

IUCN

© 2016 International Union for Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources

Reproduction of this publication for educational or other non-commercial uses is authorised without prior written permission from the copyright holder(s) provided the source is fully acknowledged.

Reproduction of this publication for resale or other commercial purposes is prohibited without prior written permission of the copyright holder(s).

The views expressed in this publication do not necessarily reflect those of International Union for the Conservation of Nature (IUCN) or of the Commission on Environmental, Economic and Social Policy (CEESP).

The designation of geographical entities in this paper, and the presentation of the material, do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of IUCN [**or other participating organisations] concerning the legal status of any country, territory, or area, or of its authorities, or concerning the delimitation of its frontiers or boundaries.

This publication should be cited as: Springer, Jenny and Boe, Kaia. 2016. *Enhancing Learning and Collaboration on Natural Resource Governance in IUCN: A Natural Resource Governance Framework (NRGF) Mapping Analysis of IUCN Projects and Initiatives*. NRGF Paper. Gland, Switzerland: IUCN and CEESP.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This report is the result of a collaborative effort involving the Natural Resource Governance Framework (NRGF) knowledge basket (hosted by the IUCN Commission on Environmental, Economic, and Social Policy, or CEESP), IUCN colleagues in the Secretariat (country offices, Regions and thematic programmes) and IUCN Commission leads. Aroha Te Pareake Mead, as CEESP Chair and NRGF Co-Chair at the time of the development and dissemination of the survey, provided the impetus for conducting it as well as insightful and strategic guidance on the survey contents and approach. The survey methodology and template structure were inspired by previous efforts by the Global Ecosystem Management Programme to map Ecosystem-based Adaptation work within IUCN. Inputs and technical expertise from members of the NRGF Working Group strengthened the design of the survey. IUCN project and programme staff invested time and effort in responding to the survey, and Regional Programme Coordinators played a key role in coordinating and consolidating information on the relevant projects under their remit. Comments on the report from Lorena Aguilar, Jessica Campese, Paul Martin, Barbara Nakangu, Emmanuel Nuesiri, Maggie Roth, Gretchen Walters and the IUCN staff who reviewed information on their projects and programmes are gratefully acknowledged, as is the overall advice and support provided by Gonzalo Oviedo. The authors thank all the participants and anticipate that the report will be an important input to the further development of the IUCN NRGF and its contributions to the IUCN 2017-2020 intersessional Programme Area 2: *Promoting and supporting effective and equitable governance of natural resources*.

IUCN, CEESP and authors are grateful to the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (Sida) for supporting the production of this paper and the broader development of the Natural Resource Governance Framework.

of separate surveys by each programme may not provide a full picture of these types of collaborations.

The report synthesizes responses following the format of the original survey. Section 2 below provides an introduction to the work reported by responding programmes. This is followed by section 3 on Objectives, which groups the main approaches and types of work reported into a number of categories, with examples of each. Section 4 on Technical Skills/Expertise summarizes information provided on governance-related expertise and how this is accessed from internal and external sources. Section 5 summarizes the main types of results reported and highlights knowledge products likely to be particularly relevant for NRGF. Section 6 discusses Challenges and Lessons conveyed in the responses and Section 7 summarizes feedback on areas of Institutional Support required. The concluding Section 8 offers reflections on implications for the further work of the NRGF.

2. INTRODUCTION TO IUCN GOVERNANCE WORK – BY PROGRAMME AND COMMISSION

IUCN Global Thematic Programmes

Responses were received from eight of the 12 IUCN global thematic programmes.

Global Forests and Climate Change Programme (GFCCP)

GFCCP provided information on a large portfolio of gov-CN (lo06 people.14

Protected Area Governance best practice guidelines – including assessments at the national protected areas system level in several countries, complemented in some cases by selected site-level assessments.

- t Inclusion of governance criteria in the Green List – a new global standard for protected areas - including on equitable establishment of protected areas, and on equitable governance.

information on the governance-related work reported by each, moving from east to west.

[Regional Office for Oceania \(ORO\)](#)

nity-based management of conservation areas. In addition to site-based work in seven sites, this project is drawing lessons from the experience to inform public policies on decentralized management of natural resources in ve West African countries. Another policy project focuses on informed decision-making around extractive industry activity and bene t sharing, including by building capacity on environmental and social assessments, raising awareness among stakeholder groups about existing legislation, and promoting transparency around decisions and activities. Other site-based projects include:

- t Collaborative management of artisanal sheries in Guinea Bissau, including development of participatory management plans.
- t Strengthening the restoration and sustainable management of natural resources in the Inner Delta of Niger, to improve local community living conditions and adaptation to climate change

ENHANCING LEARNING AND COLLABORATION ON NATURAL RESOURCE GOVERNANCE IN IUCN | 9

livelihoods. This information is fed into The IUCN Red List of Threatened Species. The Species Survival Commission co-hosts with CEESP the Sustainable Use and Livelihoods Specialist Group which seeks to enhance equitable and sustainable use of wild species and their associated ecosystems. It is hosting a series of “Beyond Enforcement” workshops that explore perspectives and issues around communities, governance, incentives and sustainable use in combating wildlife crime.

World Commission on Environmental Law (WCEL)

The World Commission on Environmental Law (WCEL) is a network of environmental law and policy experts from all regions of the world who volunteer their knowledge and services to IUCN activities. WCEL, together with the IUCN Academy of Environmental Law (AEL), which promotes university teaching and research on environmental law, has collaborated with the IUCN Environmental Law Centre on the Law for Sustainability initiative described in the ELC section, above. To further develop this work, a group of AEL lawyers is now beginning to scope out a more comprehensive evaluation of the effectiveness of environmental law principles from the Convention on Biological Diversity. The WCEL has also worked with CEESP on a joint Specialist Group focused on indigenous peoples, customary and environmental laws, and human rights (SPICEH). WCEL also coordinates an Access and Benefit-sharing Group with the objective to provide an international expert forum for the discussion and resolution of some of the complex challenges presented by the ABS concept and its implementation.

World Commission on Protected Areas (WCPA)

The mission of the World Commission on Protected Areas is to promote the establishment and effective management of a worldwide representative network of terrestrial and marine protected areas. As part of this, it has provided expertise and support to the work of IUCN’s Protected Areas Programme to develop guidance on governance of protected areas and promote recognition of multiple types of protected area governance. The WCPA Natural Solutions Specialist Group has been working to develop principles for justice and equity in the distribution of benefits from ecosystem services in protected areas. WCPA maintains a Specialist Group on Cultural and Spiritual Values of Protected Areas, and recently established a Task Force on Protected Areas Governance to follow up recommendations from the Governance Stream of the 2014 World Parks Congress.

The survey report (see below) on objectives and activities of IUCN governance work in IUCN. Since

hero

ason, s ts is dief-

bjecg to ne cratgorys r anothver. Ast thesamme ime, m the tyioly doces idicrat cljusvers ofkey-ripentatioas andap prachces in IUCN’s wor,t and is is(also) TJO.123 Tw 0 -1.326 TD[poissblce tovidentfryexamples of prbjecas r initiatives thme. Ties on thsef a in types of

ovides lljusrrativeexample,t andoeffers(someor)18(eect)TJO Tw (-)TJO -1.326 TD[atioas(onp(otentialsynergivas and impicrations r NRGF)129

initiatives, to reduce deforestation and forest degradation while contributing to the improvement of local livelihoods for women and men.

A cluster of ORMACC projects, including regional implementation of the global Pro-Poor REDD+ project, which has focused on the design of Free, Prior, Informed Consent (FPIC) guidelines for REDD+ processes, and production of a new, detailed map of indigenous territories in Central America, and how they relate to ecosystems and protected areas.

[Enhancing knowledge and capacities on governance](#)

- t An IUCN Centre for Mediterranean Cooperation project considering governance elements in its work on mitigating negative effects of climate change on the ecosystem services provided by protected areas to local people.

B

- t **The Forest Poverty Toolkit:** This toolkit, developed by PROFOR and IUCN, supports data collection and analysis on the contributions of forests to local livelihoods, and builds the evidence base for how forests sustain the poor. Since the importance of forests to livelihoods is often overlooked in national policy processes such as poverty reduction strategies due to inadequate information, the toolkit also includes strategies for communication and policy engagement.
- t **Action learning/Action Research:** An approach increasingly adopted within IUCN and applied to projects, which aims to iteratively improve projects or initiatives through collaborative learning and periodic analysis and revision of project activities.
- t **Free, Prior, Informed, Consent (FPIC):** IUCN, as part of its ESMS, requires that FPIC be obtained for any intervention that takes place on the lands, waters, or territories of indigenous peoples; may have negative economic, social, cultural or environmental impacts on their rights, resources or livelihoods; involves the use of their traditional knowledge; or promotes the development and generation of social or economic benefits from cultural heritage sites or resources to which they have legal (including customary) rights.
- t **IUCN Standard on Indigenous Peoples:** This Standard, which is also part of the ESMS, requires that IUCN projects:
 - t anticipate and avoid negative economic, cultural, social and environmental impacts on indigenous peoples or, if avoidance is not possible, minimise and/or compensate for impacts;
 - t take specific conditions, rights and needs of indigenous peoples – including their social, economic and cultural rights – fully into account in project planning and implementation and ensure that their social and cultural identity, customs, traditions and institutions are fully respected, including their cultural and spiritual values and perspectives on the environment;
 - t optimise opportunities for providing culturally appropriate and gender inclusive benefits to indigenous peoples as agreed with them.
- t **The Restoration Opportunities Assessment Methodology (ROAM),** produced by IUCN and the World Resources Institute (WRI), provides a framework for countries to rapidly identify areas suitable for forest landscape restoration (FLR).

Other more general methodologies, or tools highlighted by one or two respondents include: legal analysis; gender

analysis and mainstreaming, and the IUCN Environment Gender Information (EGI) platform; rights-based approaches; participatory mapping; the IUCN Protected Area Standards; the IUCN Resilience Framework; CEESP Sharing Power resources and tools; the Forest Carbon Partnership Facility technical guidance on developing a Consultation and Participation Plan, and the UN-REDD Guidelines on Stakeholder Engagement in REDD+ Readiness.

With regard to expertise and/or training of project staff, approximately (just over) half of the responses provided information about specific relevant areas of expertise, including: legal expertise, gender expertise (particularly from the IUCN GGO), advanced degrees in social science (particularly for the RFGI project), participatory approaches, CBNRM, FPIC, practical expertise (e.g., from ORMACC, 5-10 years experience working on governance projects with indigenous peoples and local communities), rights-based approaches, international water law, pro-poor approaches and rural sociology. Approximately (just under) half of the surveys gave no response, or the expertise cited was not clearly governance related.

To the question regarding whether external expertise was tapped, many of the responses responded generally that both internal/project staff expertise and external expertise contributed to the project. Where sources of external expertise were specified, these generally fell into three categories:

- t Local experts in countries of implementation – such as legal, gender, ESMS and indigenous experts
- t IUCN specialists located in Secretariat global programmes – such as the Gender Advisor, Social Policy Advisor, and staff of the Global Forest and Climate Change Programme
- t Commission expertise – particularly from CEESP and the Commission on Ecosystem Management

Regarding safeguards, the majority of responses either stated that they did not apply specific safeguard standards, did not respond on this point, or provided responses that were not specific enough to identify a standard. Specific safeguard standards that were cited by respondents include:

- t The IUCN Environmental and Social Management System
- t IUCN's Standard on Indigenous Peoples
- t World Bank or other donor safeguards
- t Gender, REDD+, IUCN Protected Area Governance Principles and/or environmental safeguards (each mentioned by 1-2 respondents)

Discussion

These responses indicate that some specific governance-related methodologies are in use in IUCN, though

not a consistent focus on any particular ones. While of course different methods and tools are needed for different types of work, the responses indicate a potential niche for NRGF in bringing greater coherence to methods related to governance. They also show that there are useful and relevant materials developed and/or already in use by IUCN programs that NRGF can build on.

The responses also indicate a need to increase the explicit use of safeguards. Given that IUCN's updated Environmental and Social Management System has just been rolled out, this is likely to increase, though may also be an area for NRGF to highlight in awareness and/or training activities.

Comments on the report further highlighted the increase, over the last 3-5 years, in collaborations between IUCN global and regional initiatives and the GESSP and CEESP Commission to address governance issues. Examples include collaborative work to strengthen the rights-based approaches in the World Heritage Programme, gender integration in the work of the Global Forest and Climate Change Programme, and increased attention to indigenous and gender rights in the Global Drylands Initiative.

t ORMACC Central America map on the overlaps

practitioners during project development, and ensuring trust when practitioners use research results.

Challenges related to the capacity and coordination of governments and other actors

- t Limited transfer of financial and human resources to decentralized authorities.
- t Institutional inertia at the regional level and poor capacity in the local administration.
- t Lack of alignment between federal and jurisdictional priorities, thus affecting large scale investments in landscape restoration that require a strong political support and coordinated strategic planning from both central and local governments.
- t Linking local voices to global policy forums is still tricky and representativeness of their constituency by apex organizations is not always strong.
- t National forest and farm organizations often do not know global/regional organizations defending the same causes and do not feel that international policy and decisions are really relevant to them, nor impacting them.
- t The programme is largely implemented through grant projects awarded to partner organizations in country. The capacity of the implementing organizations determines the quality of the outcome of the projects to a large extent.
- t i) weak institutional enabling environment on benefit sharing and participatory management ii) disorganized CBOs iii) absence of credible local representatives iv) overall weak governance structures v) limited knowledge and capacities of vulnerable groups.

Practical challenges of community-based work

- t Maintaining a presence on the ground and constant communication with local communities and opinion leaders/decision makers has been a big challenge.
- t Working in indigenous territories demands much time and budget.
- t 24/7 patrolling needed in peak illegal fishing season, IUCN had to serve as resource mechanism when local authorities failed to act.
- t Hard to attribute increased fish stocks to project given confounding factors.
- t The planned activities designed to generate forestry business models were adversely affected by structural problems of markets, along with lack of support by the government, which the project could not replace.

Challenges related to knowledge and learning

- t While there is a high value in engaging with the research community to advance research and build the evidence base for practical work in the field, much of the research remains in inaccessible journals and is not applied to the field or co-developed with practitioners.
- t Consultations and FPIC are topics with very few references in Central America, in general, indigenous peoples, local communities, and national government authorities don't know about FPIC international and national law, so it is necessary to spend a lot of time in training and dialogue.
- t Cross-learning and learning consolidation and communication.
- t Translation of lessons, experiences and outcomes into global knowledge and tools.
- t Simplifying complex governance concepts for application in the field, in multiple languages.
- t Communicating simply and succinctly the value and components of good environmental governance across all levels from communities to national governments.
- t For bio-ecologists to work with economists, understand each other's language and concepts, and discuss each other's' doubts.

Lessons

Along with challenges, IUCN staff offered many reflections on lessons to take from their experiences, that could be useful for others pursuing similar work.

One persistent theme in the lessons shared was the importance of engaging and working with existing institutions. For example, it was noted that,



context of an area or project. For example, respondents highlighted the need to understand the context and needs of people with whom the project wants to work, the national political, social and legal context, the role of women in governance systems, local capacities, and (in the case of work on rural livelihoods) *the needs of forest markets (demand) and the capacity of companies to supply them.*

A third theme explored in the lessons was the need to build opportunities for partnerships to grow and for diverse stakeholders to share their perspectives and priorities for collaboration. In some cases, respondents reflected on how projects had facilitated or provided a catalyst for connections between government officials and communities. It was noted that: *It is rewarding to gather government departments or agencies, NGOs and local communities around a common vision and objectives. Each entity benefits from diversity and complementarity.*

Another theme running through the lessons was the importance of capacity building and support to development of local governance structures. Respondents advised on working with local actors to identifying capacity gaps and tailor capacity building as required throughout the life of the project. Capacity of local implementing partners was also a focus of lessons, including the need to ensure that partners are technically strong, have good networks in the area of implementation, and have capacity for conflict before embarking on work involving sensitive issues of governance and rights.

In relation to policy advocacy, a key lesson concerned the need to ensure that advocacy efforts are conducted with the direct engagement and commitment of local stakeholders. Policy efforts also depend on national momentum and openings, significant experience, and active networks. It was noted that community exchanges can foster awareness and engagement in advocacy efforts.


Regarding timeframes, respondents noted that governance related processes and the associated relationships and trust take time, and must be flexible and responsive to opportunities. Projects should be designed for a minimum of 4-5 years, and even the technical expertise required for governance work takes time to develop. Tangible, measurable results may only come years after the initiation of a project. As a parting word: *Be patient – it pays off.*

7. INSTITUTIONAL SUPPORT

The survey concluded with requests for recommendations regarding types of institutional support that IUCN could provide to strengthen and enhance work on natural resource governance.

One main type of support requested by programmes was to do more to foster social learning on governance issues in IUCN, including through sharing of experiences and lessons and capacity building. For example, comments related to this point include:

- t It would be extremely useful to have a basic



IUCN is a membership Union composed of both government and civil society organisations. It harnesses the experience, resources and reach of its 1,300 Member organisations and the input of some 15,000 experts. IUCN is the global authority on the status of the natural world and the measures needed to safeguard it.

CEESP, the IUCN Commission on Environmental, Economic and Social Policy, is an inter-disciplinary network of professionals whose mission is to act as a source of advice on the environmental, economic, social and cultural factors that affect natural resources and biological diversity and to provide guidance and support towards effective policies and practices in environmental conservation and sustainable development.

The Natural Resource Governance Framework (NRGF) is an IUCN initiative created for the purpose of providing a robust, inclusive, and credible approach to assessing and strengthening natural resource governance, at multiple levels and in diverse contexts. The NRGF is hosted by the IUCN Commission on Environmental, Economic and Social Policy (CEESP), working in close collaboration with the IUCN Secretariat and partners across the Union.