

Annex 1: Terms of Reference

End of Term Review of the IUCN Commissions 2004

1. Background Context for the Review

The IUCN Commissions

The IUCN Commissions form one of the three pillars of the Union. The other two pillars are the IUCN membership and the Secretariat. The purpose of the Commissions is to provide state of the art knowledge and expertise drawn from a wide range of volunteer experts as a contribution to fulfilling the IUCN Mission and Programme.

There are currently six IUCN Commissions – The Commission on Education and Communication, (CEC), The Commission on Environmental, Economic and Social Policy (CEESP), The Commission on Environmental Law (CEL), The Commission on Ecosystem Management (CEM), The Species Survival Commission (SSC) and The World Commission on Protected Areas (WCPA).

The 2003 Bossey Report of the Consultative Group on Commissions states that “the six Commissions represent formal networks of knowledge in fields critical to fulfilling the Union’s mission, and bring individual experts into the fold of the Union. The Commissions are governed by the IUCN Statutes and Regulations, driven by Congress mandates and resolutions, and guided by the Sonloup Accords (1995, 1998).”

The knowledge produced by the Commissions is derived from voluntary networks of experts who represent the state of the art thinking and practice in fields of conservation and sustainable development. The knowledge of these experts is delivered to the Union through a variety of outputs such as published books and reports, policy briefs, case studies, data bases, videos, action plans, the provision of technical advice and in some cases field project implementation.

The assumptions behind the concept and rationale of Commissions in IUCN is that they enrich the organization with their global reach and spread of volunteer experts, that they contribute to achieving the Mission and Programme of IUCN, and that without them IUCN as an organization and Union, including its membership and the delivery of its programme and policies, would be of lesser value and lose some of its comparative advantage in relation to other conservation organizations.

Accountability and Performance Review of the Commissions

In keeping pace with the development of modern organizations, and in response to pressure from members and donors, IUCN has taken steps in the past 5 years to put in place an evaluation system that is designed to strengthen learning and accountability in the Secretariat and Commissions to members, donors and partners. In 2001 the IUCN Council adopted the IUCN Evaluation Policy, which sets standards for the types and quality of evaluation in IUCN, and there is now a regular cycle of Strategic Reviews carried out across the component programmes of the Secretariat.

While both Sonloup I and II agreements identified, *inter alia*, the need for improved accountability and evaluation of Commissions, few of these recommendations were implemented between 1995 and 2003. The recent Bossey report renews the commitment for improved performance review and accountability.

2. Mandates for the End of Term Review of Commissions

In adopting the Strategy for IUCN at the Buenos Aires General Assembly in 1994, members reinforced their support for the Commissions as a vital component of the Union. With a view to enhancing the work of the Commissions, members requested that reviews of Commissions should be undertaken periodically and that these should identify the minimum resources needed for efficient operation.

1. Members subsequently adopted Resolution 19.2 on the Role of the Commissions which requires that:
 - a. Each Commission should be subject to a triennial end-term review, to be prepared by an independent evaluator, nominated by the Director General and confirmed by Council and undertaken in consultation with the Chair or his/her nominee; regular mid-term reviews should not be required but Council may commission a mid-term review of any Commission if special circumstances require it;
 - b. There should in future be an in-depth review every six years of the role, structure, mandate and operation of each Commission, carried out according to a schedule providing for three Commissions to be reviewed during each three-year period;
 - c. The conclusions of the reviews under (c) and (d) should be reported to each succeeding session of the General Assembly;
 - d. High priority should be given to defining performance indicators and ensuring that the mission statements and objectives are drafted in terms that enable such definition;

In addition to these provisions, the IUCN Statutes empower the World Conservation Congress to establish the Commissions and determine their mandates while the Council may propose to the Congress the creation, abolition, or subdivision of a Commission, or amendment of a Commission's mandate (Article 74). The Regulations further provide that "Prior to each ordinary session of the World Congress, the Council shall review the terms of reference and the activities of each Commission."

3. Status of Reviews during 2000-2004

All six Commissions were reviewed during the last Intersessional period, and the results presented to Congress in Amman 2000.

- SSC June 2000 (S. Turner)
- WCPA, May 1998 (R. Crofts, E. Lahmann)
- CEC, October 1999 (B. Romjin)
- SSC, CEM, CEL and CEESP, June 2000 (Bruszt, Turner)

As is apparent from this list, there was not a consistent approach to the Reviews of last term. Different reviewers carried them out at different times, with different TORS, and with varying degrees of internal and external reviewers. A common performance framework was used in the reviews carried out by Bruszt and Turner as a step towards (but not fulfilling completely) the requirement to develop and apply a standard set of performance indicators. Although the results of these Reviews may have been useful to the individual Commissions that commissioned them, because of a lack of common performance framework it was not possible to draw overall conclusions about the relevance, effectiveness and efficiency and impact of the IUCN's Commissions as a group.

4. Scope and Objectives of the 2004 End of Term Review

The 2004 Review of Commissions presents an opportunity to more fully meet a part of the requirements of the 1994 Buenos Aires Resolution, while at the same time building on the performance review agreements of the Bossey process. The Review also presents an opportunity to contribute to the Study on Knowledge Management recommended by the Bossey report by helping to assess the effectiveness of the Commissions in generating and managing state of the art knowledge products.

The Review will provide an overview of the performance of Commissions over the past Intersessional period taking the mandates of the Commissions approved at the Amman WCC as the starting point against which to assess performance. The review will focus mainly on the organizational level and will not examine in any depth the results of specific projects and programmes of the Commissions. Commission documents and databases, the Programme Information Management System (PIMS) and the project and programme evaluation database will be used to provide a sample of information on Commission programme and evaluation results.

The Review will also provide a forward-looking assessment of how well positioned the Commissions are to meet the challenges driving the conservation and development agenda as reflected in the global situation analysis of the IUCN Programme.

Specifically, the objectives of the Review are –

1. To assess the relevance of each Commission to IUCN's constituency (members, partners, donors), and to the IUCN Policy and Programme.
2. To assess the effectiveness and efficiency of each Commission in fulfilling its mandate and achieving its objectives. In particular, the Review will focus on the use of the specific knowledge products and services of the Commissions in their area of expertise;
3. To assess the effects of the Commissions knowledge products and services on intended users. To determine the extent to which the knowledge product effects are aligned with the new intended outcomes of the Intersessional Programme.
4. To review the positioning of the Commissions in relation to the initiatives that are shaping the global environmental conservation agenda, such as the Millennium Development Goals, PRSPs, the WSSD Plan of Action and other major poverty-environment related initiatives.
5. Based on the conclusions of the Review 1) recommend the key issues affecting performance to which Commissions should respond; 2) recommend whether or not a more in-depth review of any Commission is warranted.

5. Methodology for the Review

The consultants commissioned to undertake the Review will further develop the methodology, however the basic methodology will include:

1. A Draft Evaluation Matrix and Workplan: The Review Team will refine the draft evaluation matrix presented in Annex 2 and produce a preliminary workplan by January 30, 2004 in consultation with the Director General, the Evaluation Coordinator and the Commission Chairs (representative). The matrix will identify the key questions, sub-questions, the main data sources and methods to be used to collect the data (e.g. interview, group / panel discussion, survey, other).

2. A mixture of data collection approaches including: Semi-structured interviews, surveys and dialogues with key IUCN stakeholders – Commission members, IUCN members, partners, staff members, representatives from other major conservation organizations, and representatives of other actors in the poverty-livelihoods -sustainable development field.
3. A documentation analysis: The review team will review basic documentation such as the mandates, work programmes and progress reports of the Commissions (2000-2004) and the draft Intersessional Results (2005-2009) of the IUCN Programme and each Commission; the 2000 Review of Commissions, the Bossey Report of the Consultative Group on Commissions and the Sonloup III decisions, the External Reviews (1999 and 2003), the reports of the Governance Task Force, evaluations and reviews of Commission work undertaken since 2000 and other relevant documentation provided by each Commission. A complete list of relevant documents will be prepared by the M&E Unit in consultation with the Commissions and it will be updated throughout the study as required.
4. An analysis of knowledge products: IUCN's Evaluation Coordinator will provide a draft list of the knowledge products produced over the Intersessional term, their intended uses, and users. The list will be derived from Commission workplans, progress reports, and will be verified by the Commission Secretariat focal points. The Review team will review the products and conduct interviews with users to assess the level of knowledge product coverage, use and influence. Using these data the team will make recommendations on ways to improve coverage, use and influence of the IUCN Commission knowledge products.
5. An analysis of the positioning of the Commissions in relation to key global challenges: IUCN will convene a high level panel of development-environment experts with experience in major global initiatives such as the WSSD, Monterey Summit etc. The panel will be asked to comment on key global issues and trends, and how to better position the work of Commissions in order to improve IUCN's global influence.

6. The Review Team

A team of two respected senior reviewers will carry out the Review with assistance on data collection as required. At least one of the Reviewers will be familiar with IUCN. The Director General will nominate the Review Team members, after consultation with the Commission Chairs.

The profile of the Review Team members will be senior professionals with specific expertise in the field of conservation and sustainable development at global and regional levels, and in the areas of knowledge management and evaluation.

7. Management and Conduct of the Review

The Review Team leader will be responsible for the management and conduct of the Review including the quality and credibility of the review process and the design of the methodology and tools, data collection, data analysis and reporting.

The Director General and the Evaluation Coordinator will manage the Review.

The Draft Review Report will be provided to the Commission Chairs and the Director General. The Council (or Bureau in between Council meetings) will receive the Final Report and any comments from the Commission Chairs and Director General, and once accepted will develop a follow-up Action Plan based on the Review findings and recommendations.

The Council will report to Congress on the results of the Review and on the Action Plan.

8. Timeframe

The Review will be carried out between January and March 2004.

Annex 2: Evaluation Matrix

TORs Major Issue	Sub Issue	<p align="center">Objective 1</p> <p>To assess the relevance of each Commission to IUCN’s constituency (members, partners) to the IUCN Policy and Programme?</p>	Examples of Data Sources
Performance of the Commission	Rationale/ Relevance	<p>Is the mission/mandate of the Commission still relevant? Does it motivate appropriate experts to join the Commission?</p> <p>To what extent does the Commission’s mandate, goals, areas of knowledge and work plans support (align with) the IUCN Intersessional Programme?</p> <p>To what extent are the Commissions knowledge areas, products and services relevant to the performance of IUCN’s Intersessional Programme?</p> <p>To what extent is the Commission engaging in cutting edge, innovative products and services?</p> <p>Do Commission members and other stakeholders view the work of the Commission as relevant to the conservation movement generally and IUCN’s work more specifically?</p> <p>To what extent do stakeholders inside and outside IUCN support (are satisfied with) the work of the Commission?</p>	<p>Mandate from Montreal Congress</p> <p>Objectives as stated in the mandate,</p> <p>Intersessional and annual work plan</p> <p>Annual reports to Council</p> <p>Progress reports</p> <p>Stakeholders / constituents interviews</p> <p>Survey</p> <p>Intersessional Programme</p> <p>Documentation review</p>
	Commission’s mission, mandate and history	<p>To what extent is there a clear vision of the work that the Commission can do to contribute to the Mission of IUCN and to the Conservation movement more generally?</p> <p>What influence has the Commission had on the programme of IUCN?</p>	<p>Intersessional and annual workplan</p> <p>Stakeholders interviews</p> <p>Secretariat interviews</p>

		<p align="center">Objective 2</p> <p>To assess the effectiveness and efficiency of each Commission in fulfilling its mandate and achieving its objectives. In particular, the Review will focus on the use of specific knowledge products and services of the Commissions in their area of expertise. (See also objective 3)</p>	
	Effectiveness	<p>To what extent has the Commission carried out its work plan?</p> <p>To what extent has the Commission provided the knowledge products and services identified in its work plan? Have they mechanisms in place for quality control?</p> <p>What use has been made of the Commission's knowledge products?</p>	<p>Mandate and strategy Reflection of the work of the Commission in the IUCN Programme Stakeholder interviews Knowledge products Evaluations Working level surveys User interviews</p>
	Efficiency	<p>Has the Commission used its resources in a cost effective way? (Resources = money, volunteers, staff)</p> <p>Are there more efficient ways for the Commission to achieve the same results?</p>	<p>Financial reports Audited reports Stakeholder interviews Secretariat interviews</p>
	Financial viability	<p>How does the Commission's growth strategy relate to current and expected resources?</p> <p>Has the Commission been able to generate funds outside of IUCN?</p> <p>Are COF resources allocated appropriately to support the Commission's mandate and work plan?</p>	<p>Financial reports Fund raising strategy / plan Stakeholder interviews Secretariat interviews Strategy</p>
Capacity of the Commission	Strategic leadership	<p>To what extent has strategy and leadership affected the Commission's performance?</p> <p>Is the leadership of the Commission seen as leaders of their field and do they inspire members?</p> <p>Does the Commission have a strategic plan to guide its work? Is the strategy linked to its mandate? Is it participative? Transparent? Is it used? Has it helped support performance?</p>	<p>Statement of the Commission – Mandate - Mission - vision-values Situation analysis Strategy Stakeholder interviews Survey</p>

External Review of IUCN Commissions 2004

	<p>Programme management</p>	<p>To what extent has the Commission been able to plan, implement, and monitor its work programme and projects? How has its programme management affected its performance?</p> <p>Do the Commission programmes represent the state of the art work in their areas of expertise?</p> <p>To what extent are the programmes and projects of the Commissions linked to the Programme of the Union at both the global and regional level?</p> <p>To what extent is the Commission collaborating with other commissions in delivering the programme?</p>	<p>Intersessional and annual work plans and reporting Situation analysis Stakeholder analysis Indicators and monitoring process Work plans and monitoring reports Evaluations Stakeholder interviews Survey Secretariat interviews Document review</p>
	<p>Management of membership, human resources, finances, and inter/intra institutional linkages</p>	<p>What financial, administrative, technical support from the Secretariat is available to the Commissions? Are these adequate for the Commission to deliver its workplan?</p> <p>How well has the Commission managed (planned, implemented and monitored) the human resources and financial resources?</p> <p>How does the Commission renew existing members and identify new members to refresh membership (for new issues)?</p> <p>Has it developed and managed inter/intra institutional linkages to improve the Commission's performance?</p> <p>Does the volunteer membership of the Commission represent the state of the art in global expertise in the field of the Commission?</p> <p>How far are the work processes of the Commission congruent with IUCN policies relating to gender, equity and official languages?</p> <p>Does the Commission motivate the voluntary spirit of its members?</p>	<p>Budget Operational plan Contracts for staff Performance appraisals for staff Joint work plans / links with other programmes, Commissions, regions interviews. Partners / alliances interviews Stakeholder interviews Survey Secretariat interviews Documentation review</p>
	<p>Monitoring and evaluation</p>	<p>Are the Commission's monitoring and evaluation processes adequate to improve its performance? (Adequate = standards, quality)</p>	<p>M&E plan and process M&E reports Lessons learned</p>

		<p style="text-align: center;">Objective 3</p> <p>To assess the effects of the Commission’s knowledge products and services on intended users. To determine the extent to which the knowledge products effects are aligned with the new intended outcomes of the Intersessional Programme.</p>	
	<p>Effectiveness</p>	<p>To what extent are the knowledge products and services aligned with the intended outcomes of the new Intersessional Programme?</p> <p>How and where were the knowledge products distributed? What factors influenced the decision where and how to distribute the products?</p> <p>What has been the thematic and geographic coverage of the knowledge products and services?</p> <p>Are the knowledge products known and available to IUCN constituents and stakeholders?</p> <p>Are the knowledge products and services viewed by internal and external stakeholders as ‘state of the art’?</p> <p>What are the concrete results (e.g. changes in policy, systems), if any, that can be attributed to the knowledge products and services of the Commission?</p> <p>What effects (e.g. changes in behaviour, knowledge, attitudes), if any, have the Commission’s knowledge products and services had on their users?</p> <p>What were the unexpected effects, if any, of the Commission’s products and services?</p>	<p>Programme Framework Strategy Component programme planning documents Progress and evaluation reports Distribution lists Website (archives; links) Case studies Commission interviews Survey Internal (Secretariat and Members) and external stakeholder interviews (i.e. potential users)</p>

		<p align="center">Objective 4</p> <p>To review the positioning of the Commissions in relation to the initiatives that are shaping the global environmental conservation agenda, such as the MDGs, PRSPs, WSSD Plan of Action and other major poverty/environment initiatives.</p>	
<p>External Context of the Commission</p>	<p>Effects of IUCN changes on Commission</p>	<p>What impact has the IUCN context (introduction of global programme framework; regionalization and decentralization) had on the performance of the Commission?</p> <p>How well has the Commission dealt with the changes in the IUCN context?</p>	<p>IUCN Strategy, Programme framework / priorities Stakeholder interviews Secretariat interviews Document review</p>
	<p>Impact of changes in the conservation world directly related to the performance of the Commission</p>	<p>What impact have any changes in the conservation world related directly to the content or organization of the Commission had on the performance of the Commission?</p> <p>How well has the Commissions responded to changes in their field of endeavor?</p>	<p>Significant literature Stakeholder interviews Key informant interviews. Secretariat interviews Document review</p>
	<p>Impact of changes in the larger conservation world on the performance of the Commission</p>	<p>What impact have any changes in the broader conservation / environment world had on the Commission's performance?</p> <p>How well has the Commission responded to changes in the broader conservation world?</p>	<p>Stakeholder interviews Key informant interviews</p>
	<p>Niche and competition</p>	<p>What is the competition for the different Commissions?</p> <p>How well do the Commissions maintain their niche in light of the competition?</p>	<p>Key informant interviews Situation and institutional analysis Stakeholder interviews Secretariat interviews</p>

External Review of IUCN Commissions 2004

<p>Recommendations for the Future</p>	<p>Positioning the Commissions</p>	<p>What are the existing work items and/or knowledge products of the Commissions that link to the major global issues (poverty, trade, security, culture/religion etc) MDGs, PRSPs? Are there other significant mechanisms used by the Commission to influence the major global issues? Are these appropriate? adequate?</p> <p>Are the mandates of commissions seen as adequate by the IUCN constituency – internal and external – for the Commissions to remain relevant to development agendas and current (emerging) global issues?</p> <p>How can the links between the current (emerging) global agenda (poverty & environment, trade and environment etc.) and the work of the Commissions be strengthened?</p>	<p>Findings and conclusions of the study Stakeholder interviews Secretariat interviews Knowledge product analysis</p>
		<p style="text-align: center;">Objective 5</p> <p>Based on the conclusions of the review: 1) recommend the key issues affecting performance that the Commission should respond to; 2) recommend whether or not a more in-depth review of any Commission is warranted.</p>	
		<p>What needs to be done to improve the performance of IUCN Commissions over the next period?</p> <p>Are there better vehicles than a Commission to achieve the same results?</p> <p>Are the knowledge products and services of Commissions seen as the adequate by the internal and external stakeholders for the Commissions to remain relevant to development agendas and emerging global issues?</p>	<p>Findings and conclusions of the study</p>

Annex 3. Key Informants

COMMISSIONS

Bruce Amos
WCPA, Regional Vice-Chair

Mohammed Bakarr
WCPA, Deputy Chair

Deborah Baranga
CEC, Regional Vice-Chair

Leon Bennun
SSC, Steering Committee

Luigi Boitani
SSC, Steering Committee

Grazia Borrini-Feyerabend
CEESP, Vice-Chair
Co-Chair Working Group

Peter Bos
CEC, Theme Leader

David Brackett
SSC, Chair

David Bramwell
SSC, Plant Conservation Committee Member

Daniel Buckles
CEESP, Member

Jorge Caillaux-Zazzali
CEL, Regional Vice-Chair

Julia Carabias Lillo
WCPA, Steering Committee

Donna Craig
CEL, Steering Committee

Roger Crofts
WCPA and CEM, Member
WCPA Regional Vice Chair

Randall Curtis
WCPA, Member

Rebecca d’Cruz
SSC, Regional Vice-Chair

Holly Dublin
SSC, Steering Committee
Specialist Group Chair

Megan Dyson
CEL, Member

Michael Encalada
CEC, Regional Vice-Chair

Taghi Farvar
CEESP, Chair

Mark Halle
CEESP, Vice-Chair, Working Group Chair

Denise Hamu
CEC, Chair

Mohd Nordin Hasan
CEM, Regional Vice-Chair

Frits Hesselink
CEC, Member

Marc Hockings
WCPA, Vice-Chair

Kheng-Lian Koh
CEL, Vice-Chair

Ashish Kothari
CEESP, Working Group Chair

Elena Kreuzberg-Mukhina
SSC, Specialist Group Chair

Paul Kuruk
CEL, Specialist Group Chair

Danna Leaman
SSC, Specialist Group Chair

Nik Lopoukhine
CEM, Regional Vice-Chair

Georgina Mace
SSC, Steering Committee
Chair, Red List Committee

Hillary Masundire
CEM, Chair

Mike Maunder
SSC, Steering Committee
Plant Conservation Committee

Ricardo Melendez-Ortiz
CEESP, Vice-Chair

Kenton Miller
WCPA, Chair

Rob Monro
CEESP, Member

Ramon Perez-Gil Salcido
SSC, Steering Committee

Adrian Philips
WCPA, Member

Nick Robinson
CEL, Chair

Karen Seto
CEM, Theme Leader

Gill Shepherd
CEM, Steering Committee

Jane Smart
SSC, Plant Conservation Committee

Richard Smith
CEM, Member

Andrew Smith
SSC, SIS and Specialist Group Chair

Bruce Stein
SSC, Member

Paul Stein
CEL, Specialist Group Leader

Lee Thomas
WCPA, Deputy Chair

Daniella Tilbury
CEC, Theme Leader

Gwendolijn van Boven
CEC, Member

Keith Wheeler
CEC, Regional Vice-Chair

Piet Wit
WCPA, Deputy Chair

Wang Xi
CEL, Member

Marija Zupancic Vicar
WCPA, Steering Committee

IUCN COUNCIL

Wren Green
Regional Councillor

Johan Holmberg
Appointed Councillor

Lynn Holowesko
Regional Councillor
Chair, Governance Task Force

Huguette Labelle
Regional Councillor

Dan Martin
Vice-President

IUCN STAFF

Lorena Aguilar Revelo
Senior Adviser, Gender and Regional Coordinator Social
Area Regional Office for Meso-America

Ger Bergkamp
Coordinator, WANI
Water and Wetlands Programme

Joshua Bishop
Senior Adviser, Economics & Environment

Martha Chouchena-Rojas
Head, Policy, Biodiversity and International Agreements
(PBIA)

Andrew Deutz

Acting Head, Canada Office

Lucy Emerton

Regional Group Head, Sri Lanka Country Office

Wendy Goldstein

Focal Point: CEC

Coordinator, Education & Communication

Scott Hajost

Executive Director, USA Multilateral Office

Line Hempel

Head, Budget

Finance Department

William Jackson

Director, Global Programme

Marianne Jacobson

Liaison Officer CEESP

Editor, Trade BioRes

Enrique Lahmann

Regional Director, Regional Office for Meso-America

Nancy MacPherson

Coordinator, Monitoring and Evaluation Initiative

Susan Mainka

Head, Species Programme

Tamás Marghescu

Regional Director, Regional Office for Europe

Aban Marjer Kabraji

Regional Director, Asia Regional Office

Jeffrey McNeely

Chief Scientist

James Muchira

Internal Auditor

James Murombedzi

Regional Director, Regional Office for Southern Africa

Gonzalo Oviedo

Senior Adviser, Social Policy

Miguel Pellerano

Regional Director, Regional Office for South America

Corli Pretorius

Head, Global Communications

Simon Rietbergen

Acting Coordinator: Ecosystem Management

Head, Ecosystem Management Programme

Pedro Rosabal

Senior Program Officer, Programme on Protected Areas

Stuart Salter

Manager, Species Information Service

John Scanlon

Head, Environmental Law Centre

David Sheppard

Head, Program on Protected Areas

Achim Steiner

Director General

Simon Stuart

Coordinator, Global Amphibian Assessment

Ibrahim Thiaw

Regional Director, Regional Office for West Africa

Eldad Tukahirwa

Regional Director, Regional Office for Eastern Africa

Jean-Christophe Vie

Deputy Coordinator, Species Survival Programme

Giuseppe Zaccagnini

Legal Counsel

OTHER KEY INFORMANTS

Heike Baumuller

Program Manager, Natural Resources, ICTSD
Geneva, Switzerland

Peter Bridgewater

Secretary General, Ramsar Convention
Gland, Switzerland

Gabor Bruszt

Konsultation HB
Stockholm, Sweden

Nick Davidson

Deputy Secretary General, Ramsar Convention
Gland, Switzerland

David Dickson

Executive Director
SciDev.Net
London, UK

Louise Fortmann

Professor: College of Natural Resources, University of
California
San Francisco, USA

George Greene

Former Assistant Director General, IUCN
Ottawa, Canada

Kevin Grose

Manager, Information Services
UN Framework Convention on Climate Change
Secretariat
Bonn, Germany

Chris Hails

Director, Programmes, WWF
Gland, Switzerland

Mohammed Hassan

Executive Director, Third World Academy of Sciences
Trieste, Italy

Robert Hepworth

Conventions Division, UNEP
Nairobi, Kenya

Natarajan Ishwaran

Deputy Director, Chief of Natural Heritage Section,
World Heritage Centre, UNESCO
Paris, France

Olivier Jalbert

Programme Officer, Economic, Social and Legal Affairs
CBD Secretariat
Montreal, Canada

Eshan Masood

Biodiversity Coordinator, SciDev.Net
London, UK

Julie Middleton

Environmental Consultant, Palmer Development Group
South Africa

Kalemani Jo Mulongoy

Principal Officer, Science and Technology Affairs
CBD Secretariat
Montreal, Canada

Stephen Nash

Conservation International
Long Island, NY, USA

Walt Reid

Director
Millennium Ecological Assessment
Penang, Malaysia

Thomas Rosswall

Executive Director, ICSU
Paris, France

David Runnalls

President, International Institute for Sustainable
Development
Ottawa, Canada

Richard Sandbrook

Vice Chair UK National Committee / Former Director
IIED
London, UK

Bobbi Schijf

Evaluation Consultant
The Netherlands

Hugh Synge

Editor, Plant Talk
London, UK

Hebe Vessuri

Head, Department of Science Studies, Institute for
Scientific Research
Caracas, Venezuela

KNOWLEDGE PRODUCTS AND SERVICES USERS

* IUCN Commission Member

** IUCN Staff Member

Ariadne Angula

Student, University of Toronto
Canada

Salvatore Arico

Biodiversity Program Officer, Division of Ecological
Sciences UNESCO
France

Jonathan Baillie *

Co-ordinator, Global Mammal Assessment, Zoological
Society of London
United Kingdom

Antonio Benjamin

Director, Lawyers for a Green Planet Institute
Brazil

Peter W Bos *

Senior Executive Officer, International Nature Affairs
Directorate for Nature
Netherlands

Peter Bridgewater *

Secretary General, Ramsar
Switzerland

Carl Bruch

Director, Africa Program
Environmental Law Institute
USA

Markus Burgener *

Lawyer, TRAFFIC
South Africa

Mark Burgman

Professor, School of Botany, University of New South
Wales
Australia

Robyn Bushell *

Head: School of Environment and Agriculture,
University of Western Sydney
Australia

Jorge Cabrera

Lawyer, CITEG-Guatemala
Guatemala

Jorge Caillaux-Zazzali *

President, Sociedad Peruana de Derecho Ambiental
Peru

Rebecca Cairns-Wicks *

Chair, South Atlantic Specialist Group, St Helena Nature
Conservation Group
United Kingdom

Ben Collen

PhD Student, Institute of Zoology, Imperial College of
London
United Kingdom

Peter Christich *

International Officer, Office of International Affairs, US
Environmental Protection Agency
USA

William Cosgrove

Vice-President, World Water Council / Ecoconsult Inc.
Canada

Katalin Czippán *

Director, Environmental Education and Communication
Program
Hungary

Ali Delhavi *

ePOOR (Digital Divide), Pakistan Centre for Trade and
Sustainable Development
Pakistan

Chris Dickens

Director, Umgeni Water
South Africa

David Duthie *

UNEP/GEF Biodiversity Enabling Activities
Kenya

Alejandro Nadal Egea *

Professor, El Colegio de Mexico
Mexico

Edgar Fernández

Researcher, Student
Costa Rica

Bob Fisher *

Consultant, Natural Resources Management Community
Australia

Moustafa Fouda *

Director: Nature Conservation Sector, Egyptian
Environmental Affairs Agency
Egypt

Eliezer Frankenberg *

Deputy Chief Scientist, Nature And National Parks
Protection Authority
Israel

Phil Franks *

ICD Network Coordinator, CARE International
Nigeria

Yolan Friedmann *

Director of Conservation, Endangered Wildlife Trust
South Africa

Lisa Gaylord

Environmental Programme Coordinator, USAID
Madagascar

Donald Gilmour *

Consultant, Queensland
Australia

Pascal Girot *

Environmental Risk Management Adviser
BDP/ESDG United Nations Development Programme
Costa Rica

Janice Golding *

School of Geography and the Environment, University of
Oxford
United Kingdom

Peter Goodman

Coordination Biodiversity Research
Kwazulu-Natal Wildlife
South Africa

Paul Gray *

Coordinator and Senior Program Adviser for Ontario
Parks, Ministry of Natural Resources (Ontario Parks)
Canada

Mike Griffin *

Mammal & Reptile Coordination
Ministry of Environment and Tourism
Namibia

Ronaldo Gutierrez

Founder, Upholding Life and Nature
Philippines

Blair Hedges

Professor, Pennsylvania State University
USA

John Herity *

Director, Biodiversity Convention Office
Environment Canada
Canada

Alexander Heydendael

(Previously) CBD Secretariat
France

Sofia Hira-kuri

Professor of Law, United Nations University - IAS
Japan

Danielle Hirsch

Coordinator for Water/Senior Policy Adviser, Both ENDS
Netherlands

Branka Hlad *

Adviser to the Director, Ministry of Environment and
Physical Planning
Slovenia

Robert Hofstede

Ecuador Programme, University of Amsterdam
Ecuador

Sidney Holt *

Executive Director, International League for the
Protection of Cetaceans
Italy

Margaret Jacobsohn *

Co-Director, Integrated Rural Development and Nature
Conservation
Namibia

Jorge Arturo Jimenez

Director, Organización para Estudios Tropicales
Costa Rica

Kagumako Kakuyo

Senior Program Officer, CBD Secretariat
Canada

Tomáš Kažmierski *

Project Manager, Regional Environmental Centre
Czech Republic

Elin Kelsey *

Elin Kelsey and Company
Monterey
USA

Mariann Kiss

Hortobágyi National Park Directorate
Hungary

Sergei Kuzmin *

Professor, Russian Academy of Science
Russia

Michael Lau *

South China Programme, Kadoorie Farm and Botanic Garden
China

Antonio La Vina

Senior Fellow, World Resources Institute
Philippines

Bill Magnusson *

Researcher, Instituto Nacional de Pesquisas da Amazonia
Brazil

David Marcogliese *

St Lawrence Centre, Environment Canada
Canada

Michal Miazga

Programme Coordinator, Polskie Biuro REC
Poland

Patti Moore

CEL Head of Regional Law Programme
Secretariat Focal Point for Asia, IUCN Asia Regional Office
Thailand

Le Hung Nam

Project Coordinator, Institute of Water Resources Planning (IWRP)
Vietnam

Valerie Neronov *

Deputy Chair, Russian MAB Committee
Russia

Arthur Noguiera

Principal Officer, CBD Secretariat
Canada

Peter Novellie *

Coordinator, Conservation Services, SA National Parks
South Africa

Grzegorz Okolow *

Kampinoski Park Narodowy
Poland

Katarína Oravcová

ŠOP SR, State Nature Conservancy
Slovakia

Arthur Paterson *

International Affairs Specialist, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
USA

Amber Prasad Pant

Professor of Law, Tribhuvan University
Nepal

Thymio Papayannis *

Senior Adviser and Med-INA Director, Convention on Wetlands
Greece

Gilles Pinay *

Centre d'Ecologie Fonctionnelle & Evolutive (CNRS)
France

Lori Pottinger

Director for Africa Programme and Editor, Director, Africa Program and Editor, World Rivers Review
USA

Kishore Rao *

Head, Asia Regional Protected Areas Program
Vietnam

Galen Rathbun *

Chair, Afrotheria Specialist Group, California Academy of Sciences (retired)
USA

Alena Reitschmiedová *

Head: Environmental Education and Public Participation Department, Czech Environmental Institute
Czech Republic

Brian Richter

Director, Freshwater Initiative, The Nature Conservancy
USA

Mark Ritchie *

President, Institute for Agriculture and Trade Policy (IATP)
USA

Robbie Robinson *

Private Protected Areas Consultant
South Africa

Jon Paul Rodríguez *

Chair, National Advisory Specialist Group, Centro de Ecología - IVIC
Venezuela

Carlo Rondinini

PhD Student, University of Rome
Italy

James Perran Ross *

Executive Officer, Crocodile Specialist Group, Florida Museum of Natural History, University of Florida
USA

Patrizia Rossi *

Director, Parco Naturale Alpi Marittime
Italy

Angela Ruiz

Lawyer, Research Institute: Instituto de Estudios en
Enjerico Enero
Peru

Sylvi Ofstad Samstag *

Senior Adviser, Department of Nature Management
Norway

Georgina Santos-Barrera

UNAM, Facultad de Ciencias, Distrito Federal
Mexico

Jeffrey Sayer *

Senior Associate, WWF International
Switzerland

Peter Johan Schei

International Negotiations Director, Directorate for
Nature Management
Norway

Rodolphe Schlaepfer

Swiss Federal Institute of Technology Lausanne
Switzerland

Andreas Schubert *

Scientific Adviser, Secretaria de Medio Ambiente,
Direccion Nationale de Parques
Dominican Republic

Patrick Semwogerere *

Trainer and Communicator, National Wetlands Program
Uganda

Dennis Shoko *

Lecturer, University of Zimbabwe
Zimbabwe

Jadwiga Sienkiewicz *

Head of Department, Institute of Environmental
Protection
Poland

Markku Simula

Indofur
Finland

Vladimir Smakhtin

Principal Scientist, International Water Management
Institute
Sri Lanka

Byung-chun So

Professor, Ajou University Law Department
Korea

Lars Soeftestad *

Community-Based Natural Resource Management
Network and Supras Consult
Norway

Jemaiel Sondes

Lawyer
Tunisia

Andrej Sovinc *

European Coordinator, Parks for Life
Slovenia

Ali Stattersfield *

BirdLife International
United Kingdom

Effendy Sumardja *

Special Assistant Minister, State Ministry of the
Environment
Indonesia

Jan Terstad *

Senior Adviser, Ministry of Environment
Sweden

Tina Trampuš *

Institute for Nature Conservation of the Republic of
Slovenia
Slovenia

Rauno Väisänen *

Director, National Heritage Services
Finland

Domitille Vallee

Coordinator, Dialogue on Water, Food and the
Environment (CGIAR)
Sri Lanka

Peter Paul van Dijk *

Fjordhest-Gard
Netherlands

Minka Vicar *

Senior Adviser, National Education Institute
Republic of Slovenia

Sangay Wangchuk *

Head: Nature Conservation Services, Royal Government
of Bhutan, Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry
Bhutan

Grahame Webb *

Wildlife Management International
Australia

Rod Wentworth

Aquatic Scientist, VT Dept Fisheries and Wildlife
USA

Webster Whande *

Programme Coordinator, PLAAS
South Africa

Sebastian Winkler **

Senior Policy Officer, IUCN Policy, Biodiversity and
International Agreements
Switzerland

Bruce Young *

Regional Coordinator of Global Amphibian Assessment,
Nature Serve
Costa Rica

Masahito Yoshida

Director, Conservation Science Division, NACS-J
Japan

Jana Zacharova

Ministry of Environment, Department of Nature and
Landscape Protection
Slovak Republic

Annex 4. Research Instruments

- 4.1 Commission Leadership Interview
- 4.2 Commission Leadership Interview – Regional Vice-Chairs
- 4.3 Commission Leadership Interview – Sub Group Leaders
- 4.4 Commission Member Interview
- 4.5 IUCN Regional Offices Interview
- 4.6 Knowledge Producers Interview
- 4.7 Knowledge Products and Services Users Interview
- 4.8 Questionnaire for Users of Commission Knowledge Products
- 4.9 Knowledge Products Questionnaire for Secretariat

4. 1 COMMISSION LEADERSHIP INTERVIEW

1. What do you see as the main strengths and weaknesses of the Commission?
2. What are the main risks facing the Commission in doing its job?
3. Are there any other issues regarding the Commission that we should be aware of - either at regional or international levels?
4. What are the main opportunities for the future that the Commission should be focusing on?
5. What impact has the changing IUCN context (“single” programme and regionalization) had on the Commission and its ability to perform well?
6. What interaction do you have with other Commissions?
7. How is the Commission approaching the increased attention in IUCN to the development agenda and issues like poverty?
8. For the Commission membership of your subgroup or region:
 - a. How are members selected?
 - b. Does the current membership represent the strongest people in terms of expertise?
 - c. What proportion would you say is active? What is needed to make more people active?
9. How satisfied are you with the performance of the Commission in this current Intersessional?
 - a. Which parts of the Commission have been the high achieving/most successful ones?
 - b. Which have been the weaker areas?
 - c. What have been the main limitations to achieving an even better performance?
10. What are the Commission’s most important products and services?
 - a. Who are the key audiences or users?
11. What checks and balances do you have for quality control of the knowledge generated and the outputs?
12. What kind of knowledge network is the Commission? Is this what is needed or should the Commission be something different?
13. Which are the key organizations outside IUCN that the Commission seeks to influence? In what ways and using what means?
14. With which other organizations or networks are you most closely collaborating?
15. Which organizations are your main competitors [for funds, members, influence]?
16. What resources (from IUCN or other sources) have you had to support the work you do in the Commission for the current Intersessional? How have these been used?

4.2 COMMISSION LEADERSHIP INTERVIEW – REGIONAL VICE CHAIRS

FOR YOUR REGION

1. What do you see as the main strengths and weaknesses of the Commission?
2. What are the main risks facing the Commission in doing its job?
3. Are there any other issues regarding the Commission that we should be aware of - either at regional or international levels?
4. What are the main opportunities for the future in your region or more broadly that the Commission should be focusing on?
5. What impact has the changing IUCN context (such as the “one” programme and regionalization) had on the Commission and its ability to perform well?
6. What is your strategy to deal with regionalization?
 - a. What interaction do you have with the Regional or Country Offices?
 - b. How do you get the Commission’s input to the program?
 - c. What interaction do you have with other Commissions in the region?
7. How is the Commission approaching the increased attention in IUCN to the development agenda and issues like poverty?
8. For the Commission membership in your region?
 - a. How are members in the region selected?
 - b. Does the current membership represent the strongest people in the region in terms of expertise and/influence?
 - c. What proportion would you say is active? What is needed to make more people active?
9. How satisfied are you with the performance of the Commission in this current Intersessional?
 - a. Which parts of the Commission have been the high achieving/most successful ones?
 - b. Which have been the weaker areas?
 - c. What have been the main limitations to achieving an even better performance?
10. What are the Commission’s most important products and services (in your region/ more generally)?
 - a. Who are the key audiences and users?
11. What kind of knowledge network is the Commission? Is this what is needed or should the Commission be something different?
12. Which are the key organizations outside IUCN that the Commission seeks to influence? In what ways and using what means?
13. With which other organizations or networks are you most closely collaborating?
14. Which organizations are your main competitors [for funds, members, influence]?
15. What resources (from IUCN or other sources) have you had to support the work you do in the Commission for the current Intersessional? How have these been used?

4.3 COMMISSION LEADERSHIP INTERVIEW – SUB GROUP LEADERS

1. What do you see as the main strengths and weaknesses of the Commission?
2. What are the main risks facing the Commission in doing its job?
3. Are there any other issues regarding the Commission that we should be aware of - either at regional or international levels?
4. What are the main opportunities for the future that the Commission should be focusing on?
5. What impact has the changing IUCN context (“one” programme and regionalization) had on the Commission and its ability to perform well?
6. What interaction do you have with other Commissions?
7. How is the Commission approaching the increased attention in IUCN to the development agenda and issues like poverty?
8. For the Commission membership of your subgroup?
 - a. How are members selected?
 - b. Does the current membership represent the strongest people in terms of expertise?
 - c. What proportion would you say is active? What is needed to make more people active?
9. How satisfied are you with the performance of the Commission in this current Intersessional?
 - a. Which parts of the Commission have been the high achieving/most successful ones?
 - b. Which have been the weaker areas?
 - c. What have been the main limitations to achieving an even better performance?
10. What are the Commission’s most important products and services?
 - a. Who are the key audiences or users?
11. What checks and balances do you have for quality control of the knowledge generated and the outputs?
12. What kind of knowledge network is the Commission? Is this what is needed or should the Commission be something different?
13. Which are the key organizations outside IUCN that the Commission [or your subgroup] seeks to influence? In what ways and using what means?
14. With which other organizations or networks are you most closely collaborating?
15. Which organizations are your main competitors [for funds, members, influence]?
16. What resources (from IUCN or other sources) have you had to support the work you do in the Commission for the current Intersessional? How have these been used?

4.4 COMMISSION MEMBER INTERVIEW

1. What Commissions, Specialist Groups or Task Forces are you involved in?
2. What do you see as the main strengths and weaknesses of the Commission or its sub-groups?
3. What are the main risks or problems facing the Commission (or its sub-groups) in fulfilling its goals?
4. What are the main opportunities or new directions for the future that you think the Commission should be focusing on?
5. How and when did you join the Commission? Were you invited or did you apply?
6. Are you involved in Commission or IUCN activities in your region? Do you know other members of the Commission in your region?
7. What does the Commission mean to you as a network? What is its main value to you?
8. How active a member would you say you are? What has been your involvement over the past four years (this current Intersessional)?
9. What are the main reasons for your not being more involved in the work of the Commission?
10. What other networks are you active in or belong to? How do they compare to the Commission?
11. What is your view about the Commission increasing its attention on the development agenda and issues like poverty?
12. What are the Commission's most important products and services? Who in your view are the key audiences or users for what the Commission does?
13. Which are the key organizations outside IUCN that the Commission seeks to influence? In what ways and using what means? Are these the right target groups?
14. How satisfied are you with the performance of the Commission in this current Intersessional?
 - a. Which parts of the Commission have been the high achieving/most successful ones?
 - b. What is your view of the Commission leadership and management?

4.5 IUCN REGIONAL OFFICES INTERVIEW

The Review is of all six IUCN Commissions:

Commission on Ecosystem Management (CEM)
Commission on Education and Communication (CEC)
Commission on Environmental Economics and Social Policy (CEESP)
Commission on Environmental Law (CEL)
Species Survival Commission (SSC)
World Commission on Protected Areas (WCPA)

PLEASE CONSIDER EACH QUESTION IN THE CONTEXT OF EACH COMMISSION THAT YOU KNOW

1. How are the Commissions engaging with your Regional Office? What kind and degree of interaction is there between the RO and the Commissions?
2. What interaction is there between the Commissions and IUCN Members in your region?
3. How are the Commissions adapting to the changing IUCN context (“one” programme and regionalization/decentralization)?
4. What changes do the Commissions need to make to perform more effectively in your region? Is there any particular organizational model for a Commission that seems to work best at the regional level?
5. In your region, does the membership of the different Commissions represent the state of the art in their fields?
6. What other knowledge networks exist in the region that can compete with the Commissions in their areas of competence?
7. How effective is the leadership of the different Commissions within your region?
8. Are you able to access the Commission members in your region? Do you know who or where they are?
9. Can you give me some examples of successful outputs/impacts of any Commission in your region?

4.6 KNOWLEDGE PRODUCERS INTERVIEW

- Knowledge product/service name
- Interviewee/informant's surname, name, title, position, institution, country, email, telephone – *preferably from sources other than the interviewee in order not to waste his/her time during the interview*. An Excel template should be used with fields in the order of the information required
- Date and time interviewed, and by whom
- The reason why the person was interviewed (author, editor, working group chair, key informant for this product, etc.)

Short introduction based on, and extending, the content of the email request for the interview. Use own initiative depending on type and background of person interviewed. Make sure he/she understands what is meant by knowledge products and services – refer to list in Working Document.

Note that the user could be external or internal to the IUCN, and in the latter case can be a Commission member, Secretariat or IUCN Member. Please adjust your questions if necessary to suit the particular informant's circumstances.

1. Placing the Informant

- 1.1 Note beforehand where possible, and otherwise ask, if and in what way they are linked to IUCN.
- 1.2 For how long have you been acquainted with the IUCN Commission(s)? In what capacities did you work with them/serve as member (if relevant)? (What are your linkages to IUCN and its Commissions?)

2. Conceptualization of the Knowledge Product/Service

(The rest of the interview focuses on the particular knowledge product under consideration. Please refer to the product by its name when conducting the interview).

- 2.1 Who initiated the idea of the knowledge product/service? Who developed the concept?
- 2.2 What were the “driving forces” that led to the idea and development of the knowledge product/service? In other words, what were the primary reasons why this product was a Commission priority for this Intersessional period?
- 2.3 If this was not answered in 2.2: How did you determine that the product responds to a specific need in the field and how did you ensure that you had a good assessment of the field? Did you use a situation analysis, for example?
- 2.4 Do you believe that the reasons for generating the product were appropriate, taking into account the mandate and purpose of this Commission and of IUCN Commissions in general? Please explain your answer.
- 2.4 How did you get involved in the development/creation of this knowledge product/service? What motivated you to become involved?
- 2.5 Who else were key players and in what roles/what did they contribute?
- 2.7 What value did the knowledge product/service add to its field? And to the work of the Commission?
- 2.7a How purposeful are you in ensuring that your product(s) add the greatest value when you take your comparative advantages into account? (asked of Commission Chairs and other Commission leaders)
- 2.8 Is it in your view a “cutting edge” product/service? Does it advance the frontiers of knowledge in areas that are *at present* considered relevant to the conservation movement? Please give reasons for your answer.

- 2.9 Does this product/service link to or inform any major global issues (poverty, trade, security, PRSPs and MDGs)? If so, please note the area(s) and the measure to which it informs this issue/these issues.
- 2.10 How is this product/service positioned *relative to those of other knowledge providers* in the field? Please give reasons for your answer.
- 2.11 What quality control mechanisms and processes were used to ensure the quality of this knowledge product/service?
- 2.12 Do you have established standards and/or guidelines that are part of your quality control processes?

3. Targeting the Audience

- 3.1 Who did you regard as the primary potential users of this product/service? In other words, at whom was it aimed?
- 3.2 Were you (and the others involved in the production of the product/service) from the beginning clear about the agendas and audiences you wanted to influence or whose capacities you were trying to build? Did you develop the knowledge product/service from the beginning with the intended users in mind?
- 3.3 Did you try to identify the key people, the “connectors” or most influential organisations that needed to be targeted in order to increase the potential influence of the product/service? If so, what process (if any) did you follow to identify them?
- 3.4 Has the product addressed the thematic and geographic needs identified during your prioritization processes, for example in your situation analysis?
- 3.5 Did you reach your intended users? Do you have a system in place to monitor this? What would you suggest that can be used to determine whether your product/service is actually used? (e.g. Website downloads; citations)

4. Dissemination

- 4.1 Did you have a strategy for disseminating the product? If so, what were its key elements?
- 4.2 How and where was the knowledge product distributed (or the service implemented)? What factors influenced these distribution patterns?
- 4.3 Were the distribution tools and methods used appropriate to ensure adequate coverage of the targeted audiences (for example, in terms of North/South access)? Please give reasons for your answer.

5. Use and Influence of the Specific Knowledge Product

- 5.1 Do you know of any examples of where the product/service was used? (Probe: how, where, by whom, why)
- 5.2 Do you know of examples where it obtained concrete results (e.g. affected a policy or system) or influenced the knowledge, attitude or behaviour of people or organisations? Could you provide contact details of those who could tell us more?
- 5.2 Are you aware of any unexpected effects of this product/service?

6. Link to IUCN Work and Programme

6.1 To what extent has this product helped you in your planning and work for IUCN? If not, do you think it should have done so? Please explain your answer.

6.2 Was this product/service part of your priorities and work plans during this Intersessional Period?

7. Other

7.1 Are there any other issues you would like to raise with us in the context of what we have discussed?

4.7 KNOWLEDGE PRODUCTS AND SERVICES USERS INTERVIEW

Ensure that you note the following clearly in your transcription

- Knowledge product/service name
- Interviewee/informant's surname, name, title, position, institution, country, email, telephone – *preferably from sources other than the interviewee in order not to waste his/her time*. An Excel template should be used with fields in the order of the information required
- Date and time interviewed, and by whom
- The reason why the person was interviewed (user of knowledge product/service)

Give short introduction based on, and extending, the content of the email request for the interview. Use own initiative depending on type and background of person interviewed. Make sure they understand what we mean by knowledge products and services – refer for your own understanding to the list in our Working Document.

Note for your own information that the user could be external or internal to the IUCN, and in the latter case can be a Commission member, Secretariat or IUCN Member. Please adjust your questions if necessary to suit the particular informant's circumstances.

Note: Do not interview authors, editors or primary drivers of the production of this book with this protocol – another has been designed for this purpose.

1. Placing the Informant

1.1 Note beforehand (if you know), whether they are IUCN Secretariat staff or Commission (which?) member.

IUCN Secretariat	Commission member	No
------------------	-------------------	----

1.2 Do you have any particular linkages to the IUCN Commissions? (Asked to those Users not covered in question 1.1 to see if they have been ex IUCN staff, donor, etc. This includes whether they are IUCN Members)

1.3 How well are you acquainted with the work of the IUCN Commissions? (Note if for a specific one).

Very well	Fairly well	Somewhat	Not really
-----------	-------------	----------	------------

2. Use and Influence of the Knowledge Product

This section refers exclusively to the knowledge product that you need to discuss with them. Use the name of the product/service wherever appropriate.

THE PRODUCT ITSELF

2.1 Are you familiar with this specific product (or service)? If so, how did you first get to know about it? (Give name of product/service).

Very familiar	Fairly familiar	Somewhat familiar	Not at all familiar
---------------	-----------------	-------------------	---------------------

(Note: If they are not familiar with it, you need to terminate the interview here).

2.2 Did you find its style and format attractive and user-friendly? (Note that this question might need to be adapted depending on the type of knowledge product or service). Please suggest improvements if you wish to do so.

Very attractive and user-friendly	Fairly attractive and user-friendly	Needs significant improvement	Not at all attractive and user-friendly
-----------------------------------	-------------------------------------	-------------------------------	---

2.3 Do you believe that this product (or service) is a *credible and reliable* source of information for your work or field of interest? Please explain your answer. (Or: In your eyes what makes it credible and reliable)?

Yes	No	Don't know
-----	----	------------

2.4 Did this product add any value to its field? For example did it generate new knowledge that advanced its field, develop tools or methods, integrate and repackage existing knowledge for new insights, bridge the gap between theory and practice in order to assist practitioners; or develop the capacity of specific (other) groups? Please explain your answer.

Yes	No	Don't know
-----	----	------------

Give them the fields below as examples:

Generated new knowledge that will advance the field	Developed new tools and methods	Integrated and repackaged existing knowledge for new insights	Developed capacity of specific groups (who?)	Bridged gap between theory and practice in order to assist practitioners	Other (please note what they are)
---	---------------------------------	---	--	--	-----------------------------------

2.5 Is it in your view a “cutting edge” product? Does it advance the frontiers of knowledge in areas that are *at present* considered relevant to the conservation movement? Please give reasons for your answer.

Yes, it certainly advances the frontiers of knowledge in relevant areas	It advances the frontiers, but not in currently relevant areas	It does not advance the frontiers, but builds capacity	No, it does not advance the frontiers of knowledge, nor does it build capacity	Don't know
---	--	--	--	------------

2.6 More specifically, does this work link to, or inform in any of the major global issues? If so, please note the area(s) and the measure to which it informs this issue/these issues.

Yes	No	Don't know
-----	----	------------

Area(s) it informs: Poverty___ Trade___ Security___ Culture/religion___ PRSPs___ MDGs___
Other_____

2.7 How is this product (or service) positioned *relative to those of other knowledge providers* in the field? Please give reasons for your answer.

The seminal work in this regard	One of the leading contributions	“One of a crowd”	Irrelevant to the key issues of today in the conservation movement	Don't know
---------------------------------	----------------------------------	------------------	--	------------

2.8 Was the timing of the release of the product (or provision of the service) appropriate to address the need at which it was aimed? Please explain your answer.

Yes, it was appropriate	No, it was too late to make a real impact	It was ahead of its time	Don't know
-------------------------	---	--------------------------	------------

2.9 Would you have preferred the product to be distributed in another way/format? Here we refer to the medium – electronic, CD-ROM, hardcopy, etc. Can you provide guidance on what the best technologies are today for effective distribution of this type of product?

THE USE OF THE PRODUCT

2.10 Who do you believe should be the primary user(s) of this product?

2.11 Did you or your organization use this product (or service) in any way? If not, please explain why not. If yes, please provide examples of use (Special probe needed here – who used it, for what purpose and how, what did it achieve, why this product and not another, etc. Try to build a story around its use.)

Yes we have used it (give examples)	No we have not used it
-------------------------------------	------------------------

2.12 Did you pass on the specific product to any other potential user(s)? If so, to whom and why?

2.13 Do you know of any other examples of use of this product (or service) that we could follow up with other individuals, organisations or initiatives at local, national, regional or global level? If so, please could you provide contact details?

THE INFLUENCE OF THE PRODUCT

2.14 Did the use of the product (or service) lead to any concrete results (for example changes in systems, methods, approaches, policies, guidelines) of which you are aware – both in the case of your own use or its use by others? (In the case of others, and if it is not the contact given in 2.13, ask again for informant contact details. Probe for results – what was achieved and where, what changes took place, in whom, why and can it be attributed directly to this product).

Yes (give examples)	No, I am not aware of any concrete results
---------------------	--

2.15 Can you identify any effect or influence, for example changes in behaviour, knowledge or attitudes that the product (or service) had on yourself, your organization or any initiative of which you are aware? (In the case of others, and if it is not the contact given in 2.14, ask again for informant contact details. Probe for influence – who was influenced and where, what was the nature of the influence, why did the influence take place and can it be attributed directly to this product?).

Yes (give examples)	No, I am not aware of any effect or influence
---------------------	---

2.16 Are you aware of any unexpected effects (considering what you would have predicted the effects to be) of this product (or service)? If yes, please give examples.

Yes (give examples)	No, I am not aware of any unexpected effects
---------------------	--

3. General Perceptions of IUCN/Commissions as Knowledge Provider

3.1 If you are familiar with the work and products of the IUCN Commissions or one of the Commissions, do you regard their knowledge products generally as credible and reliable? (Note to which Commission(s) they refer, if any specific one. Note any comments they might have on this issue. If they say it is *not* reliable or credible, please note the reasons why)

Yes, they definitely are	Most of the time	Only sometimes	Not at all	Don't know
--------------------------	------------------	----------------	------------	------------

3.2 Do you find the knowledge products and services of the Commission(s) in general easily accessible? Please give reasons for your answer.

Yes, always	Most of the time	Sometimes	Not at all
-------------	------------------	-----------	------------

3.3 As a general guideline, in what formats (in book form, on Website, etc.) would you prefer to access these products?

3.4 Can you mention any Commission products and services that stand out as of particular significance? Are there any that you have used extensively?

4. Link to IUCN Work and Programme

4.1 Question only to IUCN Secretariat staff, Commission Executive or Steering Committee member, or IUCN Member: Has this product informed or contributed to your IUCN work plan or its implementation? Please explain your answer.

Yes it has helped me in my IUCN work	No it has not helped me in my IUCN work
--------------------------------------	---

5. Other

5.1 Are there any other issues you would like to raise with us in the context of what we have discussed?

4.8 QUESTIONNAIRE FOR USERS OF COMMISSION KNOWLEDGE PRODUCTS

- Please tick or highlight the boxes where appropriate to indicate your answer.
- Please comment on any aspect where you wish to do so.
- Please note that all individual survey information will be treated as strictly confidential by the Review Team.
- Please note that the “knowledge product” in this questionnaire refers to the product [PRODUCT] of the [COMMISSION]

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

a.	Your organisation							
b.	Country in which you are based							
c.	Level of your work	Policy	Institutional	Programme	Field project	Other (please note level below)		
		Other:						
d.	IUCN affiliation (if relevant)	Commission member (please note which Commission below)			IUCN Member		Secretariat	
		Commission:	CEC	CEESP	CEL	CEM	SSC	WC PA
e.	How familiar are you with the work of the [COMMISSION]?	Very familiar	Fairly familiar	Somewhat familiar			Not at all familiar	
f.	Are you familiar with the knowledge product [PRODUCT]?	Very familiar	Fairly familiar	Somewhat familiar			Not at all familiar	

If you are not at all familiar with the Commission knowledge product in (f) above, please complete and return the questionnaire at this point (It is important for us to know if you are not familiar with the product, so please do not hesitate to return an incomplete questionnaire).

1. The Quality and Contribution of the Knowledge Product

1.1	Do you believe that this knowledge product is a <i>credible and reliable</i> source of information? Please give a reason for your answer.	Yes	No	I don't know
		Comment:		
1.2	In what way, if at all, did this knowledge product contribute to its field? (Please feel free to select more than one.)	It did not contribute in any significant way		
		It generated new knowledge that will advance the field		
		It established new tools and methods		
		It integrated and repackaged existing knowledge for new insights		
		It provides information to develop essential capacity in the field		
		It bridged a gap between theory and practice in order to assist practitioners		
		Other (please specify)		
Comment:				
1.3	Is this knowledge product a “cutting edge” contribution to the field? In other words, has it advanced at the time of its release the frontiers of knowledge in areas that were then, or are now, relevant to the conservation movement? Please explain your answer.	Yes	No	
		Comment:		

1.4	Does the product have a significant focus on, or inform any of the major current global issues (listed right)?			Yes	No	I don't know
		Poverty				
		Trade				
		Security				
		Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers				
		Millennium Development Goals				
		Other (<i>please note</i>)				
Comment:						
1.5	Was the timing of the release of the product appropriate to address the need at which it was aimed?	Yes, it was appropriate	No, it was too late to make a real impact	It was ahead of its time	I don't know	
		Comment:				
1.6	Is the product in the right form, format and style to reach its audience? Please explain your answer.	Yes			No	
		Comment:				

2. The Use of the Knowledge Product

2.1	Did you or your organisation use this product? If not, please indicate the reason. If yes, please provide example(s) of use.	Yes			No		
		Comment and example(s):					
2.2	Who do you believe should be the users of this product? In other words, who would truly benefit from using this product?						
2.3	How would you prefer this type of product to be distributed to be most accessible and useful to you and to other users across the world?	Website	CD ROM	Hard copy	E-book	Other	
		Other:					
2.4	Did you pass the product on to any other potential user(s)? If so, to whom and why?	Yes			No		
		Comment:					
2.5	Do you know of any examples of use of this product by other individuals, organisations or initiatives at local, national, regional or global level? If so, please could you provide examples and relevant contact details?	Yes			No		
		Example(s) of use:					

3 The Influence of the Knowledge Product

3.1	According to your knowledge, what concrete results did the use of the product lead to if any (for example changes in systems, methods, approaches, policies, guidelines)? If you know of concrete results, please provide examples.	Yes (refer to examples)	No, I am not aware of any concrete results
		Example(s):	
3.2	Can you identify any effect or influence, for example changes in behaviour, knowledge or attitudes, that the product had on yourself, your organisation or any initiative of which you are aware?	Yes (refer to examples)	No, I am not aware of any such effect or influence
		Example(s):	
3.3	Are there any other Commission knowledge products (not necessarily from this list) that you have used extensively? Please note which one(s).	Yes	No
		Comment:	

4 Other

4.1	Is there anything else that you would like to share or raise with us in the context of this Review?	Comment:
-----	---	----------

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR VALUABLE TIME.

4.9 KNOWLEDGE PRODUCTS QUESTIONNAIRE FOR SECRETARIAT

- Please tick or highlight the boxes where appropriate to indicate your answer.
- Please comment on any aspect where you wish to do so.
- Please note that all individual survey information will be treated as strictly confidential by the Review Team.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION					
a. Your IUCN position					
Regional Director	Programme Coordinator	Senior Adviser	Commission Focal Point	Regional Commission Focal Point	Country Office Director
b. IUCN Programme Region in which you are based (if applicable):					
c. We have selected the following nine knowledge products of the six Commissions as case studies for the Review. These will be the focus of the questions that follow. Please note your familiarity with each product by ticking the appropriate boxes:					
	KNOWLEDGE PRODUCT			I am familiar with:	I have used:
CEC	i. Nature Management in Partnership - A capacity development programme in communication				
CEESP	iii. <i>BRIDGES Trade BioRes</i> . Technical Newsletter, ITCSD/GETI joint product				
	iv. <i>Policy Matters</i> , Vol. 12, Sept 2003 – Community Empowerment for Conservation.				
CEL	v. <i>Capacity Building for Environmental Law in the Asian and Pacific Region: Approaches and Resources, Volumes I & II</i> . Edited by Donna G Craig, Nicholas A Robinson, Koh Kheng-Lian				
	vi. <i>Flow – The Essentials of Environmental Flows</i> . Edited by Megan Dyson, Ger Bergkamp, John Scanlon. Done in collaboration with WANI.				
CEM	vii. <i>Using the Ecosystem Approach to Implement the Convention on Biological Diversity – Key Issues and Case Studies</i> . Ecosystem Management Series No. 2. RD Smith and E Maltby				
SSC	viii. <i>Guidelines for the Application of Red List Criteria at Regional Levels (Version 3.0)</i> . Prepared by the Species Survival Commission, Jun 2003				
	ix. <i>Species Information Service (SIS)</i> as Applied to the Global Amphibian Assessment				
WCPA	x. <i>Evaluating Effectiveness – A Framework for Assessing the Management of Protected Areas</i> . Best Practice Protected Area Guidelines Series No. 6. Marc Hockings, with Sue Stolton and Nigel Dudley; Series Editor: Adrian Phillips.				

"The knowledge produced by the Commissions is derived from voluntary networks of experts who represent the state of the art thinking and practice in fields of conservation and sustainable development. The knowledge of these experts is delivered to the Union through a variety of outputs such as published books and reports, policy briefs, case studies, data bases, videos, action plans, the provision of technical advice and in some cases field project implementation."

Extract from the Terms of Reference for the Review of the IUCN Commissions 2004.

1.	GENERAL		
1.1	In your opinion, did the products with which you are familiar respond to an articulated need in your region or thematic area? If so, please provide examples. If not, please explain why you think this is the case.	Yes	No
		Comment:	
1.2	Did you or your programme office collaborate with the Commission in i) the generation of any of these knowledge products, or ii) in the application of any of these products in your region or programme? If so, please note which ones.	Yes	No
		Comment: (i) (ii)	
2.	THE DISSEMINATION OF THE PRODUCTS		
2.1	Did you or your office help with the dissemination of any of the knowledge products in the list above? If so, for which products?	Yes	No
		Comment:	
2.2	Have you been involved with any of the Commissions in the development of a dissemination strategy which targeted specific users for any of these products? If so, for which products?	Yes	No
		Comment:	
2.3	On what basis did you target the distribution of these products if it was not part of a jointly developed dissemination strategy with the Commissions?	Comment:	
3.	THE USE OF THE PRODUCTS		
3.1	Did you use any of the knowledge products listed above to assist you in your work during this Intersessional period? If so, please list these and explain how you have used them.	Yes	No
		Comment:	
3.2	Could you provide other examples of use of any of these products listed above, including by other individuals, organisations or initiatives at local, national, regional or global level? Please provide contact details of those involved, if available.	Comment:	

4.	THE INFLUENCE OF THE PRODUCTS		
4.1	Are you aware of any concrete results stemming from the use of any of these products (for example changes in systems, methods, approaches, policies, guidelines)? Please provide examples from your own or others' experience and, if possible, contact details of those who can provide more information.	Yes	No
		Comment:	

External Review of IUCN Commissions 2004

4.2	Do you know of any effect or influence, for example changes in behaviour, knowledge or attitudes, that any of these products had on yourself, your office or any other initiative of which you are aware? Please provide examples and, if possible, contact details of those who can provide more information.	Yes	No
		Comment:	
4.3	Are there any other Commission knowledge products not on this list that you have used extensively? If so, please give examples.	Yes	No
		Comment:	
5.	OTHER		
5.1	Is there anything else that you would like to share or raise with us in the context of this Review?	Comment:	

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR VALUABLE TIME.

Annex 5: Web Survey of Commission Members



IUCN
The World Conservation Union

Web Survey for All IUCN Commission Members

Review of the IUCN Commissions



Introduction Page 1 of 6

[Next](#)


Commissioned by the IUCN Council and the Director General, this Review is an important way for you to provide feedback on the relevance, effectiveness and efficiency of the IUCN Commissions, and ultimately to help improve the performance of IUCN and its Commissions.

Thank you for taking a few minutes to fill out this on-line questionnaire.

Your response **will be received only by the Review Team** and will be regarded as **absolutely confidential**.

A summary of the results will be available to all those who send us responses.


[Next](#)



IUCN
The World Conservation Union

Web Survey for All IUCN Commission Members

Review of the IUCN Commissions



Survey Questions Page 2 of 6

[Prev](#) [Next](#)

1. Of which IUCN Commissions are you a member? (*Check as many boxes as needed*)

<input type="checkbox"/> CEC	<input type="checkbox"/> CEESP	<input type="checkbox"/> CEL
<input type="checkbox"/> CEM	<input type="checkbox"/> SSC	<input type="checkbox"/> WCPA

2. Which one of the Commissions do you see as your **main** affiliation? (Check one box only)

- CEC
- CEESP
- CEL
- CEM
- SSC
- WCPA

[Prev](#) [Next](#)



Web Survey for All IUCN Commission Members

Review of the IUCN Commissions



Survey Questions

Page 3 of 6

[Prev](#) [Next](#)

Please answer the following questions in the context of the main Commission (and its subgroups) to which you belong.

3. How familiar are you with the activities and outputs of your Commission?

Not at all	Only marginally	Fairly familiar	Very familiar
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

4. How familiar are you with the IUCN Interseasonal Programme for 2001-2004 that was adopted at the World Conservation Congress in Amman, Jordan in October 2000?

Not at all	Only marginally	Fairly familiar	Very familiar
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

5. To what extent is the work of your Commission at the cutting edge of its field?

No opinion	Very much so	Mostly	Somewhat	Far from cutting edge
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

6. How relevant do you think the work of your Commission is to the emerging global poverty-environment agenda?

Don't know	Very relevant	Fairly relevant	Not relevant	We should stay focused on the conservation agenda
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

7. In general, how satisfied are you with the management and organization of your Commission?

No opinion	Very satisfied	Fairly satisfied	Dissatisfied	Very dissatisfied
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

8. Has the current leadership of your Commission inspired and motivated you? (Note that the question refers to the *Commission* leadership and not to that of any subgroup)

No	Yes	Not sure	Do not know the leaders
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

[Prev](#) [Next](#)



Web Survey for All IUCN Commission Members

Review of the IUCN Commissions



Survey Questions

Page 4 of 6

[Prev](#) [Next](#)

9. How would you describe the value to you of being a member of your Commission?

10. How involved are you in the work of your Commission (this includes your involvement in any of its subgroups)?

Not at all involved	Only marginally involved	Quite involved	Very involved
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

11. What are the main reasons preventing you from being more involved in the work of the Commission?

12. What other international professional knowledge network(s) are you involved in other than the IUCN Commissions? *Please list up to four (We do not mean your professional associations like an engineers association or University Alumni).*

13. If you could invest your time in **one** international network would it be the IUCN Commission or one of the other networks you have listed in question 12?


My IUCN Commission	One of my other networks
<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

[Prev](#) [Next](#)

IUCN
THE WORLD CONSERVATION UNION

Web Survey for All IUCN Commission Members

Review of the IUCN Commissions



Survey Questions Page 5 of 6

[Prev](#) [Next](#)

The last three questions are for coding purposes.

14. In which country do you live?

15. Please indicate your age group:

Under 40 years

40-59 years

60 years and over


16. Please give your name (*used for security purposes to control access to the survey; you will not be identified by name*)

[Prev](#) [Next](#)

IUCN
THE WORLD CONSERVATION UNION

Web Survey for All IUCN Commission Members

Review of the IUCN Commissions



Thank you! Page 6 of 6

Thank you for your contribution to the review.

Your responses have been registered successfully. Please Close the Web page to Exit.

Annex 6. List of References

The following list represents the documents that were provided to us in hard copy. In addition to these it should be noted that we accessed further information available on websites, including –

- websites of IUCN, each Commission and the Red List Programme
- websites of selected Specialist Groups
- websites of the main Conventions: CBD, CITES, Ramsar, Common Heritage
- Others: Asia-Pacific Centre for Environmental Law, International Centre for Trade and Sustainable Development, International Institute for Sustainable Development.

Through these websites we were able to review Commission documents such as minutes of Steering Committees, Executive Committee meetings, background information on Commission related work on, for example, the IUCN Academy of Environmental Law, the Species bulletin, workshop reports, the Durban Accord, the Durban Plan of Action, the CBD/COP7 Programme of Work on Protected Areas, UN List of Protected Areas and the Ecosystem Approach Principles in the various versions.

Commission Background Documentation

1. Terms of Reference for IUCN Commissions (including amendments)
2. Bylaws of the IUCN Commissions (all but CEESP)
3. Mandates for the IUCN Commissions 1991-1993: Proceedings of the 18th Session of the General Assembly
4. Mandates of the IUCN Commissions, 1994-1996: Proceedings of the 19th Session of the General Assembly
5. Mandates of the IUCN Commissions: 1997-2000. Proceedings of the First World Conservation Congress. 1996
6. Mandates of the IUCN Commissions 2001-2004. Proceedings of the Second World Conservation Congress. 2000.
7. Review of IUCN Commissions, David Munro & Gabor Bruszt, January 1994
8. A Critical Review of Knowledge Management Models, R. McAdam and S. McCreedy, The Learning Organization, 1999, vol. 6, no. 3, p. 91-100
9. The Knowledge Audit, J. Liebowitz et al, Knowledge and Process Management, 2000, vol. 7, no. 1, p. 3-10
10. Review of IUCN Commissions 2000, Gabor Bruszt & Stephen Turner, June 2000
11. Strategic Intentions: Principles for Sustainable Development Knowledge Networks, H. Creech, International Institute for Sustainable Development (IISD), Winnipeg, 2001
12. Commission Annual Workplans: 2001-2004. All except CEESP 2001, 2002
13. Commission Intersessional Programmes 2001-2004
14. Quarter 1 - 2003 Perceptions of Interactions with Commissions, 2003
15. Quarter 3 - 2003 Perceptions of Interactions with Commissions, 2003
16. Report of the Consultative Group on Commissions, April 2003
17. Criteria and Terms of Reference for Commission Chairs: Election of Chairs of IUCN Commissions: Letter from Achim Steiner, Director General, November 14, 2003

18. Knowledge Networks: Guidelines for Assessment, H. Creech and A. Ramji, International Institute for Sustainable Development (IISD), Winnipeg, 2004
19. Measuring While You Manage: Planning, Monitoring and Evaluation Knowledge Networks, H. Creech, International Institute for Sustainable Development (IISD), Winnipeg, 2004
20. IUCN Commission Members and Membership List on CD, IUCN, January 2004
21. Pre-2000 Knowledge Products – Summary, Alex Moiseev, M&E Initiative, January 2004
22. IUCN Commission Review: Knowledge Products - Lists, Range and Reach, Alex Moiseev, M&E Initiative, January 2004
23. Commission Intersessional Programme Drafts 2005-2008

Commission on Ecosystem Management (CEM)

1. Extractive Industries in Arid and Semi-Arid Zones: Environmental Planning and Management, Ecosystem Management Series, No. 1, IUCN, CEM & UNCCD
2. Commission on Ecosystem Management Steering Committee Meeting, CEM, March 13-15, 2002
3. Using the Ecosystem Approach to Implement the Convention on Biological Diversity: Key Issues and Case Studies, Ecosystem Management Series, No. 2, IUCN & CEM, Ramsar, RHIER, Royal Holloway University of London, WWF, UNESCO, 2003
4. Commission on Ecosystem Management Steering Committee Meeting, CEM, March 6-8, 2003
5. Operationalizing the Ecosystem Approach, Gill Shepherd, CEM, November, 2003
6. ECOSYSTEMS E-Letter, CEM, 2004

Commission on Education and Communication (CEC)

1. CEC Work Programme 2000-2004
2. CEC Annual Workplans for 2001-2004
3. Steering Committee Meeting: Description of the Business Idea or Product Market Combination, CEC, January/February 2001
4. Report of the Steering Committee Meeting, CEC, January 31-February 2, 2001
5. CEC Report to Council October 2001
6. Role & Responsibilities of the Commission Leadership: Revised Steering Committee for 2001-2004, CEC
7. Report of the Steering Committee Meeting, CEC, May 22-24, 2002
8. CEC Report to IUCN Council, May 2002
9. CEC Report to IUCN Council, December 2002
10. CEC Progress and Assessment Report 2002
11. IUCN Committed to People and Nature, CEC, Powerpoint Presentation, 2003
12. Supporting the United Nations Decade of Education for Sustainable Development 2005-2014, CEC, 2003
13. CEC Members' Perception on the Vision and Niche of CEC and Motivation and Expectations, CEC, May 2003
14. Strategic Planning Meeting for the CEC Program 2005-2008 Report; Bossey, Switzerland 26-28 May 2003

15. Visual Identity Manual: IUCN Commission on Education and Communication, CEC in collaboration with the Canadian International Development Agency (CIDA), June 2003
16. Perception Is the Only Reality: Report of a Quick Scan Among Major CEC External Stakeholders: Towards a Strategic Plan for CEC 2004-2010, CEC, June 2003
17. CEC Report to IUCN Council June 2003
18. Report CEC Strategic Planning 2005-2008, CEC, November 2003
19. CEC Business Plan 2005-2008, November 2003
20. Building the Capacity to Manage Critical Protected Areas in the Face of Global Change, Asia Regional Consultative Workshop on PALNet, November 24-26, 2003
21. CEC Report to IUCN Council, December 2003
22. CEC Programme 2005-2008 Draft Report

Commission on Environmental, Economic and Social Policy (CEESP)

1. Community Conserved Areas: A Bold Frontier for Conservation, IUCN, WCPA, CEESP, TILCEPA, CMWG, CENESTA
2. World Alliance on Mobile Indigenous Peoples (WAMIP): Briefing Notes on Mobile Peoples & Conservation, IUCN, WCPA, CEESP, TILCEPA, CMWG, CENESTA
3. Policy Matters: Sustainable Livelihoods & Co-management of Natural Resources, CEESP, issue 10, September 2002
4. Policy Matters: Trade, Environment and Investment: Cancun and Beyond, CEESP, Issue 11, September 2003
5. Policy Matters: Community Empowerment for Conservation, CEESP, Issue 12, September 2003
6. Occasional Papers: Natural Protected Areas and Social Marginalization in Mexico, CEESP, Issue 1, September 2003
7. Governance of Protected Areas: An Emerging Concept at the Vth World Parks Congress, IUCN, WCPA, CEESP, TILCEPA, CMWG, CENESTA, September-December 2003
8. BRIDGES Trade BioRes, ICTSD/CEESP-GETI Biweekly Newsletter. Several Editions, 2003

Commission on Environmental Law (CEL)

1. Environmental Legal Education in the Asia Pacific Region: The Asia-Pacific Center for Environmental Law (APCEL) Experience, Prof. Koh Kheng-Lian, September 2000
2. Chair's Report to Council, 2001 – 28-30 October 2001
3. IUCN ELP Progress and Assessment Report 2001
4. IUCN ELP Progress and Assessment Report 2002
5. IUCN Commission on Environmental Law – A Year in Pictures. Report to Council, December 2002
6. Capacity Building for Environmental Law in the Asian Pacific Region: Approaches and Resources, Craig, D., Robinson N., Koh K-L, (eds) Asian Development Bank, Manila, 2002
7. IUCN ELP Progress and Assessment Report 2003 and 2000-2003
8. IUCN ELP Quadrennial Programme 2001-2004 Draft
9. IUCN ELP Strategic Plan 2002-2003
10. IUCN ELP Annual Workplan and Budget Narrative 2002, 2003, 2004

11. Flow – The Essentials of Environmental Flows. Dyson, M., Bergkamp, G., Scanlon, J. (eds) IUCN. 2003
12. IUCN ELP Draft 2005-2008 Business Plan

Commission on Species Survival (SSC)

1. Evaluation of IUCN SSC & TRAFFIC's Analyses of Proposals to Amend CITES Appendices: Final Report, Universalis, July 2000
2. Voluntarism in the Species Survival Commission of IUCN Final Report, Mark R. Stanley Price, July 2001
3. Species Survival Commission Action Plan Evaluation, SSC, May 2002
4. Guidelines for Application of IUCN Red List Criteria at Regional Levels, Version 3.0, IUCN, SSC, 2003
5. 2003 Directory and Information Resource - Species Survival Commission, SSC
6. Identifying Important Site for Conservation of Freshwater Biodiversity: Extending the Species-Based Approach: Draft, Will R. T. Darwall and Jean-Christophe Vié, SSC, February 2003
7. Assessment and Conservation of Freshwater Biodiversity in Eastern Africa, SSC, May – October 2003
8. IUCN Species Information Service (SIS) and e-IUCN, Sue Mainka, October 31, 2003
9. Species Information Service - Planned Products, SSC, 2004
10. Presentation of the Blue Lists at World Conservation Congress, Bangkok, ETH (Ecole Polytechnique Fédérale de Zurich), January 12, 2004
11. Marine Turtles Response, Sue Mainka, January 21, 2004

World Commission on Protected Areas (WCPA)

1. Analysis of the CNPPA Members Survey for the Development of the CNPPA Strategic Plan, WCPA
2. Ecosystems, Protected Areas and People (EPP) & The Protected Areas Learning Network (PALNet), WCPA
3. Mountains Initiative Task Force, CEM & WCPA
4. Safeguarding Humanity's Common Heritage: IUCN and the World Heritage Convention: Promoting Conservation, Ensuring Credibility, WCPA
5. Conservation Partnerships in Africa 2003, WCPA & CEESP
6. Guidelines for Protected Area Management Categories, WCPA & WCMC, 1994
7. Global Representative System of Marine Protected Areas, Vol. 1-4, Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority, The World Bank and IUCN, 1995
8. Best Practice Protected Area Guidelines Series:
 - No. 1 System Planning for Protected Areas, IUCN & Cardiff University, 1998
 - No. 2 Economic Values of Protected Areas: Guidelines for Protected Area Managers, IUCN & CEM, Ramsar, RHIER, Royal Holloway University of London, WWF, UNESCO, 1998
 - No. 3 Best Practice Protected Area Guidelines Series: Guidelines for Marine Protected Areas, 1999
 - No. 4 Best Practice Protected Area Guidelines Series: Indigenous and Traditional Peoples and Protected Areas: Principles, Guidelines and Case Studies, 2000

- No. 5 Best Practice Protected Area Guidelines Series: Financing Protected Areas: Guidelines for Protected Area Managers, 2000
- No. 6 Evaluating Effectiveness: A Framework for Assessing the Management of Protected Areas, IUCN & Cardiff University, 2000
- No. 7 Transboundary Protected Areas for Peace and Cooperation, 2001
- No. 8 Sustainable Tourism in Protected Areas: Guidelines in Planning and Management, 2002
- No. 10 Best Practice Protected Area Guidelines Series: Guidelines for Management Planning of Protected Areas, IUCN & Cardiff University, 2003
9. Protected Areas: Benefits beyond Boundaries: WCPA in Action, IUCN WCPA, 2000
10. Protected Areas Programme, Vol. 11, no. 3, 2001; Vol. 12, no. 1, 2002; Vol. 12, no. 2, 2002; Vol. 13, no. 1, 2003
11. WCPA - Guide for Members, WCPA, June 2001
12. Vth World Congress on Protected Areas 2003 Business Plan, WCPA, November 2001
13. WCPA Strategic Plan 2002-2012, WCPA, September 2002
14. World Parks Congress and WCPA Steering Committee Meeting: Agenda and Background Documentation, WCPA, October 28-November 1, 2002
15. United Nations List of Protected Areas CD-ROM, IUCN, UNEP, WCMC & WCPA, 2003
16. IUCN Bulletin :no. 2, 2003: Vth IUCN World Parks Congress "Benefits beyond Boundaries", IUCN Headquarters, February 2003
17. World Heritage Convention: Effectiveness 1992-2002 and Lessons for Governance, IUCN, UNESCO, World Heritage, July 2003
18. Securing Protected Areas in the Face of Global Change: Options & Guidelines. Call for Comment and Input, WCPA (Ecosystems, Protected Areas and People Project), August 2003
19. Registration Brochure and Hotel Booking Form & Fact Sheet Pack: Vth World Parks Congress 2003, WCPA, September 8-17, 2003
20. Convention on Biological Diversity Convention of the Parties (CBD COP 7): Trip Report by IUCN/WCPA Team at COP 7, WCPA, 2004
21. Mining and Protected Areas: We Need to Talk, DGO/Article from Plant Talk 35, January 1, 2004
22. WCPA Review: Notes for Commission Review Meeting, David Sheppard, January 29, 2004
23. Report of the Evaluation of the World Parks Congress, Draft, IUCN and Universalia Management Group, February 2004

IUCN Corporate and Programme

1. IUCN Knowledge Management Strategy Paper. Draft Terms of Reference, Corli Pretorius, IUCN
2. IUCN Learning Network: Executive Development for a Sustainable Future, IUCN
3. Definition of a Gender Policy for the Union
4. Equal Employment Opportunity Policy, IUCN Human Resources Department
5. External Review of IUCN Programme, Gabor Bruszt, June 1999
6. WCC Proceedings, Amman, Jordan 2000, IUCN, 2000
7. WCC Resolutions and Recommendations: Amman, Jordan, IUCN, 2000

8. World Protected Areas Leadership Forum: The Inaugural Meeting: Airlie House Report, IUCN, March 2000
9. Vision and Reality: The World Heritage Convention in Action, IUCN Bulletin, no. 2, 2001
10. An Assessment of Progress 2002: IUCN Programme, 2002
11. IUCN Statutes and Regulations, IUCN Headquarters, revised on Oct 10, 2000 and May 29, 2002, respectively
12. Developing a Method for Prioritizing Sites for Freshwater Biodiversity Conservation: Report on a workshop organized by the IUCN Freshwater Biodiversity Assessment Programme, IUCN, Wetlands International, WANI & DGIS, June 2002
13. Human Resources: Recruitment and Appointment: Interns/Volunteers, IUCN Human Resources Department, May 2003
14. Governance Task Force Paper, Equipping IUCN for the 21st Century: The Governance Debate – Past, Present and Future, 5 May 2003
15. Statement of Principles on Equitable Human Resources Development, IUCN Human Resources Department, May 2003
16. IUCN Membership List, IUCN, July 2003
17. Background Paper on Poverty and the Environment: Preliminary Draft Prepared for the Poverty and Environment Workshop of IUCN, August 4-7, 2003
18. IUCN - External Review, External Review Team, October 2003
19. Report of the Governance Task Force, Council Paper UC.59/2003/, Governance Task Force, December 2003
20. IUCN Knowledge Management Strategy Paper, International Institute for Sustainable Development (IISD), January 2004
21. Annual Workplan: The IUCN Programme, 2004
22. IUCN Learning Network: Business Plan, Version 2.0, IUCN, January 2004
23. IUCN Intersessional Programme Draft (commencing in 2005), IUCN Programme, January 2004

Other

1. Millennium Development Goals, Millennium Summit, September 2000
2. Le Patrimoine Mondial, UNESCO, 2001
3. Organizational Assessment : A Framework for Improving Performance, International Development Research Centre and Inter-American Development Bank, 2002
4. Working Paper Series: Is Trade Good or Bad for the Environment? Sorting out the Causality: Working Paper 9201, National Bureau of Economic Research, Inc, September 2002
5. Arctic Marine Strategic Plan, 1st Draft, December 2003
6. Interdisciplinary Research and Management in Mountain Areas (IRMMA), Parks Canada, Banff Centre, IUCN, January 2004

