

WAGENIN



Table of contents

Summary of Synthesis Report of the External Review of IUCN 2007	i
List of Tables	x

6. Conclusions.....	54
6.1 A Proposed Plan of Action	54
6.2 Reflections on the Review	55
Appendix 1 Consolidated List of Recommendations.....	57
Annex 1: Report on Linking Conservation to Livelihoods in Africa (Objective 2)	
Annex 2: Report on Linking Practice to Policy (Objective 3)	

from one review to another. This is true for the last External Review 2003 and it is true for this External Review 2007. IUCN and its donors invest heavily in reviews. There should be better systems and controls for ensuring that management acts on its own *Management Response* to reviews.

The review team heard virtually universal endorsement for the concept of IUCN as a highly valued organization with a unique and probably irreplaceable membership structure that gives IUCN international credibility and authority. IUCN is clearly doing much good work at all scales and in all regions and is delivering important results and products. That IUCN is doing valuable work in many areas is not the key issue. Rather it is whether IUCN is sufficiently focused on and aligned with its own value proposition - that it works through its members and harnesses the efforts of thousands of volunteers through its Commissions - to be a global leader in strategic influencing through world-class knowledge products and convening processes. This is the question for IUCN that is addressed by the review.

The review found IUCN's unique niche for convening different actors across different scales to forge shared understanding, commitment for change and joint action to be undisputed. Yet there was widespread concern that IUCN's full potential in this regard is not being realised. The context in which IUCN is operating is changing very rapidly, leading the review team to conclude that significant revitalization is required across the Union if it is to fully achieve its potential and remain a relevant and financially viable organization into the future.

Many of the issues raised by this review are not new to IUCN. They have been raised repeatedly in various reviews, evaluations and strategy documents over the recent past. Consequently this review has also focused on the key underlying constraints to change. IUCN has a strong base of support and much commitment to its cause, yet there is also a potentially damaging level of frustration emerging. The coming Intersessional Programme will be a critical period for IUCN to demonstrate that it can change and that it can deliver on its full potential. The areas where change is most needed are identified below.

IUCN is a membership organization. Members want to see IUCN doing more convening and strategic influencing work that involves them. To do this IUCN needs to utilize its resources in a different way and have more resources for membership support and strategic influencing. The current project model makes this difficult. Currently IUCN's key organizational systems like ICT, MIS, M&E and knowledge management as well as some of its staff capacities are weak for a global organization with major influencing, knowledge brokering and communications functions. Over the recent past the leadership of IUCN, its funding model and its management structure and processes have not enabled IUCN to escape a vicious circle of taking on projects to support the secretariat to undertake more projects.

initiatives in different areas and transformation processes, in the Commissions and in the secretariat.

There are cracks in the Union. They produce difficulties in coordination, competition over resources and poor communication across and within the three pillars. One of the most fundamental and exciting challenges facing IUCN is rethinking how to revitalize the Union in a world of globalization, new forms of social networking, and competing demands on the resources which are the lifeblood of IUCN – volunteers, networks, highly professional staff, the attention of governments, and the resources contributed by members and donors. Council needs to understand the changes in the external and internal environments of IUCN and provide leadership to the Union.

What is reasonable to expect from a governing body that is composed of volunteer Council members that comes together infrequently and cannot be expected to know the Programme or organization in detail? Council needs to consider if there is a gap between governance supply and demand and if so, how it might be bridged. The review has suggested Task Forces of Council that might include Council members, staff and outside experts. The important issue to resolve is how to ensure that the Union has the strong governa

Investing in core capacities

The review has noted that IUCN has neither sufficient resources nor the appropriate targeting of existing resources to make the necessary investments in core organizational capacities that are essential for it to be a relevant and effective organization into the future. Over the coming period IUCN must significantly increase its investments in core capacities such as: knowledge management, management information systems, communications; staff development; Commission support; strategic influencing; performance assessment and monitoring and evaluation. IUCN should focus on overcoming what appears to be a vicious cycle of under-resourcing its critical systems that seems to be one of the reasons for the Union's inability to respond adequately to strategic issues that have been repeatedly raised by previous reviews and evaluations.

The review fully endorses the work that is currently going into transforming IUCN's management information systems and the introduction of the enterprise resource planning (ERP) system. It has also noted the constructive communication within the secretariat about these developments and the intention to drive the process through representative working groups. It is a concern that the resources necessary to implement this proposed transformation have not yet been fully secured.

To improve IUCN's core organizational capacities will require considerable attention and time input from staff. It will also require a cultural change in the organization in terms of staff's willingness to support and utilize corporate wide systems and procedures.

Leadership and change management

IUCN undertakes analysis and seeks evidence to guide and support what it does and how it does it. It is less effective in putting plans and recommendations into action. IUCN is involved in many reviews and planning exercises across different parts of the Union and at all levels in the lead-up to the WCC in 2008 and the start of the next Intersessional Programme in 2009. Despite good intentions, the history of IUCN has until now been too much characterized by reviews that produce repeated recommendations that are not followed up; policies that exist more on paper than in reality; and targets that are not adequately monitored to see if they are achieved.

The timeframe for effective planning for the next Intersessional Period is so short that planning processes that should be sequential and build logically from one step to the next are taking place more or less simultaneously without sufficient interaction to inform one another. Strategies like the Membership Strategy and Commissions' mandates all need to be framed by a major

List of Tables

- Table 3.1 Main review findings on IUCN Members
- Table 3.2 Main review findings on Linking Conservation and Poverty Alleviation
- Table 3.3 Main review findings on Linking Policy Between Scales

Acronyms and Abbreviations

BRAO Western Africa Regional Office

CPRI fo(412 19()-0.0123.06591(o)-5 68L.344' 10.62 TL ()o9()-0.012n34494(f)-3 .10062 o9()-0.01201252(412

Acknowledgements

This External Review has only been made possible through the time generously made available to

Four, IUCN has a very wide base of support, an extremely impressive record of achievements and a generally highly dedicated set of members, commission members and secretariat staff. Important changes have occurred over recent years and the new Director General has made clear her commitment to enabling and supporting an open and constructive reform agenda. There is every reason to believe that the conditions are right for IUCN to reshape itself to better achieve its undisputed potential as a unique organization for conservation and sustainable development.

1.2 Scope and Objectives of the Review

IUCN and its core framework donors jointly commissioned the external reviews with the main purpose of improving the design and delivery of the IUCN Programme. Framework donors also use the reviews to obtain evidence on the value for money that IUCN delivers with their support. The review is intended to be forward looking and to examine a few topics in depth rather than attempt to investigate the breadth of the entire IUCN Programme. It is timed to assist donors to consider their future support to IUCN for the period 2009-2012 and to assist the Director General and Council to develop future strategy and action for the next Intersessional Period.

The three main topics selected by IUCN and the Framework Donors for the External Review 2007 are:

- Objective 1 The value IUCN adds to its Members, particularly in the South (Volume 2)
- Objective 2 Linking conservation to livelihoods in Africa (Annex 1 to this volume)
- Objective 3 Closing the Policy-Practice Loop: with a thematic focus on the Water Programme and the Global Marine Programme (Annex 2 to this volume)

In examining the three topics, the review team identified some common problems in the governance and management of IUCN that are reducing IUCN's performance in each review area. The review team encountered widespread concern and frustration expressed by staff about the functioning of the secretariat. At the request of the Director General and with the agreement of the Framework Donors, the review team agreed to also address some of the major issues facing IUCN that cut across the three topic areas of the review. In hindsight the review team believes that these broader organizational issues should have been in the original terms of reference, for they lie at the heart of IUCN's ability to perform well as a membership organization and to effectively deliver its programme.

These broader organizational issues are the focus of this synthesis report. We see them as more fundamental and difficult challenges for IUCN that are impediments to IUCN's continued good performance. If these challenges are not dealt with, changes to strategies to deal with membership, linking conservation to livelihoods and making the policy-practice loop work will

valuable work and achievements. Rather, they are about how to value add to and capitalize on this work in ways that harness the full strength of the Union.

Some of the highlights noted by the review and related to its terms of reference include:

Scope and engagement of global programmes: The Global Marine and Water Programmes are both undertaking a diverse range of initiatives on well targeted at priority issues working from local to global levels. They are very well networked in their field and are working creatively to combine knowledge products, tools kits, capacity development and influencing work in ways to effect structural change. Both programmes are working albeit in different ways and with varying successes to improve the linkages between regional

Why do reviews of IUCN find the same problems as reviewers have before them? Are the problems themselves intractable? Is IUCN weak as a learning organization? Is it a problem of lack of resources? Is it a matter of leadership or a lack of consensus on the way forward?

It is true that the problems are difficult and their resolution requires resources that are not already budgeted. But with a reordering of priorities, resources can and should be shifted to make progress on problems that have been repeatedly identified (and accepted by management) as major impediments to performance. Monitoring and evaluation reporting is still weak in IUCN which reduces its effectiveness as a learning organization. But the underlying problem appears to have been one of weak systems for assuring governance and management accountability. Council has not required clear and regular reports from management on the follow-up to the main organizational reviews required by the statutes and donors. Senior management has not required timely reports on the follow-up, nor ensured that whatever resources are needed are provided for in the secretariat budget and work-plans. We will return to these questions in sections 4 and 5.

There are major costs to IUCN of failing to act on recommended changes. The main cost is not that IUCN is investing in reviews that will identify problems that are already well known. It is not that IUCN is falling behind other organizations in some key areas, although both are real costs. It is that IUCN stakeholders - including Council members, members, and staff - get discouraged when they see too little change to remedy widely known and long-standing problems, for some of which IUCN already has strategies in place. It is in this context that the leadership of the Director General for strengthening IUCN and initiating a change management process for the Secretariat as well as her commitment to making necessary changes, that are so important.³ Among the positive changes proposed are strengthening of the support provided to members and Commissions from the secretariat, strengthening the support for learning and leadership, and more support to governance.

³ Julia Marton-Lefevre, 2007, Strengthening IUCN: De

6 Organizational systems and operational procedures within the Secretariat need to change if

actual loss of a member, opportunities are missed to reach more people within the member organization.

3.2 Objective 2: Linking conservation to livelihoods in Africa

For Objective 2 the review team assessed IUCN's programme delivery in building the case for linking conservation to livelihoods in Africa. The review examined the scope of work, its relevance, the delivery of benefits for conservation and poverty reduction, how purposeful IUCN is in designing projects that link poverty and conservation, and how well it scales up and transfers lessons.

A critical question raised by the review is where should IUCN focus, given its value proposition, to improve the linkages between conservation and poverty alleviation. The view of many IUCN members and secretariat staff, which is supported by the review team, is that more attention could be given to creating the enabling environment for conservation issues to be more integrated into poverty alleviation and other development projects. This would require IUCN to be more active at the national policy level, and to engage actively with development financing institutions and implementing agencies. In the policy arena sector development plans and poverty reduction strategy plans are examples of potentially important points of engagement. However, this sort of engagement would require a different funding model and a willingness by donors to fund IUCN for strategic influencing work in place of the current emphasis on field implementation. The work with Parliamentarians in West Africa, the Parliamentarians' visit to the Mt Elgon Project and the directors of conservation meetings in East Africa, together with projects such as the Southern Africa Biodiversity Support Programme, are good examples of what IUCN could be doing on a wider scale.

IUCN could potentially strengthen its conservation and poverty work by establishing more and closer partnerships with development organisations. Three benefits could arise from this. One, strengthening the expertise needed for designing and implementing direct poverty alleviation interventions. Two, it would achieve greater integration of conservation issues into the work of development organisations. Three, expanding the experience base on which to draw lessons about conservation poverty links.

While recognising that IUCN is heavily funded through ODA resources, the review considers that donors should be realistic in their expectations of IUCN. The implementation of large scale direct poverty alleviation projects is clearly not core business for IUCN, nor does it have the expertise. Yet clearly the conservation issue is central and fundamental to poverty alleviation. The challenge for donors and IUCN is to ensure the right niche, focus and set of partnerships to optimise IUCN's value added contribution to a sustainable livelihoods approach to poverty alleviation.

In 2005 IUCN launched the Conservation for Poverty Reduction Initiative (CPRI) which clearly positions IUCN in relation to the Millennium Development Goals. A target of USD 300 million was established for this initiative. It is not clear what progress has been made or if it is an intention that is still to be acted on. The project part of the web-site dealing with the initiative remains under construction. However, the new Livelihoods and landscapes and Mangroves for the Future programmes respond to many of the issues and opportunities raised by this review. These will be very important models for IUCN in the future, and deserve considerable management support to ensure effective implementation.

Reflections sIU-3.146.270.296435(ii)-3.06591(s)6.75214()-1a de 90.295063(o)-5(r)1.34494()-(i)-3.06552b9TJ -2305

that IUCN's only strategy on policy is focussed ent

from field projects, and the design of programmes and projects and coherence across the Union. It is too often not clear what is to be learned about what in order to influence what. This raises the importance of giving more attention in IUCN to the *theories of change* that underpin its intervention strategies.

The review concludes that the entire assumption about the direct relevance between IUCN's overall project portfolio and specific policy influencing initiatives needs to be more closely questioned. The project portfolio, particularly at the regional level has often developed as a result of donor interests and priorities for particular countries and regions. Historically there has been limited effort to identify and develop regional projects that would directly support global policy initiatives. With initiatives such as Livelihoods and landscapes and the Water and Nature Initiative this is now beginning to change. Further, the assumption that the information needed for policy influencing could or should come predominantly from IUCN's field projects seems very questionable. Clearly there is a much wider set of experiences that IUCN should presumably be drawing on in building its resources for strategic influencing.

From members and secretariat staff there was universal consensus that IUCN could be taking a stronger role in policy/strategic influencing at national and regional scales and that at these scales its convening function was being underutilised. Four main reasons for this were commonly expressed. One, there is a lack of resources for doing this work. Two, the portfolio of projects remains too focused on field implementation at the expense of strategic influencing. Three, the secretariat has an inadequate skill set to fully support a more substantial programme of strategic influencing work. Four, there is insufficient engagement between members, national committees and the secretariat on strategic influencing issues.

Weak monitoring and evaluation and knowledge management systems were universally recognised as a constraint to effectively learning from projects and being able to widely share lessons. This is not simply in terms of the ICT backbone and the weak management information system, although both are certainly an issue. Rather it is the lack of the human organization systems, and the resources to support them, to bring people from across the Union together to reflect on experiences, establish learning agendas and to jointly undertake action-learning initiatives. For example, the review team was struck by how infrequently staff from the different

4.

- Council is not requiring management to provide the kind of reporting on progress in implementing strategies and follow-up to recommendations by reviews that it needs to carry out its oversight function. This includes the follow-up to the External Review 2003 – many of whose recommendations are repeated here because of inadequate follow-up. Council receives a large amount of documentation from the secretariat and it does not need more, but it probably needs different reporting to help Council members to focus on those areas where oversight is most needed. An effective accountability framework for IUCN must start at the top – that is, at Council and senior management level.
- Strategic leadership is needed from Council now more than ever. IUCN is facing serious challenges and is responding with new strategic initiatives in different areas and transformation processes, in the Commissions and in the secretariat. A new Strategy for the Union is being developed. Strategic oversight by Council is essential to ensure that these various strategic initiatives are mutually consistent and supportive and in line with Council's vision.
- There are cracks in the Union. They produce difficulties in coordination, competition over resources and poor communication across and within the three pillars. One of the most fundamental and exciting challenges facing IUCN is rethinking how to revitalize the Union in a world of globalization, new forms of social networking, and competing demands on the resources which are the lifeblood of IUCN – volunteers, networks, highly professional staff, the attention of governments, and the resources contributed by members and donors. Council needs to understand the changes in the external and internal environments of IUCN and provide leadership to the Union.

What is reasonable to expect from a governing body that is composed of volunteer Council members that comes together infrequently and cannot be expected to know the Programme or organization in detail? What does IUCN need in terms of oversight and leadership from Council as it goes forward? Council needs to consider if there is a gap between governance supply and demand and if so, how it might be bridged. The review has suggested Task Forces of Council that might include Council members, staff and outside experts. The important issue to resolve is how to ensure that the Union has the strong governance that most observers say it clearly needs.

4.2 Changing external environment

IUCN is operating in a fast-moving environment, not only with respect to the escalating scale and complexity of environmental changes but in the organizational environment in which IUCN does its work. If the work to be done is ever more urgent and challenging, so too is the need for IUCN to be able to evolve and adapt itself to changing circumstances. And most observers inside and outside of IUCN see the Union as too unwieldy to lead in new directions and slow to change even when change is widely recognized as needed. One of the main reasons is that IUCN has grown to be very large f

a

through central budget support reinforces the reality that accessing development funding is much more complicated and time-consuming than it was ten years ago.

4.3 Resource constraints and priorities

In 2006 IUCN's Secretariat income was CHF 123 million. Since 2001 total income has increased slightly from CHF 114 million. By comparison in 2006 WWF had an income of CHF 704 million and Conservation International CHF 118 million. IUCN with its global reach, regional and national offices, commissions, and its diverse and broadening portfolio of work is trying to achieve a great deal with comparatively limited resources.

IUCN derives at least 85% of its income from Overseas Development Assistance (ODA) funding through a limited number of OECD countries. Significantly approximately 73% of IUCN's income is restricted to specific ODA funded projects. Membership fees and other sources provide approximately 11% of income as unrestricted. Membership fees represent c.9% of total forecast income 2005-2008 but 66% of unrestricted income – they are equivalent to about half of the money from the Framework donors. A group of OECD donors, and very recently a private foundation, provide framework funding that in 2006 accounted for 16% of income. Historically IUCN has used a significant proportion of the framework funding for programme implementation work. Since 2001, income from all sources has increased slightly but the underlying structure of funding has not significantly changed and shows no sign of doing so in the immediate future.

The consequence of this funding structure, combined with budget choices made by management, is that IUCN is severely constrained in terms of the investments it can make in core organizational functions such as knowledge management, staff development, management systems development, membership support and commission support. As this review has observed, this constrains IUCN's capacity to engage in the strategic influencing activities that are central to achieving its mission and to its value proposition. By comparison, the annual reports of WWF and Conservation International indicate more flexible funding and considerably higher expenditure on activities and functions that underpin strategic influencing.

This overall funding situation for IUCN is well understood by management and staff and actions are being taken to try and improve the situation. This includes working to increase framework funding, diversifying the funding base, improving financial management and internal financial incentive structures, and developing a portfolio of new projects (programmes) that have greater strategic influencing potential. However, so far it is not at all clear that these developments will bring about sufficient change in the underlying resources structure and budgeting priorities to enable the urgent investments that are required in organizational capacities.

The Review Team considers that responsibility for t

dilemmas in the development sector. The donor comm

Report of the External Review of IUCN 2007

5. Recommendations

These recommendations follow the order in which the areas are discussed first, as major challenges (section 4) and then in terms of steps to overcome the challenges (section 5). This order leads to recommendations on the “what” followed by “how”. In the introduction to each

and (3) any new 'compact' between members and the Union that may be developed as part of the new IUCN Strategy 2020.

5.1.2

The present membership policy is primarily determined by the technical and operational needs of the 2005-2008 Programme; the generation of financial resources; and IUCN's global outreach, image and positioning. In practice very few members are engaged in delivering the programme and many new members 'cost' the Union more financially than the member fees they contribute.

The current emphasis on membership growth has exacerbated some of the organizational weaknesses of IUCN and needs rethinking in the light of recent developments in virtual networks, public-private-partnerships and strategic alliances. New forms of partnerships and perhaps new categories of membership or association that might also be able to include business among others need to be reconsidered if IUCN is to achieve its mission.

RECOMMENDATION 2: A NEW MEMBERSHIP STRATEGY FOR 2009-2012

COUNCIL and the DIRECTOR GENERAL should develop a new membership strategy based on consultation with the members and input from Commissions and the secretariat. The strategy should be consistent with the new IUCN Strategy 2009. Inter alia, the strategy should include:

- 2.1. The benefits and responsibilities of membership including services to be provided to members by the secretariat should be made clear so that members can better understand the value proposition of IUCN to them;
- 2.2. Targets for increasing members in different regions and categories and with different profiles should be reexamined.

5.2

influencing work – it is. However, the structure of IUCN’s donor based funding has locked too much of the organizations resources, particularly in the regions, into a field implementation mode of operation.

This is not the only constraint to a greater focus on strategic influencing. Historically, IUCN has given much attention to the biophysical and technical aspects of conservation and for this it is much respected. Its staff expertise remains very much oriented to the natural sciences with much less expertise in the economic, social and political sciences. Within the membership, the secretariat and the Commissions it is not always clear how to go about strategic influencing in this middle ground between advocacy, scientific research and field implementation. Today there

Report of the External Review of IUCN 2007

- 4.7. Ensure that regional directors or at least one other senior staff member at the regional level have high level abilities related to strategic influencing
- 4.8. Provide the regional offices with dedicated staff and resources for strategic influencing activities
- 4.9. Improve the balance in skill sets across the secretariat, to ensure greater depth in advocacy, communication, and the social sciences as part of a staff development and longer-term recruitment plan.
- 4.10. Ensure the recommendations of the Regionalization and Decentralization Review, particularly those directed at an improved regional model for the secretariat, are implemented.

5.2.3 Knowledge Management

Knowledge management and the engagement of IUCN's members, partners and target audiences in well-supported learning networks are fundamental to IUCN's strategic influencing capacity. In today's digital world it is also obviously vital that information is well organised and presented on web-based platforms. Further, a problem for many is information overload rather than lack of information. This creates an extra challenge for an organisation like IUCN to ensure its information is packaged and presented in ways appropriate to its diverse audiences so that they are timely, cost-effective and efficient.

IUCN has a long history of being a powerhouse of scientific, technical and policy publications in the conservation world. This tradition is clearly continuing and the review team has noted many excellent publications. It has also been impressed by the work being done on a diverse range of practical guides and manuals aimed at translating broad conservation objectives into on-ground action.

In 2005 IUCN produced a comprehensive and well articulated draft Knowledge Management Strategy. It established a framework for action to steer developments in IUCN's knowledge management to the year 2012. This strategy noted that in terms of knowledge management systems appropriate for the future:

The review suggests that in moving forward with knowledge management more focus be given to the processes and end-uses to which knowledge will be used. With the current emphasis, in many

5.5.

It is necessary to make a distinction between the external evaluation function and the development of monitoring and evaluation systems that are embedded in project, programme and organization processes to provide the necessary information for management, accountability, learning and organizational profiling. Within the Secretariat, the roles, responsibilities, and lines of accountability for the external evaluation, performance assessment and embedded monitoring and evaluation functions appear to require clarification and potentially some restructuring.

Clearly IUCN must be able to report to its donors and supporters on what it is doing and demonstrate what it is achieving. Despite widespread recognition of the difficulties in measuring impact, donors are increasing their requirements for more reporting on outcomes and results and are looking for evidence of impacts from the projects that they fund. For the security of its long term funding IUCN must take this issue very seriously.

RECOMMENDATION 6: STRENGTHENING THE MONITORING AND EVALUATION FUNCTION

The DIRECTOR GENERAL oversee a substantial upgrading of the secretariat's capacities, structures, procedures and resources for monitoring and evaluation processes to support learning and accountability functions and to enable reporting on the Unions activities and achievements in a synthesised and coherent manner. Specifically:

- 6.1. Conduct an internal review of the secretariat's successes and failures in institutionalising monitoring and evaluation over the last 10 years as a basis for establishing a Monitoring and Evaluation Plan for 2009-2012.
- 6.2. In the context of the well-recognised difficulties of monitoring and evaluation in the development sector, greater clarity is sought from the Framework Donors about their medium and longer term requirements.
- 6.3. The DIRECTOR GENERAL review the roles, responsibilities and reporting relationships for the corporate evaluation, performance assessment and programme monitoring functions as well as their appropriate locations within the organisational structure to ensure that needs for independence and accountability and integration are appropriate.
- 6.4. Monitoring and evaluation functions and capacities continue to be strengthened and supported in regional and thematic programmes.
- 6.5. Monitoring and evaluation systems to support the Programme 2009-2012 are carefully designed to ensure that they provide the necessary information for both accountability and learning, are realistic in terms of data entry required and can be effectively

- 6.7. Management require programme monitoring reports to make specific reference to member involvement in programme implementation and should reward staff for successful member engagement through incentive schemes such as budget allocation and performance appraisal.

5.3 Strengthening the business model

The business model refers to the way IUCN raises funding, uses its resources and internally structures its financial management. The nature of the business model impacts on financial

resourcing that seems to be one of the reasons for the Union's inability to respond adequately to strategic issues that have been repeatedly raised by previous reviews and evaluations.

The review endorses the work of the MIS Initiative and its three areas of development:

1. ERP ICT stream – focusing on the finance management needs and building the global ICT backbone of IUCN;
2. The Programme and Knowledge Management stream – to support IUCN's programme delivery;
3. Management Information System stream – providing management with the information needed for management decision-making

It has also noted the constructive communication within the secretariat about these developments and the intention to drive the process through representative working groups. It is a concern that the resources necessary to implement even the first phases of this proposed transformation have not been fully secured. It is beyond the scope of this review to make detailed comments on the appropriateness of the current strategy.

As critical as the MIS Initiative is to IUCN's overall organizational performance, it will be essential for the Secretariat to also invest in the core technological tools and human and organizational capacities that are directly related to IUCN's value proposition and its overall programme objectives. Knowledge management (learning processes and web-based information management) and staff capacities for strategic influencing are particularly critical in this regard.

To improve IUCN's core organizational capacities will require considerable attention and time input from staff. It will also need a cultural change in the organization in terms of staff's willingness to support and utilize corporate wide systems and procedures. Leadership will be essential. Given the tendency of IUCN staff to dedicate themselves to programme implementation, it will be necessary to explicitly build organizational capacity development into job descriptions, work planning and performance app

RECOMMENDATION 7: ENHANCING AND CORE CAPACITIES

The 13 projects selected as case studies for the review (see Annex 1) are good examples of nationally or regionally funded projects that are clearly more aligned with a strategic influencing agenda.

Within the Secretariat there are differing opinions on how much scope is available to change this situation given donor priorities and funding modalities. But there are good examples of funded projects for strategic influencing such as the Forest Law Enforcement and Governance work. While not underestimating the difficulties of donor funding modalities for IUCN, the review team considers that there is more, and quite possibly considerably more, scope for different types of projects to be funded nationally and regionally. Certainly in the Africa regions it is not clear that IUCN has adequately engaged with donors on this issue nor is it clear that sufficient effort has gone into formulating projects in a way that would enable greater value relative to the value proposition.

In any project implemented by IUCN there must be a fair contribution to the overhead costs of management, knowledge management, communication, staff development and monitoring and evaluation. This may be as management fees and/or as specific project activities that nevertheless enable this contribution. It is understood that the proposed enterprise resource planning system and modified internal accounting procedures will al

- 8.6. Component Programmes be asked to include in their Workplans and planning budgets for 2009-2012 more information on how (and where possible, which) members will be involved in implementation of the programme.
- 8.7. The Secretariat more proactively seek project funding from donors at the national and regional levels that is primarily focused on strategic influencing, learning, innovation and knowledge management or which include sufficient resources for these functions to be carried out.
- 8.8. The secretariat more clearly articulate its added value through convening, knowledge management and other strategic influencing activities and how this aligns with donor objectives and priorities in particular regions and countries.
- 8.9. A track record of existing projects and initiatives of a strategic influencing nature be developed to provide examples for acquisition
- 8.10. More regular bi-lateral and multi-donor meetings be held at national and regional levels to discuss and negotiate how projects can be developed that give a better fit between both donors' objectives and IUCN's added value.

5.3.3 Enhancing Donor Support

IUCN achieves a great deal with relatively limited resources, while having to manage diverse and growing expectations of the Union from its donors and members. Some of the resource challenges for IUCN are in part a direct consequence of the aid architecture. There are almost certainly opportunities for IUCN to broaden its funding base through foundations and corporate sector support. However, in the medium term it is difficult to see the backbone of IUCN's funding coming from anywhere other than development assistance donor support.

IUCN is a unique organization but also experiences unique funding challenges. It is attempting to work on a global

the new global programme, there may also be possibilities of increasing funding from other ministries and not just from development cooperation.

RECOMMENDATION 9: ENHANCING DONOR SUPPORT

Framework Donors take a more proactive role in supp

unrestricted funding. The 2005-2008 Financial Plan gives little attention to strategies or targets for alternative funding outside the traditional streams.

IUCN, particularly through its business and biodiversity initiative, has started to develop new partnerships with business. So far this has included initiatives with Shell, Holcim, and others. IUCN has also produced a strategy and operational guidelines for private sector engagement.

With the enormous power of global corporations and business as a key agent in driving change, it is difficult to imagine IUCN being effective in the future without some form of closer engagement with the private sector. The themes in the Programme 2009-2012 such as climate change and energy and poverty-alleviation cannot really be tackled without paying attention to the role of business and what factors drive its decisions and actions. In terms of poverty alleviation the current focus is very much on marke

10.3.

- 12.4. After an initial diagnostic stage, it is further suggested that the change management process should focus first on improving the operating processes and procedures. This is based on the management principle that if you have the organizational processes right they can overcome sub-optimal structures but if you don't have the processes right there is no organogram that will function optimally.
- 12.5. The DIRECTOR GENERAL should use the change management diagnostic process with other analyses to identify new skill sets needed in the secretariat and reflect these in new recruitment and job descriptions.
- 12.6. THE DIRECTOR GENERAL should put into place organizational changes and processes within the secretariat to strengthen the secretariat's capacity to improve services and communications to members as part of the change management process. Where appropriate, input should be sought from members and from others to ensure that changes are based on best practice and meet the needs and capacities of members.
- 12.7. A report on the change management process and its financial implications for 2009-2012 should be provided to Council who should also receive regular updates on progress made and remaining challenges.

6. Conclusions

To recall some of the opening words of this review: the world is facing an escalation in the loss of biodiversity and the degradation of ecosystems, with the problems now compounded by climate change. The consequences for nature and human wellbeing are dire. In such a context IUCN is precisely the type of organization that must be supported and strengthened by the international community. There is virtually universal endorsement for ‘concept’ of IUCN. It is therefore more important than ever that the Union is effective in working towards its mission.

IUCN has, and is doing valuable work in all regions. The review was able to see first-hand only a tiny fraction of the programme, policy and projects that IUCN is engaged in. Its potential as a force for good in the world is enormous. IUCN’s reach and influence if it can fully harness the power of the Union is also enormous. The weaknesses that have been identified in this review and others are impediments to a better functioning IUCN but they are all problems that are solvable.

6.1 A Proposed Plan of Action

If there is one message coming from the work of this review it is that IUCN should take stock of where it is, look at what it has learned, review its existing strategies, establish its own priorities for action and focus its efforts on making the changes needed and following through to ensure that they work.

The review has led to many recommendations dealing with the three areas for special attention and with the overarching issues. (Annex 3 provides a complete list). If there were a few key actions that are both important and immediate to do, we would propose the following four linked steps:

PRIORITY ACTION 1 - Undertake a meta-review of all the reviews and strategies IUCN has done over this Intersessional Period and produce (1) an analysis of where they are mutually supportive and where they are inconsistent; (2) rationalize the recommended actions into an integrated and streamlined Action Plan 2009-2012 that will underpin the next IUCN Strategy; (3) produce an operational/business plan with agreed priorities based on sound financial analysis and (4) assign resources and specific responsibilities for achieving the different components of the plan.

PRIORITY ACTION 2 - Develop a new Membership Policy and Strategy that can guide

seen to be extremely valuable on both sides. But these interactive processes take time and they, like field missions, must be planned in advance.

IUCN and its Framework Donors invest significantly in these reviews. To ensure that the

Appendix 1 Consolidated List of Recommendations

RECOMMENDATION 1: A NEW COMPACT WITH MEMBERS

COUNCIL and the DIRECTOR GENERAL should consider the findings of this review on

**RECOMMENDATION 6: STRENGTHENING THE MONITORING AND
EVALUATION FUNCTION**

RECOMMENDATION 11: STRATEGY AND PLANNING COHERENCE AND FOLLOW-UP

The DIRECTOR GENERAL and COUNCIL agree on a clear hierarchy and coherence of strategy and planning documents that include a long term strategy, the Intersessional Programme, and rolling business plans and organisational development plans.

RECOMMENDATION 12: CHANGE MANAGEMENT

The DIRECTOR GENERAL establish and lead a change management process that will make an overall diagnosis and analysis of the problems in the Secretariat; will identify the needed changes