



## Contents

Acronyms .....	ii
Executive summary.....	1
<i>Background</i> .....	1
<i>Overall management of the process</i> .....	1
<i>Activities</i> .....	1
<i>Innovation</i> .....	2
<i>Internal information flows</i> .....	2
<i>Integration into the programme</i> .....	2
<i>External communications</i> .....	2
<i>Conclusions</i> .....	3
1. Conduct of the review .....	4
2. Innovation projects in IUCN.....	4
3. Evolution of the 3I-C poverty project.....	5
4. Management structures of the 3I-C project.....	6
4.1 <i>The 3I-C Steering Committee</i> .....	0.02

## **Acronyms**

CEESP	Commission for Environmental Economics and Social Policy
CEM	Commission for Ecosystem Management
CIFOR	Center for International Forestry Research
DG	Director General (of IUCN)
FCPFCP	

## **Executive summary**

### ***Background***

There is a long history of IUCN senior management attempting to encourage staff to be at the forefront of innovation that can lead to reinvigoration, renewal and reinvention of the programme to ensure that the Union remains relevant in a changing world. The 3I-C concept is the latest of these endeavours. It differs from previous attempts at innovation in that there is a much more strategic focus applied to all aspects of the projects, from concept development through to implementation and follow up. Serious attention was given by senior management in HQ to ensure that those aspects that were perceived as being critical (particularly innovation, information flows, integration into the programme and wider communications) were addressed explicitly in all 3I-C projects.

The 3I-

### ***Innovation***

There was clear innovation that came from the project and this can best be summed up by quotes from some of those interviewed:

- “The conceptual framework has given us a structure to deal with pro-poor conservation in IUCN.”
- “The very idea that IUCN could work on poverty is a huge new game.”
- “Before this most people (in IUCN) were afraid to touch poverty—it is now an accepted fact.”
- “It has empowered and emboldened the DG to go out on a limb (and speak about poverty).”
- “The conceptual framework is very creative and exciting (and reflects input from very disparate backgrounds).”
- “The 3I-C concept is a wonderful innovation in itself, as it attempts to fuse the relations between HQ, the regions and commissions.”
- “The ideas themselves are not new—what is innovative is that it provides an opportunity to get environment off the periphery and into the centre of economic/social decision making.”
- “Clarifying precisely what it is that we are talking about (in relation to the conservation-poverty links) is a major advance.”

### ***Internal information flows***

Internal information flows were managed effectively by regular interaction within and

*Tween HQ, ironment Tc -0.2047 TD a775 TD -0892 by regulagr5 TD -0n*

was coming from the project, and an IUCN position paper,

1.

there would be three to four projects per year with about CHF 250,000 available per project.

The three “Is” (Innovation, Information and Integration) and the “C” (Communications) combine to produce the shorthand (3I-C) which defines the current attempt to address the innovation issue. The 3I-C approach is the outcome of more focused and strategic thinking on the topic, and has attempted to avoid some of the shortcomings of previous endeavours by adopting a more structured management approach. There has also been much greater clarity about what might be the key ingredients that contribute to learning and innovation. The outcome of this analysis was the development of a set of Operational Guidelines to guide applications from the IUCN programmes for funds to support potentially innovative projects. The guidelines themselves have also evolved and have been modified based on the experiences gained as the first 3I-C projects got under way. For example, the requirement for a situational analysis was added after the 3I-C poverty project commenced.

One of the basic elements of the 3I-C approach was the requirement for a partnership consisting of a global programme, a regional programme and a commission to be the essential planning and executing structure for the project. This was intended to foster integration and to assist take-up of the learning and innovation that emerged from the project. For ease of management, the global programme was preferred as the financial manager.

### **3. Evolution of the 3I-C poverty project**

The Forest Conservation Programme (FCP) has a long history of working at the interface between conservation and socio-economic systems. Work on buffer zone management and ICDPs (Integrated Conservation and Development Projects) goes back well over a decade. The establishment of the Working Group on Community Involvement in Forest Management in the mid 1990s set the scene for a substantial body of work that analysed some of the conservation-development linkages more explicitly and linked the findings to regional and global policy debates. The regional forest programmes (particularly in Eastern Africa and Asia) have long running portfolios of field projects, many of which had enhancement of rural livelihoods as explicit aims. The FCP in HQ initiated a more focused study on the links between conservation and livelihoods in early 2001 (prior to the establishment of the 3I-C fund). This study was commissioned to identify the assumptions, key issues and basic questions relating to sustainable livelihoods from





#### ***4.2 The basic partnership***

The basic management structure that is required for all the 3I-C projects is that of a partnership involving a HQ programme, one (or several) r

- Chair of CEESP<sup>2</sup>.

This group acted as an inner executive that interacted on a regular and frequent basis as a  
cras g

debate. The reason for this decision was that the expertise needed was not available within the FCP itself. This arrangement has worked well in terms of ensuring that competent intellectual “clout” was brought to bear on the issues. While this went against one of the intentions of the 3I-C approach, it is difficult to see how it could have been done differently within the budget and staffing constraints that existed. If a larger budget was available, the best of both worlds might have been achieved. Part of the budget could have been used to free up time for the project lead person to devote quality time to the project<sup>3</sup>. At the same time, competent consultants could have been engaged who could have worked in tandem (in a mentoring capacity) so that knowledge and capacity were transferred as the process unfolded. In fact, this is basically what did occur, ePiol xss unfolded. fcwfsd occ6.been



The sequencing of the activities and events (up to the time of the Aberdares workshop) was graphically reconstructed recently as shown in the attached figure (S. Jeanrenaud pers. com.). This is helpful, as it makes it easier to conceptualise how the various activities fitted together.

The first major series of activities started with the situational analyses and concluded with the outputs planned at the Khao Yai Core Team planning workshop in July 2002. Up to this point, the activities more or less followed the timeline and activities proposed in the project concept of April 2002. One of the activities identified in the Khao Yai workshop was for the Head of the FCP to explore “...*areas of common interest*” with the IUCN Special Advisers. This led to a series of discussions with the Economics Special Adviser and the realisation by the Head of the FCP that the major entry point for exploring the linkages between conservation and livelihoods (and poverty) up to that time had been through social systems rather than through economic systems. This was a reflection of the areas of expertise brought by the consultants and most of the staff members with relevant field experience. It was realised that the economic emphasis was missing in the emerging conceptual framework and the overall thinking. This opportunistic interaction between the Head of the FCP and the Economics Special Adviser continued with the development of several project proposals with an explicit economic focus. It was also decided that a second workshop would be conducted to (among other things) inject some economic thinking into the process. This was held in the Aberdares in Kenya, and was strongly supported by the Economics Special Adviser. An additional CHF 40,000 was leveraged from the 3I-C fund as a contribution to the funding for this workshop.

This HQ discussion on economic issues is shown as the second set of activities in the attached figure, and is noteworthy in that it was carried out without a great deal of communication with all members of the Core Team. At the same time, the conceptual writing was continuing, albeit somewhat slowly (this is shown as the third set of activities in the figure). An important outcome of these two somewhat separate sets of activities that developed after the Khao Yai workshop was that a sense of frustration and annoyance emerged in the minds of the consultants who were engaged to lead the conceptual writing. They felt that they had been shut out of the process, and that they no longer knew what was going on or what was planned. This partly contributed to a hiatus in the writing. In effect, the connecting arrow shown in the figure as providing communication between the two sets of activities was rather weak.

The two somewhat separate strands were brought together in the conceptual writing, in the policy positions and in the integration of the findings of the project into the IUCN programme.

While the process produced some negatives in terms of frustrations and uncertainties experienced by the consultants, there were also positives, in that the injection of more explicit economic thinking undoubtedly led to a significant enriching of the ultimate outcomes. Perhaps more critically, the outcomes will be better balanced and will have greater relevance to instruments such as PRSPs. They will also be far more credible with donors and other partners concerned with poverty alleviation strategies and actions on the ground.



There were several events that proved to be critical in terms of being explicit points of learning along the way—



	elimination), other? (eg rights-based approach)
Partnerships	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Alliance for pro-poor conservation with key partners (those at this meeting and others)</li> <li>•Alliance with key Members and look to recruit new members and Commission members</li> <li>•Indigenous peoples and local communities</li> <li>•Collaborate with Private Sector</li> <li>•Joint commission – secretariat task force</li> <li>•Partnerships should be results-based and include sharing knowledge, building capacity and as appropriate policy advocacy</li> </ul>
Mainstreaming in the programme	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Adjust: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– 2005-08 global programme documents</li> <li>– component programme plans</li> </ul> </li> <li>•Develop a preliminary set of ‘big ideas’ at global, regional and national levels for linking practice and policy</li> <li>•Further develop M&amp;E, reporting and communications and fundraising</li> </ul>
Analyze and document	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Urgent - document and distribute PRSP experience</li> <li>•Mid term urgency - finalize the 3I-C funded book</li> <li>•Less urgent – link practice and policy on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– How to make conventional programmes and projects poverty focused</li> <li>– Cost-benefits and incentives at all levels</li> <li>– Poverty-environment links</li> <li>– Tools and methods</li> <li>– Underlying causes of poverty and environmental degradation, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>+ International drivers</li> <li>+ Competing interests / power and politics</li> <li>+ Local level issues – access, power, tenure etc</li> <li>+ Recognize trade offs</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> </ul>
Knowledge management and communications	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Substance must be lead by Programme and Commissions – supported by Communications</li> <li>•Clarify terms - conservation and poverty etc</li> <li>•Short and clear powerpoint and other resources for use by the ‘ambassadors’</li> <li>•Contribute to the Knowledge paper being developed for WCC</li> <li>•Assist in review of Communications capacity</li> <li>•Develop a strategy for all levels: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Key targets, key messages, appropriate tools, capacity building etc</li> </ul> </li> <li>•internal (DG, Council, WCC, Members, Commissions, thematic areas, regions etc)</li> <li>•external (environmental and development forums, private</li> </ul>

3I-C follow-up

| sector etc)

- Finalize and distribute products
- Evaluate process and communicate lessons learned (recognize that issues are often more complex than anticipated)
- Hand over responsibilities to Programme to integrate (interim team – 1 x PPG executive member as chair and to include Stewart, Special



	<p>better—it was not pursued seriously.”</p> <p>“CEESP only became involved after the project concept had been approved—was not involved in the conceptual development.”</p> <p>“The ideas were developed by the centre based on their priorities.”</p> <p>“CEESP was treated as an add-on and not as a true partner.”</p> <p>“Commissions were not taken seriously and felt marginalised.”</p> <p>“CEM involvement was a mismatch.”</p>
Nature of the innovation	<p>“The very idea that IUCN could work on poverty is a huge new game.”</p> <p>“Before this most people (in IUCN) were afraid to touch poverty—it is now an accepted fact.”</p> <p>“It has empowered and emboldened the DG to go out on a limb.”</p> <p>“The conceptual framework has given us a structure to deal with pro-poor conservation in IUCN.”</p> <p>“The conceptual framework is very creative and exciting (and reflects input from very disparate backgrounds).”</p> <p>“The 3I-C concept is a wonderful innovation in itself, as it attempts to fuse the relations between HQ, the regions and commissions.”</p> <p>“The ideas themselves are not new—what is innovative is that it provides an opportunity to get environment off the periphery and into the centre of economic/social decision making.”</p> <p>“Clarifying precisely what it is that we are talking about is a major advance.”</p>
The products	<p>“The conceptual framework gave a new frame of reference for viewing the IUCN work.”</p> <p>“The post-Aberdares guidance notes from the Global Director are a very effective summary of IUCN’s position on poverty.”</p> <p>“There has been a big impact that will have a long influence.”</p> <p>“The book will be a very powerful tool, particularly in discussions with the members, and will help to take it further.”</p> <p>“The book will be a seminal product.”</p>
Communications	<p>“Products started to flow early and were well communicated.”</p>
Integration into the programme	<p>“All this stuff was not just sitting on the side, but was feeding into the cycle of how we do our business.”</p> <p>“The Asia region restructure was influenced by the learning coming from the project.”</p> <p>“Some of our A and B list projects were re-designed as a result of our involvement with the project.”</p> <p>“The products from the Aberdares workshop have been incorporated into the ROSA annual planning framework.”</p> <p>“The material distributed after the Aberdares workshop was a powerful programming influence for the regions involved in the project (not sure about other regions).”</p> <p>“In Africa people grab this immediately, they don’t need convincing.”</p> <p>“Bringing it immediately into the intersessional plan made it more meaningful.”</p>

Consequences for the future	<p>“Communications needs to flow through to the WCC—need space for this new, important issue to be aired.”</p> <p>“Need something to continue to engage in the topic to encourage integration.”</p> <p>“HQ people could get involved in using it as a learning platform for policy work.”</p> <p>“Can this be replicated in other regions?”</p> <p>“Need tools and skills to assess the poverty situation and to design approaches to address it (need capacity building).”</p> <p>“This work can be used to fuse a working relationship between the regions and the commissions to mainstream the process.”</p> <p>“Time and resources need to be put aside to take it forward.”</p> <p>“Resources are needed for follow -up to champion the cause across the Union.”</p> <p>“Could use this work to engage with partners in-country more effectively.”</p> <p>“We now have a message to get us in the door for meaningful discussions with agriculture and other ministries.”</p> <p>“Involvement in the 3I-C project has been an inspiration to be more explicit in analysing and designing projects regarding poverty issues.”</p> <p>“Still need to convince some of the in-house people.”</p> <p>“Could use this model to design a longer term collaborative project.”</p>
-----------------------------	--

## 7. Results and outputs

The project concept identified many results and outputs, and it is instructive to compare what was planned with what was achieved. The following table provides this information (up to January 2004).

**Table 3. List of major results and outputs of the 3I-C poverty project**

<b>Key activities and products</b>	
<b>What was planned</b>	<b>What was achieved</b>
<b>Situation analysis</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Literature review</i></li> </ul>	

<b>IUCN Position Statement</b>	<i>power</i> ". <i>Beyond Rhetoric</i> is the nearest formal IUCN "position" as at January 2004.
<b>A speech by the Director-General to the WSSD</b>	A speech was made by the DG at WSSD that was informed by the arguments made in <i>Beyond</i>

The project timeline intersected with many important global events, in particular WSSD, WPC and several meetings of the UNFF, and the learning coming from the project was reflected in how IUCN engaged in these events. As the outcomes of the project were emerging the key findings were used to inform IUCN's policy positions at these important fora, and position papers and statements on the linkages between conservation and poverty were presented at the various meetings.

### ***7.1 What was the innovation?***

***7.2 Implications for the IUCN programme--was integration achieved?***

Full integration of the ideas embedded within pro-poor conservation will take a long time, and there are widespread and on-going implications for the entire Union. One issue that was raised by several people interviewed related to the future implications of what some described as a radical shift in paradigm for the Union. This could imply a change in the



are huge, but somewhat different issues in the poverty-conservation nexus in the Americas, and it could be worth considering devoting resources to a follow-up set of activities in other regions in order to validate the conceptual framework to ensure its universal relevance.

## **8. Influence outside IUCN**

IUCN is seen by many (possibly most) outside observers as primarily a conservation organization that gives little more than lip service to sociological or economic outcomes. It is a surprise to many outsiders that IUCN has a long history of engagement in the socio-economic aspects of conservation. The participation of relevant people from UNDP, CARE and CIFOR in the Aberdares workshop opened a window for outsiders to see IUCN actively and honestly involved in an internal re-assessment of its focus. This involvement was greatly appreciated and allowed meaningful cross fertilisation of ideas. It also opens the way for IUCN to be more actively and credibly involved in poverty-related discussions in a wider range of fora.

## **9. What made it work?**



One line of thinking is that the 3I-C poverty project was a low risk project—IUCN had to take this direction if it was to survive. This raises the question of how high risk projects will be viewed. It may be that high risk projects (i.e. those with a reasonable chance of failure) are the ones that could identify the really innovative programmatic possibilities.

## **11. References**

Anon. (2003 a) Pro-poor conservation: Elements of IUCN's conceptual framework (Work in progress).

Anon. (2003 b) Guidance notes for developing pro poor conservation results in IUCN intersessional programme.

Jeanrenaud, S. (2001) Sustainable livelihoods: documentation of assumptions, key issues, questions. Report to IUCN Forest Conservation Programme.

Jeanrenaud, S. (2002 a) Poverty alleviation and conservation: Linking sustainable livelihoods and ecosystem management. 3I-C Report to IUCN Forest Conservation Programme.

Jeanrenaud, S. (2002 b) Conservation and livelihood: Lessons. 3I -C Report to IUCN Forest Conservation Programme.

Kazoora, C. (2002) Poverty alleviation and conservation: Linking sustainable livelihoods and ecosystem management. A case study of Uganda. IUCN EARO Nairobi.

Mariki, S.W. (2002) Country Study for "Poverty alleviation and conservation: Linking sustainable livelihoods and ecosystem management. Tanzania case. IUCN EARO Nairobi.

Morris, J. (2002) Bitter bamboo and sweet living: Impacts of NTFP conservation activities on poverty alleviation and sustainable livelihoods. A case for Lao PDR. IUCN Asia Regional Office, Bangkok.

Nguyen Van Duong, J. Morris, Le Thi Phi and J. Raintree (2003) Domesticated NTFPs, secured livelihoods: Impacts of NTFP domestication and agro-forestry on poverty alleviation and livelihood improvement. A case for Vietnam. IUCN Asia Regional Office,

## **Appendices**

### ***Appendix I Terms of Reference for review***

#### **Review / evaluation of 3I-C project on Poverty and the Environment Terms of Reference**

##### **Background**

The 3I-C project was established to develop a strategy and approach to enable IUCN to convincingly demonstrate the link between poverty alleviation, sustainable livelihoods and ecosystem management and to build effective partnerships with social development organizations.

##### **Purpose of the review / evaluation**

The review / evaluation is being carried out to assess the effectiveness of the 3I-C process and the usefulness of its products, to learn from the experience, and to assess how the innovative thinking coming from the project was integrated and institutionalised within IUCN--to keep it relevant in a changing world.

##### **Tasks to be carried out**

1. Analyse the process that has been used to implement the 3I-C project on poverty and the environment managed by the Forest Conservation Programme and several 3I-C partners.
2. Evaluate the effectiveness / appropriateness of the process within IUCN's management / cultural context—particularly with IUCN's claim to be a knowledge-based institution.
3. Analyse how the knowledge generated from the project was integrated into the thinking of the Forest Conservation Programme and its 3I-C partners, and if time permits, into the thinking of the new IUCN Programme.
4. Evaluate the usefulness of the products and other outputs of the project in terms of achieving the objectives set for 3I-C.
5. Comment on the approaches used to communicate the messages and lessons coming from the project. In particular, comment on how the knowledge generated from the project was packaged for broader integration across the union (the regions, commissions and global thematic programmes).
6. Comment on the relevance of a 3I-C approach within IUCN to identify and explore innovations—with suggestions for improvements.

##### **Timing**

Tasks to be carried out between October 2003 and February 2004

##### **Number of days**

A total of 15 days will be spent on carrying out the tasks, with approximately 3 days spent in Gland and the remainder spent at home base.

*Appendix II List of people interviewed*

<b>Person</b>	<b>Position and location</b>
<b>IUCN Headquarters</b>	
Achim Steiner	Director General, IUCN Gland
Bill Jackson	Director Global Programme, IUCN Gland
Jeff McNeely	Chief Scientist, IUCN Gland
Stewart Maginnis	Head of Forest Conservation Programme , IUCN Gland
Simon Rietbergen	Acting Coordinator, Ecosystem Management Programme, IUCN Gland
Gonzalo Oviedo	Senior Adviser, Social Policy, IUCN Gland
Joshua Bishop	Senior Adviser on Economics, IUCN Gland
Caroline Ponti-Martinet	Programme Officer, Programme Planning and Evaluation Team, IUCN Gland
Corli Pretorius	Head of Global Communications, IUCN Gland
Nancy McPherson	Head of Evaluation, IUCN Gland
<b>IUCN Regional Offices</b>	
Guido Broekhoven	Coordinator, Regional Forest Programme for Asia, IUCN Asia Regional Office
Andrew Duetz	Head, IUCN Canada Office, Montreal
Andrew Ingles	Head, Ecosystems and Livelihoods, IUCN Asia Regional Office
Richard Friend	Mekong River Ecosystem Management Adviser, IUCN Asia Regional Office
Carmel Mbizvo	Programme Coordinator, Social and Policy Programme, IUCN ROSA
Susan Matindi	NEPAD Programme Coordinator, IUCN EARO
Oumou Koulsoum Ly	Coordinator, IUCN Senegal Country Office, Dakar
Edmund Barrow	Coordinator, Forest conservation and Social Policy, EARO
<b>IUCN Commissions</b>	
Taghi Farvar	Chair, CEESP
<b>Consultants</b>	
Bob Fisher	CEESP member and Consultant, Sydney
Sally Jeanrenaud	Special Assistant to the D-G, CEESP member and Consultant, IUCN Gland
<b>Non IUCN</b>	
William Sunderlin	Programme Leader, (FSP) CIFOR Bogor
Peter Hazlewood	Global Coordinator, Poverty and Environment Initiative, UNDP USA