

Strategic Review of the IUCN Centre for Mediterranean Cooperation

Volume I – Final Report

Written by:

Marie-Helene Adrien, Review Leader
Nancy MacPherson, M&E Coordinator,
IUCN
Meg Gawler, Independent Consultant

November 2004

IUCN
The World Conservation Union



UNIVERSALIA

Executive Summary

Introduction

The IUCN Centre for Mediterranean Cooperation (CMC) was established in 2001 in response to requests from IUCN Members at the 1994 General Assembly in Buenos Aires, and again at the 1996 World Conservation Congress in Montreal. The general objective of the CMC is “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.”¹ Specific objectives relate to strengthening the involvement of IUCN Mediterranean membership, reinforcing the Barcelona Convention and other regional agreements, promoting common action between Members, Commissions and the Secretariat, and complementing and adding value to regional activities.

The Strategic Review of the IUCN Centre for Mediterranean Cooperation (CMC) was commissioned by the IUCN Director of Global Programme at the request of the Director of the Centre for Mediterranean Cooperation for the purpose of assessing progress in establishing the Centre and for accountability to the core donors of the Centre. The Review assessed the relevance, strategic positioning, niche, and thematic effectiveness of the CMC Programme as well as the effectiveness of the management, leadership and organizational development of the Centre.

Methodology

The Review was informed by an Organisational Performance Review of the IUCN Centre for Mediterranean Cooperation conducted by Universal Management Group and a Thematic Programme Review conducted by the IUCN M&E Unit with the participation of the heads of the Global Thematic Programmes and the CMC thematic staff.

Primary data was collected using a combination of qualitative and quantitative techniques including document review, interviews, on-site visits, three distinct questionnaire surveys of IUCN Members, IUCN Regional Directors and Programme Coordinators, and CMC Staff. In addition interviews were held with thematic experts. To wrap up the Review process, a peer review session was held with the Heads of IUCN global thematic programmes to review the data analysis from the thematic review and to make recommendations for the future development of the CMC Programme.

Key Findings and Conclusions

Relevance: Overall the IUCN Centre for Mediterranean Cooperation was found to be very relevant to IUCN Members, donors and to the IUCN programme managers surveyed. It is valued by its core donors and there is significant support for it to develop its convening role further in its next stage of development.

Effectiveness: The Centre is generally seen to have accomplished a significant amount since its inception, and it is considered to be a leader in conservation in the eco-region. Having laid a solid foundation in its first phase of development, there is substantial support and encouragement for the Centre to move from knowledge generation to supporting the application of this knowledge in programme and policy implementation. In particular, Members expressed considerable satisfaction with the fact that the CMC has been responsive to the ideas of Members. It has, however, been less successful at creating cross linkages in its work between and among its thematic programme areas. This remains a challenge for the next phase of development.

¹ “Proposed IUCN Mediterranean Programme and Office”, IUCN, January 1998, p. 8.

Efficiency: The Review found that overall the Centre uses its people and resources efficiently, and that it could support a larger portfolio of projects and programmes as the Centre grows. Lack of space and inefficient use of infrastructure was noted as a current problem by many staff.

Financial viability: The Review found that there is no immediate concern with respect to the financial viability of the Centre in the medium term. CMC's major donors have demonstrated their support for the Centre, and there is evidence that CMC has begun a positive strategy to diversify its funding base.

Thematic programme findings and conclusions: Because of the early stages of development of many of the thematic programmes, it was not appropriate to expect the Review to assess the results of thematic programmes. At the same time the Review was required to get a sense of how well the thematic programmes were developing. Accordingly, the Review sampled the perceptions of a range of thematic experts on the relevance, effectiveness (so far), and the quality of the thematic products and processes of the Forest, Marine, Species, Protected Areas and Water and Wetlands Thematic Programmes. The Review also noted the suggestions made by thematic experts for future programme development.

The CMC Programme is considered to be **relevant** to and responding to many of the key conservation issues and trends of the Mediterranean eco-region. There is less evidence of how the CMC is or should be addressing key sustainable development issues of the eco-region, particularly the economic and social dimensions of development. This should be clarified and strengthened in the next phase of development.

A clear **rationale** exists for the thematic areas that have been developed to date, and CMC has a strong **mandate** from Members, partners and experts for CMC to continue to further develop the Programme. The CMC Programme as a whole is seen as **effective**, and CMC is seen as a credible partner.

To maintain and build this momentum the Centre needs to ensure follow-up to current programme activities and a more balanced programmatic coverage across the eco-region both thematically and geographically; quality control of products and services; clarifying and/or improving the relationship with WESCANA, ROFE, and with Members and Commissions, and strengthening the vision and leadership of some of the thematic areas.

Expectations of the Programme from Members, partners and experts are high, and in some thematic areas CMC's capacity to deliver is low or limited. Strong collaboration and communication in most thematic areas with Members, partners and Commissions is seen as a major factor influencing future success.

The challenges of building and managing a balanced, representative programme for the Mediterranean eco-region may perhaps be greater than initially anticipated.

Areas of Concern: The CMC Programme needs more capacity and resources to follow-up effectively on key activities and to engage fully in the priorities of the region. CMC is at a critical stage of its development. Expectations are high and the Centre faces the challenge of scaling up the successful efforts of the start-up phase. This cannot be done without more capacity and resources. Internal management systems have improved but more needs to be done to support the development of good management and human resources systems for the Centre, especially if the Centre is to grow substantially in its next phase of development.

Recommendations

After three years of existence, the CMC's overall performance as an organisational unit is perceived to be good. As it enters a new phase in its development, the CMC should view the consolidation of the Centre's organisation and its programming as key priorities.

The Review proposed the following recommendations as critical to the future development and success of the Mediterranean Programme:

1. That CMC develop a strategy for the next five years to address appropriate ways to scale up the delivery and reach of the Mediterranean Programme, including a corresponding business model.²

To achieve this, CMC should strengthen the strategic focus and longer term vision in each thematic area and for the overall programme. This should include a rationale for CMC's presence (or lack of presence if appropriate) across the region thematically and geographically.

A strategy for achieving greater reach and influence in each thematic area (and for the overall programme) in the eco-region be developed. In addition, the socio-economic dimensions (including gender and equity) of conservation and sustainable development in the Mediterranean eco-region should be more fully developed in the CMC 2005-2008 Intersessional Programme.

2. That CMC work with senior human resources specialists to improve human resources management and organisational administration.

Based on the decisions made with respect to its future strategy and programming model, CMC should align its existing capacities to support these decisions, particularly with respect to human resources, infrastructure and financial systems.

3. As a preventive measure, CMC should strengthen its monitoring and evaluation, with specific attention to safeguarding the quality of its products and services.

The CMC should develop a monitoring and evaluation framework for its programme focused on the new longer term strategy and proposed outcomes for the CMC. It should also put into place a standardised peer review process so that as the programme grows there are safeguards to ensure that the high quality products currently being produced by CMC remain so, and that the reputation of IUCN is protected.

4. That appropriate options and roles for involvement of IUCN Members and Commissions in the implementation of the Mediterranean Programme be clarified and implemented where appropriate in the next Intersessional period.

This recommendation mirrors the recent governance reform decisions requiring greater integration of the Commissions in the IUCN Programme, and the implementation of the new IUCN Membership Strategy which seeks to clarify the roles for Members in the IUCN Programme. CMC should address these issues as part of the broader Secretariat and Council effort to implement the governance reform changes in the next Intersessional period.

5. That CMC develop enhanced approaches to communications with Members, partners and Commissions.

Responding to this recommendation should not be seen as the sole responsibility of the communications staff or focused solely on the hardware of communications (Websites and newsletters). Rather, improved communications should be a shared responsibility of all thematic programme managers, achieved through a range of targeted strategies including purposeful identification of CMC's users of its products and services, and improved monitoring and feedback processes capable of tracking the use and influence of CMC's work.

² Recommendation 1 assumes that the leadership of IUCN wishes to develop the CMC model further given the current challenges in making the overall model work. Recommendation 7 addresses the need to revisit the model and assess the pros and cons of the overall model in light of the lessons learned through the CMC experience.

6. That the IUCN Director General and Director Global Programme take immediate steps to address current tensions between WESCANA, Europe, and the Centre for Mediterranean Cooperation.

Considerable confusion and tensions among various stakeholder groups were noted in the Review with regard to the respective roles and relationships between the IUCN offices for Europe, WESCANA and the Mediterranean Centre for Cooperation. All three Directors (WESCANA, ROfE, CMC) and the Director General and Director Global Programme should meet to work out the best way to proceed positively into the next Intersessional period.

7. That the IUCN Director General and the Director Global Programme carefully review the lessons learned from the implementation of the current CMC model before decisions are made to engage in similar arrangements in other regions.

Even though the CMC is performing well programmatically, there are significant statutory, cultural and organizational management challenges inherent in the current CMC model. The pros and cons of the CMC model should be carefully assessed before decisions are taken to replicate the model in another region.

Acronyms

ACCOBAMS	Agreement on the Conservation of Cetaceans in the Black Sea, Mediterranean Sea and Contiguous Atlantic Areas
ALESCO	Arab League Educational, Cultural and Scientific Organisation
BIS	Biodiversity Information System
CBD	Convention on Biological Diversity
CEM	Commission on Ecosystem Management
CIESM	Commission Internationale de l'Exploration Scientifique de la Méditerranée
CMC	IUCN Centre for Mediterranean Cooperation
EFA	Environmental Flow Assessment
EU	European Union
EUFORGEN	European Forest Genetic Resources Programme
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organisation of the United Nations
FLR	Forest Landscape Restoration
GFCM	General Fisheries Commission for the Mediterranean
GTZ	German International Cooperation Agency
GWP-Med	Global Water Partnership
HR	Human Resources
IAH	International Association of Hydrologists
ICARDA	International Center for Agricultural Research in the Dry Areas
INBO	International Network of Basin Organisations
IWRM	Integrated Water Resources Management
MEDPOL	Mediterranean Pollution Monitoring and Research Programme
MedWet	Mediterranean Wetlands Initiative
MENBO	Mediterranean Network of Basin Organisations
MPA	Marine Protected Area
PA	Protected Areas
RAC/SPA	Regional Activity Centre for Specially Protected Areas
ROfE	IUCN Regional Office for Europe
SDC	Swiss Agency for Development Cooperation
SSC	Species Survival Commission
UNESCO	United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation
WANI	IUCN Water & Nature Initiative

WCPA	World Commission on Protected Areas
WESCANNA	The IUCN Programme for West and Central Asia and North Africa
WFD	Water Framework Directive
WSSD	World Summit on Sustainable Development
WTO	World Trade Organisation
WWF	World Wide Fund For Nature
WWF MEDPO	WWF Mediterranean Programme Office

Contents

1. Introduction	1
1.1 Context	1
1.2 Purpose	2
1.3 Organisation of the Report	3
2. Methodology	3
2.1 Overall Approach	3
2.2 Approach to Data Collection	3
3. Overall Performance of the IUCN Centre for Mediterranean Cooperation	4
3.1 Introduction	4
3.2 Relevance and Strategic Positioning	4
3.3 Effectiveness	7
3.4 Efficiency	9
3.5 Financial Viability	10
4. CMC Thematic Programme Component Review	11
4.1 Introduction	11
4.2 Methodology and Approach to the Thematic Review	11
4.2.1 Purpose and Objectives	11
4.2.2 Data Collection	12
4.2.3 Thematic Data Analyses	13
4.2.4 Limitations to the Data Collection Approach	13
4.3 Summary of Thematic Findings	13
4.3.1 Introduction	13
4.3.2 Forest Conservation	14
4.3.3 Marine Conservation	16
4.3.4 Protected Areas	20
4.3.5 Species Conservation	23
4.3.6 Water and Wetlands	27
4.4 Overall Programme Conclusions	32
5. Factors That Positively Affect CMC Performance	32
6. Significant Areas of Concern	33
7. The Future – Priorities and Recommendations	35
7.1 Stakeholders' Suggestions	35
7.2 Recommendations	37

Exhibits

Exhibit 3.1 CMC Trends – Operational Expenses and Project Revenues	9
Exhibit 3.2 CMC Donor Funding (2001 – 2004)	10

Appendices

Appendix I List of Findings	41
-----------------------------	----

Please note that Volume II contains the full Appendices including: Terms of Reference, Data Collection Tools, Interview Protocols, List of documents reviewed, Interview list, Questionnaire results, Reflections on the Socio-Economics work of CMC

1. Introduction

The Strategic Review of the IUCN Centre for Mediterranean Cooperation (CMC) was commissioned by the IUCN Director of Global Programme, at the request of the Director of the IUCN Centre for Mediterranean Cooperation. The Review was led by Dr Marie Helene Adrien of Universalia and managed by the IUCN M&E Office.

1.1 Context

The IUCN Centre for Mediterranean Cooperation

IUCN Members requested IUCN to establish a programme for the Mediterranean eco-region as far back as the 1994 General Assembly in Buenos Aires, and again at the 1996 World Conservation Congress in Montreal. In 1997 over 100 Members met in Malaga, Spain to discuss the draft document for the establishment of the Mediterranean programme, and in 2001 the IUCN Centre for Mediterranean Cooperation (CMC) was officially established.

The programme scope of the IUCN Centre for Mediterranean Cooperation includes: all states bordering the Mediterranean Sea including islands; Andorra and Palestine; and Jordan, Portugal and the FYROM (Macedonia) which are non-riverine but may be considered culturally and ecologically Mediterranean.

The Mediterranean Programme bridges two IUCN Programmatic Regions – Europe and WESCAN (West, Central Asia, North Africa and Middle East) – engaging with the Membership of both these regions and seeking to bring an innovative ecosystem approach to regional conservation and sustainable development issues in the Mediterranean eco-region.

In the first phase of its development the Centre has received core funding from the Government of Spain (Ministry of Environment, Madrid) and the regional Government of Andalucia (Ministry of Environment). Project level support has been received from, among others, the Swiss Agency for Development Cooperation (SDC); the Italian Ministries of Environment and of Foreign Affairs; the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organisation (UNESCO); the British Government; the Netherlands government; the Spanish International Cooperation Agency; European Commission and the Total Foundation. Events have been co-sponsored by IUCN Members, such as Diputacion de Barcelona, and other partners such as the regions of Andalucia, Murcia and Languedoc-Roussillon.

As set out in the 1998 Programme document, the general objective of the CMC is “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.”³ Specific objectives relate to strengthening the involvement of IUCN Mediterranean membership, reinforcing the Barcelona Convention and other regional agreements, promoting common action between Members, Commissions and the Secretariat, and complementing and adding value to regional activities based on existing achievements.

IUCN Cycle of Strategic Reviews

As part of its system of evaluation, set out in the IUCN Evaluation Policy, IUCN undertakes a regular series of Strategic Reviews. These reviews assess a range of key performance criteria including relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and sustainability of an IUCN component programme (regional or thematic) or policy. Strategic Reviews may be conducted as *internal peer reviews* or be *externally led* depending on the nature of the circumstances or the preference of those commissioning the review.

³ “Proposed IUCN Mediterranean Programme and Office”, IUCN, January 1998, p. 8.

Strategic Reviews of IUCN regional and thematic programmes are commissioned by the Director Global Programme.

The IUCN Centre for Mediterranean Cooperation has been included in the 2004 review cycle at the request of the Director of the Mediterranean Programme. In commissioning the Mediterranean Review, the Director Global Programme agreed that it was an opportune time to review progress of the establishment of the Centre in order to ensure its sound future development.

1.2 Purpose

The overall purpose of this review is to assess progress in establishing the IUCN Centre for Mediterranean Cooperation using the initial programme document as a starting point, and to make recommendations for the future strategic direction of the programme and the management and organisational development of the IUCN Centre for Mediterranean Cooperation.

The specific objectives of the review are:

- To assess the relevance of the CMC to the IUCN Members, partners and donors in the Mediterranean eco-region, and to the broader IUCN Programme.
- To assess the strategic positioning (niche) of the CMC in relation to the major issues and trends and other actors in the Mediterranean eco-region.
- To assess the effectiveness of thematic work carried out so far in the major thematic areas, including protected areas, marine, water and wetlands, drylands, forests and ecosystem management, species, climate change, and legal agreements. (This includes questions of quality of work, innovation, leading edge conservation, and the strategy of IUCN – knowledge, empowerment, governance (KEG).
- To identify major gaps in the CMC and to suggest future directions for programme development and the implications for programme management and delivery. (This includes both areas of content as well as capacity issues.)
- To assess the effectiveness of strategic management, leadership and organisational development of the CMC.
- To assess the financial viability of the CMC.
- Based on the above review, to make recommendations for the future development, leadership, management and funding of the CMC.

The review is commissioned by the IUCN Director Global Programme at the request of the Director of the Centre for Mediterranean Cooperation for purposes of accountability and learning for future improvement. These two offices are expected to use the review to make improvements in the next phase of programme implementation, including management and organisational systems.

The major stakeholders of the review are Members, partners, donors, IUCN thematic programme staff (Mediterranean office and global thematic programmes), IUCN senior management including the Regional Directors of Europe, WESCANA and the managers of other relevant IUCN Programmatic Regions.

1.3 Organisation of the Report

The results of the Strategic Review of the IUCN Centre for Mediterranean Cooperation are presented in two Volumes. This document (Volume I) presents a synthesis of the results of the Review of the overall Organisational Performance of the CMC as well as the results of the Review of the Thematic Programmes of the CMC. The report is organised as follows:

- Section 2 describes the methodology for carrying out the strategic review
- Section 3 presents an assessment of the CMC's overall organisational performance and is organised around the themes of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency and financial viability of CMC
- Section 4 presents a synthesis of the review of the five thematic programme components of the CMC, namely – Forest Conservation, Species Conservation, Protected Areas, Marine Conservation, and Water and Wetlands.
- Section 5 identifies key factors that positively affect CMC's performance
- Section 6 highlights major areas of concern for the CMC
- Section 7 discusses the growth strategy and priorities for the future, and presents recommendations.

Volume II is a separate document containing the main Appendices to the report, including the ToRs, methodological instruments, lists of interviewees, a list of documents reviewed and the results of the analysis of the three questionnaires – the IUCN Members Survey, the Regional Directors and Programme Coordinators Questionnaire, and the CMC Staff Questionnaire.

2. Methodology

2.1 Overall Approach

The Strategic Review was informed by two distinct review processes: the Organisational Performance Review of the IUCN Centre for Mediterranean Cooperation conducted by Universalia Management Group and the Review of the CMC Thematic Programme Components conducted by the M&E Unit with the participation of the heads of the Global Thematic Programmes and the CMC thematic staff. This synthesis report of the Strategic Review integrates the results and findings of these two evaluation processes

The methodology for conducting the strategic review was driven by an evaluation matrix that included the key evaluation questions, data sources, and data collection methodologies (Volume II).

2.2 Approach to Data Collection

Universalia collected primary data using a combination of qualitative and quantitative techniques including document review, interviews, on-site visits, and three distinct questionnaire surveys of IUCN Members, IUCN Regional Directors and Programme Coordinators and CMC Staff. The following provides a description of the methods used.

Document Review: The team reviewed a wide range of documents related to the CMC. These are listed in Volume II.

Questionnaires: A Web-based questionnaire survey was administered to 130 IUCN Members from the Mediterranean eco-region. Seventy-two completed questionnaires were returned. In addition, a questionnaire was distributed to all staff members of the CMC (10 responses out of 12), and another questionnaire was administered to the IUCN Regional Directors and Programme Coordinators (14 responses out of 20). The complete results of the survey are presented in Volume II.

Interviews: Face-to-face individual interviews were conducted with 31 thematic experts; 16 IUCN Members; 2 Councillors; 11 staff of the CMC; and 6 IUCN Headquarters senior staff (DG, Director of Global Programmes, Director of HR, Head of Budget, and one senior staff in finance, Coordinator of Evaluation). In addition, three telephone interviews were conducted with core donors of the CMC.

On-site Visits: Universalia conducted visits to IUCN’s Secretariat in Switzerland and to the CMC in Malaga in order to deepen its understanding of the organisational performance of the CMC. In addition, the team attended the IUCN Members meeting in Naples in June 2004 which provided an opportunity to gain further insights to the perceptions of Members and Councillors.

3. Overall Performance of the IUCN Centre for Mediterranean Cooperation

3.1 Introduction

This section presents the results of the organisational assessment of the overall performance of CMC after three years of existence, in terms of its relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, and financial viability as an organisational unit.

Specifically, we have examined:

- *CMC relevance:* the extent to which the CMC has responded to its key stakeholders.
- *CMC effectiveness:* the extent to which the CMC’s programme has been supportive of good quality, innovation and cutting edge thematic work, since its inception;
- *CMC efficiency:* the extent to which CMC resources were used optimally to reach the planned objectives, and finally,
- *CMC financial sustainability:* the extent to which the CMC is a financially viable organisation that can sustain its programming and results achievement.

It should be noted that while the organisational component of the Review covered stakeholder perceptions of the effectiveness of the overall CMC Programme, the Thematic Review results presented in Section 4 discuss the performance of the individual CMC thematic programme components at a more specific and detailed level.

3.2 Relevance and Strategic Positioning

In this section we examine the extent to which the objectives of the CMC’s programmatic work are consistent with the requirements and needs of its major stakeholders (i.e. Members, partners, donors, IUCN thematic programme staff and IUCN senior management). We also look at CMC’s strategic positioning, which refers to the ability to consolidate a niche, based on its comparative advantage in the Mediterranean eco-region.

IUCN Members, Regional Directors and Programme Coordinators surveyed were asked to characterise the relevance of the CMC to their work, and to the issues and trends within the conservation and sustainable development realm. Overwhelmingly, responses suggest a strong ongoing relevance of the Mediterranean programme, as summarised below.

Finding 1: The programme thematic work carried out by the CMC is very relevant to IUCN Members, Regional Directors and Programme Coordinators and donors.

A majority of member respondents reported that the specific thematic areas of CMC are relevant or very relevant to the work of their organisation. The Protected Areas, Water and Wetlands, Drylands, and Species Conservation thematic areas were perceived as relevant or very relevant by more than 75% of the Members surveyed, while Marine Conservation and the Legal Agreements and Convention thematic areas were found relevant by more than 68% of respondents.

Similarly, all the thematic areas mentioned above were perceived as relevant or very relevant to the work of IUCN component Global Thematic Programmes by a majority of IUCN Regional Directors and Programme Coordinators. The relevance of the Mediterranean Thematic Programmes to the conservation and sustainable development trends and issues of the region was also recognised as strong by a clear majority of IUCN Members and IUCN Regional Directors and Programme Coordinators. In addition, more than 70% of the CMC's staff perceived the Mediterranean programme as relevant to the trends and issues mentioned above. Furthermore, many respondents, including Members, donors and CMC staff, confirmed that the thematic work carried out by the CMC is relevant to the Barcelona Convention and other treaties for the region.

Similarly, the information emerging from the individual thematic reviews indicated that the thematic areas developed by the CMC are perceived as relevant to the needs of the region, as noted by the thematic experts interviewed (see Section 4).

Although respondents provided a variety of reasons for the relevance of the CMC's thematic work, there appears to be wide recognition and agreement that the Mediterranean region is a distinctive eco-region which has high levels of endemism. The CMC adopted an eco-region approach, as opposed to a 'geo-political' approach, in order to respond to the distinctive Mediterranean conservation needs.

"Its mission is very relevant as to explore new ways of dealing with IUCN work: from the traditional regional approach to a more ecosystemic approach."

Finding 2: The Centre for Mediterranean Cooperation (CMC) is valued and relevant to its Spanish donors

From a Spanish donors' perspective, the relevance of the CMC is linked to its 'platform' function of sharing IUCN experience with Andalusia and Spain, and channelling the Andalusia experience at an international level. The World Parks Congress session in Durban that was hosted with the Junta de Andalusia was cited by Spanish donors as a good example. The CMC is also recognised by Spanish donors as a catalyst for cooperation amongst actors and countries in the region, and for greater engagement of Members in environmental activities. For Spain, it was important that the CMC had facilitated relationships with Morocco.

Spanish donors interviewed reported that the CMC is capable of making significant contributions in terms of promoting debate on environmental issues. In addition, they agree that the Centre is filling a gap in the region and is a necessary institution, though not yet well-known.

Finding 3: The relevance of the CMC's programme to IUCN Global Programme and specifically to the IUCN Regional Office for Europe (ROfE) and WESCANA regional offices, is acknowledged by IUCN staff, although many Members hesitated to comment due to their limited knowledge of these two regions.

The Mediterranean Programme continues to be relevant to the European office (ROfE) and the WESCANA office. Respondents reported that the CMC addresses the needs of a part of these two large regions and provides a focus on an eco-region relatively neglected by IUCN in the past.

Members however are less inclined to comment, reportedly, due to their limited knowledge of the work of the two regions – 38% of member respondents reported that they were not familiar with the compatibility of CMC with ROFE's work, while 38% of respondents did not know whether the CMC's programme was compatible with the WESCANA work. Nevertheless, more than 43% of respondents found the work carried out by the CMC compatible or very compatible with the programmes undertaken by ROFE and WESCANA.

Although this goes beyond the scope of this exercise, a significant number of Members, particularly from the North Africa region, took the opportunity of this strategic review to challenge the rationale for including North Africa in WESCANA. They mentioned the cultural differences, the geographic dispersion and the differences in the eco-systems as important reasons to review the structure of WESCANA.

Finding 4: While strategically positioned in the region, the CMC needs to further anchor its niche around the notion of regional cooperation, and to balance conservation and development issues.

As mentioned above, the 'eco-region' approach to the Mediterranean provides the CMC with a unique position in the region. Indeed, very few organisations in the region have the mandate to work at the regional level and to "develop activities of pan-Mediterranean significance"⁴, while complementing Members' ongoing activities. The individual thematic reviews confirm that, overall, the CMC has properly anchored its niche in the region. In most of the thematic work undertaken by the CMC, the convening role of CMC in linking governments, NGOs and academia, is recognised as a strong comparative advantage.

Yet, several respondents among IUCN Members and senior management indicated that the specificity of the CMC lies in the notion of cooperation in the Mediterranean and therefore, the CMC should further engage in activities that secure and enhance cooperation. Senior managers reported that CMC had focused on bilateral partnerships rather than IUCN Member coordination because the CMC was still in the early stage of its development and had not yet been recognised as a key player in the region. As the CMC's programme consolidates, the importance of creating "pan-Mediterranean" activities and fostering coordination among regional actors should not be neglected.

The CMC is also reported to be somewhat biased towards conservation issues (although this is said of IUCN in general). There may be a need to better balance conservation and development matters.

Finding 5: There is strong support from the IUCN Regional Directors and Programme Coordinators with respect to the ability of the Mediterranean programme to play a convening role in its first phase of development.

Amongst the IUCN Regional Directors and Programme Coordinators interviewed the responses were split as follows:

- 70% of respondents indicate that the Mediterranean programme is playing a convening role in developing its programme
- 61% of respondents indicate that the Mediterranean programme has developed strong North-South Linkages
- 62% respondents indicate that the Mediterranean programme has allowed the Mediterranean voice to be better heard in the global processes in which IUCN is active.

⁴ « Proposed IUCN Mediterranean Programme and Office », IUCN, January 1998, p. 10.

- 71% indicate that the IUCN Mediterranean programme has been effective in testing, assessing and modifying global guidelines for practical implementation in the region

Finding 6: IUCN Members, Regional Directors and Programme Coordinators have varying levels of familiarity with the thematic areas of the CMC. Suggestions were provided for other or additional thematic issues that should be addressed by the CMC in its next phase.

More than a third of member respondents reported that they are ‘not at all familiar’ or only ‘somewhat familiar’ with each of the thematic areas. The least known areas are work undertaken on climate change and legal agreements and conventions – approximately 50% of member respondents indicated that they were not familiar with these areas.

Similarly, the IUCN Regional Directors, Programme Coordinators and Heads of Global Thematic programmes reported they were familiar with only a few thematic areas, most likely their speciality field. More than 50% indicated a lack of familiarity with each of the thematic areas.

A majority of respondents (both IUCN Members and managers) mentioned that there are emerging conservation and sustainable development issues that should be addressed by the CMC in its next phase of development. Many thematic areas were identified, but there was no consensus on which issues should take priority. The areas mentioned include: islands and coastal conservation, invasive species, eco-management, control of the passage of large boats in the Mediterranean, tourism and sustainable development, marine conservation management, over-fishing, deep-sea conservation, marine education through aquariums, under-water resources, intermittent rivers, decentralisation of natural resources planning and management, urban and rural landscape linkages and protected area management, and poverty reduction strategies linkages.

3.3 Effectiveness

In this section on effectiveness we explore the extent to which the CMC’s programme has achieved its objectives and has been supportive of good quality, innovative, cutting edge thematic work. Overall, the information collected (primarily through the individual thematic reviews) indicates that the CMC has been effective in the delivery of its programme in its first phase of development and delivery. (More detailed comments on specific thematic areas can be found in Section 4.)

Finding 7: A large majority of respondents suggest that the Centre for Mediterranean Cooperation has accomplished a substantial amount since its inception. A small number of respondents indicated that the results achieved are not commensurate with the financing received.

Most respondents interviewed perceived the first three years as CMC’s foundation years and recognised the scope and the extent of results achieved to date. The outputs of these first years are characterised as knowledge generation, information dissemination, networking and positioning, all of which are necessary for creating the foundations of a solid programme. The issue for the future is to move from knowledge to supporting the application of this knowledge in programme and policy implementation.

From the perspective of some IUCN Members, the efforts required to translate an idea into a real programme were, in themselves, a challenge. Members indicated that they are particularly pleased with results achieved to-date, and this was evident in the favourable responses and feedback in Naples at the IUCN Members meeting, as well as through interviews. Members commented on their great satisfaction with the fact that the CMC has pursued the ideas expressed by Members since the Buenos Aires Conference and has rallied Members through common themes around the Mediterranean. From a donors’ perspective, the renewal of their financial commitment illustrates their level of satisfaction with the results achieved.

Some Members mentioned that the CMC should foster greater interaction with its membership; they indicated that the lack of collaboration with membership impeded the CMC from increasing innovation and taking leadership on conservation issues in the region.

For a small number of respondents, results achieved seemed modest given the strong financing received by the Centre for Mediterranean Cooperation. This perception emerged through comparing outputs of the Centre for Mediterranean Cooperation with outputs achieved in other programmes with more modest budgets.

“Good start, well planned, carefully implemented, good progress for field projects planning and establishment”

“For the limited amount of time that the office has been in place, it has delivered a substantial volume of work and has initiated a number of regional processes that would lead to long-term actions”

“À date, le programme a reçu beaucoup de financement. Est-ce qu’il en a fait assez? Il est encore tôt pour le dire. “

“Je ne sais pas si les résultats atteints sont à la hauteur des ressources (importantes) du programme – d’autres régions en font plus avec moins d’argent. Peut-être que le programme est encore jeune pour qu’on se prononce.”

Finding 8: The CMC has succeeded in focusing its programme. The challenge remains to strike a balance between maintaining donor interest while ensuring that the specific needs of the eco-region are addressed by the programme.

At the inception of CMC’s programme, the IUCN Membership defined a wide array of thematic areas and topics in which the CMC could play a key role in the region. This process led some respondents to view the early stage of the programme as non-strategic, lacking focus, and dispersed. However, as reported by those involved more closely with the programme, this experimental phase was necessary to reflect and identify the most appropriate thematic areas for the CMC.

Based on an analysis of environmental issues and programmes in the region, the CMC’s management along with IUCN Members and Secretariat identified the programmatic priorities for the CMC. The short-listing of thematic areas was based on 1) existing gaps in the region, 2) areas in which IUCN is best positioned, and 3) common interests of the Members. As evidenced by the data collected, through adequate filtering the Centre for Mediterranean Cooperation has been able to create a programme that is more focused and relevant to the needs of the ecosystem and the needs of Members.

Like most programmes supported by donors, the CMC is constantly confronted with the need to make choices and it has done so, attempting to align these choices with its areas of expertise or with the needs of the region. Yet, in some instances, questions remain as to whether choices are made based on donor interests rather than on IUCN Members needs, the needs of the ecosystem, or the expertise of the CMC.

Finding 9: Overall, the CMC has been effective in the implementation and delivery of quality work in its thematic areas. It has been less effective in creating crosscutting links between and among its thematic programmes.

As mentioned above, based on IUCN Member consultation and situational analysis, the Centre has focused on a limited number of thematic areas, namely Species, Marine, Protected Areas, Water and Wetlands as well as Forests. These were identified as filling a gap in the region and responding to pressing conservation needs in the Mediterranean.

According to Members surveyed, the CMC has been effective in most of its thematic areas. With the exception of work on legal agreements and international conventions, all thematic areas are rated as good or very good by more than 80% of Members.

All data suggest that each individual thematic programme has an effective approach to delivery, but that there is a need to create more links between programmes, and to find synergies among the various programmes.

Finding 10: A strong majority of respondents view the CMC as a leader in conservation issues.

More than 60% of respondents find the CMC is a leader in conservation. Those who were less positive indicated that:

- More interaction with IUCN Members is desired
- Other organisations in the region have greater experience in some areas
- The organisation is still young to be a leader
- There is a lack of innovative pilot projects in the field

The data are not conclusive with respect to the Mediterranean Programme’s leadership within the IUCN’s overall programming – 46% of IUCN Regional Directors and Programme Coordinators find the programme somewhat a leader in the IUCN’s overall programming and organisational development; and 60% of IUCN Members find the Mediterranean Programme “effective” or “very effective” in mobilising Members.

3.4 Efficiency

In this section we examine the efficiency of the CMC – its ability to maximise the use of its resources.

Finding 11: CMC is characterized as a Centre that is efficient. Use of people and resources is satisfactory. It should be noted that CMC’s infrastructure could support a larger portfolio of projects and activities.

Through our review of CMC’s ratio of operations costs to project/programmes costs we can make the following observations: during the first year, as can be expected from a new organisation, the ratio of project activities to cost centre was very high. This can be justified by the fact that IUCN was starting its activities in the Mediterranean.

In the last two years, project activities have increased as indicated in Exhibit 3.1. The data suggest that there has been some improvement in CMC efficiency since 2002. CMC’s ratio of operational costs to programme costs, which was 3:1 in 2002, is now in 2004 approximately 1:1. This would seem to indicate that CMC has significant absorptive capacity and should be able to handle more projects. This could also explain why some interviewees felt that CMC has substantial resources for the results that it delivers. IUCN HQ could work with CMC to monitor and benchmark these ratios. In our experience, a 20% ratio for project activities to operational expenses is an acceptable norm.

A review of CMC’s most recent expansion in 2004 through the Swiss Cooperation Agency (WESCANNA North Africa Biodiversity Programme) with funding of CHF 590,000 would also suggest a move in the right direction.

Exhibit 3.1 CMC Trends – Operational Expenses and Project Revenues

	Operational Expenses (Euros)	Project Activities Revenues (Euros)
2002	447,533	158,649
2003	596,357	667,246
2004	658,342	645,481

Source: IUCN – Med Office. Budgets 2001-2004

Finding 12: CMC needs to improve the management of its infrastructure.

While the overall use of resources is judged satisfactory, staff noted the inefficient use of infrastructure. Until recently, the use of space has allowed the CMC to maximise resources. As staff expands within the same infrastructure, space restrictions will have an impact on productivity. Staff suggested that there are not enough meeting rooms, and not enough privacy for work that requires focused concentration. Given the relative flexibility in resources, the CMC should forecast space requirements as it forecasts programme expansion.

3.5 Financial Viability

To perform well, an organisation must be attentive to its ability to generate the resources it requires. Financial viability is an important performance criterion, and one which the CMC has met successfully.

Finding 13: There is no immediate concern with respect to the financial viability of the CMC, in the medium-term. The CMC will need to continue to diversify funding sources and obtain additional project and programme funding.

As can be seen in Exhibit 3.2, CMC's major donors have indicated and demonstrated their support for the programme. The CMC has begun a positive strategy to expand its funding base, and results are encouraging. These initiatives should be maintained and increased in the coming years.

Exhibit 3.2 CMC Donor Funding (2001 – 2004)

Donor	Activity	Budget	Date
Ministry of Environment, Madrid	Annual core support	€300,00 per year	2001-2004
Junta de Andalucia	Annual core support	€280,000 per year	2000-2004
The Swiss Agency for Development Cooperation	WESCANA North Africa biodiversity programme	590,000 Swiss Franc	April 2004- December 2004
Italian Ministry of Environment	Hosting a members meeting	€100,000	June 2004
Italian Ministry of Foreign Affairs	Co-funding of WANI (IUCN Water & Nature Initiative)	€140,000	2003-2004
Spanish International Cooperation Agency	Four international meetings (including 2 international training seminars)	€160,000	2003, 2004
Total Foundation	High seas governance legal project	€150,000	February 2003- September 2004
European Commission	Co-funding a workshop on Forest landscape restoration in the Med.	€50,000	2003
British Government (DEFRA)	Support to Morocco's efforts to control invasive North American ducks	£ 5,000	2003
Languedoc Roussillon	Hosting a workshop	€5,000	January 2003
Netherlands government	Co-funding WANI project	88,000 Swiss Franc	2003-2004
UNESCO	Technical support for the management of a world heritage site in Tunisia	US\$23,000	2002
Diputacion de Barcelona	Hosting a workshop	€ 15,000	November 2002

4. CMC Thematic Programme Component Review

4.1 Introduction

This component of the Strategic Review was undertaken by a lead thematic reviewer, Meg Gawler, and input was provided in each thematic area by the heads of the IUCN global thematic programmes – Stewart Maginnis (Forests), Carl Gustaf Lundin (Marine), Pedro Rosabal (Protected Areas), Jean-Christophe Vié (Species), Jean-Yves Pirot, Ger Bergkamp and consultant Larry Haas for Water and Wetlands. Joshua Bishop provided forward looking suggestions for programming in socio-economic dimensions, and Joachim Gratzfeld provided an overview of the work of the Commission on Ecosystem Management (CEM). It should be noted that the latter two areas – socio-economics and ecosystem management were not included in the review interviews since these were very new areas of programme development with few activities having been implemented.

The thematic staff of the Mediterranean office provided initial background information on the thematic work programme and activities, along with a list of possible interviewees. They were also part of the discussion on the results of the thematic interviews and recommendations for future programming: Rami Salman (Forests and Ecosystem Management), Francois Simard, Ameer Abdulla, Claudianne Chevalier (Marine), Andres Alcantara (Protected Areas), Jamie Skinner and Cesar Alcacer (Water and Wetlands).

4.2 Methodology and Approach to the Thematic Review

4.2.1 Purpose and Objectives

In order to adequately address the overall purpose and objectives of the review, the methodology included a limited assessment of key aspects of the thematic work of the Mediterranean Programme.

It was recognised that most thematic parts of the Mediterranean Programme are in the early stages of development and could not be evaluated as a full work programme of results. The review methodology was adjusted accordingly to reflect the early stage of development of the programme.

The intent of the thematic review was: 1) to provide a check on the strategic approach and progress of the CMC thematic programme activities; 2) to obtain impressions from experts on the quality and effectiveness of the work carried out so far; 3) to identify implications for future programming; and 4) to further experiment with and develop the ‘peer review’ component of reviews as requested by the Director General and senior management under the implementation of the IUCN Evaluation Policy.

In particular the thematic review contributed to the following review objectives:

- To assess the strategic positioning (niche) of the Mediterranean Programme in relation to the major issues and trends and other actors in the Mediterranean eco- region.
- To assess the effectiveness of thematic work carried out so far in the major thematic areas, including protected areas, marine, water and wetlands, drylands, forests and ecosystem management, species, climate change, and legal agreements.
- To identify major gaps in the Mediterranean Programme, to suggest future directions for programme development and the implications for programme management and delivery. (This includes areas of content as well as capacity issue

4.2.2 Data Collection

Data collection included a review of thematic workplans (annual and intersessional) and semi-structured interviews with experts in the thematic areas of forests, marine, protected areas, species and water and wetlands. The areas of law and work on international conventions was subsumed under several of the thematic areas. It was also decided that since little thematic work had been done on ecosystem management and socio-economics that these areas could not be the subject of review interviews, but would be included in the forward looking part of the process on future programming opportunities.

A total of 31 interviews were carried out with experts in the thematic areas of forests (7), marine (6), protected areas (6), species (6), and water and wetlands (6). The list of those interviewed and the interview protocol with the specific questions asked is provided in Volume II.

Thematic experts were identified by both the Mediterranean Programme thematic staff, and global thematic programme heads. In some cases, lists of workshop attendees were used to select a sample of interviewees. In other cases, where more limited work had taken place, a short list of experts was proposed by thematic staff. The criteria for their selection was that they should have been directly involved in either a significant thematic programme activity (such as implementation of a thematic project or technical workshop or expert training) or in the production of a thematic product (such as guidelines or listing of species), or involved in both. It was accepted that the thematic experts would not be completely impartial since some had a professional interest in the outcome of CMC's work, however given that there was not a full set of programme results to review it was decided that a limited sampling of the views of thematic experts would provide some external perceptions of the Mediterranean Programme, and was better than not hearing any external voices at all in the thematic part of the review.

Limitations to the data collection approach are discussed in section 4.2.4.

The key areas of inquiry covered in the thematic interviews included:

- The **relevance** of the thematic work (water, species, etc) to the **key conservation issues** facing the Mediterranean eco-region
- The **relevance** of the thematic work to the **key sustainable development issues** facing the Mediterranean eco-region
- Clarity of the **long term vision** beyond the immediate work (Is the vision clear, data based, linked to key issues?)
- Comparative advantage and **appropriate niche** for IUCN
- The extent to which the work is **strategic** in addressing the key issues and trends in the Mediterranean eco-region
- The **quality** of the work in terms of technical standards – regionally, globally
- **Effective implementation** of the work by the Mediterranean office thematic staff, and partners, if applicable (well-organised, delivered on time, credible, according to the expected results, objectives)
- **Gaps** in the work so far in terms of **thematic and geographic coverage, partnerships - collaboration** (major issues not covered, geographic areas not served, collaboration issues)
- Future programme development
- **Emerging issues** that the Mediterranean Programme should address in its next stage of development
- **Areas of strategic collaboration** for the programme to explore in its next phase of development
- Suggestions for the **management and leadership** of thematic work in the future
- **Major success factors** for the future development of the programme

The findings, conclusions and suggestions presented for each thematic area follow this sequence.

4.2.3 Thematic Data Analyses

A Review working session was held in Malaga on July 14-15, chaired by the Review Leader, Marie-Hélène Adrien, and attended by the heads of global thematic programmes, their Mediterranean thematic counterparts, and the M&E Coordinator. At the working session, the results of the organisational part of the review were presented by Marie-Hélène Adrien, and the results of the thematic interviews were presented by thematic lead consultant Meg Gawler.

Global thematic programme heads and their Mediterranean counterparts then discussed the results of the thematic interviews in small groups and reached conclusions and recommendations, taking into account the results of the interviews and the knowledge of the global and regional thematic specialists. The findings, conclusions and recommendations reflected in this report include the input from respondents as well as the thematic staff.

4.2.4 Limitations to the Data Collection Approach

A number of limitations to the data collection approach taken in this review are worth noting for future reviews. The small numbers of interviews with technical experts in each area made it difficult to generalise across the programme from the interview results. Names of targeted external thematic experts were not always easy to identify in every thematic area, and the time taken to identify and set up interviews was longer than anticipated. This was compounded by the summer holiday schedule when many people were not readily available. And finally, the original intention of having global thematic programme heads involved in a full peer review process including assisting in conducting interviews with the external expert constituency in their area of expertise proved to be unrealistic in terms of their available time. This left the lead thematic consultant to complete the majority of interviews, and too little time at the end of the data collection to adequately synthesise the results for the discussion with the thematic review team in Malaga. These limitations will provide valuable lessons for the future development of peer review processes in IUCN.

Peer reviews are approaches that support organizational learning and cross-fertilization of knowledge. Although IUCN indicates that it is committed to such a working culture in the IUCN Evaluation Policy, it is unclear that IUCN senior management has put in place the appropriate organisational structures to support peer reviews, including: clear accountability for participating in peer review, clarification that participation in peer reviews is part of IUCN professional staff's roles and responsibilities, an incentive system that supports participation in peer reviews, and real allocation of time to engage in peer reviews.

4.3 Summary of Thematic Findings

4.3.1 Introduction

This section provides the findings, conclusions and suggestions for future programme development in each of the areas of Forest Conservation, Marine Conservation, Protected Areas, Species Conservation and Water and Wetlands. The data reflects the input from respondents as well as the thematic staff based on the presentations and discussions of the Malaga working session.

Bearing in mind the early stages of development of most thematic programmes, these results should be viewed as an indicative snapshot of performance. No attempt was made to compare or synthesize performance across the thematic programmes, or to rank the suggestions made by thematic experts and thematic programme heads. All suggestions are captured in the report as a contribution to future programme planning development.

It is expected that the next Review of the Mediterranean thematic programmes should be in a position to review actual results achieved and to compare the performance of mature programmes across the CMC programme.

4.3.2 Forest Conservation

Overview

The Forest activities and products included in the review were:

- the Forest Landscape Restoration workshop in Castelabatte in May 2003, and associated background materials and CD of proceedings
- the Forest Landscape Restoration workshop in Chilento, Italy
- the publication “*Forest Landscape Restoration in the Mediterranean Context*”

Relevance

Finding 14: Forest Landscape Restoration (FLR) provides an appropriate entry point for forest-related activities in the Mediterranean.

Forest Landscape Restoration (FLR) provides the right entry point for forest-related activities in the Mediterranean due to the links that can be easily made to (and between) the three Rio conventions and the Barcelona convention (MCSA); land degradation; livelihoods and poverty reduction; and as a working example of an ecosystem approach to restoration.

Vision and Niche

Finding 15: There is evidence of a good niche for CMC’s FLR work in the Mediterranean that can provide the basis for a long term vision for forest related work.

The limited interviews conducted suggest that there is not yet a clear vision for forest-related activities in the Mediterranean but that the focus on FLR clearly complements CMC’s overall vision for the Mediterranean and the Forest Conservation Programmes’ global vision for forests. Similarly, CMC’s work on Forests aligns well with IUCN’s niche in the region to convene and promote lesson sharing among and between civil society and governments, with a specific view to encourage implementation of international and regional environmental commitments.

Interviewees raised the issue of possible overlap with Plan Bleu and suggested that IUCN could cooperate more with the Ministerial Conference on Forests and International Association for Mediterranean Forests.

Strategic Level of Work

Finding 16: Views were mixed on the strategic focus of Forest Landscape Restoration work.

Some of those interviewed thought that forest-related activities to date have not been strategically thought through, while others felt that the Forest Landscape Restoration work is very strategic in that it addresses the situation of half the forests in the Mediterranean context.

It was felt by some respondents that CMC’s FLR activities resulted more from the capacity and interest of the global programme to provide support on Forest Landscape Restoration and the desire in CMC to test the concept within the region, than to a specific strategy.

Technical Quality

Finding 17: The high technical quality of CMC’s work on forest-related issues has been widely recognised.

Respondents noted that the publications from Castellabate were carefully reviewed and vetted, and that IUCN’s products, standards and classification systems are known widely. Interviewees also noted that because products benefit from the reputation of IUCN as a whole that CMC should safeguard this reputation.

Effectiveness

Finding 18: CMC lacks the capacity to ensure follow-up and support for outcome-focused results.

There is wide recognition that the CMC FLR work at the output level (in this case the FLR workshop and publication) is excellent, however discussions and interviews noted the lack of followup on the Castellabate workshop and suggested that there is now a need to focus on the level of outcomes and to support the application of knowledge to bring about conservation changes. The need to improve communications was also raised in the interviews.

Gaps

Given the limited capacity of CMC, interview respondents suggest that CMC should continue to concentrate on Forest Landscape Restoration related activities, focusing on building partnerships and using optimum geographic entry points where Forest Landscape Restoration can have real added value.

Agriculture, rural activities and social issues were suggested as important considerations in future forest development work. Interviewees also remarked on the need to find a balance between global forest priorities and a Mediterranean specific focus. Geographic areas for future consideration include North Africa and the Eastern Mediterranean.

Emerging Issues

In the thematic interviews, respondents were asked to identify emerging issues that the Mediterranean Programme should address in its next stage of development.

It was suggested that future Forest Landscape Restoration activities should complement, where possible, the existing CMC themes of biodiversity conservation, desertification, sustainable use, water and islands. In addition FLR work be strategically aligned with the global Forest Conservation Programme’s niche of livelihoods and landscapes.

Interviewees raised the following issues to be considered in future programme development: effects of agriculture, coastal development, rural development, land conflicts, new laws in EU (European Union) accession countries, climate change, desertification and forest fires, globalisation and the influence of the private sector, pollution, poverty, landscape water management, forest governance, forest genetics and reproductive material.

Areas for Future Strategic Collaboration

Respondents were asked to identify areas of strategic collaboration for the programme to explore in its next phase of development.

Interview respondents suggested that CMC should identify those Members and other partners who are undertaking work directly relevant to Forest Landscape Restoration, and seek out opportunities to add value to their work. While CMC should not immediately implement field-based activities itself, it should seek to catalyse the efforts of Members and partners to do so.

Specific suggestions for collaboration from those interviewed included: WWF (World Wide Fund For Nature) Mediterranean Programme, Europa, EC, Activity Centres of the Mediterranean Action Plan, Europarc, Birdlife, Food and Agriculture Organisation of the United Nations (FAO), Barcelona Convention, International Union of Forest Research Organizations, European Forest Genetic Resources Programme (EUFORGEN), the German Agency for Technical Cooperation (GTZ) and the Italian Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

It was noted that the relationship with WESCANA requires further work in the next phase of forest programme development, however reviewers recognised that this is part of a broader programmatic issue related to improved programme management and development in WESCANA and the need to strengthen working relationships with other IUCN regions and programmes.

Suggestions for Management and Leadership

The management and leadership of the CMC Forest work is perceived to be good. Respondents suggested that CMC should position itself to play a leading role on dry temperate forests within IUCN's Temperate and Boreal Forest Programme. It was felt that there is no compelling reason to build a stand-alone forest programme, but that Forest activities should be implemented within the context of terrestrial and coastal ecosystem management.

Interviewees suggested that biome programmes could be integrated – forests and water, forests and species – and that consideration could be given to working by sub-regions. Interviewees also encouraged CMC to enlarge its representation in other forums to make the whole CMC team better known, to be more proactive and visionary, and to improve communication.

Success Factors for the Future

Factors considered important for the future success of the forest programme in the Mediterranean included the following. CMC should:

- Effectively demonstrate the relevance of Forest Landscape Restoration to sustainable development within the Mediterranean.
- Address land tenure and be aware of upstream development planning;
- Reinforce cooperation at the local level
- Develop partnerships, bring government and civil society together especially in North Africa;
- Demonstrate relevance to economic well-being .
- Improve communication, specifically to provide FLR material on the Mediterranean website and in the regular Mediterranean newsletter.
- Recognise that CMC has limited resources and that CMC should initiate activities only when it has sufficient capacity and intent to follow-up.

4.3.3 Marine Conservation

Overview

The Marine component of the CMC programme is reasonably well established, having been in existence since shortly after the opening of the Mediterranean office. Review interviewees were familiar with a subset of the following products and services of the Marine Programme:

Deep sea / high sea ecosystem knowledge and conservation: Workshop on legal aspects of Mediterranean high seas, Malaga (CD-Rom); Session on protection of the deep sea at CIESM Congress; Brochure on high sea governance – legal aspects; Rencontres Méditerranéennes, Marseille.

Sustainable aquaculture: Workshop on aquaculture and environment, Barcelona.

Ecosystem approach to fisheries: Workshop on implementation of the concept of the ecosystem approach for Mediterranean fisheries; Workshop of the Fisheries Working Group of the European Sustainable Use Group of Specialists of SSC (Species Survival Commission); Workshop at EU Commission; Meetings of the General Fisheries Council for the Mediterranean; Symposium on Biodiversity and Fisheries, Porquerolles.

Marine Protected Areas Ecological Network: Meetings with various partners (Council of Europe, Europarc, NGOs, etc); Marine Programme (general): web pages, web bulletins; Members meeting, Naples 06/04

Relevance

Finding 19: CMC's work on Marine Conservation is seen to be relevant to the Mediterranean eco-region.

The approaches to conservation applied by IUCN (management of protected areas, environmental law, ecosystem approach) are felt to be relevant to marine conservation issues in the Mediterranean. Interviewees commented in particular on the IUCN work on Marine Protected Areas (MPAs) and fisheries, which is considered highly relevant. At the same time however it was felt that the MPA programme does not have sufficient capacity and resources to address many of the significant issues in this area in the Mediterranean.

Vision and Niche

Finding 20: There is a real niche for CMC in Marine Conservation in the Mediterranean. Key roles that CMC has begun and should continue to play include convenor work on high seas and aquaculture, and promoting collaboration in fisheries among different cultures.

Overall, CMC's Marine work is considered to be moving in the right direction. CMC is perceived as a plus for the region, and is not duplicating the work of others. The challenge for CMC is to find its niche within overall regional cooperation, including its relationship with the regional UNEP Action Plan. Although IUCN is known as a think tank, it is encouraged to work not only on policy, but in the field as well. Some concern was expressed that IUCN should leave sustainable development to others.

Strategic Level of Work

Finding 21: CMC Marine initiatives are seen as strategic because they address areas in which little work has been done, e.g., deep and high seas and shark conservation. However, more focus and clarity is needed on specific Intersessional results and activities that specifically illustrate this strategic focus.

Three strategic priorities were suggested: 1) MPA management effectiveness throughout the Mediterranean; 2) establishing an MPA network by 2012, including Marine Protected Areas as a tool for fisheries management; and 3) coastal conservation in North Africa.

Technical Quality

Finding 22: The quality of CMC Marine documents is considered good and scientifically credible in technical forums.

As an example, the recent marine workshop in Malaga was thought to be well-organised and interesting, as well as producing high quality products. It was suggested that to help ensure ongoing technical quality CMC could make more use of experts from the Commissions and other expert networks. Respondents noted positively that the quality of Marine products has been improving over time.

Effectiveness

Finding 23: CMC Marine work was felt to be very effective, well-organised, credible and continuing to improve. Effectiveness has been enhanced by having Arabic-speaking marine staff.

The effective presence of the Mediterranean Marine programme at the Durban Parks Congress was noted by interviewees. It was suggested that effectiveness could be enhanced by disseminating a hard-copy newsletter, especially for scientific data. Interviewees noted that IUCN is known for its competence, especially in conservation of the high seas.

A more productive relationship with WESCANA could be developed in the broader context of the new Intersessional Programme and the new management of WESCANA.

Gaps

Gaps in marine work were identified as sustainable fishing, coastal zone management, and islands. It was noted that CMC is well-placed to add value in the area of sustainable fishing. Coastal zone management is an important issue in the Mediterranean and there is potential for IUCN to play a role in environmental impact assessment, coastal tourism, desalinisation, capacity building, improving national legislation and developing technical tools. However, given its limited capacity and resources, CMC is not likely to be able to address these issues comprehensively at this time. Although CMC has clearly identified that the biological gaps in programmatic action are in the coastal areas of the southern countries, the CMC programme does not include specific activities to address these areas.

Gaps in geographic coverage include: North Africa, the Adriatic, the high seas, the Black Sea, the Red Sea, and the Canary Islands.

Emerging Issues

The following emerging issues in Marine Conservation were identified:

- mechanisms to protect sub-marine landscapes and their natural and archaeological values
- identifying priorities for fisheries-managed areas within a marine protected areas network
- sustainable aquaculture
- sustainable fishing, including artisanal fishing
- legal and institutional aspects of conservation – governance of biodiversity
- connectivity among protected areas – “From island to network”
- invasive species
- the changing legal regime of the Mediterranean, where coastal states are likely to extend their jurisdiction; this will require new agreements in fisheries, environment, and cultural protection.

Areas for Future Strategic Collaboration

According to those interviewed, CMC Marine work has solidified its presence, and is known to the main players (EU, FAO). However, communications are not sufficient, particularly with respect to planning.

There is a need to build on and strengthen interaction with Members. In addition, collaboration with governments could be diversified. Strengthening the relationship with the EU and securing EU resources was highlighted as important.

Opportunities were suggested for collaboration with new partners, as well as strengthening existing relationships. These included:

- IUCN Commissions, especially increased support from SSC to link work on protected areas with that of key species, particularly sea mammals
- RAC/SPA (Regional Activity Centre for Specially Protected Areas) in Tunis for Marine Protected Areas
- Barcelona Convention and Mediterranean Action Plan
- Mediterranean Commission on Sustainable Development
- Bern Convention; Bonn Convention; ACCOBAMS (Agreement on the Conservation of Cetaceans in the Black Sea and Mediterranean and Contiguous Atlantic Areas)
- General Fisheries Commission for the Mediterranean (GFCM)
- Commission Internationale de l'Exploration Scientifique de la Méditerranée (CIESM)
- Secretariat for Life in Jordan
- Med Cities in Barcelona
- MedPol (Mediterranean Pollution Monitoring and Research Programme) in Athens
- Local and regional governments, especially for coastal zone work.

Suggestions for Management and Leadership

Interview respondents believe that leadership in Marine Conservation is good, and that CMC has made great progress. They suggested that leadership challenges for the future include: bridging Europe and WESCANA successfully, reinforcing the specificity of the Mediterranean Programme, improving communications, and strengthening relationships with Members and Commissions.

Success Factors for the Future

The following success factors were identified:

- More clearly identify CMC's strategic niche and its role vis-à-vis other organisations in the region.
- Remain a pioneer, and be original.
- Provide visibility. Lead by example.
- Build capacity and collaborate.
- Raise funds, and broaden CMC's funding base.
- Work in North Africa – this is where coastal pressures will be in 15 years.
- Maintain capacity in Arabic, and translate materials into Arabic.

- Build confidence with Members in the region: put in place a mechanism to keep regular contact, and keep Members better informed.
- Coordinate with other Regional Seas Programmes.

4.3.4 Protected Areas

Overview

The products and services commented on by interviewees in the thematic review of CMC's work in Protected Areas included the following:

Manual on Protected Areas; Workshop to prepare for WPC, Murcia, March 2003; CD on Protected Areas in the Mediterranean Context; Publication on ecological connectivity in Mediterranean landscapes; Publication on protected areas and infrastructure development; Workshop on High Seas Marine Protected Areas (Marine Protected Areas); European meeting on Trans Boundary Protected, Belgrade, June 2004; Proceedings of the Malaga meeting on Marine Protected Areas.

Relevance

Finding 24: The CMC work on Protected Areas is seen as highly relevant and has a strong mandate from Members (approximately 80% of Members are dealing with PA issues).

Respondents notes that Protected Areas are recognised as a core business of IUCN, with a track record of achievement, and that Protected Areas are considered highly relevant to the needs of the eco- region as a key component of biodiversity conservation and sustainable development. Approximately 80% of IUCN Members in the eco-region deal with protected areas issues.

It was noted that Protected Areas provide key entry points to address other cross-cutting issues, such as tourism, landscape planning, governance, financing, infrastructure development, and sustainable fisheries. Protected Areas under Categories V and VI can be promoted as engines to encourage conservation and socio-economic development. In addition, there is increased attention by governments and NGOs to use Trans Boundary Protected Areas to promote regional cooperation.

Vision

Finding 25: CMC has a well-defined vision for its work on Protected Areas.

CMC's vision for protected areas is linked to the ten-year Durban Action Plan. Key targets noted include the 2010 target on reducing biodiversity lost (Countdown 2010) and the 2012 target in relation to marine biodiversity (World Summit on Sustainable Development [WSSD] and the Convention on Biological Diversity [CBD]). The vision is associated with the development of a global representative system of terrestrial and Marine Protected Areas.

Interviewees suggested that a higher order strategic plan on Marine Protected Areas would be useful, as well as clearly articulated mid-term and long-term visions. Important mechanisms include promoting the application of the ecosystem approach at different levels (local, national and regional), assessing the effectiveness of Protected Areas at these levels, and sharing knowledge to improve PA management..

Niche

Finding 26: IUCN has a unique convening role in Protected Areas, that is, linking governments, NGOs and academia in different environmental and cultural contexts, in particular with respect to follow-up of World Parks Congress outcomes in the region.

Protected Areas are recognised worldwide as a core business of IUCN. Respondents noted that IUCN could play an important role in strengthening and implementing the protocol to the Barcelona Convention on Marine Protected Areas. In addition, IUCN could help link global with regional discussions on Marine Protected Areas across cultural boundaries, and promote Trans Boundary Protected Areas.

Strategic Level of Work

Finding 27: CMC's Protected Areas work is perceived to be strategic in facilitating a unified Mediterranean position on Protected Area issues to influence global agendas.

Interviewees indicated that CMC's Marine Protected Areas work is gaining recognition in the region for its potential to address degradation of coastal areas and new economic opportunities, and for assisting signatories of the Barcelona Convention in implementation activities. It was also noted that dryland ecosystems are a key gap in the Global Protected Areas System. There were mixed views on the degree to which CMC's Protected Areas concepts and approaches are being implemented. CMC was encouraged by some interviewees to consider cultural and social issues more in their PA work.

Technical Quality

Finding 28: The Protected Areas products and services known to interviewees were perceived to be of high technical quality, innovative and well-balanced. CMC was encouraged to be more analytical in some cases.

Specific feedback from interviewees indicated that the Manual on Protected Areas was a good product, although it could be more analytical. Respondents indicated that the Conference in Murcia was well organised and that technical meetings were of high organisational and technical quality. There were mixed views on the constraints imposed by donors and the lack of coherence between the Murcia workshop and Durban World Parks Congress.

According to feedback received, ensuring the technical quality of CMC's Protected Areas products and services will require:

- a multilingual approach
- maintaining innovation by enhancing cooperation with Commissions and networks and greater use of IUCN 3I-C funding
- a greater effort to move from knowledge gathering to application (development and testing the tools box)
- enhancing networking and liaison with key institutions that can support the CMC programme (value added)
- human resources development to maintain and expand a professional and effective team
- ensuring that products satisfy the expectations of donors and Members, and are also technically endorsed by experts (Commissions and others).

Effectiveness

Finding 29: Views were mixed on the effectiveness of the Protected Areas work.

Some interviewees felt that the PA staff were professional and effective, and that IUCN's credibility has grown in the Regional Activity Centre for Specially Protected Areas in Tunis as a result of CMC's work. It was felt that CMC has strong credibility with scientific communities and government, but perhaps less with local communities.

Others expressed concerns that it is not clear that the PA programme has made substantial progress in two years working with Tunis in Protected Areas in the Mediterranean, and that it was proving to be difficult to get North Africa, Middle East and Europe to work together. Concerns were also expressed about products that were not completed months after the event, such as the paper on Protected Areas and Sustainable Development, and the database of training organisations. Suggestions were also made to improve leadership in PA work, and communications with regional experts and Members of Commissions.

Gaps

The main thematic gaps identified by interviewees in Protected Areas work included the implementation of the World Heritage Convention in the Mediterranean, and better addressing economic and cultural aspects of Protected Areas. Geographic gaps were identified as North Africa and the Middle East.

Respondents also noted the following thematic gaps: economic assessment of Protected Areas linked to payment for ecological services (sustainable tourism, watershed management, etc.), application of IUCN categories in the design and management of Natura 2000, the application of PA lessons in North Africa, and the application of the biodiversity information system to enhance design, planning and management of Protected Areas systems.

Other gaps that were identified included: environmental education; Trans Boundary MPAs; innovative governance options for PA management; Protected Areas in deeper water beyond territorial limits; inclusion of culture, land use and landscape approaches; addressing the linkages between agriculture and biodiversity; and islands.

Emerging Issues

The following emerging issues in Protected Areas were suggested:

- regional implementation of the Durban Action Plan, with particular attention to linkages, training, governance, and sustainable financing
- integrated projects, such as Mouluya-Chafarinas-Alboran
- consideration of linking protected areas and the concept of corridors
- compiling and disseminating lessons learned on the process of decentralisation, particularly in North Africa and the Middle East, and encouraging governments in these areas to do more work on protected areas
- sustainable tourism in Protected Areas as a mechanism for socio-economic development
- infrastructure development, and landscape planning and management, including restoration
- promoting the engagement of the private sector in Protected Areas management.

Areas for Future Strategic Collaboration

It was suggested that the CMC Protected Areas Programme needs to improve collaboration both within IUCN as well as with regional partners. In particular the scope of collaboration needs to reflect a more balanced regional profile beyond Spain.

Internally, collaboration could be enhanced with: WCPA (World Commission on Protected Areas) on management effectiveness and application of IUCN PA management in the Mediterranean, SSC, CEM and the European office and the new office in Belgrade. Externally, collaborations could be developed with RAC/SPA, Cooperation Agencies (Spain, France, Italy), WWF MEDPO (Mediterranean Programme Office), EU on policy frameworks for coastal management and fisheries, World Trade Organisation (WTO), foundations, and regional and central governments.

Interviewees expressed concern that the relationship between CMC and WESCANA must be improved, and that outstanding issues and conflicts should be addressed by IUCN management.

Suggestions for Management and Leadership

There were mixed views on the leadership of the CMC work on Protected Areas. Some interviewees felt that CMC has implemented a significant amount of PA work and that the leadership role in PA was recognised in the region. Others believe CMC needs to be more inclusive of IUCN constituencies across the eco-region, and more aggressive in communicating and marketing the PA programme to increase visibility and credibility with some stakeholders. One respondent suggested the creation of a consultative technical body to guide Protected Areas work and to open up the programme to new ideas from Members and others.

Success Factors for the Future

Success factors for the future work in Protected Areas include:

- enhancing IUCN's catalytic work to link Members and experts across the region
- emphasising IUCN's convening role, especially for countries that work in isolation
- Marine Protected Areas network that is representative of Mediterranean biodiversity
- high quality products and good professional team
- using expertise in the northern part of the Mediterranean to build capacity and confidence in the South and East, and to bring them together
- strategic development of human resources, creating bigger teams through the use of interns, new staff, secondment arrangements, etc.
- more cooperative approach with Members, and more active engagement with Commissions
- maintaining donor confidence, while diversifying the funding base
- exploring the decentralisation of functions to different parts of the eco-region.

4.3.5 Species Conservation

Overview

Interviewees were familiar with the following Species products and services undertaken by the CMC: Workshop on sharks, San Marino, August 2003; Mediterranean Action Plan for Sharks; Shark Red List; Shark information and media pack; Study on the economic value of wild species, Morocco; Project on medicinal plants in North Africa; Communications workshop with CEC; Conference on invasive species in Spain; and work on ruddy ducks.

Relevance

Finding 30: Work undertaken by CMC on sharks, medicinal plants and invasive species is considered highly relevant to conservation and sustainable development issues and trends in the region.

There is a strong rationale for the CMC work on Species. Interviewees noted that CMC fills a gap in conservation in the region and that it is member-driven. Although species are heavily exploited and continue to be lost, CMC's work has the potential to illustrate that species biodiversity can play an important role in sustainable development in the region by demonstrating the potential for people and biodiversity to coexist. Species work was noted to be of direct relevance to sustainable livelihoods issues in North Africa (medicinal plants). Suggestions were made that the Mediterranean Species work would make a good case study.

Vision

Finding 31: CMC has not articulated a long-term vision for Species Conservation work in the Mediterranean.

Although the current Species work on sharks is perceived to be very relevant to the needs of the region, respondents agreed that there is currently no clear longer term vision for the broader species conservation work of CMC. While current work is made possible as a result of funding opportunities, a longer term vision and strategy are needed to develop and market CMC's work in this area.

They noted that the UNEP Mediterranean Shark Action Plan covers biodiversity but not fisheries, and both are needed.

Niche

Finding 32: IUCN has a very strong comparative advantage and niche for Species conservation work in the Mediterranean.

There is a clear need for technical advice and tools on species conservation, and IUCN is perceived by interviewees to be uniquely positioned to undertake this work. Interviewees cited IUCN's globally and regionally recognised work on the assessment of the status of species. IUCN was cited as the only player with a regional approach to shark conservation, the only organisation working on both biodiversity and fisheries fronts, on medicinal plants, and with access to a wide range of technical expertise. In addition, IUCN's strategy and balanced approach of working with multiple stakeholders was praised as highly appropriate in working with the fisheries sector.

At the same time CMC was encouraged to clarify its role as technical advisor and/or policy facilitator in this work, and to sort out possible overlapping roles with WESCANA, the Barcelona Convention, and the Bern Convention.

Strategic Level of Work

Finding 33: CMC's Species work is considered strategic because of the high importance of the issues to the region and the approach taken to the work.

Although it was noted that there is no overall strategy for Species work, CMC's work in this area is seen as strategic because of the critical importance of biodiversity to the eco-region, and because the work is based on the implementation of the Barcelona Convention and the Mediterranean Action Plan. However, CMC is considered by some as too timid and reactive in tackling species issues and should become bolder and more proactive in entering the national and regional arena. In addition, interviewees suggested that

CMC should balance its work on terrestrial and marine species, and develop more specific Intersessional species results.

Technical Quality

Finding 34: Overall, the Species work products and outputs are perceived to be of high quality.

In general the CMC's work on sharks was perceived to be of high quality. The shark workshop, its outputs and its organisation were considered to be very good, and the Red List was cited as excellent work along with the shark media pack and the web site. The work on ruddy ducks was also considered good.

It was noted however that dissemination and communication of the results need to be improved, and it was noted that a report on invasive species was of poor quality and could have made better use of existing SSC work.

Effectiveness

Finding 35: CMC work on Species is considered to be very effective, timely and well-organised.

While the CMC work on Species was perceived to be very effective, respondents also indicated that CMC's work needs to be much more visible, and that an investment in communications is needed to make this happen for CMC and for IUCN in general. IUCN was also encouraged to maintain its credibility by ensuring ongoing good quality technical work at both the regional and global level to safeguard its reputation.

In addition, IUCN's approach of bringing stakeholders together to undertake this work was perceived as an effective strategy. There was agreement that despite being a data rich region for biodiversity that more biodiversity information is needed in this eco-region.

Gaps

Although respondents identified gaps in specific species and geographical regions, it was also recognised that the region is large and complex in terms of species conservation and CMC cannot tackle it all in the developmental phases of the programme.

Respondents suggested that individual species requiring attention included the monk seal, macaques (Barbary macaque), birds, carnivores, and wetland species. The coastal zone and islands were also recommended for attention, and the Black Sea was suggested to be included in Mediterranean species work.

There has been good engagement of stakeholders on sharks and invasive species in most parts of the eco-region, with the exception of North Africa. CMC was encouraged to do more to bridge the North-South gap by putting together topical teams to work on species issues, and to engage in more capacity building in the southern and eastern parts of the region.

Emerging Issues

No real emerging issues were identified. Rather, interviewees commented that there is a need to implement existing agreements and strategies. Examples given were the European Strategy on Invasive Species, national action plans, and protocols for medicinal plants used in industry. It was recommended that for the medium term the emphasis should be on making full use of existing mechanisms, networks and tools, rather than taking on new issues.

Areas for Future Strategic Collaboration

Interview respondents perceive that CMC has the right approach to collaboration, and that great potential exists for strategic alliances if CMC strengthens its capacity for consultation and cooperation. They believe that to realise this potential CMC needs to strengthen its consultation with stakeholders (especially fishers) and government, as well as its cooperation with Members.

Suggestions were made to strengthen working relationships with key SSC Specialist Groups and SSC more generally, and to harmonise work with WESCANA and the Regional Office for Europe. Comments indicated that initially IUCN's presence was not welcome by RAC/SPA, but it is now recognised that IUCN has a key role to play.

Interviewees suggested that making documents available in Arabic will be important for building collaboration, especially with governments in the region.

Suggestions were made as follows for collaboration with some new organizations, as well as strengthening collaboration where they exist:

- WWF
- BirdLife
- General Fisheries Council for the Mediterranean
- European Union and European Commission
- UNEP Mediterranean Action Plan
- ACCOBAMS (Agreement on the Conservation of Cetaceans in the Black Sea and Mediterranean and Contiguous Atlantic Areas)
- Arab League – important for arid lands
- Union du Magreb Arabe
- Kuwait Development Fund
- Islamic Development Bank
- UNESCO, ALESCO (Arab League Educational, Cultural and Scientific Organisation)
- Island Centre in Turkey/Greece
- Bern Convention.

Suggestions for Management and Leadership

The management and leadership of CMC's Species work are perceived to be good, but the role/mandate of CMC (as a technical advisor, a policy facilitator, or both) needs to be clarified and better communicated in the region. It was suggested that CMC establish an advisory council of Members from the region to assist in strengthening consultation with Members.

IUCN senior management was strongly encouraged to clarify the roles and mandates of the Malaga, Brussels and new WESCANA offices. Suggestions were also made to decentralise specific themes – for example, desertification covered from the new Amman office, and Marine covered from the Malaga office. The need for strengthened communications to make the work of CMC better known was also noted.

Success Factors for the Future

It was suggested that IUCN credibility and the technical quality of its species work are the key factors for ongoing success. Other success factors were identified as:

- Ensuring a sound scientific basis of IUCN products
- Widening geographic representation
- Working inclusively with Members
- Supporting the full implementation of existing agreements and action plans (ex: Mediterranean Shark Action Plan)
- Raising awareness / good communications
- Addressing key threats, such as invasive species
- Securing funds
- Designating a focal point staff member for sharks
- Enhancing the functioning of the General Fisheries Council for the Mediterranean
- Developing indicators to monitor the decline or recovery of species.

4.3.6 Water and Wetlands

Overview

The Water and Wetlands global team undertook their own comprehensive internal review of the work of the CMC as an additional input to the overall Review. Their complete report is not replicated here, but is available as a complementary study. Interview respondents were familiar with the following subset of water and wetlands products and services: Book and CD on Environmental Flows; Regional component of the global Water, Wetlands and Climate Change Initiative in 2002 and 2003, including Mediterranean Resource Kit brochure on adaptation priorities / processes, country baseline and thematic studies, technical resource material, and Regional Roundtable with MedWet [Mediterranean Wetlands Initiative] and GWP-Med (Global Water Partnership), in Athens); Joint project with MedWet and GWP on the effects of climate change on wetlands; assessment in different countries plus workshop in Athens, and global framework for action; review of case studies on how environmental flows are incorporated into planning; and analysis of Integrated Water Resources Management (IWRM) in the region.

Relevance

Finding 36: The work of CMC in the area of Water is seen as very relevant to the needs of the region. Particularly relevant is its work on environmental flows, as many rivers are heavily exploited and some no longer reach the sea.

Respondents notes that there is a strong rationale and support for the work of CMC in the area of water. Water demand in the Mediterranean region is rising sharply, and water management – balancing social, environmental and economic dimensions – is high on the policy agenda. In practice, governments often wish to mobilise all or most of the available water for productive or consumptive uses, and in many instances ecosystems form a neglected part of the water supply chain. At the regional and country levels, many water-related agreements and policies exist in the Mediterranean (e.g. Environmental Flow Assessments [EFAs] are included in the EU Water Framework Directive, and in new legislation in Spain) and increasingly countries focus on complying with those.

Clarification is needed on the links between CMC's current work on water and impacts on poverty reduction and livelihood strategies, particularly vis-à-vis health, employment, and economic growth. It was also perceived that, although this work is relevant in theory, CMC needs much greater capacity and a strategy of working with others to translate the theory and concepts into real action to make a difference in the Mediterranean region.

Vision and Niche

Finding 37: IUCN is seen to have a clear niche in the area of Water – focusing on bridging the gap between governments and NGOs, linking policy and field practice, and producing quality knowledge products – however, the longer term vision has not been effectively communicated.

Although the vision for CMC's work on Water is based on a clear conceptual framework (the *Vision for Water and Nature*), linked to an international agenda, and relevant to other IUCN global and regional programmes, external stakeholders do not have a clear idea of CMC's vision for the water sector in the Mediterranean eco-region. More work is needed to clarify the vision for the Mediterranean eco-region in mainstreaming the ecosystem approach into water management work. In particular, the IWRM work was noted to be more descriptive than visionary.

It was noted that many countries lack the required mixture of commitment, resources, knowledge and know-how to start implementing sustainable water management, and that this is the niche for IUCN. There was strong support for the CMC focus on the mainstreaming of an ecosystem approach to water management, and closing the gap between policy and practice.

Water resources actors who have not been able to establish relationships with other environmental and conservation NGOs, see CMC as a suitable partner. For example, the International Network of Basin Organisations (INBO) and Mediterranean Network of Basin Organisations (MENBO) have agreed to work with CMC (and IUCN globally) to address environmental issues in river basins. In addition, CMC and MENBO are cooperating with logos on knowledge products. A challenge remains to establish the networks and high quality inputs to maintain the quality and productivity of the programme in the longer term.

Respondents also noted that other organisations are dealing with agriculture and wetlands and land and irrigation management and that IUCN needs to maintain its current focus to achieve the best comparative advantage.

Strategic Level of Work

Finding 38: CMC's work on Water is perceived to be strategically positioned to mainstream environmental considerations in catchment management. It was noted that IUCN has a large agenda compared with its capacity and resources to deliver.

Interview respondents noted that CMC has carefully selected its niche and focus in Water, and that it has developed activities using strategic criteria as well as taking advantage of global IUCN products. While external stakeholders recognise the strategic value of the work on environmental flows, and are for the most part supportive of the approach taken so far, they also believe IUCN needs to exhibit caution – to ensure that its focus not only responds to the needs of the Mediterranean, but is also realistic in terms of ability to deliver.

It was felt that the programme is positioned to take advantage of strategic opportunities in relation to:

- the adoption of policies to adopt integrated management approaches in most of the 20 plus countries in the region;
- the presence of regional agreements on environmental and water management;
- implementation of the Water Framework Directive in EU countries in the region, which also has a significant influence on the regional policy agenda (Pan-Med and north-south cooperation), and on national policy in eastern and southern Mediterranean.

Technical Quality

Finding 39: The current technical quality of CMC products on water was perceived to be good. Quality assurance could be enhanced even further by structured review processes such as a technical advisory committee and testing of products.

Feedback from respondents was positive concerning the quality of the products developed by the programme, as supported by the high number of requests for the CD-Rom on Climate Change Adaptation and the comments received at the regional meeting in Naples. An important factor in developing and maintaining quality products has been the use and linkage with WANI (IUCN Water & Nature Initiative) products, such as the CHANGE and FLOW tool books. Suggestions were made that more effort needs to go into targeted dissemination.

Interview respondents noted that CMC's production of quality materials during 2002-2004 helped build confidence and trust with strategic partners who recognise a niche for IUCN in the region.

Effectiveness

Finding 40: CMC is generally perceived as effective and credible in the Water sector. Capacity is needed to ensure effective and targeted follow-up aimed at political impact.

IUCN's main Members and partners on water issues believe that the development of the Water programme is making good progress. It has now acquired credibility with a few influential partners and Members in an otherwise crowded and complex institutional and technical setting. The success with current activities is partly evidenced in the follow-up requests for support, and the success rate in getting basin partners to work with the CMC in developing significant project proposals.

CMC will need to build the capacity to formulate and articulate policy positions in line – or in contrast – with other environmental NGO positions, so that its work on water management can make a difference.

Gaps

In discussing gaps, it was noted that more thinking is needed to see how the CMC Water Programme should use the EU Water Framework Directive (WFD) which is a major policy tool for the region. Two potential linkages were suggested:

- “Good Ecological Status”: to define reference basins, indicators, etc. CMC should mobilise its networks and link to nodes of those networks already involved; this also has clear links with environmental flows and wetlands, with the concept of intermittent rivers, and with groundwater issues
- translating WFD into national policies, guidance, laws, and institutional arrangements.

Suggestions for specific areas to address included: water economics / valuation (allocation and highest value); water governance (within the basin and nationally); and collaboration with key networks.

External stakeholders interviewed also recommended addressing:

- the “silent revolution”, i.e., the abstraction of groundwater by millions of farmers in arid and semi-arid lands
- “virtual water”, which may be a huge boon to conservation, as countries can be fed without using their scarce water resources
- putting theory into practice
- island wetlands, which are both highly threatened and a key to sustainable development in the Mediterranean.

In terms of geographic coverage, external stakeholders expressed the view that CMC is working in the right places. It was noted that rather than gaps, there may be too broad a focus in the Water programme.

Issues of timing (i.e., when to scale up the programme and fill gaps) and capacity were noted as important to address, specifically the urgent need for a Water Co-ordinator.

Emerging Issues

External stakeholders suggested addressing the following emerging issues in the area of Water:

- potential wars over water, especially in the Middle East
- the link between water catchments and coastal zones
- socio-economics
- wetland governance
- social equity
- the water-food-environment agenda
- national IWRM plans.

Given the developmental stage of the programme, it was suggested internally that the programme should first develop a number of field projects, before starting to work more on horizontal issues. These can be tackled once demonstration projects have been established to demonstrate the policy-practice and science – society link.

At the same time, the programme will seek to progressively integrate its work on Water with other thematic / component programmes. It will be important to communicate on groundwater issues and transboundary resources management.

Areas for Future Strategic Collaboration

CMC's collaboration in the area of water is generally perceived to be good – “generally they have the right approach and a rich network with donors, Members and partners.” Care should be taken to ensure that CMC develops its role as a ‘catalyst’ of water collaboration with a range of partners in the Mediterranean than relying on experts alone.

It was suggested that linkages identified to strengthen in the short-term include those with water “academia” and research institutions, and networks around different knowledge products (e.g. economics valuation tools, policy analysis).

There was considerable support for the approach taken by CMC in their first phase of development of collaboration in the area of water. This appears to support the aim of the setup phase which was to establish links between conservation actors and water practitioners at basin and national levels, collaboration among all basin actors within demonstration projects, and collaborations with regional knowledge / expert networks active in water and catchment areas and development partners.

External stakeholders interviewed felt that cooperation with conservation actors also needs to be strengthened, for example the Ramsar Secretariat and MedWet, as well as the following:

- Arab Water Council
- Centre for Environment and Development for the Arab Region and Europe (CEDARE), in Egypt
- International Association of Hydrologists, in Spain
- Spanish Hydro-geological Service
- environmental and agricultural economists

- donors
- transboundary projects.

It was noted that cooperation with key institutions (e.g. MEMBO, GWP) and networks (e.g., IAH - International Association of Hydrologists) should be enhanced and linkages explored with like-minded initiatives and projects in similar countries or regions such as Chile, South Africa, and California.

It will be important to link the work in the demonstration sites to national level (policy) actors. This could for example include Ministers, parliamentarians, political party members, NGO lobby groups (e.g. hunters and fishers associations).

Suggestions for Management and Leadership

CMC's management and leadership in the Water sector is perceived as excellent, with a practical approach and a solid grasp of the issues. Feedback from stakeholders suggests that there is a need to ensure a focused programme realising the potential for greater collaboration within the region, playing the role of catalyst, and providing greater support to Members.

It was noted that, to continue to develop this thematic area, a senior Regional Water Resources Programme Coordinator needs to be recruited (to be co-funded using the framework agreement with Spain). This position is key to establishing IUCN's catalytic role on Water in the region. A strategy, including funding, is needed to fill this position as soon as possible. Programme management and development issues with WESCANA and Europe should be clarified.

Success Factors

Major factors for success that were identified included: quality networks, linking conservation actors and water practitioners, providing relevant products (e.g., integrated management tools), an active advisory committee, a clear niche to avoid duplication, and successful implementation of field projects.

External stakeholders also suggested the following success factors:

- making CMC work on Water widely available
- focusing on nurturing existing contacts and collaborations
- environmental education
- improved communications - letting partners know what IUCN is doing – communication is a major capital IUCN should use more
- governments see that their priorities are reflected in the programme
- linking biodiversity and water development
- water related to livelihoods – also recognise that most rural people are farmers and target intergenerational change in practices
- governments perceiving IUCN as helping with real problems (e.g., drought)
- focusing on new governance mechanisms for the management of water in the Mediterranean
- concrete outputs at the national and regional levels
- translating global priorities at the national level
- IWRM on the ground, regionalised to the Mediterranean
- leaving the EU Water Framework Directive to others.

4.4 Overall Programme Conclusions

Looking across the findings of all the thematic areas, one can draw some indicative conclusions concerning the overall relevance and effectiveness of the CMC Programme in its first phase of development.

- 1) The CMC Programme is considered to be relevant to and responding to many of the key conservation issues and trends of the Mediterranean eco-region. There is less evidence of how the CMC is or should be addressing key sustainable development issues of the eco-region, particularly the economic and social dimensions of development.
- 2) A clear rationale exists for the thematic areas that have been developed to date, and CMC has a clear mandate from Members, partners and experts for CMC to continue to further develop the Programme.
- 3) The CMC Programme as a whole is seen as effective, and CMC is seen as a credible partner. To maintain and build this momentum the following issues need to be clearly articulated and communicated during the next phase of programme development:
 - Ensuring follow-up to current programme activities and more balanced programmatic coverage across the eco-region both thematically and geographically,
 - quality control of products and services,
 - clarifying and/or improving the relationship with WESCANA, ROfe, and with Members and Commissions, and
 - strengthening the vision and leadership of some of the thematic areas.
- 4) Expectations of the Programme from Members, partners and experts are high, and in some thematic areas CMC's capacity to deliver is low or limited.
- 5) Strong collaboration and communication in most thematic areas with Members, partners and Commissions is seen as a major factor influencing future success.
- 6) The challenges of building and managing a balanced, representative programme for the Mediterranean eco-region is perhaps greater than initially anticipated.

5. Factors That Positively Affect CMC Performance

As discussed in Sections 3 and 4, the CMC is highly relevant to its stakeholders, and is effectively delivering high quality thematic programmes. In this section we identify the key supporting factors that have allowed CMC to develop successfully in its inception phase.

Finding 41: Strong support from IUCN Members and from key donors, as well as the quality of CMC staff, constitute key strengths of the programme.

The Strategic Review has reaffirmed the strong support from IUCN Members for CMC. Both the questionnaire and the interviews conducted in Naples suggest that Members are very pleased to have a structure within IUCN that focuses on the Mediterranean, and are keen to further engage in activities initiated by the CMC. In fact, several Members mentioned that it was also up to them to contribute to the mission of the CMC by providing greater feedback on CMC's programme, and by increasing their involvement in information dissemination.

Positive feedback from Spanish donors shows their appreciation and further illustrates the success of the Centre. The thematic work on forests, undertaken in collaboration with Junta Andaluca, demonstrates that donor support goes well beyond funding. Members have also commented that strong backing from core donors is a key strength of the Centre.

CMC staffing was also cited frequently as one of its factors of excellence. Respondents indicated that the CMC staff was young and energetic, motivated, eager and engaged to do good work. The expertise of IUCN scientific experts and Directors was also noted as a key asset of the CMC. This expertise increases CMC's credibility and positions the Centre as a strong and respected player in international fora in various thematic areas.

“Very good staff and well qualified.”

“Équipe compétente et motivée.”

“A dynamic and multi-skilled team of professionals fully committed to the work of the Centre.”

Finding 42: CMC's financial and administrative systems generally provide timely and adequate information.

End-users report that CMC's systems, although not perfect, deliver the data required in a timely fashion. More specifically, the CMC is praised for its effectiveness in delivering financial reporting in a timely manner, and in a format that responds adequately to the needs and expectations of HQ. As the CMC begins to manage larger projects, it may require project financial management in addition to regular financial management.

Finding 43: CMC's programme leadership is generally sound. Coordination and communication could be improved.

The challenges in the creation of the new Mediterranean programme were numerous. Initially, there were uncertainties as to whether the level of funding would be sufficient, whether the IUCN Members would be supportive of the results, and whether such a pilot project would make sense within the structure of IUCN. The Director took up the challenge positively and is reported to have worked very hard in developing the networks, establishing the contacts, sharpening the vision and dealing with a diverse and challenging IUCN Member environment.

IUCN Members and Regional Directors and Programme Coordinators surveyed were somewhat reluctant to make judgment on the effectiveness of the CMC's management because of their lack of knowledge on the matter. Approximately 30% of respondents said they did not know, while approximately 40% of respondents indicated that the management of IUCN was 'effective' or 'very effective' in the delivery of a successful programme.

6. Significant Areas of Concern

As in any organisation, some aspects of CMC's organisation are problematic and deserve special attention in order to ensure the ongoing performance of the CMC. These areas of concern are discussed below.

Finding 44: Overall, the CMC programme needs more capacity and resources to follow up on key activities and engage in priorities of the region.

Some IUCN thematic staff commented that CMC's thematic activities, such as workshops and meetings, are likely to raise expectations from Members and other key stakeholders. They acknowledged that there has been a lack of follow-up on activities and that this reflects poorly on CMC. However, they also noted that the lack of systematic follow-up is related more to resource shortages than to staff negligence and that staff do not necessarily have the means to strengthen communication with Members and other stakeholders.

Lack of capacity and resources has also prevented CMC from actively engaging in the area of coastal management, which was identified as a clear priority in the region. Although CMC management clearly recognises the importance of this area, the present level of human and financial resources does not allow the Centre to actively build up and sustain work in this area.

Finding 45: Internal management of the CMC has improved since 2002. More needs to be done.

During 2001-2002 CMC experienced several staff management issues that resulted in a lack of trust and a climate of hostility amongst staff. These issues significantly affected staff morale. Conflicts emerged from a variety of issues and circumstances, including: a Director whose technical excellence is recognised by all, but who is reported to be less skilled in managing people (system person versus people person) and who has received very limited support in human resource management from IUCN Headquarters; as well as difficulties in managing a fluctuating workload.

However, since 2003, the situation is reported to have improved, as evidenced by the implementation of team meetings and by constructive feedback given to staff. The change in perception with respect to internal management is slow and improvements are still needed to fully regain the trust of staff and maintain a good work culture. One of the concerns reported is the need to reinforce the team approach. The approach to work is still perceived to be individualistic and does not yet truly engage all the skills of the staff.

It should also be noted that the ambitious goals of developing the CMC required the establishment of support systems. The approach taken may have been appropriate for the start-up phase, but the systems no longer can support the level and pace of growth of the Centre. As the Centre enters a consolidation stage, different management approaches, structures and processes may be required to stabilise the organisational development of the Centre.

Finding 46: Human resources policies, rules and procedures are not well articulated or enforced in a transparent way.

Small organisations can sometimes function with no explicit human resources rules or policies, however, despite being small in size, the CMC is a heterogeneous group of individuals – in terms of languages, nationalities, cultural backgrounds, norms, etc. To function effectively the staff of CMC need clear expectations in their day-to-day work environment. The current lack of HR management rules and standards is creating frustration amongst the staff.

A great majority of staff expressed dissatisfaction with respect to either the actual HR policies in place, or with the seeming lack of transparency in enforcing the policies. Their discontent is related to the lack of follow-up and/or clarity on the following issues: expatriate taxation policy, the policy about bonuses and the lack of enforcement of such policy, compensation expectations, and the lack of career development plans. In addition, lack of flexibility in some aspects of the HR management (overtime, schedule, etc.) was mentioned as a cause of dissatisfaction.

It should be noted that although HR issues and organisational management present no immediate threats to the sustainability of the office, they nevertheless represent a significant risk for the CMC. Efforts deployed to recruit good professionals can be neutralised if the follow-up to HR issues does not take place, or if the awareness of the importance of HR management does not increase.

Finally, CMC should consider whether the compensation packages that it offers to staff are attractive enough to bring in the top-calibre professionals that it wishes to attract to implement a maturing programme.

Finding 47: Quality control and monitoring and evaluation need to be strengthened and institutionalized

Many respondents indicated that the CMC could benefit from more systematic quality control systems, including thematic peer review, and from incorporating lessons learned into ongoing and future activities. Staff and Members reported some inconsistencies in quality control due to staff inexperienced in quality control measures and lack of time and procedures.

The management and the thematic staff of the CMC recognise that quality control is somewhat *ad hoc*. They also noted that relying on Headquarters for peer review has proven to be unrealistic given the demands on HQ thematic staff to support all IUCN regions. CMC thematic staff have received inadequate feedback from HQ thematic staff on proposals and concept papers to ensure good peer review and high quality work. Whether quality control should be carried out internally at the CMC or with the HQ remains to be determined. The Review team was informed that the issue of quality control and peer review are also issues for IUCN HQ and for Commissions. As the work on Species illustrates, involvement from the Commissions in peer review and quality control is another possibility. In the future, quality control should be exercised with particular attention to the delivery of thematic products, proposals, etc.

Data collected also indicate that improvements are needed to consolidate a monitoring and evaluation system. Document reviews reveal rather limited implementation of monitoring activities. The Progress Reports from 2002 and 2003 demonstrate how activities undertaken have contributed to progress on CMC's Key Result Areas, and how these link to IUCN Key Results Areas, but they do not indicate how the various activities could result in long-term impact. They simply provide an extensive list of activities that have been conducted. There is no indication that any follow-up has occurred to assess how participants have benefited from and used the information disseminated through workshops, papers and conferences, or what impacts have resulted at the environmental level. This lack of monitoring may weaken the CMC's ability to remain fully relevant in the long run. It is also noted that the need to move to monitoring and evaluating outcomes and impacts was recommended in the External Review of IUCN and that this is an overall IUCN Programme and M&E priority for the next Intersessional period.

7. The Future – Priorities and Recommendations

7.1 Stakeholders' Suggestions

With respect to priorities for the future, the data collected indicate that most respondents consider expanding CMC's funding base as a priority for the future, as well as developing a broader communication strategy for the work of CMC.

With respect to the diversification of funding, there is an overall perception that the CMC is still too reliant on the Junta and the Ministry of Environment for its operating resources. Efforts made to diversify funding sources are praised, and more should be done.

Finding 48: Donors suggest some specific orientations to support the future performance of the CMC.

The Spanish donors interviewed indicated some specific actions for the future of the CMC. According to this group of stakeholders, looking forward, the CMC should intensify its communication and outreach. In particular, it is said that the CMC needs a stronger presence in social and economic fora in Andalusia and Spain. This would help in clarifying what the CMC does and what IUCN is about, particularly since, according to donors, some perceive IUCN as a funding agency.

The complementarity of IUCN/CMC's work to other activities undertaken by various actors in the region, particularly political/governmental actors, also needs to be clarified. As it is clearly mentioned in the "Proposed IUCN Mediterranean Programme and Office" document, the CMC should add value to existing Members' activities and avoid any duplication. In the case of Spain, the CMC should avoid direct conflict with members in local/national policy arenas that are driven by short-term interests.

Although the Centre has focused on some priority issues for the region (water, protected areas and marine as the most commonly mentioned and the best known to respondents), donors suggest that the CMC consider work on renewable energy (wind and solar power), forestry issues, urban environment, all of

which are key for the Mediterranean. It is recognised however that urban issues are not a priority for IUCN.

Although the CMC and IUCN have a discourse about sustainable development (linking development and environment protection or conservation) there is a feeling amongst the donors interviewed that conservation prevails. For donors who see a strong link between poverty reduction and conservation, this is of some concern. They would like to see the CMC draw closer links between people's development needs and the conservation of nature. A potential limitation to this is the CMC's limited field experience. The Centre has nevertheless presented to the Spanish Cooperation Agency (AECI) in Tunisia a first project to develop a management plan for a particular area where development concerns intersect with protected habitats. The CMC should also increase its on-the-ground efforts to put theory into practice in diverse Mediterranean contexts. Two ways were suggested for achieving this objective: First, by strengthening the capacities of local organisations working on sustainable development (institutional capacities such as resource generation); or, second, by working directly with local populations (through participatory processes around protected areas).

Finding 49: Members noted three elements for the future success of CMC: 1) clarification of the relationship between Europe, WESCANA and CMC, 2) sustaining the funding base for core work, and 3) increasing interaction and communication with Members.

In addition to the Members' suggestions, IUCN Regional Directors and Programme Coordinators noted the following elements as critical to CMC's success: stronger leadership and team spirit, more senior staff, increased linkages between technical programmes and policy development, pro-active approach in identifying new Members, stronger IUCN management support, and promoting the Mediterranean perspective in planning and managing natural resources.

Among the various suggestions for improvement, both Members and IUCN Regional Directors mentioned the following: greater clarification with WESCANA and Europe, increasing core funding, and focusing on fewer issues. With respect to the relationship between CMC, WESCANA and RofE, since mid 2004 CMC has been operationally managing all North African projects and activities while the modalities are still being sorted out. This is a positive step toward clarifying roles and responsibilities of the three entities.

With respect to communications, the data collected by both the organisational and thematic review processes suggest a need for CMC to better articulate and share its programming ideas.

Finding 50: The results of the various communication activities are notable, in spite of some criticisms from French-speaking Members. At this stage, the consolidation of the communication activities through a clear strategy should be a priority for the future.

A review of the communication activities carried out by CMC over the last years is very encouraging, and the member questionnaire responses and interviews suggest a good level of satisfaction with the information provided.

In particular, 73% of Members surveyed indicated that the image of the CMC was either good, very good or excellent. A majority of respondents reported that the electronic bulletin and other CMC publications were useful to their work and dissemination purposes. Also, 63% of Members surveyed indicated that the information provided on the CMC website was useful and 94% reported that regular updates on the CMC would be welcomed. It should be noted that the vast majority of Members do share the communication material received from CMC, either with colleagues in their organisation or with peer researchers outside their organisation. This suggests indeed that the material received is read, appreciated and considered of good quality.

Nevertheless, a few criticisms were made by some French speaking Members who felt the need for more information to be available in French and for an increased ability of CMC staff to communicate with them

in French. Although these concerns should not be put aside, the perspective of the French Members must be balanced with the perspectives of many Members interviewed at the Naples IUCN Members meeting who praised CMC for its ongoing efforts to communicate in more than one language.

The Member questionnaire, as well as the thematic reviews, suggest a demand for more communication, a relatively common request for many young organisations interacting with Members. Therefore, at this stage, CMC's communication efforts need to be scaled up and developed into a programme that is supported by the broader IUCN investment in communications – i.e. the global communications strategy and capacity of the Communications Group at HQ as well as the CEC. The CMC communication team has begun to develop a strategy, with the intention of creating a feedback loop with Members. The Membership Unit at HQ could also assist with the further development of the monitoring and feedback loop with Members.

The challenge now is to develop and implement the strategy and continue to clarify important elements of the communications function – such as overall purpose, specific objectives and targets. The function needs to clarify the following questions:

- What should be the specific objectives and aim of CMC communications? Should it support information sharing, relationship building, networking, awareness raising, advocacy, or all of these?
- Roles and responsibilities for communication functions in CMC: How should the communication programme interface with the other thematic components? It is not enough to suggest that the Coordinators of thematic programmes pass information to the Communication person, as this just reinforces the notion that communication is primarily information posting only.
- How best to engage Members in the communications strategy for CMC?

7.2 Recommendations

After three years of existence, the CMC's overall performance as an organisation is perceived to be good. As it enters a new phase in its development, the CMC should view the consolidation of the organisation and its programming as key priorities.

We therefore propose the following recommendations as critical to the future development and success of the Mediterranean Programme:

1. That CMC develop a strategy for the next five years to address appropriate ways to scale up the delivery and reach of the Mediterranean Programme, including a corresponding business model.⁵

CMC is at a critical stage of its development. It has developed and implemented a well respected set of activities in its first stage of development. It has grown in size and programmatic content and this in turn has generated increasing demands from Members, partners and donors for more projects, networking, policy and international conventions work in almost all parts of the Mediterranean. CMC has developed an Intersessional Programme Plan for 2005-2008 that sets out programmatic results for this period, however the Intersessional Plan does not provide adequate guidance for the strategies for longer term growth, direction, strategy and business model for the programme.

⁵ Recommendation 1 assumes that the leadership of IUCN wishes to develop the CMC model further given the current challenges in making the overall model work. Recommendation 7 addresses the need to revisit the model and assess the pros and cons of the overall model in light of the lessons learned through the CMC experience.

Choices will have to be made, and these should be made, not just on an *ad hoc* opportunistic basis, but on a well thought through strategic plan and situation analysis of regional and global trends and issues, and on a business model that optimize IUCN's comparative advantage in the future.

An early version of a Strategic Plan and Situation Analysis for the Mediterranean Centre provided the initial basis for programming and this could be updated and developed further into a new longer term Strategic Plan.

The next phase of programme development and implementation (2005-2008) will be critical for CMC. Expectations of CMC from Members, partners and donors are high, and it is likely that CMC will no longer be considered in its developmental phase. In order to maintain and increase its current credibility, CMC will need to deliver a more even set of higher level results in addition to its current successful activities. It will also be expected to be present and active in more countries in the eco-region.

To achieve this, the following is recommended:

- 1) CMC should strengthen the strategic focus and longer term vision in each thematic area and for the overall programme across the eco-region thematically and geographically, and that this include a rationale for CMC's presence (or lack of presence if appropriate) across the region thematically and geographically.
- 2) A strategy for achieving greater reach and influence in each thematic area (and/or the overall programme) in the eco-region be developed. Strategies may differ for each thematic area depending on the partners available, the capacity available within IUCN, and the appropriate role for IUCN to play in each area (convener, technical adviser, etc). Consideration should be given to the many suggestions provided during this Review for increased collaboration, partnerships and alliances in each thematic area to enable the Programme to have greater reach and influence in the Mediterranean eco-region.
- 3) That CMC strengthen the socio-economic dimensions of the CMC Programme. It is suggested that CMC revise its 2005-2008 Intersessional Programme to include a stronger set of results focused on socio-economic (including gender and equity) dimensions of conservation and sustainable development in the Mediterranean eco-region. Revisions should include consideration of suggested areas of work made during the Review by the senior economics adviser and other experts.

2. That CMC work with senior human resources specialists to improve human resources management and organisational administration.

Action is required to maintain a good work culture at CMC. IUCN HQ should provide senior human resources expertise to work with the Director of CMC to enhance internal management. This might include training or personal coaching in human resources management, as well as the delegation or sharing of some aspects of CMC's internal management. Appropriate management structures, processes and incentives for the Mediterranean office should be part of this work, as well as strengthened linkages between HQ support systems and the Mediterranean office.

Based on the decisions made with respect to its future strategy and programming model, CMC should align its existing capacities to support these decisions, particularly with respect to the following:

- Human resources strategy: CMC will need to consider the skills and competencies required by the programming model it elects to use (i.e. technical skills, project management skills, and administrative skills). The programming model may also affect CMC's hiring (i.e. new personnel profiles) as well as its professional development plans for existing staff.
- Infrastructure: As noted in this review, CMC infrastructure requires immediate attention, as it is jeopardising the organisation's efficiency. In addition, depending on the programming model

selected, CMC may also need to plan for expansion (i.e. if it begins carrying out more project work, it may require more project staff and thus more space).

- Financial systems: CMC has adequate financial systems to support its current work. If its project work increases, however, CMC may need to increase its capacity for project financial management within its existing accounting system, and include project-related functions in the role of the accounting staff.

3. As a preventive measure, CMC should strengthen its monitoring and evaluation, with specific attention to the safeguarding the quality of its products and services:

The IUCN HQ M&E Unit should assist the CMC in developing and implementing an appropriate M&E framework and capacity for the next phase of their programme, with particular attention to monitoring and evaluating its overall strategy and outcomes. The example of conducting interviews with users of its services and products demonstrated in this review and in the 2004 Review of the IUCN Commissions could be integrated as part of regular practice of CMC.

The CMC should put into place a standardised peer review process so that as the programme grows there are safeguards to ensure that the high quality products currently being produced by CMC remain so, and that the reputation of IUCN is protected. Products of poor quality should not be allowed to be disseminated and CMC should build on and extend the existing peer review processes that are currently functioning well for some CMC thematic programmes.

4. That appropriate options and roles for involvement of IUCN Members and Commissions in the implementation of the Mediterranean Programme be clarified and implemented where appropriate in the next Intersessional period.

Feedback from the Review process called for greater collaboration of CMC with partners, Members and Commissions in the next phase of programme development and implementation. CMC should seek to clarify the possible options for involvement of Members and Commissions.

The Review recognizes that this is timely in that recent governance reform proposals have called for greater integration of the Commissions in the IUCN Programme, and that the new IUCN Membership Strategy seeks to clarify the roles for Members in the IUCN Programme. CMC should seek to become an active player in the processes that will further define these decisions globally and in the Mediterranean.

5. That CMC develop enhanced approaches to communications with Members, partners and Commissions.

The survey to stakeholders suggests an adequate level of satisfaction with some of the improvements made in the last year in communications, however a recurring issue throughout the Review from Members, partners and experts, is the need for CMC to continue to improve its communication with Members, partners and Commission. The Review suggests that further work needs to be done to fully understand the nature of and rationale for these requests, including the needs of Members and partners, and the role that communications should play in developing the programme.

Responding to this recommendation should not be seen as the sole responsibility of the communications staff or focused solely on the hardware of communications (Websites and newsletters). Rather, improved communications should be a shared responsibility of all thematic programme managers, achieved through a range of targeted strategies including purposeful identification of CMC's users of its products and services, and improved monitoring and feedback processes capable of tracking the use and influence of CMC's work. The recent Knowledge Products Study undertaken as part of the Review of the Commissions can provide CMC with approaches and tools in this area. The need for more or better

targeted information should be clearly differentiated from the role that communications can play in building and maintaining relationships with Members and partners.

6. That the IUCN Director General and Director Global Programme take immediate steps to address current tensions between WESCANA, Europe, and the Centre for Mediterranean Cooperation.

Considerable confusion and tensions among various stakeholder groups were noted in the Review with regard to the respective roles and relationships between the IUCN offices for Europe, WESCANA and the Mediterranean Centre for Cooperation. Reporting lines, overlapping roles in programme development, competition in fund raising, and relationships with Members are among the issues that require attention. While there is no doubt that some of this confusion arises from the nature of the ‘model’ of CMC as an anomaly among statutory and programmatic regions, if the current model is to continue these tensions should not be allowed to simmer on over the World Conservation Congress and into the next Intersessional period. All three Directors (WESCANA, RoFE, CMC) and the Director General and Director Global Programme should meet to work out the best way to proceed positively into the next Intersessional period.

7. That the IUCN Director General and the Director Global Programme carefully review the lessons learned from the implementation of the current CMC model before decisions are made to engage in similar arrangements in other regions.

Even though the CMC is performing well programmatically, there are significant statutory, cultural and organizational management challenges inherent in the current CMC model. The pros and cons of the CMC model should be carefully assessed before decisions are taken to replicate the model in another region.

Appendix I List of Findings

- Finding 1: The programme thematic work carried out by the CMC is very relevant to IUCN Members, Regional Directors and Programme Coordinators and donors.
- Finding 2: The Centre for Mediterranean Cooperation (CMC) is valued and relevant to its Spanish donors
- Finding 3: The relevance of the CMC's programme to IUCN Global Programme and specifically to the IUCN Regional Office for Europe (ROfE) and WESCANA regional offices, is acknowledged by IUCN staff, although many Members hesitated to comment due to their limited knowledge of these two regions.
- Finding 4: While strategically positioned in the region, the CMC needs to further anchor its niche around the notion of regional cooperation, and to balance conservation and development issues.
- Finding 5: There is strong support from the IUCN Regional Directors and Programme Coordinators with respect to the ability of the Mediterranean programme to play a convening role in its first phase of development.
- Finding 6: IUCN Members, Regional Directors and Programme Coordinators have varying levels of familiarity with the thematic areas of the CMC. Suggestions were provided for other or additional thematic issues that should be addressed by the CMC in its next phase.
- Finding 7: A large majority of respondents suggest that the Centre for Mediterranean Cooperation has accomplished a substantial amount since its inception. A small number of respondents indicated that the results achieved are not commensurate with the financing received.
- Finding 8: The CMC has succeeded in focusing its programme. The challenge remains to strike a balance between maintaining donor interest while ensuring that the specific needs of the eco-region are addressed by the programme.
- Finding 9: Overall, the CMC has been effective in the implementation and delivery of quality work in its thematic areas. It has been less effective in creating crosscutting links between and among its thematic programmes.
- Finding 10: A strong majority of respondents view the CMC as a leader in conservation issues.
- Finding 11: CMC is characterized as a Centre that is efficient. Use of people and resources is satisfactory. It should be noted that CMC's infrastructure could support a larger portfolio of projects and activities.
- Finding 12: CMC needs to improve the management of its infrastructure.
- Finding 13: There is no immediate concern with respect to the financial viability of the CMC, in the medium-term. The CMC will need to continue to diversify funding sources and obtain additional project and programme funding.
- Finding 14: Forest Landscape Restoration (FLR) provides an appropriate entry point for forest-related activities in the Mediterranean.

- Finding 15: There is evidence of a good niche for CMC's FLR work in the Mediterranean that can provide the basis for a long term vision for forest related work.
- Finding 16: Views were mixed on the strategic focus of Forest Landscape Restoration work.
- Finding 17: The high technical quality of CMC's work on forest-related issues has been widely recognised.
- Finding 18: CMC lacks the capacity to ensure follow-up and support for outcome-focused results.
- Finding 19: CMC's work on Marine Conservation is seen to be relevant to the Mediterranean eco-region.
- Finding 20: There is a real niche for CMC in Marine Conservation in the Mediterranean. Key roles that CMC has begun and should continue to play include convenor work on high seas and aquaculture, and promoting collaboration in fisheries among different cultures.
- Finding 21: CMC Marine initiatives are seen as strategic because they address areas in which little work has been done, e.g., deep and high seas and shark conservation. However, more focus and clarity is needed on specific Intersessional results and activities that specifically illustrate this strategic focus.
- Finding 22: The quality of CMC Marine documents is considered good and scientifically credible in technical forums.
- Finding 23: CMC Marine work was felt to be very effective, well-organised, credible and continuing to improve. Effectiveness has been enhanced by having Arabic-speaking marine staff.
- Finding 24: The CMC work on Protected Areas is seen as highly relevant and has a strong mandate from Members (approximately 80% of Members are dealing with PA issues).
- Finding 25: CMC has a well-defined vision for its work on Protected Areas.
- Finding 26: IUCN has a unique convening role in Protected Areas, that is, linking governments, NGOs and academia in different environmental and cultural contexts, in particular with respect to follow-up of World Parks Congress outcomes in the region.
- Finding 27: CMC's Protected Areas work is perceived to be strategic in facilitating a unified Mediterranean position on Protected Area issues to influence global agendas.
- Finding 28: The Protected Areas products and services known to interviewees were perceived to be of high technical quality, innovative and well-balanced. CMC was encouraged to be more analytical in some cases.
- Finding 29: Views were mixed on the effectiveness of the Protected Areas work.
- Finding 30: Work undertaken by CMC on sharks, medicinal plants and invasive species is considered highly relevant to conservation and sustainable development issues and trends in the region.
- Finding 31: CMC has not articulated a long-term vision for Species Conservation work in the Mediterranean.

- Finding 32: IUCN has a very strong comparative advantage and niche for Species conservation work in the Mediterranean.
- Finding 33: CMC's Species work is considered strategic because of the high importance of the issues to the region and the approach taken to the work.
- Finding 34: Overall, the Species work products and outputs are perceived to be of high quality.
- Finding 35: CMC work on Species is considered to be very effective, timely and well-organised.
- Finding 36: The work of CMC in the area of Water is seen as very relevant to the needs of the region. Particularly relevant is its work on environmental flows, as many rivers are heavily exploited and some no longer reach the sea.
- Finding 37: IUCN is seen to have a clear niche in the area of Water – focusing on bridging the gap between governments and NGOs, linking policy and field practice, and producing quality knowledge products – however, the longer term vision has not been effectively communicated.
- Finding 38: CMC's work on Water is perceived to be strategically positioned to mainstream environmental considerations in catchment management. It was noted that IUCN has a large agenda compared with its capacity and resources to deliver.
- Finding 39: The current technical quality of CMC products on water was perceived to be good. Quality assurance could be enhanced even further by structured review processes such as a technical advisory committee and testing of products.
- Finding 40: CMC is generally perceived as effective and credible in the Water sector. Capacity is needed to ensure effective and targeted follow-up aimed at political impact.
- Finding 41: Strong support from IUCN Members and from key donors, as well as the quality of CMC staff, constitute key strengths of the programme.
- Finding 42: CMC's financial and administrative systems generally provide timely and adequate information.
- Finding 43: CMC's programme leadership is generally sound. Coordination and communication could be improved.
- Finding 44: Overall, the CMC programme needs more capacity and resources to follow up on key activities and engage in priorities of the region.
- Finding 45: Internal management of the CMC has improved since 2002. More needs to be done.
- Finding 46: Human resources policies, rules and procedures are not well articulated or enforced in a transparent way.
- Finding 47: Quality control and monitoring and evaluation need to be strengthened and institutionalized
- Finding 48: Donors suggest some specific orientations to support the future performance of the CMC.

Finding 49: Members noted three elements for the future success of CMC: 1) clarification of the relationship between Europe, WESCANA and CMC, 2) sustaining the funding base for core work, and 3) increasing interaction and communication with Members.

Finding 50: The results of the various communication activities are notable, in spite of some criticisms from French-speaking Members. At this stage, the consolidation of the communication activities through a clear strategy should be a priority for the future.