments for sponsored delegates
- § Good team work – finance administration, Bank, worked well with participants.
- § Well prepared team and inputs arrived in Congress – huge workload for the team before the Congress.

What did not work

- § Process was much too complex and time consuming
- § Too many applicants for sponsorship, should be narrowed down in invitation / nomination letters.
- § Need an easier regionalized process as was done in Amman. The full process should be decentralized to the regions since they have better knowledge of the participants possible contributions, and can handle money transfers ahead of time
- § Also decentralize to the workshop stream leaders.
- § Better system to avoid queries.
- § Registration was open during daily staff meetings so registration staff missed hearing important information that delegates expected them to know.
- § Decisions made by local South African staff were not shared with the IUCN team.

VIP function

What worked

- § Availability and flexibility of regional directors to deliver messages and act as focal points for VIPS
- § Extremely good support and sharing of experience in protocol issues from VIP Protection South Africa.
- § Fast track for VIPs to register (using scanned photos, etc) organized late but highly effective.
- § Good support from the team – 4 from Secretariat, no South Africa volunteers.

What did not work

- § Lack of information on who was a VIP and who was not.
- § Lack of information from South Africa
- § Roles were not defined at first
- § VIP lounge was functional but not attractive – too far from venue
- § Delegates at registration could choose VIP status when they were not entitled to this. It should not have been an option on the registration form.
- § Lack of information from VIPs who did not communicate they were attending and just showed up. 'No shows' also not communicated.
- § Problems with airport pickups.
- § Difficulty in obtaining information re VIPS from the South Africa side and who was SA or IUCN responsibility.
- § Use of VIP facilities – only set up Day 2 – probably underused

Recommendations for improvements

- § Need more effective team work between Host Country and IUCN
- § Earlier planning and clarity of which VIPS are invited.
- § More IUCN senior staff working on this ahead of time.

6. Documentation and Translation

of 0.0125 T2943ff FeedbackTD -0.tio583 Tw () 017 T772 -473.25 TD.tio-13.5 Tf 0.097.9922 () T

- § Good French and Spanish typists to work with translators
- § On call translators were reliable, delivered when necessary
- § Some good volunteers who came to help

What did not work - challenges

- § Inadequate resources allocated to translation
- § Not enough support staff particularly during final phase because the quantity of work had not been forecasted
- § Difficult to meet deadlines - discussion groups did not respect deadlines, and work arrived late to the documentation staff
- § Documents which were returned for updating the translations were either difficult to use or not useable because of the numerous changes.
- § Too little turnaround time
- § Emai

- § The bulk of the work (modifications, etc.) came in the last four days and created a huge backlog of work for translation.
- § When the documentation came in, the hours were long and there was a perception by the team that there was an unequal distribution of work.
- § There were no debriefing sessions at the end of the day to review progress or raise issues that should be taken to senior management.
- § Staff did not have mobile phones so they could go and rest and be recalled. This could have been easily fixed, as there was a phone rental bureau on site.

Design, editing, production of publications distributed at the WPC

Challenges

- § Much of the material for editing and setting was delivered late to PSU, causing scheduling conflicts with non-Congress publications that were also due for press launches and events.
- § Some programmes requested reprinting and delivered publications only 3-4 weeks before the Congress which was achieved despite tight deadlines.
- § UNEP-WCMC had great difficulties in finalizing the copy for the UN List of Parks and Protected Areas. The text submitted was very late, poorly edited and PSU staff had to check the tables and figures and return copy. They had to completely redraw the pie charts and reedit them. The author changed/updated it daily for a period of 2 weeks. This was a real challenge as this was a level one output. Publishing forwarded this to WCPA for checking and sign off as there are real concerns on quality of product. Publishing has serious reservations about the final product

Recommendations for 3rd WCC

- § Programmes are requested to submit their publishing plans early and try to adhere to time lines.
- § Level one outputs cannot be received so later to jeopardize quality control. There must be a proper peer review/sign off process or the publication should come out as a draft, as with the Guidelines for MPAs.

Shipping to the WPC

On the positive side

- § Publishing shipped approximately 4,000 items from Cambridge, books, CD ROMS, leaflets, posters. This also included items from partner organizations and publishers.
- § Publishing assisted Administration in Gland in managing overall shipping, giving guidance where required. PSU in Gland also assisted all the programmes shipping to the exhibition in their shipping arrangements.
- § Onsite - PSU liaised with the shippers, located all shipments, unpacked materials.
- § For the return, PSU packed, labelled and shipped all its own material and gave guidance on the return of material for programmes.
- § Our own shippers were excellent and the shippers contracted to broker and manage shipments into the country were also excellent and a great help to us.

Challenges

- § With programmes running late on text delivery and requests for reprints, much material had to be sent at higher expense to reach the Congress in time.
- § The pallets were dropped by customs/shippers within the host country and relabeled. Non level 1 outputs were relabeled as level one outputs and began to be inserted in the Document Bags. This was picked up in time.

Recommendations for 3rd WCC

- § The host country needs to employ one shipping firm to broker and manage customs entry and freight storage on the ground.
- § All shipments for the Document Bags must be rechecked before packing starts.

Translation

What worked

- § Professionalism of the staff worked well – hard working, committed translators
- § Communication was smooth between the translators

What did not work

- § The translators and secretaries need to be able to leave the premises when there is no work but to be on call immediately. They should be able to return to hotels to rest rather than being on-station all day long with nothing or little to do and then having to work from 8 pm to 1-3am in the morning.
- § Work flow: the flow of work between the team in charge of producing the documents and the team in charge of translating, formatting, photocopying and distributing the documentation should be improved:
- § changes in the documents need to be properly tracked
- § only final versions of documents must be given – not always the case here.
- § the projected workplan needs improvement – staff need to work closely with the Resolutions Team to know when material is coming in and in what quantity
- § there were not enough translators and secretaries available
- § Office Space: need for improved ergonomics of the working area (typing chairs were not ergonomically sound and were uncomfortable after long hours of work) and to ensure quiet space within which to concentrate – located too close to the photocopiers, noise of moving partitions, etc
- § No resting space for staff when exhausted – would have been good to had a place to lie down and rest
- § No food and beverages were provided at night when working on translations
- § Not adequate replacement staff for French translation (Spanish was adequate – 3 persons)
- § Balance of work – little to do at the beginning, and too much to do at the end – translators could have been re assigned to Registration at the beginning to help out
- § Long waiting periods – if translators had mobile phones they could do something else and be called when needed

- § There must be stricter control for access to IUCN offices and in particular the Documentation Centre; this was a big problem in Durban because delegates were always disturbing the staff. This was also a problem encountered in Amman
- § The workspace and equipment must be of high quality, as staff work long hours
- § Provision of quiet working space for the translators, as concentration and close collaboration between the translators and the typists is required
- § Use of remote translators: It can work but we need as minimum on site:
- § 2 translators + 2 secretaries per language – note that if volunteer secretaries are used you probably need at least three per language since working very long hours (12-14 hours) is difficult for a volunteer.
- § Multiple backup internet connections (different ISPs)
- § Easy, fast communications between the remote translators and the team on site
- § For Bangkok, because of the workload either 4 on site or suggest 3 on site and one more as a remote translator.
- § Quality of secretaries for the translators: Having secretaries that are motivated, professional,

7. Exhibition Centre

Management of the Exhibition Centre
Overall

Challenges

- § Publishing was asked to manage the exhibition in January 2003, AFTER submitting the 2003 workplan and budget and ratification by Council. The workload was substantive and impacted heavily on publishing development plans.
- § There were problems from the start due to the lack of coordination and decision on behalf of congress organizers and host country. This led to many months of coordinating a project, the parameters of which were constantly being changed.
 - Ø WPCA and the host country had a misunderstanding of what was available in terms of exhibition space and costs covered.
 - Ø Publishing was misinformed that free exhibition space would be available
 - Ø WCPA informed all members (IUCN and Commission) that there would be non-commercial exhibition space
 - Ø The host country had problems on its procurement for local exhibition companies.
 - Ø The final Exhibition Management Company was contracted in June - 3 months prior to the opening of the Congress.
 - Ø Publishing spent a tremendous amount liaising between WCPA, Members, potential exhibitors and basically holding the fort.
- § The decision to make the exhibition a professional self-financing one was taken too late and caused problems with potential exhibitors who found they could not participate due to the excessive costs, or who did exhibit but who continually complained. There was now not enough lead-time to raise sponsorship – yet WCPA /host country expectations were high. The organizers threatened to pull the exhibition if not enough costs were covered. They also did not understand the IUCN constituency.
- § On site there were serious problems with the set-up: nothing ready on time, fire regulations not respected, last minute changes being made to the floor plan. This demanded constant negotiation and crisis management to keep people happy. There was little room to manoeuvre with Village Exhibitions. They did compensate by giving us more space than initially paid for to compensate for the inconvenience caused and also to fill up empty space that they had not been able to rent out.
- § Problems on site were many and consisted of: non delivery of requested furniture, non-delivery of fascia headings, non-delivery of locks for cupboard, non-delivery of computer and non-installation of ASDL lines. Many exhibitors became quite irate. Things were further aggravated by the constant disappearance of furniture during the night! Despite the so-called security, tables, chairs and desks would disappear to other stands and the exhibition organizers were unable to control this.
- § We became the “peace-makers”, crisis managing irate exhibitors who did not have the correct layout, furniture, set-up etc., and finding solutions between IUCN members and partners and the exhibition organizers.
- § There is a tremendous amount of work to do, unloading, unpacking and repacking. PSU staff were severely overworked at set up and take down compounded by parallel work sessions such as the staff feedback session which took place at the same time as exhibition take down.

Recommendations for 3rd WCC

- § IUCN must decide what sort of exhibition it wishes, and how it should be paid for

- § An external company should be contracted to manage the exhibition early on, so costs can be agreed
- § The prices should be made low enough for our members to participate – or sponsorships found.
- § The host country needs to employ one shipping firm to broker and manage customs entry and freight storage on the ground.
- § IUCN needs more visibility / bigger, better or more interesting corporate displays
- § Combine all the different IUCN displays into one large exhibit / space with sub-units to showcase IUCN as a Union and show how all the various elements fit together.
- § An experienced IUCN team needs to be in place to manage in advance and liaise on the ground, and trouble shoot - with own office and computer links. The substantive amount of work should not be underestimated.
- § The team needs support for set up and take down.
- § Parallel sessions such as the staff feedback sessions should not take place until all IUCN staff have completed their jobs or extra assistance found for the take down tasks afterwards.

IUCN Publications Booth

What worked

- § The initiative was taken to make the bookstore also a reading area – where people could browse. This worked extremely well and was very popular. It made the area much more attractive.
- § The “lounge” area was a good networking site and enticed people to stop and look. It was well sited -close to the Palnet Centre for training and the restaurant.
- § The IUCN Publications booth itself was good for networking and giving advice on publications. We met many of our authors, discussed potential publishing projects, and received many new publications for distribution in the Catalogue.
- § At the 15e

WCPA Distribution Centre

What worked

- § This was a new initiative – to run the distribution of all the free documentation from the publications area, so that the paper could be controlled, anything inappropriate removed and main areas kept tidy.
- § The distribution centre was a great success. It is a good idea to have a central area, but it needs to be closer to the core of the business.
- § We were given two volunteers for part of the time – who were a great help in keeping the shelves filled up and tidy and the stocks replenished.
- § We had booked a container for storage of material, and were very grateful that we had, as everything that was delivered for distribution – consisted of 3,000 print runs, and could not all be issued at once.

Challenges

- § Dealing with all the enquiries regarding distribution, prior to the meeting.
- § Because the exhibition and distribution area was in a separate building from the main Congress, we could not control the free paper that was still put out on spare tables in the DICC. There was no-one managing this at the DICC. The DICC therefore looked untidy, and we did not review/see all the material put out for free. Slightly undermined our new system.
- § We collected copies of all the material we handed out for archive purposes. Unfortunately, there was no lock on our cupboard where we stored this and the volunteers very kindly also handed all the archive material out for free near the end of the exhibition!
- § We had to manage irate authors/publisher's who had been promised they could put their material in the documentation bag, who were told later that it should go through us.
- § Even though we did not handle everything, we handled hundreds of thousands of pieces of paper/publications/leaflets/posters.

Recommendations for 3rd WCC

- § Our recommendation is that this is a good idea, but the whole organization has to adhere to the process. Members of staff handed out their own publications in the DICC although they knew the system. No-one managed the material in the DICC and removed it. Therefore, if it is to be followed for WCC, a policy must be agreed and implemented.
- § The whole of Pions in the (e, ohav) 01. ourn thrd where w2lose §
There's ae Tw (e of) 012 TDcations ine042lose

- § The workshop stream poster wall worked well and people actually used their posters as discussion points – regularly visiting.
- § The standard of posters was extremely high

Challenges

- § Dealing with all the enquiries regarding distribution, prior to the meeting.
- § It took us 5 hours to put the exhibition up – as there were so many!!!
- § Sadly, several were stolen.

Recommendations for 3rd WCC

- § Our recommendation is that this is a good idea, if poster sessions are to be part of the previous Commission meetings, Earth Forum etc.
- § People should be warned re theft.

Banff Photo exhibition

- § This was an exhibition of top quality photographs from Banff Mountain Festivals. The packing, transport and setting up was arranged and paid for by WCPA. It was delivered to the DEC directly from Canada, with instructions for mounting. Mounting, dismantling and packing had to be done by the Publishing staff with helpers.
- § PSU staff did not think that this exhibition was so outstanding as to warrant the amount of time and money spent in getting it to Durban and back to Canada. It did not seem to entice many viewers, in fact more people were to be seen the other side of the panels looking at the workshop stream poster wall. If this sort of occasion occurred in the future it might be better to have an idea of what the exhibition is before accepting it.

8. Communications

- § Video interview – closing video – CEC
- § Placing documentation and communication in close proximity
- § Issues management strategy
- § Press conference
- § Host country connections – working with local media
- § Accreditation of media from other countries
- § Communications being represented on the executive committee

What did not work

- § Not enough forward looking planning as well as planning tasks by the day, defining terms of reference for individuals and for the team
- § Lack of integration of regional and HQ team
- § Capturing the essence – content of workshops was difficult since the workshops were complex
- § Programme did not have ownership of the workshops
- § Weak input from the Programme including regions into the media kit
- § Programme was too complex to be able to communicate the results well
- § Lack of network access and inadequate linkages with documentation hampered efficiency
- § Volunteer skills were not matched to the tasks for which they were required
- § Pulling out volunteers from the team to serve other units
- § Use of English without translation in the workshop sessions
- § Press conferences with no forward planning
- § Communication office was located too far from the press centre
- § Massive amount of written material is not the most effective way of communicating.

Recommendations

- § Better planning of the broader communication strategy
- § Communications to come up with 2-3 key messages
- § Decide on branding IUCN for the event – not ad hoc
- § Build an integrated regional and HQ Team before the Congress
- § Early involvement and planning allows communications staff to plan story lines and press conferences in advance
- § Define roles, responsibilities of communication staff, and volunteers, and communicate this effectively to the broader staff team
- § Communication integrated into the programme rather than ad hoc and add-on
- § Integrate the accreditation of media with the overall registration process
- § Develop a full media pack a month before the event
- § Develop an issue management and crisis communication strategy early
- § Work with local media relations early

§ Encourage more media participation, particularly from regions . Cirly f8W n BT 9egions

9. Side meetings, Special Events, Field Trips, Security

Summary

Aspects of the side meetings and special events that went well included good preparation, planning and teamwork ahead of time, and flexibility and good communication flow between staff. The quality of the Help Desk in particular was cited by many staff as excellent. The field trips were effectively planned conceptually as part of the workshop programme, which was seen as a useful learning opportunity. Communication with South Africa counterparts on site went well, especially the audiovisual senior managers who were very cooperative and efficient. The use of cell phones for the organizing staff to communicate with their team was invaluable.

Aspects that did not work as well included – lack of space to accommodate some of the more popular side meetings; too much noise in the open areas affected the atmosphere and effectiveness of some of the side meetings. Information on events was not always announced or was inaccurate, and signage was often poor. Rooms were changed and the speaker's room not announced. Confusion existed between side meetings and special events. There was inadequate communication with Host Country on special events and roles were unclear on site, and venues were more expensive than anticipated. Delays in transport for field trips caused frustration along with the lack of interpretation on route. Some field trips were too complex and some too expensive for participants from developing countries.

Security posed a major problem throughout for the Congress staff and participants. Preparation was inadequate between IUCN and Host Country security people. IUCN Offices were not secure and the Congress Centre itself was too easily accessed. There was not always time for management to deal sensitively and adequately with victims of crime.

Suggestions for improvements include establishing clearer communication and more effective working relationships with the Host Country, as well as clear TORs for both host country and IUCN teams. The provision of secure offices and lockers provided for staff, and improved assistance for victims of crime. A mobile Help Desk of the same high quality is suggested for Bangkok, along with more mobile phones for staff, improved signage and improved contact information on delegates on site.

Detailed Staff Feedback

Side meetings

What worked

- § Preparation work – side meetings were well prepared due to good team work and good planning and organizing ahead of time
- § Flexibility – good communication flow
- § Having a road map
- § Appointing a person well in advance to take reservations was excellent.
- § Help Desk – dealt well with issues and problems

- § Flexibility and availability of staff focal points
- § Team work
- § Meeting leaders were happy
- § Immediate help available at the location of side meetings
- § Good contact with colleagues by cell phones
- § Change of venue – usually not a problem – people adapted and were flexible.

What did not work

- § Capacity did not always match the information given – not enough chairs and space
- § Too much noise in the open areas seriously affected the atmosphere and limited the effectiveness of the meetings
- § 7:00 a.m. organizing meetings were too early – move to 8:30
- § Some meetings were not announced – electronic messaging not always accurate or timely
- § Problems with signs and helping people find their way to meetings
- § Posted speaker sessions not advertised, therefore poor attendance
- § Change of meeting rooms
- § Speakers room not announced

Special Events and Short Courses

What worked

- § Good team work – flexible, staff available
- § Help Desk assistance very good
- § Good preparation of special events contributed to their successful
- § Communication with South Africa counterparts on site went well
- § Course leaders and participants seemed to be satisfied
- § Audio visual management was good
- § Team work with Bank – got system planned in advance
- § Direct professional link with suppliers

What did not work

- § Confusion between side meetings and special events
- § Task assigned too late – need earlier appointments
- § Inadequate communication for coordinator – not on time from South Africa
- § Lack of guidelines
- § Difference in communications with South Africa to arrange special events – unclear role at site level
- § Venue hires were more expensive than anticipated – short notice
- § South Africa role and responsibility not well defined

- § Short course room allocation
- § No proper guidance to staff
- § Not much information provided
- § Difficulty in communicating with the host country
- § No feedback from host country
- § Very expensive venue charges
- § Hierarchic decision making structures – too many layers
- § Confusion between side meetings and side events
- § In general positions were assigned late.

Field Trips

What worked

- § Well integrated into WCPA programme aspects and linked to content of the workshop streams
- § Planning was good

What did not work

- § Some too long, delays in transport leaving
- § No interpretation along the way
- § Some too complex to organize
- § Many too expensive for participants from developing countries

Security

What worked

- § Very good people assisting – in some cases they found and returned lost purse with considerable money inside and nothing missing.
- § Discreet and efficient
- § Coordination
- § Staff learned on the job
- § Flexibility to change the setup of the Secretariat office spaces to make it more secure.

What did not work

- § Definition of roles and responsibilities
- § IUCN Offices not secure, too accessible
- § Concerns around the validity of security passes and ease of access
- § Security or lack of it is a sensitive issue – not enough time to deal well with victims of crime
- § Inadequate preparation between IUCN and Host Country security people.
- § Issuing daily passes was a security problem

Improvements needed

- § Clear roles and responsibilities defined for Host Country - IUCN
- § Ensure that the IUCN Secretariat area is secure – locks for computers, rigorous screening at the door
- § Have skilled people dealing with victims of crime – help

§ List of delegates

§ Computer at the Help Desk where staff could provide contact details

§