

IUCN

GLOBAL PROGRAMME TEAM

FOREST CONSERVATION PROGRAMME

**FOREST CONSERVATION PROGRAMME
REVIEW REPORT**

Prepared by the IUCN FCP Review Team:

Alejandro C. Imbach, Team Leader

FOREST CONSERVATION PROGRAMME REVIEW REPORT

SUMMARY OF REVIEW FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

A Programmatic Review of the IUCN Forest Conservation Programme (FCP) and the overall IUCN Forest Team (FCP and the IUCN Regional Forest Programmes) was carried out between April and July 2007. The Review included visits and interviews to the IUCN HQ and seven Regional Offices. The Review Team consisted of Hosny El-Lakany, Nicholas Ng

c. *Having established these limitations, it is also*

The Forest Team

- a. *The Forest Team has a long and productive history and it is an enthusiastic and committed group*
- b. *In the last few years there has been a reduction in the physical presence of FCP staff in the regions, and a decrease in the regular meetings of the Team. The reasons given by FCP for that situation is that FCP engagement in the regions has shifted from one of trying to serve all regions generally to other that is more (ruthlessly) prioritized from the perspective of “where we should be (Brazil, China, Indonesia, etc) and what we should be doing “(FLEG, FLR, etc). As a consequence, BRAO has benefited more from FCP presence and support as has China, Brazil and BRAC. This also means that other areas have suffered - SUR outside Brazil and ROSA (in this last case also because they did not make the RFC staff investments required). There is a clear consensus among the RFPs about the significant importance of getting back both physical presence and regular Team meetings.*
- c. *The LLS implementation brings new challenges to the Forest Team. The first one is about strengthening and extending the Team, the second is about using properly the Knowledge Management and Communications components of LLS to strengthen the Team (and vice versa) and the third is to fully develop the LLS potential to create a new generation of regional projects able to revitalize the RFPs.*

The Forest Team in the context of IUCN regionalization and decentralization

RECOMMENDATIONS

The recommendations of the Review Team are organized in 6 areas, and they are specifically addressed to the pertinent units

1. To IUCN and FCP Senior Management: Maintain the leadership in forest issues
 - 1.1. To maintain and enhance the leading role of FCP globally in supporting conservation of biodiversity outside Protected Areas while emphasizing their economic, social, cultural and ecological values, especially for the poor, through appropriate management
 - 1.2. Simultaneously, while being supportive to conservation of biodiversity and landscape restoration in forests outside Protected Areas, FCP management should be sensitive to new potential global paradigm shifts in this very dynamic sector, as maintaining a stable and cohesive FCP is essential for its success and the conservation of its leadership in the forest sector.
 - 1.3. To emphasize outcome-oriented activities and improve timely knowledge sharing and information exchange.
 - 1.4. To enhance collaboration with other IGO's and NGO's especially with the CPF.
2. To FCP and the Forest Team: Keep doing the good work
 - 2.1. To preserve the good perception that FCP has within and outside IUCN
 - 2.2. To preserve and enhance the leading role played in terms of the work relationships between a Global Programme and the Regional ones. Issues as strong participation, decentralized implementation, fair sharing of budgets and overheads and others are highly appreciated and are setting benchmarks in this area
 - 2.3. To maintain the priority setting processes and the consistent decisions with those priorities. Within available resources, it is hard to find significant areas for FCP to improve. Obviously there are other persons, programs and projects within IUCN that have priorities different than the FCP ones, but there is no way to ascertain that those priorities are better than the FCP ones. The good thing about FCP is that they have set priorities and they are acting accordingly; the fact that some of these priorities can be disputed is of secondary importance.
3. To FCP, LLS Coordination Unit and Regional Offices Directors: To manage adequately the risks brought by LLS to FCP and the Regional Forest Programmes
 - 3.1. The LLS Coordinator should allocate to LLS the entire time foreseen for the Project (90% of its time while keeping 10% as FCP Deputy Head) immediately. At the moment of the Review much more than 10% was allocated to FCP activities not directly related to LLS.
 - 3.2. A new person needs to be integrated into FCP to fill the gap left by the LLS Coordinator. The best alternative is to appoint a senior staff level person.
 - 3.3. LLS in Asia requires urgently a capable person dedicated to the LLS Project. Four of the eleven LLS sites are in Asia. There is neither a Coordinator of RFP in Asia nor a dedicated person to coordinate LLS. The best option is to urgently negotiate with the region to have the ELG1

4. To FCP and LLS Coordination Unit: To manage adequately the opportunities brought by LLS to FCP and the Forest Team
 - 4.1. *To use the opportunity that LLS is bringing to establish and operate a good M&E system. This has not been achieved in IUCN yet for a large Project more details in Annex 10)*
 - 4.2. *To use the opportunity that LLS is also bringing to establish a reasonably operating KM / Communications system (with emphasis in KM rather than Communications or IT), linking different types of stakeholders across geographical areas and between different levels (from local to global). If this is achieved, IUCN and FCP will benefit significantly(more details in Annex 10)*
 - 4.3. *To benefit from the opportunities that LLS is also bringing to develop capacities within IUCN regions by making use of its experts. There is a strong need to develop these capacities, particularly in those new areas addressedTjETEM brin*

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Summary of Findings and Recommendations	2
Table of Contents	7
List of Acronyms	8
1. Introduction	9
2. Objectives and Key Questions	9
3. Methodology	11
4. Review Results	13
4.1 The Forest Conservation Programme (FCP)	13
4.2 The IUCN Regional Forests Programmes (RFPs)	29
4.3 The IUCN Forest Team	34
4.4 The Forest Team experience and the IUCN decentrali- zation and regionalization process	37
5. Recommendations	43

ANNEXES (Volume 2)

Annex 1. Terms of Reference	
Annex 2. Review Matrix	
Annex 3. List of documents reviewed	
Annex 4. List of people interviewed / consulted	
Annex 5. Report on FCP Strategic Direction and Relevance	
Annex 6. FCP Project Pipeline Analysis	
Annex 7. FCP Income Analysis	
Annex 8. Arbor Vitae Newsletter Analysis	
Annex 9. List of FCP Publications	
Annex 10. Preliminary Paper 1: Analysis of LLS functions, positions and TOR	
Annex 11. Preliminary Paper 2: Analysis of LLS implementation and supervision arrangements in Asia	

ACRONYMS

ARO	IUCN Asia Regional Office
BRAO	IUCN Bureau Regionale pour la Afrique de l'Ouest
CARO	IUCN Central Africa Regional Office
CBD	Convention on Biological Diversity
CPF	Collaborative Partnership on Forests
CI	Conservation International
CIFOR	International Center for Forestry Research
EARO	IUCN Eastern Africa Regional Office
FAO	UN Food and Agriculture Organization
FCP	The IUCN Forest Conservation Programme
FLEGT	Forest Legislation, Empowerment, Governance and Trade
FLR	Forest Landscape Restoration
GEF	Global Environment Facility
ICRAF	International Center for Research on Agroforestry
ITTO	International Tropical Timber Organization
LLS	Livelihoods and Landscapes Strategy Project
MFF	Mangroves for the Future Project
ODA	Overseas Development Assistance
ORMA Office)	IUCN Oficina Regional para Mesoamerica (IUCN Mesoamerica Regional Office)
REDD	Reduced Emissions from Deforestation and Degradation
RFP	Any of the IUCN Regional Forest Programmes
ROSA	IUCN Regional Office for Southern Africa
SUR Office)	IUCN Oficina Regional para Sudamerica (IUCN South America Regional Office)
SVBC	Strengthening Voices for Better Choices Project
TNC	The Nature Conservancy
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNEP	United Nations Environmental Programme
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
UNFCCD	United Nations Framework Convention to Combat Desertification
UNFF	United Nations Forest Forum
WWF	World Wide Fund for Nature
WRI	World Resources Institute

1. INTRODUCTION

A Programmatic Review of the IUCN Forest Conservation Programme (FCP) and the overall IUCN Forest Team was carried out between April and July 2007, as part of the regular IUCN programme to review its different global and regional units.

The Review was requested by the Director of the IUCN Global Programme (Bill Jackson) and the Head of the IUCN Forest Conservation Programme (Stewart Maginnis). The organization of the evaluation was done by Alex Moiseev (IUCN Programme M&E Programme Officer). The Terms of

The specific objectives of the review are:

1.

Issues	Key Questions
Objective 4: To contextualize the experience of IUCN Forest Activities in the wider experience of IUCN Regionalization and Decentralization.	
Regionalization and Decentralization	To what extent is the experience of the Forest Team typical or atypical of IUCN experience in Regionalization and Decentralization?
	What lessons can Forest Team take from the Regionalization and Decentralization process to apply to their context?

3. METHODOLOGY

Review matrix

Using the Objectives, Evaluation Issues and Key Questions as a starting point, the first step in the review process was the development of the pertinent Review Matrix. This matrix includes:

- Review Objectives
- Issues
- Key Questions
- Sub-questions
- Indicators

Stage 3. Finally all members of the Review Team exchanged partial reports and came together for a final meeting at IUCN HQ to articulate the different findings and recommendations. Immediately after, the Review debriefing meeting took place at IUCN HQ. There were two debriefing sessions: the first for the senior staff who commissioned the Review and the second for the FCP staff. Their inputs were taken into consideration for the preparation of this Report.

Sources of Information

The sources of information for the Review were basically three:

1. Documents from IUCN, IUCN FCP, IUCN Regional Forest Programmes and Projects and other documents. The list of reviewed documents is included as Annex 3 of this Report.
2. Interviews to IUCN staff (at IUCN HQ and regions), partners and other stakeholders. The list of interviewed people is included as Annex 4.
3. Mandates and Work Programmes of various IGO's and NGO's addressing forestry issues.

Information analysis and results

The Programmatic Review was basically an expert assessment of the situation and overall performance of FCP and its relationships with the general Forest team, including an analysis of the Regional Forest Programme in the aspects affecting FCP.

As an expert assessment, it was not based in the quantitative analysis of surveys, questionnaires or other data gathering instruments, but in the expert integration and assessment of the information gathered from the different sources.

As one of the objectives of the Review was the provision of feedback and recommendations to the FCP Senior Management and other Senior Staff about emerging problems and opportunities to improve the Forest Team performance (particularly FCP), two Preliminary Papers addressing urgent emerging issues and specific requests were prepared and delivered during the Review process. The rationale for this procedure was the need to provide urgent and formal feedback to Senior Managers without waiting for the completion of the formal Review process. These Preliminary Papers are presented at the Results part of this Report and included as Annexes.

4. REVIEW RESULTS

The presentation of results is divided in four parts:

- 1.

All mentioned aspects, and a few other ones were included in this review of FCP. The results of

According to the IUCN Forest Conservation Program for the Intersessional period 2005- 2008 the FCP mission was stated as: “in line with the global IUCN mission is to influence, encourage and assist societies throughout the world to conserve biodiversity in forest and tree-dominated landscapes and ensure that the use of forest resources is equitable and ecologically sustainable”. The document was intended to provide the program with a clear and comprehensive long-term direction for safeguarding the world’s forest and is, as such, expected to remain relevant for many years to come.

The strategic 2005 - 2008 program identified the following priorities:

- The need for workable strategies that value and conserve forest biodiversity,
- Ensuring forest conservation contributes to a just and equitable world and
- Ensuring conservation interventions leverage significant changes.

In trying to identify a niche for FCP, the 2005 - 2008 programme further stated that in every respect, in terms of the status, threats and opportunities, the figures associated with forests are huge. FCP resolved therefore, to build its engagement strategy on encouraging key stakeholders to modify their behaviour in such a way as to deliver long-term and equitable conservation. This concept has guided this part of the review.

In line with the global IUCN mission and vision, consistent with its strategic and operational

in forest and forest conservation issues (perhaps with the exception of illegal logging). Public awareness of, and interest in, forest loss and degradation has also sharply declined from where it stood at the end of the 1990s. Most international dialogues on forests move along in fits and starts and have experienced widespread disillusionment among Civil Society who believe that the will is not there among governments to find tangible and constructive ways out.

Cognizant of that dilemma, IUCN\FCP tried to respond to the evolving global priorities. The six objectives and associated twenty-seven "Results or Outcomes" cover a wide spectrum of forest conservation and related activities. It is clear that the programme has responded to paradigm shifts in global forestry from conservation per se to management of protected areas, ecosystem management and sustainable forest management.

As important as that, by the year 2000 FCP developed and applied what they called "the green thread" approach. At that moment FCP took the decision not to follow events (forums, congresses, etc.) but to take an issues driven approach to policy work focusing on specific issues as forest landscape restoration, governance, and others presented later. The green thread approach has had two main consequences:

1. Unlike other international NGOs, IUCN-FCP did not walk away from international policy meetings but did become much more selective on only investing in those where it could contribute something significant - e.g. FLR / FLEG /Poverty and Conservation. That decision meant (controversially in IUCN internal terms) spending more time in UNFF/ITTO/CPF and less at the CBD.
2. While still investing in international policy the "green thread approach" also means that FCP significantly shifted the balance from global processes to supporting national and regional processes where they find better likelihood to contribute to effective progress.

By the end of 2005, FCP has progressed in the implementing of the “green thread approach” and

By 2006, IUCN/FCP had undergone an evolution in all its programmatic directions from conservation of biological diversity in “protected areas”, to landscape restoration, to livelihood and landscape strategies, that recognizes the absolute necessity of integrating conservation into productive landscape for the benefit of society, especially the rural poor.

Analysis of other key institutional players

A brief analysis of the key global organizations dealing with forestry issues was undertaken and it is presented in Annex 5. The organizations considered were:

- CIFOR
- ICRAF
- World Bank
- GEF
- FAO
- ITTO
- UNFF
- UNEP
- Post-UNCED Conventions (Biodiversity, Climate Change and Desertification)
- International NGOs (WWF, TNC, CI, WRI)

Examining the mandates, priorities and strategies of several allied international and regional bodies reveals that the programme of work and the programmatic directions of IUCN/FCP are in line with trends prevailing in the sector in general. The clear shift from traditional biodiversity conservation towards sustainable management beyond protected areas for multiple functions and benefits is globally dominant at present as far as research, development and financing are concerned. A significant development in IUCN’s policy has been prompted by the fact that FCP is more convinced now that the main threat to the rich resources of biodiversity in the forest is not logging; but rather the insatiable hunger for land needed to meet the world’s expanding demands for palm oil, soy beans, rubber and other tropical crops, or at times by large-scale infrastructure development such as road building and mining.

The current overarching objectives of comparable programs around the world is to enhance livelihood by contributing to improved policies and practices related to the management and use of forests and forested land coupled with special emphasis on policies governing other sectors which have impact on forests. The holistic linkages between livelihood and sustainability, of which conservation of biological diversity is an integral component are now high on the global agenda, and FCP can justifiably claim leadership as it is in the fore front in this connection.

This trend has been developed and to some extent implemented in response to having poverty reduction occupying a prominent position in MDGs. FCP, which started \cfc li

4.1.2 FCP Management

The management of the Forest Conservation Programme has been analyzed from the following perspectives:

- Programme development
- Budget management
- Staffing
- Networking
- Policy making
- Communications and knowledge management
- Leadership

Programme Development

FCP has a long history in IUCN, being among the first Global Programmes that developed joint activities with IUCN regions, long before the beginning of the IUCN regionalization and decentralization process.

Through this 20-year long process, some of the key milestones in the development of the Programme were:

- The creation of the Programme and the establishment of the Forest Conservation Advisory Group (late 80s)
- The beginning of joint work with the IUCN Regions that started in the late 80s and continued until today. During this long period the joint work has also evolved, to the point that today there are global Projects designed and negotiated by FCP that are being implemented by regional Programmes (e.g. the Strengthening Voices for Better Choices Project that is implemented by the Asia Regional Office)
- Agreement with WWF (Forest for Life Strategy and Arbor Vitae) (late 90s)
- The conceptualization work on Poverty and Conservation (2002-3)
- The development of the concept and methods for Forest Landscape Restoration - FLR (2002)
- The development of work on Forest Governance linked to the FLEG and AFLEG processes and the SVBC Project (2004-5)
- Livelihoods and Landscapes Strategy - LLS (2006-7)

While the previous paragraphs emphasize some key elements in the history of the FCP development, an analysis of the Project Pipeline (ABC list) since 2003 shows a clear path towards Programme consolidation in terms of broadening programmatic scope and reach as well as of budget growth and stability. This analysis can be consulted in Annex 6.

Having said that, it can also be noted that during the long LLS negotiation and approval process the non-LLS portfolio shrunk and that FCP is now (at the time of the Review) doing significant efforts to rebuild its project pipeline while starting LLS implementation.

Obviously, as the Programme developed the links and joint work with Member organizations and Commission experts also increased.

Budget management

Budget management is an essential issue in the review of any IUCN unit given the high reliance of the organization in Project funding, particularly at the level of Regional Offices and Programmes where usually more than 80% of the income comes from Project overheads and staff time charges. It is also essential for the overall Union whose capacity to absorb and write-off deficits is very limited given its structure and funding realities.

In terms of budget management FCP has a good and consistent record of on-target spending. Budget management was consistent with Programme development, so as Programme grew so did budget allowing for staff increases and building reserves. These reserves allowed for pursuing and negotiating larger initiatives as LLS, FLEG and SVBC (in fact, during 2006, the last year of LLS development and negotiation, FCP drew on its reserves to maintain the process while avoiding deficits).

A brief analysis of FCP income analysis is included as Annex 7, providing additional information about this issue.

One additional and relevant point in terms of budget management is that FCP has invested its resources to support the work at Regional Offices. Until recently most of IUCN RFPs receive an earmarked core contribution during the IUCN budget process. This contribution had its origins in the core contribution that FCP received a few years ago and that it shared with different RFPs as a way to support and develop forest conservation related work around the world. Changes in the management of core funds that came with the negotiation of IUCN Programme support with different donors led later to the pooling of all core resources into a single fund. But the original contributions to RFPs still exist in the form of funds allocated to them from the unrestricted core funds. At this point it is necessary to say that the mentioned pooling of resources also led to a reduction in the amount of core funds received by the RFPs, as the core funds are assigned to the Regional Offices and then redistributed there by the Regional Directors (or other structures delegated by them) who, facing different funding needs and urgencies, have finally reduced the amount of resources originally assigned to RFPs. These cuts can be very significant depending on the overall deficit/surplus situation of the specific office.

Other related aspect of budget management is the way in which FCP share budgets and overheads with the Regional Offices and RFPs (even when current overheads are considered as

FCP staff is composed as follows:

- FCP Head
- FCP Deputy Head (now shifted 80% to LLS Coordination)
- Senior Scientific Adviser (part-time, shared with LLS)
- Two Programme Officers
- Administrative Officer
- Secretary
- Communications officer (shared with LLS)
- Interns (one at the moment)
- Regular Consultants

A basic staffing analysis shows that, within available financial resources, the FCP staffing seems reasonably good. Perhaps a minor comment may be that while there is a good base of young professionals there is a notable scarcity of mid-level managers (just one person). In the future, and as it has happened in many other IUCN global and regional units, this second-tier weaknesses translate later in problems when senior staff retires, shift to other positions within the organization or moves to other organizations.

The second-tier weaknesses can be addressed either by hiring staff or by investing in developing junior staff skills or both. In the case of junior staff development, this requires a clear strategy and continuous supervision and monitoring in order to ensure a career development process. This strategy should be developed and implemented in close cooperation with the Human Resources Unit.

that most probably neither they nor FCP are going to be able to add more collaborative work under the current system of institutional incentives.

The second aspect is that FCP has not prioritized the joint work with other Global Programmes, so despite the eventual contacts, the good perceptions and the recognition that more can be done, there is not much additional interaction to show. As mentioned before, this situation is due to the restricted financial resources and the prioritization made by FCP. It should also be mentioned that this situation is not happening just with FCP, but it is the regular one regarding the IUCN Global Programmes who, in general, work in isolation. This situation is stated as a fact and not as a positive or negative judgment, and it surely responds to the different positive and negative institutional incentives regarding joint work between Global Programmes that were not analyzed further in this Review.

- IUCN Members

FCP has an explicit policy to engage with member organization throughout the world related to forestry conservation work. As part of this policy, FCP has a Programme Officer dedicated part-time to member engagement activities. This assignation is relatively recent and there is some progress in the attempts to engage with IUCN members.

The initiative is commendable and should be continued and intensified as financial resources allow for that. Moreover, the articulation between networking with members and the communications and knowledge management activities (see next section) should be intensified as these last two develop more intensively as part of the LLS activities linked with FCP.

- Regional Forest Programmes (RFPs)

While this aspect is addressed at Section 4.3: The Forest Team, the situation can be summarized in terms of need of additional presence in Latin America and Asia and the revitalization of the regular Forest Team meetings. RFPs recognize the efforts of FCP to support them but they also find that more efforts are needed. There are large expectations about the potential of LLS to help filling these gaps.

Externally, FCP is linked to different formal and non-formal networks related to forest conservation and management issues. As in other cases, there is space and demand for FCP to engage more intensively and extensively in external networking, but the current priorities cannot be expanded until other urgent priorities such as putting in place adequate management structures for Climate Change and LLS are completed and staff time is freed to undertake new tasks.

Policy making

Many of the issues related to policy were already presented in Section 4.1.1 Strategic direction of the Programme. Therefore, this section will just summarize the key points.

As also mentioned in other management areas, FCP is actively working in global policy making but has set clear priorities about its engagement. Currently the basic priorities regarding policy are ITTO, UN Forest Forum (UNFF), the CPF (Collaborative Partnership of Forests) and the regional FLEGT (Forest Law, Empowerment, Governance and Trade). Recently the FCP played a significant role in the design of the World Bank Forest Policy.

There is close collaboration with ITTO since 2000. Currently, there is joint work regarding the Guidelines for Biodiversity Conservation in production forests, that were developed by FCP at ITTO request and that are currently being tested in several countries.

FCP also is active with UNFF before 2000. The FCP action was significant at this level, to the point that at UNFF5 the three Ministerial Roundtables at UNFF were about issues flagged by FCP: Poverty, FLEGT and Forest Landscape Restoration. As a complementing activity to the ones with UNFF, FCP is an active partner of CPF (Collaborative Partnership on Forests) with other 13 international organizations such as GEF, CIFOR, World Bank, ITTO, IUFRO, UNFF, UNFCCC, UNFCCC, UNEP, ICRAF and others).

There is an explicit decision from FCP about not to prioritize participation in the CBD process and meetings due to the need to prioritize efforts given limited resources, and also a view about the CBD scope expanding too much on forest issues and losing focus and, consequently, effectiveness.

There are potential and expectations for FCP involvement in other spaces (such as CBD) where IUCN plays a significant role as an organization. This may happen when new resources are negotiated or staff time is freed to allow for broader priorities.

Communications and Knowledge management

As in other areas, this one is considered as well managed within available financial resources, and there was also a prioritization of efforts.

One prioritized area was the publication and distribution of Arbor Vitae, The IUCN / WWF Forest Conservation Newsletter. Arbor Vitae is part of the joint products coming from the IUCN / WWF joint work on forest conservation issues. Over the years, FCP has taken a larger responsibility on the production of Arbor Vitae and the newsletter has been refocused and redesigned, shifting from a format based on the dissemination of diverse news towards other format where the articles are focused on a specific theme that changes from issue to issue.

A brief analysis of the contents and contributors to Arbor Vitae (included as Annex 8) shows a remarkable presence of articles from partners and from IUCN regional staff, showing the FCP effort to make Arbor Vitae an expression of the overall Forest Team including external partners.

Moreover, Arbor Vitae was recently reviewed achieving very positive results in terms of reach, usefulness and readers interest, as shown in the summary included in Annex 8.

In terms of publications, the complete list is significant (close to 120 titles until mid-2005) as shown in Annex 9. In the last few years there was a shift towards the production of commercial books and three important titles were produced over the last few years:

- SAYER, J.; MAGINNIS, S. (eds) 2005. Forests in landscapes. Ecosystems approaches to sustainability. London, Earthscan. 256 p.
- SAYER, J. (ed) 2005. The Earthscan Reader on Forestry & Development. London, Earthscan. 434 p.
-

A publication deserving to be mentioned specifically is the book on Conservation and poverty that presented the conceptual approach emerging from IUCN FCP experiences and lead into the landscapes and livelihoods approach. This publication was influential throughout IUCN and other organizations; its complete

Having established these limitations, it is also necessary to recognize the efforts of the FCP management to set priorities and to maintain them in spite of complains and pressures to do other things. It is very difficult to assess what the right priorities are as they depend significantly on the perceptions and experience of the managers who made the prioritization; moreover, any prioritization is always accompanied by the unhappy claims of those who were not prioritized. Therefore, the review team wished to highlight the good management practice of setting and maintaining priorities rather than a probably less useful analysis about whether or not the right priorities were established. Just for the record, the Review Team agrees with the criteria used by FCP to make their priorities.

4.1.3 The Climate Change and LLS challenges

As mentioned in the Programme Management part in the previous Section, over the last couple of years the evolution of FCP led to the engagement of the Programme in two new, additional and very large initiatives: Climate change (CC) and Livelihoods and Landscapes (LLS).

For different reasons both evolved quickly over the last year creating unexpected pressure and demands over the FCP staff and the consequent temporal loss of balance in the FCP operations. The key expression of this imbalance is the overload and overstretching affecting the FCP senior staff and the eventual risks that this overload is creating. Both cases are analyzed separately in the following sections.

- *Climate Change*

Climate change is not a new theme for IUCN. The organization had dedicated staff to this issue since the earlier years of the current decade. Given the need to find an adequate institutional niche for this theme and willing to avoid the creation of new understaffed units, the Climate change (CC) expert was integrated into the Forest Conservation Programme given the links between the early CC agenda (basically carbon sequestration, carbon trade markets and similar) and forest management and reforestation.

This situation changed dramatically over the last couple of year with the significant rise of fossil fuel prices, the overall recognition that climate change is happening, the growing obvious impact of climate change effects around the world, the subsequent fast emergence of the field of agro-fuels, bio-fuels and sustainable energy sources, the debate between mitigation and adaptation, the year 1.519 a IjETEMC /Span 4MCID 12r

Currently, this situation has not changed and its future is still not clear. There are good reasons to create a separate Climate Change Programme or unit from a management point of view, but there also good programmatic reasons to keep it within an existing Programme in order to avoid the risk of having a unit operating in isolation. Regardless of the decision, it seems evident that this area is going to grow considerably over the next few years, particularly with the strong demand from all Regional Office to have the IUCN Secretariat to engage more intensively in adaptation issues.

Therefore, if this area is going to remain with FCP there is an urgent need to strengthen its staff, as well as the staff in the Regional Offices willing to engage in this theme. It is not reasonable to assume that FCP, under its current structure and funding, is going to be able to develop a broad, relevant and successful programme on climate change.

- *Livelihoods and Landscapes Strategy Project (LLS)*

At the end of 2006 the negotiations between FCP and the Government of the Netherlands concluded successfully with the approval of the LLS Project whose implementation began in January 2007.

LLS will address four key thematic components: Poverty reduction, Governance, Landscape restoration, and Markets & Incentives. It will be field implemented in eleven geographical sites and countries as follows:

1. Upper Guinean Forest Landscapes / Ghana and Liberia
2. East and Southern African Forest Landscapes / Uganda, Tanzania and Mozambique
3. Sahelian Landscapes / Burkina Faso, Mali and Sudan
4. Congo Basin / Cameroon, Congo Brazzaville and the Central African Republic
5. African Great Lakes / Burundi, DRC and Rwanda
6. Mekong Region / Cambodia, Lao PDR, Thailand and Vietnam
7. South Asia / India
8. Western China / China
9. South-east Asia / Indonesia
10. South America / Brazil
11. Mesoamerica / México, Guatemala and El Salvador

With an overall budget of 80 million Euros (16 million contributed by the donor and 64 million to be raised as co-financing) LLS is currently the la

Opportunities

Besides the expected contribution to forest landscapes governance and restoration, LLS provides opportunities for significant expansion and improvement in key areas as:

- Monitoring & Evaluation (M&E)
- Networking (internal and external)
- Knowledge management (KM)
- Communications

These four areas are closely interlinked while serving different purposes. Monitoring and evaluation provides feedback to management at different levels on performance and impact of the different activities while serving the mandatory function of reporting to donors and IUCN. At the same time several M&E products such as lessons learned, best practices, reports and other are valuable for knowledge management and communications.

Networking is very close to co

Preliminary suggested actions

At the time of the review no major problems were actually happening. Some potential areas for problems were identified and discussed during the review. As a result, a Preliminary paper on the LLS implementing structure (Analysis of LLS functions, positions and TOR) was written and discussed during the first part of the review in May. This paper was focused on the LLS Coordination demands on senior staff time and its implications, as well as a brief analysis of the Monitoring & Evaluation and Knowledge Management functions and what they demand. This Preliminary Paper is attached as Annex 10.

Finally, but not less important, it is necessary to highlight that at the moment of the review no major problems were identified as actually taking place in LLS. What the review identified were potential areas for problems, some of them eventually in the near future; therefore and in order to contribute to the proper and timely addressing of them by the FCP and LLS managers the mentioned Preliminary papers were developed.

4.2 THE IUCN REGIONAL FOREST PROGRAMMES (RFPs)

4.2.1 Overall situation

This section is focused in the analysis of the regional units, programmes and other regional and country structures dealing with forest conservation issues, which are collectively named in this document as the Regional Forest Programmes (RFPs).

While this review was not focused in these regional programmes, the relationships between them and the FCP is a relevant part of the review. The relationship between the regional programmes and the FCP is a relevant part of the review. The relationship between the regional programmes and the FCP is a relevant part of the review.

- c. All RFPs seems to be suffering from declining budgets whose origins are mixed (changes in donor priorities, capacity constraints, changes in the allocation mechanisms of IUCN core funds, etc.). A significant change happened over the last decade by which the RFPs that used to raise their own large field projects shifted to become dependent on the large global

4.3 THE IUCN FOREST TEAM

The IUCN Forest team is a virtual team integrated by FCP, the RFPs and other experts from IUCN Commissions. It is a virtual structure because it is not included as such in the formal structures and processes in IUCN, but it is also a team because they meet more or less regularly every 18 months and keep an active traffic of emails, documents and small informal side-meetings at other events.

It is at this level that the interaction between FCP and the RFPs take place and these interactions were part of aspects reviewed during the process reported in this paper.

In overall terms, the Forest Team is the one of the oldest within the IUCN Secretariat, as it started to exist more or less at the same time of the Wetlands one in the late 1890's. Since those years the team has gone through several ups and downs but there is a good history and a good record.

A few years ago, FCP was able to provide core funds to the few RFPs operating in different Regional Offices. With the changes in the way IUCN allocated core funds a few years ago, this support was diluted and, in some cases, almost lost. This situation weakened the work of the Forest team (more details about this in Section 4.4). Moreover, the creation of new RFPs in other offices finally made almost impossible for FCP to recuperate this mechanism.

The preparation, negotiation and approval of the Strengthening Voices for Better Choices (SVBC), the first global project negotiated by FCP and given to a Regional Office (Asia) to take care of implementation strengthened the links between FCP and the RFPs in several regions. The same happened with the Poverty and Conservation project funded by IUCN AAAC Fund that linked the work of FCP with RFPs in Asia and Africa. Finally, the participatory preparation of LLS again helped to strengthen the links between the different components of the Forest Team, and it is expected that the LLS implementation will intensify this process.

Currently, and as a consequence of the activities explained before, there is a substantial level of credibility and good will towards FCP and the Forest Team in all IUCN regions. There is also a genuine level of enthusiasm about LLS and the way in which its implementation has been planned.

There are also some weak points in the internal relationships of the Forest Team. The most frequently mentioned ones are:

- The need for more physical presence of the FCP staff in some regions (particularly Latin America and Asia)
- Along the same line, the need to recuperate the regular rhythm of the Forest Team meetings. Those meetings, planned to happen every 18 months have not taken place since the last Conservation Congress in Bangkok in late 2004. The March 2007 global LLS meeting in Montreux, Switzerland, helped to fill the gap, but this was a (meeting)-7(o)1cusne

The Forest Team and the implementation of the LLS

As almost all RFPs are involved in the implementation of LLS, there are also a few challenges for the Forest Team emerging from this implementation. In the opinion of the Review Team, there are three key challenging aspects to consider.

The first challenge for the Forest Team over the next 2 years is to make additional and significant efforts to strengthen the Team at several levels. As mentioned before, LLS is an innovative initiative that is trying to take to the field a number of issues that were conceptually developed over the last few years, but whose actual implementation still needs to be tested and validated. These issues are related with the shift towards a conceptual approach that look at the links between forest biodiversity conservation and its broader context (poverty and livelihoods, governance, natural resources issues, climate change, landscape-level approach, etc.) The first obstacle in this process is the understanding of the issues, which at the moment seems uneven and incomplete across the system, including partners and other stakeholders. Therefore, an efficient system needs to be put in place to ensure not just that the issues are understood and practiced as expected but also that experiences, lessons learned, best and worst practices, etc. are captured and circulated throughout the system.

There are several ways of doing this task, and the following one is offered as a suggestion to be considered by the FCP management. It goes along a series of general steps:

1. To define and strengthen a core forest group (formal or not), bringing together the staff members from the entire Forest Team (not just FCP) who have the best understanding of the issues addressed by LLS, field experience and commitment to team work. This group should meet periodically to assess the situation and challenges of LLS, support the Coordination Unit in setting the general directions and adjustments for the entire Programme, get involved in the capacity building processes in different regions, etc.

Members of this group should be chosen, not bureaucratically appointed; in other words this should not be a representational body but a top-experts one. Because of that, the FCP senior managers have to take the leadership in this task.

2. Develop the next circle of influence by revitalizing the current Forest Team, including the core group and all other key staff and non-staff persons from both LLS and RFPs. This Team can be organized to operate by large regions (e.g. Africa, Asia & Latin America) with regular general meetings of all members. This second group, the current Forest Team, will be devoted not only to the implementation of LLS but also to the development of their own technical and managerial capacities required for the successful implementation of LLS. One of the problems mentioned when over-viewing the RFPs was the uneven skills and capacities across the Forest Team to deal with the new issues brought by LLS and FCP. Therefore, the first goal of this Team for the first couple of year is to raise knowledge and skills to the same level across the Forest team in terms of the issues addressed by LLS.
3. Develop a third circle team including partners and other stakeholders outside IUCN and the RFPs. This circle (perhaps organized by countries or sub-regions, depending on what fits best) will be mostly managed by the members of the Forest Team. Developing this third circle will provide incentives for training and learning to the Forest team members but, more important, it will bring people from organizations outside IUCN to a sphere or work and trust very close to LLS and IUCN, and it will serve as first space to be reached by the LLS efforts on both communications and knowledge management.

that situation is that FCP engagement in the regions has shifted from one of trying to serve all regions generally to other that is more (ruthlessly) prioritized from the perspective of “where we should be (Brazil, China, Indonesia, etc) and what we should be doing” (FLEG, FLR, etc). As a consequence, BRAO has benefited more from FCP presence and support as has China, Brazil and BRAC. This also means that other areas have suffered - SUR outside Brazil and ROSA (in this last case also because they did not make the RFC staff investments required). There is a clear consensus among the RFPs about the significant importance of getting back both physical presence and regular Team meetings.

- c. The LLS implementation brings new challenges to the Forest Team. The first one is about strengthening and extending the Team, the second is about using properly the Knowledge Management and Communications components of LLS to strengthen the Team (and vice versa) and the third is to fully develop the LLS potential to create a new generation of regional projects able to revitalize the RFPs.

4.4 THE FOREST TEAM EXPERIENCE AND THE IUCN DECENTRALIZATION & REGIONALIZATION PROCESS

This section is aimed to analyze how the Forest Team influences and is influenced by some general processes that shaped and still shape the entire operation of the IUCN Secretariat. Perhaps the most important of these processes is the regionalization and decentralization one, but as explained below, two other significant aspects related with this process (IUCN Intersessional Plans and the IUCN funding model) should also be included in the analysis.

While the Forest Team was established before the regionalization and decentralization process (it was not even called Forest Team at that times), IUCN has been decentralized since the early nineties, therefore the development of the Forest Team along the last decade or more is framed in the regionalization and decentralization process. This process is still evolving as demonstrated by the recent communication from the IUCN Director General about reorganizing Regional Offices over the next couple of years.

While the regionalization and decentralization process is crucial for this analysis, the role of the IUCN Intersessional Programme (IUCN IP) should not be forgotten. According to the IUCN Statutes, the IUCN Secretariat should conduce its business in terms of implementing a Programme between successive sessions of the IUCN General Assembly (hence the name Intersessional). The IUCN General assembly is now an integral part of the IUCN World Conservation Congress, organized every 4 years, therefore the IUCN IP provides priorities and guidelines for the work of the Secretariat along those 4 year periods. The IUCN shift towards a regionalized and decentralized structure also meant an increasing importance of the IUCN IP as an instrument to keep consistence and coherence across all regions and programmes.

Finally, but not less important, the evolution of the IUCN funding model over the last decade also influenced the way in which the Forest Team operates and interacts with the other components on the Union.

Based on the previous points, this Section will present first a brief analysis of the three mentioned aspects (the regionalization and decentralization process, the IUCN IP and the IUCN funding model) and then the way in which these processes interact with the Forest Team will be addressed.

The IUCN Secretariat regionalization and decentralization process

The IUCN Secretariat started with a small Secretar

benefits, Biodiversity assessment, Communications and Knowledge management and Management of the Union) and 3 Strategies (Knowledge, Empowerment and Governance). In the following IP (2005-2008) the strategies became the guiding principles and were converted in Key Result Areas. Both attempts constituted a step ahead, but none were completely satisfactory. Now, for the next IP (2009-2012) IUCN is presenting a new planning structure based on five themes (Biodiversity, Climate change, Energy, Poverty and Markets) and key specific results for each theme.

It is reasonably expected that this new theme-based structure, coupled with the large-Projects, will have a high potential to create the internal incentives leading to internal joint work within and between the different geographic and thematic units.

In the specific case of FCP and the Forest Team it is evident that the new IP provides a number of different entry points to articulate the work of different projects and different components of the same projects to larger issues such as biodiversity, climate change, energy, etc. How to use these IP thematic clusters formed by the convergence of different activities from different Programmes and units around the world remains a challenge to be addressed before the next IUCN Congress in late 2008.

Despite that, definitively there is potential for the Forest team to use this IP clusters to

fun-1(arnal)thethe ,ase to ns3 es from ith ts a(intiod)TJ0.001 Tc -0.0017 Tw7 10.9164 5-4(o ncegrow ns3envir

In ye hesledmant ante

This double process slowly strengthens the HQ based units and started to create financial constraints to the regions, leading to the situation we have today. At this point, it is useful to highlight two things: the first is

Styles of running joint global / regional activities

Currently the large Projects and initiatives operated from HQ run in two models:

a) Those that can be named as the cooperative on

5. RECOMMENDATIONS

The recommendations of the Review Team are organized in 6 areas, and they are specifically addressed to the pertinent units

1. To IUCN and FCP Senior Management: Maintain the leadership in forest issues
 - 1.1. To maintain and enhance the leading role of FCP globally in supporting conservation of biodiversity outside Protected Areas while emphasizing their economic, social, cultural and ecological values, especially for the poor, through appropriate management
 - 1.2. Simultaneously, while being supportive to conservation of biodiversity and

- 3.5. LLS in South America needs support from LLS Coordination Unit and FCP. There are less serious risks there given the fact that only one LLS site is there, but desirable scaling-out and scaling-up effects can be lost due to lack of experience, contacts, etc.
 - 3.6. Additional negotiations are needed to clarify expectations from both FCP and ORMA regarding LLS scope, reach and themes. The LLS process seems not to be enough well defined yet there.
 - 3.7. There is a need for a focal, dedicated and capable person from the LLS Coordination Unit / FCP assigned to assist the Latin America (both SUR and ORMA). This assistance is available to Africa and Asia sites. This is badly needed and it does not require a full-time position.
4. To FCP and LLS Coordination Unit: To manage adequately the opportunities brought by LLS to FCP and the Forest Team
 - 4.1. To use the opportunity that LLS is bringing to establish and operate a good M&E system. This has not been achieved in IUCN yet for a large Project more details in Annex 10)
 - 4.2. To use the opportunity that LLS is also bringing to establish a reasonably operating KM / Communications system (with emphasis in KM rather than Communications or IT), linking different types of stakeholders across geographical areas and between different levels (from local to global). If this is achieved, IUCN and FCP will benefit significantly(more details in Annex 10)
 - 4.3. To benefit from the opportunities that LLS is also bringing to develop capacities within IUCN regions by making use of its experts. There is a strong need to develop these capacities, particularly in those new areas addressed by LLS as the landscapes approaches, livelihoods, etc.
 - 4.4. To reinforce and revitalize the joint work of the Forest Team by having a more frequent physical presence of FCP staff in the RFPs and by revitalizing the Forest Team meetings
 5. To Global Programme Director and FCP. To use, and benefit from, LLS to strengthen the IUCN regionalization and decentralization process
 - 5.1. To set an internal and formal conflict resolution process. The decentralized implementation of LLS is expected to create internal conflicts. An explicit and agreed process to deal with internal conflicts and problems and to solve them should be formally established, allowing for any part to turn to it when necessary. At the moment such a process does not exist.
 - 5.2. To make all needed efforts to fight the temptation to use LLS resources in the regions to address budget deficit issues. That requires frequent and effective presence in the regions and continuous and effective supervision and joint work by the LLS Coordination Unit and other higher levels.
 - 5.3. To extend M&E and lessons learned activities to include aspects of decentralization, regionalization, conflict resolution between FCP and the regions, capacity building progress, and other issues related not just to LLS/FCP but also relevant to broader aspects of the Center/ Regions relationships.

6. To Global Programme Director and FCP. To find solutions for the Climate Change management demands on FCP
 - 6.1. To make the necessary decisions to deal with the increasing senior management time demands posed by the Climate Change unit. There are different management solutions to the problem (shifting Climate Change out of FCP, hiring new senior staff for FCP or other), and the Review Team does not think that its recommendations should be at this level.