

# **DISCUSSION PAPER**

## **Towards a Strategic Plan for the IUCN Mediterranean Programme**

**February 2002**

**IUCN Centre for Mediterranean Cooperation**

**IUCN**  
The World Conservation Union

# Table of Contents

<b>1 THE PURPOSE OF THIS DISCUSSION PAPER.....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>2 SITUATION ANALYSIS – THE MEDITERRANEAN CONTEXT .....</b>	<b>1</b>
2.1 HISTORICAL OVERVIEW – A SHARED HISTORY.....	1
2.2 CURRENT HUMAN AND ENVIRONMENTAL SITUATION .....	2
<b>3 STAKEHOLDER ANALYSIS – MAJOR ACTORS RELEVANT TO IUCN IN THE MEDITERRANEAN .....</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>4 IUCN’S NICHE AND COMPARATIVE ADVANTAGE IN THE MEDITERRANEAN .....</b>	<b>7</b>
4.1 DEFINING ROLES FOR IUCN IN THE MEDITERRANEAN.....	7
4.2 CAPACITY ASSESSMENT.....	8
<b>5 LONG TERM STRATEGY.....</b>	<b>9</b>
5.1 PROGRAMME OBJECTIVES AND OUTCOMES .....	9
5.2 MAIN PROGRAMME THEMES .....	10
5.3 MAIN PROGRAMME STRATEGIES .....	10
<b>6 MEDIUM TERM PLAN (2002-2004) .....</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>7 MANAGING THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROGRAMME.....</b>	<b>13</b>
7.1 STAFFING OF THE IUCN MEDITERRANEAN PROGRAMME OFFICE:.....	13
7.2 INTERACTION BETWEEN THE MEDITERRANEAN PROGRAMMES AND IUCN STATUTORY REGIONS .....	13
7.3 CONSTITUTION OF AN ADVISORY BOARD .....	14
7.4 FINANCING THE START UP PHASE .....	14
7.5 MONITORING AND REPORTING.....	14
7.6 EVALUATION.....	15
<b>ANNEX 1.....</b>	<b>16</b>
<b>ANNEXES 2,3,4.....</b>	<b>20</b>

# 1 The Purpose of this Discussion Paper

This Discussion Paper is a step towards a Strategic Plan for the IUCN Mediterranean Programme that was established in October 2001. It takes account of the discussions that have been held between Mediterranean members to identify the role and niche of IUCN in the region<sup>1</sup>, the proposals put forward by members, and by the IUCN global Secretariat in 1999, the reorientation of IUCN's overall Programme in Amman 2000<sup>2</sup>, and of guidance given by the IUCN Council and Director General in 2001. A summary of these inputs is presented in Annex 1 and provides the basis on which the programme is being developed.

The purpose of the document is to set out the information and analysis that provides a clear rationale, niche and comparative advantage for IUCN in the Mediterranean region<sup>3</sup>, and that will provide the foundation for the development of a relevant and sustainable IUCN Programme for the Mediterranean. Furthermore it is hoped that this Strategic Plan will help to identify those areas in which IUCN can have longer term impact in the Mediterranean in terms of addressing the key issues affecting conservation and the sustainable use of natural resources. Lastly the document will begin to identify the comparative advantages of IUCN in terms of maximizing the roles that IUCN can play with the IUCN constituency in the Mediterranean in order to best deliver a relevant, focused and sustainable Programme.

This Discussion Paper has been reviewed within the IUCN Secretariat, through the Mediterranean Task Force designated by the Director General, then by a meeting of Chairmen of Mediterranean IUCN National Committees and IUCN regional Councillors. It is also shared with the current core financial supporters of the programme (Ministry of Environment, Madrid, and Consejería de Medio Ambiente, Andalucía).

## 2 Situation Analysis – the Mediterranean Context

### 2.1 Historical overview – a shared history

A Mediterranean region is identified on the basis of its common history and culture, by its common geography and ecological characteristics and by the enclosed nature of the shared sea. This latter point has been the basis for concerted policies and actions in the region over the last 30 years.

The particular Mediterranean geography, where a narrow, productive coastal fringe, is bounded to the south and east by desert, and to the north often by mountain ranges, has meant that the shared sea has frequently been the inward-looking focus of civilizations for thousands of years. From the sea-faring Phoenicians, through Romans, Moors, Ottomans, and smaller States such as Navarre, Venice, Genoa - all have made their mark on the region, often with significant regional empires lasting hundreds of years. More recently, countries such as France, Italy and Spain have all occupied southern or eastern Mediterranean countries at particular times in the late 18th century, or following the break-up of the Ottoman Empire around the time of the First World War.

These historical links have led to the establishment of trading networks, significant exchange of populations and a sense of shared culture that continues to this day. It has also led to particular European countries having privileged links with southern and eastern Mediterranean countries through

---

<sup>1</sup> Meeting of over 100 IUCN members in Málaga in 1997

<sup>2</sup> IUCN inter-sessional programme 2001-2004

<sup>3</sup> The programme scope will cover the **Mediterranean eco-region**, that includes all states bordering the Mediterranean Sea, including islands, plus Andorra, Jordan, Portugal and FYROM, which are considered cultural and ecologically Mediterranean, and Palestine.

common language and a sense of shared history that still strongly influences financial flows and linkages. The Balkans are marked by their historical association with the former communist bloc, and the geo-political logic often locates them as a subset of Eastern Europe, although these countries also assert their Mediterranean character.

As far as links with Europe and the European Union are concerned, the 1995 Barcelona declaration marked a turning point that committed the entire EU to implement a “proximity policy” of aid and assistance for the region, that provided 9 billion Euros in grant and loans during 1995-1999 under the MEDA programme, far beyond what the riparian European states alone had previously been able to provide. Cyprus and Slovenia are candidates for the current round of accession to the EU, and Turkey, and Malta remain candidates for the subsequent round. North African States have also developed a regional group – L’Union du Maghreb Arabe, that includes Mauritania.

## 2.2 Current Human and Environmental Situation

It is useful to start any analysis of the current human and environmental situation with a general overview of the human (meaning social, economic, cultural aspects) and environmental situation of this region.

<b>Human wellbeing index</b>
<i>Medium</i>
Albania
Croatia
Egypt
France
Greece
Israel
Italy
Macedonia
Portugal
Slovenia
Spain
<i>Poor</i>
Algeria
Bosnia
Jordan
Lebanon
Libya
Morocco
Syria
Tunisia
Turkey
Yugoslavia

This purpose is well served by the Wellbeing Index recently developed by Prescott-Allen, that includes and aggregates in a single Index a broad range Human and Environmental Indicators.

The Wellbeing Index is built by aggregating 87 environmental, economic and social indicators. The Index has a 0 to 100 range, divided in five sections: Bad (0-20), Poor (21-40), Medium (41-60), Fair (61-80) and Good (81-100). The Index considers Human and Environmental Wellbeing together, therefore it is not possible to obtain a good overall ranking without performing well in both areas. As can be seen in the Table all the Mediterranean Countries fall in the Poor and Medium Categories.

### Human aspects

The GDP per capita of the Mediterranean EU countries is twelve times that of their North African counterparts, and population growth and slow-growing economies make legal or illegal immigration to the EU an attractive prospect for many as well as providing temporary jobs especially in the agricultural sector. EU policy is therefore clearly aimed at creating a free trade space in the region to promote exchange and economic growth, although divergent opinions, notably in the agriculture sector, make this a challenging process.

In general the main EU policy thrust is to improve economic growth throughout the region (while ensuring sustainable development) and promoting exchanges of experience to continue to improve mutual understanding between the region’s countries and cultures.

The Mediterranean-rim countries presently hold 427 million people, and almost 250 million of them live less than 100 km from the Mediterranean coast. The population of the northern-rim nations will grow from 192 million in 2000 to 196 million in 2025; the population of the southern- and eastern-rim nations will grow from 235 million to 327 million over the same period. Mediterranean countries are also an international travel destination for nearly 200 million visitors per year, the majority of whom visit the coastal zone.

## Environmental aspects

Analysis of the environmental situation provides additional information on the overall sustainability values for Mediterranean countries.

For many countries, water resources are a key issue, except perhaps in the more water-rich Balkans, and the global debate on water finds a voice in the Mediterranean region. For example, of the 12 southern and eastern Mediterranean countries, the Blue Plan estimates that 8 now annually use more than 50 per cent of their renewable water resources; two of them (the Palestinian Territories and Libya) are already using more than their renewable water resources. By the year 2025 the Blue Plan estimates that 10 of the 12 countries may be consuming more than 50 per cent of their renewable water resources, with eight of them using more than 100%. Some 70 % of Mediterranean water is used for agriculture, much of it for consumption within Europe. Many wetlands have been lost through drainage and diversion (eg. 65% in Greece, 28% in Tunisia).

The Mediterranean Commission on Sustainable Development proposes to pursue increased demand-side management rather than following historical strategies of offering new resources that may prove costly (as the cheaper sources have already been mobilised) and less sustainable. The Blue Plan estimates that if the quantities of water now being lost or wasted in Mediterranean countries were reduced by half (estimated at 75 km<sup>3</sup>), nearly 80% of the additional needs for water between now and 2010 could be made met through savings alone.

Low rainfall combined with unsustainable farming practices has led to desertification in many areas, with for example 30% of Greece being declared “threatened” and 60% of Portugal facing a moderate risk of desertification. In semi-arid areas, many years of unsustainable farming techniques have led to erosion, salinisation and land degradation. Sustainable use of Mediterranean forests is affected by the economics of exploitation that usually render them less viable than those in northern Europe, and by the challenge of controlling regular and often hazardous fires in a complex local socio-economic context.

Fisheries have long been exploited by artisanal and industrial fishermen, and local consumption now exceeds production fourfold. Aquaculture has yet to make up the gap, and expert views are divided on the feasibility, and advisability of taking this course. Sought after species are in decline (eg Tuna and Swordfish). EU policies sustaining fishing fleets are partly to blame for over-fishing. The by-catch of threatened species (dolphins, seals, turtles) is also significant locally, although the situation appears to be improving. The complexity of the Mediterranean fishery is illustrated by the presence of 110 commercial species, compared to only 40 for the North Atlantic.

### **A distinctive eco-region<sup>4</sup>**

The Mediterranean region has high levels of endemism that have led to its identification as a global biodiversity hotspot. This is in part due to the area being spared during the recent ice ages, the presence of significant massifs (eg Atlas, southern Taurus, Gudar, Javalambre, Levant...) and also to the long history of varying land-use by people in the area that has created and maintained a wide range of habitats.

The table shows that the diversity of vascular plants in the Mediterranean is significant compared to other regions of the world<sup>5</sup>.

<sup>4</sup> Drawn from UNEP (1997). Conservation of wetlands and coastal ecosystems in the Mediterranean region.

<sup>5</sup> Quezel P and Médail F, 1995. La région Méditerranéenne, centre mondiale majeur de biodiversité végétale. 6ème rencontres de l'Agence Régionale pour l'environnement Provence-Alpes-Côtes d'Azur.

*Table 1. Diversity of vascular plants in four global hotspots*

Region	Area sq km	No. plant species	No. endemic species	% endemic species
Mediterranean	2,300,000	25,000	12,500	50 %
Zaire	2,345,000	11,000	2,800 (approx)	30 %
India	3,166,000	15,000	5,000	30 %
Australia	7,682,000	22,000	7,600	34 %

Data for Morocco shows that it has particularly high species diversity and endemism and holds approximately 3,800 species of plant, of which 829 are endemic. Four of these are in danger of extinction and 238 species are directly threatened. Other countries with high species richness and endemism representative of the region as a whole include Syria (2,600 species, 395 endemic) and Greece (4,000 species, 554 endemic). The rate of endemism on Mediterranean islands is especially high, with 10% of species often being endemic.

The biological diversity of the Mediterranean is not limited to plants. Of 62 species of amphibian in the Mediterranean, 35 are endemic (56%), as are 111 of the 179 reptile species (62%). In Morocco, for example, there are 93 reptile species, 20 of which are endemic (21%). Of the 184 mammal species recorded, 25% are endemic and 52 species are threatened (excluding marine mammals).

The Mediterranean is also hugely important for its bird populations, being on the migration route of millions of waterfowl. An estimated 2 billion migratory birds of 150 species use Mediterranean wetlands as stopover or seasonal sites. About 50 per cent of the wintering Western Palaearctic populations of ducks and coot occur in the Mediterranean region.

Twenty globally threatened bird species live in the region. Seven of these breed in Mediterranean wetlands, and wetlands host about seventy other species whose populations are locally threatened. Stress on water resources in many Mediterranean countries makes this biome of particular vulnerability.

Knowledge of the biodiversity of the region is heterogeneous at country level, sometimes restricted to species lists, occasionally also including spatial distribution. Data is dispersed, and there is no regional summary, nor internationally recognised baseline for easily assessing which plants or invertebrates listed as endemic or on national red lists are in fact truly globally threatened. Taxonomic expertise is often lacking, and there may be disagreements on nomenclature and classification, especially for the lower Orders. Protection measures for large mammals (eg. seals, cetaceans, antelopes) and birds tend to be adequate<sup>6</sup>, but where biodiversity hotspots for flora, and other groups, have been identified there is as yet little explicit linkage to regional and national policies, beyond the limited species lists under the Habitats Directive and Barcelona Convention..

All Mediterranean countries have created protected areas networks that seek to protect pristine or representative areas, both terrestrial and marine. Some of these are uninhabited, others depend on the active participation of local people in and around them for the maintenance of their natural values. Different countries display different degrees of flexibility with respect to incentives for biodiversity conservation, and provisions for sustainable use. Many still implement a "protectionist approach" with strong centralized jurisdiction over particular land areas, with weak linkage to local populations, resource users, or local economies although legislation, and attitudes, continue to evolve. Often centralized jurisdiction over protected areas may be at odds with decentralized powers (eg of regional governors and their equivalents), or there may be conflicts of interest between the concerned ministries (eg where new environmental ministries have been created), raising the need for interministerial coordination with existing protected area managers such as forestry or agriculture

<sup>6</sup> For example Birdlife International has identified Important Bird Areas and species action plans covering all threatened species in the region.

departments. Equally there is recognition that land-use policies outside protected areas, both in coastal zones and semi-mountainous areas, contribute to the creation of unique Mediterranean landscape values.

The capacity of protected areas to be seen as an opportunity, rather than a constraint, for local development, represents one of the emerging areas of work in the region, and several countries have growing experience on this topic.

### **3 Stakeholder Analysis – Major Actors Relevant to IUCN in the Mediterranean**

This section presents an overview of the major IUCN constituents in the Mediterranean Region, including:

- ? IUCN Members in the region
- ? IUCN Commissions in the region
- ? International and Regional organizations active in the field of conservation and sustainable development
- ? National and major organizations (NGO and governmental) active in the field of conservation and sustainable development in their countries – potential partners and potential competitors
- ? Donors and funding organizations in the Mediterranean

#### **Member organizations**

IUCN has around 145 members in 19 riparian Mediterranean countries plus three countries - Jordan, Portugal and the FYROM (Macedonia) that are non-riparian but are considered culturally and ecologically Mediterranean. This figure includes sixteen State members of IUCN. There are 9 formally or informally recognised IUCN National Committees that are in Egypt, France, Italy, Jordan, Lebanon, Morocco, Spain, Syria and Tunisia.

Within the existing IUCN Statutes, and taking account of the IUCN regionalisation structure, the Director General of IUCN has directed the Mediterranean office to focus on thematic programmes, and to leave membership and statutory issues to the existing regional structures (WesCANA and ERO).

#### **IUCN Commissions**

IUCN has six scientific Commissions and all of them have voluntary members in the Mediterranean. These Commissions are:

- ? WCPA      World Commission on Protected Areas
- ? SSC        Species Survival Commission
- ? ELC        Environmental Law Commission
- ? CEC        Commission on Education and Communications
- ? CEM        Commission on Ecosystem Management
- ? CEESP     Commission on Environmental, Economic and Social Policy

Annex 2 presents a list of members of these Commissions in the Mediterranean region.

## **Regional cooperation**

Regional environmental conventions and programmes have been in place since 1976. The first international environmental Convention signed after the World Summit in Stockholm (1972) was the Barcelona Convention of 1975, ratified by 20 Mediterranean riparian Parties (19 States plus the European Union). The Convention has had numerous legal consequences, namely in supporting and updating legal provisions at the national levels. The first Regional Seas Programme of UNEP (Mediterranean Action Plan - MAP) was established in 1976 to support the implementation of the Convention.

Other pan-Mediterranean agreements have followed, such as the Genova Declaration (1985), the Nicosia Charter (1989), and Agenda 21 for the Mediterranean (Tunis 1995), establishing a Mediterranean Commission for Sustainable Development (1996). The Convention on Desertification has an Annex devoted to the northern Mediterranean region.

The EU has recognized cooperation with southern and eastern Mediterranean countries as a priority and launched an ambitious cooperation programme (MEDA) following the Euro Mediterranean Summit in November 1995. The World Bank acts in the region through a special unit, the Mediterranean Environmental Technical Assistance Programme (METAP), in concertation with the European Commission.

The Barcelona Convention was reviewed by the parties in 1995. It is now called the "Convention for the Protection of the Marine Environment and the Coastal Region of the Mediterranean". Significantly, it includes a new "Protocol concerning the Specially Protected Areas and Biological Diversity in the Mediterranean" (1996), which is to a certain extent a regionalization of some elements of the Convention on Biological Diversity. A Mediterranean Commission for Sustainable Development was created as an autonomous body of the MAP. It has a unique structure, bringing together NGOs, private sector, governments and local authorities. The Director General of IUCN has named the Malaga Office as the IUCN focal point for the Convention and the reinforcement of collaboration between IUCN and the Convention is one of the motivating forces described in the financing agreement between the Spanish Ministry for the Environment, Andalucia and IUCN.

In the 1990s pan-Mediterranean initiatives were launched by some NGOs, many of which involve IUCN members - eg the WWF-International Mediterranean Programme, the MEDForum network of NGOs, the Mediterranean information Office and the MedWet Programme for Mediterranean Wetlands (EU and Ramsar Convention). Mediterranean networks also exist on other topics such as water (Global water partnership – MedTAC)

In conclusion, the Mediterranean ecosystem has been identified as one of the major global biodiversity hotspots, and it is clear that there is a genuine Mediterranean space that is recognised through regional policy and funding initiatives, and through the institutionalised structure of the governmental, intergovernmental and NGO bodies in the region. Information and experience on biodiversity conservation and sustainable use exists, yet this is rarely available to all concerned actors. The strong institutional framework on the northern shore (strong NGOs and universities, clear EU Directives and finance, effective Protected Area networks) is mirrored to the South and East by weaker NGOs and lack of human and financial capacity that hampers an effective approach to conservation and sustainable use of the region's shared biodiversity and natural resources.

## **National Organizations**

A basic inventory of national organizations active in conservation and sustainable development is not currently available, although there is a good directory of over 2000 Mediterranean NGOs (WWF). Identification of other actors will be included in the 2002 Workplan for the Programme.



## Donors and Funding Organizations

There is a basic list of funding organizations in the Mediterranean already compiled by IUCN in 1999 during the development of the office. The list needs to be brought fully up to date and the additional work required to complete it will be included in the 2002 Workplan.

## 4 IUCN's Niche and Comparative Advantage in the Mediterranean

If IUCN is to have a long-term impact and a sustainable presence in the Mediterranean, careful and strategic choices must be made in the development of the Programme. Areas of work must be selected that maximize IUCN's core competencies, that build on the strengths and comparative advantages of the membership and partners, and that attract long term investment from donors and partners.

The situation analysis for the Mediterranean (Section 3) provides an analytical basis upon which to choose the most relevant areas of work for IUCN. It should also offer guidance on the most appropriate roles and partnerships for IUCN in order to deliver a relevant, high quality programme.

The following is a summary of that analysis:

### The key issues and trends affecting conservation and the sustainable use of natural resources:

- ? The overall human wellbeing picture for Western European countries is medium, while human wellbeing in Northern Africa, Middle East and the Balkans is poor to medium;
- ? Human population density is high and increasing in most coastal areas;
- ? There are major wealth disparities between rich countries and poor countries in the region (12 times more in the North than in the South);
- ? The general environmental situation can be substantially enhanced throughout the region;
- ? The biodiversity conservation situation can be improved – only two countries have more than 10% of their land surface as protected areas (France and Israel) leaving the remainder below minimum international standards;
- ? The situation of fresh water balance (withdrawal and renewal) is critical in half of the basin. Only the northern Balkan countries and France have a good fresh water supply.

### 4.1 Defining roles for IUCN in the Mediterranean

The niche and comparative advantage of IUCN as a member organization and its long experience in biodiversity conservation and sustainable development suggest the following roles for IUCN in the Mediterranean:

1. Strengthening and supporting the work of the Union (Members, Commissions and their different structures) through networking, coordination, facilitation, training and technical assistance;
2. Supporting policy-making on conservation and sustainable development through advocacy, development of policy proposals and guidelines, participation in regional bodies and other means aimed to empower Union Members and Commissions participation in regional and national policy making;
3. Drawing on field activities and regional experience to demonstrate the feasibility and appropriateness of the IUCN approach to biodiversity conservation, sustainable use of natural resources and equitable sharing of benefits coming from conservation and sustainable use.

The first two roles are linked with the distinctive feature of IUCN as an international member-based organization that strengthens its constituents to improve their capacities to influence policy. The third role draws on the IUCN record and expertise to promote innovative and practical approaches to address key human and environmental challenges, working with local communities, organizations and governments to convert policies into better daily life realities.

## 4.2 Capacity Assessment

Part of the analysis of niche and comparative advantage includes an assessment of the capacity of IUCN and its partners to play the roles suggested above, and to deliver a relevant, credible and high quality Programme in the Mediterranean.

Once the Medium Term Programme Objectives have been refined, a capacity assessment will be carried out that assesses the available technical, managerial and organizational skills and capacities in IUCN as well as proposed partner organizations to deliver the results in the chosen areas of work.

Typically a capacity assessment will look at both the technical skills and capacities required to work in a technical field, as well as the organizational skills and capacities that are required to manage and deliver a high quality programme. These include skills and systems in programming, management, strategic leadership, financial management, human resources management, information management and communications. IUCN uses an internationally recognized organizational assessment methodology developed by the International Development Research Centre (IDRC) for capacity assessment that is linked to ongoing overall performance of IUCN and partner organizations who are contracted to deliver aspects of the programme.

A summary of the framework used by IUCN to assess organizational capacity is set out in Annex 3.

### **Strengths and weaknesses of IUCN capacity to support the Mediterranean:**

A first rapid inventory of available technical capacities to assist in the improvement of IUCN strengths includes the following:

- a. The IUCN Mediterranean Task Force created by the Director General to support the development of the office and programme. Members include representatives of the IUCN Global Thematic Programmes relevant to the region:
  - ? Forests Programme
  - ? Wetlands Programme
  - ? Marine and Coastal Areas Programme
  - ? Protected Areas
  - ? Species
  - ? Social Programme
  - ? Law
- b. The technical and scientific capacities of the IUCN Commissions and Specialist Groups;
- c. The technical, scientific, financial and infrastructure capacities of members and partners (that remain to be fully inventoried);
- d. The institutional capacity and expertise of IUCN to bring together different organizations from different places and countries to address issues of common interest;
- e. institutional capacity of IUCN to work at different levels (international, regional, national, local) and to connect processes between those levels allowing for mutual feedback and reinforcement.

Some areas require capacity improvement on the part of the Secretariat :

- a. expertise in arid and semiarid ecosystems. IUCN has worked in these ecosystems in other parts of the world and some experts can be found within IUCN staff and Commissions, but a strong regional technical capacity in this field will need to be developed.
- b. appropriate funding to support the activities. The generous contribution of the Consejería del Medio Ambiente (Andalucía, Spain) and the Ministerio del Ambiente (Spain) support the basic structure and operations of the Programme until 2004, however it will be necessary to generate a strong funding base for the different activities to be carried out in the region.
- c. little direct expertise in the political dynamic of the region. The Mediterranean is a complex and heterogeneous region with very different, and sometimes contradictory, interests and ideas. Therefore, the support of members and partners in this region is a key to the success of the Programme.

## 5 Long Term Strategy<sup>7</sup>

Building on the Mission of IUCN, the aim of the IUCN Mediterranean Programme is :

*“To influence, encourage and assist Mediterranean societies in achieving both the conservation and sustainable use of natural resources, and sustainable development”.*

The impact achieved by the gradual fulfilment of this Mission will be demonstrated by improvements on people’s wellbeing and/or ecosystem condition at both local and regional levels, as well as by progress at both levels in biodiversity conservation, sustainable use of natural resources and the pertinent equitable sharing of the benefits from those activities.

This Mission is pursued through four strategic approaches, agreed at the Amman Congress, which are to strengthen:

- ? **Knowledge:** generating, integrating, managing, and disseminating knowledge for the conservation, sustainable and equitable use of nature and natural resources;
- ? **Empowerment:** building capacity, responsibility and willingness of people and institutions to plan, manage, conserve and use nature and natural resources in a sustainable and equitable manner;
- ? **Governance:** systemic improvement of laws, policies, economic instruments and institutions for the conservation and sustainable and equitable use of nature and natural resources;
- ? **Operations:** effective management, information, finance, human resources and communication systems as the foundations for effective delivery and use of knowledge, empowerment and governance.

### 5.1 Programme Objectives and Outcomes

The objectives and outcomes of the Programme to be achieved in the long term emerge from the issues and trends described in the situation analysis. The objectives define what the Programme is planning to do over the long term, while the outcomes define the changes in the context that the Programme is expecting to generate. Both are summarized in the following table.

Programme Objective	Outcomes
1. Make knowledge, information and experience on conservation and management of biodiversity, ecosystems, islands, fisheries and	? Organizations of all types in the region access and use information made available by IUCN; ? Projects and activities make explicit use of information, methods and approaches made available by IUCN;

<sup>7</sup> This section draws on the results of the Malaga members meeting ( See Annex 1).

water resources, available for conservation, sustainable use and rehabilitation efforts. (K)	? Experience and lessons learned from local processes is shared across the region and IUCN in general.
2. Strengthen and support IUCN Members and Commissions in the region to deal with research, policy making, management and conservation of biodiversity, ecosystems, islands, fisheries and water resources. (E)	? Networking mechanisms are run and used by Members and Commissions; ? Member and partner organizations using IUCN approaches and methods in their activities; ? Active exchange of experiences and views among Members and Commissions across the region on conservation and development issues.
3. Promote, both globally and regionally, Mediterranean policies on conservation and sustainable development, and support mechanisms for their implementation. (G)	? Policy makers in the Mediterranean are supported by IUCN Members, Commissions, and the Programme in developing policies and implementations mechanisms consistent with IUCN approaches; ? Members and Commissions increase their participation in regional and national bodies dealing with conservation and development issues; ? Members and Commissions are supported by the Programme with scientific information and technical advice in their policy making work; ? Experience and lessons learned from local processes are fed into policy making processes.
4. Effective Management of the Programme to achieve effective delivery and use of knowledge, empowerment and governance.	? Outcomes and impacts are achieved; ? Programme constituents (Members, Commissions, partners, donors) benefit from Programme performance.

## 5.2 Main Programme Themes

At the very outset of discussions concerning the IUCN Mediterranean office, IUCN members met in Malaga in 1997 to define the five priority themes of the programme<sup>8</sup>. These were agreed as :

- ? biodiversity conservation (ecosystems, species)
- ? desertification
- ? island management
- ? sustainable use of natural resources (eg fisheries conservation and management)
- ? water resources conservation and management

These broad topics provided the starting point for developing the IUCN Mediterranean programme.

## 5.3 Main Programme Strategies

- ? to adopt a generic role of facilitation and constituency mobilization, looking primarily for ways to support the work of other organizations under the IUCN approach, rather than a direct implementation role;
- ? to recognize the differences in cultural, economic and social characteristics of the people and countries across the region, aiming to develop specific action strategies and mechanisms well suited to each specific location. This is a key factor in working successfully in a region with extremely divergent wealth levels and often violent conflicts;
- ? to implement Programme activities jointly with Members, Commissions and partners. Their degree of involvement in each activity will depend on the particular combination of constituents' interests and skills, donor or beneficiary requirements and requisites to ensure high quality standards of the products;

<sup>8</sup> See Annex 1

- ? to develop strong North-South linkages and regional equity in programme implementation;
- ? to avoid duplication of activities with IUCN Members and other regional actors, while building on achievements of existing IUCN programmes;
- ? to develop a representative advisory body in order to ensure proper and independent feedback on the Programme activities;
- ? to set a dynamic and flexible process of Programme cycle management that ensures flexible planning, adequate monitoring and reporting, regular evaluations and sharing of lessons learned within the region and across IUCN;
- ? to ensure that a Mediterranean voice is heard in global processes in which IUCN is already active, and to assist in testing, assessing and where appropriate modifying agreed global guidelines (for example under the major environmental conventions) for practical implementation in the region.

## **6 Medium Term Plan (2002-2004)**

The Medium Term Plan is structured according to the IUCN Intersessional Programme (2001-2004). This is articulated around seven Key Result Areas (KRA) to which all IUCN regional and thematic programmes and Commissions contribute. The Key Result Areas are large areas of work agreed to by the IUCN membership at the Amman Congress, October 2000, and they provide a framework to guide the delivery of IUCN's work between Congresses.

The seven Key Result Areas are:

1. Effective management and restoration of ecosystems
2. Key institutions, agreements, processes and policies
3. Incentives and finance
4. Equitable sharing of costs and benefits
5. Assessment of biodiversity and of related social and economic factors
6. Information management and communication systems
7. Effective, efficient, and accountable governance and management of the Union.

Aligning the Mediterranean programme with the IUCN intersessional programme is an essential first step to developing annual workplans that clearly define how the products of the regional programme fit clearly into IUCN's global framework. How the priority programme themes identified by the Malaga meeting in 1997 as priorities for the IUCN Mediterranean programme<sup>9</sup> would fit with the IUCN Programme Key Result Areas is presented in the following Table.

This Medium Term Plan provides the context for assessing the staff needs of the office and developing annual work plans and budgets to meet the outcomes expected. Clearly the diversity of themes laid down by the members is ambitious, and the capacity of the Mediterranean programme to meet members' expectations will need to be reviewed on a regular basis.

KEY RESULT AREA	PROGRAMME THEME	MEDITERRANEAN PROGRAMME RESULTS
? Effective management and restoration of ecosystems	Biodiversity conservation Biodiversity conservation Biodiversity conservation Desertification Sustainable resource use Sustainable resource use Sustainable resource use Islands Sustainable resource use Water Resources Mgmt	? The effectiveness of PAs at regional level is assessed and improved ? Multi-country/transboundary actions for biodiversity conservation are supported ? Support is given to the sustainable management of Mediterranean forests ? Importance of arid lands for biodiversity is assessed ? Linkages between agriculture and biodiversity are explored ? Driving forces in land-use change are identified and linkages to key actors developed ? The role of marine PAs in supporting artisanal fisheries is assessed and promoted ? Experience on the management of island protected areas is shared ? The sustainable use of Mediterranean fishery resources is pursued ? Integrated water catchments management is promoted
? Key institutions, agreements, processes and policies	Biodiversity Conservation  Biodiversity Conservation Biodiversity Conservation Biodiversity & resources Biodiversity & Prot. Areas Islands Sustainable resource use Desertification Water Resources Mgmt	? Development and implementation of Barcelona Convention provisions on biodiversity and resources use are supported. ? Refinement of legal instruments for protected areas is undertaken ? Implementation of CBD is supported in the region ? The global biodiversity forum prior to Ramsar COP 8 (2002) is undertaken in Valencia ? Mediterranean inputs to the World Parks Congress (2003) are promoted ? Policies for biodiversity protection and sustainable use in island communities are promoted ? Guidance on adaptation strategies to climate change is developed under the UNFCCC. ? Linkages are established with the desertification convention, and IUCNs emerging policy is supported ? Environmentally-sensitive water use indicators for policy makers are developed ? The World Commission on Dams report is followed up in the region
? Incentives and finance	Sustainable resource use	? Incentives for sustainable use, agriculture and biodiversity are developed and promoted
? Equitable sharing of costs and benefits	Biodiversity Conservation Sustainable resource use Sustainable resource use	? Protected areas are used to support and revitalise rural economies. ? Experience in integrating conservation and local economies is developed and shared ? Development of nature-based tourism is promoted
? Assessment of biodiversity and of related social and economic factors	Biodiversity Conservation Biodiversity Conservation Biodiversity Conservation Biodiversity Conservation Biodiversity Conservation	? A Mediterranean Red List is developed ? Information on species and PAs is made available to regional actors ? Progress on implementing species action plans is monitored ? Information on status of island biodiversity is developed ? Status of threatened species in fisheries is assessed
? Information mgmt and communication systems	Sustainable resource use All Themes	? Linkages are built with key Mediterranean actors on fisheries and arid lands conservation and management ? A technical bridge between global conventions processes and the Mediterranean region is developed
? Effective, efficient, and accountable governance and management of the Union.	All Themes	? North-South linkages between IUCN members are supported and structured ? Capacity of IUCN Commissions in the region to support the programme is enhanced ? The management structure and systems for the Med Programme are developed and strengthened to support effective delivery of the programme ? Leadership is provided by the IUCN Secretariat and the IUCN membership. ? Sources of funding are diversified over time. ? Project pipeline is strong and relevant to the key needs of the region.

## 7 Managing the Implementation of the Programme

In the Intersessional Programme adopted by the IUCN members at the Amman Congress, IUCN's work is defined at two levels:

1. The activities, initiatives and projects of the Secretariat and the Commissions for which IUCN is directly accountable in terms of effectiveness and financial management. This would include work done in partnership with members and other organizations for which there is a signed contractual agreement.
2. The activities, processes and/or initiatives that may be catalysed or influenced by the Union, but for which the Secretariat and Commissions do not have any direct responsibility or accountability.

This Strategic Plan seeks to set out a framework and guidance for the first category of work – that for which the Director General, and those staff delegated by the Director General to manage on his behalf, are accountable – in this case the Global Programme Director, and the Programme Director of the Mediterranean Programme. The second category of work – the work of members – is not the management responsibility of IUCN or the concern of this Strategic Plan.

IUCN members exercise their voting privileges at each World Congress to elect Regional Councillors and to approve the overall Programme of the Union. IUCN seeks to support a participatory and consultative approach with members and other key stakeholders in determining the focus, priorities and direction of its programme, however the ultimate responsibility and accountability for managing the quality of work and the financial viability of the Programme rests with the Director General and his delegated staff.

The Malaga Office is considering the final form of its legal structure within Spain, and a study to this effect is ongoing with a view to responding to the Director General's request for a governance structure that clearly ensures the direct accountability of the Malaga Office to the global Secretariat. In the long term the current intention is to seek diplomatic status, which will require an act of Parliament. In the short term a structure that optimises tax and employment efficiency with public utility may be the optimal solution.

### 7.1 Staffing of the IUCN Mediterranean Programme Office:

In January 2002 the staff consists of a Director, one senior programme officer and one secretary. A finance officer will join the office on March 1 2002. During 2002 two or perhaps three additional technical and communications staff will be appointed.

There will also be opportunities for staff seconded by IUCN members, and members of Commissions to work together to achieve the purposes of the IUCN programme. The Malaga Office will also provide support towards an expert in the European Regional Office in Brussels to liaise with the European Commission on issues of Mediterranean interest. The feasibility of offering intern opportunities for young Mediterranean professionals for short, fixed periods will also be assessed.

The office will favour staff and consultants, including scientists and other technical specialists, from the region. Appointments will be advertised and will be made on the basis of merit according to IUCN's usual procedures.

### 7.2 Interaction between the Mediterranean Programmes and IUCN statutory regions

The Mediterranean programme will work in coordination with the WESCANA programme and the European Regional Office and will implement initiatives in the countries of the Mediterranean sub-region. ERO will be the IUCN platform in Brussels for EU activities and policies relevant to the Mediterranean, as well as providing a focal point for issues concerning the EU – either policy processes, or fund-raising.

WESCANA will remain as one regional programme, assuming full responsibility for membership matters, national committees and statutory issues. WESCANA will continue to implement its programme through two sub-regional centres for the southern parts of the Mediterranean region, one for North Africa with a coordination centre in Tunisia and the other for the Northern Arabian Peninsula in Jordan. In addition, it will also continue implementing thematic priorities (*biodiversity, water, desertification, marine, education and communication, protected areas, environmental law and equity and sustainability*) from the regional centres, as identified by WESCANA members, Commissions and partners as part of WESCANA strategy and programme framework. One of the important guiding principles is "complementarity" : the Mediterranean programme does not seek to replace the existing programmes and structures already in place but to clearly be synergistic at regional level.

The Mediterranean Centre will focus on initiatives at pan-Mediterranean regional/ecosystem level that involve more than one country. It will thus be an added value to the ongoing IUCN technical programmes, in particular for European and WESCANA programmes, and will play no role in membership matters, which remain clearly linked to the IUCN statutory regions. The Mediterranean programme will in the future be IUCN's official point of contact for the Barcelona Convention. Where joint activities have already been agreed by WESCANA with UNEP-RAC/SPA, MedWet and METAP in the southern part of the Mediterranean region, these will be continued as planned. The Mediterranean programme will assume increasing responsibility for regional actions with these partners as the programme develops.

### **7.3 Constitution of an Advisory Board**

It is important for the Mediterranean Programme to maintain strong linkages and communications with the 145 IUCN members in the region. This creates a particular challenge as it cuts across two statutory regions and requires effective participation with the membership without interference in existing planning and project implementation processes in WescANA and Europe.

The Mediterranean office took the initiative of inviting the chairmen of the nine National committees in the region, the Mediterranean regional councillors, ERO and WescANA to a consultation meeting on an earlier draft of this strategy. Together, the chairmen present represented over 80% of the Mediterranean membership and are in a good position to provide an interface between the Mediterranean office, and members in their respective countries.

The meeting recognised that constant interaction and consultation with the entire membership would be extremely time-consuming and therefore proposed that an Advisory Board be created in order to promote a transparent, equitable and participative approach to developing and implementing the Mediterranean Programme. The Director of the Programme will propose the structure and role of such an advisory board, ensuring that the mechanism proposed is inclusive and its composition simple to determine and manage over time while drawing on experience elsewhere in the Union.

### **7.4 Financing the start up phase**

The core budget for the Office from 2001 to 2004 will be supported by the host country (Consejería de Medio Ambiente, Andalucía, and Ministry of Environment, Madrid). The total annual contribution from both parties is expected to be of the order of €570,000 per annum. IUCN will seek additional programme support from other Mediterranean countries as well as undertaking fund-raising from a range of donors once the programme is up and running. So far, France and Italy have either contributed funds, or declared their intention to do so.

The Parque Tecnológico de Andalucía provides office space, excellent communications facilities, and meeting rooms to facilitate and support the efficient functioning of the programme.

### **7.5 Monitoring and Reporting**



Monitoring and Reporting will be focused on four key components:

- ? Monitor the fulfilment of the activities included in the workplans and the delivery of the committed products timely and with the required quality.
- ? Monitor the progress towards the programme outcomes. This monitoring will require specific data collection tasks, such as questionnaires, interviews and field visits, in order to obtain the expected information.
- ? Collecting and analyzing monitoring information coming from field projects and activities implemented by partner organizations.
- ? Preparation of Reports (internal and external) as required by IUCN HQ, Programme funding organizations, Programme constituents and Programme Communications needs.

## **7.6 Evaluation**

The Mediterranean Programme will initiate a mid term review in 2003 to allow for an internal review of progress made towards key objectives and results, and an assessment of the strategy of the programme, in order to allow for adjustments to the strategy and work programme for the term. This process will involve members, partners and the Secretariat staff.

The programme will support a self-assessment culture whereby processes are supported to enable the staff, partners and membership to evaluate their performance and experience and highlight lessons learned. The internal self-assessment process will be planned and implemented starting with the Workplan 2002.

The programme may be subject to external evaluations by funding organizations and internally through the regular cycle of IUCN Programme Reviews under the direction of the Programme Planning Group (PPG) and the Director of Programme.

All reviews and evaluations (internal and external) will be required to follow IUCN Evaluation Policy and standards and the programme will organise an annual financial audit.

## ANNEX 1

### Summary of the process that led to the IUCN Mediterranean Programme

#### Development of a pan-Mediterranean programme for IUCN

Over the last 15-20 years IUCN has developed some activities with a pan-Mediterranean focus, although scattered through time and not responding to a regional framework. In the period 1982-1986 IUCN supported the development of the first activities of the RAC/SPA (Regional Activity Center for Specially Protected Areas) of UNEP/MAP in Tunis. IUCN also assisted in the establishment of the METAP (Mediterranean Environmental Technical Assistance Programme of the World Bank). The WESCANA programme (that includes the following Mediterranean countries: Algeria, Egypt, Libya, Morocco, Tunisia, Jordan, Lebanon, Syria and Palestine) has also conducted a strategy and programme framework as a region and a similar exercise was conducted in both North Africa and Northern Arabian Peninsula resulting in programme priorities which are now being implemented through a coordination of activities from Tunisia and Jordan.

The Species Survival Commission (SSC) has been active in the formulation and follow-up of the MAP Action Plans for Marine Turtles and for the Mediterranean Monk Seal. The SSC through its plant specialists' group on Mediterranean islands has completed a strategy for action on island plants; and together with WWF, IUCN has coordinated a major *Centers of Plant Diversity* project with a specific section on the Mediterranean.

The IUCN World Commission on Protected Areas (WCPA, previously CNPPA), formulated the Action Plan for Protected Areas in North Africa/Middle East and the Action Plan for Protected Areas in Europe "Parks for Life". The N.Africa/W.Asia Programme implements an Arid Lands Biodiversity Programme since 1996. These activities provide the backdrop to the emergence of the office – Box 1.

#### Box 1. Steps leading to the establishment of an IUCN Mediterranean Programme and Office

- 1994: Recommendation 19.17 of the IUCN General Assembly in Buenos Aires calls for a "New operative region and IUCN Office for the Mediterranean".
- 1995: The 42<sup>nd</sup> Council Meeting endorses the recommendations of the Working Group and recommends further elaboration of an IUCN Mediterranean Programme.
- 1996: Resolution CGR.1.15 is adopted at the World Conservation Congress in Montreal, recommending the establishment of an Office for the Mediterranean, implementation of recommendations from the 1995 Working Group, evaluation of potential financial needs and sources taking into consideration the proposed offer from Spain, establishing a network of regional members, and promoting the implementation of the Barcelona Convention and the MAP.
- 1997: An analysis of IUCN's niche and potential roles in the region is prepared based on consultations with regional partners (MAP, Bern Convention, Ramsar, WWF, MedWet). The draft framework document and niche analysis is circulated to all IUCN members in the Mediterranean.
- 1997: The IUCN Mediterranean Members Meeting in Malaga 23-25 Oct.1997 discusses the draft strategy document; considerations and recommendations are made and included in the meeting report. The meeting approves the location of the Mediterranean Programme Office in Malaga and welcomes the offer from the Spanish authorities to cover the core funding for the first years of office operation.
- 1999: WCPA members organize a meeting at Cilento, Italy to discuss approaches to Mediterranean protected areas through an IUCN programme.

2000:	The Ministry of Environment, Madrid, the Consejeria de Medio Ambiente of Andalucia and IUCN sign a tripartite agreement establishing the office in the Technological Park in Malaga.
2001	Meeting of WCPA to define training needs and networks for protected areas staff
2001:	Office opens in October 2001.

### **Defining the programme : Malaga 1997 and Cilento 1999**

The IUCN Mediterranean members went through a process of defining the role of IUCN in the region at a meeting in Malaga in 1997 where over 100 members participated. A comprehensive assessment of the ongoing initiatives, and the gaps that need to be filled, demonstrated the viability of an IUCN programme for the region.

The members discussed the mission, objectives (Box 2) and themes to be addressed as well as defining the nature of IUCN's priority actions in the region (Box 3). The programme objectives generally concern process issues concerning the way in which the programme is going to function, rather than technical objectives for the programme itself. These were formulated as "categories of activity" (Conservation of Biodiversity and Sustainable Use of Resources).

The World Commission on Protected Areas also held a Mediterranean meeting in Cilento in 1999 that discussed the needs of the regions protected areas networks and identified priorities for IUCN in the region and these discussions also inform the proposals made in the main part of this document.

#### **Box2 . Mission, objectives and themes defined by the members in Malaga 1997**

##### *Mission*

"To influence, encourage and assist societies of the Mediterranean to achieve the conservation and sustainable use of natural resources and sustainable development in the Mediterranean region".

##### *General Objective*

To identify and engage the capacities of the Members, Commissions and the IUCN Secretariat, in order that IUCN can provide value added to the conservation of nature and sustainable development in the Mediterranean eco-region.

##### *Particular Objectives*

1. To strengthen the involvement of the IUCN membership in Mediterranean countries by raising their institutional, technical and scientific capacities.
2. To support the implementation and to reinforce the Barcelona Convention, Mediterranean Action Plan, and other international agreements with interest and application to the region (42nd Meeting of the Council).
3. To pursue a stronger presence of the IUCN at the regional level, promoting coordination and common action between the Secretariat, the Commissions and the Members, in accordance with the IUCN policy of regionalization.
4. To build on other existing IUCN programmes, UN institutions, NGO networks and other partners with regional programmes and activities, so as to complement the on-going initiatives and apply IUCN's mission to these Mediterranean regional activities.
5. To collect, to promote and to disseminate and exchange information, the analysis and synthesis of experiences and the deepening of theoretical and practical knowledge, making all available to IUCN members and other through effective communications.

The members proposed that in terms of thematic activities the Mediterranean Programme of IUCN will focus on themes and activities with a clear Mediterranean character that can not be covered by other existing IUCN Programmes.

The **first priority** themes were identified based on:

- ? Existing gaps in the region
- ? Areas in which IUCN is best positioned
- ? Common interests of the members

The themes responding to these criteria were identified as :

- a) Islands
- b) Natural resource uses
- c) Biodiversity (species, habitats) and landscape conservation
- d) Water resources
- e) Arid lands, transition areas and desertification

A list of second priority themes was identified as:

- f) Integrated coastal zone management
- g) Wetlands
- h) Mediterranean forests
- i) Protected areas management
- j) The sea

This is a very long list of themes for a small IUCN Mediterranean programme office to undertake without the severe risk of dispersing its efforts over too many themes, and failing to deliver firmly on any of them. Clearly the range of interests of members is extremely large and there is the natural desire to see the IUCN Mediterranean programme become involved in all the themes of importance to all members.

The members also identified the kind of activities that IUCN could undertake in the region (Box 3, next page) and many of these are pertinent for the Mediterranean programme, notwithstanding the current definition of roles between the Mediterranean programme and ERO/WESCANA.

**Box 3 Types of Activity envisaged for the IUCN Mediterranean Programme**

- Policy development: by supporting the implementation and development of regional Conventions, strengthening equity, influencing cooperation policies and programmes, formulating new initiatives.
- A convening role, as facilitator and catalyst, facilitating that Mediterranean issues have a stronger influence in the EU, linking inter-governmental organizations, governments and NGOs, creating a climate for greater dialogue, collaboration, and strengthening existing partnerships.
- Advocacy: providing advice to influence policy makers, public administrations and cooperation agencies, closing the gaps between the legal provisions and their enforcement.
- Identifying and mobilising financial resources from multi and bi-lateral donor and cooperation agencies.
- Programme coordination and networking, establishing and strengthening links with other regional partners, promoting members activities within the frame of identified common objectives and regional priorities, establishing north/south linkages between members, helping the Commissions implement their strategic plans.
- Capacity building: exchanging experiences within members through thematic workshops and discussion fora, drawing common lessons, facilitating training activities.
- Technical assistance, facilitating technical services provided by the Union, providing advice in the preparation of strategies and action plans, assisting in their implementation, monitoring and evaluation.

The process leading to the emergence of an IUCN programme is based on a thorough analysis of the potential role of IUCN in the region, and the priorities of its members and it reflects the wide range of issues that the members feel are important. While in the long term it may be possible to address them all as the programme develops, in the short term it is essential to begin with a clearly focussed programme on a few key themes.

## ANNEX 2 Mediterranean members of IUCN Commissions

- JANUARY 2002 -

	Ecosystem Management . CEM	Environment al Law. CEL	Education & Communicat ion. CEC	Environment al Economics & Social Policy. CEESP	World Commission on Protected Areas. WCPA	Species Survival Commission. SSC
ALGERIA	1		1		1	8
CROATIA	1	1	3	1	2	12
CYPRUS						3
EGYPT	2	2	3	1	14	12
FRANCE	10	12	5	8	32	193
GREECE	2		3	1	6	35
ISRAEL	1	3	3	2	1	34
ITALY	2	5	2	3	20	94
JORDAN		2	6	1	4	7
LEBANON			4	1	5	3
LIBYA ARAB JAMAHIRIYA		1	1			1
MALTA						4
MONACO				1	2	1
MOROCCO		5	3	1	1	21
PALESTINIAN AUTHORITY						
PORTUGAL		2	6		2	38
SLOVENIA			4	1	17	13
SPAIN	2	8	25	2	13	167
SYRIAN ARAB REPUBLIC		12		2		2
TUNISIA	1		1		2	12
TURKEY		2	2		3	32

## Annex 3 A checklist of questions for assessment of performance<sup>10</sup>

### PART ONE: ASSESSMENT OF PERFORMANCE ASPECTS

	<b>KEY QUESTIONS (questions have been selected as examples from the Enhancing Organizational Effectiveness toolkit and can be adapted)</b>
1. Relevance	<p>How relevant is the unit's work in relation to the Union's KRA's and KEGO?</p> <p>How relevant is the unit's work in relation to its constituents or stakeholders needs?</p> <p>Does the unit's work represent cutting edge thinking in conservation and development?</p> <p>What is the credibility of the unit within and outside IUCN ?</p> <p>What is its influence within and outside IUCN ?</p>
2. Effectiveness	<p>How well is the unit's programme related to the IUCN Mission, Vision, KRA's, Strategy (KEGO)</p> <p>How well has the unit done meeting its annual and strategic plans What are the main reasons to justify the differences between planned results and those achieved ?</p> <p>How well has the unit done in linking and achieving its results with the IUCN Quadrennial programme KRAs What are the main reasons to justify the differences between those planned and those achieved ?</p> <p>How well has the unit responded to unexpected and unplanned events?</p> <p>How well has the unit integrated new thinking from across the Union, and innovation from other sources?</p> <p>How well has the unit worked with other parts of the Union – regionally and globally?</p>
3. Efficiency	<p>How well has the unit managed their resources (staff, funding, time)?</p> <p>How has it used the core funds received (to invest in new processes, to fund routine operations, risk capital, matching funds, etc)?</p> <p>What is its ratio between technical and support staff?</p> <p>How efficient are work practices and procedures?</p>
4. Impact	<p>Does the unit know what impact it has had? How has this been measured or assessed?</p> <p>What is the impact of the unit within and outside IUCN?</p> <p>What are the major impact milestones of the unit?</p>
5. Financial viability	<p>How adequate is the level of funding of the unit in relation to its programme expected outcomes?</p> <p>How broad is the funding base of the unit, both in number and variety of funding sources and in the amount obtained from each source?</p> <p>How dependent has the unit been on IUCN core funds (unrestricted and restricted) in the last 3 years? Why?</p> <p>How well has the unit done in securing external (non IUCN) financial support for its activities? Why has it succeeded or failed in getting external support? How is this related with the unit's relevance and impact?</p> <p>Has the Unit been able to keep their expenses within budget in the last 3 years?</p>

<sup>10</sup> Produced by the IUCN M&E Initiative, Gland for use in organizational assessments. Based on the performance framework in the book 'Enhancing Organizational Effectiveness' by IDRC and Universalia Management Group.

	Has the unit been forced to cut staff because of financial constraints?
--	---

A NOTE ON WEIGHTING: Unless there are extenuating circumstances, the weight given to each of the above areas should be equal in reaching a conclusion on the overall performance of a unit.

## PART TWO: ASSESSMENT OF FACTORS THAT CONTRIBUTE TO PERFORMANCE

	KEY QUESTIONS
Capacity	<p><b>Strategic leadership</b></p> <p>Does the Unit have a strategic plan to guide its work? Who participated in its elaboration? Is it aligned with the overall IUCN strategy? Is it known to and supported by the members or constituents of the unit? Is it used regularly for decision making?</p> <p>Is there a process in place for monitoring the implementation of the strategic plan?</p> <p>How effective is senior staff in carrying out their strategic leadership role?</p> <p>How participatory is the leadership style of the unit?</p> <p>Does the leadership and management of the unit understand and use 'niche' management to help it to achieve its results?</p> <p>Does the leadership / senior management ensure that the unit undertakes regular situation analysis in order to make strategic choices about its programme and the institutions with which it works?</p> <p>What governance bodies or mechanisms are in place and how well do they function? (national or regional members advisory committees, or equivalent)</p> <p>What internal review and organisational development processes are in place and what impact are they having?</p> <p><b>Structure</b></p> <p>Does the structure of the unit (management, decision making) facilitate or hinder the unit in achieving its results?</p> <p>Are roles and responsibilities clearly defined?</p> <p>Are there adequate linkages or opportunities for linkages when needed across programmes and projects?</p> <p>Is decision making clearly defined and decentralized appropriately?</p> <p>Do staff have the authority to set agendas and act accordingly?</p> <p><b>Programme planning and management</b></p> <p>Do staff at different levels receive proper guidance from the managers in the unit?</p> <p>Are the programmes and projects linked to other IUCN units and Programmes? (integration – horizontal and vertical)</p> <p>What is the involvement of members and Commissions in the implementation of the Programme?</p> <p>How innovative are the programmes and projects?</p> <p>Did programmes and projects deliver the committed products on time?</p> <p>Does the unit have the appropriate resources and management systems and structures to effectively deliver its planned programme?</p> <p><b>Human resources management</b></p> <p>How well do staff profiles fit programme and project needs?</p> <p>Are there incentives in place to support good performance and career advancement?</p> <p>What behaviors are supported by incentives?</p> <p>Is there a training programme for the staff?</p> <p>Is the working environment adequate?</p> <p>Is there a gender balance mechanism in place and is it used effectively?</p> <p>Are there unresolved issues of equity of pay?</p> <p>Is there an ombudsman or SLC function? Is it used?</p> <p>Are there appropriate staff recruitment and orientation procedures in place?</p> <p>Is there an effective and supportive staff appraisal system in place and being used?</p> <p>How well are staff being managed, supervised and mentored?</p>



	<p><b>Financial resources management</b>  Is there an explicit financial strategy or business plan?  Is there an appropriate budgeting mechanism? Is it participatory?  Do managers at different levels receive timely and accurate financial information?  Are project resources spent on time?  Is there an auditing mechanism in place? What are its results?  Are financial services being effectively provided to sub-units (eg projects)</p> <p><b>Monitoring and Evaluation</b>  Are staff trained and skilled in monitoring and evaluation?  What types of M&amp;E processes are in place – for purposes of learning, accountability, control?  Which programmes and processes are doing M&amp;E? Are there major gaps?  How do M&amp;E results feed into reporting and decision-making?</p> <p><b>Infrastructure and administration support</b>  Are the offices and equipment (vehicles, computers) adequate to deliver the expected results – and are they managed well?  Is the communication technology (information management, internet, phone lines) adequate to support effective delivery of the programme?</p> <p><b>Other capacity factors to consider:</b>  Process management - Are problem solving processes in place and do they work to the satisfaction of staff?  Inter-institutional linkages – Does the Unit work well with partners, donors and other organizations?</p>
Motivation	<p><b>History and purpose</b>  What are the milestones in the history of the unit?  How has the unit evolved over time?  Is there a clear sense of purpose in the staff? Is that purpose consistent with the IUCN Mission?</p> <p><b>Culture</b>  What are the main characteristics of the Unit as perceived by different groups within and outside the Unit and how do such characteristics affect the Units performance?  How is staff morale?  What is the level of commitment of staff and managers?</p> <p><b>Incentives and rewards</b>  What is the staff perception of the incentive mechanisms ?  How does the staff perceive the status of the unit regarding their own interests and career?  How does the staff perceive the level of equity within the unit?</p>
External Context	<p><b>Stakeholders</b>  Who are the key stakeholders for the unit?  How do the stakeholders value the unit's products and services?  How responsive has the unit been to its stakeholders needs and requests?  Who are the unit partners in delivering work? How do they perceive the partnership with the unit? (value added?)  Who are the unit competitors? Why are they competitors and not partners? Are they taking over the unit's niche? Why?  How do donors and funders perceive the value of the unit's products and services?  How is the unit affected by donor trends in funding?  How does the political and socioeconomic environment affect the unit?  How is the unit affected by the administrative and legal environment of the country, region?</p>

MAIN DATA SOURCES AND DATA COLLECTION TOOLS

Data sources and data collection methods are identified as examples according with the different factors to be reviewed. The following Table provides a starting point for these tasks.

<b>FACTOR</b>	<b>DATA SOURCES</b>	<b>DATA COLLECTION TOOLS</b>
Effectiveness	Unit Staff Unit Documents & Reports Other IUCN Units Partners Members	Document analysis Interviews Questionnaires
Efficiency	Unit Staff Unit Documents & Reports IUCN Finance Office IUCN Human Resources Office	Document analysis Interviews
Relevance / impact	Unit Staff Unit Documents & Reports Other IUCN Units Partners (including beneficiaries) Members Donors	Document analysis Interviews Questionnaires Focus Groups
Financial viability	Unit Staff Unit Documents & Reports IUCN Finance Office Donors	Document analysis Interviews
Capacity	Unit Staff Unit Documents & Reports Other IUCN Units Partners Members	Document analysis Interviews Questionnaires Focus Groups
Motivation	Unit Staff Unit Documents & Reports	Interviews
External context	Unit Staff Other IUCN Units Partners Members Donors	Interviews Questionnaires