
Ecosystems and Livelihoods Group 2 (ELG 2) Review

Review Report

**Prepared by Alejandro Imbach and Kent Jingfors,
ELG 2 Review Team**

May 2005



TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.	INTRODUCTION	1
2.	TERMS OF REFERENCE (TORs)	1
3.	METHODOLOGY	2
4.	KEY FINDINGS	3
4.1	OVERALL SITUATION	3
4.2	MANDATE	4
4.3	INTERNAL INTEGRATION	5
4.4	INTEGRATION ACROSS ASIA WITH COUNTRY PROGRAMMES AND ELG	5
4.5	PROGRAMMATIC FIT	6
4.6	PROGRAMME DELIVERY AND USE	7
4.7	CO-LOCATION	7
4.8	CONSTITUENCY	8
4.9	OTHER OPERATIONAL ISSUES	8
5.	DETAILED FINDINGS	8
5.1	MANDATE	8
5.2	PROGRAMME FIT	10
5.3	PROGRAMME DELIVERY AND EFFICIENCY	12
5.4	CO-LOCATION	14
5.5	CONSTITUENCY	15
5.6	OTHER OPERATIONAL MATTERS	16
6	RECOMMENDATIONS	17
Annex 1.	Terms of Reference	20
Annex 2.	Review Matrix	24
Annex 3.	Information Sources Matrix	27
Annex 4.	Questionnaires	30
Annex 5.	List of persons interviewed	37
Annex 6.	Review Agenda	38

ACRONYMS

ARO	IUCN Asia Regional Office
CO	Country Office
CP	Country Programme
CR	Country Representative
ELG	Ecosystems and Livelihoods Group
IUCNSL	IUCN Sri Lanka Country Office
RBP	Regional Biodiversity Programme
REEP	Regional Environmental Economics Programmes
RMP	Regional Marine Programme
RTP	Regional Thematic Programmes
SPT	Strategic Planning Team

1. INTRODUCTION

The Ecosystems and Livelihoods Group 2 (ELG2) was established in late 2002 as a result of the first stage of the reorganization process undertaken by the IUCN Asia Regional Office (ARO). This process was in response to the rapid growth of the Asia Programme. ELG2 resulted from the clustering of three existing Regional Thematic Programmes (RTP): Regional Biodiversity Programme (RBP), Regional Environmental Economics Programme (REEP) and Regional Marine Programme (RMP). ELG2 started its operation in January 2003 in Colombo, Sri Lanka, simultaneously with its analog, the ELG1, based in Bangkok, Thailand.

In the year following its establishment in 1998, the IUCN ARO began a process of conducting regular reviews of its different units, at a pace of two or three every year. Before the 2002 reorganization, these reviews were focused on the Country Programmes and the Regional Thematic Programmes. After reorganization, both ELGs were added to the list of units to be reviewed. Over the last couple of years, several reviews took place as part of this regular process, such as the Pakistan Programme Review, the Regional Forest Programme Review, the Vietnam Office Review, the Regional Finance Unit Review, among others.

As part of this process, a Review of ELG2 was scheduled to take place in late 2003 or early 2004, following the meeting of the Regional Conservation Forum (Colombo, Sri Lanka, December 2003). A number of different problems caused delays of this particular Review, which finally took place in late April 2005 (see detailed Review Agenda attached as Annex 6).

The Review Team consisted of Alejandro Imbach (an external consultant, and former Regional Programme Coordinator, who acted as Team Leader) and Kent Jingfors (current IUCN Asia Regional Programme Coordinator).

This Report summarizes and presents the key features and results of the ELG2 Review.

2. TERMS OF REFERENCE (TORs)

The TORs for this specific review were developed by IUCN ARO in March 2005 and they guided the entire process.

The TORs defined 6 major focus areas for the Review:

- Mandate and integration
- Programmatic fit
- Programme delivery
- Co-location
- Constituency
- Other operational aspects

These six major areas were subdivided in 26 more specific aspects.

The complete TORs for the ELG2 Review are included as Annex 1 of this Report.

3. METHODOLOGY

The methodology used for this Review is presented in this section (including several complementary Annexes) as established by the IUCN Monitoring and Evaluation Policy and Standards.

Basically the ELG2 Review had 4 components:

Review Design: drafting of the TORs, preparation of the Review and Information Sources matrixes and development of information gathering tools (lists of documents, questionnaires, interview guidelines, etc.);

Information gathering and analysis:

In this way, the relevant sources of information for each issue were identified.

- e) Development of questionnaires / interview guidelines. Based on the previous step matrix, specific questionnaires / interview guidelines were developed for each cluster. The complete set used in the Review can be found in Annex 4.
- f) Interviews. The following step was the identification of staff available for interview during the Review period. The information collected was used to prepare the list of persons to be interviewed (see list as Annex 5). Some of these interviews were made face-to-face in Bangkok and Colombo, while others were done by telephone calls (e.g. Country Offices, SPT and IUCN Headquarters). Persons interviewed by phone received the pertinent questionnaire one or two days before the interview.

The interviews were done, in person or by phone, during the period April 20 to May 01. Some were done individually by the Review Team members and others were done jointly.

- g) Information organization and analysis. The information collected from documents, reports and interviews was analyzed and organized in key and detailed findings.
- h) Key findings were summarized in a Power Point presentation and presented to a meeting including the ELG2 staff and the IUCN Sri Lanka Country Representative. After the presentation, a 2-hour session was conducted to open the discussion and collect the reaction of the participants to the findings. This information was then incorporated in the findings (see next Report Section on Key Findings).

i)

excellent relations and joint work on environmental economics with the co-located Sri Lanka Country Office, and growing joint work with this Office on coastal and marine issues despite the relatively short period of active operation of the reactivated Marine Programme;

financial consolidation of the ELG2 Coordination through self-funding and contributions from all Programmes;

an expanded portfolio that cuts across both country programmes and regional ELGs, and contributes effectively to the overall regional and global programme;

increased level of team work within ELG2. While this level of team work still has room to improve, there is a visible difference between the current situation and the initial one when ELG2 was established;

remarkably positive perception about the ELG focal point role played by the ELG Head by the served Country Offices (Nepal and Sri Lanka);

recognition by the global constituency for its work during the WCC and for taking the technical lead in developing and coordinating post-tsunami project proposals.

- d) This progress was achieved through the intensive efforts of the ELG2 staff and its Head. All of them should be commended for the overall good performance of the Group.
- e) At the same time, performance hindering issues were identified during the Review and they

- provision of a regional platform connected with the global ones for networking, intelligence gathering, exchange of experiences and other similar aspects;
- proposal development and fund raising at both national and regional level, jointly with the Country Programme and beneficial for both
- access to information, expertise, regional and global institutions and similar

4.3 INTERNAL INTEGRATION

- a) Perceptions from both outside and inside ELG2 suggest that integration and joint work within ELG2 has not been fully achieved yet.
- b) There are just a few joint programmatic activities among the three Programmes and these joint activities are not very visible.
- c)

- d) The first can be addressed through a short process of meetings, reflection and refining. The second needs an organizational review that looks for structures that promote synergy, team work and close collaboration. Impediments to those attributes need to be removed. That may sound drastic, but the integration required both within and between ELGs and COs is so central to the cohesion of the ONE IUCN Programme that other considerations should necessarily take second place.
- e) Integration between ELG2 RPTs with their HQ counterparts has generally been good (e.g. Marine and Economics) whereas the regional “ELG” construct is still not widely understood by HQ staff.

4.5 PROGRAMMATIC FIT

- a) **Regional Biodiversity Programme (RBP)**. There are concerns about the RBP fit within IUCN Asia in the sense that Biodiversity is the business of the entire IUCN, not just a single Programme within a Group (such as ELG2).
- b) Having a Programme with the same scope of the organization leads almost inevitably to overlap and frictions. Initially, when RBP was the only Regional Thematic Programme in Asia, it was not a problem; but the multiplication of RTPs with clear focus on different issues related to biodiversity has become increasingly problematic.
- c) Having said that, it is also necessary to recognize that RBP deals with a number of very relevant lines of work, ranging from global conventions and global and regional partners to other activities closer to the field.
- d) Therefore, it seems that there is room for splitting the RBP work and maintaining the more field-related aspects within the ELG structure (e.g. Species, TRAFFIC) and to shift its global and policy component5(a)0.8(s a)w[16w(ong s, TRAFF)-5.1(lerTA.09848 0 TD0.0006 Tc3(iceleels thatfacip

-5.1EPd.)J-1.6393 -1.1639 TD0.002 Tc0 Twfe)

- e) There is a good interpersonal relationship at the top of both units, and excellent integration in some technical areas (e.g. Environmental Economics) that should be extended to all common technical areas.

4.8 CONSTITUENCY

- a) A surprisingly complicated issue emerged here as a result of the low level of consensus about who the key constituencies of COs and ELGs are? In other words, who are they serving?
- b) This issue and its implications were already addressed at the initial section, as well as its connection with mandate and other issues.
- c) Given all these connections, it is not difficult to understand that the perceptions about how well ELG is serving its constituency is not homogeneous. As this issue did not emerge as a key one, it is treated in more detail in the next section on Detailed Findings.

4.9 OTHER OPERATIONAL ISSUES

- a) There are some concerns from Regional Finance about the financial health of ELG2.
They expect that the small projected deficit for 2005 will be covered by consulting-type work contracted during the year.
They are concerned by the complete lack of secured (C) income for 2006 and afterwards
- b) On the other hand, it seems that all current Programmes are working on Project proposals. Several of these proposals (Especially from RMP and REEP) are related to post-tsunami rehabilitation, therefore it is expected that the approval process will be faster than usual. For example, there are currently at least two tsunami related proposals totaling USD 1.7 million that have the potential to engage both ELG2 and IUCNSL/IUCNT and extend beyond 2005, if approved (both factored at 80%).
- c) There is also a concern about the short-term nature of most ELG2 projects, as they convey the idea that most of the ELG2 work is consulting.
- d) While consulting is just a form of contracting work, some efforts should be made to demonstrate that all these pieces of short-term work are tied up together and point to the same direction. This is not obvious at the moment.
- e) Related to the previous point, getting some medium and long term projects (3 years and beyond) needs to be considered as a priority.
- f) It should be noted that the emphasis is on medium and long term projects more than large ones. Medium and long term projects increase stability and if they are large, even better. Large short-term projects increase vulnerability because they lead to growth in the structure without time to develop sustainability.
- g) It is believed that if ELG2 becomes a single team, working in an integrated way focusing on coastal landscapes in a post-tsunami environment, getting these medium to long term projects will be considerably easier.

5. DETAILED FINDINGS

This section presents short and specific comments about the complete set of points defined in the TORs of the Review. Some issues were already presented in t1 Tc-0.0008king ,ed itthe

ELG and they are assumed to fit into this larger structure. There is also an issue with the name of RBP; biodiversity is the business of the entire IUCN and all its units regardless of the level; therefore, having one unit within a Group carrying that name is somewhat misleading. Moreover, many activities fit under "biodiversity" and that situation has led to a number of conflicts due to overlap between RBP and the other RTPs in Asia. Section 6 includes Recommendations about this aspect.

(d) An analysis of its integration and cooperation with other ELGs and Country Programmes in terms of developing new cooperative programmes and dialogues, together with a commentary on difficulties, if any, in furthering these aspects, and recommendations for improving the situation, as applicable.

Again, the situation here is heterogeneous. The new RMP is too new to have had significant interactions, but the early signs are encouraging. Both REEP and RBP have a good record of cooperation with the Country Offices. There are different perspectives about the depth of this cooperation. That means that, even recognizing the efforts and activities implemented by RBP in the countries, the COs seem to attach more value to the interaction with REEP on the basis that this interaction has helped them more in developing and strengthening their capacities and skills.

t,riinTinaA(ch .7(h)807B(dini976(Q-28)42(61))157.00(esuppeGT*02)-(67)0-7(t4.9)11i3

going to reach the entire organization. Thinking in terms of the ELG just doing that implies significant increases in staff and costs that the COs seem not to be ready to support while just asking the ELG to fund themselves through Projects increases their workload and has the potential to generate significant conflicts with the COs. So, a more sophisticated model needs to be reinforced that links Regional ELG to Countr

approach seems to be in the process of adoption by the Sri Lanka ELG. So, in a year or so, it is going to be possible for IUCN Asia to assess the benefits and constraints of this model using the actual experience of some of its own regional and country units.

- (g) Development of new areas of work to provide a 'Centre of Excellence'-type status.

The basic finding is that this concept is still too new, most of the interviewed staff have not heard about it, and for those that have, they have different (and sometimes contradictory) notions. The prevailing view in Asia seems to be that this is (or should be) an academic institution and not really used in the context of an IUCN programme or capacity.

What does seem clear is that ELG2 has in a very short period of time developed considerable, high quality experience (together with the IUCN Sri Lanka country office) on disaster recovery issues after the tsunami.

5.4 CO-LOCATION

- (a) A short situational analysis in regard to locating ELG2 in IUCN Sri Lanka, and recommendations for addressing constraints, obstacles etc., if any;

As mentioned in the Key Findings, there is a good level of consensus that co-locating ELG2 in Sri Lanka was a good decision. There were (and there will be) issues arising from this co-location but in general they were managed and the relationship and collaboration between these two units remains quite good in general. The imminent addition of TRAFFIC to this mix will create a "cluster" whereby ELG2 will also act as a host organization in addition to being co-located with the Sri Lanka country office.

- (b) A critical commentary on advantages and disadvantages of continuing ELG2 in Colombo;

The advantage of continuing ELG2 in Colombo is to provide continuity to the joint efforts and to the process of supporting IUCNSL to develop its core capacities in the areas of ELG2 expertise.

There are no evident disadvantages when comparing Colombo with other locations of Country Offices.

There is always a question about whether or not all the ELGs should come together to a single location and become a single team. This issue was already raised and analyzed in 2002 during reorganization and the basic rationale at that time was the need to keep a balance in the deployment of technical capacities across the different parts of Asia. This rationale seems to be still valid.

Obviously the second stage of reorganization and the clustering of Country Offices is going to reverberate across the entire IUCN system in Asia. Whether or not that will impact on the current rationale for ELG locations remains to be seen.

- (c) An analysis of the degree of 'fusion' between ELG2 and IUCN SL in programme planning, delivery, staff interactions;

There is not such a thing as fusion between ELG2 and IUCNSL. There is no evidence that IUCNSL has become dependent on ELG2 or that ELG2 is focusing too much of its work on Sri Lanka. There is a temporary focus of the marine work on post-tsunami issues but this is a relatively short-term

period and this work has also been extended to Thailand (another country hit by tsunami where IUCN has a country programme).

Therefore, it seems that the relationship between these units is quite healthy (despite occasional grumblings from both sides) and mutually beneficial.

The ELG2 Head, and REEP through her, also maintains active networks and contacts with colleagues from the same discipline area in the region and around the world. The RMP coordinator is partially hired by a network (CORDIO) and through that he is linked to other networks related to coastal and marine issues. Neither REEP nor RBP maintain similar e-mail lists or websites as does RBP.

Needless to say, all these networks are extremely useful for the type of work that ELG2 is doing, therefore these activities should be encouraged and, hopefully, integrated into a larger networking and communications effort for IUCN Asia as a whole.

(c) A commentary on the capacity building of the constituency through joint work, training programmes, etc.

See previous sections.

5.6 OTHER OPERATIONAL MATTERS

(a) A brief review of ELG2 financial situation, and its contribution to the Asia programme;

The ELG2 financial situation seems to have improved significantly in relation to its first year of operation. The unit is now able to cover all its costs and the flow of incoming work for the next few months seems more than enough to cover any deficit for 2005 projected currently on the basis of the existing OABC list. Compared with 2004, the expenditure budget for 2005 has risen significantly (from USD292,863 to USD469,270) largely as a result of recruiting a REEP Coordinator and a Programme Coordinator for ELG2 - both of these positions are considered to be sound, long-term investments in moving towards financial sustainability for the unit.

In the medium term, there are valid concerns about the lack of any secure income (C Projects) for 2006 or later. On the other hand, the window of opportunity created by the tsunami seems to be

on integrated coastal zone managements issues. Needless to say, financial room needs to be created before considering such expansion.

(c) Identification of new and emerging areas that would strengthen the ELG2 programme;

This is a difficult question that is perhaps better answered by other programmes in IUCN that have the "pulse" on these areas (e.g. Global Programme at HQ, Emerging Programmes in Asia). What was collected from the interviews was a recommended focus on integrated coastal zone management (including Coastal and Marine Protected Areas) as a natural continuation of the post-tsunami recovery efforts; expanding the environmental economics theme into areas of National Green Accounting, Fiscal Reform and how to use these as incentives for maintaining or enhancing-5.xTc-0.0st a

e)

- m) Environmental Assessment (EA) should stay with Emerging Programmes for now and not be added to the current programmatic scope of ELG2.

INTEGRATION ACROSS ASIA

- n) The general pattern followed by REEP in terms of helping to set specific EE capacities in the countries and allocating substantial time and resources to develop them should be taken as a model to be followed by the new integrated team.
- o) Integration among regional and country ELGs is an issue that remains to be addressed and this Review does not have more specific recommendations in this regard.

OPERATIONAL ISSUES

- p) Current efforts to improve Programme Coordination systems and procedures should be maintained.
- q) Additional efforts should be made to develop a portfolio of medium to long term (2-5 years) integrated projects that draws on the multi-disciplinary expertise both from within ELG2 and between ELG2 and ELG1.
- r) Projects (especially those requiring field implementation) should involve the pertinent Country Offices from the early planning and design stages, and include CO staff and other partners (particularly Members) during implementation.

- (e) An analysis of resource (HR, Finances) constraints, if any, in programme delivery;
- (f) An Analysis and recommendations on the emerging “task team” approach to programme planning, development and delivery; and
- (g) Development of new areas of work to provide a ‘Centre of Excellence’-type status.

4. *Co-location:*

- (a)

Useful Reference Material:

Intersessional Programme, 2005-2008 for Asia and ELG 2 (and other programmes as desired);
Background papers on Restructuring, including the paper by Don Gilmour to the ARD in mid-2002.

Quarterly Reports, particularly Annex A and the annexes on Constituency Matters;

Sample publications from ELG 2;

IUCN Asia Regional Office
Bangkok

21 March, 2005

ANNEX 2. ELG2 REVIEW MATRIX

MANDATE	QUESTIONS
(f) An analysis of the clarity of the mandate of ELG 2 vis-à-vis its previous component RTPs to the staff, and the common understanding thereof, including perceptions, at all levels of	

Programme).

constraints and potential?
Has it helped your unit?

	Are they benefiting IUCNSL? Is IUCNSL becoming too dependent on ELG2? Is ELG2 too focused on Sri Lanka?
(w) A commentary on the corporate services provided by IUCN SL to ELG 2, and recommendations for improving these services, as appropriate.	How adequate are the corporate services provided by IUCNSL to ELG2 (&RTPs)? Why? Is there room for improvement? How?

CONSTITUENCY	QUESTIONS
(x) An analysis of the involvement of Members and Commission Members in the ELG 2 programme;	How adequate has been the involvement of ELG2 (&RTPs) with Members and Commission members?

ANNEX 3. ELG2 REVIEW - INFORMATION SOURCES MATRIX

MANDATE	ELG2	ELG1	CP / HQ	RPC	ARO	SL
(ff) An analysis of the clarity of the mandate of ELG 2 vis-à-vis its previous component RTPs to the staff, and the common understanding thereof, including perceptions, at all levels of staff on the mandate;	X	X				
(gg) Assessment of the achievements of ELG 2 against the original objectives and internal reviews undertaken so far;	X					
(hh) A critique on the level of integration amongst the component RTPs, their fit in this particular ELG, and the relevance or otherwise of continuing with the regional thematic programmes; and	X					
(ii) An analysis of its integration and cooperation with other ELGs and Country Programmes in terms of developing new cooperative programmes and dialogues, together with a commentary on difficulties, if any, in furthering these aspects, and recommendations for improving the situation, as applicable.		X	X	X	X	X
PROGRAMME FIT						
(jj) An analysis of the development of the OABC list for ELG 2 during the last two years to advise on the fit of the work programme within the overall IUCN Asia programme;	X			X	X	
(kk) A commentary on the opportunities for long term work for ELG 2 within the overall programme;	X		X	X	X	
(ll) The degree to which this programme has addressed the needs of the constituency (from the perspective of the Programme).	X		X	X		
PROGRAMME DELIVERY AND EFFICIENCY						
(mm) A critical review of the implementation of the 'APDG' process, including programme planning, project design and implementation, including monitoring and evaluation systems, and timely delivery and quality assurance of outputs;	X			X		

(nn) A KEGO-wise analysis of outputs during the last two years;	X			X		
(oo) A short analysis of the highlights of outputs of ELG 2 in the last two years, including their 'Reach' and 'Expected Use', and how these have been used in influencing the 'conservation agenda';	X	X	X	X		
(pp) Effectiveness of ELG 2 in achieving its own Results, and their contribution to those of the Union;	X					
(qq) An analysis of resource (HR, Finances) constraints, if any, in programme delivery;					X	
(rr) An Analysis and recommendations on the emerging "task team" approach to programme planning, development and delivery; and	X	X		X	X	
(ss) Development of new areas of work to provide a 'Centre of Excellence'-type status.	X	X	X	X	X	
COLOCATION						
(tt) A short situational analysis in regard to locating ELG 2 in IUCN Sri Lanka, and recommendations for addressing constraints, obstacles etc., if any;	X					X
(uu) A critical commentary on advantages and disadvantages of continuing ELG 2 in Colombo;	X				X	X
(vv) An analysis of the degree of 'fusion' between ELG 2 and IUCN SL in programme planning, delivery, staff interactions; and	X				X	X

and its contribution to the Asia programme;						
(bbb) A brief review of the human resources capacity of ELG 2 vis-à-vis its mandate and the programme, and any broad recommendations for strengthening HR capacity;	X				X	
(ccc) Identification of new and emerging areas that would strengthen the ELG 2 programme;	X	X		X		
(ddd) Identification of needs to reformulate or re-focus existing programmes and activities within ELG 2; and	X	X		X		
(eee) Comments on any other matters germane to the efficient delivery of the Programme.	X	X	X	X	X	X

ANNEX 4 - ELG2 REVIEW QUESTIONNAIRES (ASIA REGIONAL OFFICE STAFF)

MANDATE		QUESTIONS
(d) An analysis of its integration and cooperation with other ELGs and Country Programmes in terms of developing new cooperative programmes and dialogues, together with a commentary on difficulties, if any, in furthering these aspects, and recommendations for improving the situation, as applicable.	SPT	How good is the integration between your unit and ELG2 and its RTPs? Why? Problems, constraints and potential? Are all ELG2 RTPs relevant to your unit? Why? What is the RTP with whom your unit has the better joint work? Why? Can you see room for improvement? How? What constrains the improvements?
(e) An analysis of the development of the OABC list for ELG 2 during the last two years	SPT	
(f) A commentary on the opportunities for long term work for ELG 2 within the programme;	SPT	What are the opportunities that you envisage for the long term work of ELG2 (and its RPTs) in Asia?
(l) An analysis of resource (HR, Finances) constraints, if any, in programme delivery;	FIN HR	Has ELG2 (& RTPs) faced resource constraints over the last couple of years? Why? If yes, could it have been avoided?
(m) An Analysis and recommendations on the emerging "task team" approach to programme planning, development and delivery; and	SPT	How do you understand the task team approach to programme planning, development and delivery? How does it fit with ELG2 (&RTPs)? Potential advantages, problems?
(n) Development of new areas of work to provide a 'Centre of Excellence'-type status.	SPT	How do you understand this concept? What are the ELG2 Areas with potential to apply the concept? What will be the added value? Does ELG2 have the necessary expertise for that? Should ELG2 continue in Colombo? Why? Advantages and disadvantages?
(p) A critical commentary on advantages and disadvantages of continuing ELG 2 in Colombo;	ALL	
(q) An analysis of the degree of 'fusion' between ELG 2 and IUCN SL in programme planning, delivery, staff interactions; and	SPT	Is there any particular fusion between IUCNSL & ELG2 regarding pro-grammme planning, delivery and/or staff interactions? How do they work? Are they benefiting IUCNSL? Is IUCNSL becoming too dependent on ELG2? Is ELG2 too focused on Sri Lanka?
(s) An analysis of the involvement of Members and Commission Members in the ELG 2 programme;	CDC	How adequate has been the involvement of ELG2 (&RTPs) with Members and Commission members? Why? Can it be improved? How?
(t) A commentary on networking with global or regional institutions; and	CDC	How adequate has been the involvement of ELG2 (&RTPs) with global and regional institutions? Why? Can it be improved? How?
(u) A commentary on the capacity building of the constituency through joint work, training	SPT CDC	What is the constituency of ELG2? Why? Is this adequate? How adequate has been the work of ELG2 in building

programmes etc.

the capacity of its constituency?

(v) A brief review of ELG 2 financial situation, and its contribution to the Asia programme

FIN

How good is the financial situation of ELG2 (&RTPs)?
What are the trends?
Are they contributing as expected to the Asia Region funding?

(w) A brief review of the human resources capacity of ELG 2 vis-à-vis its mandate and the programme, and eventual strengthening

HR

How good is the HR situation of ELG2 (&RTPs)?
What are the trends?

(x) Identification of new and emerging areas that would strengthen the ELG 2 programme

SPT

What are the new and emerging areas that can be addressed by ELG2 ?
Can IUCN go into those areas with its current structure and staff?

(y) Identification of needs to reformulate or re-focus existing programmes and activities within ELG 2

SPT

What are the needs to reformulate (or re-focus) existing Programme and activities within ELG2? Why?

(z) Comments on any other matters germane to the efficient delivery of the Programme

ALL

ANNEX 4 (cont.) REGIONAL PROGRAMME COORDINATOR QUESTIONNAIRE

MANDATE

QUESTIONS

(d) An analysis of its integration and cooperation with other ELGs and Country Programmes in terms of developing new cooperative programmes and dialogues, together with a commentary on difficulties, if any, in furthering these aspects, and recommendations for improving the situation,

If not, should IUCN try it anyway?

(x) Identification of new and emerging areas that would strengthen the ELG 2 programme

(y) Identification of needs to reformulate or re-focus existing programmes and activities within ELG 2

(z) Comments on any other matters germane to the efficient delivery of the Programme

What are the new and emerging areas that can be addressed by ELG2 (&RTPs)?

Can IUCN go into those areas with its current structure and staff?

What are the needs to reformulate (or re-focus) existing Programme and activities within ELG2? Why?

ANNEX 4 (cont.) ELG1 STAFF QUESTIONNAIRE

MANDATE

- (a) An analysis of the clarity of the mandate of ELG 2 vs. its previous component RTPs, and the common understanding thereof, including perceptions, at all levels of staff on the mandate;
- (d) An analysis of its integration and cooperation with other ELGs and Country Programmes in terms of developing new cooperative programmes and dialogues, together with a commentary on difficulties, if any, in furthering these aspects, and recommendations for improving the situation, as applicable.
- (f) A commentary on the opportunities for long term work for ELG 2;
- (g) The degree to which this programme has addressed the needs of the constituency (from the perspective of the Programme).
- (j) A short analysis of output highlights of

QUESTIONS

- Do you know the ELG2 mandate? How clear is it for you? What are the key differences between ELG2 and the RTPs?
- How good is the integration between your unit and ELG2 and its RTPs? Why? Problems, constraints and potential? Are all ELG2 RTPs relevant to your unit? Why? What is the RTP with whom your unit has the better joint work? Why? Can you see room for improvement? How? What constrains the improvements? What are the opportunities that you envisage for long term work of ELG2 (and its RPTs) in Asia?
- How well has ELG2 RPTs addressed the needs of the constituency (from the perspective of the Programme)? Why? Problems, constraints and potential? Has it helped your unit?

ANNEX 4 (cont.) COUNTRY REPRESENTATIVES, PROGRAMME COORDINATORS and HQ
QUESTIONNAIRE

Phone Interviews (30 minutes each)

MANDATE

(d) An analysis of its integration and cooperation with other ELGs and Country Programmes in terms of developing new cooperative programmes and dialogues, together with a commentary on difficulties, if any, in furthering these aspects, and recommendations for improving the situation, as applicable.

(f) A commentary on the opportunities for long term work

QUESTIONS

How good is the integration between your unit and ELG2 and its RTPs? Why? Problems, constraints and potential

Are all ELG2 RTPs relevant to your unit? Why?

What is the RTP with whom your unit has the better joint work? Why?

Can you see room for improvement? How?

What constrains the improvements?

What constrains the improvements?

ANNEX 4 (cont.) SRI LANKA OFFICE QUESTIONNAIRE

MANDATE

- (d) An analysis of its integration and cooperation with other ELGs and Country Programmes in terms of developing new cooperative programmes and dialogues, together with a commentary on difficulties, if any, in furthering these aspects, and recommendations for improving the situation, as applicable.

- (o) A short situational analysis in regard to locating ELG 2 in IUCN Sri Lanka, and recommendations for addressing constraints, obstacles etc., if any;
- (p) A critical commentary on advantages and disadvantages of continuing ELG 2 in Colombo;
- (q) An analysis of the degree of 'fusion' between ELG 2 and IUCN SL in programme planning, delivery, staff interactions; and

- (r) A commentary on the corporate services provided by IUCN SL to ELG 2, and recommendations for improving these services, as appropriate.
- (z) Comments on any other matters germane to the efficient delivery of the Programme

QUESTIONS

- How good is the integration between your unit and ELG2 and its RTPs? Why? Problems, constraints and potential?
- Are all ELG2 RTPs relevant to your unit? Why?
- What is the RTP with whom your unit has the better joint work? Why?
- Can you see room for improvement? How? What constrains the improvements?
- How good was the decision to locate ELG2 in Sri Lanka? Why?
- Is there room for improvement? How?

- Should ELG2 continue in Colombo? Why? Advantages and disadvantages?

- Is there any particular fusion between IUCNSL and ELG2 regarding programme planning, delivery and/or staff interactions? How do they work? Are they benefiting IUCNSL?
- Is IUCNSL becoming too dependent on ELG2? Is ELG2 too focused on Sri Lanka?
- How adequate are the corporate services provided by IUCNSL to ELG2 (&RTPs)? Why?
- Is there room for improvement? How?

ANNEX 6. ELG2 REVIEW AGENDA

DAY	TASKS
April, Wednesday 20	Briefing and interviews: Assistant Regional Programme Coordinator, Human Resources Director
Thursday 21	Interviews: Regional Finance Director Regional Constituency Development Director ELG1 Programme Coordinator
Friday 22	Phone Interviews: Country Offices and SPT ELG1 Regional Environmental Law Programme
Saturday 23	Information processing and analysis
Sunday 24	Information processing and analysis
Monday 25	Interviews and Phone In