

Species Programme Management Response

To the PriceWaterhouseCoopers Review of the
Species Programme
(March 2006)



Introduction

This organizational review of the IUCN Species Programme, commissioned by the Director Global Programme and the Head of the Species Programme aimed to provide analysis, findings and recommendations to support an organizational re-structuring. The IUCN Species Programme welcomes the review, and largely agrees with its recommendations.

The recommendations under Section A were of limited value in addressing key issues faced by the Species Programme. The numbered recommendations from the Review report, starting in Section B, address the challenges with more clarity and therefore more detailed responses and actions are provided in Sections B through D.

Management recognizes that the main challenge restricting IUCN from achieving a more integrated programme of work on Species are unclear roles and responsibilities and weak strategic direction on species from IUCN as an institution (as opposed to direction from SSC). Senior Management and the Commission Chair are aware of this problem and are taking steps to address it, including the SSC's strategic planning exercise and efforts to develop clear draft roles and responsibilities by the Secretariat.

A management response has been provided with two major inputs: a Task Force, comprising staff from GPT, CFDR and HMRG from all three Directorates of Programme, Strategies and Operations, as well as the Species Programme Head and Deputy Head was convened as a limited term body to assist the Head in responding to this review, and in implementing a change management process. In addition staff of the Species Programme at their three separate locations (IUCN HQ, Cambridge UK and Washington DC) each developed a response which was then, through a consultative process, developed into the one response.

We will report on the implementation of this response and action plan at the end of 2006 and then again at mid-year in 2007. Reporting after that time will be dependent on the status of implementation of the actions.

Acronyms

CFDR	Conservation Finance and Donor Relations
CI	Conservation International
DG	Director General
FTE	Full-time equivalent
GPT	Global Programme Team
HR	Human Resources
HRMG	Human Resources Management Group
PBIA	Policy, Biodiversity and International Agreements Unit
PWC	PriceWaterhouseCoopers
RL	Red List of Threatened Species
RLDB	Red List database
SIS	Species Information Service
SP	Species Programme
SSC	Species Survival Commission
SSS	Senior Species Scientist
TORs	Terms of Reference
WCMC	World Conservation Monitoring Center

Recommendation	Management response	Remarks	Timeframe	Cost – Level of Effort
<p>A.3 The <i>objectives thus obtained and agreed upon should then clearly cascade into the individual Terms of Reference of each job posting</i>, in a</p>				

Recommendation	Management response:	Remarks	Timeframe	Cost – Level of Effort
<p>A.5 In moving towards the vision of redefining conservation work in terms of systems and cycles, it essential that SP should engage more systematically and constructively with other IUCN programmes and with the regional offices.</p> <p>This objective could be achieved by identifying common programme objectives or areas where specific programme objectives are mutually dependent and supportive. At the early stages of designing workplans and elaborating budgets, these commonalities and interdependencies must be considered in order to ensure that interaction between SP and other programmes is structurally ensured.</p> <p>Although this requires significant effort at an early stage, we are convinced that SP will be able to realise</p>				

Recommendation	Management response:	Remarks	Timeframe	Cost – Level of Effort
----------------	----------------------	---------	-----------	------------------------

B. Organizational Model – Structural Adjustment (note: more specific recommendations in Sections C and D)

Recommendation	Management response:	Remarks	Timeframe	Cost – Level of Effort
<p>B.1 Adapt recommended model (see diagram)</p> <p>B.2 In attempting to draw what we believe to be the best structure for SP, we have [recommended] created positions such as “Species Senior Scientist”, have grouped some activities under “Special Technical Projects”, have allocated scientific and managerial “Focal Point” roles and put</p>	<p>Partially agree, we are working with HRMG to produce a suitable organizational model.</p>			

Recommendation	Management response:	Remarks	Time Frame	Cost – Level of Effort
<p>C.2 (2). Create Task Force</p> <p>The re-allocation of responsibilities and tasks, revision of individual terms-of-reference and restructuring of certain positions, should be the object and focus of a task force comprising SP management and IUCN Human Resources specialists. This may involve potential further input from an external partner with specific expertise in organizational redesign.</p>	<p>Agreed. Task Force has met twice and had a major input into this response; it has been helpful to engage staff from outside the SP.</p> <p>It will meet once more in the autumn of 06 to review progress in implementation of response.</p>	<p>The Task Force will be a limited term body to assist the Head in responding to this review and implementing a change management process.</p> <p>Currently, the Task Force is comprised of</p>		

Recommendation	Management response:	Remarks	Timeframe	Cost – Level of Effort
<p>C.4 (4). Create intermediate management level</p> <p>Managerial skills are not lacking. What must be decided and instituted is the middle-management layer of the suggested model, referred to as “Focal Points”. This must take both the scientific and organizational dimensions into account, including the need to delegate operational management of the 2 remote locations.</p>	<p>Agree: a senior management tier will be developed within the programme: The</p>			

Recommendation	Management response:	Remarks	Timeframe	Cost – Level of Effort
<p>C.7 (7). Strengthen network support function</p> <p>The SP gives support to the wider network, which is the triple helix of members, regions and commissions, specifically the Species Survival Commission, in a number of areas. The functions which provide this support should be labeled as such, and this should include a dedicated communications role (“Network Support and Communications.”)</p>	<p>On the assumption that this recommendation is about support to the SSC network</p> <p>Network support to the SSC will be strengthened. There are currently two network support posts, both of which are vacant. These positions will be filled.</p> <p>The recommendation here (not spelt out) is supported: the current Communications job share should be split into 2: one part concentrating on external media and the other to be reoriented (0.4 FTE) toward network support (communications</p>			

-1.1479

TD0

Tc(

Recommendation	Management response:	Remarks	Timeframe	Cost – Level of Effort
<p>D.2 (11). Ensure continued access to technology</p> <p>As SP continues to enhance the technological underpinnings of the programme (Red List database, SIS), there must be stronger assurance that the required technology will continue to be available, either on offer by 3rd parties or internally to the IUCN. This requires a technology plan which identifies current and future needs, sources which can service those needs and potential funding to pay for them.</p>	<p>Agree, SP is coordinating with Director Global Operations, with the engagement of senior management and others in IUCN as appropriate, to define a plan for the development of SIS versions 2.0 and then 3.0</p> <p>IUCN as a whole needs to decide what to do with the Oracle donation (which was to IUCN – including support for SIS – see recommendations for senior management in A)</p> <p>Ongoing capacity needs of the SP (e.g. longer term funding for GIS and SIS) will be assess and addressed, resources permitting</p>	L Dao		

Recommendation	Management response:	Remarks	Timeframe	Cost – Level of Effort
<p>D.4 (13). Strengthen communications</p> <p>Given that it is recommended to maintain three distinct locations for strategic reasons, it is very important that the SP makes a concerted effort to create a sense of common belonging and purpose through informal knowledge sharing and a formal communication framework. This may take the form of regular, structured conference calls around a specific subject (e.g. budget review, resource allocation, fundraising opportunities, technical briefs), but should also include documented communication other than e-mail (e.g. progress reports, mid-term staff reviews, upward and/or 360° feedback, etc.)</p>	<p>Agree.</p> <p>New tier of management will define internal communications strategy:</p> <p>SP will contribute four CNGs per year to facilitate external communications between SP and the rest of IUCN</p>	<p>Overall, there is a need to “mainstream” the SP in the thinking of the rest of IUCN</p> <p>Communication will flow better once organizational structure agreed finalized.</p> <p>Strategy to include succinct trip reports / meetings/ structured conference calls</p>	<p>By end-year</p>	<p>Should be minimal</p>

D.5 (14). Improve resource allocation and task prioritization

The SP should examine ways in which staff utilization and workloads could be tracked in order to assess whether tasks being accomplished are in accordance with objectives

core activities

Recommendation	Management response:	Remarks	Timeframe	Cost – Level of Effort
<p>D.6 (15). Effectively manage partnerships</p> <p>As SP has chosen to engage in a number of strategic partnerships, these need to be clearly governed by the appropriate, binding memoranda of understanding and service level agreements. Responsibility within SP for maintaining and monitoring the relationships with each partner must be established and communicated. Particular attention must be paid to potential confusion in reporting lines where partnerships include seconded staff positions.</p>	<p>Agree.</p> <p>New MOUs are being negotiated with RL partners following internal discussions re data ownership/use/brand issues following from the recommendations of the review of the RL Consortium</p>	<p>Note that: IUCN Legal Adviser and Director of Operations want further thought on the policy and strategic implications of the potential new agreements which go beyond the</p>		