

Review of the Implementation of the Red List Programme Agreement

Charles Lusthaus, Review Leader

January 2005



Executive Summary

Introduction

Through its Species Survival Commission (SSC), IUCN has been assessing the conservation status of species, subspecies, varieties and subpopulations on a global scale for four decades in order to identify taxa threatened by extinction and to promote their conservation. The *IUCN Red List of Threatened Species* provides taxonomic, conservation status and distribution information on taxa evaluated using the IUCN Red List Categories and Criteria. It is widely recognized as the world's most objective and authoritative assessment of species at risk of extinction. Last published in 2000 and updated in 2002 and 2003, the analysis included assessments of more than 18,000 species and showed that one in every four known mammal species and one in every eight known bird species are threatened. While the findings in 2000 were dire, the new update of the Red List, including over 38,000 species, will indicate that the state of many threatened species continues to deteriorate.

Recognizing the limitations of IUCN's financial, technical and scientific resources, four conservation organizations—BirdLife International, Conservation International (CI), NatureServe and the Ocean Conservancy¹—signed an agreement with IUCN to support the Red List Programme (RLP) in 2002.

Universalialia developed interview protocols based on the evaluation matrix to guide the work. The interview protocols are linked to the original work plan questions developed in the review matrix.

Universalialia employed content analysis techniques to review the various documents (minutes, interview notes, web documents, etc.), using the areas from the review matrix as broad themes.

Key Findings

This review has made a number of findings. Among them are:

- 1) The Red List Programme continues to need financial and technical support to meet the implementation schedule set down in its 2000 strategic plan and updated in 2004. Thus the rationale for the Agreement continues to be relevant.
- 2) The common principles, which underline the Red List Agreement, remain relevant today.
- 3) Consortium membership continues to meet the strategic interests of each of the four organizations.
- 4) While all partners agree to the Red List Programme vision, goal and objectives, some have diverging expectations with regards to the use of the Red List.
- 5) While the roles and responsibilities of the Red List Programme Committee are reasonably clear, this is not the case for the Consortium Members. It is unclear who is responsible for providing Consortium leadership and for developing a consortium model that works.
- 6) The Governance system has been able to balance the existing asymmetrical relationships within the Consortium. However, this is and will continue to be a source of concern.
- 7) There are no stated procedures for changing the Consortium Membership or for resolving Consortium disputes.
- 8) Strategic leadership is not apparent in the Consortium's work. There is no strategy or business plan to guide its work.
- 9) There is an overlap of activities between the Consortium and the Red List Programme Committee.
- 10) Consortium processes like problem solving, decision-making, risk management, conflict resolution and communication are at very early stages of evolution.
- 11) The credibility and the authority given to the IUCN Red List and its brand is a critical asset that requires protection.
- 12) The Consortium Agreement section on branding along with the draft branding policy might compromise the credibility of the IUCN Red List.
- 13) There is ambiguity among partners with regards to the recognition of contribution as well as

3. The Consortium Agreement needs to be clarified and updated:

The Red List Programme Agreement needs to be updated. While not all of these items need to be in the Agreement, it is important to clarify their meaning and include them as part of the framework by which the Consortium is governed.

Typical characteristics of a partnership agreement	Changes recommended
Clear vision and or goals of the agreement	No changes recommended
Clear statement of objectives and outcomes	We recommend that the Consortium should support the enhancement of the resources available to the Red List Programme to implement its objectives.
Clear expectations (roles and responsibilities) of the parties	We recommend that the Consortium clarify its expectations with respect to the provision of resources, fundraising and other activities. Once agreed to, there should be a review and reporting process.

The scope and identity of the

The recommended models require an understanding of both the technical as well as the managerial and operational requirements of the Consortium and the Red List Programme. Our review suggests that the managerial and operational aspects of the RL and the Consortium have not been adequately analyzed and articulated.

6. IUCN should clarify the relationship between the SIS and the Consortium:

SIS is a substantial project that has been in various stages of evolution in IUCN for the past decade. The Agreement implies that the Red List Programme Committee is responsible for overseeing the

Appendices

Appendix I Terms of Reference	30
Appendix II Stakeholders Consulted	33
Appendix III Selected Documents Reviewed	34
Appendix IV Interview Protocols	35
Appendix V Evaluation Matrix	37
Appendix VI List of Findings	39
Appendix VII Key Programmes of Partner Organizations	41
Appendix VIII The Red List Programme Agreement	44

1. Introduction

1.1 The IUCN Red List Context

Through its Species Survival Commission (SSC), IUCN has been assessing the conservation status of species, subspecies, varieties and subpopulations on a global scale for four decades in order to identify taxa threatened by extinction and to promote their conservation. The *IUCN Red List of Threatened Species* provides taxonomic, conservation status and distribution information on taxa evaluated using the IUCN Red List Categories and Criteria. This system is designed to determine the relative risk of extinction, but the Red List also includes information on other taxa, including species that are already extinct in the wild. The Red List is available in a searchable database maintained by the IUCN on its Web Site.

The IUCN Red List of Threatened Species is widely recognized as the world's most objective and authoritative assessment of species at risk of extinction. Last published in 2000, the analysis included assessments of more than 18,000 species, 11,000 of which are threatened with extinction.² It showed that one in every four known mammal species and one in every eight known bird species are

Review of the Red List Programme Agreement

Date	Key Milestones
2004	Global Amphibian Assessment completed
2004	Red List Indicators developed and published

The expansion of the taxonomic documentation was a major objective of the Red List Programme over the past Intersessional Programme period (2000-2004) and will be again in the next Intersessional period (2005-2008). Indeed, the Programme made major gains in the 1996 and 2000 Red Lists, when mammals and birds were employed as indicators to arrive at conclusions on the

- 3) To assess the benefits of the Consortium to the four Red List partners.
- 4) To document the lessons from the first years of experience with the Consortium.
- 5) To make recommendations related to the above issues for the future development, management and governance of the Red List Consortium.
- 6) To develop and test an approach and methodology for the review of partnerships that can be used in future IUCN reviews of other partnership arrangements

2. Methodology

2.1 Approach to the Review

There is growing enthusiasm in the public, private and non-profit sectors for a variety of novel inter-organizational relations, including partnerships, consortia, alliances, networks, and joint ventures. In particular, partnerships and consortia are promoted as the answer to many global challenges. However, it remains unclear whether or not these relationships actually enhance performance, and if so, how?

The assumption is that these new organizational relations will enhance results both quantitatively and qualitatively, and also result in synergistic rewards, where the outputs and outcomes of the partnership are greater than the sum of the individual partners' contributions. While a handful of studies have been done to test this assumption (cf Ellinger et al 2000, Shah and Singh 2001), most of the work in this area remains anecdotal. In short, synergistic rewards are sought, but they are rarely articulated and measured.

Reviews carried out on inter-organizational arrangements typically concentrate on results, but real change can only be promoted through a better understanding of how to improve the relevance and efficiency of the delivery of goods and services. Recent reviews in the private sector (Kaplan and Norton 2001) highlight the danger of over-emphasizing short-term benefits and ignoring important process dimensions. Outputs and outcomes are clearly important, but an awareness of the institutional arrangements, which support the development of results, is critical in making better strategic and managerial decisions.

While we understand the need to better analyze institutional arrangements that either support or detract from consortium results, there has been relatively little work done in this area. Good practice suggests that we identify and analyze the key factors that may influence the results of the partnerships. This would encompass the institutions and incentives governing the implementation of the policies and programs, including the agreement, leadership, governance, policies, formal and informal rules, resources, its operational model and programming approach.

In addition to institutional factors, personal relationships, the history, context, organizational stage of development and cultural compatibility affect the degree to which intended results are achieved. Consortia and partnerships are dynamic systems, constructed to solve significant problems that are elusive to single organizations. The programmatic and change logic inherent in these arrangements are often implicit, and the general assumptions and hypotheses that underlie these arrangements are not well known or clearly understood. They can be difficult to understand because, while a great deal of effort has gone into understanding the institutional workings of partnerships, there has been relatively little documentation of this human dimension. Consequently, it can be equally difficult to obtain reliable data on both the process and the results.

For all of their complexity, consortia, networks and partnerships have become much more important as NGOs have realized both their own limitations and those of national and international bodies. Many of the new institutional arrangements between and among organizations that have emerged are

Accordingly, this review is an assessment of the rationale, purpose, arrangements and operations of the Red List Agreement as implemented through the Consortium. Terms of Reference guided the

We visited the offices of NatureServe and Conservation International in Washington, D.C., IUCN's offices in Gland, Switzerland and met with the Cambridge based Red List Programme Secretariat staff in London.

The data collection was complemented by a document review. We sought documents from a range of sources, as well as literature on partnership evaluation from both the academic and practitioner field. These are listed in Appendix II.

2.3 Data Collection Tools, Instruments and Analysis

Universalialia developed interview protocols based on the evaluation matrix to guide the work. The interview protocols are based on the questions in the review matrix.

We employed content analysis techniques to review the various documents (minutes, interview notes, web documents, etc.), using the areas from the review matrix as broad themes.

2.4 Schedule for the Review

The sequence of activities for the review was organised as follows:

- Review matrix and work plan submitted by September 3rd
- Data collection throughout the month of September and October
- Draft report submitted on Monday October 18th
- Feedback from IUCN on Draft report scheduled for October 25th
- Final report to be submitted Monday November 1st

3. Rationale of the Consortium

3.1 Introduction

The issues facing the review with respect to the rationale of the Consortium included w-6 3

The principle purpose of the Red List Agreement was to support the implementation of the Red List Programme. In this context, one of the reasons to continue the Agreement is that the continuing need to raise resources to support the Red List Programme. We asked our interviewees if such a need remains.

In general, the rationale for the establishment of

Interviewees indicate that there has been insufficient progress to ensure a fuller representation of fresh water and marine species, and that neither invertebrates nor plants are adequately represented. Access to the data through the Species Information System remains limited and there is no widely accepted approach to creating an index of biodiversity.

In short, a considerable amount of effort and resources are required to support the achievement of the objectives of the IUCN Red List Programme as set out in the Agreement. With respect to resources, while the Agreement indicated that the four organizations would work together to secure funding, most progress in this area is linked to special projects that support one or two Consortium Member's strategic interests. The Consortium has shown little progress in joint fundraising.

Nevertheless, the Members of the Consortium still believed that their collaboration on the Red List could stimulate joint fundraising efforts:

“Joint fundraising is difficult. A couple of years ago we had a proposal that we were going to support.
ojm

to their core activities. Because of their organizational culture and conservation philosophy, these organizations are motivated to support the use of the Red List as an advocacy tool. Indeed, they would like to integrate some reference to their own methodologies within the new GSA and they note that this falls within the fourth objective of the Consortium Agreement. This has raised some concerns among Consortium Members.

RLP Committee minutes reveal that there has been an initial discussion on how the Red List should be used.⁷ While one partner mentioned that “SSC has always been careful to keep the Red List out of policy,” another suggested that conservation should be at the centre of the programme and that the Red List should be shaped to target policy outcomes and engage policy-makers. It is the opinion of one IUCN representative that adding an “advocacy spin” to the Red List Programme publications could undermine its credibility as an independent scientific and technical group. If this occurs this would subvert one of the important reasons for the Consortium Agreement.

4. Contributions and Benefits to the Red List Programme

4.1 Introduction

The Consortium's principle purpose was to “establis

contribution to the Red List Programme with its advanced data sets, multiple NGO partners, network of expert ornithologists and staff skilled in biodiversity assessment. It has been an active participant in SSC and its staff has worked on the Red List Programme Committee from its inception. BirdLife has been and remains a strong supporter of the Red List approach. Its data, along with the new

inclusion of a link to the RLP site, the development of new data-sharing agreement with SIS, fundraising for the Global Amphibian Assessment website and the production of range maps for birds and mammals in the western hemisphere. People praise NatureServe's database as the "best in North America and good South American data as well" (Interviewee 18) and hope that it will be made

Typical characteristics of a partnership agreement	Rating	Comments
Clear approach and process of implementing oversight	Fair	While oversight for the RLP Committee is clear, there is no specific oversight provision for the Consortium.
Clear Consortium model for engaging in work	Fair	Individuals work for the Consortium as required. There is no agreement among the Consortium Members on their organizational model.
Capacities and funding arrangements	Fair, but many aspects remain unclear	The Consortium Members are extremely

Finding 8: The function and purpose of the Consortium are clearly stated in the Agreement, but certain ambiguities remain with respect to how it is interpreted and implemented.

According to the Agreement, the purpose of the Consortium is “to establish a formal basis for co-operation to enhance the implementation of the Red List.” Section 11 of the Agreement elaborates on the concept of ‘co-operation’ and identifies collective fundraising as one of the Consortium’s main purposes.

As one informant stated, “monitoring the Species of the world is a huge task. Certainly bigger than anything IUCN can do. Yet this is our task and it is a good one—one which IUCN SSC and the Red List Programme Committee are well positioned to carry out” (Interview 3). From this perspective, the function of the Consortium is to bring resources to the table to support the implementation of the Red List Programme.

Some informants viewed the Consortium as just a starting point for increasing the resources to the Red List Programme. “We need the Consortium to help us think about how we are going to reach our

Roles and responsibilities of partner organizations	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Fundraising: US\$ 400,000 per year
BirdLife International	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Implementation of the Global Red List Bird Programme, with a minimum of two staff (documentation and monitoring of Bird status, data management, development of indicators, contribution to Red List Governance, collaboration to the analysis of Red List information) - Fundraising: US\$ 300,000 per year
Conservation International	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Implementation of a biodiversity assessment unit, with a minimum of three staff (support to the development of new networks of RLAs, collaboration with new RLAs for assessments, oversight the production of global assessments, leadership on Worldwide Biodiversity assessment) - Fundraising: US\$ 300,000 per year
NatureServe	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Development and data management relevant to assessing the status of Western hemisphere biodiversity, with a minimum of five staff (collaboration to specific assessments, collaboration to the development of biodiversity indicators) - Fundraising: US\$ 250,000 per year

These roles and responsibilities can be interpreted as nothing more than the normal work of the Consortium Members. For example, the normal work of the Consortium Members is to develop and maintain the Red List of Threatened Species. The normal work of the Consortium Members is to develop and maintain the Red List of Threatened Species. The normal work of the Consortium Members is to develop and maintain the Red List of Threatened Species.

for this, and we also new that the Red List needed to stay as an IUCN product. That's how the Agreement started to be formulated. I remember in 1997, when the Red List Committee was just forming, we thought we should have Bilateral MOUs with the Committee and then it changed—I do not remember why. But all of a sudden in around 2000 we started talking about a Joint Venture, an Agreement. But it was always to support the development of the SSC Red List.”

From the outset, the members saw IUCN as the Consortium's leader. Things were different within IUCN, which accepted the leadership of the Red List Programme Committee, but not the Consortium. The Red List Programme Chair commented, “I feel very comfortable as the Red List Programme Chair... however, I did not feel comfortable as the Consortium Chair.” As we understand the situation, the two positions are perceived in quite different terms: The Chair of the Red List Programme is essentially the head of a scientific and technical committee, while the Consortium leads an institutional committee. Many interviewees made it clear that IUCN did not provide institutional leadership, nor did other Consortium members assume the leadership.

The lack of leadership from senior officials who have signed the Agreement has contributed to the confusing nature of the governance and Consortium model. What is the organizational image of the Consortium? How should it get work done? The Red List Programme Committee is a combination of volunteers, professionals who are paid to participate in the Committee, and the professional Secretariat staff. This is a formula that works for the Red List Programme Committee. The Secretariat, which is funded by IUCN, provides the Red List Programme Committee with administrative, managerial and technical support.¹⁵

On the other hand, there is a perception that Natu

and fundraising. Though the Consortium should have included the SIS in its deliberations, this has not been done until this year.

“The Red List Committee recognized that developing and completing the SIS is a major priority and a huge task. However, the Committee’s immediate priority is the annual production of the Red List and while SIS is unavailable, the current Red List database will continue to be used. While not a central concern of RLP Committee meetings, it was noted that ... incorporating Red List data into SIS at some point in the future should not be a major problem.” (RLC meetin

Part of the reason for this lack of collective action might be that the Consortium has no management model to support collective action. Who will bring the groups together to support collective work?

Finding 16: Strategic Leadership is not apparent in the Consortium's work. There is no strategy nor business plan to guide the work of the Consortium.

The idea of strategic leadership is relatively simple: Groups need a way to scan their external and internal environments in order to develop strategies and business plans that guide their actions. This has to be an ongoing process and, where necessary, they must be prepared to change direction. In carrying out strategic leadership, groups clarify their niches, identify potential products and services, and create ways to make the 'vision' a 'living vision'. Strategic leadership is the ability to direct this process and obtain the support of those stakeholders responsible for action.

In the case of the Consortium, members have agreed to collectively support the implementation of the Red List Programme. The Red List Programme is

made nor which strategy was used to enlarge the Committee. Our informants indicated that expansion was required to make up for the shortage of data for groups like plants, marine species, fresh water species and invertebrates.

Finding 21: Consortium processes like problem solving, decision-making, risk management, meeting skills, conflict resolution and communication are at very early stages of evolution.

The Consortium has developed relatively informally. The progress that has been made has been more the result of the hard work and dedication of individuals serving on the Consortium than the way it is organized or managed. Meetings are held, problems are addressed and decisions are made, but the same issues continue to reoccur and relatively little progress seems to be made on organizational and managerial issues. This is the sign of a group that is at an early stage of evolution. While the Consortium has been an official entity for two years, it was four years in the making, and in that time

While personal relationships within the Consortium have improved trust levels, the difficulties with the Agreement and the low level of formalization of the Consortium has hindered the development of institutional trust. The lack of formal terms of reference has made it difficult to distinguish between the Consortium and the RLP Committee.

Trust facilitators such as the experience of success, predictable communications and positive social relations, have played a positive role in the building of trust in the Consortium. On the other hand the lack of clarity with respect to schedules and plans, problems with follow up, unrealistic expectations and the lack of substantive feedback have had a negative effect.

Our informants have said that trust amongst the Consortium Members has increased. This view is colored in part by the impending release of the GAA and GSA. Although the interviewees are enthusiastic about these events, they are concerned that the relationships that have been built are institutionally fragile. The Consortium has to manage the required changes and possibility of new participants for trust to be increased.

Finding 24: Partner organizations express a certain level of reticence to share data that will be analyzed and reviewed by other organization data

The SSC¹⁸ is charged with the task of protecting the technical quality of the Red List brand, but it has delegated this responsibility to the RLP Committee. The Programme Committee is a technical body, which provides technical oversight of the Red List. In contrast, the Consortium is a group of organizations that have agreed to join together in support to the development of the Red List Programme. The interest of the Consortium is institutional and there is consequently a certain pressure and tension between it and the RLP Committee.

The Consortium's identity needs to be tied to two principles:

- Its support to ensure the authority and credibility of the IUCN Red List.
- Its support to the development of the Red List in such a way that it retains its authority and credibility.

Finding 26: The Consortium Agreement section on branding along with thth827T613.-.9(b)r4.568.4-5.8(616 -1558 TD

According to the Agreement, IUCN SSC is the custodian of the Red List and “holds the rights and responsibilities associated with it.” At this stage, IUCN is still the rightful owner of the Red List and the principal decision-maker with regard to its use. Yet, the development of the enhanced Red List products would not be possible without the engagement of various partners. How can IUCN recognize these contributions and at the same time maintain the integrity of the brand? This issue is far from being resolved.

Two releases help illustrate the issue. The publication of important assessments and products like the *Threatened Birds of the World* and the upcoming Global Amphibian Assessment (GAA) has raised ownership and branding questions. For example, *Threatened Birds of the World* is clearly BirdLife’s own effort. It compiled the data, performed the analysis and published the book. The Consortium’s added value for BirdLife is that it is part of a “credible comprehensive data system” that covers more than birds. But does that mean IUCN SSC be recognized in any way? What is appropriate?

On the other hand, the GAA has primarily involved work by CI and IUCN and, to a much lesser extent, NatureServe. Is it thus a consortium produc

indicate that it plans to budget no additional managerial or operational resources for the Consortium. The same is true for the other members. Thus in the short term, it appears that existing pattern will continue unless some strategic decisions are made.

An alternative scenario is to set the Consortium up solely for the purpose of finding a significant donor to fund the development of the RLP over the medium term. In such a case, the Consortium would continue until funding is secured and then disband.

From our perspective, the sustainability of the Consortium is linked to the purpose of the Consortium—long term or short term.

6. Conclusions and Recommendations

Conclusions

The purpose of this review was to assess the performance of the partnership. Specifically, this study explored three aspects of the Consortium:

- § The extent to which the rationale for the Consortium is still valid.
- § The benefits of the Consortium to the four Red List partners.
- § The extent to which the organizational arrangements, management and governance of the Consortium are effective and still appropriate.

In general, most of our informants had a positive estimation of the Consortium. In particular, they indicated that, compared to previous experiences in the Biodiversity Conservation Information System and World Conservation Monitoring Centre, the Red List Consortium seemed to be working. However, we found that despite this generally positive opinion, significant issues exist with respect to the institutional arrangements that threaten the sustainability of the Consortium and even the Red List itself. This section summarizes our findings and provides recommendations to improve the working of the Consortium.

Does it make sense for the Consortium to continue? Our findings suggest that the *rationale* for the Consortium is still valid, for both the Consortium itself and the member institutions. At the Consortium level, our informants agreed that the Red List Programme will continue to need considerably more resources than IUCN can provide over the next 5 years.¹⁹ Members stressed their dependency on the credibility and authority of the IUCN Red List as a primary benefit of the Consortium. One member cited the enormity of the challenge and the need for significant resources—a need that only a consortium might meet. Another member stressed the benefits of participating in a group with other organizations. All were committed to expanding the Red List and saw the vision articulated in the Agreement as appropriate.

On a less positive note, the Consortium's original purpose was to “enhance the implementation of the Red List Programme,” and of its rationale to create synergy between the four signatories to generate additional resources. This, in most of our informants' eyes, has been a disappointment.

A number of issues emerged from the analysis of the data on institutional arrangements. On the positive side, most interviewees support the Consortium and the direction it had taken. However, this general satisfaction masks some difficulties with the institutional arrangements. We found that the Agreement needs clarification in some areas and, in other areas, new sections should be written.

For example, there has been confusion with respect to the role and function of the Consortium. Our review indicates that, while there are clear individual accountabilities to member organizations, there is not a clear institutional accountability. In other words, how does the Consortium hold itself

¹⁹ One interviewee asked why IUCN hasn't engaged in “big” fundraising for the Red List Programme. The interviewee suggested that foundations and organizations such as the GEF and the World Bank, should have been solicited for funds. We do not know whether or not IUCN has or has not done this. We do know that it appears that IUCN's strategy for raising resources for the Red List Programme is linked to this Consortium.

accountable for the things it says it will do. We make a number of recommendations with regard to the Agreement and Consortium governance below.

We found that, with respect to institutional management, the Consortium has taken an ad hoc approach to strategy, management and operations. Few resources have been put into its management.

Review of the Red List Programme Agreement

Recommendation 5: Institutional members need to be more explicit about the management model most appropriate for “Managing the Consortium.”

The institutional members will need to determine

Appendix I Terms of Reference

Review of the Implementation of the Red List Programme Agreement

Background and Rationale for the Review

The Red List Programme Agreement was signed in 2002 by four partner organisations:

- IUCN Secretariat and Species Survival Commission (based in Gland)
- NatureServe (based in Washington D.C.)
- BirdLife International (based in Cambridge)
- Conservation International – Centre for Applied Biodiversity Science (based in Washington D.C.)

This agreement gave birth to the Red List Consortium. At the start-up of the Consortium, the Ocean Conservancy was also involved but decided to drop out.

Audience for the Review

The Review has been commissioned by the IUCN Director - Global Programme, and is managed by the M&E Unit.

The audience for the Review is the senior management of the four partner organisations of the current Red List Partnership: IUCN (Secretariat and SSC), NatureServe, BirdLife International, Centre for Applied Biodiversity Science – Conservation International.

Performance areas, issues and questions

A detailed Evaluation Matrix will be developed as a first step in the Review, outlining the main performance areas, questions and sub questions that will be covered in the Evaluation. A preliminary list of performance areas and issues to be explored include the following:

- The rationale, mandate, purpose of the Consortium
-

- Documents will be reviewed including, but not limited to:
 - The Red List Programme Agreement;
 - The Red List Programme, work plan and organizational structure;
 - Minutes of the Red List Programme Committee meetings;
 - Documents produced by the Partnership;
 - Literature on other evaluations of partnerships and effective organizational arrangements for partnerships.

Timeframe for the Review

- Terms of Reference drafted and circulated by mid July.
- Evaluation matrix and work plan submitted by late July.
- Data collection mid August to mid September.
- Draft final report: October 1
- Feedback from IUCN on Draft report: October 15
- Final report: November 1, 2004
- The evaluation will be completed in time to report the findings and recommendations to the

Appendix III Selected Documents Reviewed

Documents Reviewed
Minutes of the Red List Programme Committee Meetings (March 2001, November 2001, May 2002, December 2002, May 2003, November 2003)
Minutes of the Partners meetings (March 2001, May 2002, May 2003, May 2004)
“The Red List Programme Agreement”, signed in July 2002
Species Survival Commission (SSC), “Strategic Plan 2001-2010”, October 2000.
Species Survival Commission (SSC), “Strategic Plan 2001-2010, 2005-2008 Component Programme Plan”, 2004
Birdlife International, “How Birdlife works; Operational Procedures of Birdlife International”, November 2003.
Ekos Research Associates, “Lessons learned on Partnerships”, October 1998
OED Working Paper Series No.6, Simon Maxwell & Tim Conway, “Perspective on Partnership”, 2000.
Integrated Care Network, “Criteria for evaluating partnerships”, 2002
National network for Collaboration Framework, “Collaboration framework- Addressing Community Capacity”, 1995
Connie Coley Loden, “Strategic Partnering, Partnering for change”, 2002.
IBM Centre for the Business of Government, “Collaboration, Using Networks and Partnerships”, 2004

Appendix IV Interview Protocols

Informants from NatureServe, Birdlife, Conservation International & SSC

Introduction

- Please describe your role within your orga

Benefits

- What are the main benefits that the Consortium brings to your organization?
- Do you benefit from potential synergy that aris

Appendix V Evaluation Matrix

Issues	Questions	Sources of Data	Data Collection Methodology
Rationale for the consortium	Has the establishment of a consortium supported the expansion (financial, HR, Knowledge) and the development of the Red List Programme?	IUCN Secretariat Red List partners Other partners Donors	Interviews Document review

Review of the Red List Programme Agreement

- Finding 18: There is an overlap of activities between the Consortium and the RLP Committee. This is partly a consequence of the unclear roles and responsibilities identified in Finding 9.
- Finding 19: Operational work planning and reporting within the IUCN Red List Programme Secretariat has supported progress of the Red List Programme. However, this is not the case for the Consortium.
- Finding 20: There is no plan for developing potential new institutional relationships to enhance the implementation of the RLP Programme.
- Finding 21: Consortium processes like problem solving, decision-making, risk management, meeting skills, conflict resolution and communication are at very early stages of evolution.
- Finding 22: The Consortium has not adequately managed the horizontal issues arising in the communication function.
- Finding 23: All parties agree that the Red List Agreement has helped build trust among the four organizations. But significant work remains to be done.
- Finding 24: Partner organizations express a certain level of reticence to share data that will be analyzed and reviewed by other organizations. This has created concerns about transparency.
- Finding 25:

Conservation International

Conservation International (CI) aims to address urgent conservation issues through several strategies and programmes identified below.

Conservation International's mission and key programmes	
Mission	CI's mission is to conserve the Earth's living natural heritage, our global biodiversity, and to demonstrate that human societies are able to live harmoniously with nature.
Key programmes	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Research and Science through the Center for Applied Biodiversity Science (CABS)- Business and Environment through the Center for Environmental Leadership in Business- Protected Areas- Conservation Investments- Conservation enterprise- Policy and Economics- Ecotourism- Education and awareness- Population and environment- Clim change ate

As with Birdlife International, the Consortium's rationale appears highly relevant to CI's research & science programme. CI aims to strengthen resear

Appendix VIII The Red List Programme Agreement